English only/Unicamente en inglés /Seulement en anglais



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

International Affairs 5275 Leesburg Pike, MS: IA Falls Church, VA 22041-3803



AC28 Doc. 17.1.1 Annex 10

IN REPLY REFER TO: FWS/DSA/NOP 2015/027

JUN 30 2015

Mr. John Scanlon Secretary-General CITES Secretariat International Environment House 11 Chemin des Anémones CH-1219 Châtelaine-Geneve Switzerland

VIA EMAIL: info@cites.org

Dear Mr. Scanlon:

This letter responds to the Secretariat's request in Notification to the Parties No. 2015/027, of 11 May 2015, that Parties provide new information on fishery management measures for sharks, with particular emphasis on information pertaining to the shark species and manta rays that were included in Appendix II at CoP16, and the implementation of CITES provisions for trade in these species since 12 September 2014.

In response to this request, the United States would like to provide information on a few recent U.S. federal shark regulations that implement measures adopted by regional fishery management organizations (RFMOs) for shark species listed under CITES. More information on U.S. federal shark management can be found at <<u>www.nmfs.noaa.gov</u>>:

- U.S. National Plan of Action for Sharks (updated in 2014): http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/ia/resources/publications/ccrf/npoa_sharks_2014.pdf
- Final U.S. regulations to implement the measures that the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) adopted for oceanic whitetip, silky, and whale sharks (published 19 Feb. 2015): https://federalregister.gov/a/2015-03388
- Final U.S. regulations to implement the measure that the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) adopted for whale shark (published 18 Sept. 2014): https://federalregister.gov/a/2014-22278.

In addition, the United States made positive Non-Detriment Findings for the export of porbeagle shark *Lamna nasus*) and the three species of hammerhead shark (*Sphyrna lewini, S. mokarran, S. zygaena*). Copies of these Non-Detriment Findings are attached.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please contact Rosemarie Gnam, Ph.D., Chief of the Division of Scientific Authority, via email: <u>Rosemarie Gnam@fws.gov</u>.

Sincerely,

Rosemanie Gram

Rosemarie Gnam, Ph.D. Chief, Division of Scientific Authority

Attachments (2)



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE



International Affairs 5275 Leesburg Pike, MS: IA Falls Church, VA 22041-3803

MEMORANDUM

JUN 18 2015

To: Chief, Division of Management Authority

From: Chief, Division of Scientific Authority Rosemand From

Subject: General advice for the export of wild *Sphyrna lewini* (scalloped hammerhead shark), *Sphyrna mokarran* (great hammerhead shark) and *Sphyrna zygaena* (smooth hammerhead shark) harvested in the commercial fishery by U.S. fisherman in the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico in the 2015 harvest season.

Advice: The Division of Scientific Authority (DSA) finds that the export of wild Sphyrna lewini (scalloped hammerhead shark), Sphyrna mokarran (great hammerhead shark) and Sphyrna zygaena (smooth hammerhead shark) harvested by U.S. fisherman in the 2015 harvest season in the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico is not detrimental to the survival of the species, provided that the harvest is in compliance with U.S. management plan in place for the species.

We will review and re-issue a general advice for these hammerhead sharks annually, in an effort to be responsive to new data and information that may become available. <u>This find only pertains</u> to hammerhead sharks caught in the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico and applications for the export of hammerhead sharks caught in U.S. waters other than the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico will be reviewed separately.

Basis for advice:

Species Distribution/Range in the United States

Sphyrna lewini (scalloped hammerhead shark), Sphyrna mokarran (great hammerhead shark) and Sphyrna zygaena (smooth hammerhead shark) are wide-ranging, primarily coastal species which are also occasionally found in the open oceans. These species are found primarily in warm temperate and tropical waters worldwide at depths to 1000 meters; however, most often these species are associated with continental shelf habitat. In the Western Atlantic the scalloped hammerhead is found from New Jersey to Brazil, including Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean, while the great hammerhead and smooth hammerhead are found as far northward as North Carolina and Nova Scotia, respectively (Compagno, 1984).

The scalloped hammerhead (*Sphyrna lewini*) is found world-wide in coastal warm temperate and tropical seas. It is primarily a coastal species, occasionally documented in open ocean, and is found from the surface and intertidal areas to greater than 275 m deep (Morales et al. 2007).

The great hammerhead has a wide ranging population throughout tropical waters of the world, from approximately latitudes 40°N to 35°S. It is migratory, with some populations moving polewards in the summer, as seen along the Florida coast and in the South China Sea. This

species is found throughout the south-west Indian Ocean but in South Africa is confined to the KwaZulu-Natal coast, where it co-exists with the scalloped hammerhead *S. lewini*, also an inhabitant of the tropics, and the smooth hammerhead *S. zygaena*, which favors cooler waters. There is a pupping and nursery ground in a coastal mangrove estuarine area of southern Belize (Denham et al. 2007).

The distribution of the smooth hammerhead is not well known partially because it is believed that it is occasionally misidentified as the scalloped hammerhead. Nevertheless it is known to have a wider range than the other two species since it is more tolerant of cooler water (Casper et al. 2005). Compared to the scalloped and great hammerheads, the smooth hammerhead stays closer to the surface and is generally found in water less than 20 meters (66 ft) deep.



Distribution map for Sphryna lewini (from IUCN).

Biological characteristics

These three species of hammerhead are the largest species within the family Sphyrnidae. Hammerhead sharks are viviparous with reproductive cycles including an 8-12 month gestation period followed by a one year resting period. The northwestern Atlantic population of scalloped hammerhead appears to grow more slowly and to a smaller overall size than conspecifics in the eastern and western Pacific Ocean. The oldest known specimen, including both males and females, was from the northwestern Atlantic and was estimated to be 31.5 years of age (Kotas et al. 2011), while Piercy et al. (2007) estimated the oldest age of males and females in the Gulf of Mexico to be 30.5 years.

Although the scalloped hammerhead is relatively fecund compared to other large sharks (with litters of 12-38 pups) the generation period is greater than 15 years in the Gulf of Mexico and its life-history characteristics mean that it resilience to exploitation is relatively low (Morales et al. 2007). This species is expected to have a low resilience to exploitation because of its life-history

characteristics, including its tendency to aggregate (Maguire et al. 2006). Maximum size reported in different studies of the scalloped hammerhead ranged from 219-340 cm total length (TL) for males and 296-346 cm for females (Morales et al. 2007). A growth study by Branstetter (1987) in the Gulf of Mexico found maximum length for both sexes to be 329 cm TL. The age and size of first maturity in the Gulf of Mexico has been estimated at 10 years and 180 cm TL for males and 15 years and 250 cm TL for females (Branstetter 1987).

The great hammerhead (*S. mokarran*) is viviparous with females breeding only once every two years. Litter size ranges between 6 and 42 pups after an 11 month gestation period. Size at birth is 50 to 70 cm. The species suffers from very high bycatch mortality, making it vulnerable to over-exploitation and population depletion (Lemine et al. 2007). Generally solitary, it is unlikely to be abundant wherever it occurs. The maximum total length is reported to be between 550 and 610 cm however, 400 cm is more common for a mature adult. Males mature at between 234 and 269 cm, and reach at least 341 cm. Females mature at between 250 and 300 cm and reach between 482 and 549 cm (Lemine et al. 2007).

The smooth hammerhead (*Sphryna zygaena*) is encountered least among the three species (Ha 2006). While this species is primarily a coastal-pelagic and semi-oceanic species which occurs on the continental shelf to 200 m depth, it has also been observed in freshwater in the Indian River in Florida (Ebert 2003). While there is limited biological data available, the smooth hammerhead is believed to have a lifespan of at least 20 years (FLMNH 2008) and reach a maximum size of between 370 and 400 cm TL (Compagno 2007). Gravid smooth hammerhead females have been reported at sizes ranging from 220 to 255 cm forked length (FL), however, no conversion factor between FL and TL was provided. Work on the coast of West Africa showed, of 21 sampled specimens, there was a mean litter size 33.5 (Castro and Mejuto 1995).

Population Status and Trends:

The IUCN Redlist assessed the smooth hammerhead (*Sphryna zygaena*) in 2005 and the scalloped hammerhead (*Sphryna lewini*) and great hammerhead (*Sphryna mokarran*) in 2007. *Sphyrna lewini* was assessed as Endangered with an unknown population trend, *Sphryna mokarran* as Endangered with decreasing population and *Sphryna zygaena* as Vulnerable with a decreasing population trend. All of these were global assessments. Since each species in found worldwide, and there are known to be discrete populations in different areas of the world, threats and population statuses will vary locally.

The scalloped hammerhead was reviewed by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) for an Endangered Species Act (ESA) listing. During that review six distinct population segments (DPS) were identified including the Northwest Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico DPS, Central and Southwest Atlantic DPS, Eastern Atlantic DPS, Indo-West Pacific DPS, Central Pacific DPS, and Eastern Pacific DPS (Miller et al. 2013, Hayes 2008). In July 2014, NMFS determined that while the Northwest Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico DPS did not warrant an ESA listing, the Eastern Atlantic and Eastern Pacific DPSs warranted an Endangered designation and the Central and Southwestern Atlantic and Indo-Pacific DPSs warranted a Threatened designation (Miller et al. 2013). The total global catch of hammerhead species is estimated between 2000 and 6000 tonnes over the past decade and continues to rise (Simpfendorfer 2014). Multiple sources of data point to severe population declines of the scalloped hammerhead in the Atlantic over the past few decades. It is likely that scalloped hammerheads have experienced periodic overfishing from 1983 - 2005 and overfishing began in the Northwest Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico in the early 1980s (Jiao et al. 2011). In the Northwest Atlantic, longline fleets exert intense fishing pressure on sharks and in an analysis of grouped hammerhead data from U.S. pelagic longline logbook data it was estimated that hammerhead shark abundance declined by up to 91% since 1986 (Baum et al. 2003). The primary component of the harvest was scalloped hammerhead and data from the Virginia Institute of Marine Science indicates that the harvest of the scalloped hammerhead outnumbered that of the smooth hammerhead by more than ten to one (Ha 2006). Both the pelagic and bottom longline observer programs in the United States have recorded a 2 to 3:1 ratio for the scalloped hammerhead to the great hammerhead (Denham et al. 2007, Lemine et al. 2007).

Sphryna lewini populations in the northwestern Atlantic may be overestimated due to the recent discovery of a cryptic species that morphologically appears to be almost identical to the scalloped hammerhead shark (Naylor et al. 2012, Quatro et al. 2006, Quatro et al. 2013). The new species, the Carolina hammerhead (Sphyrna gilbert sp. nov.), was originally identified within South Carolina waters (Quatro et al. 2006, Quatro et al. 2013) but can be found from South Carolina to Brazil (Pinhal et al. 2011), thus overlapping the current range of S. lewini. Coastal South Carolina is also believed to be a nursery ground for this new, cryptic species (Quatro et al. 2006). Currently, there are no available data regarding the ratio of this new, cryptic species to the Atlantic S. lewini population (Miller et al. 2013).

Multiple data sources from the Atlantic Ocean have documented substantial declines in populations of the scalloped hammerhead but few population assessments are available for the species. In the Northwest Atlantic Ocean however, Hayes et al. (2009) conducted an assessment from which NMFS determined that scalloped hammerhead sharks were overfished and experiencing overfishing (76 FR 23794, April 28, 2011). That assessment also informed a NMFS management plan that uses a quota system to regulate harvest of the hammerhead species complex (S. lewini, S. mokarran and S. zygaena). The assessment indicated that the scalloped hammerhead population size had declined between 83 and 85 percent between 1981 and 2005 with the population in 1981 estimated at between 142,000 and 169,000 individuals, but by 2005 the population estimate had declined to about 24,000 sharks (Hayes et al. 2009). An assessment for the hammerhead complex in the northwest Atlantic Ocean, utilizing catch and population trend data from multiple studies, found a 72% decline in abundance from 1981-2005 (Jiao et al. 2008). A standardized catch rate index of a hammerhead complex (S. lewini, S. mokarran, and S. zygaena) from commercial fishing logbook data in the U.S. pelagic longline fishery between 1986-2000, and from observer data between 1992-2005, estimated a decline of 89%, while pelagic longline observer data indicated that Sphyrna spp. declined by 76% between 1992-2005 (Camhi et al. 2009, Baum et al. 2003).

Catch of all species within the hammerhead complex by the commercial sector in the Hawaiian coastal and pelagic waters is very low, averaging only 226 pounds per year over the years 1953-2013 and there was no indication of a trend over this time period. Most of the hammerheads

were either smooth or scalloped and no catches of great hammerheads have been documented in these waters by fisheries observers since the observer program was initiated in the region in 1990 (Miller et al. 2014).

Threats

Globally, overharvest in both directed and bycatch fisheries is the primary threat. Fishing on juvenile members of the stocks is of particular concern since these fish will never have the opportunity to reproduce and replace themselves in the population. The directed and bycatch fisheries primarily utilize the fins but some meat is also utilized, especially for local consumption. Fins are primarily consumed in the Asian market. The high price for "grade-A" fins, the grade assigned to all three hammerhead species, is an important factor driving unsustainable harvest.

Species Management:

At the global level, the entire family Sphyrnidae, which includes the three CITES listed hammerhead sharks, are listed among the Highly Migratory Species (Annex 1) in the United Nations (UN) Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). The Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 Relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks, which builds on UNCLOS and has been in force since 2001, encourages States to cooperate on these multijurisdictional stocks through regional and subregional management bodies. Since the Agreement's inception there have been regional agreements aimed at conserving these migratory stocks but while the agreement's aim is conservation, there are relatively few enforcement measures.

Also globally, on November 9, 2014, the scalloped hammerhead (*Sphyrna lewini*) and the great hammerhead (*Sphyrna mokarran*) were listed under Appendix II of the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS or Bonn Convention). The CMS provides a global platform for the conservation and sustainable use of migratory animals and their habitats. A CMS Appendix II listing acknowledges that these species need, or would greatly benefit from, international cooperation on management and encourages Parties to take cooperative actions on management, including establishing global or regional measures to conserve the species. CMS decisions may also trigger management responses nationally. It should be noted that the United States is not a Party to CMS.

At the regional level, the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) manages tunas and tuna-like species and adopts measures to address bycatch of other species caught in association with ICCAT fisheries. ICCAT, an intergovernmental regional fishery management organization founded in 1969, has 50 Contracting Parties and its Convention area spans the entire Atlantic Ocean, including the Gulf of Mexico, Caribbean and Mediterranean Seas. Under a recommendation adopted in 2004, ICCAT Parties are required to report data on catches of sharks in all fisheries managed by ICCAT. However, catch data for sharks (including hammerheads) are still not reported by many Contracting Parties. Effective in 2011, ICCAT Recommendation 10-08 established a prohibition on retaining onboard, transshipping, landing, storing, selling, or offering for sale any part or whole carcass of a hammerhead shark of the family Sphyrnidae (except *Sphyrna tiburo*) taken in the Convention

area in association with ICCAT fisheries. Annual reporting of hammerhead discards and releases is required by this measure, although these data are also incomplete. At the national level, the United States has a species management plan for the hammerhead shark complex (scalloped, great, smooth) in the Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, and Caribbean Sea, which was developed as part of the larger National Marine Fisheries Service 2006 Consolidated Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Management Plan. The hammerhead management plan, included in Amendment 5a of the 2006 plan, incorporates regulatory mechanisms designed to rebuild the hammerhead stock complex over a 10 year period with the rebuilding starting 7/3/2013 (NMFS 2013). The regulations that implement the management plan provide for a quota system which allows U.S. Atlantic permitted fishermen, both commercial and recreational, to harvest a specified amount of hammerhead sharks on an annual basis. The harvest quota is based on the best available science which currently includes a stock assessment for the scalloped hammerhead (Hayes et al. 2009) and historical catch data from each of the fisheries.

The hammerhead sharks in the management complex (great, scalloped, and smooth) are included under a single hammerhead shark fisheries harvest quota, which is based on the scalloped hammerhead stock assessment performed by Hayes et al. in 2009. The harvest quota is split and allocated separately for the Gulf of Mexico fishery and Atlantic coastal fishery. A single harvest quota was established for the hammerhead shark complex because it is difficult to differentiate among these three hammerhead species, particularly when dressed.

The Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico commercial quotas were calculated by subtracting recreational landings, commercial discards, and research set-aside from the hammerhead shark total allowable catch (TAC) of 79.6 metric tons (mt) dressed weight (dw). This calculation was based on a harvest of 2,853 scalloped hammerhead sharks having average dressed weight of 61.5 pounds per individual. The resultant total commercial quota for all hammerhead shark species is 52.4 mt dw (115,457 lb dw), which is then divided into the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico regions using the average percentage of total hammerhead shark landings in each region over the years 2008 through 2011, 51.7 percent in the Atlantic and 48.3 percent in the Gulf of Mexico. Consequently, the Atlantic hammerhead shark complex commercial base quota is 27.1 mt dw (59,736 lb dw) and the Gulf of Mexico commercial base quota is 25.3 mt dw (NMFS 2013).

In the Atlantic Ocean, including the Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean, in addition to the annual harvest quota, license and reporting requirements, size limit and gear restrictions for recreational fisherman are used to regulate the harvest. Commercial permits are issued for both the directed and bycatch fisheries. In the directed fishery, fishermen target hammerhead sharks, while in the bycatch fishery fisherman other species but retain the hammerheads that are caught incidentally. A Directed permit allows the holder to harvest any amount of hammerhead shark up to the annual harvest quota. An Incidental permit allows the holder to retain up to three hammerhead sharks per trip. Once the annual harvest quota is reached, the fishery is closed and neither directed nor incidental permit holders may land hammerhead sharks but shark dealers are allowed to sell any hammerhead sharks that were stored before the closure. Commercial fishermen may use bottom longline, gillnet, rod and reel, handline, and bandit gear; fishermen using pelagic longline cannot land, possess, or sell hammerhead sharks. A Recreational permit is issued to an individual who may harvest up to one hammerhead shark per day provided no tunas, swordfish, or billfish are onboard the vessel; the fish must be a minimum of 87 inches (fork

length); a recreationally caught hammerhead shark cannot be sold. Recreational fishing for hammerhead sharks is allowed year-round and only rod and reel and handline are allowed. All fish landed in both the recreational and commercial fisheries must be landed with their fins naturally attached. Dealers who purchase hammerhead shark from commercial fisherman must adhere to strict reporting requirements.

The harvest of the Atlantic hammerhead shark complex is monitored through reporting by fishermen and dealers. The commercial fishermen must report their directed and incidental catch to NMFS within seven days of landing at the dock and the dealers must report activity every Tuesday for purchases made the previous Sunday through Saturday time period. When a level of 80% of the annual quota has been reported, the fishery is closed to further harvest; this closure becomes effective five days after a notice is issued. The buffer of the additional 20% of quota is to allow time for fish already harvested to be landed and reported. If the annual quota is exceeded, the overharvest is deducted from the following year's harvest quota. Through this accounting measure, the calculated annual harvest quota averages out to the allowed annual harvest over a series of years. Also, due to the real-time nature of the harvest reporting, there is less chance of harvesting significantly more than any one year's quota allocation.

A linked quota system reduces bycatch and overharvest by allowing for the simultaneous closure of two shark management groups in a region where shark species that are in separate management groups have the potential to be caught together on the same shark fishing trip. In both the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico (for management purposes, the Gulf of Mexico includes fish landed in the Caribbean), the hammerhead management group (scalloped, great and smooth hammerheads) is linked to the Aggregated Large Coastal Sharks Species Group (LCS) (silk, tiger, blacktip, spinner, bull, lemon and nurse sharks). If either the hammerhead management group or the LCS group reaches the 80% harvest limit explained above, both of these management groups are closed to harvest simultaneously, even if only one of the groups has reached 80% of their quota. During the first two years of the quota linkages (2013 and 2014), the quantity of hammerheads caught had only reached approximately 50% of the quota when the harvest season was closed because the linked LCS complex quota had been reached. The Gulf of Mexico hammerhead and LCS harvest season opened its 2015 season on January 1, 2015, and closed on May 3, 2015; at that time, approximately 54% of the hammerhead quota had been harvested. The Atlantic hammerhead and LCS harvest season will not open until July 1. 2015. Both the opening of the season and the seasonal quota are adjusted annually based on harvest from the prior year (NMFS 2013).

Hammerhead shark regulations are set on both state and federal levels, and state regulations are consistent with regulations issued by NMFS. In the Atlantic, state fishery regulations are promulgated jointly among the states within the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC). In certain instances, state regulations may be more restrictive than the corresponding federal regulations but they cannot allow for a harvest in excess of the federally established TAC. State specific regulations apply to fisheries within three nautical miles from the shoreline, while federal regulations apply to fisheries from the three mile limit to the 200 mile nautical mile EEZ (ASMFC 2008, ASMFC 2013).

Summary

The hammerhead shark fisheries in U.S. waters of the Northwestern Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico are managed under a quota system which allows harvest from directed, bycatch and recreational fisheries. Anyone participating in these fisheries is required to be licensed, either by the NMFS or in the state where they are fishing. The quotas under which this system is managed are determined based on the best available data which includes a 2009 species assessment, a species assessment of the scalloped hammerhead in 2013, a species assessment of the great hammerhead in 2014, and historical harvest records from the directed, bycatch and recreational fisheries. The annual harvest is closed to fishermen when the NMFS determines, through harvester and dealer reports, that 80% of the annual quota has been harvested. The harvest quota is adjusted annually, based on the previous year's harvest, to insure the quota is not exceeded, over a multi-year period. If there is overharvest in one year, the TAC for the following year is reduced. There is one TAC quota for the three species of hammerhead which are harvested in U.S. Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, and Caribbean waters and it encompasses all fish harvested whether they are taken from waters governed by state or federal regulations. The species management plan currently being followed is designed so that the population will rebuild within 10 years (by 2023) and the harvests since the plan was implemented have not exceeded the established quota.

Conclusion

The Division of Scientific Authority (DSA), based on the information and data available, and management measures currently in place, finds that the export of wild hammerhead sharks harvested by U.S. fisherman in the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico in the 2015 harvest season is not detrimental to the survival of the species, provided that the harvest is in compliance with the U.S. management plan in place for the species.

Literature cited

ASMFC. 2008. Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission: Final Draft Interstate Fishery Management Plan for Atlantic Coastal Sharks. Fishery Management Report No. 46. August, 2008.

ASMFC. 2013. Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission: Addendum III to the Interstate Fishery Management Plan for Atlantic Coastal Sharks. October, 2008.

Baum, J.K., Myers, R.A., Kehler, D.G., Worm, B., Harley, S.J. and Doherty, P.A. 2003. Collapse and conservation of shark populations in the Northwest Atlantic. *Science* 299: 389-392.

Branstetter, S. 1987. Age, growth and reproductive biology of the Silky Shark, *Carcharhinus falciformis*, and the Scalloped Hammerhead, *Sphyrna lewini*, from the northwestern Gulf of Mexico. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 19: 161–173.

Camhi, M.D., S.V. Valenti, S.V. Fordham, S.L. Fowler and C. Gibson. 2009. The Conservation Status of Pelagic Sharks and Rays: Report of the IUCN Shark Specialist Group Pelagic Shark Red List Workshop. IUCN Species Survival Commission Shark Specialist Group. Newbury, UK. x + 78p.

Casper, B.M., Domingo, A., Gaibor, N., Heupel, M.R., Kotas, E., Lamónaca, A.F., Pérez-Jimenez, J.C., Simpfendorfer, C., Smith, W.D., Stevens, J.D., Soldo, A. & Vooren, C.M. 2005. *Sphyrna zygaena*. In: IUCN 2013. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2013.2. <<u>www.iucnredlist.org</u>>.

Castro, J.A. and Mejuto, J. 1995. Reproductive parameters of blue shark, *Prionace glauca*, and other sharks in the Gulf of Guinea. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 46: 967–73.

Compagno, L. J. V. 2007. FAO Species Catalogue for Fishery Purposes. No. 1. Sharks of the World: An annotated and illustrated catalogue of shark species known to date. Vol. 3. (Carcharhiniformes). FAO, Rome.

Compagno, L. J. V. 1984. Sharks of the World. An annotated and illustrated catalogue of shark species known to date. Part II (Carcharhiniformes). FAO Fisheries Synopsis No. 125, Vol. 4, Part II. FAO, Rome.

Denham, J., Stevens, J., Simpfendorfer, C.A., Heupel, M.R., Cliff, G., Morgan, A., Graham, R., Ducrocq, M., Dulvy, N.D, Seisay, M., Asber, M., Valenti, S.V., Litvinov, F., Martins, P., Lemine Ould Sidi, M. & Tous, P. and Bucal, D. 2007. *Sphyrna mokarran*. In: IUCN 2013. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2013.2. <<u>www.iucnredlist.org</u>>

Ebert, D.A. (2003). *Sharks, Rays, and Chimaeras of California*. University of California Press. pp. 178–179.

FLMNH (Florida Museum of Natural History). 2008. Biological Profile: smooth hammerhead Sphyrna zygaena, FLMNH website. Available at: <u>Available at:</u> <u>http://www.flmnh.ufl.edu/fish/gallery/descript/smhammer/smoothhammerhead.html.</u>

Ha, D.S. 2006. Ecology and Conservation of Virginia Shark Species: Analysis of 30 Years of Virginia Long-Line Census Data, 1974-2004. Ph.D. dissertation, Virginia Institute of Marine Science, College of William and Mary.

Hayes, C. 2008. Investigating single and multiple species fisheries management: stock status evaluation of hammerhead (Sphyrna spp.) sharks in the western North Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. Thesis. Virginia Tech University, Blacksburg, Virginia, USA.

Hayes, C.G., Jiao, Y. and E. Cortés. 2009. Stock assessment of scalloped hammerheads in the Western North Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 29: 1406–1417.

Jiao, Y., C. Hayes, and E. Cortés. 2008. Hierarchical Bayesian approach for population dynamics modelling of fish complexes without species-specific data. ICES Journal of Marine Science 66:367 - 377.

Jiao, Y., Cortes, E., Andrews, K. and F. Guo. 2011. Poor-data and data-poor species stock assessment using a Bayesian hierarchical approach. Ecological Applications 21:2691-2708.

20

Kotas, J.E., Mastrochirico, V. and Petrere Junior, M. 2011. Age and growth of the Scalloped Hammerhead shark, *Sphyrna lewini* (Griffith and Smith, 1834), from the southern Brazilian coast. Braz. J. Biol., 2011, vol. 71, n 3, p. 1-7.

Lemine Ould Sidi, M. & Tous, P. and Bucal, D. 2007. *Sphyrna mokarran*. In: IUCN 2013. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2013.2. <www.iucnredlist.org>.

Maguire, J.-J., Sissenwine, M., Csirke, J., Grainger, R. and Garcia, S. 2006. The state of world highly migratory, straddling and other high seas fishery resources and associated species. FAO Fisheries Technical Paper. FAO, Rome, Italy.

Miller, M.H., Carlson, J., Cooper, P., Kobayashi, D., Nammack, M., and J. Wilson. 2013. Status review report: scalloped hammerhead shark (Sphyrna lewini). Report to National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources. March 2013.131 pp.

Miller, M.H., Carlson, J., Hogan, L. and D. Kobayashi, D., 2014. Status review report: great hammerhead shark (*Sphyrna mokarran*). Report to National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources. March 2013.131 pp.

Morales, M.R., Navarro, S.S., Pérez-Jiménez, J.C., Ruiz, C., Smith, W., Valenti, S.V. & Vooren, C.M. 2007. *Sphyrna lewini*. In: IUCN 2013. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2013.2. <www.iucnredlist.org>.

Naylor GJP, Caira JN, Jensen K, Rosana KAM, White WT, Last PR. A DNA sequence-based approach to the identification of shark and ray species and its implications for global elasmobranch diversity and parasitology. *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*. 2012; 367:1–262.

NMFS. 2013. Final Amendment 5a to the 2006 Consolidated Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Highly Migratory Species Management Division, Silver Spring, MD. Public Document. pp. 410.

Piercy, A.N., Carlson, J.K., Sulikowski, J.A. and Burgess, G. 2007. Age and growth of the scalloped hammerhead shark, *Sphyrna lewini*, in the north-west Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 58: 34-40.

Pinhal, D., Shivji, M.S., Vallinoto, M., Chapman, D.D., Gadig, O.B.F., and Martins, C. 2011. Cryptic hammerhead shark lineage occurrence in the western South Atlantic revealed by DNA analysis. Mar Biol, Online First, 23, December 2011.

Quattro, J. M., Stoner, D. S., Driggers, W. B., Anderson, C. A., Priede, K. A., Hoppmann, E. C., Campbell, N. H., Duncan, K. M., and Grady, J. M. (2006). Genetic evidence of cryptic

speciation within hammerhead sharks (genus Sphyrna). Marine Biology 148, 1143–1155. doi:10.1007/S00227-005-0151-X

• . . .

Quattro, J.M., W.B. III Driggers, J.M. Grady, G.F. Ulrich and M.A. Roberts, 2013. *Sphyrna gilbert* sp. nov., a new hammerhead shark (Carcharhiniformes, Sphyrnidae) from the western Atlantic Ocean. Zootaxa 3702(2):159-178.

Simpfendorfer, C. A. (2014). Information for the development of Non Detriment Findings for CITES listed sharks. Report to Department of the Environment, Canberra ACT.



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE Washington, D.C. 20240



MEMORANDUM

AUG 0 5 2014

Chief, Division of Management Authority To:

From:

Chief, Division of Scientific Authority Rosenarie Anan

Subject: General advice for the export and introduction from the sea of wild porbeagle shark (Lamna nasus) harvested in the commercial fishery by U.S. fisherman in the 2014 harvest season, opening on January 1, 2014.

Advice: The Division of Scientific Authority (DSA) finds that the export and introduction from the sea of wild porbeagle shark harvested by U.S. fisherman in the 2014 harvest season is not detrimental to the survival of the species, provided that the harvest is in compliance with U.S. management plans in place for the species.

We will review and re-issue a general advice for porbeagle shark annually, in an effort to be responsive to new data and information that may become available.

Basis for advice:

Species Distribution/Range in the United States

The porbeagle shark is a wide-ranging, primarily coastal species which is also found in the open oceans. It is found in temperate and cold-temperate waters worldwide (1 to 18°C), at depths of approximately 1-700 meters; this species is most commonly associated with continental shelf habitat (Compagno, 2001). The species is centered within the North Atlantic, and within a circumglobal region of temperate water in the Southern Hemisphere including the South Atlantic Ocean, the Indian Ocean, the South Pacific Ocean and the Southern Ocean (Compagno, 2001).

The global population is generally separated into fished stocks located within the Northeast Atlantic, the Mediterranean Sea, the Northwest Atlantic, South Atlantic, Indian Ocean and Southern Ocean. The United States' harvest occurs within the Northwest Atlantic stock.

In the Northwest Atlantic this species' primary population center is located within Canada's territorial waters (Campana and Gibson, 2008). There is seasonal movement within this stock and the species is most commonly associated with continental shelf habitat from close inshore (summer) to far offshore; it is seldom found beyond the Canadian and U.S 200 mile Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) (Campana and Gibson, 2008).

In the Northwest Atlantic this species has been found to make annual migrations along the coast between the Gulf of Maine and Newfoundland, and is known occasionally from areas to as far south as New York, New Jersey and possibly South Carolina (Compagno, 2001; Campana et al. 1999; Campana and Joyce, 2004). Within U.S. territorial waters, the species is primarily located in 5-10°CC water (Campana and Joyce, 2004). Compagno (2001) noted its distribution included Bermuda. While the Northwest Atlantic stock of porbeagle has been shown to undertake migrations up and down the Atlantic coast of North America, long-term tagging data indicates this stock does not mix with the Northeastern Atlantic porbeagle stock (Compagno, 2001; ICCAT SCRS/ICES, 2009).



Distribution map for Lamna nasus (from FAO Species Identification Sheet 2003). Red/Dark: certain; Pink/Light: uncertain).

Biological Characteristics

This is a relatively slow growing, long-lived species that is late maturing and bears an average of four pups yearly after a gestation period of about eight months (in the North Atlantic) (Aasen, 1963; Gauld, 1989). Metabolically it maintains core body temperature above ambient sea temperature and is therefore often referred to as "warm-blooded". Due to its low reproductive potential, long life and late age of maturity, this species is vulnerable to overharvest.

Overall, when comparing porbeagle sharks from the North and South Atlantic stocks, the North Atlantic stocks are larger, faster growing and have a shorter lifespan than the South Atlantic stock. In the southern hemisphere (southwest Pacific), the species is estimated to live for approximately 65 years (Francis *et al.*, 2007), while some research has estimated the Northwest Atlantic stock to live up to 45 years(Compagno 2001). The Northeast Atlantic stock is slightly slower growing than the stock in the Northwestern Atlantic (Francis *et al.*, 2008).

Maximum total length for this species is over 300 cm and possibly as long as 370 cm, but most fully grown specimens are much smaller (Compagno 2001). In the western North Atlantic, ages at maturity for males and females are approximately eight and 13 years, respectively, and lengths at maturity are 180-215cm and 230-260cm total length, respectively (Natanson *et al.*, 2002).

Population Status and Trends

The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Redlist assessment for the global population of porbeagle indicates the status is Vulnerable (Stevens *et al.*, 2006). The most recent

assessment has determined the Northwestern Atlantic stock of porbeagle is increasing, likely due to the adherence to the management plan currently in place (ICCAT SCRS/ICES, 2009).

A 2009 ICCAT/ICES joint assessment estimated the total population size in the Northwest Atlantic, which is defined as north of 35N and west of 42W(approximately from Labrador, Canada south to Rhode Island), to be 22 to 27 percent of its size in 1961 and 95 to 103% of its size in 2001. By 2000, overharvest of this stock had reduced the average size of sharks and catch rates to the lowest levels on record, and catch rates of mature sharks in 2000 were 10% of those in 1992. In 2000, biomass was estimated to be 11–17% of virgin biomass (DFO, 2001). Since harvest quotas were reduced in 2002, population abundance has remained relatively stable with SSB, and number of mature females in the population, estimated at about 95-103% and 83-103% of the 2001 levels, respectively. The Northwest Atlantic porbeagle stock has been determined to be overfished, but due to the management in place it is not currently experiencing overfishing. Currently, this stock is increasing (Campana *et al.*, 2009).

Threats

Globally, overharvest is the primary threat (Stevens *et al.*, 2006). The fishing of juveniles is of particular concern since these fish will never have the opportunity to reproduce and replace themselves in the population. The fisheries produce meat and fins; consumption of meat occurs primarily in Europe, and fins primarily in the Asian market. Porbeagle fins are generally less valued than fins of other shark species, but fins are still exported to Asian markets as by-products of meat processing (Mundy-Taylor and Crook 2013).

Detailed catch records exist for the North Atlantic fisheries, which have been primarily exploited by North American and European fleets, but less data are available for the southern stocks (Semba *et al*). In the early 1960s, before the fishery collapsed, the Northwest Atlantic supported harvests up to 9,000 metric tons (mt). Apparently sustainable harvests of 350 mt occurred here until the 1990s and this allowed some rebuilding of the stock (Campana *et al.*, 2002). With tightened harvest restrictions in place in the Northeast and Northwest Atlantic, additional pressure is a concern for the South Atlantic stocks where cooperative stock management is not well developed. The lack of restrictive management of the southern stocks without adequate monitoring and proper documenting of harvest and trade has the potential to result in regional stock collapses.

Most harvest occurs within the Canadian and U.S. EEZs, where essential habitat for this pelagic species is located (ICCAT SCRS/ICES, 2009) and where harvest is strictly regulated.

Species Management

At the global level, the porbeagle shark is listed among the Highly Migratory Species (Annex 1) in the United Nations (UN) Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). A UN Agreement on Straddling and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks, which builds on UNCLOS and has been in force since 2001, calls on States to cooperate on these multijurisdictional stocks on actions and approaches to ensure their long-term conservation and sustainable use.

There is bilateral understanding that the Northwest Atlantic stock of porbeagle shark is a shared stock between the United States and Canada. The U.S. and Canada are utilizing the latest stock

assessment information to manage the fishery. Each country independently determines their harvest quota for this species and the combined quotas provide for rebuilding the stock. This type of regional cooperation is what was envisioned in both the UNCLOS and the UN Agreement on Straddling and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks.

Also at the regional level, porbeagle shark have been harvested as bycatch in fisheries targeting other species, including the Northwest Atlantic tuna and swordfish fisheries. The International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT), founded in 1969, is the intergovernmental organization responsible for the conservation and management of Atlantic tuna and tuna like species occurring in the Atlantic Ocean and adjacent seas. ICCAT (which is currently composed of 49 Contracting Parties) has adopted numerous recommendations for the management and conservation of both target stocks and bycatch species. ICCAT has also adopted both binding and non-binding measures on porbeagle data collection and management.

In 1995, ICCAT adopted its first (non-binding) measure on sharks, which called on its members to provide relevant information to FAO to support that body as the focal point of an effort to initiate a program to collect biological data on sharks, including on stock abundance and the magnitude of bycatch. Additional measures have been adopted since 2003 encouraging and eventually requiring ICCAT members to provide all catch and effort data for porbeagle and other shark species caught in association with fisheries managed by ICCAT, including estimates of dead discards and size frequencies. Regular reporting to ICCAT of harvest and discard data on porbeagle has greatly improved in recent years. Some Contracting Parties do not, however, fully report their data on porbeagle shark to ICCAT.

ICCAT adopted a specific management measure for porbeagle in 2007 that required Contracting Parties to take appropriate measures to reduce fishing mortality of porbeagle shark. In 2007, ICCAT requested that its science body conduct a stock assessment for porbeagle shark no later than 2009. In ICCAT's Standing Committee for Research and Statistics, in cooperation with the International Counsel for the Exploration of the Sea, ICCAT's science body conducted the requested stock assessment for Atlantic stocks. The results of the assessment are the scientific basis for porbeagle species management plans in both Canada and the United States. Additional conservation action has been considered by ICCAT since the 2009 stock assessment, in particular, a prohibition on retention of porbeagle shark. To date, no consensus has been reached on the need for such action. In the United States, porbeagle shark are primarily caught incidentally to other target species in the longline fishery and represent a relatively small proportion of the global catch.

The European Union (EU), as of January, 2010, prohibited all EU vessels from fishing for, landing, retaining, transshipping or finning porbeagle sharks either within or outside of EU territorial waters (EU, 2010). The EU has been a primary global consumer of porbeagle products (particularly the meat), and prior to the 2010 action, EU member states, especially Spain, were major contributors to worldwide porbeagle harvest.

At the national level in the United States, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) began managing Atlantic sharks, including porbeagle sharks, in 1993. Currently, the 2006 Consolidated Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan incorporates regulatory

measures designed to rebuild the Northwest Atlantic porbeagle stock over a 100 year time frame, with the rebuilding start date of 7/24/2008 (NMFS, 2009 2008). As part of the rebuilding plan, NMFS established a total allowable catch that allows for commercial and recreational harvest. The total allowable catch level is based on average U.S. landings at the time in an effort to maintain the level of fishing mortality recommended in a 2005 Canadian assessment (NMFS, 2008). The 2009 ICCAT stock assessment did not change the conclusions from the 2005 or 2009 Canadian assessments and therefore did not require a change to the rebuilding plan.

In addition to the annual commercial harvest quotas, permit and reporting requirements, size limit and gear restrictions for recreational fishermen are used to regulate the harvest. Commercial fishermen must have at least one of two permits in order to land and sell porbeagle sharks. The directed limited access permit allows commercial fishermen to target porbeagle sharks as long as the fishing season is open. The incidental limited access permit allows commercial fishermen to land up to 16 pelagic sharks, including porbeagle sharks, per trip as long as the fishing season is open. Commercial fishermen who target swordfish and tuna using pelagic longline gear must have one of these shark limited access permits in order to allow them to keep any porbeagle sharks that are caught incidental to their target species. Recreational fishermen must also have a permit and are restricted to one shark per trip with a minimum size of 54 inches fork length; recreationally caught fish cannot be sold. Many recreational fishermen fish in tournaments, many of which target pelagic sharks, including porbeagle sharks. These tournaments are required to be registered and may be selected to report. All fishermen, commercial and recreational, are required to keep shark fins naturally attached to the shark carcass. Dealers, who purchase the porbeagle from commercial fisherman, must have a federal dealers permit and must adhere to strict reporting requirements.

The annual total allowable catch (TAC) for U.S. permitted fishermen, both commercial and recreational, is 11.3 metric tons (mt) dressed weight (dw). The TAC includes allowances for commercial discards and incidental catch of 9.5 mt dw, recreational landings of 0.1 mt dw, and commercial landings of 1.7 mt dw (NMFS, 2008). The commercial harvest of porbeagle sharks is restricted by a commercial quota of 1.7 mt dw and is monitored through reporting by fishermen and dealers. The commercial fishermen must report their directed and incidental catch to NMFS within seven days of landing at the dock and the dealers must report activity within 10 days of purchasing catch. When an estimated 80% of the annual commercial quota has been landed, the fishery is closed to further harvest; this closure notice becomes effective five days after it is issued. The buffer of the additional 20% of quota is used to account for any late reports and to ensure the quota is not exceeded. If closure the quota is exceeded, any overharvest is deducted from the following year's harvest quota. In the 2011 and 2012 fishing seasons the commercial quota was exceeded by 2.1 metric tons and as a result, the commercial quotas for subsequent seasons were reduced. The fishing season was closed in 2013 which accounted for 1.7 mt dw and in 2014, the quota was reduced to 1.3 mt dw.

Porbeagle regulations are set on both state and Federal levels, and state regulations are consistent with regulations issued by NMFS. The Atlantic state fishery regulations are promulgated jointly among the states within the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC). In certain instances state regulations may be more restrictive than the corresponding Federal regulations but they cannot allow for a harvest in excess of the Federally established TAC. State-specific

regulations apply to fisheries within three nautical miles from the shoreline, while Federal regulations apply to fisheries from the three mile limit to the 200 mile nautical mile EEZ. These regulations also apply to U.S. fishermen permitted to fish on and in the high seas.

Recreational fishing for porbeagle shark is allowed year-round. Only hand lines, and hook and line gears are allowed in the recreational fishery. There is a one shark per vessel per trip bag limit, and the shark must have a minimum fork length of 54 inches. All porbeagle sharks must be landed with their fins naturally attached.

Summary

The porbeagle fishery in U.S. waters of the Northwestern Atlantic is managed under a rebuilding plan which allows harvest from directed, bycatch and recreational fisheries. Fishers participating in these fisheries are required to be permitted, either by NMFS or in the state where they are fishing. The total allowable catch is based on the ICCAT/ICES joint stock assessment, which is the best available science . The annual harvest is closed to fishermen when NMFS determines, through federal dealer reports, that at least 80% of the annual quota has been harvested. The commercial quota is adjusted annually, based on the previous year's harvest, to ensure the quota is not exceeded, over a multi-year period. If there is overharvest in one year, the commercial quota for the following year is reduced. There is one TAC for this species which is harvested in U.S. waters, and it encompasses all fish harvested whether they are taken from waters governed by state or Federal regulations. The species management plan currently being implemented allows the population to rebuild. According to the results of the 2009 assessment, the Northwestern Atlantic population is increasing.

Conclusion

The Division of Scientific Authority (DSA), based on the information and data available, and management measures currently in place, finds that the export and introduction from the sea of wild porbeagle shark harvested by U.S. fisherman in the 2014 harvest season is not detrimental to the survival of the species, provided that the harvest is in compliance with U.S. management plans in place for the species.

Literature_cited

Aasen, O. 1963. Length and growth of the porbeagle (Lamna nasus, Bonaterre) in the North West Atlantic. FiskDir. Skr. Serie Havundersokelser 13(6): 20-37.

Anonymous, 2012. Response to Notification to the Parties No. 2011/049, Concerning Sharks. CITES AC26. Inf. 1. <u>http://www.cites.org/common/com/AC/26/E26-01i.pdf</u>.

ASMFC Coastal Sharks Technical Committee. 2008. Coastal Sharks Technical Committee Consensus Recommendations: Final Draft Interstate Fishery Management Plan for Atlantic Coastal Sharks. April 10, 2008

Campana, Steven E., Warren Joyce, Linda Marks, Lisa J. Natanson, Nancy E. Kohler, Christopher F. Jensen, Joseph J. Mello, and Harold L. Pratt Jr. 2002. Population dynamics of the porbeagle in the Northwest Atlantic Ocean. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 22:106-121.

Campana, S.E. and Joyce, W.N. 2004. Temperature and depth associations of porbeagle shark (*Lamna nasus*) in the northwest Atlantic. *Fish. Oceanogr.* **13**:52–64.

Campana S. and Gibson, J. 2008. Catch and Stock Status of Porbeagle Shark (*Lamna nasus*) in the Northwest Atlantic to 2007, NAFO Doc. 08/36.

Campana, S., Marks, L., Joyce, W., Hurley, P., Showell, M. and Kulka, D. 1999. An analytical assessment of the porbeagle shark (*Lamna nasus*) population in the northwest Atlantic. CSAS. Res Doc.99/158.

Campana, S., Gibson, J., Fowler, M., Dorey, A., and Joyce, W. 2009. Population dynamics of porbeagle in the northwest Atlantic, with an assessment of status to 2009 and projections for recovery. SCRS/2009/095.

Compagno, L.J.V. 2001. Sharks of the world. An annotated and illustrated catalogue of shark species known to date. Volume 2. Bullhead, mackerel and carpet sharks (Heterodontiformes, Lamniformes and Orectolobiformes). FAO Species Catalogue for Fishery Purposes. No. 1, Vol. 2. Rome, FAO. 2001. 269p.

COSEWIC. 2004. Assessment and status report of the porbeagle shark (*Lamna nasus*) in Canada. Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada. Ottawa. viii + 43 pp http://www.globalshark.ca/ramweb/papers-total/COSEWIC_2004.pdf

DFO. 2001. Porbeagle shark in NAFO subareas 3-6. Scientific Stock Status Report. B3-09. 9 pp.

DFO, 2005. Recovery Potential Assessment of Atlantic Porbeagle Shark: Meeting of the Maritimes Regional Advisory Process; 22 March, 28 June and 14 July, 2005. DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Proceed. Ser. 2005/019.

European Union (EU). 2010. Council Regulation (EU) No 23/2010 of 14 January 2010 fixing for 2010 the fishing opportunities for certain fish stocks and groups of fish stocks, applicable in EU waters and, for EU vessels in waters where catch limitations are required, and amending Regulations (EC) No 1359/2008, (EC) No 754/2009, (EC) No 1226/2009, and (EC) No 1287/2009. Journal of the European Union. 26.1.2010. L 21/1.

Francis, M.P., Campana, S. E., and Jones, C. M. 2007. Age under-estimation in New Zealand porbeagle sharks (Lamna nasus): is there an upper limit to ages that can be determined from shark vertebrae? Marine and Freshwater Research 58: 10–23.

Francis, M. P., Natanson, L. J. and Campana, S. E. 2008: The biology and ecology of the Porbeagle shark *Lamna nasus*. In: Pikitch, E. K. and M. Camhi (Eds). *Sharks of the open ocean*. Blackwell Scientific Publications.

Gauld, J.A. 1989. Records of porbeagles landed in Scotland, with observations on the biology, distribution and exploitation of the species. Scottish Fisheries Research Report 45, ISSN 0308 8022.

ICCAT SCRS/ICES. 2009. Report of the 2009 Porbeagle stock assessments meeting. Copenhagen, Denmark, June 22 to 27, 2009. SCRS/2009/014. 57 pp.

Mundy-Taylor V. and Crook V. 2013. Into the deep: Implementing CITES measures for commercially-valuable sharks and manta rays. Report prepared for the European Commission.

Natanson, L.J., Mello, J.J. and Campana, S.E. 2002. Validated age and growth of the porbeagle shark (*Lamna nasus*) in the western North Atlantic Ocean. Fishery Bulletin 100:266-278

NMFS. 2008. Final Amendment 2 to the Consolidated Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Highly Migratory Species Management Division, Silver Spring, MD.

NMFS/HMS. 2008. Guide for complying with the Atlantic Shark Fisheries Regulations in Amendment 2 to the consolidated HMS FMP. Department of Commerce. <u>www.nmfs.noaa.gov/sfa/hms/sharks/Compliance_Guide_for_Amendment_2_FINAL.pdf</u>.

NMFS. 2009. Final Amendment 1 to the 2006 Consolidated Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan, Essential Fish Habitat. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Highly Migratory Species Management Division, Silver Spring, MD. Public Document. pp. 395.

NMFS. 2010. Final Amendment 3 to the Consolidated Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Highly Migratory Species Management Division, Silver Spring, MD. Public Document. pp. 632.

NOAA/OCRM. 2011. State Jurisdictional and Federal Waters. State Coastal Management Programs, Ocean Management and Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning. Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM). National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Silver Spring, Maryland (NOAA).). Stevens, J., Fowler, S.L., Soldo, A., McCord, M., Baum, J., Acuña, E., Domingo, A. & Francis, M. 2006. Lamna nasus. In: IUCN 2013. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2013.1. <www.iucnredlist.org>. Downloaded on 30 October 2013.

Stevens, J., Fowler, S.L., Soldo, A., McCord, M., Baum, J., Acuña, E., Domingo, A. and Francis, M. 2006. Lamna nasus. In: IUCN 2013. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2013.1. www.iucnredlist.org. Downloaded on 30 October 2013.

Semba, Y., Yokawa, K., Matsunaga, H. and Shono, H. 2013. Distribution and trend in abundance of the porbeagle (*Lamna nasus*) in the southern hemisphere. Marine and Freshwater Research, 2013, 64, 518–529