



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

Provisional General Published Reasons for the Decisions on Appeal in the Horse Mackerel Fishery: 2015/16

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 These are the Provisional General Published Reasons for the Decisions on Appeal in the Horse Mackerel Fishery: 2015/16 (*Provisional Appeals GPR*) by the Minister of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (*Minister*).
- 1.2 The document is structured as follows: (A) Introduction (B) Appeals Process (C) Decisions on Systemic Grounds of Appeals, and (D) Adapted Quantum Allocation Methodology. Annexed to this spreadsheet are the results of the appeals process in terms of fishing rights allocations.
- 1.3 This Provisional Appeals GPR should be read in conjunction with the General Policy on the Allocation and Management of Fishing Rights: 2013 (*General Policy*) as well as the Policy on the Allocation and Management of Fishing Rights in the Horse Mackerel Fishery: 2015 (*HMK Policy*)
- 1.4 This document contains my provisional decision on the allocation of rights and quantum, and is subject to confirmation or variation upon receipt of comments from affected category B right holders. If the continuing verification process, which may include a forensic audit, reveals that a rights holder provided false information or made a material misrepresentation, or if this is required by performance reviews, I will exercise my powers in terms of section 28 of the Marine Living Resources Act, Act 18 of 1998 (*MLRA*).
- 1.5 This Provisional Appeals GPR addresses grounds of appeal of a systemic nature that were raised by appellants and how I propose to deal with these issues, and decide the appeals in general. Where necessary and appropriate, the Provisional Appeals GPR makes specific reference to individual appeals. However, it does not respond to each and every claim and allegation by individual appellants, especially where such complaint is overtaken by the decision I have made on the other grounds of appeal which have been raised. Where appropriate and necessary, specific individual complaints that may not have been addressed in the Provisional Appeals GPR are dealt with in the individual appeal decisions.
- 1.6 Each appellant or affected applicant in the sector will receive the following documents by e-mail:
- A letter incorporating the appellant's score on appeal and indicating whether it is provisionally successful in being allocated a right;
 - The provisional Appeal Decision setting out the reasons for the appeal score;

- Where applicable, a copy of the adjusted score sheet on appeal;
- The Provisional Appeals GPR.

1.7 A Final Appeals GPR will be released once I have received and considered the comments to the Provisional Appeals GPR.

1.8 Appeals are governed by Section 80 of the MLRA read with Regulation 5(3) of the Regulations, published under Government Notice R1111 in Government Gazette 19205, dated 2 September 1998. In arriving at my decisions, the following considerations apply:

1.8.1 I am guided by the objectives of the MLRA as set in section 2 of the Act. I have endeavoured to ensure that my appeal decisions are in line with these objectives;

1.8.2 I am also guided by the prevailing norms of the Constitution and the prescripts of administrative law and specific policies applicable to the fishing industry.

1.8.3 I have considered all relevant information including: (i) the grounds of appeal, (ii) supplementary appeal information, (iii) the Regulation 5(3) reports prepared by the Delegated Authority; and (iv) the outcome of the various review applications in the High Court;

1.8.4 I have also considered legal memoranda and legal opinions, the contents of which documents are confidential and privileged and will not be released without the consent of the Department and myself.

1.8.5 I am also mindful of the guidance of the Courts in exercising my duties. The Constitutional Court, in the matter of *Bato Star (Pty) Ltd v Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism and Others* (CCT 27/03) [2004] ZACC 151 made the following remarks:

“[5] ... Deep-sea trawling... was pioneered in South Africa by a handful of companies who remain dominant in the sector. Like most of the South African economy, the sector is dominated by companies

¹ *Bato Star Fishing (Pty) Ltd v Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism and Others* (CCT 27/03) [2004] ZACC 15 at paragraphs [5] and [6]

that historically were established, owned and managed by white people. Accordingly, one of the ten objectives identified in section 2 of the Marine Living Resources Act, 18 of 1998 (the Act) is:

'(j) the need to restructure the fishing industry to address historical imbalances and to achieve equity within all branches of the fishing industry.'

[6] This objective as well as all the other objectives set out in section 2 of the Act are, by their nature, incapable of immediate or short-term fulfilment. The objectives require action by the executive to facilitate their fulfilment in the medium- and long-term. Measures aimed at the achievement of the goal identified in section 2(j) of the Act need to be taken side by side with the steps designed to fulfil the other objectives identified in the Act. In particular, the Act recognises that the industry exploits a scarce marine resource that may be destroyed if not carefully managed and monitored. Most of the other objectives flow from this realisation. The other objectives identified in s 2 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...'

1.8.6 The Court² also remarked as follows:

"[34] The provisions of s 2 and s 18 make it plain that the obligation imposed upon the decision-maker is an obligation to 'have regard to' the factors mentioned in s 2, and to 'have particular regard to' the factor mentioned in the case of s 18(5). The repetition of the requirement of the factor of transformation indicates its importance and the need for special attention to be given to the questions of restructuring and redress in the fishing industry. The historical imbalances which continue to disfigure the South African economy are felt acutely in the fishing industry. By underlining the importance of restructuring so as to redress imbalances, the Act emphasises that the unjust status quo cannot be maintained simply in the interest of stability. The thrust of the Act in this respect is in keeping with the Constitution, which opens its Preamble by recognising the injustices of the past, and then declares in s 1 that equality is a foundational value. When making his determination on quotas the Chief Director was accordingly obliged to give special attention to the importance of redressing imbalances in the industry with the goal of achieving transformation in the industry.

[35] However, what is also clear, as indicated above, is that the broad goals of transformation can be achieved in a myriad of ways. There is not one simple formula for transformation. To the extent that the Act emphasises the need for decisions to facilitate the process of transformation, it suggests no

² *Bato Star Fishing (Pty) Ltd v Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism and Others (CCT 27/03) [2004] ZACC 15 at paragraphs [34] to [37]*

particular preference for the manner in which this should be achieved. The manner in which transformation is to be achieved is, to a significant extent, left to the discretion of the decision-maker.

[36] Section 18(5) is of great importance at the stage when fishing rights are allocated. This section requires the Minister to make allocations that will achieve the objective contemplated in s 2 and, in doing so, he is enjoined to 'have particular regard to the need to permit new entrants, particularly those from historically disadvantaged sectors of society'.

[37] Various objectives are set out in s 2. Sections 2(d) and 2(j) are directed to transformation and capacity building. They provide that regard must be had to:

(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;

...

(j) the need to restructure the fishing industry to address historical imbalances and to achieve equity within all branches of the fishing industry'.

2 APPEALS PROCESS

- 2.1 My reconsideration of the appeals in the Horse Mackerel ("HMK") fishery is the result of the various review applications that were instituted against the decisions of then Delegated Authority, the Deputy Director General: Fisheries Management ("*Delegated Authority*") and the then Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries ("*former Minister*") in the HMK sector. The various review applications are set out below.

- 2.2 On 8 November 2019, three Category A applicants instituted an application to the Western Cape High Court, in the matter of *Blue Continent Products (Pty) Ltd and 2 others v Minister of Environment, Forestry and Fisheries and 35 others*, under case number 19974/19 (“BCP application”), to have the appeal decision of the Minister dated 24 May 2019 in relation to appeals in the HMK fishery reviewed and set aside.
- 2.3 On 4 December 2020 an order was made by the Western Cape High Court, which set aside:
- 2.3.1 the appeal decision by the former Minister on 24 May 2019, in relation to HMK fishery, in so far as it introduced 30 new entrant applicants to horse mackerel;
 - 2.3.2 the appeal decision to allocate to those new entrants 62.62% of the TAC, leaving only 35.54% of the TAC available for allocation to successful Category A right holders; and
 - 2.3.3 the endorsement and implementation of the Delegated Authority’s QAM
- 2.4 On 18 May 2021, the same three Category A applicants applied to the Western Cape High Court, under case number 19974/19 for a variation of the BCP order so that paragraph 2 thereof reflects the position that all 58 appeal decisions are set aside and remitted to the Minister for reconsideration.
- 2.5 As a result of those orders, I was required to reconsider all the appeals in relation to Category A, B and C appellants in the HMK sector, afresh.³
- 2.6 My power to consider appeals is regulated by section 80 of the MLRA, read with Regulation 5(3) in terms of the Regulations published under Government Notice R1111 in Government Gazette 19205, dated 2 September 1998.
- 2.7 A total of 58 appeals were received, 12 category A appeals, 25 category B appeals and 21 category C appeals.

³ On 11 June 2021, an order was also granted by the Western Cape High Court, under case number 7088/21, which provided that pending my reconsideration of the 58 appeals in the HMK fishery, applicants granted rights in the fishery by the Delegated Authority on 20 December 2016, in terms of section 18 of the MLRA were permitted to fish and any consequent permits issued (if any) to the applicants in terms of section 13(1) of the MLRA for the 2021 fishing season, remained valid.

- 2.8 It is important to distinguish between the three categories of appellants:
- 2.8.1 Category A appellants are those appellants who have previously been awarded rights in the HMK fishery;
 - 2.8.2 Category B appellants are appellants who were not previously awarded rights in the HMK fishery, but who have been awarded rights in other sectors; and
 - 2.8.3 Category C appellants are appellants who have not previously been awarded rights in any of the fishing sectors.

3 GROUNDS OF APPEAL

- 3.1 The grounds of appeal raised by appellants included the following:
- 3.1.1 Ambiguity/ lack of clarity on certain questions in the application form;
 - 3.1.2 Unsuitable vessels nominated by applicants;
 - 3.1.3 Errors in scoring applicants;
 - 3.1.4 Allegations against other applicants;
 - 3.1.5 Underweighting of black ownership under the transformation scores;
 - 3.1.6 Scoring of sections that were not applicable to completely new entrants who had never been involved in the fishing industry;
 - 3.1.7 Exclusion on the basis of being paper quota risk holders;
 - 3.1.8 A failure of the system of scoring and weighting to properly assess, score and weight applicants in relation to transformation, job creation, and compliance, and the over-weighting of certain evaluation criteria;
 - 3.1.9 An oversight in the application of the peremptory requirement that applicants demonstrate a right of access to a suitable vessel;
 - 3.1.10 A failure to ensure that paper quota holders are excluded from the Horse Mackerel Fishery;
 - 3.1.11 A failure of the QAM to observe and achieve the applicable principles and objectives outlined in the MLRA, the General Policy and the HMK Policy and the failure to achieve the purpose of the QAM;
 - 3.1.12 The decision not to allocate the full TAC available for allocation in order to create the "Rewards Pool";
 - 3.1.13 The reduction of certain applicants' allocated percentage of the TAC; and

3.1.14 The proliferation of new entrants.

4 DECISIONS ON SYSTEMIC/CROSS CUTTING GROUNDS OF APPEAL

4.1 In this Provisional Appeals GPR, I address certain overarching issues which apply to a number of the appeals. The individual Appeal Decisions should in each instance be read together with the Provisional Appeals GPR.

4.2 A number of appellants correctly pointed out in their appeals that certain questions in the application form cannot fairly be applied to new applicants. This was recognized by the former Minister when he dealt with the appeals, and those elements were zero weighted or discarded by him. I have done the same.

4.3 Many applicants complained that sub-para 1.27 of the application form was ambiguous, in that it was not clear that the question was intended to determine the applicant's or its shareholders' involvement in other fishing businesses such as fish farming, processing, marketing etc. This question sought to score applicants on whether they owned equity in a fishing vessel, were involved in fish processing, fish marketing or aquaculture or held a fishing right. To resolve this issue, I have taken into consideration facts in that regard which were submitted by the applicant after the Delegated Authority's decision was made, but which existed at the time that the application was lodged with the Department.

4.4 In response to question 6.1 applicants were required to complete the table and indicate which percentage shareholding/membership interest were held by black persons during 2005, 2009 and 2015. This question disadvantages new entrants since they would in most instances only have come into existence in 2015. In order not to prejudice new entrants who were only able to record their black shareholding/membership in 2015, full points were awarded if the applicant had 100% black shareholding/membership in 2015.

4.5 The GPR allocates points per black/female/youth/disabled shareholder or member in respect of question 6.3 on the application form. It permits a maximum of 150 points in respect of these categories and years of service of employees. It gives rise to potential anomalies where there are more than ten shareholders/members: For example:

- An applicant which has 100 members/shareholders will easily reach the maximum of 150 points even if many of the members/shareholders satisfy none of the qualifying criteria; and

- An applicant with more than 10 shareholders may potentially score much more than (for example) an applicant which only has 10 shareholders/members or less, despite satisfying only some of the qualifying criteria.

4.6 This would be a perverse outcome given that the goal of this question is to encourage and reward transformation. I have therefore dealt with this on the following basis:

- Where the Appellant has not more than 10 shareholders/members, points are allocated per each qualifying person;
- Where the Appellant has more than 10 shareholders/members, points are allocated per each qualifying person, but the score in that regard is reduced *pro rata* to the points which would be awarded if there were 10 shareholders/members. This is because the maximum score of 150 allows for a maximum of 10 shareholders/members;
- An applicant's *pro rata* shareholding profile is only capable of being accurately calculated if the applicant provided information on the qualifying criteria in respect of each shareholder;
- Where the Appellant's shareholding is held by another legal entity or more than one legal entity, details of qualifying criteria in respect of each effective shareholder needs to be provided, in the case of such an entity or entities;
- Where the Appellant is a Trust or its shareholding is held by a Trust, I took a wide view to award points to the beneficiaries of the Trust, provided that details of qualifying criteria in respect of each beneficiary is provided;
- Where the Appellant is a Non-Profit Organisation, no points were allocated to the entity or its Directors.

4.7 In Category B and C appeals, some applicants did not indicate in section 4 of the application form that they had access to a suitable vessel, and provide proof of such access. Paragraph 7.2 (d) of the HMK Policy states "*An applicant will be required to demonstrate a right of access to a vessel suitable for the harvesting of horse mackerel in the fishery*", as one of the "*Balancing criteria*". Access to a suitable vessel is in terms of paragraph 6.1.1(e) of the General Policy regarded as a minimum essential requirement for participating in the sector, and the Delegated Authority has no discretion to condone non-compliance with an essential requirement for participating in the sector.

- 4.8 Under section 4, there was a need to adjust the points allocated due to the operation of an algorithm with the online FRAP scoring systems. This is best explained by way of an example: If an appellant had the majority shareholding in a suitable vessel it was entitled to 25 points under question 4.1. However, the system did not allow the allocation of 25 points under question 4.1. It only permitted a maximum of 5 points. In order to ensure that an appellant received its full allocation of 25 points, 5 points were awarded under each of questions 4.1 to 4.5. A similar adjustment had been adopted by the Delegated Authority.
- 4.9 With regard to the system of scoring and the proliferation of new rights holders the following is noted. The granting of fishing rights provided for in section 18 of the MLRA, the rights allocation decision within a particular fishery, and the determination of the quantum allocation to each right holder are decisions that are interlinked and interdependent. No decision can be made in isolation from the other decisions.
- 4.10 Category A appellants have raised grounds of appeal that ultimately relate to the removal of paper quota holders from this specific fishery. They propose the reallocation of TAC from paper quota new entrants to Category A applicants that have scored well. I have adopted a QAM that requires a higher threshold so as to reduce the risk of paper quota holders. In a number of instances, applicants stated that they intended to use the rights allocated to them to enable them to obtain access to a suitable vessel. If that intention was genuinely held, the fact that they subsequently failed in that endeavour is a fact which arose after they had submitted their applications to the Department, and cannot be taken into account in an appeal. However, taking note of the grounds of appeal and the need to prevent paper quota right holders, I have requested information from certain rights holders relating to their performance in the sector. This will be subject to scrutiny by the Department in relation to the question of active participation in the sector, and in appropriate cases can be addressed through section 28 of the MLRA.

5 PROPOSED QUANTUM ALLOCATION METHODOLOGY

- 5.1 Having consulted with the Technical Advisory Team on HM, and on the basis of the information that has been provided to me, I set out below my proposed QAM with regard to the allocation of rights to successful appellants on appeal.
- 5.2 To assist me in reconsidering the appeals per the relevant Court orders, I appointed the Appeals Advisory Team ("AAT") through the Department of Justice and Constitutional Development. The Appeals Advisory Team consists of a panel of practising advocates.

- 5.3 Members of the Appeals Advisory Team were required to advise me, as the appeal authority, on issues of a legal and substantive nature in respect of certain of the appeals.
- 5.4 The AAT had to consider and evaluate each of the relevant Regulation 5(3) reports prepared by the Delegated Authority, in respect of such appeal instructed upon, in line with: the objectives and provisions of the MLRA, the General Policy and the HMK Policy. The AAT considered and evaluated each matter instructed upon and advised me on the merits thereof.
- 5.5 The AAT made certain preliminary appeal recommendations to me, after evaluating and assessing each appeal. Having considered such recommendations, as well as the advice of the Technical Advisory Team in the HMK sector, I have made Appeal Decisions in each of the appeals and rescored successful appellants. I also re-ranked successful appellants and current right holders in accordance with their scoring.
- 5.6 I propose to deviate from the QAM that was implemented by the Delegated Authority as follows:
- 5.6.1 Five (5) Category A appellants were successful on appeal and are eligible to be awarded a right in addition to existing rights holders. The successful Category A appellants are:
- 5.6.1.1 Bhana Coastal Fishing CC was awarded 31,43% by the Delegated Authority. On appeal its score increased to 67,50%.
- 5.6.1.2 Klipbank Visserye Personeel (Pty) Ltd was scored 49,71% by the Delegated Authority. It now scores 52,18%.
- 5.6.1.3 Hentiq 3043 (Pty) Ltd was awarded 39,74% by the Delegated Authority and on appeal its score increased to 51,34%.
- 5.6.1.4 BP Marine Fish Products CC's score increased from 47,88% by the Delegated Authority to 51,09% on appeal.
- 5.6.1.5 Visko Sea Products (Pty) Ltd was excluded by the Delegated Authority. On appeal, its exclusion was set aside and it was awarded a score of 61.51%.
- See Table 1 below.*

- 5.6.2 I propose to allow twelve (12) category B entities and seven (7) category C entities into the sector, on the basis of all the information before me, including: available data, the viability of the resource, the number of entrants already in the sector, the need of sufficient TAC per rights holder, the risk of paper quota holders, and the need to open up the sector to new entrants where the sector is largely monopolised by a few existing rights holders.
- 5.6.3 The twelve (12) top-scoring Category B entities are: Ulwandle Fishing, Ulwandle Inshore Fishing, Fisherman Fresh, Premier Fishing, Le Tap Fishing, Mayibuye Fishing, Offshore Fishing, Capenis Investment, JC Fishing, Algoa Marine Exporters, Zimkhita Fihsing and Vecto Trade 126 (Pty) Ltd and (See *Table 1 below*). This means that thirteen (13) previously successful Category B entities are now out-scored and unsuccessful. I am affording these thirteen (13) entities the opportunity to address me on my provisional decision to exclude them from the successful applicants, before reaching a final decision on these appeals.
- 5.6.4 The top 7 scoring Category C entities are: Kalmia Trading 1001 CC, Ukuloba Kulungile Investments, Atlantis Seafood Products, Pavillion Investments, Yamkela Khoisan Marine NPC, XCape Tuna and Korana Fishing. There were previously six successful Category C entities. I have decided to retain Korana Fishing (a previously successful entity) in the aim to support new entrants in a capital intensive and monopolised industry, where it has shown commitment and has obtained a relatively high score on appeal.
- 5.6.5 The 20% of the HMK TAC is allocated among the 12 (twelve) successful Category B entities in a manner that allows each entity to obtain at least 1% of TAC, subject to the penalty factor and individual concerns applicable to related "brother-sister" entities - thus ensuring what is recognised by the Department as a viable allocation, having regard to the fact that Category B rights holders hold rights in other fishery sectors as well. See *Table 1 below*.
- 5.6.6 20.02% of the HMK TAC is allocated proportionately among the 7 successful Category C entities, with each entity being granted a minimum allocation of 2.86% of the TAC - thus ensuring what is recognised by the Department as a viable allocation. See *Table 1 below*.

5.6.7 The remaining portion of the HMK TAC following such allocations to Categories B and C is then redistributed among the Category A entities, resulting in a final allocation of 60% of the HMK TAC to Category A entities. See *Table 1 below*.

6 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The abovementioned takes into account and balances the following concerns: the number of entrants already in the sector; the need to admit new entrants into the sector; the limited availability of the resource and TAC; the risk of paper quota holders; the allocation of rights in a manner that is viable for new entrants; and the capital intensive nature of the HMK sector.
- 6.2 Before finalizing the appeal decisions in the HMK sector, I will address a notice to each of the concerned right holders who would be affected by my provisional appeal decision, so as to provide them with the opportunity to address me, specifically in so far as their rights previously awarded under the Delegated Authority/former Minister may be overturned on appeal by me.
- 6.3 Once I have received and considered all such comments, I shall make a final decision on the proposals in the table set out below. In terms of my provisional appeal decision, the following thirteen (13) entities who were previously allocated rights in the HMK sector would no longer qualify for a right on appeal: (i) Finecorp Trading, (ii) Seeheim Visserye, (iii) Dyer Eiland Visserye, (iv) Terrassan Pelagic Fishery, (v) Ukloba Fishing, (vi) Timowise, (vii) Chettys Fisheries, (viii) ZWM Fishing, (ix) Global Pact Trading 193, (x) Bayana Fishing, (xi) Sevlac Investments, (xii) Champan's Seafood and (xiii) Namutoni Visserye (Pty) Ltd.
- 6.4 I note that individual HMK TAC apportionments may be split/ limited where there are "brother-sister" relationships between existing right holders and those appellants who are allocated rights on appeal, per the provisions of the relevant policies.



MS B D CREECY, MP

MINISTER OF FORESTRY, FISHERIES AND THE ENVIRONMENT

DATE: 21/12/2021

Table 1

Cat	Registered Name	Score	Allocation
A	SEA HARVEST CORP. PTY LTD	89,72	8,20
A	EYETHU FISHING PTY LTD	86,05	7,40
A	IRVIN & JOHNSON LTD	85,85	5,69
A	BLUE CONTINENT PRODUCTS	83,33	16,02
A	SEAVUNA FISHING CO. PTY LTD	NS	6,67
A	BHANA COASTAL FISHING CC	67,50	2,73
A	VISKO SEA PRODUCTS PTY LTD	61,51	2,40
A	KLIPBANK VISSERYE PERSONEEL	52,18	4,14
A	HENTIQ 3043 PTY LTD	51,34	4,14
A	BP MARINE FISH PRODUCTS CC	51,09	2,61
B	ULWANDLE FISHING PTY LTD	88,15	1,39
B	ULWANDLE INSHORE PTY LTD	85,38	8,64
B	FISHERMAN FRESH CC	82,99	1,44
B	PREMIER FISHING SA PTY LTD	82,81	1,31
B	LETAP CC	81,15	1,35
B	MAYIBUYE FISHING PTY LTD	80,92	0,28
B	OFFSHORE FISHING COMPANY	78,90	1,35
B	CAPENIS INVESTMENTS PTY LTD	74,36	0,28
B	JC FISHING CC	74,28	0,74
B	ALGOA MARINE EXPORTERS	72,99	1,47
B	ZIMKHITHA FISHING PTY LTD	71,78	1,47
B	VECTO TRADE 126 PTY LTD	71,59	0,28
C	KALMIA TRADING 1001 CC	79,36	2,86

C	UKULOBA KULUNGILE INVEST.	71,38	2,86
C	ATLANTIS SEAFOOD PRODUCTS	62,60	2,86
C	PAVILION INVESTMENTS PTY LTD	53,00	2,86
C	K2015290802 PTY LTD	49,05	2,86
C	YAMKELA KHOISAN MARINE NPC	45,42	2,86
C	KORANA FISHING PTY LTD	43,93	2,86

2021 APPEALS 60:40 (10A + 12B + 7C)

Allocated	100,00
Cat A	60,00
Cat B	20,00
Cat C	20,00