

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES  
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

---

Thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties  
Bangkok (Thailand), 2-14 October 2004

Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

Species trade and conservation issues

CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF SHARKS

1. This document has been submitted by the Animals Committee (AC).
2. Decision 12.47 states the following:

*The Chairman of the Animals Committee shall maintain the liaison established with the Secretary of the Committee on Fisheries of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, to monitor the implementation of the International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA-Sharks). The Chairman of the Animals Committee shall report on progress with the implementation of IPOA-Sharks at the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.*

3. Resolution Conf. 12.6 on Conservation and management of sharks includes the following paragraphs:

*DIRECTS the Animals Committee to continue activities specified under Decision 11.94 beyond the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and to report on progress at the 13th meeting of the Conference of Parties;*

*DIRECTS the Animals Committee to critically review progress towards IPOA-Sharks implementation (NPOA-Sharks) by major fishing and trading nations, by a date one year before the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES;*

*DIRECTS the Animals Committee to examine information provided by range States in shark assessment reports and other available relevant documents, with a view to identifying key species and examining these for consideration and possible listing under CITES;*

*DIRECTS the Animals Committee to make species-specific recommendations at the 13th meeting and subsequent meetings of the Conference of the Parties if necessary on improving the conservation status of sharks and the regulation of international trade in these species.*

4. The AC collaborated closely with the Secretariat on issues concerning shark conservation and management, and provided advice as necessary. This document therefore also reports on the implementation of three Decisions that are directed to the Secretariat as follows:

*11.151 The Secretariat shall continue to liaise with the World Customs Organization to promote the establishment and use of specific headings within the standard tariff classifications of the Harmonized System to discriminate between shark meat, fins, leather, cartilage and other products.*

*12.48 The Secretariat shall transmit to FAO the concerns of the Conference of the Parties regarding the lack of progress in implementing the IPOA-Sharks, and urge FAO to take steps to encourage the implementation of the IPOA-Sharks by States and regional fisheries management organizations.*

*12.49 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.*

5. At the 19th meeting of the AC (AC19; Geneva, August 2003), the Chairman reported that in compliance with Decision 12.47, he had liaised with FAO and that FAO had agreed to keep him informed of progress with the implementation of the IPOA-Sharks. From then onwards, the issue was mostly dealt with by the shark working group that the AC established at AC19, and which continued monitoring progress intersessionally. The working group reviewed all information at AC20 (Johannesburg, March-April 2004), including communications with FAO. Thus the AC was continuously kept informed of the latest developments.
6. The Committee noted that in compliance with Decision 12.49, the Secretariat had circulated Notification to the Parties No. 2003/051 just before AC19, and that the deadline for comments was 30 September 2003. The Committee requested the IUCN/SSC Shark Specialist Group to summarize the responses received by the Secretariat, and it agreed to do this. The Committee believed that the Notification had been formulated in too general terms, and that it would greatly assist the Parties if more specificity and structure could be provided. Accordingly, it recommended that a questionnaire, prepared by the IUCN/SSC Shark Specialist Group and modified by the Committee at AC19, be sent to the Parties as part of a follow-up Notification. This Notification to the Parties (No. 2003/068) was sent on 12 November 2003.
7. At AC20, the IUCN/SSC Shark Specialist Group introduced its report summarizing responses to Notifications to the Parties Nos. 2003/051 and 2003/068. Although twice as many Parties had reported progress towards implementation of the IPOA-Sharks than was the case two years previously, with particularly good progress by some African range States, there was not much evidence of improved shark fisheries management. It was suggested that it was important for the AC to continue the review by determining whether the collection of species-specific catch and landings data and the monitoring and management of shark fisheries had improved. TRAFFIC suggested that the AC focus its attention in future on the 20 shark-fishing States that are responsible for over 80 per cent of world shark landings reported to FAO. The Committee expressed appreciation for the voluntary efforts of the IUCN/SSC Shark Specialist Group regarding the compilation of information, and urged consideration of financial support for future shark projects.
8. The AC agreed to submit IUCN's document on the implementation of the IPOA-Sharks at the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties, following the incorporation of a few late responses to Notification to the Parties No. 2003/068, and to continue to monitor implementation of the IPOA-Sharks after CoP13 (see Annex 1).
9. The need for capacity-building efforts in developing countries and high seas fisheries for implementing the IPOA-Sharks, as urged in Resolution Conf. 12.6, to be undertaken by the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI) and Regional Fisheries Management Organizations, was highlighted at AC20. Further support from FAO for initiatives such as training workshops and species identification manuals was urgently needed. It was noted that requests for support from FAO would normally carry greater weight if made by Parties that are also FAO members. The observer from FAO at AC19 informed the meeting that FAO would continue in its efforts to encourage implementation of the IPOA-Sharks with the resources available to it, and to cooperate with CITES as appropriate.
10. Regarding the shark species codes referred to in Decision 11.151, the Committee discussed information documents AC20 Inf. 2, AC20 Inf. 3 and AC20 Inf. 4 that sought to provide a system compatible with the World Customs Organization (WCO) six-digit code classification. The proposed system was thought to be flexible and adaptable for species and products, while it could be expanded to provide information at any taxonomic level. The Committee expressed appreciation for the progress on this issue but cautioned against too complex a system and noted the need to liaise with FAO.

11. Consequently, the following workplan for the AC was recommended to assist the Secretariat in implementing Decision 11.151:
  - a) Liaison with the FAO Secretariat (April – May 2004)
    - i) One or more members of the AC would brief FAO staff on Decision 11.151 and discuss any parallel work within the FAO COFI Sub-Committee on Fish Trade; and
    - ii) On behalf of the Secretariat, AC members would revise documents AC20 Inf. 2, AC20 Inf. 3 and AC20 Inf. 4 as necessary to accommodate, if possible, recommendations from FAO on trade and species codes.
  - b) Consultation with WCO on process (June – July 2004)
    - i) On behalf of the Secretariat, AC members would contact appropriate staff at WCO to discuss Decision 11.151 and the current revision of harmonized trade codes.
    - ii) After consultation on timelines, submission protocol and desired input, AC members would further revise documents AC20 Inf. 2, AC20 Inf. 3 and AC20 Inf. 4 to accommodate WCO needs. This may or may not involve proposing all species codes to WCO.
  - c) Secretariat liaison (August – September 2004)
    - i) It was recommended that the Secretariat formally respond to WCO's letter of 2003, submitting new versions of documents AC20 Inf. 2, AC20 Inf. 3 and AC20 Inf. 4 on behalf of CITES Parties. Further contact between the CITES Secretariat and WCO would be possible after this point.
    - ii) The Secretariat should update Parties at CoP13 and perhaps rescind Decision 11.151 as fulfilled.
12. As directed in Resolution Conf. 12.6, the AC offered species-specific recommendations aimed at improving the conservation and management status of sharks and regulation of international trade in these species, conscious of the fact that these recommendations are offered separately and distinct from the CITES listing process since most of the species concerned are currently not included in the CITES Appendices. The AC is aware that it can provide scientific and technical advice on proposals to include sharks in the Appendices, but is in no position to endorse or reject such proposals formally. These recommendations (see Annexes 2 and 3) concern the spiny dogfish shark (*Squalus acanthias*), the porbeagle shark (*Lamna nasus*), the great white shark (*Carcharodon carcharias*), freshwater stingrays of the family Potamotrygonidae, the sawfishes of the family Pristidae, the gulper sharks of the genus *Centrophorus*, the school, tope or soupfin shark (*Galeorhinus galeus*), the requiem sharks of the genus *Carcharhinus*, the guitarfishes (shovelnose rays) of the order Rhinobatiformes, the devil rays of the family Mobulidae, and other key species identified by the IUCN/SSC Shark Specialist Group.
13. With regard to the work programme for sharks under CITES, at AC20 the Committee concluded that the actions directed to it and the Secretariat in Decisions 12.47, 12.48 and 12.49 had been completed and recommends therefore that these three decisions be deleted.
14. With regard to Resolution Conf. 12.6, the AC believes that the list of taxa in the table of Annex 2 of the present document would benefit from further work, possibly including the identification and prioritization of additional key species, if the AC is to fulfill completely the Resolution's directions to it (see the last two DIRECTS under paragraph 3 above).
15. The AC is of the opinion that this could best be achieved during an intersessional shark workshop and recommends that the Conference of the Parties adopt the Decisions presented in Annex 3. These and other means are necessary to fulfill the requirements of Resolution Conf. 12.6 beyond CoP13. Therefore, the AC proposes that Resolution Conf. 12.6 be updated by changing in the operational part "13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties" to "14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties".

16. The AC proposes that the Conference of the Parties adopt the draft decisions in Annex 3 regarding species-specific recommendations on improving the conservation status of sharks and the international trade in these species that it is directed to make in compliance with Resolution Conf. 12.6.

#### COMMENTS FROM THE SECRETARIAT

- A. The Secretariat generally concurs with the conclusions presented in the present document and the recommendations of the Animals Committee on this subject, namely that there is a need to keep under review the conservation of sharks subject to significant levels of off-take and the regulation of trade in specimens of such species. The Secretariat is of the opinion that the actions taken under the auspices of FAO concerning the management of sharks remain highly appropriate and should continue to be supported. The Animals Committee documents that the number of States that are reporting progress towards the implementation of FAO's International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA-Sharks) has more than doubled since CoP12. It remains however of particular concern that some of the main shark-fishing nations have not yet initiated actions in this regard. The effective implementation of National Plans of Action will also need to be promoted and regularly assessed to ensure actual improvement of shark management and conservation. The Secretariat therefore supports the Animals Committee's suggestion to continue to monitor progress towards IPOA-Sharks implementation beyond CoP13, and to amend Resolution Conf. 12.6 accordingly. It encourages the Animals Committee to consult shark and fisheries management experts, and to involve national fisheries management agencies in its review of the IPOA-Sharks.
- B. The Secretariat supports the essence of the draft decisions presented in Annex 3 of this document. In response to its mandate in Resolution Conf. 12.6, the Animals Committee highlighted a number of taxa for which it formulated species-specific recommendations directed to Parties and range States, and the Secretariat recognizes that the proposed measures are valuable and necessary. While the Animals Committee's directions help to prioritize conservation needs and promote targeted research, monitoring and reporting, they should not postpone or decrease attention to other sharks. There is indeed a need to improve the fishery management for all shark species. This can probably best be achieved through the implementation of the IPOA-Sharks, particularly by the major shark-fishing nations. Species-specific actions can usefully complement, but not replace, this more generic management approach.
- C. With regard to the proposed technical workshop on the conservation and management of sharks, the Secretariat wishes to stress that from the onset, it would seek full consultation of and collaboration with FAO. It is also mindful that to be successful, such a workshop would require the involvement of regional fishery organizations and national fishery agencies, and that species-specific and management recommendations are likely to vary from region to region.

Report on the implementation of the UN FAO International Plan of Action for  
the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA-Sharks)

1. This document, an updated version of AC20 Inf. 5, was produced by a co-chair of the IUCN Shark Specialist Group (SSG).

Introduction

2. Decision 12.49, adopted at the 12th meeting of the Conference of Parties (CoP12) 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*'.
3. Decision 12.47 directed '*The Chairman of the Animals Committee ... to monitor the implementation of the International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA-Sharks)....*'
4. Other relevant action points from CoP12 are outlined in the report of the Animals Committee's intersessional working group on sharks (see document AC20 Doc. 19).
5. The following actions are among those taken in response:
  - a) The United States of America presented at the 19th meeting of the Animals Committee (AC19, Geneva, 2003) a report on 'Progress made by the United States in developing and implementing the IPOA Sharks' (document AC19 Doc. 18.1). This contained a report by the USA National Marine Fisheries Service to Congress of December 2002. It described current shark fisheries management activities and regulations, international trade in shark products, bilateral and regional management activity, and current research.
  - b) The government of Japan presented at AC19 a report on 'Progress made by Japan in developing and implementing the IPOA-Sharks' (document AC19 Doc. 18.3). The main part of this report was a comprehensive paper 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).
  - c) The Secretariat issued two Notifications to the Parties requesting information on the implementation of the IPOA-Sharks. The first (Notification 2003/051) was a general request for information, the second (Notification 2003/068), circulated at the request of the Animals Committee, contained a structured questionnaire designed to assist States report on progress with implementation.
  - d) The Animals Committee asked the SSG to analyse and report on responses to the above Notifications (subject to available resources, the lack of which severely hampered analysis).
  - e) Twenty Parties replied to one or other of the two Notifications from the Secretariat. Several additional questionnaire responses were received through the SSG, some from staff of government fisheries departments, some from other SSG members in the State concerned. Additional responses were received during and shortly after the 20th meeting of the Animals Committee (AC20, Johannesburg, 2004).
6. 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 Chairman of the Animals Committee.
7. 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 sub regional or regional fisheries management organisations to implement fully the IPOA-Sharks, as a matter of priority, and also, *inter alia*, urged all States to cooperate with FAO in order to assist developing States to implement the IPOA-Sharks.

8. This document presents the SSG's analysis of the results of the Notifications. It also includes the results of responses received through the SSG 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 SSG by the FAO Fisheries Department.

#### Responses of CITES Parties to Notifications

9. The following Parties responded to Notification to the Parties No. 2003/051: European Commission (on behalf of European Member States) and Brunei. The following Parties responded to Notification to the Parties No. 2003/068: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Gabon, China (Hong Kong)\*, Korea (Republic of), Macedonia\*, Mexico, New Zealand, Poland\*, Saint Lucia, Singapore, South Africa, Tanzania (United Republic of), Turkey\* and the United Arab Emirates.
10. The following questionnaires were completed through the SSG network: China (prepared in consultation with CITES MA), Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, Namibia and the Seychelles.
11. A database containing the results of the questionnaires is available. The results are summarized in Annex 1. Finally, the SSG became aware in early March of five National Shark Plans prepared by States belonging to the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission in West Africa; these have not yet been added to the database or Annex 1.

#### Results

12. The following pages should be read in conjunction with an updated version of the table summarizing progress with the IPOA-Sharks that was prepared for AC18 and updated prior to CoP12 (see Summary table of IPOA-Sharks implementation in Annex 1). 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 Notification to the Parties (whether directly to the CITES Secretariat or through the SSG), unless they indicated that they had no shark fisheries. The latter are included in the analysis and tables presented below.

#### Result: No action taken

13. Thirty-two States (Tables 1 to 3), including three 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 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 therefore not listed here either. The Republic of Korea, which was listed in Table 1 of AC20 Inf. 5, informed the Shark Working Group during AC20 that it is intending to implement the IPOA-Sharks. 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.

---

\* 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).

**Table 1 Important shark fishing nations (landing > 10,000t/yr) not yet implementing the IPOA-sharks**

Nigeria	Sri Lanka	China (Taiwan province)
---------	-----------	-------------------------

**Table 2 Other States not yet implementing the IPOA-Sharks**

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

**Table 3 States without shark fisheries**

Belgium	Lithuania	Poland
Latvia	Macedonia	Romania

Result: Working towards implementation

14. 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 (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 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	
Korea (Republic of)	
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 <sup>5</sup>
Benin	El Salvador	Seychelles
Brunei Darussalam <sup>1</sup>	Fiji	Sierra Leone
Cambodia	Guinea Bissau <sup>2</sup>	Sudan
Cap Vert <sup>2</sup>	Marshall Islands	Sweden
Chile	Morocco	Syrian Arab Republic
China	Norway	Tonga
Columbia	Oman <sup>3</sup>	Trinidad and Tobago
Costa Rica	Palau <sup>4</sup>	Turkey <sup>6</sup>
Cote d'Ivoire	Panama	Uruguay
Cuba (Annual SARs produced)	Papua New Guinea	United Arab Emirates
Cyprus	Peru	Vietnam

1. Description of fisheries (SAR equivalent) provided to CITES.  
2. Engaged in regional initiative of Commission Sous-Regional des Peches, West Africa.  
3. Five-year programme 'The Shark Project' initiated to develop a national shark plan.  
4. Progress not reported to FAO or CITES, but known to have introduced stringent shark protection and fishery legislation in 2003.  
5. Reported to CITES that it is not implementing the IPOA-Sharks, but has described and is monitoring its shark fisheries.  
6. Response to CITES Secretariat unclear.

Result: Draft documents prepared

15. Five States (including the EU and two EU Member States) have draft Shark Assessment Reports (SAR) or National Plans of Action (NPOA) (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. Preparation draft Shark Plan in progress.
Indonesia	Drafted April 2004 at workshop of Australia-Indonesia ACIAR Shark and Ray Project, in collaboration with the SSG. Undergoing translation in preparation for government approval.
United Kingdom	EU action awaited, but shark plan 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 AC19; final minor edits needed before submission to government and adoption (due 2005)

Result: SARs and NPOAs completed

16. Twelve States have stated that they have completed either SARs or NPOAs, 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 (CSRП). The CSRП 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 blocked by some stake-holders
?Thailand	Reported to FAO in 2002; document(s) not specified and not available
United States	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	CSRП member; NPOA incorporating SAR and NPOA actions
Guinea	CSRП member; NPOA incorporating SAR and NPOA actions
Mauritania	CSRП member; document not yet seen
Namibia	NPOA adopted by Cabinet in 2004
Senegal	CSRП member; NPOA incorporating SAR and NPOA actions

#### Effectiveness of implementation

17. When considering this review, 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 do not include adequate data collection, monitoring or management measures. It is of course impossible to assess the adequacy of documents that have not been made available to CITES or to FAO.
18. 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). For example one response stated: “Assistance will be needed with training, capacity building and research before it will be possible to implement the IPOA-Sharks”. Other constraints include objections from industry (apparently a problem in Mexico), or simply a 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 independent of the structure recommended formally by FAO (examples of States achieving this are Canada and New Zealand).
19. Earlier reviews undertaken for meetings of the Animals Committee and the Conference of Parties noted that most of States that had implemented the IPOA-Sharks in earlier years were already managing their shark fisheries (examples are the United States 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

20. Two years ago, 29 States reported progress with the implementation of the IPOA-Sharks but only five of these had Shark Assessment Reports (SAR) or National Plans of Action (NPA) available for public consultation and review. Only one of the 18 major shark fishing States (Australia) had a SAR and only two (Japan and the United States) had completed NPAs, with a preliminary draft from the European Union. 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 SAR. While the latter is certainly useful, it was not prepared in order to implement the IPOA-Sharks. All of the NPAs and SARs reviewed in 2002 had failed to meet some of the recommendations from FAO, while some fell seriously short of these standards (see AC18 Doc. 19.2).
21. By the end of June 2004, 65 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-Sharks and recognition that action should be taken at some unspecified time in the future. Thirty-one States, including three of the world's major shark fishing nations, had either still not indicated whether they would be implementing the IPOA-Sharks 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).
22. Seventeen of the States reporting progress stated that they had produced draft or final SARs or NPAs, compared with just five States two years ago. This figure includes ten 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 and 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 it had taken particular care to meet the standards recommended by FAO. Resource constraints meant that it was not possible to complete such a detailed critical analysis of these and other documents available in 2003 and 2004 as SSG undertook in 2002.
23. Many African States 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.
24. It is suggested that, if all the provisions of Resolution Conf. 12.6 are to be implemented, it is important for the Animals Committee not only to monitor the delivery of shark plans and assessments by Parties, but to determine how many States are actually managing their shark fisheries as a result, and hence whether the implementation of the IPOA-Sharks has led to any real improvement in the conservation and management status of shark fisheries and populations in the wild.

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
EU	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
China (Hong Kong)				Y	Y	Y									
Korea, Rep. of	Y	Y													
Macedonia	N	N													
Mexico	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y		Y	N	Y
New Zealand	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
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?	?
South Africa	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Tanzania, United Rep. of		Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Turkey															
United Arab Emirates	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N

**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			
EU	?							
Ecuador	N	Y		N	N	N	N	N
Gabon	Y				Y	Y	N	N
Korea, Rep. of	N	N						
Mexico	N	Y			N	N	N	N
Saint Lucia	N	N						
Singapore	N?	N						
South Africa	N	Y	Y		Y			Y
Tanzania, United Rep. of	N	N	Not yet					
United Arab Emirates	N	Y		Y		N	N	N

**A iii) Progress with preparation of National Plan of Action (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	
EU	Y								
Ecuador	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Gabon	Y	N							
Korea, Rep. of	N	N	Y	N					
Mexico	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Saint Lucia	N	N							
Singapore	N?	N							
South Africa	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	
Tanzania, United Rep. of	N	N	Not yet	Not yet					
United Arab Emirates	N	N	Y	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)
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
Indonesia	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	?	Y	-	Y	Y	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
China	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Fiji	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Indonesia	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

**B iii) Progress with preparation of National Plan of Action (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
Indonesia	N	N	Y	Y		Y			
Japan	Y	N							
Namibia	Y	N							
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

### Summary table of IPOA-Sharks implementation

- 1 This Appendix, updated from an original Table in document 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 the 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.
2. 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.
3. European Union Member 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 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).
Cameroon	No		No	No		

Country	Reports to COFI 24, 2001		Situation in 2002		Situation in 2004	
	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA
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).	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 <sup>2</sup>	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*				Draft in progress		
Italy						
Spain*						Working towards development (report to FAO COFI 25).
UK*						Drafted for coastal waters

\*\*\* Progress being made on regional shark plan through the West African Subregional Fisheries Commission (see 'regional initiatives' below).

<sup>2</sup> 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 2004	
	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA
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***	Incorporated in NPOA	Yes, not implemented
Ghana	No	No				
Grenada	No	No	No	No		
Guinea	No		No*** Not mentioned in response to FAO re. implementation of CCRF		Incorporated in NPOA	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		Draft prepared in April 2004
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?)
Kenya	No	No				

\*\*\* Progress being made on regional shark plan through the West African Subregional Fisheries Commission (see 'regional initiatives' below).

Country	Reports to COFI 24, 2001		Situation in 2002		Situation in 2004	
	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA
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	Cabinet approval received in 2004
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 <sup>3</sup> . 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).
Pakistan*	No	Intention to prepare in near future	No	No		
Palau	No	No				

\*\*\* Progress being made on regional shark plan through the West African Subregional Fisheries Commission (see 'regional initiatives' below).

<sup>3</sup> QMS: Quota Management System.

Country	Reports to COFI 24, 2001		Situation in 2002		Situation in 2004	
	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA	SAR	NPOA
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).
China (Taiwan)*			No	No		
Tanzania (UR)					No. (Response to CITES Notification).	

\*\*\* Progress being made on regional shark plan through the West African Subregional Fisheries Commission (see 'regional initiatives' below).

Country	Reports to COFI 24, 2001		Situation in 2002		Situation in 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*	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 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'.	

Species-specific recommendations of the Animals Committee aimed at improving the conservation and management status of sharks and regulation of international trade in these species

1. The recommendations in this document have been formulated in compliance with directives to the Animals Committee in Resolution Conf. 12.6 to *examine information provided by range States in shark assessment reports and other available relevant documents, with a view to identifying key species and examining these for consideration and possible listing under CITES and to make species-specific recommendations at the 13th meeting and subsequent meetings of the Conference of the Parties if necessary on improving the conservation status of sharks and the regulation of international trade in these species.*
2. These recommendations are offered separately and distinct from the CITES listing process, regardless of the outcome of pending and future listing proposals. The Animals Committee is aware that it can provide scientific and technical advice on proposals to include sharks in the Appendices, but is in no position to formally endorse or reject such proposals.

Spiny Dogfish Shark *Squalus acanthias*

3. At AC20, Germany introduced a draft proposal to include spiny dogfish *Squalus acanthias* in Appendix II, with accompanying annotations and decisions (see documents AC20 Inf. 7, AC20 Inf. 20 and AC20 Inf. 22), requesting and receiving feedback from participants. The problem of identification of fins of this species in trade was noted. These are a by-product of the fisheries that are driven by international trade demand for meat (which is traded under the species name). It was suggested that because the fins are not readily recognizable as a spiny dogfish product, they might not need to be covered by a CITES listing. It was suggested that an annotation might exclude the fins. However, in the case of animals, the Convention provides that for species included in Appendices I or II, any readily recognizable part or derivative thereof is included, i.e. parts such as fins cannot be exempted from the listing (unlike for Appendix-II or -III listed plant species, or Appendix-III listed animal species). The Secretariat advised that this should not be an impediment to listing.
4. The Animals Committee concluded that the conservation and management status of the species is unfavorable in most regions, with many Northern Hemisphere populations severely depleted, and recommends the following:
  - a) Range States and Regional Fishery Management Organizations should take steps to improve data collection and management for spiny dogfish. In particular, the United States and Canada are encouraged with urgency to work together to link existing assessment programmes and establish bilateral, science-based management measures for spiny dogfish.
  - b) Parties that are Member States of the European Union are encouraged with urgency to seek and implement, via national and EU level measures, scientific advice on developing a conservation plan that allows the rebuilding of the stocks of spiny dogfish occurring and harvested in EU waters.
  - c) In regions where information on stock status is poor, range States are encouraged to develop precautionary and adaptive management measures to ensure that spiny dogfish catches are sustainable.
  - d) Parties are encouraged to report dogfish catches, landings and trade data to FAO and to train customs officials in using existing spiny dogfish codes.

Porbeagle Shark *Lamna nasus*

5. At AC20, Germany introduced a draft proposal to include porbeagle *Lamna nasus* in Appendix II, and a related resolution (see document AC20 Inf. 6), requesting feedback from participants. In response to a question on whether the species was caught in target or bycatch fisheries, it was noted that it is

both a target species and a highly valuable retained component of multispecies fisheries that may primarily target other species. The term bycatch is inappropriate for such a valuable species that may make the fishery of other target species economically viable. It was also noted that porbeagle can be released alive from longlines.

6. The Animals Committee concluded that North Atlantic populations have been severely depleted and noted that quotas in EU waters apply only to non-EU fleets through access agreements. As these quotas are far higher than can be supported by the stock and do not restrict fishing effort they are not considered to be an effective management measure in this case. The Animals Committee recommended the following:
  - a) ICCAT members are encouraged to collect and report data on catches and discards of porbeagle sharks, as per ICCAT Resolution 95-2 which has yet to be complied with, and undertake stock assessments in order to develop management recommendations. Other relevant Regional Fishery Management Organizations are encouraged to establish and implement similar programmes.
  - b) The US and Canada are encouraged to enhance existing management for their shared porbeagle stock by establishing a cooperative, bilateral research and fisheries management programme.
  - c) The World Customs Organization (WCO) is encouraged with urgency to establish a harmonized international code for porbeagle sharks.

#### White Shark *Carcharodon carcharias*

7. At AC20, the Animals Committee examined information on this species (see documents AC20 Inf. 1, AC20 Inf. 19 and AC20 Inf. 23), noting evidence of population declines in this low abundance, high value species that is sought after for trophies and enters trade as curios and fins. The constraints of the current Appendix-III listing regarding controlling trade were noted and the Animals Committee suggested that the draft listing proposal be amended to explain how uplisting would improve trade monitoring. The Animals Committee concluded that conservation and management status of white sharks is unfavorable in some regions and that some of the international agreements aimed at improving the conservation of this species are not being sufficiently implemented.
8. The Animals Committee recognized that the documents included information additional to that presented in Australia's proposal that might be of value to Parties and to the FAO assessment process. The Animals Committee encourages Australia to consider incorporating it into their proposal. The representative of Oceania agreed to transmit these comments to Australia.

#### Freshwater Stingrays Family Potamotrygonidae

9. The Animals Committee examined an information document on South American freshwater stingrays, submitted by the Management Authority of Brazil (see document AC20 Inf. 8). These species are very valuable in the international aquarium trade as well as being used for food locally. There is concern that illegal trade is underway. Aquarium trade exports are regulated by Brazil through quotas, but apparently not in neighboring states, creating management challenges for shared stocks. It was recognized that CITES listing of species is difficult if there is no adequate protection within the proponent range State. The Animals Committee noted that the document would benefit from the inclusion of more species abundance, distribution and trend data once the updated Red List Assessments are available.
10. The Animals Committee recommended that:
  - a) Range States for these species jointly examine cross-border trade that may be facilitating illegal trade and consider Appendix III listings, where appropriate, to control illegal exports; and that
  - b) the document be revised, with the addition of more species abundance, distribution and trend data, and submitted to CoP13 or AC21.

## Identification of other key species

11. The Animals Committee examined a review of the IUCN/SSC Shark Specialist Group's (SSG) progress with assessing the threatened status of sharks. The SSG has so far assessed ~25% of taxa. Document AC20 Inf. 21 identifies taxa that are threatened globally or regionally, usually as a result of unsustainable fishing. Many of these species enter international trade. The Animals Committee noted that there is considerable overlap between these species and the ~70 species listed in Paragraph 16, Oceanic Sharks, of Annex 1, Highly Migratory Species, of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), as requiring international cooperation to ensure the conservation and optimum utilization of such species. These are: *Hexanchus griseus*, *Cetorhinus maximus*, Family Alopiidae, *Rhincodon typus*, Family Carcharhinidae, Family Sphyrnidae, and Family Isurida [an old name for Family Lamnidae].
12. A selection of taxa from these two sources is listed in a table providing a provisional list of some key species and higher taxa of sharks (see document AC20 Inf. 28). These represent a small proportion of the approximately 1,100 living species of chondrichthyan fishes (sharks, skates, rays and chimaeras) and the species in UNCLOS Annex 1. Additional columns in the table indicate why these taxa were selected by the SSG; a combination of factors including:
  - a) listed on UNCLOS;
  - b) listed or proposed for listing on Appendices of CITES or the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS);
  - c) shared or high seas stocks (thus requiring joint management by fishing States for successful sustainable management);
  - d) declining as a result of unsustainable levels of exploitation;
  - e) included on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species;
  - f) effectiveness of management; and/or
  - g) entering international trade.
13. The Animals Committee discussed the list of taxa in the table. Views were expressed that it was either too long (including some taxa that may be of relatively low priority for the development of recommendations by the Animals Committee under Resolution Conf. 12.6 or are already listed on the Appendices), or too short (excluding additional key species that required recommendations for improving their conservation status and the regulation of international trade in their products). Inclusion of the table in the report of the Animals Committee to CoP13 was eventually agreed to, provided that its purpose was made clear. Despite the wording of Resolution Conf. 12.6, directing the Animals Committee to examine key species 'for consideration and possible listing under CITES', the table was not intended to provide a comprehensive species list for this purpose. The list and the recommendations below were offered separately and distinct from the CITES listing process, regardless of the outcome of any pending or future listing proposals. It was noted that the SSG's initial review of the threatened status of sharks would not be completed until 2005 at the earliest and would be followed by further reviews as additional data became available. The table should, therefore, be considered as a provisional first list of key species requiring special attention from Parties, while additional lists of key species and recommendations should be produced for future meetings of the Animals Committee. Effective management of these species could preclude the need for future CITES listings.
14. The Animals Committee had insufficient time to develop recommendations for all key taxa in the table, but focused on some of those considered to be of particularly high conservation priority. It should be noted that lack of recommendations for other species does not mean that they are not also in need of conservation or management measures. The following are listed in taxonomic order, excluding those species already reviewed above.

## Sawfishes Family Pristidae

15. This entire family (seven species) is being classified by IUCN as critically endangered. Records are now extremely rare, but products (particularly fins and rostra) are valuable and still enter trade in small quantities. The Animals Committee recommends that Parties that are or have been range States for Pristidae undertake, as a matter of urgency, a review of the status of these species in their

coastal waters, rivers and lakes, and, if necessary, introduce conservation and trade measures to reduce extinction risk (the US has already listed smalltooth sawfish *Pristis pectinata* Latham, 1794, as endangered and prohibited all take of the species within its 200 mile EEZ).

#### Gulper sharks Genus *Centrophorus*

16. These species live in low productivity deep ocean environments. They have low growth, reproductive and metabolic rates and are long-lived, even more so than other deep water sharks. Fisheries are driven by international demand for liver oil and meat and result in extremely rapid stock depletion. An FAO Deep Sea Workshop in December 2003 recommended that “a precautionary approach to the management of these and other deep sea species is absolutely essential”, including monitoring of catches, landings and trade at species level, preparation of good identification guides, improved use of observers, and development of standard carcass forms to improve reporting, which should include both species and their products. The Animals Committee recommends that Parties support this approach.

#### School, tope, or soupfin shark *Galeorhinus galeus*

17. These sharks, valued for their meat and fins, are (or have been) important in target and multispecies fisheries in temperate waters world-wide. Most stocks are shared between several Range States, and in most regions are seriously depleted. Only a small number of States have achieved successful management of this biologically-vulnerable species. The Animals Committee recommends that range States request FAO’s assistance with developing a capacity building workshop for this species in order to train managers from developing States and other States where coastal shark fisheries are not being managed. This would also serve as a case study for the management of other coastal shark fisheries. This was drawn to the attention of the FAO observer.

#### Other priority species

18. The Animals Committee identified the following three taxonomic groups that contain a significant proportion of species subjected to unregulated unsustainable fishing pressures, leading to severe stock depletion, and whose high value products enter international trade in large numbers:
- a) Requiem sharks Genus *Carcharhinus*;
  - b) Guitarfishes, Shovelnose rays Order Rhinobatiformes; and
  - c) Devil rays Family Mobulidae
19. It recommends that range States pay particular attention to the management of fisheries and trade in these taxa, including undertaking reviews of their conservation and trade status. It was noted that many of the Carcharhinid sharks were high seas pelagic species that could only be managed through the joint efforts of States, Regional Fisheries Management Organizations and other international bodies.

#### Additional recommendations

20. In addition to the above species-specific recommendations, the Animals Committee urges Parties, through FAO, and regional fisheries organizations:
- a) To develop, adopt and implement new international instruments and regional agreements for the conservation and management of sharks, particularly on the high seas where the provisions of the Fish Stocks Agreement need to be implemented for sharks, and where multilateral fisheries access of partnership agreements are operating; and
  - b) to consider recommendations for activities and guidelines to reduce mortality of endangered species of sharks in bycatch and target fisheries, and to develop waterproof shark identification guides for fishermen to improve shark species identification and data collection.

**Table Provisional list of some key shark species identified under Resolution Conf. 12.6 by the Animals Committee**

- i) The species included in this table have been identified by the Animals Committee in compliance with directives to the Animals Committee in Resolution Conf. 12.6 to *examine information provided by range States in shark assessment reports and other available relevant documents, with a view to identifying key species and examining these for consideration and possible listing under CITES and to make species-specific recommendations at the 13th meeting and subsequent meetings of the Conference of the Parties if necessary on improving the conservation status of sharks and the regulation of international trade in these species.*
- ii) This table is not intended to provide a comprehensive species list for consideration and possible listing under CITES. It is offered separately and distinct from the CITES listing process, regardless of the outcome of any pending or future listing proposals, and represents a provisional first list of key species requiring special management attention from Parties. Effective management of these species could preclude the need for future CITES listings.

Species name	UNCLOS	CITES/CMS	Shared stocks	Declining	IUCN Red List*	Management**	International trade
<p>* Where a range of Red List assessments are given for species groups, these refer to different taxa within these groups. Where a range is provided for a single species, these refer to the global assessment (with regional assessments in brackets).</p> <p><i>Key to Red List Assessments: NE: Not Evaluated; LC: Least Concern; DD: Data Deficient (many of these will be reviewed in 2004); NT: Near Threatened; VU: Vulnerable; EN: Endangered; CR: Critically Endangered (categories VU, EN and CR are collectively referred to as 'threatened')</i></p> <p>** Effective shark management or conservation activity is limited to only a few states (there is no space to provide details here) and there is no dedicated or effective shark fisheries management on the high seas.</p>							
<i>Hexanchus griseus</i> Bluntnose sixgill shark	Yes		?	Yes	NT	No	?
<i>Squalus acanthias</i> Spiny dogfish		Consultation for CITES II	Yes	Yes	NT (VU/EN)	Some	Yes
Genus <i>Centrophorus</i> Gulper Sharks (~ 10 species)			Yes	Yes	DD–CR	Mostly none	Liver oil (meat?)
Family Squatinidae Angel Sharks (~ 20 species)			Some	Yes (some)	LC–EN	Mostly none	?
<i>Rhincodon typus</i> Whale shark	Yes	CITES II CMS II	Yes	Yes	VU	Mostly none	Yes
Family Odontaspidae Sand tigers (3 species)			Yes	Yes	DD–VU, (NT–CR)	Mostly none	Fins, aquaria
Genus <i>Alopias</i> Thresher sharks (3 species)	Yes		Yes	Yes	DD under review (NT)	Mostly none	Meat and fins
<i>Cetorhinus maximus</i> Basking shark	Yes	CITES II	Yes	Yes	VU (EN)	Mostly none	Fins

Species name	UNCLOS	CITES/CMS	Shared stocks	Declining	IUCN Red List*	Management**	International trade
<i>Carcharodon carcharias</i> Great white shark	Yes	CITES III & proposal II CMS I & II	Yes	Yes	VU	Some	Jaws and fins
Genus <i>Isurus</i> Mako sharks (2 species)	Yes		Yes	Yes	DD under review (NT)	Mostly none	Meat and fins
<i>Lamna ditropis</i> Salmon shark	Yes		Yes	In NW Pac?	DD	Mostly none	Meat and fins
<i>Lamna nasus</i> Porbeagle shark	Yes	Consultation for CITES II	Yes	Yes	NT (VU-EN)	Mostly none	Meat and fins
<i>Galeorhinus galeus</i> School/tope/soupfin shark			Yes	Yes	VU (NT-EN)	Mostly none	Meat and fins
Genus <i>Mustelus</i> Smoothhound sharks (25 species)			Yes	Some	LC-VU	Mostly none	Meat
Family Carcharinidae (12 genera, 54 species)	Yes						
Genus <i>Carcharinus</i> (31 species, including)	Yes						
<i>Carcharhinus albimarginatus</i> Silvertip shark	Yes		Yes	Yes	DD (under review)	None	Fins
<i>Carcharhinus amblyrhynchoides</i> Graceful shark	Yes		?	Yes	NT	None	Fins
<i>Carcharhinus amblyrhynchos</i> Gray reef shark	Yes		?	Yes	NT	Mostly none	Fins
<i>Carcharhinus amboinensis</i> Pigeye or Java shark	Yes		Yes	Yes	DD (NT)	None	Fins
<i>Carcharhinus brachyurus</i> Bronze whaler	Yes		Yes	Yes	NT (LC,DD,VU)	Mostly none	Fins
<i>Carcharhinus brevipinna</i> Spinner shark	Yes		Yes	Yes	NT (VU)	Mostly none	Fins and meat
<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i> Silky shark	Yes		Yes	1 stock > 90%	LC (under review)	None	Fins
<i>Carcharhinus galapagensis</i> Galapagos shark	Yes		Yes	Yes	NT (DD)	None	Fins
<i>Carcharhinus leucas</i> Bull shark	Yes		Yes	Yes	NT	Mostly none	Fins
<i>Carcharhinus limbatus</i> Blacktip shark	Yes		Yes	Yes	NT (VU)	Mostly none	Fins and meat

Species name	UNCLOS	CITES/CMS	Shared stocks	Declining	IUCN Red List*	Management**	International trade
<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i> Oceanic whitetip shark	Yes		Yes	1 stock >99%	NT (under review)	None	Fins
<i>Carcharhinus melanopterus</i> Blacktip reef shark	Yes		?	Yes	NT	Mostly none	Fins
<i>Carcharhinus obscurus</i> Dusky shark	Yes		Yes	1 stock >80%	NT (VU)	Mostly none	Fins
<i>Carcharhinus perezi</i> Caribbean reef shark	Yes		?	?	NE	Mostly none	Fins
<i>Carcharhinus plumbeus</i> Sandbar shark	Yes		Yes	Yes	NT	Mostly none	Fins
<i>Galeocerdo cuvier</i> Tiger shark	Yes		Yes	Yes	NT	Mostly none	Fins
Genus <i>Glyphis</i> River sharks (6 species)	Yes		?	Yes	EN-CR	Mostly none	Jaws, fins
Genus <i>Negaprion</i> Lemon sharks (2 species)	Yes		Yes	Yes	NT, VU (EN)	Mostly none	Fins
<i>Prionace glauca</i> Blue shark	Yes		Yes	Yes	NT (under review)	None	Fins
Family Sphyrnidae Hammerheads (8 species)	Yes		Most	Most	LC, DD, NT (3) NE (3)	Mostly none	Fins
Batoid fishes (skates and rays)							
Family Pristidae Sawfishes (7 species)			Some	Yes	All CR	Mostly none	Fins and rostra
Order Rhinobatiformes Guitarfishes, Shovelnose rays (~ 57 species)			Some?	Yes	Most NE, some threatened	Mostly none	Fins are top quality
<i>Dipturus batis</i> Common Skate			Some	Yes	EN (CR) under review	Unmanaged	?
Family Potamotrygonidae Freshwater Stingrays (16-18 species)			Some	Yes	DD, under review	Partial	Ornamental
Genus <i>Mobula</i> , Devil rays (9 species)			Some	Yes	NT (2), VU (1), NE (6)	Unmanaged	Gill rakers
<i>Manta birostris</i> Manta Ray			Yes	Yes	DD/VU	Unmanaged	Gill rakers

DRAFT DECISIONS OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

Directed to the Secretariat

13.XX The Secretariat shall:

- a) assist in obtaining funds from interested Parties, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, exporters, importers and others to support a technical workshop of relevant experts on conservation and management of sharks;
- b) contingent on the availability of external funding, convene in 2005 a technical workshop on conservation and management of sharks *inter alia* to consider and review progress with the implementation of the IPOA-Sharks, identify and prioritize key shark species, and make species-specific recommendations on improving the conservation status of sharks and the regulation on international trade in these species;
- c) invite representatives of major shark-fishing Parties, the Animals Committee and relevant bodies, including FAO, Regional Fisheries Management Organizations, the fishery sector, the IUCN/SSC Shark Specialist Group, fishery experts and other stakeholders to the technical workshop; and
- d) summarize findings and recommendations of the technical workshop for consideration by the Animals Committee.

Directed to the Animals Committee

13.XX The Animals Committee shall:

- a) review, with the assistance of experts as may be needed, the outcomes of the technical workshop convened by the Secretariat on the conservation and management of sharks and other relevant information, make species-specific recommendations, examine progress with the implementation of other elements of Resolution Conf. 12.6, and assess the need to amend or update the Resolution; and
- b) report at the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

13.XX The Animals Committee shall, in consultation with FAO and relevant Regional Fisheries Management Organizations, monitor the implementation by Parties and range States of its species-specific recommendations to improve the conservation status of sharks and the regulation of international trade in these species, and report at the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Directed to the Parties

13.XX Range States of spiny dogfish *Squalus acanthias* and school, tope or soupfin shark *Galeorhinus galeus* shall improve data collection and reporting to FAO of catches, landings and trade; improve research and fisheries management measures, including collaborative research and science-based management of shared stocks; develop precautionary and adaptive management measures for poorly-known stocks and rebuilding plans where necessary; and seek assistance from FAO for capacity-building in coastal shark fisheries management where necessary.

13.XX Range States of porbeagle shark *Lamna nasus* shall improve data collection and reporting to FAO, ICCAT and other Relevant Regional Fisheries Organizations (RFOs) on catches, landings and trade; urge the World Customs Organization to establish a harmonized international code for porbeagle sharks; and establish cooperative, bilateral and multilateral research, stock assessment and fisheries management programmes for shared stocks, through RFOs where appropriate.

- 13.XX Range States of freshwater stingrays, family Potamotrygonidae, shall review the status of these species, jointly examine cross-border trade and illegal trade, and consider Appendix-III listings, where appropriate, to control exports.
- 13.XX Range States of sawfishes, family Pristidae, shall undertake, as a matter of urgency, a review of the status of these species in their coastal waters, rivers and lakes and, if necessary, introduce conservation and trade measures to reduce the risk of extinction.
- 13.XX Range State of gulper sharks, genus *Centrophorus*, shall adopt a precautionary approach to the management of these and other deep sea species, including monitoring of catches, landings and trade at species level, preparation of good identification guides, improved use of observers, and development of standard carcass forms to improve reporting, which should include the species as well as their products.
- 13.XX Range States of requiem sharks, genus *Carcharhinus*, guitarfishes, order Rhinobatiformes and devil rays, family Mobulidae shall pay particular attention to the management of fisheries and trade in these taxa, including undertaking reviews of their conservation and trade status.
- 13.XX All Parties shall develop, adopt and implement, through bilateral arrangements, regional fisheries organization, FAO and other international bodies, new international instruments and regional agreements for the conservation and management of sharks of the high seas, pelagic shark species and straddling shark stocks.