

REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE UN FAO INTERNATIONAL PLAN OF ACTION FOR SHARKS (IPOA–SHARKS)

This document was produced by a Co-chair of the IUCN Shark Specialist Group

Introduction

1. Decision 12.49, adopted at the 12th meeting of the Conference of Parties reads: '*The Secretariat shall encourage CITES authorities of Parties to obtain information on IPOA–Sharks implementation from their national fisheries departments and report on progress at future meetings of the Animals Committee*'.
2. Resolution Conference 12.6, Conservation and Management of Sharks, directed '*the Chairman of the Animals Committee to monitor the implementation of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization's International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA–Sharks)*'.
3. Other relevant action points from the 12th meeting of the Conference of Parties are outlined in the report of the Intercessional Working Group on Sharks (AC20 Doc. 19.5).
4. The following actions are among those taken in response:
 - i. The United States of America presented to the 19th meeting of the Animals Committee a report on 'Progress made by the United States of America in developing and implementing the IPOA–Sharks' (AC19 Doc. 18.1). This contained a report by the USA National Marine Fisheries Service to Congress, December 2002. It described current shark fisheries management activities and regulations, international trade in shark products, bilateral and regional management activity, and current research.
 - ii. The government of Japan presented to the 19th meeting of the Animals Committee a report on 'Progress made by Japan in developing and implementing the IPOA–Sharks' (AC19 Doc. 18.3). The main part of this report was a lengthy document on the status of Japanese shark fisheries (effectively a Shark Assessment Report) prepared by the Fishery Agency of Japan for the 25th FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI), February 2002. This described skate, spiny dogfish and bottom trawl fisheries on the continental shelf, distant water fisheries for oceanic sharks, and the status of the whale shark, basking shark and white shark (the three species listed on CITES Appendices).
 - iii. The Secretariat has issued two Notifications to Parties requesting information on their implementation of the IPOA–Sharks. The first (Notification 2003/051) was an unstructured request for information, the second (Notification 2003/068), circulated at the request of the Animals Committee, was a structured questionnaire designed to assist States report on progress with implementation.
 - iv. The 19th meeting of the Animals Committee asked the IUCN Shark Specialist Group to analyse and report on responses to the above Notifications (subject to available resources – the lack of which has severely hampered analysis).
 - v. A number of States replied to one or other of the two Notifications from the Secretariat. Some additional questionnaire responses were received through the Shark Specialist Group, some from staff of government fisheries departments, some from other Shark Specialist Group members in the State concerned.

5. The FAO Secretariat undertook its regular analysis of implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries in preparation for the 25th Meeting of the Committee on Fisheries (COFI) in 2003 and drew the results to the attention of the Chair of the Animals Committee.
6. The poor implementation of the IPOA–Sharks was debated at the 58th Session of the United Nations' General Assembly (UNGA) in 2003. The UNGA Resolution on Sustainable Fisheries (paragraphs 47-50) called upon States, FAO and subregional or regional fisheries management organisations to implement fully the IPOA–Sharks, as a matter of priority, and also, *inter alia*, urged all States to co-operate with FAO in order to assist developing States to implement the IPOA–Sharks.
7. This document presents the IUCN Shark Specialist Group's analysis of the results of the Notifications. It also includes the results of responses received from members of the Shark Specialist Group network (these are not official government responses), and information made available at meetings of FAO COFI since 2001. Finally, it presents information derived from responses to an FAO questionnaire monitoring the implementation of the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fishing, circulated in May 2002 and kindly made available to the IUCN Shark Specialist Group by the FAO Fisheries Department.

Responses of CITES Parties to Notifications

8. The following Parties responded to Notification 2003/051:

European Commission (on behalf of European Member States)
Brunei

9. The following Parties responded to Notification 2003/068:

Australia	Mexico
Belgium	New Zealand
Canada	Poland *
Costa Rica	Saint Lucia
Ecuador	Singapore
Gabon	Turkey *
Hong Kong SAR, Republic of China *	United Arab Emirates
Macedonia *	United Republic of Tanzania

* These Parties did not use the questionnaire for their responses, in most cases because they have no shark fisheries (although Turkey does report shark landings to FAO).

10. The following State questionnaires were completed by Shark Specialist Group members:

China (prepared by SSG member in consultation with CITES Management Authority)

Fiji	Namibia
Japan	Seychelles

11. A database containing the results of the questionnaires is available but not presented here. The results are summarised in Annex 1.
12. Finally, the Shark Specialist Group became aware in early March of five National Shark Plans prepared by States belonging to the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission in West Africa; these were added to the summary and to Annex 2 just before submitting this document, but have not yet been added to the database or Annex 1.

Results

13. The following pages should be read in conjunction with Annex 2, an updated version of the table summarising progress with the IPOA-Sharks that was prepared for AC 18 and updated prior to CoP 12. Additional States have been added when these have provided information to the FAO, or through the Commission Sous-Regional des Peches (West Africa), or in response to the CITES notification (whether directly to CITES or through the Shark Specialist Group), unless they indicated that they had no shark fisheries. The latter are included in the analysis and tables presented below.

No action taken

14. Thirty-two States (Tables 1-3), including four major shark fishing nations (landing over 10,000t/year, Table 1), have stated during or since the FAO COFI meeting in 2001 that they have not implemented or will not be implementing the IPOA-Sharks, and have not provided any new information to enable this assessment to be updated since. As States regularly decide to implement the IPOA after initially indicating that they would not be doing so, it is likely that several States on this list are intending to implement the IPOA-Sharks but have not informed FAO or CITES of their activities or intention to take action. Palau, for example, has not been included on this list because it is known to have implemented strict controls on shark fisheries in 2003, although it has apparently not reported this progress to either the CITES or the FAO Secretariat. Although Saint Lucia reported to CITES that it would not be implementing the IPOA-Sharks, it appears from the information provided in response to the Notification to have begun to do so (it has described and is monitoring its shark fisheries); it is not, therefore, listed here either. Five States will not be implementing the IPOA-Sharks because they have no target shark fisheries (Table 3). The EU Shark Plan will nevertheless cover most of these, when it has been finalised and is implemented.

Table 1. Important shark fishing nations (landing >10,000t/year) apparently not implementing the IPOA-Sharks

Republic of Korea	Sri Lanka
Nigeria	Taiwan Province of China

Table 2. Other States apparently not implementing the IPOA-Sharks

Bangladesh	Honduras	Myanmar
Cameroon	Iceland	Niue
Dominica	Iran	Singapore
Egypt	Jamaica	Suriname
Eritrea	Kenya	United Republic of Tanzania
Ghana	Kuwait	Tunisia
Grenada	Madagascar	
Haiti	Mauritius	

Table 3. States without shark fisheries

Belgium	Lithuania	Poland
Latvia	Macedonia	Romania

Working towards implementation

15. Forty-seven States (Tables 4 and 5) have either reported that they are working towards implementation or are considered to be doing so on the basis of other information received. (Many EU Member States are not listed on any of these tables if they are not major shark fishing nations and have not provided information on implementation of the IPOA-Sharks; these

States are expecting the European Fisheries Commission to take action on their behalf.) Eight of the States working towards implementation (including one EU State, Table 4), are major shark fishing nations (landing >10,000t/year). Two of the latter (Canada and New Zealand) are already implementing shark fisheries management independently of the FAO IPOA-Sharks.

Table 4. Important shark fishing States (landing >10,000t/year) working towards implementation of the IPOA-Sharks

State	Comments
Argentina	
Canada	Focusing on assessment and management of certain important target fisheries
Spain	Report to CITES. Unclear whether this is through EU or independently
India	
Indonesia	
Malaysia	
New Zealand	Stock assessments and quota management system already in place
Pakistan	

Table 5. Other States working towards implementation

Angola	D R Congo	Philippines
Barbados	Ecuador	Saint Lucia ⁴
Benin	El Salvador	Seychelles
Brunei Darussalam ¹	Fiji	Sierra Leone
Cambodia	Guinea Bissau ²	Sudan
Cap Vert ²	Marshall Islands	Sweden
Chile	Morocco	Syrian Arab Republic
China	Norway	Tonga
Columbia	Oman	Trinidad and Tobago
Costa Rica	Palau ³	Turkey ⁵
Cote d'Ivoire	Panama	Uruguay
Cuba (Annual SARs produced)	Papua New Guinea	United Arab Emirates
Cyprus	Peru	Vietnam
<p>1. Description of fisheries (SAR equivalent) provided to CITES.</p> <p>2. Engaged in regional initiative of Commission Sous-Regional des Peches, West Africa.</p> <p>3. Progress not reported to FAO or CITES, but known to have introduced stringent shark protection and fishery legislation in 2003.</p> <p>4. Reported to CITES that it is not implementing the IPOA, but has described and is monitoring its shark fisheries.</p> <p>5. Response to CITES Secretariat unclear.</p>		

Draft documents prepared

16. Four States (including the EU and two EU Member States) have draft SARs or NPOAs (Tables 6 and 7). The European Union, includes three major shark fishing nations (landing >10,000t/year: Spain, France and the United Kingdom).

Table 6. Major shark fishing States with draft SAR or NPOA

State	Comments
European Union	Status report prepared in 2003, Draft Shark Plan in progress
United Kingdom	EU action awaited, but NPOA for coastal waters drafted

Table 7. Other shark fishing nations with draft SAR or NPOA

State	Comments
Italy	Draft Shark Plan prepared 2000, but not implemented; will be covered under EU action
South Africa	Draft presented at AC 20; final minor edits needed before submission to government

SARs and NPOAs completed

17. Twelve States have stated that they have completed either Shark Assessment Reports, or Shark Plans, or both (Tables 8 and 9). Six of these (Table 8) are major shark fishing nations, landing over 10,000t/year. Unfortunately the documents from two of these States, whose progress was reported to FAO, are not available for review and their status is uncertain. The other six (Table 9) are all African States, four of them members of the west African Commission Sous-Regionale des Peches (CSRPs). The CSRPs initially produced a sub-regional shark plan, endorsed by the Sub-Region's Fisheries Ministers and has since proceeded to encourage its Member States to develop their own National Plans in cooperation within the group. Other States with completed SARs or Plans will not be listed here if they have not reported progress to FAO or to CITES.

Table 8. Major shark fishing States with completed SAR or NPOA

State	Comments
Australia	SAR and NPOA, latter published but not yet nationally endorsed
Brazil	NPOA, as reported to FAO COFI in 2003; document not available
Japan	NPOA available in 2001, SAR presented to AC19
Mexico	Implementation of shark management plan and legislation blocked by industry
?Thailand	Reported to FAO in 2002; document(s) not specified and not available
United States of America	NPOA produced. Regular shark assessments and shark fisheries management were already underway independently of the IPOA-Sharks

Table 9. Other shark fishing nations with completed SAR or NPOA

State	Comments
Gabon	SAR and NPOA (not implemented) reported to CITES; documents not seen
Gambia	CSRPs member; NPOA incorporating SAR and NPOA actions
Guinea	CSRPs member; NPOA incorporating SAR and NPOA actions
Mauritania	CSRPs member; document not yet seen
Namibia	NPOA awaiting approval by Cabinet
Senegal	CSRPs member; NPOA incorporating SAR and NPOA actions

Effectiveness of implementation

18. When undertaking a review of this sort, it is vital not to overlook the overall aims of the IPOA-Sharks: to improve species-specific catch and landings data collection, and the monitoring and management of shark fisheries. This will not be achieved if the NPOAs that are prepared under the IPOA-Sharks do not include adequate data collection, monitoring or management measures (an earlier SSG and TRAFFIC report to AC19 criticised the content of several documents available in 2002). It is, of course, impossible to assess the adequacy of documents that have not been made available to CITES or to FAO.
19. Improved management of shark fisheries will not take place either if even the most detailed of Shark Plans are simply not implemented once prepared, for whatever reason. Lack of implementation may arise from a lack of capacity and resources (identified as a major constraint by all developing States), objections from industry (apparently a problem in Mexico), or simply from lack of political will. It will take several years to be able to assess the efficacy of implementation of new Shark Plans. Conversely, it is possible to achieve most of the aims of the IPOA-Sharks through existing fisheries monitoring and management measures, completely independently of the structure recommended formally by FAO (examples of States achieving this are Canada and New Zealand). It is suggested, therefore, that it is important for the Animals Committee to conclude its current review by determining how many States are actually managing their shark fisheries and whether IPOA implementation has led to any real improvement in the management status of shark populations. Similar reviews of progress with implementation of effective management in the field will be required in future years if the provisions of Resolution Conf. 12.6 are to be delivered.
20. Earlier reviews undertaken for meetings of the Animals Committee and the Conference of Parties noted that most of the small number of States that had implemented the IPOA-Sharks in earlier years were already managing their shark fisheries (examples are the United States of America and Australia). It is also important to note that some States that have reported that they are not implementing the IPOA-Sharks are also already managing their shark fisheries (Canada and New Zealand, as noted above). On the other hand, based on available information, it appears that some States, although having drafted National Shark Plans some years ago have, for one reason or another, not managed to translate these documents into improved data collection, monitoring and management of sharks. Perhaps this situation can be improved in future with the encouragement of FAO, CITES and the Fisheries Resolution of the UN General Assembly in 2003.

Conclusions

21. Two years ago, 29 States had reported progress with implementation of the IPOA-Sharks and only five of these had Shark Assessment Reports or National Plans of Action available for public consultation and review. Only one of the 18 major shark fishing States (Australia) had an SAR and only two (Japan and United States of America) had completed National Plans of Action, with a preliminary draft from the European Union.
22. The two other States reporting available documentation in 2002 were Italy, which had produced a draft shark plan, and the Seychelles, which referred to a case study on shark fisheries in the Seychelles commissioned by FAO in 1998 (one of several national case studies from this period, before the IPOA was drafted) as its Shark Assessment report. While the latter is certainly useful, it was not prepared in order to implement the IPOA-Sharks.
23. All of the documents reviewed in 2002 had failed to meet some of the standards recommended by FAO (see AC18 Doc. 19.2).
24. By end February 2004, 63 States had reported some progress (mostly unspecified) towards implementation of the IPOA-Sharks, more than double the number two years ago. It should be

noted, however, that this progress might consist of no more than a general awareness of the existence of the IPOA and recognition that action should be taken at some unspecified time in the future. Thirty-two States, including four of the world's major shark fishing nations, had either still not indicated whether they would be implementing the IPOA or had indicated (at some stage) that they would not be doing so (in some cases because they undertake little or no shark fishing activity).

25. Sixteen of the States reporting progress stated that they had produced draft or final Shark Assessment Reports or Shark Plans, compared with just five States two years ago. This figure includes nine (50%) of the world's 18 major shark fishing nations (but documentation from a few of these States was not specified or not made available for scrutiny; these figures should be viewed with caution until more information is available). In a few cases, little obvious progress has been achieved over the past two years, although a brief review of the documents prepared by Australia indicated that this State had taken particular care to meet the standards recommended by FAO. Resource constraints means that it was not possible to complete such a detailed critical analysis of these and other documents available in 2003/04 as had been undertaken in 2002.
26. The author considers that it is particularly important to recognise the efforts of the many African States that have placed great importance on the implementation of the IPOA-Sharks, particularly in comparison with progress in other regions with larger fisheries and greater resources. Ensuring that these efforts are translated into improved data collection, monitoring and management will require assistance with capacity-building from other States, as urged by the 2003 UN General Assembly Resolution and encouraged under CITES Resolution Conf. 12.6.

Annex 1. Summary of responses to CITES Notifications 2003/051 and 2003/068

Table A. Responses received by CITES Secretariat

A i) Status of fisheries, trade, data collection and implementation of the IPOA–Sharks

State	Fisheries			Trade			Data collection							IPOA-Sharks	
	Sharks landed from target fisheries?	Sharks landed from by catch fisheries?	Regulations specifically for shark fisheries?	Export of shark products?	Imports of shark products?	Customs codes for shark products?	Data collected on catches including discards?	Data collected on catches excluding discards?	Data collected on landings?	Fishery-independent research underway?	Fleet data collected?	Catch and effort data collected?	Habitat research or data collection underway?	SAR produced? (See SAR table)	NPOA produced? (see NPOA table)
Australia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Belgium	Y/N	Y/N	?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Brunei	N	Y	N		Y				Y	?	Y			N	
Canada	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Costa Rica	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
EC	Y	Y	Y						Y	Y	Y	Y	?	?	Y
Ecuador	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Gabon	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Hong Kong				Y	Y	Y									
Macedonia	N	N													
Mexico	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y		Y	N	Y
Poland	N	N													
Saint Lucia	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Singapore	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N?	?
Turkey															
United Arab Emirates	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
United Rep. of Tanzania		Y?	N	Y	N		Y	N			Y	Y	N	N	N

(Table continued over...)

A ii) Progress with preparation of Shark Assessment Reports (as reported to CITES)

	SAR produced	SAR planned	Action initiated	Initial discussions, no draft yet	Draft produced	Public / industry consultation	Workshop planned	Draft SAR finalised, but awaiting adoption
Australia	Y							
Belgium	N	N						
Brunei								
Canada	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Costa Rica	N	Y	N	N	N			
EC	?							
Ecuador	N	Y		N	N	N	N	N
Gabon	Y				Y	Y	N	N
Macedonia								
Mexico	N	Y			N	N	N	N
Poland								
Saint Lucia	N	N						
Singapore	N?	N						
Turkey								
United Arab Emirates	N	Y		Y		N	N	N
United Rep. of Tanzania	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

A iii) Progress with preparation of National Shark Plan (as reported to CITES)

	NPOA produced	NPOA implemented	NPOA planned	Action initiated	Initial discussions, no draft yet	Draft produced	Public consultation underway	Workshop planned	Draft NPOA finalised, but awaiting adoption
Australia	Y	N							Y
Belgium	N	N	N						
Brunei									
Canada	N	N?	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Costa Rica	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	
EC	Y								
Ecuador	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Gabon	Y	N							
Hong Kong									
Macedonia									
Mexico	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Poland									
Saint Lucia	N	N							
Singapore	N?	N							
Turkey									
United Arab Emirates	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
United Rep. of Tanzania	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

Table B. Responses received from Shark Specialist Group member

B i) Status of fisheries, trade, data collection and implementation of the IPOA–Sharks

	Fisheries			Trade			Data collection						IPOA-Sharks		
	Sharks landed from target fisheries	Sharks landed from by-catch fisheries	Regulations for shark fisheries	Export of shark products	Imports of shark products	Customs codes for shark products	Data on catches incl. discards	Catches excl. discards	Data on landings	Fishery-independent research	Fleet data	Catch and effort data	Habitat research or data collection	SAR produced? (See SAR table)	NPOA produced? (see NPOA table)
PR China	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y				N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Fiji	N	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Japan	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Namibia	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
New Zealand	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Sultanate of Oman	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Rep. of Seychelles	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N

B ii) Progress with preparation of Shark Assessment Report (as reported to SSG)

	SAR produced	SAR planned	Action initiated	Initial discussions, no draft yet	Draft produced	Public / industry consultation	Workshop planned	Draft SAR finalised, awaiting adoption
PR China	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Fiji	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Japan	Y	Y	Y	N	?	N	N	N
Namibia	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	
New Zealand	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Sultanate of Oman	N	Y	N					
Rep. of Seychelles	N	Y		Y	N	N	N	N

(Table continued over...)

B iii) Progress with preparation of National Shark Plan (as reported to SSG)

	NPOA produced	NPOA implemented	NPOA planned	Action initiated	Initial discussions, no draft yet	Draft produced	Public consultation underway	Workshop planned	Draft finalised, awaiting adoption
PR China	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Fiji	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Japan	Y	N							
Namibia	Y	N				Y	Y	Y	Y
New Zealand	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Sultanate of Oman	N	N	Y	Y					
Rep. of Seychelles	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N

Annex 2. Summary Table of IPOA-Sharks implementation

This Annex, updated from an original Table in AC18 Doc 19.2, lists all States that have reported on progress with implementation of the FAO IPOA-Sharks by preparing Shark Assessment Reports (SAR) or National Plans of Action (NPOA). This includes reports to FAO (meetings of the Committee on Fisheries (COFI) or response to an FAO Questionnaire in May 2002 regarding the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fishing (CCRF) and associated IPOAs), to the CITES Notifications in 2003, or to Shark Specialist Group (SSG) requests for information. Sources of information for 2002 were given in AC18 Doc 19.2 and are not repeated here. A blank cell indicates that no information was available.

The table also identifies the 18 major elasmobranch fishing States ('starred' *) whose annual landings reported to FAO exceeded 10,000t in 1999, whether or not they have reported progress with IPOA-Sharks implementation.

European Union states that have responded on progress or which are one of the 18 major elasmobranch fishing states are grouped under the European Union, since the European Commission is responsible for fisheries management throughout the EU.

Country	Reports to COFI 24, 2001		Situation in 2002		Situation in March 2004	
	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA
Angola	No	Intention to prepare in near future				
Argentina *	Yes		No	No (workshop in 2000 and meeting in 2001)		Would be developed in 2003/04 (report to FAO COFI 25).
Australia *	Final draft available		Yes	No, but in the process of being developed	Yes (response to CITES Notification)	Yes, but not yet nationally endorsed (response to CITES). [Working towards development (report to FAO COFI 25)]
Bangladesh	No	No	No	No		
Barbados	No	In preparation	IPOA-Sharks not mentioned in response to FAO re. implementation of CCRF			
Benin	No	Intention to prepare in near future	IPOA-Sharks not mentioned in response to FAO re. implementation of CCRF			
Brazil *	Yes	In preparation	In prep., due end 2002	In prep., due end 2002		Yes (reported to FAO COFI 25)
Brunei Darussalam					Description of fisheries provided in response to CITES Notification.	No indication given in response to CITES Notification whether a NPOA might be prepared.
Cambodia	No	No	No	No		Would be developed in 2003/04 (report to FAO COFI 25).

Country	Reports to COFI 24, 2001		Situation in 2002		Situation in March 2004	
	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA
Cameroon	No		No	No		
Cap Vert	No	In preparation	No***	No***	No***	No***
Canada *	In preparation	In preparation	For some target species	For some target species	No (some target species assessed)	No. Focuses on managing target fisheries (response to CITES Notification). Working towards development (report to FAO COFI 25).
Chile			No, because sharks are bycatch only (response to FAO re. implementation of CCRF)			Would be developed in 2003/04 (report to FAO COFI 25).
China	No	No	No	No	No, initial discussions held (response to SSG).	No, initial discussions held (response to SSG).
Columbia	No	Intention to prepare in near future				Would be developed in 2003/04 (report to FAO COFI 25).
Costa Rica	Yes	Intention to prepare in near future	Basic information only		No, but planned (response to CITES Notification).	No, but planned (response to CITES Notification).
Cote d'Ivoire	In preparation	No				
Cuba	Yes		A yearly SAR is prepared	No		
Cyprus	No	No				Would be developed in 2003/04 (report to FAO COFI 25).
DR Congo	In preparation					
Dominica	No					
Ecuador	Yes	In preparation			No (response to CITES Notification).	Preparation underway (response to CITES Notification).
European Union *	No	In preparation. Preliminary draft available	No – briefly covered in draft NPOA	Preliminary draft unchanged.	Status report prepared by STECF ¹	Working towards development (report to FAO COFI 25). Hope to finalise 2001 draft by COFI in 2005 (response to CITES)
Belgium	No. (Response to CITES Notification)	No. (Response to CITES Notification).
France *

¹ Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries, July 2003. Commission Staff Working Paper SEC(2003)1427.

Country	Reports to COFI 24, 2001		Situation in 2002		Situation in March 2004	
	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA
Italy Spain * UK *	Draft in progress	Working towards development (report to FAO COFI 25).
Egypt	No	No	No to both. IPOA-Sharks not mentioned in response to FAO re. implementation of CCRF			
El Salvador						Would be developed in 2003/04 (report to FAO COFI 25).
Eritrea	No	No				
Fiji	No	Intention to prepare in near future	No	No	No, but planned (response to SSG)	No, but planned (response to SSG). FAO has provided assistance for development (report to FAO COFI 25).
Gabon					Yes (response to CITES Notification).	Yes, July 2003. (response to CITES Notification).
Gambia	In preparation	No	No***	No***	Yes	Initial action points in SAR
Ghana	No	No				
Grenada	No	No	No	No		
Guinea	No		No***. Not mentioned in response to FAO re. implementation of CCRF			Yes
Guinea Bissau	No	In preparation	No***	No***		
Haiti	No	No				
Honduras	No	No				
Iceland	No	No				
India *	No	Intention to prepare in near future	Some species protected. No SAR or NPOA. Five year study underway on population dynamics of commercial species (response to FAO re. implementation of CCRF)			
Indonesia *	Yes	Intention to prepare in near future	No (research underway)	No		Would be developed in 2003/04 (report to FAO COFI 25).
Iran	No	No	Not mentioned in response to FAO re. implementation of CCRF			
Jamaica	No	No				
Japan *	Yes	In preparation (before COFI). Completed (at COFI)		Yes, unchanged from 2001 submission to COFI	Yes. Presented to AC 19.	Yes (unchanged?)

Country	Reports to COFI 24, 2001		Situation in 2002		Situation in March 2004	
	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA
Kenya	No	No				
Rep. Korea *	No	No	No	No		
Kuwait	No	No				
Latvia	No					
Lithuania	No	No				
Madagascar	No	No	No	No		
Malaysia *	Yes	No	No	No		
Marshall Islands	No	In preparation		Draft document		Working towards development (report to FAO COFI 25).
Mauritania	No	No	No ***	No ***		Yes
Mauritius	No	No	No	No		
Mexico *	Yes	In preparation	No	Draft	No, but planned (response to CITES Notification).	Yes (reported to FAO COFI 25 & to CITES Notification), but not implemented (blocked by industry).
Morocco	No	In preparation	Not mentioned in response to FAO re. implementation of CCRF			
Myanmar	No	No	No	No		
Namibia	No	Preparation underway.	No	Draft undergoing internal governmental review	No. Will follow NPOA implementation	Yes (reports to FAO & CITES) but awaiting Cabinet approval
New Zealand *	No	Intention to prepare in near future	In progress (draft not available)	In progress (draft not available)	Planned. Annual stock assessments undertaken (response to CITES Notification)	Planned (response to CITES Notification), use QMS ² . Working towards development (report to FAO COFI 25).
Nigeria *			No	No		
Niue	No	No	No	No		
Norway	No	Intention to prepare in near future				
Oman					Planned (response to SSG).	Would be developed in 2003/04 (report to FAO COFI 25); planned (response to SSG).

² QMS: Quota Management System.

Country	Reports to COFI 24, 2001		Situation in 2002		Situation in March 2004	
	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA
Pakistan *	No	Intention to prepare in near future	No	No		
Palau	No	No				
Panama	No					Would be developed in 2003/04 (report to FAO COFI 25).
Papua New Guinea						Working towards development in 2003/04 with FAO assistance (report to FAO COFI 25).
Peru	Yes	In preparation				
Philippines	In preparation	In preparation	No. Research underway	NPOA Planning workshop envisaged in 2002		Would be developed in 2003/04 (report to FAO COFI 25).
Romania	No	No				
Saint Lucia					No (response to CITES – but a brief assessment attached).	No, fishery too small but would continue to monitor (response to CITES Notification).
Senegal	In preparation	No	No ***	No ***		Yes
Seychelles	In preparation	In preparation	Available in Lestang 1999		No, but planned (response to SSG).	Would be developed in 2003/04 (report to FAO COFI 25). Planned (response to SSG).
Sierra Leone	No	Intention to prepare in near future			Plans to produce	Plans to produce, fishery regulations already introduced
Singapore					No, but see ASEAN initiative (response to CITES Notification).	
South Africa	No	No	Will be available in 2002	Will be available in 2002		Yes (reports to FAO COFI 25 & CITES)
Sri Lanka *	No	No	No	No		
Sudan	No	No				Would be developed in 2003/04 (report to FAO COFI 25).
Suriname						
Sweden						Working towards development (report to FAO COFI 25).
Syrian Arab Republic						Working towards development (report to FAO COFI 25).
Taiwan *			No	No		
Tanzania (UR)					No. (Response to CITES Notification).	

Country	Reports to COFI 24, 2001		Situation in 2002		Situation in March 2004	
	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA
Thailand *	No	In preparation	No implementation because no shark resources in Thailand (response to FAO re. implementation of CCRF)			Yes (reported to FAO COFI 25)
Tonga	No	Intention to prepare in near future				
Trinidad and Tobago						Working towards development (report to FAO COFI 25)
Tunisia	No	No				
Turkey	No	No			Response to CITES Secretariat unclear.	
Uruguay		Intention to prepare in near future	No	No, but planned this year		
United Arab Emirates					Planned under current five year plan ending in 2007 (response to CITES Notification)	
United States of America *	Yes	In preparation (before COFI). Completed (at COFI)	Regular shark assessments carried out	Yes	Regular shark stock assessments	Yes
Vietnam	No	Intention to prepare in near future	No to both. IPOA-Sharks not mentioned in response to FAO re. implementation of CCRF			

Regional initiatives	Situation in May 2002		Situation in 2004	
	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA
SEAFDEC (Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam)	Developing a research project on sharks that may form the basis of SAR	Plans to develop a regional Plan of Action		
West African Subregional Fisheries Commission (Cap Verde, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Mauritania and Senegal) [Sierra Leone joined in early 2004.]		Subregional Plan adopted Sept 2001. Meeting March 2002 to prioritize actions.		Yes. Meeting in March 2004 to discuss National Plans and prioritize actions.
Mediterranean Sea				Mediterranean Action Plan developed under UNEP
CCAMLR, GFCM, IATTC, ICCAT, IOTC, NAFO and SEAFDEC	See Table 3 in AC 18 Doc. 19.2.		FAO Report to COFI 25 notes that these RFMOs are 'addressing the IPOA-Sharks'.	