



**MINISTER
FORESTRY, FISHERIES AND THE ENVIRONMENT
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA**

**GENERAL PUBLISHED REASONS FOR DECISIONS ON APPEAL
IN THE HAKE LONGLINE SECTOR
FISHING RIGHT ALLOCATION PROCESS 2021/2022**

INTRODUCTION

1. These are the General Published Reasons for the Decisions on appeal in the Hake Longline sector: 2021/2022 by the Minister of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (Minister). This document is titled the "*General Published Reasons for Decisions on Appeal in the Hake Longline Sector-Fishing Right Allocation Process 2021/2022*" (the Appeals GPR).
2. The Appeals GPR is structured as follows:
 - 2.1 Introduction;
 - 2.2 Systematic/Cross cutting Grounds of Appeals;
 - 2.3 Quantum Allocation Methodology (QAM);
 - 2.4 Outcome of the Appeals;
 - 2.5 Conclusion; and
 - 2.6 The final allocation of commercial fishing rights in the Hake Longline sector is set out in **Annexures A, B and C** to the Appeals GPR.
3. During February 2022, the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (the Department) completed the Fishing Rights Allocation Process of 2021/2022 (FRAP 2021/22), in the Hake Longline sector. Ms KSH Morake-Makhelemele; Director: Aquaculture Technical Services, published her decisions in respect of the FRAP 2021/2022 in the "*General Published Reasons for the Decisions on the Allocation of 2021/22 Fishing Rights and Quantum in the Hake Longline Sector*" (GPR).
4. Applicants who were dissatisfied with the Delegated Authority's decision were entitled to appeal against the decision(s) of the Delegated Authority, in terms of section 80 of the Marine Living Resources Act 18 of 1998 (MLRA), read with regulation 5 of the Regulations to the MLRA, via the Department's FRAP Appeals online system. The closing date for FRAP 2021/2022 appeals was 29 April 2022. In response to several requests from the fishing industry, the closing date was extended to 29 July 2022. The Department received two hundred and eighty (280) appeals in the Hake Longline sector across the different categories of applicants.

5. Appeals are governed by section 80 of the MLRA read with Regulation 5(3) of the Regulations to the MLRA, published under Government Notice R1111 in Government Gazette 19205, dated 2 September 1998.
6. This Appeals GPR addresses the issues raised in the appellants grounds of appeal, and it sets out how I, in my capacity as the Appeal Authority in terms of section 80 of the MLRA, dealt with these issues to determine and decide the appeals in general.
7. I note, at the outset, that in making my decisions on the appeals that have been submitted against the decisions of the Delegated Authority, I considered and balanced a wide range of factors. These include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - 7.1 The principles and objectives derived from the Constitution that are relevant to the FRAP 2021/2022;
 - 7.2 The principles and objectives of the MLRA as stated in section 2 thereof;
 - 7.3 The purpose and objectives of the 2021 General Policy on the Allocation of Commercial Fishing Rights: 2021 (the 2021 General Policy) read with the various sector specific policies on the allocation of commercial fishing rights: 2021 (the Sector Specific Policies);
 - 7.4 The need to broaden access to the fishing industry, by introducing new entrants to the various fisheries;
 - 7.5 The need for transformation of the fishing industry to achieve equity and to address historical imbalances;
 - 7.6 The desirability of multi sector involvement, facilitating participation through the value chain;
 - 7.7 The need to minimise negative impacts on the fishing industry, including instability or disruption of existing participation in job creation, and minimising job losses;
 - 7.8 The need for sustainable development of the natural resource through, among other, the determination of the Total Allowable Catch (TAC) and/or Total Applied Effort (TAE);
 - 7.9 The need to address the dynamics of each specific fishery;
 - 7.10 The need to minimise the risk of paper quota holders;
 - 7.11 The adjustments that need to be made where related entities have applied for rights in the sectors;
 - 7.12 The need to assess applicants within a category against other applicants in the same category so that new entrants are not unfairly prejudiced on certain criteria where existing right holders may score higher;

7.13 The desirability of giving successful applicants a reasonable prospect of active and meaningful participation in the fishery;

7.14 The Constitutional Court judgment in the matter of *Bato Star (Pty) Ltd v Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism and Others (CCT 27/03) [2004] ZACC*, which provides important guidelines for me to consider when I exercise my duties as gate-keeper of the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (the Department).

8. In arriving at my decisions, I also had regard to the following:

8.1 The 2021 General Policy is a guideline document on the allocation and granting of commercial fishing in terms of section 18 of the MLRA. The granting of rights in the Hake Deep Sea Trawl section will be guided by the 2021 General Policy on the Allocation and Management of Commercial fishing rights read with the Sector Specific Policy on the Allocation and Management of Commercial Fishing Rights in the Hake Longline fishery: 2021 (the Sector Specific Policy).

8.2 The 2021 General Policy and the Sector Specific Policy are based on, among other, the Constitution, the MLRA, the Broad Based Black Economic Empowerment Act, 2003 (Act No. 53 of 2003) (BBBEEA), the National Empowerment Fund Act, 1998 (Act No 105 of 1998) (NEFA), the Promotion of Administrative Justice Act, 2000 (Act No 3 of 2000), the Promotion of Access to Information Act, 2000 (Act No 2 of 2000), and the Protection of Personal Information Act, 2013 (Act No. 4 of 2013) (POPI).

8.3 The 2021 General Policy and the Sector Specific Policy give effect to the objectives of the MLRA as listed in Section 2 thereof. The objectives identified in section 2 of the MLRA are the following:

- (a) *The need to achieve optimum utilisation and ecologically sustainable development of marine living resources;*
- (b) *the need to conserve marine living resources for both present and future generations;*
- (c) *the need to apply precautionary approaches in respect of the management and development of marine living resources;*
- (d) *the need to utilise marine living resources to achieve economic growth, human resource development, capacity building within fisheries and mariculture branches,*

employment creation and a sound ecological balance consistent with the development objectives of the national government;

- (e) the need to protect the ecosystem as a whole, including species which are not targeted for exploitation;*
- (f) the need to preserve marine biodiversity;*
- (g) the need to minimise marine pollution;*
- (h) the need to achieve to the extent practicable a broad and accountable participation in the decision-making processes provided for in this Act;*
- (i) any relevant obligation of the national government or the Republic in terms of any international agreement or applicable rule of international law; and*
- (j) the need to restructure the fishing industry to address historical imbalances and to achieve equity within all branches of the fishing industry.”*

8.4 The objective of transformation of the fishing industry is a constitutional and legislative imperative. The primary vehicle for the promotion of the transformation of the South African fishing industry is the MLRA. Therefore, in exercising any power under the MLRA, regard must be given to the stipulated objectives and principles set out in section 2 of the MLRA with measures to achieve the objective to restructure the fishing industry, to address historical imbalances and to achieve equity within the fishing industry.

8.5 The assessment of appeals is undertaken per the different categories of applicants to ensure that new entrants are not prejudiced when compared to existing rights holders. Those applicants who held rights in the fishery for which they are re-applying during the period 2006 to 2020 are considered as Category A applicants. Applicants who held rights in sectors other than the fishery they are applying for during the period 2006 to 2020 are considered as Category B applicants. Applicants who did not hold commercial fishing rights during the period 2006 to 2020 are considered as Category C applicants. Category B and C applicants are also referred to as “new entrant” applicants.

9 In determining each of the appeals, I considered all relevant factors and the information before me, including but not limited to:

9.1 The Marine Living Resources Act, 1998 (Act No 18 of 1998);

9.2 The Regulations in terms of the Marine Living Resources Act;

- 9.3 General Policy on the Allocation of Commercial Fishing Rights: 2021;
 - 9.4 The Policy for the Allocation and Management of Commercial Fishing Rights in the Commercial Hake Longline fishery: 2021;
 - 9.5 The FRAP applications;
 - 9.6 The Delegated Authority's GPR dated 28 February 2022;
 - 9.7 The Delegated Authority's decision letters;
 - 9.8 The Appeal forms;
 - 9.9 Regulation 5 (3) reports; and
 - 9.10 Relevant case law
- 10 Where necessary and appropriate, the Appeals GPR refers to individual grounds of appeal. However, the Appeals GPR does not respond to each appeal and to every allegation by individual appellants made therein. Specific grounds of appeals which are not addressed in the Appeals GPR, are dealt with in the individual appeal decisions that will be sent to appellants.
- 11 Each appellant in the sector will receive the following documents:
- 11.1 The individual Appeal Decision, incorporating the reasons for such decision;
 - 11.2 Where applicable, a copy of the adjusted score sheet on appeal;
 - 11.3 Entities who are allocated a Hake Longline right on appeal will receive a Grant of Right letter; and
 - 11.4 The Appeals GPR will be published on the Department's website.
- 12 The Appeals GPR is final. However, the allocation of fishing rights is subject to the correctness of the assertions made and information submitted by the applicants / appellants, and performance reviews. If any information in the online application or online appeal process is found not to be true or complete, or if false information is provided, or material information is not disclosed, this may lead to the revocation, suspension, cancellation, alteration or reduction, in terms of section 28 of the MLRA, of any right, license or permit granted on the strength of the FRAP 2021/2022 application or appeal.

SYSTEMATIC/CROSS CUTTING GROUNDS OF APPEAL

Provision of new information on appeal

13 Section 8.4 of the 2021 General Policy regulates information to be considered during the application process and provides *inter alia* that:

8.1 Information to be considered

8.1.1 The approach set out below will be adopted by the Delegated Authority regarding information to be taken into account for assessing the applications:

- (a) ...
- (b) Late information

Information submitted after closing date for applications will not be considered.

14 Whilst the provisions in the various applicable policies are couched in strict terms, I am aware that a policy serves as a guide to decision-making and cannot bind the decision-maker inflexibly. In this regard, I am guided by the Constitutional Court's judgement in the case of *Bato Star Fishing (Pty) Ltd v Minister of Environmental Affairs*¹ where the court held that an approach to procedural fairness requires that policy not be applied rigidly and inflexibly.

15 Moreover, appeals in terms of section 80 of the MLRA are regarded as wide appeals which entail a reconsideration of the application and may include consideration of additional information.

16 In light thereof, where appellants sought to provide additional information to their application forms, on appeal, based on the wide powers afforded to me in my capacity as the Appeal Authority, I considered such further information, provided that the information was in existence at the time when the appellant submitted its original application. This was to ensure that the fairness of the competitive process was not compromised.

¹ (2004 (7) BCLR 687 (CC).

Calculation of Scores

- 17 Several applicants argued that they were not able to test the correctness of the scores which the Delegated Authority allocated to on certain aspects of the application form because they were not clear on how these scores were calculated.
- 18 In my view, the Delegated Authority provided sufficient information on the calculation of scores. These are set on the Delegated Authority's GPR, read with the scoresheets.
- 19 Nevertheless, I have set out below the manner in which the calculations were applied. In addition, an excel file will be published on the DFFE website, which sets out each step in the calculation of scores.

Section 5- Fishing Performance

- 19.1 Fishing performance was calculated by summing the catches across all the years submitted by an applicant and by then dividing this sum by the sum of the applicant's previous allocation for the same years (length of right varied due to right transfers) and by then multiplying the result by 100 to produce a percentage score. Points were allocated on sliding scale based on the performance percentage.

Section 6: Transformation

- 19.2 Question 6.3- The calculation is based on the increase in transformation from the start of the right to 2020 and considers an entity's level of black ownership as well as ownership by women, youth, and disabled people. The values provided for "Black People", "Women", "Youth" and "Disabled persons" were summed for 2006 and 2020, separately as the start and end values and then compared to determine if there had been an increase in transformation. On checking these calculations, it was discovered that applicants with a zero transformation as at 2006, were scored 100% as their increase in transformation between 2006 and 2020. This was because it is not possible to divide any number by zero. I accordingly replaced these 0's with 1 to address the anomaly and gain an accurate reflection of transformation by the applicant.

- 19.3 Question 6.6- In the DA's GPR (page 30), it is stated that the "Applicants were evaluated for their contributions to Employee Share Schemes. Applicants that did not have Schemes in place or where Schemes were not applicable were allocated scores of zero." However, in the table associated with this text it is recorded that applicants that reported share schemes of 0-10% would receive a score of 1. This created inconsistencies in scoring. In order not to prejudice any applicant, I applied a minimum score of 1 consistently to applicants who had no share scheme or who had responded yes to share schemes but provided no % values on this aspect, or where schemes were not applicable, were allocated scores of zero (0). scored entities with no
- 19.4 Question 6.7- Applicants were asked to provide information on Capital Payments they had made to Employee Ownership Schemes for the five years from 2016 to 2020. For each year that an applicant provided information on payments made to the scheme the Delegated Authority scored an applicant 2. For each year that an applicant made no payment and/or provided no information on such payments, the Delegated Authority scored the applicant zero. To achieve consistency, I scored each applicant 1 for each year that an applicant made no payment and/or provided no information on such payments and a score of 2 for each of the five years where an applicant provided a payment value. In total an applicant could score a minimum of 5 and a maximum of 10.
- 19.5 Some appellants argued that questions 6.5 and 6.7 in the application form favour "longer and larger" enterprises and have the effect of marginalising previously disadvantaged groups. The Delegated Authority, in the Regulation 5(3) reports, stated that Appellants were scored based on the 2021 General Policy and Sector-Specific Policy which provide that an applicant's empowerment profile and employee service record will be considered, specifically regarding black people, female, youth, and persons with disabilities (Clause 7.1.8 (f)(iii)). I am satisfied that the applicable policies fairly address the issue of transformation. There may be merit to the Appellant's argument that certain questions, as parts of the balancing criteria, may favour larger companies who have a bigger staff compliment. However, there may well be other balancing criteria that may favour smaller companies. It should also be borne in mind that applicants compete with other applicants within their category, only. I note specifically that Category C applicants were only compared with Category C applicants, some of whom were able to successfully demonstrate meeting

these kinds of larger employee benefits. In a competitive process, it is necessary and reasonable for applicants to be assessed on their ability to create meaningful employment and other societal benefits for their employees, as a way to gauge their intention to participate in the sector and in transforming the sector, if allocated a right. Nonetheless, the Delegated Authority took cognisance in the fact that existing right holders will be in a better position than new entrants to demonstrate their abilities in creating certain opportunities. For this reason, Category C applicants are only compared with other Category C applicants on their scoring, ensuring no prejudice.

- 19.6 Question 6.10- Applicants were assessed on the percentage of their wage bill that was expended on Historically Disadvantaged Individuals. An applicants' percentage contribution to each of the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment (B-BBEE) categories (race, women, youth and disability) to its total wage bill was calculated. Each percentage per B-BBEE category was then allocated a score as per the table on page 31 of the DA's GPR. Each score for the four categories was then added to give a final score. The maximum score that could be attained for this question is 24. During the consideration of the appeals, I found that some applicants had reported more employees under a specific B-BBEE category than the applicant's total number of employees. This is logically impossible. To address this issue I adjusted the total number of employees upward to reconcile with the numbers reported per category. This approach ensured that no applicant was unfairly prejudiced.
- 19.7 Questions 6.11, 6.16, 6.17, 6.19, 6.21, 6.23, 6.24 and 6.26- The DA scored applicants that answered YES to these questions a score of five (5); and applicants that answered "NO", "N/A" or left their response BLANK, were awarded a score of zero (0). Some appellants argued that they are not "designated employers" per the requirements of the Act, and they are therefore not required to comply with the legislation relevant to these questions. I awarded these appellants the maximum of 5 points, where appropriate. In my view, it is neither fair nor reasonable to assess entities on criteria that they are not in law required to comply with. I applied this approach consistently to all questions that related to legislative compliance, where relevant. Question 6.26 on Enterprise Development was scored consistent with the information provided by the applicant.

19.8 Question 6.15: Applicants were requested to indicate what percentage of their annual turnover was expended towards Corporate Social Investment for the three-year period from 2019 to 2021. Applicants that answered "N/A" or left this question BLANK were scored a 0 (zero). For each year that the applicant contributed towards CSI, the applicant was scored a percentage on a sliding scale. The score for each year was added to provide a final score. The maximum score for this question is 9. The DA's GPR refers to question 6.15 instead of 6.14 – it is evident from both the application form and the scoring instructions that the correct reference is 6.15. The Technical Advisory Team, reviewed the Delegated Authority's calculations for 6.15 and, with one exception in Category C, the scores allocated by the Delegated Authority are correct for this question. I applied the same principle as with question 6.6, namely that I applied a minimum score of 1 consistently to applicants who had not contributed to Corporate Social Investment or who had reported yes but provided no values on this aspect.

Section 7- Job Creation

19.9 A scoring protocol was developed to score questions 7.1 (for permanent jobs) and 7.2 (for temporary/seasonal/part time jobs). The data used to calculate scores was limited to the information relating to the year 2020. On question 7.1 the DA scored applicants based on the Total Number of employees. The issue raised on appeal was that this approach unfairly favoured applicants that had a large number of employees in other sectors. I scored question 7.1 for each applicant based on the number of permanent jobs that the applicant holds per ton in the sector. For category A each applicants jobs per tons was divided by the maximum value of job per ton and multiplied by 100 to standardise the result as a percentage. For category B and C, each applicants' total number of permanent jobs was divided by the maximum number of jobs for in its respective category and multiplied by 100 to standardise the result as a percentage. Question 7.2 calculates the part time jobs per ton for category A and total number of part time jobs for category B and C using the same methodology.

Section 8- Dividends and Additional Societal Benefits

19.10 Question 8.4- Only Category A applicants were scored for question 8.4 where the benefit value was calculated using the specified formula:

$$0.55 \times [\text{Total Revenue Paid}] + 0.3 \times (([\text{Number Shares Issued}] \times [\text{Average Value of a Share}]) + ([\text{Total Annual dividends}] - [\text{Annual Dividend Paid to Black shareholders}])) + 0.15 \times [\text{Annual Dividend Paid to Black Shareholders}]$$

The benefit values were then divided by the sum of the allocation (data submitted by the applicants) over the full period submitted and then normalised by scaling to the maximum benefit value per ton and multiplying the result by 100 to produce a percentage score. The Rights Registers per the Department's records was used to replace the allocation data for a second calculation to cross check the applicant's data. The Rights Register score was used as that better reflected the performance of the applicants for this question.

19.11 Question 8.6- Applicants were allocated points based on the following sliding scale depending on the number years the entity has been operating in its local area: 1-5 years=5; 6-10=10; 11-20=15 and 21 and above=20.

19.12 Questions 8.7- There were no limitations in the application form regarding recognized harbours/ports and processing facilities. As a result, applicants submitted long lists of variously spelt or misunderstood options (e.g. vessel names). On reconsideration, the information provided was summarised as 188 combinations of harbours and 625 processing facilities. At the time, given the limitations of the information provided by the FRAP system, the Delegated Authority made the decision to score only harbours and not processing facilities for the period 2006-2020, which changed the maximum possible score from 96 to 45. On appeal, I have included processing facilities in the calculation, and I extended the period under consideration from 2006-2020 to 2006-2021. I scored each of the 16 years out of 3 for harbours and 3 for processing facilities, where the highest scoring option listed is used, thus a possible maximum score of 96 (3+3*16). Each area was scored as follows: "3 points to PE, Cape St Francis and Mossel bay, 2 points for rest and score 1 for Cape Town, Hout bay, Kalk bay, Kommetjie, Gordons bay. If you have more than one harbor per year, the harbour with the highest score needs to be added to the total for the question. If there is more than one with the highest value, only one value needs to be added". Therefore, I upheld the ground of appeal that this question was to be calculated out of 96 and I ensured that all applicants were reassessed based on a total of 96 points for question 8.7.

19.13 Question 8.8- As with question 8.7, applicants had to list the port(s) and processing facilities where their catch is to be landed and processed. The information provided by each applicant was summarised as 113 combinations of harbours and 510 processing facilities. At the time, given the limitations of the data provided by the FRAP system, the Delegated Authority again scored only harbours and not processing facilities for the period 2006-2020 which changed the maximum possible score from 18 to 45. This calculation was revised to include processing facilities. The information provided per applicant was processed to ensure that the planned future frequency of use for all the harbours listed by each applicant totalled to 100%. This methodology was also used for processing facilities. As such, each applicant was scored with a maximum of 3 for future harbour use and 3 for future processing facility, thus a possible maximum of 6 which was multiplied by 3 to reach a maximum score of 18 (3+3*3). Each harbour/processing facility was scored as follows: "3 points to PE, Cape St Francis and Mossel bay, 2 points for rest and score 1 for Cape Town, Hout bay, Kalk bay, Kommetjie, Gordons bay. If you have more than one harbour per year, the harbour with the highest score needs to be added to the total for the question. If there are more than one with the highest value, only one value needs to be added". I therefore upheld the ground of appeals that this question was to be calculated out of 18 points and all applicants were reassessed based on a total of 18 points for question 8.8.

19.14 Question 9.1- Consideration was given to the amount applicants have invested in vessels, marketing, and fish processing. Investment per ton was calculated as the sum of fixed assets over the financial years. The DA's GPR records that the calculations were based on all investment reported (FY2017 to FY2021) and total hake allocation for the period 2006-2020. On reflection the inclusion of FY2021 means the investment by new Right Holders who were allocated a catch exemption could be recognised (n=3). Therefore, the hake allocation was then summed to include 2021 and then normalised by scaling to the maximum investment per ton and multiplying the result by 100. Section 9.1 was only scored for applicants in category A.

19.15 Question 10- Any other general grounds of appeal. Appellants argued that the FRAP process was designed to exclude micro and SMMEs from the hake sectors and the methodology of the Delegated Authority scored and weighed new entrant applicants prejudicially.

19.16 The Delegated Authority responded that together with the assistance of the Hake Longline Assessment team, consideration was had to the sector and its relevant policies, including the 2021 General Policy and the Sector Specific Policy which informed the decisions on the weightings and scoring criteria.

19.17 Furthermore, the Sector Policy states under section 14 with regards to New Entrants: "Whilst being mindful of the dynamics of the sector that were established under the previous long-term rights in respect of investment, performance, economic stability and business growth, the Department will consider the inclusion of new entrants to comply with section 2 Objectives and Principles, as well as section 18(5) of the MLRA of the Department. New entrant applicants will have to demonstrate that they have knowledge, skills and capacity to fish and process hake. However, it shall be noted that there is limited room to accommodate New Entrants in this fishery."

19.18 The Delegated Authority thus assessed applicants in accordance with the methodology set out in the General Published Reasons for the Decisions on the Allocation of 2021/22 Fishing Rights and Quantum in the Hake Longline Fishery (GPR), and in balancing the objectives of the MLRA and policies.

19.19 I note that the Hake Longline fishery is unique and that a delicate balancing exercise is required to meet the objectives of the MLRA, including transformation, sustainability, and job security.

Access to Information

20. Several appellants alleged a lack of access to information and/or reasons to verify their scores.
21. In the relevant Regulation 5(3) reports, the Delegated Authority responded that in the release of information, the Department has complied with the provisions of PAIA and POPIA. The POPIA Act prohibits the Department from sharing third-party confidential information and details without their consent. Applicants were able to request further information as per the process set out in the Delegated Authority's GPR, in accordance with PAIA and POPIA. I note that spreadsheets were made available on the Departmental website to assist applicants with understanding the scoring

methodology used. The Appellant was also able to request further information via CSCapplications@dfre.gov.za as stated in the GPR.

22. I note that section 32 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996, affirms the Appellant's right to access information held by the State.² The Promotion of Access to Information Act 2 of 2000 (PAIA) gives effect to the constitutional right of access to any information held by the State and enables a person to fully exercise and protect all of its rights.
23. The 2021 General Policy³ and the GPR under section 6 on page 16 give provisions for access to information. The GPR stipulates that every applicant will receive: a notification letter informing the applicant of the Delegated Authority's decision, together with the reason for that decision and the manner in which Appeals must be submitted; a scoresheet indicating the applicant's score; access to the electronic copy of the General Published Reasons. Furthermore, the GPR sets out provisions for accessing other applicants' information by using PAIA. The GPR also prescribes provisions and conditions upon granting access to information for the other applicants' applications.
24. I note that subsequent to releasing the GPR, the Delegated Authority also addressed notification letters to applicants informing them that they may the scoresheets used to record the assessment of every application in the fishery at the Department's Offices, Foretrust Building, Martin Hammerschlag Way, Foreshore, Cape Town on the Departments FRAP online system.
25. The Department published on its website the relevant score sheets and quantum allocation methodology formulae, albeit in a redacted format, so as to comply with the POPI Act. Considering all this information I find that applicants were indeed provided with all the necessary information and data, in order to determine whether they have, in fact, been correctly scored and whether quantum/effort has been allocated in a reasonable and correct manner. They received a notification letter informing each applicant of the Delegated Authority's decision on their application, together with the reason for that decision and the manner in which Appeals must be submitted.

² Section 32 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1996.

³ Clause 9.

26. This together with the GPR and the information published on the Departments website appears to be sufficient and reasonable. Appellants were also able to lodge and canvass detailed appeals on their scoring issues undertaken by the Delegated Authority.
27. Furthermore, if an applicant wanted to access application forms of other applicants, they should have taken further steps to request requested such further information in terms of the procedures and provisions of the PAIA, including an appeal in respect of such information granted by the relevant information officer, that it was still dissatisfied with. I accordingly dismissed this ground of appeal.
28. However, I noted that some of the calculations on certain questions was limited/ not clear to the reasonable person. In the spirit of transparency and fairness, detailed explanations of scoring on the relevant questions have been provided in this Appeals GPR. I note that this Appeals GPR only seeks to address overarching issues that apply to several of the appeals as categorised above. Scoring issues on specific questions by individual entities requires that this document and the calculation formulae explanations provided herein, must be read together with individual Appeal Decisions.

OUTCOMES OF THE DELEGATED AUTHORITY

29. The Delegated Authority in awarding rights in this sector recorded the following in the GPR at paragraph 9.3:

Quantum allocation in the Hake longline considered the broad starting principles as stated in the Policy on the Allocation and Management of Commercial Fishing Rights in the Hake Longline Fishery: 2021 sector specific policy, mainly an attempt to balance broadening access to the fishery through the introduction of the new entrants against improving the allocation to the smaller Right Holders to facilitate their meaningful participation in the fishery throughout the value chain while attempting to minimize negative impact on the industry.

30. The Delegated Authority's decision on allocation of Hake Longline rights was: "guided by the General Policy on the Allocation of Commercial Fishing Rights: 2021 and the advice provided by several Assessment Team members. The reasons for exclusionary criteria (improver lodgement,

material defects and non-utilization) have been deal within the General Policy on the allocation of Commercial Fishing Rights: 2021; the Policy on Allocation and Management of Commercial Fishing Right in the Hake Longline Fishery: 2021. A minimum score of 55% for Category A; 80% for Category B and 70% for Category C on the Balancing Criteria was set to determine the successful applicants.

31. This resulted in 22 new entrants in the Hake Longline sector ie. 7 in Category B, 15 in Category C.

31.1 Category A

The Delegated Authority received 105 applications from Category A applicants, and 67 successful Category A applicants were awarded rights. 68 Appeals were lodged by Category A applicants.

31.2 Category B

The Delegated Authority received 129 applications from Category B applicants and 7 successful Category B applicants were awarded rights. 82 Appeals were lodged by Category B applicants.

31.3 Category C

The Delegated Authority received 212 applications from Category C applicants and 15 Category C applicants awarded rights. 132 appeals were lodged by Category C applicants.

32. After setting aside the quantum for successful Category A's, B's and C's; the Delegated Authority distributed 12% of the remaining TAC quantum across 61 of the successful category A right holders, using a quantum ranking.
33. This resulted in 79.89% of the total HLL quantum being allocated among successful Category A right holders; 18% of the total HLL quantum being allocated to new entrants (Category B and C) and 2.11% of the total HLL TAC remained and this was reserved for appeals.
34. The Delegated Authority notes under section 10 of her GPR that the allocation of fishing rights is subject to the correctness of the assertions made and the information submitted by the applicants and the performance reviews. Furthermore, that the right and/or quantum and/or effort allocated

by her may be reduced or increased in the manner and circumstances set out in the GPR, including the appeals process.

OUTCOME OF THE APPEALS

35. There was a total of Two Hundred and Eighty (280) appeals in this sector. Below is an overview of the outcome:

34.1 Category A

Eight (8) entities scored higher than the 55 % threshold on appeal and are eligible to be allocated rights. One (1) entity successfully appealed its categorization as a Category B. Its application was reconsidered as a Category A applicant, and it scored above the 55% threshold. The total number of successful applicants in Category A increases from sixty seven (67) to seventy – six (76).

34.2 Category B

Three (3) entities scored above the 80% threshold of 80% for Category applicants, after the recalculations of scores on appeal. To ensure, among other, stability in the sector, to promote transformation in the industry and to promote middle-smaller entities, I have decided not to revoke any rights and instead to reduce the threshold for Category B applicants from 80% to 76.73%, this being the lowest ranking appeal score of the entity that was awarded a right by the Delegated Authority. On this approach, an additional two (2) Category B applicants score above the threshold on appeal. This will bring the total number of right holders in Category B from seven (7) to nine (9).

34.3 Category C

13 out of the 15 entities that were allocated rights by the Delegated Authority scored more than the 70% threshold for category C applicants after the rescoring on appeals. To ensure, among other, stability in the sector, to promote transformation in the industry and to promote the middle-smaller entities, I have decided not to revoke rights in the sector and to reduce the threshold from 70% to 68,66%, this being the lowest ranking appeal score of the entity that was awarded a right under the Delegated Authority. Six (6) additional applicants scored higher than this threshold on appeal, bringing the total number of rights holders in Category C from fifteen (15) to twenty-one (21).

REVISED CALCULATIONS

36. Where I upheld the grounds of appeal relating to the calculations of the Delegated Authority that had either been incorrectly calculated or the incorrect formula applied for the scores, I did the following:

35.1 To ensure that I achieve a fair and consistent outcome, the calculations of all the applicants in the sector was revised. It was important to revise all the calculation based on the correct formula to ensure that a like-for-like comparison between the applicants per category could be achieved.

35.2 The revised calculations revealed that there was no material impact on any of the applicants in the sense that none of the successful entities were prejudiced.

35.3 Importantly, the revised calculations are separate from the method used to calculate the quantum.

QUANTUM ALLOCATION METHODOLOGY (QAM) ON APPEAL

37. I note the rationale of the Delegated Authority and the balancing of considerations undertaken in adopting the quantum allocation methodology and the allocation of rights that was undertaken per the FRAP, specifically in homage to the General Policy and the advice of the Assessment team.

38. On appeal I have decided to adopt the same Scoring Methodology of the Delegated Authority which seeks to achieve and balance all of the objectives under the MLRA, specifically:

38.1 The desirability of multi sector involvement, facilitating participation through the value chain;

38.2 The need to minimise negative impacts on the fishing industry, including instability or disruption of existing participation in job creation, and minimising job losses;

- 38.3 The need for sustainable development of the natural resource through, among other, the determination of the Total Allowable Catch (TAC) and/or Total Applied Effort (TAE); and
- 38.4 The need to address the dynamics of each specific fishery.
39. To ensure that existing levels of transformation are not jeopardized, implementing a responsible process of transformation, increasing the sustainability of the middle-smaller entities and protecting jobs within the sector and associated industries, I have decided to adjust the thresholds of the Delegated Authority as follows: The threshold of 55 % for Category A will remain the same; the threshold for Category B applicants is adjusted from 80% to 76.73%, and the threshold for Category B applicants is adjusted from 70% to 68,66%, on the Balancing Criteria.
40. Paragraph 4.3 of the Grant of Right letters advised right holders that the TAC "may be reduced or increased, in the manner and circumstances set out in the GPR and after reserved decisions, appeals and reviews have been finalised".
41. To facilitate the admission of additional category A applicants and additional new entrants into the sector, I redistributed TAC as follows:
- 41.1 TAC allocated to Category A right holders had to be reconsidered to ensure that there is an equitable distribution of the resource, and that the TAC limit for HLL is not exceeded;
- 41.2 The minimum allocation was increased from 0.1071% to 0.1165%. Only one category B right holder received less than the new minimum allocation under the DA. I accordingly adjusted this right holder's TAC to the minimum allocation and awarded all newly successful category B and C applicants the minimum allocation;
- 41.3 I reduced the TAC allocated by the DA to successful category A entities, per her decision, which held more than 0.932% (8x the minimum allocation) by 6.5% each;
- 41.4 I reduced the TAC allocated by the DA to successful category A entities, per her decision, which held more than 0.466% (4x the minimum allocation) by 3.7214%.
- 41.5 I allocated to the newly successful category A entities, per my appeal decision, their pre-FRAP TAC allocation. I reduced the TAC allocated of those newly successful category A entities, which held more than 0.466% (4x the minimum allocation) by 3.7214%.

- 41.6 The annexures to this GPR sets out the distribution of the TAC between the different categories and entities.
42. The above Quantum allocation methodology seeks to ensure amongst other, a more equitable distribution of TAC across all right holders, whilst maintaining stability in the sector and promoting small to medium enterprises and transformation.
43. The final list of commercial fishing rights holders in the Hake Longline sector are set out in:
- 41.1. **Annexure A** (Category A);
- 41.2. **Annexure B** (Category B); and
- 41.3. **Annexure C** (Category C).

CONCLUSION

44. This decision will be effective from of the commencement of the 2024 fishing season.
45. Section 80 of the MLRA deems me to be the Appeal Authority over decisions of the Delegated Authority and I have wide appeal powers in terms thereof. I have the power on appeal to award fishing rights, and to overturn the decisions of the Delegated Authority to allocate rights, including decisions related to TAC, where such decision-making is rationale, fair and in line with the provisions of the MLRA and specific policies.
46. Should any appellant be dissatisfied with any aspect of my decision(s), it may apply to a competent court to have this decision judicially reviewed. Judicial review proceedings must be instituted within 180 days of notification hereof, in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Promotion of Administrative Justice Act, 2000 (Act No. 3 of 2000) (PAJA).



MS B D CREECY, MP

MINISTER OF FORESTRY, FISHERIES AND THE ENVIRONMENT

DATE: 4/11/2023

Annexure A: Category A

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
1	HLL21010	Balobi Processors (Pty) Ltd	78,59	1,1784	Sparticus, Karin I	Successful
2	HLL21120	Eyethu Fishing (Pty) Ltd	77,23	0,5791	MFV Highland Queen	Successful
3	HLL21292	Unathi-Wena Fishing CC	73,38	0,9880	Mary Ann, Olivia Marie	Successful
4	HLL21223	Intlanzi Fishing (Pty) Ltd	72,54	1,3304	Arizona	Successful
5	HLL21001	Balobi Fishing Enterprises (Pty) Ltd	71,53	1,1889	Karin I	Successful
6	HLL21228	Hacky Fishing (Pty) Ltd	71,34	1,1106	Swellendam	Successful
7	HLL21002	LM Fisheries (Pty) Ltd	71,23	1,3995		Successful
8	HLL21188	Ocean Ukhozi Fishing (Pty) Ltd	70,72	1,4067	Olivia Marie	Successful
9	HLL21276	Cape Fish Processors (Pty) Ltd	70,60	0,8962	Avril W	Successful
10	HLL21323	Ulwandle Fishing (Pty) Ltd	70,11	3,5138	Highland Queen	Successful
11	HLL21191	Masikhule Fishing CC	69,68	1,0265	Boloko 1	Successful
12	HLL21111	Ferro Fishing (Pty) Ltd	68,78	0,8132	Armando	Successful
13	HLL21097	Impala Fishing (Pty) Ltd	68,75	1,3074	Herman S	Successful
14	HLL21026	The Cape Peninsula Linefisherman CC	68,63	0,8499	Monnickendam	Successful
15	HLL21179	AFD Fishing CC	68,32	0,7360	Boloko 1	Successful
16	HLL21044	Biz Afrika 131 (Pty) Ltd	67,99	2,0260	Shivon	Successful
17	HLL21437	JFP Fishing CC	67,99	0,8869	Kentucky	Successful
18	HLL21016	Interfish (Pty) Ltd	67,72	2,2606	Karin 1	Successful
19	HLL21182	Heatwave Fishing Corporation (Pty) Ltd	67,19	0,8152	Boloko 1	Successful
20	HLL21057	Dyer Eiland Visserye (Edms) Bpk	67,17	1,1369	I Do	Successful
21	HLL21173	TTM Fishing (Pty) Ltd	66,82	0,8303	Shivon	Successful

General Published Reasons for Decisions on Appeal in the Hake Longline Sector Fishing Right Allocation Process 2021/2022

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
22	HLL21051	Combined Fishing Enterprises (Pty) Ltd	66,38	1,0217	Penkop li	Successful
23	HLL21234	Bluefin Holding (Pty) Ltd	66,16	0,6617	Valhalla	Successful
24	HLL21194	Valortrade 1143 CC	65,88	0,7128	Boloko 1	Successful
25	HLL21400	Mast Fishing (Pty) Ltd	65,74	0,9783	Shivon	Successful
26	HLL21303	Sceptre Fishing (Pty) Ltd	65,61	1,1352	Borderer, Nicolette	Successful
27	HLL21256	Humansdorp Community Factory Workers (Pty) Ltd	65,14	1,0145	Shivon	Successful
28	HLL21207	Taridor Five CC	64,92	0,7380	Monnickendam	Successful
29	HLL21083	Yellow Star Trading 1154 (Pty) Ltd	64,56	0,7057	MFV Boloko 1, MFV Olivia Marie, N/A	Successful
30	HLL21235	Cyrel Burrel Fishing CC	64,24	0,8911	Capt De Sousa, Cristo Rei	Successful
31	HLL21146	Ithemba Labantu Fishing (Pty) Ltd	64,13	0,6914	Intini	Successful
32	HLL21154	Saul Cloete & Vernote (Pty) Ltd	63,76	2,4150	Augusta 1	Successful
33	HLL21227	African Star Fishing (Pty) Ltd	63,44	0,6309	Armando	Successful
34	HLL21183	Faulkner Fishing Enterprises CC	63,35	0,7509	Augusta 1	Successful
35	HLL21211	Titancor Eleven CC	63,26	0,6206	Monnickendam	Successful
36	HLL21237	Full Deck Investments (Pty) Ltd	62,96	1,0266	Olivia Marie	Successful
37	HLL21246	Joenardo Fishing CC	62,91	0,8998	Tina ,Abe Shapiro	Successful
38	HLL21241	The Tuna Hake Fishing Corporation Ltd	62,84	6,2946	Abe Shapiro, Capt De Sousa, Staalkop, Ouma, Tiger Fish, Southern Tiger, Tina, Monnickendam	Successful
39	HLL21103	Amaqobela Fishing (Pty) Ltd	62,82	0,6472	Amoria	Successful
40	HLL21107	Vasco Da Gama Fishing CC	62,79	0,8940	Oceana Amethyst	Successful
41	HLL21278	Solomons Fishing CC	62,68	0,7033	Monnickendam	Successful
42	HLL21113	Soundprops 1167 Investments (Pty) Ltd	62,46	0,6787	Emerald	Successful

General Published Reasons for Decisions on Appeal in the Hake Longline Sector Fishing Right Allocation Process 2021/2022

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
43	HLL21205	Finman 213 CC	62,42	0,4780	Monnickendam	Successful
44	HLL21193	Activest Twenty (Pty) Ltd	62,40	0,7281	Olivia Marie	Successful
45	HLL21334	Pakamani Fishing (Pty) Ltd	62,36	2,1726	Pakamani	Successful
46	HLL21190	Genuine Fisheries CC	62,34	0,6033	Augusta 1	Successful
47	HLL21307	Ukloba Fishing (Pty) Ltd	62,32	2,5140	Estrela Do Mar	Successful
48	HLL21141	Sizabantu Fishing Corporation (Pty) Ltd	62,21	0,8743	Olivia Marie	Successful
49	HLL21151	Carpensis Fishing Industries (Pty) Ltd	62,18	0,3955	Silver Hunter, Augusta 1	Successful
50	HLL21109	D and H Fisheries CC	62,15	0,8996	Aquilla	Successful
51	HLL21129	Westfort Fishing CC	61,80	0,5316	South West Lapwing	Successful
52	HLL21055	Gibbiseps Visserye Pty Ltd	61,76	0,5421	Aquila, Monnickendam	Successful
53	HLL21040	Premier Fishing Sa (Pty) Ltd	61,66	0,8595		Successful
54	HLL21258	Versatex Trading 249 Pty Ltd	61,52	1,1485	Shivon	Successful
55	HLL21039	Safrika Fishing CC	61,21	0,5453	MFV Emerald	Successful
56	HLL21305	Al-Aman Fishing	60,81	0,8197	Olivia Marie	Successful
57	HLL21023	Malibongwe Fisheries Pty Ltd	60,66	0,6899	Shivon	Successful
58	HLL21058	Hentiq 1173 (Pty)Ltd	60,63	0,8275	Intini	Successful
59	HLL21098	Open Circle Projects 1 CC	60,46	0,6789	Olivia Marie, Mary Ann	Successful
60	HLL21148	Carina Fisheries CC	60,36	0,4993	Silver Hunter, Boloko 1	Successful
61	HLL21157	VM Young Visserye Bk	60,17	0,6697	Penkop II	Successful
62	HLL21037	Nati Si Nako Fishing CC	59,72	0,4043	MFV Emerald	Successful
63	HLL21122	Nalitha Fishing Group (Pty) Ltd	59,40	4,7913	Cape Frio	Successful
64	HLL21268	Algoa Marine Exporters (Pty) Ltd	59,04	0,8380	MFV Highland Queen	Successful

General Published Reasons for Decisions on Appeal in the Hake Longline Sector Fishing Right Allocation Process 2021/2022

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
65	HLL21156	Deus Te Ajude Fishing (Pty) Ltd	58,98	0,8141	Augusta 1	Successful
66	HLL21189	Yeyethu Fishing (Pty) Ltd	58,96	0,4537	Olivia Marie	Successful
67	HLL21029	Blue Venture Fishing (Pty) Ltd	58,90	0,3916	Monnickendam	Successful
68	HLL21015	Trawl Investments CC	58,09	0,6278	Sulaiman	Successful
69	HLL21108	Maintenance Fishing CC	57,94	0,7526	Penkop II	Successful
70	HLL21304	Zimele Fishing Enterprises	57,59	0,8162	Olivia Marie	Successful
71	HLL21269	J&J Visserye	57,50	0,5504	Cape Frio	Successful
72	HLL21300	Risar Fishing	57,43	1,0359		Successful
73	HLL21069	Pike Rock Fishing Corp CC	56,90	0,5791	Augusta 1	Successful
74	HLL21153	Siyakha Fishing CC	56,55	0,6875	Abraham T	Successful
75	HLL21238	Petersen's Fishing Enterprises CC	56,52	0,4868	Penkop II	Successful
76	HLL21052	Alicente Fishing (Pty) Ltd	55,49	0,9594	Intini	Successful
77	HLL21167	Umzamowethu (Oyster Bay) Fishermens Corporation Cc	54,62		RRR	Unsuccessful
78	HLL21221	Pellsrus Historical Fishing Corporation CC	54,55		Penkop II	Unsuccessful
79	HLL21335	NPS Agencies CC	54,15		Estrela Do Mar	Unsuccessful
80	HLL21101	Kupukani Fishing (Pty) Ltd	53,85		Estrela Do Mar	Unsuccessful
81	HLL21327	Khulani Fishing (Pty) Ltd	53,13		Alpha	Unsuccessful
82	HLL21324	Mossel Bay Indigenous Fisherman CC	52,74		South West Condor	Unsuccessful
83	HLL21042	Rainbow Nation Fishing CC	52,17		Alpha	Unsuccessful
84	HLL21353	Rietvlei Fishing CC	51,73		Emerald	Unsuccessful
85	HLL21265	Siyabona Fishing (Pty) Ltd	49,68		MFV Highland Queen	Unsuccessful
86	HLL21346	Trade-Off 65 (Pty) Ltd	49,67		Intini	Unsuccessful

General Published Reasons for Decisions on Appeal in the Hake Longline Sector Fishing Right Allocation Process 2021/2022

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
87	HLL21086	Alice Community Fishing Enterprise CC	49,41		Alpha	Unsuccessful
88	HLL21160	I Fortune and Crew Proprietary Limited	49,34		Silver Hunter, Sea Pride II	Unsuccessful
89	HLL21295	Kusasa Commodities 63 (Pty) Ltd	48,24		Olivia Marie	Unsuccessful
90	HLL21440	Reiger Visserye Bk	48,12		Emerald	Unsuccessful
91	HLL21131	Ezabantu Fishing (Pty)Ltd	46,52		Highland Queen	Unsuccessful
92	HLL21364	Starmark Trading (Pty) Ltd	46,48		I Do	Unsuccessful
93	HLL21438	Laaggety Visserye CC	45,33		Emerald	Unsuccessful
94	HLL21379	Bafiaansberg (Pty) Ltd	45,14		I Do	Unsuccessful
95	HLL21302	Scotshe Kloof Fishery CC	43,94		Penkop li	Unsuccessful
96	HLL21096	J-Bay Squid Catchers (Pty) Ltd	43,94		Karin 1	Unsuccessful
97	HLL21414	Henbase 2361 CC	42,70		Pakamani	Unsuccessful
98	HLL21195	Yourtrade 19 CC	40,73		Highland Queen	Unsuccessful
99	HLL21429	Injectrade1100 CC	40,41		Sulaiman	Unsuccessful
100	HLL21143	SLH Fishers Ltd	60,73		Silver Hunter, Olivia Marie	Excluded
101	HLL21312	Pimpano Sixteen CC	41,45		Silver Hunter, Sea Pride li	Excluded
102	HLL21214	Diablo Trade 113 (Pty) Ltd	59,01		Monnickendam	Excluded
103	HLL21290	Calamari Fishing (Pty) Ltd	56,88		Herman S	Excluded
104	HLL21525	Govest Eight	34,40		Abraham - T	Excluded
105	HLL21536	Simunye Fishermen CC	31,09			Excluded
106	HLL21508	V G Newman CC	28,62		Amoria	Excluded

Annexure B: Category B

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
1	HLL21085	SeaVuna Fishing Co (Pty) Ltd	89,34	0,7500		Successful
2	HLL21142	Atlantis Seafood Products (Pty) Ltd	82,76	0,6429	Pakamani	Successful
3	HLL21308	Gansbaai Marine (Pty) Ltd	81,75	0,5357	Mary Ann	Successful
4	HLL21003	Rustee (Pty) Ltd	79,39	0,1165	Sparticus,Karin 1	Successful
5	HLL21007	GGA Fishing Enterprizes (Pty) Ltd	79,36	0,3214	Karen I	Successful
6	HLL21370	Canan Fishing (Pty) Ltd	79,33	0,1165	Conquest	Successful
7	HLL21043	West Point Fishing Corporation (Pty) Ltd	78,77	0,4286	Emerald	Successful
8	HLL21004	The Jenny Fishing Enterprises (Pty) Ltd	77,71	0,1165	Karin I	Successful
9	HLL21006	MTV Fishing St Francis Bay (Pty) Ltd	77,08	0,2143	Karin 1	Successful
10	HLL21261	Mayibuye Fishing (Pty) Ltd	76,48		Arizona	Unsuccessful
11	HLL21175	Copper Moon Trading 612 (Pty)Ltd	74,62		Mary Ann	Unsuccessful
12	HLL21079	Ukuloba Kulungile Investments (Pty) Ltd	73,24		Shivon, Valhalla	Unsuccessful
13	HLL21271	Kalmia Trading 1001 Cc	70,16		Nicolette	Unsuccessful
14	HLL21033	Jc Fishing Cc	70,08		Mfv Sao Gabriel	Unsuccessful
15	HLL21252	Bayana Bayana Fishing Cc	69,42		Southern Tiger, Radiant Star	Unsuccessful
16	HLL21009	Ingwe Emnyama Fishing Enterprises (Pty) Ltd	69,38		Karin I	Unsuccessful
17	HLL21480	Moby Dick Fishing Enterprises Cc	69,14			Unsuccessful
18	HLL21008	El Calamar (Pty) Ltd	68,38		Karin 1	Unsuccessful
19	HLL21262	Zimkhitha Fishing (Pty)Ltd	68,00			Unsuccessful
20	HLL21260	Chetty's Fisheries Cc	67,50		Arizona	Unsuccessful
21	HLL21494	Argento Trading 69 Cc	67,01			Unsuccessful
22	HLL21150	Jurassic Fishing Industries (Pty)Ltd	66,97		Allison	Unsuccessful
23	HLL21236	Dewmist Investments Cc	66,52		Capt De Sousa	Unsuccessful

General Published Reasons for Decisions on Appeal in the Hake Longline Sector Fishing Right Allocation Process 2021/2022

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
24	HLL21147	Precious Prospect Trading 110 (Pty) Ltd	66,40		Amalia	Unsuccessful
25	HLL21169	Trade Factor Sixteen (Pty) Ltd	65,68		Malagas II	Unsuccessful
26	HLL21106	Mfv Westerdam (Pty) Ltd	65,67		Staalkop	Unsuccessful
27	HLL21185	Jnc Fishing Pty Ltd	65,20		Cape Challenger	Unsuccessful
28	HLL21233	Sneeuberg Fishing (Pty) Ltd	64,91		Sneeuberg	Unsuccessful
29	HLL21163	South West Trawlers Cc	64,46		South West Lapwing	Unsuccessful
30	HLL21279	Mfv Alberleze Vessel Company (Pty) Ltd	64,12		Sea Pride II, Silver Hunter	Unsuccessful
31	HLL21130	MJM Casula Fishing Cc	64,02		Blue Dolphin	Unsuccessful
32	HLL21161	Mictel Fishing Cc	63,86		Tiyalina	Unsuccessful
33	HLL21025	Spa Fishing Pty Ltd	63,28			Unsuccessful
34	HLL21274	Prima Seevisserye (Pty) Ltd	63,13		Pakamani	Unsuccessful
35	HLL21088	Chapmans Seafood Company (Pty) Ltd	63,12		Leontina Marie	Unsuccessful
36	HLL21239	Rooiberg Bay Fishing Cc	63,00		Tigerfish, Leah Cruz	Unsuccessful
37	HLL21059	Ax Fishing (Pty)Ltd	62,88		Ubuntu	Unsuccessful
38	HLL21038	Masomelele Fishing (Pty) Ltd	62,81		Mfv Sao Gabriel	Unsuccessful
39	HLL21078	Fisherman Fresh Cc	62,42		Boloko 1	Unsuccessful
40	HLL21134	Zelpy 2152 (Pty) Ltd	62,27		Rrr, Conquistador	Unsuccessful
41	HLL21200	Mosgus Fishing And Exporters No 1 Cc	62,13		Rrr	Unsuccessful
42	HLL21287	Houtbay Fishermans Widows Association No2	62,08		Amoria Ddf.344	Unsuccessful
43	HLL21165	Cape Ithemba Fishing (Pty) Ltd	62,01		Allison	Unsuccessful
44	HLL21104	Moniz Fisheries (Pty) Ltd	61,95		Aquilla	Unsuccessful
45	HLL21140	Trade Factor Fifteen (Pty) Ltd	61,46		Ku-Ula	Unsuccessful
46	HLL21315	Trademane (Pty) Ltd	61,18			Unsuccessful
47	HLL21045	Ithuba Yethu Fishing (Pty) Ltd	61,16		Emerald	Unsuccessful

General Published Reasons for Decisions on Appeal in the Hake Longline Sector Fishing Right Allocation Process 2021/2022

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
48	HLL21310	Sagittarius Fisheries (Pty) Ltd	61,12			Unsuccessful
49	HLL21053	Batsilva (Pty) Ltd	61,04		Ubuntu	Unsuccessful
50	HLL21468	Sevlac Investments No.51 CC	61,03			Unsuccessful
51	HLL21132	Gsa Ocean Products (Pty) Ltd	60,92		Bressa	Unsuccessful
52	HLL21126	At All Times Fishing (Pty) Ltd	60,89		Augusta 1	Unsuccessful
53	HLL21198	Sijubilye Fishing (Pty) Ltd	60,79		Santa Cruz	Unsuccessful
54	HLL21371	Nascimento Fishing CC	60,38		Leontina Maria	Unsuccessful
55	HLL21404	Imizamoyethu Fishing (Pty) Ltd	60,24		Elandsberg	Unsuccessful
56	HLL21080	Ocean Rocket Fishing CC	59,89		Oceana Rocket	Unsuccessful
57	HLL21125	Joville Fishing CC	59,55		Sailfish	Unsuccessful
58	HLL21226	Ew Smith Fishing CC	59,36		Cape Fish 1	Unsuccessful
59	HLL21186	Red Hawk Fishing CC	59,26		Predator	Unsuccessful
60	HLL21220	South African Fishing Empowerment Corporation (Pty) Ltd	59,25			Unsuccessful
61	HLL21477	Timowize (Pty) Ltd	59,03			Unsuccessful
62	HLL21164	Rocket Trading 35 CC	58,87		Southwest Lapwing	Unsuccessful
63	HLL21277	Ang Jerry Fishing CC	58,86		Sulaiman Kb123	Unsuccessful
64	HLL21219	Radiant Fishing CC	58,28		Oceanic Hunter	Unsuccessful
65	HLL21213	Penguin Visserye CC	58,19		Ocean Harvest	Unsuccessful
66	HLL21082	Fernandes Fishing CC	57,43		Weskus II	Unsuccessful
67	HLL21443	Changing Tide 113(Pty)Ltd	57,22		Mfv Emerald	Unsuccessful
68	HLL21216	Mount Pleasant Fishing (Pty) Ltd	56,94		Mfv Emerald	Unsuccessful
69	HLL21289	Braxton Security Services CC	56,87			Unsuccessful
70	HLL21067	Helena Rossouw Fishing CC	56,39		Southwest Heron	Unsuccessful
71	HLL21201	Balelo And Santos Fishing CC	55,67		Endurance	Unsuccessful

General Published Reasons for Decisions on Appeal in the Hake Longline Sector Fishing Right Allocation Process 2021/2022

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
72	HLL21390	Biz Afrika 32 (Pty) Ltd	55,16		Silver Hunter	Unsuccessful
73	HLL21244	Yoluntu Sea Products CC	54,99		South West Lapwing	Unsuccessful
74	HLL21243	Via Comdeus Fishing CC	54,98		Penkop II	Unsuccessful
75	HLL21123	Windhoek Fishing (Pty) Ltd	54,80		Windhoek	Unsuccessful
76	HLL21245	Dippa Distributors (Pty) Ltd	54,54		Cape Frio	Unsuccessful
77	HLL21095	Mnajama Trading (Pty) Ltd	54,34			Unsuccessful
78	HLL21192	Ikamvalethu Fishing (Pty) Ltd	53,87			Unsuccessful
79	HLL21124	Douglas H Fishing Pty Ltd	53,43		Oceana Topaz	Unsuccessful
80	HLL21470	Clipper Fishing CC	52,76		Oceana Clipper	Unsuccessful
81	HLL21372	A Penglides (Pty) Ltd	52,52		Swellendam	Unsuccessful
82	HLL21240	Sibange Fishing (Pty) Ltd	52,12		South West Condor	Unsuccessful
83	HLL21495	Raaff Fisheries CC	51,51		Emerald, Pakamani	Unsuccessful
84	HLL21249	Finecorp Trading 113 CC	50,92		Bella	Unsuccessful
85	HLL21068	Palzet Visserye	50,75		Bella Da Lunar	Unsuccessful
86	HLL21493	Marinata Vissersvroue Organisasie CC	50,38		Emerald, Pakamani	Unsuccessful
87	HLL21317	Konsortia Consultancy CC	49,30		Olivia Marie	Unsuccessful
88	HLL21197	Sheatrade 34 CC	48,56		Werkendam	Unsuccessful
89	HLL21145	Boventrek Beleggings (Pty) Ltd	47,58		Swordfish	Unsuccessful
90	HLL21432	Africa S Best 50 Ltd	47,23		Southwest Lapwing	Unsuccessful
91	HLL21476	Siyaphuhlisa Trading (Pty) Ltd	46,55		Emerald	Unsuccessful
92	HLL21457	Palm Springs Fishing	46,43		Emerald	Unsuccessful
93	HLL21330	Isivile Masikhane (Pty) Ltd	46,11		Mpho	Unsuccessful
94	HLL21288	Pelikaan Vissrye (Pty) Ltd	46,10		Emerald	Unsuccessful
95	HLL21380	Garies Consolidated Holdings Pty Ltd	46,08		Liontina Maria, Atlantic Tuna, Atalanta Vessel	Unsuccessful

General Published Reasons for Decisions on Appeal in the Hake Longline Sector Fishing Right Allocation Process 2021/2022

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
96	HLL21061	Spring Forest Trading 295 CC	45,50		Oceana Amethyst	Unsuccessful
97	HLL21054	Trakprops 22 Pty Ltd	45,41			Unsuccessful
98	HLL21074	Scarlet Dawn Trading 243 CC	45,08		South West Lapwing	Unsuccessful
99	HLL21365	Xstinct Trading	45,02		Sulaiman	Unsuccessful
100	HLL21338	Aasbank Fishing (Pty) Ltd	44,32		Wilmag	Unsuccessful
101	HLL21403	Hawston Sefarms Foundation NPC	44,24		Leonita Maria	Unsuccessful
102	HLL21466	Lavender Moon Trading 49 CC	43,39		Oceana Amethyst	Unsuccessful
103	HLL21402	Shazul Trading and Investments	42,17		Wilmag, Southwest Gannet	Unsuccessful
104	HLL21356	Vicky Rose (Pty) Ltd	42,14		I Do	Unsuccessful
105	HLL21267	Community Workers Fishing Enterprises (Pty) Ltd	41,71			Unsuccessful
106	HLL21041	Sinethemba Fishing CC	39,70			Unsuccessful
107	HLL21378	Afro Fishing Workers (Pty) Ltd	38,23		Pakamani, Emerald	Unsuccessful
108	HLL21049	During Visserye Bk	37,92		Oceana Amethyst	Unsuccessful
109	HLL21064	York Point Fisheries CC	37,83		Oceana Amethyst	Unsuccessful
110	HLL21409	J Engelbrecht Visserye CC	37,71		Emerald	Unsuccessful
111	HLL21149	Native Extreme (Pty) Ltd	36,26		Abraham T	Unsuccessful
112	HLL21474	Southern Ambition 384	36,14		Oceana Amethyst	Unsuccessful
113	HLL21351	The Market Deli (Pty) Ltd	35,56		Oceana Amethyst	Unsuccessful
114	HLL21384	Busibenyosi	34,76			Unsuccessful
115	HLL21070	Meermin Visserye (Pty) Ltd	34,19		Amoria	Unsuccessful
116	HLL21062	T&N Visserye Bk	30,83		Oceana Amethyst	Unsuccessful
117	HLL21072	Jaffa S Bay Fishing CC	58,65		Sulaiman	Excluded
118	HLL21385	Silver Solutions 2092 CC	55,94		Mpho	Excluded
119	HLL21412	Klipbank Visserye Personeel (Pty) Ltd	51,88		Leontina Maria	Excluded

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
120	HLL21445	BMC Visserye Bk	53,09			Excluded
121	HLL21012	EFH Walters Fishing CC	52,76		Oceana Amethyst	Excluded
122	HLL21065	Julies Vissery Bk	34,83		Oceana Amethyst	Excluded
123	HLL21242	Ukulima Fishing (Pty) Ltd	54,97		South West Lapwing	Excluded
124	HLL21363	Masiyibambe Njalo (Pty) Ltd	32,42		South West Condor	Excluded
125	HLL21535	K2015290802 (Pty) Ltd	36,78		Cape Challenger	Excluded
126	HLL21471	Dromedaris Visserye (Pty) Ltd	38,93			Excluded
127	HLL21503	Marion Dawn Fishing CC	40,18		Sulaiman	Excluded
128	HLL21405	FG Fishing Enterprises	48,01		Silver Hunter	Excluded
129	HLL21253	Valley River Trading 265 CC	48,84		South West Condor	Excluded

Annexure C: Category C

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
1	HLL21318	Afro Fishing (Pty) Ltd	79,84	1,8750	Swellendam	Successful
2	HLL21152	Khanyisile Fishing (Pty) Ltd	79,83	1,7500	Pakamani	Successful
3	HLL21030	Biz Afrika 1504 (Pty) Ltd	77,78	1,1250	Ocean Harvest	Successful
4	HLL21174	Ukuqala Trading CC	77,00	1,3750		Successful
5	HLL21377	Atlantic Choice Trading (Pty) Ltd	76,58	0,6250	Valhalla	Successful
6	HLL21196	Live Fish Tanks (East Coast) (Pty) Ltd	76,22	1,5000	Augusta 1	Successful
7	HLL21270	Imperial Crown Trading 398 (Pty) Ltd	75,44	0,7500	Nicolette	Successful
8	HLL21094	Zwembesi Farm (Pty) Ltd	75,17	0,5000	I Do	Successful
9	HLL21032	Westshore Fishing (Pty) Ltd	74,97	0,1165	Anneliese, Monnickendam	Successful
10	HLL21155	Silva Fishing Enterprises (Pty) Ltd	74,69	0,1250	Kariba	Successful
11	HLL21320	Kaytrad Commodities Pty Ltd	73,78	1,2500	Fr13 New Build, T83 Newbuild	Successful
12	HLL21448	Ibhayi Sea Food Wholesalers	73,55	1,0000		Successful
13	HLL21251	Izembe Trading 78 CC	72,69	0,2500	Silver Fern, Radiant Star	Successful
14	HLL21077	La Vie Seafood Products (Pty) Ltd	71,51	0,1165	Emerald	Successful
15	HLL21184	Mossel Bay Fishing (Pty) Ltd	71,38	0,3750	Boloko 1	Successful
16	HLL21297	PJFCA (Pty) Ltd	69,57	0,1165	Emerald	Successful
17	HLL21204	African Community Fishing (Pty) Ltd	69,45	0,1165	Ocean Harvest	Successful
18	HLL21118	Lady's Crop Fishing (Pty) Ltd	69,42	0,1165	Oceana Amethyst	Successful
19	HLL21217	Blue Wave Fish Traders (Pty) Ltd	69,27	1,6250	Wilmag	Successful
20	HLL21224	Mnatha Marine Technologies (Pty) Ltd	69,26	0,1165	Aquilla	Successful
21	HLL21021	Merca Fishing (Pty) Ltd	68,66	0,8750	Karin I	Successful

General Published Reasons for Decisions on Appeal in the Hake Longline Sector Fishing Right Allocation Process 2021/2022

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
22	HLL21247	Dried Ocean Products (Pty) Ltd	68,20		Olivia Marie	Unsuccessful
23	HLL21017	Uvimba Trading And Supplies (Pty) Ltd	68,11		Karin I	Unsuccessful
24	HLL21034	Thalassa Investments (Pty) Ltd	67,79		MFV Ouma	Unsuccessful
25	HLL21090	Eerste River Womans Fish Packers (Pty) Ltd	67,44		South West Condor	Unsuccessful
26	HLL21020	Schooner View Fish Traders (Pty) Ltd	66,57		Karin I	Unsuccessful
27	HLL21117	Prairie Pride Trading CC	65,50		Aquilla	Unsuccessful
28	HLL21272	Ithemba Labantu Investments (Pty) Ltd	64,30		Olivia Marie	Unsuccessful
29	HLL21181	J And B Fishing Co (Pty) Ltd	64,11		Augusta 1	Unsuccessful
30	HLL21018	Fishermen Community of Sea Vista (Pty) Ltd	63,95		Karin I	Unsuccessful
31	HLL21019	Iqhawe Fishing (Pty) Ltd	63,59		Karin I	Unsuccessful
32	HLL21024	Mamlambo Fishing (Pty) Ltd	63,34		Karin I	Unsuccessful
33	HLL21048	Chinafric Fishing (Pty) Ltd	61,44		Atlantic Tuna	Unsuccessful
34	HLL21339	Shonalanga Fisheries CC	60,84			Unsuccessful
35	HLL21296	Business Compliance Advisors Pty Ltd	60,00		Emerald	Unsuccessful
36	HLL21332	Premium Seafood International (Pty) Ltd	59,94		South West Condor	Unsuccessful
37	HLL21333	Xcot (Pty) Ltd	59,86		Emerald	Unsuccessful
38	HLL21486	Spot-On Deals Fourty One CC	59,67			Unsuccessful
39	HLL21254	Amaza Fishing (Pty) Ltd	58,92		lingwane	Unsuccessful
40	HLL21050	Zaid Mota Enterprises (Pty) Ltd	58,00		Mary-Ann	Unsuccessful
41	HLL21047	Witsands Fishing CC	57,96		Ocean Blue	Unsuccessful
42	HLL21180	EMS Fishing (Pty)Ltd	57,86		Boloko 1	Unsuccessful
43	HLL21166	Tutibiz (Pty) Ltd	57,84		South West Lapwing	Unsuccessful

General Published Reasons for Decisions on Appeal in the Hake Longline Sector Fishing Right Allocation Process 2021/2022

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
44	HLL21349	Joadem Fishing (Pty) Ltd	57,06		Sea Pride 11	Unsuccessful
45	HLL21499	Shark Diving Gansbaai Cc	56,96			Unsuccessful
46	HLL21178	Kan Trading (Pty) Ltd	56,52		Arizona	Unsuccessful
47	HLL21036	Noordbaai Vissers (Pty) Ltd	55,95		MFV Amalia	Unsuccessful
48	HLL21498	Pearly Beach Fisheries	55,30			Unsuccessful
49	HLL21210	CSW Fish Processing (Pty) Ltd	55,05		Monnickendam	Unsuccessful
50	HLL21060	Agulhas Fishing (Pty) Ltd	54,75		Ubuntu	Unsuccessful
51	HLL21127	Dormex 149 (Pty) Ltd	54,56		Malachite, Intrepid, Atu-S, Active	Unsuccessful
52	HLL21110	Lateral Anchor Brands (Pty) Ltd	54,53		Emerald	Unsuccessful
53	HLL21355	Masmanyane Fishing (Pty) Ltd	54,32		Ocean Harvest	Unsuccessful
54	HLL21177	Nelson The Seagull (Pty) Ltd	54,31		Southern Tiger	Unsuccessful
55	HLL21028	G And G Fisheries	53,70		Abraham T	Unsuccessful
56	HLL21280	Benguela Fish Shop (Pty) Ltd	52,88		Olivia Maria	Unsuccessful
57	HLL21359	Bellaria Fishing Pty Ltd	52,70		Emerald	Unsuccessful
58	HLL21168	Buccaneer Fishing (Pty) Ltd	52,66		Mpho	Unsuccessful
59	HLL21162	Bm Fisheries Pty Ltd	52,63		Monnickendam	Unsuccessful
60	HLL21348	Castle Hill Fishing Company (Pty) Ltd	52,23		Harrier	Unsuccessful
61	HLL21187	Costa And Van Wyk Enterprises (Pty) Ltd	52,19		Augusta 1	Unsuccessful
62	HLL21313	Greenfish Traders Cc	51,88			Unsuccessful
63	HLL21329	Struisbaai Vissersvereniging	51,63		Sea Pride 11	Unsuccessful
64	HLL21459	Improcare134	51,55		New Vessel	Unsuccessful
65	HLL21011	Mohzeen Trading (Pty) Ltd	51,50		Karin 1	Unsuccessful

General Published Reasons for Decisions on Appeal in the Hake Longline Sector Fishing Right Allocation Process 2021/2022

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
66	HLL21534	Speed Track Trading 3009 CC	51,07			Unsuccessful
67	HLL21281	Turquoise Fishing (Pty) Ltd	50,96		Monnaickendam	Unsuccessful
68	HLL21218	Lilitha And Lubanzi Enterprises (Pty) Ltd	50,93		Ocean Harvest	Unsuccessful
69	HLL21105	Decon Foods (Pty) Ltd	49,64		MFV Emerald	Unsuccessful
70	HLL21121	Triton Global Fishing (Pty) Ltd	49,40		Triton	Unsuccessful
71	HLL21497	Gansbaai Abalone	49,28			Unsuccessful
72	HLL21206	Nontozikhoyo General Trading (Pty) Ltd	49,06		Ocean Harvest	Unsuccessful
73	HLL21352	Allied Fishing (Pty) Ltd	48,96		Pakamani	Unsuccessful
74	HLL21215	Misty Sea Trading 350 (Pty) Ltd	48,94		MFV Emerald	Unsuccessful
75	HLL21452	Sea Side Fishing (Pty) Ltd	47,96		Oceana Amethyst	Unsuccessful
76	HLL21208	Singamandla Bafazi Fishing (Pty) Ltd	47,83		Ocean Harvest	Unsuccessful
77	HLL21393	Kholwa Fishing (Pty) Ltd	47,83		Leontina Maria	Unsuccessful
78	HLL21222	Inkululeko Fishing CC	47,20		Arizona	Unsuccessful
79	HLL21326	Oppiball Trading and Investments Pty Ltd	47,07		Oceana Amethyst, Southern Tiger	Unsuccessful
80	HLL21013	Mcr Fishing (Pty) Ltd	46,80		Sulaiman	Unsuccessful
81	HLL21391	Tahiti Fishing (Pty) Ltd	46,46		Monnaickendam	Unsuccessful
82	HLL21286	Bhh Ukuloba Fishing (Pty) Ltd	46,21		Olivia Maria	Unsuccessful
83	HLL21203	Meatrite Goodwood (Pty) Ltd	45,80		Southern Tiger	Unsuccessful
84	HLL21135	Fnt Enterprises (Pty) Ltd	45,77		Boloko 1	Unsuccessful
85	HLL21250	Empuma Fishing Sa (Pty) Ltd	45,62		Emerald	Unsuccessful
86	HLL21340	Elethu Fishing (Pty) Ltd	45,29		I Do	Unsuccessful
87	HLL21347	Your Style Fashions and Homeware (Pty) Ltd	45,29		I Do	Unsuccessful

General Published Reasons for Decisions on Appeal in the Hake Longline Sector Fishing Right Allocation Process 2021/2022

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
88	HLL21467	Ocean Secret (Pty) Ltd	45,29		I Do	Unsuccessful
89	HLL21439	Delmar Marine Pty Ltd	44,80		Sea Pride 11	Unsuccessful
90	HLL21212	Dyanti Fishing (Pty) Ltd	44,52		Monnickendam	Unsuccessful
91	HLL21422	Jua Fisheries	44,43			Unsuccessful
92	HLL21386	Cape Agulhas Marine (Pty) Ltd	44,19		N/A	Unsuccessful
93	HLL21428	Palm Coast Brand (Pty) Ltd	44,13			Unsuccessful
94	HLL21066	Rsi Trading (Pty) Ltd	43,63		Oceana Amethyst	Unsuccessful
95	HLL21337	Hawston Sea Mountain (Pty) Ltd	43,63		Sea Pride 11	Unsuccessful
96	HLL21159	Sea Spray Marine	43,19		Emerald	Unsuccessful
97	HLL21383	Jaymat Enviro Solutions Cc	42,46		Mpho	Unsuccessful
98	HLL21447	M And C Fishing Trawlers (Pty) Ltd	42,38			Unsuccessful
99	HLL21073	Pelagic Trading (Pty) Ltd	41,86		Penkop11	Unsuccessful
100	HLL21284	Sunshine Brand Solutions (Pty) Ltd	41,80		Avril W	Unsuccessful
101	HLL21344	Fisher Women Born by The Sea (Pty) Ltd	41,54		Amoria	Unsuccessful
102	HLL21398	Kumkani Fishing (Pty) Ltd	41,45			Unsuccessful
103	HLL21396	Capensis Fishing (Pty) Ltd	41,38			Unsuccessful
104	HLL21137	Camissa Fishing (Pty)Ltd	41,23		Khoe-Rasi	Unsuccessful
105	HLL21394	Atlantic Fishing Trawlers (Pty) Ltd	41,13		Leontina Maria	Unsuccessful
106	HLL21144	Sihlangene Fishing (Pty) Ltd	40,71		Elbe	Unsuccessful
107	HLL21093	Mnyameni Fishers CC	40,38			Unsuccessful
108	HLL21138	Gaia Fishing (Pty) Ltd	40,38		Penkop IJ	Unsuccessful
109	HLL21357	Guriqua Xam Development Corporation (Pty) Ltd	39,96		Emerald	Unsuccessful

General Published Reasons for Decisions on Appeal in the Hake Longline Sector Fishing Right Allocation Process 2021/2022

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
110	HLL21063	Limilo Fishers (Pty) Ltd	39,63		Augusta	Unsuccessful
111	HLL21115	Dikela Holdings	38,88		Oceana Amethyst	Unsuccessful
112	HLL21231	K2021902901 (South Africa) (Pty) Ltd	38,85			Unsuccessful
113	HLL21430	Ukuloba Pescar Fishing Enterprise (Pty) Ltd	38,63			Unsuccessful
114	HLL21487	Buffeljagsbaai Projects (Pty) Ltd	38,46		South West Condor	Unsuccessful
115	HLL21375	Shamode Trading and Investments (Pty) Ltd	38,43			Unsuccessful
116	HLL21526	Seafreeze Fishing (Pty) Ltd	37,98		Cape Challenger	Unsuccessful
117	HLL21114	Go Fish Enterprises (Pty) Ltd	37,68		Emerald	Unsuccessful
118	HLL21259	West Coast Ranch Projects and Consulting (Pty)Ltd	37,68		Emerald	Unsuccessful
119	HLL21401	Oppikaai Restaurant (Pty)Ltd	37,20			Unsuccessful
120	HLL21341	Ingomso Fishing (Pty) Ltd	35,13		Sea Pride 11	Unsuccessful
121	HLL21345	Sea Fever Fishing (Pty) Ltd	34,79		South West Condor	Unsuccessful
122	HLL21426	Jamalies Take Outs (Pty)Ltd	34,79			Unsuccessful
123	HLL21264	Umnatha Fishing (Pty)Ltd	34,20			Unsuccessful
124	HLL21328	Borderline Industries (Pty)Ltd	32,96		Ido	Unsuccessful
125	HLL21084	K2021373964 (South Africa)	32,88			Unsuccessful
126	HLL21425	TCB Fishing Enterprises (Pty) Ltd	32,74			Unsuccessful
127	HLL21389	Eumar Fishing (Pty) Ltd	32,46		Emerald	Unsuccessful
128	HLL21128	A and A Holdings (Pty) Ltd	31,85		Atu-S,Active	Unsuccessful
129	HLL21446	JDN Consulting (Pty) Ltd	30,79			Unsuccessful
130	HLL21458	Intsikayabafazi Fishing Company	30,79			Unsuccessful
131	HLL21413	Die Lighuis Vissers Vroue (Pty) Ltd	30,63			Unsuccessful

General Published Reasons for Decisions on Appeal in the Hake Longline Sector Fishing Right Allocation Process 2021/2022

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
132	HLL21524	Al-Haadi Trading 300 CC	29,88			Unsuccessful
133	HLL21336	Iliso Fishing (Pty) Ltd	29,63		MFV T83 Newbuild	Unsuccessful
134	HLL21491	K2019388407 (Pty) Ltd	29,46		Arizona	Unsuccessful
135	HLL21417	Siphumelele Fishing (PTY)LTD	29,21			Unsuccessful
136	HLL21301	Batshwasi Fishing and Trawling (Pty) Ltd	28,96		Laxe Dos	Unsuccessful
137	HLL21469	Siyacela Fishing (Pty)Ltd	28,96			Unsuccessful
138	HLL21136	Ukudoba Marine (Pty) Ltd	27,98		Leontina Maria	Unsuccessful
139	HLL21465	Valotype 76 CC	22,59			Unsuccessful
140	HLL21022	Amaqhawe Aselwandle (Pty) Ltd	65,46		Karin I	Excluded
141	HLL21092	Fiskom CC	61,54		Tierkop	Excluded
142	HLL21202	The Network of Training Cape	59,61		Monnickendam	Excluded
143	HLL21298	Marine Empowerment (Pty) Ltd	55,33		Emerald	Excluded
144	HLL21294	PJF Marine CC	54,50		Olivia Marie	Excluded
145	HLL21293	Global Management Services (Pty) Ltd	54,33		Olivia Marie	Excluded
146	HLL21325	Mermaids LI Fishing Company Pty Ltd	51,80		MFV Augusta 1	Excluded
147	HLL21046	B And J Online Solutions (Pty) Ltd	50,40		Boloko 1	Excluded
148	HLL21319	Incushe Fishing CC	49,80		MFV Boloko 1	Excluded
149	HLL21382	Piscium Fishing (Pty) Ltd	49,80		Boloko 1	Excluded
150	HLL21199	Harrys Bay Marine (Pty) Ltd	48,29		Olivia Maria	Excluded
151	HLL21408	Tubby Transport (Pty) Ltd	47,63			Excluded
152	HLL21366	Mvinjane Fisheries Pty Ltd	47,46			Excluded
153	HLL21451	Fishers KB Four (Pty) Ltd	46,94		Swordfish	Excluded

General Published Reasons for Decisions on Appeal in the Hake Longline Sector Fishing Right Allocation Process 2021/2022

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
154	HLL21360	Kerrykeel Investments 518 (Pty) Ltd	46,30		South West Condor	Excluded
155	HLL21087	Blinix Trading CC	46,14			Excluded
156	HLL21358	Ern Logistics	45,96		MFV Emerald	Excluded
157	HLL21263	Hook And Line Fresh (Pty) Ltd	45,87		Emerald	Excluded
158	HLL21502	Challenger Fisheries (Pty) Ltd	44,63		Monnickendam	Excluded
159	HLL21397	Eastcoast Trawling Division (Pty) Ltd	44,30			Excluded
160	HLL21420	Seagull Zone (Pty) Ltd	44,13			Excluded
161	HLL21433	Seeweg Visserye (Pty) Ltd	43,96			Excluded
162	HLL21322	Genisis Fishing (Pty) Ltd	43,79		Mpho	Excluded
163	HLL21418	Ceboletu Fishing (Pty) Ltd	43,79			Excluded
164	HLL21419	Bayete Fishing (Pty) Ltd	43,79			Excluded
165	HLL21454	Hout Bay Standtlopers	43,46		Silver Fern	Excluded
166	HLL21492	Smart Constructive Solutions (Pty)Ltd	43,46		Southern Tiger	Excluded
167	HLL21342	Mustang Fishing (Pty) Ltd	42,38		South West Condor	Excluded
168	HLL21407	Legacy Fishing (Pty)Ltd	42,21			Excluded
169	HLL21473	Cedestial Enterprises	42,21			Excluded
170	HLL21283	Bikutula Fishing Enterprise Limited	42,05			Excluded
171	HLL21450	Shopmate Fish Traders CC	41,99		Sulaiman	Excluded
172	HLL21533	Beyond Fishing (Pty) Ltd	41,64			Excluded
173	HLL21416	Walleys Transport	41,39			Excluded
174	HLL21460	Hangberg Aboriginal Combined Fishers Boatyard (Pty) Ltd	40,46		Silverfern	Excluded
175	HLL21520	Cutlass Fishing (Pty) Ltd	40,01			Excluded

General Published Reasons for Decisions on Appeal in the Hake Longline Sector Fishing Right Allocation Process 2021/2022

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
176	HLL21099	Madikizela Fishing (Pty) Ltd	39,13		Mpho	Excluded
177	HLL21514	Reliable Fishing (Pty) Ltd	38,96		Leontina Maria	Excluded
178	HLL21100	Ulwandle Lwethu Fishing CC	37,88		Highland Queen	Excluded
179	HLL21406	Lufra Traders (Pty) Ltd	37,80			Excluded
180	HLL21005	Cbm Fishing (Pty) Ltd	37,13			Excluded
181	HLL21369	Monkghe Fishing (Pty) Ltd	37,13		Boloko 1	Excluded
182	HLL21456	Zanozuko Fishing	37,13			Excluded
183	HLL21424	Ezantsi Emanzini	36,88			Excluded
184	HLL21392	Sereteng Fishing CC	36,40		Mpho	Excluded
185	HLL21516	Bhotani Group CC	35,51			Excluded
186	HLL21529	Mzansi Afrika Fishing	34,21			Excluded
187	HLL21464	Khanyisani Fishing (Pty) Ltd	33,96		Cape Frio	Excluded
188	HLL21410	Coastal Trawlers (Pty) Ltd	32,21			Excluded
189	HLL21488	Sive Mbontsi	32,21			Excluded
190	HLL21484	Ngokholo Construction Andcleaning and Security	32,18			Excluded
191	HLL21530	Al Andalus Marine Investments	31,51			Excluded
192	HLL21501	Elinye IY Fishing Primary Co-Operative Limited	31,46			Excluded
193	HLL21513	Thukela YI Fishing Co-Operative Limited	31,46			Excluded
194	HLL21436	Calunus (Pty) Ltd	31,38			Excluded
195	HLL21453	Yanginkosi (Pty) Ltd	31,05			Excluded
196	HLL21485	Sejindustries (Pty) Ltd	30,78			Excluded
197	HLL21490	Fish Finder Services (Pty) Ltd	30,51			Excluded

General Published Reasons for Decisions on Appeal in the Hake Longline Sector Fishing Right Allocation Process 2021/2022

No.	App. No.	Entity	Score (%)	TAC (%)	Nominated Vessel	Final Decision
198	HLL21507	Sisonke IY Fishing Co-Operative Limited	30,21			Excluded
199	HLL21478	Soth Eastern Fishing (Pty) Ltd	30,13		MFV Donna Mari	Excluded
200	HLL21505	Phambile Makhosikazi (Pty) Ltd	30,13			Excluded
201	HLL21368	Coerts North West Trading Co-Operative Limited	29,75			Excluded
202	HLL21482	Amiable 8 Trading (Pty) Ltd	29,71			Excluded
203	HLL21306	Southmen Fishing	29,13		Sulaiman	Excluded
204	HLL21350	Abathwa 111 (Pty) Ltd	28,90		Arizona	Excluded
205	HLL21423	Olegado Holdings Pty Ltd	28,46			Excluded
206	HLL21517	2021/985500/07	28,46		Ocean Blue	Excluded
207	HLL21510	RP Williams Pty Ltd	27,71			Excluded
208	HLL21527	SHQ Holdings	27,71			Excluded
209	HLL21381	Ngoza Fishing (Pty) Ltd	27,21			Excluded
210	HLL21441	Elecmatix General	27,21			Excluded
211	HLL21519	Zuludash Group (Pty) Ltd	27,21			Excluded