1. This document has been prepared by the Animals Committee. *

2. Resolution Conf. 12.6 provides the context for work on sharks undertaken since COP12:

   AGREES that a lack of progress in the development of the FAO IPOA-Sharks is not a legitimate justification for a lack of further substantive action on shark trade issues within the CITES forum;

   INSTRUCTS the CITES Secretariat to raise with FAO concerns regarding the significant lack of progress in implementing the IPOA-Sharks, and to urge FAO to take steps to actively encourage relevant States to develop NPOA-Sharks;

   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;

   ENCOURAGES Parties to obtain information on implementation of IPOA-Sharks from their fisheries departments, and report directly on progress to the CITES Secretariat and at future meetings of the Animals Committee;

   URGES FAO COFI and Regional Fisheries Management Organizations to take steps to undertake the research, training, data collection, data analysis and shark management plan development outlined by FAO as necessary to implement the IPOA-Sharks;

   ENCOURAGES Parties to contribute financially and technically to the implementation of the IPOA-Sharks;

* The geographical designations employed in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the CITES Secretariat or the United Nations Environment Programme concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The responsibility for the contents of the document rests exclusively with its author.
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;

RECOMMENDS that Parties continue to identify endangered shark species that require consideration for inclusion in the Appendices, if their management and conservation status does not improve; and

REQUESTS Management Authorities to collaborate with their national Customs authorities to expand their current classification system to allow for the collection of detailed data on shark trade including, where possible, separate categories for processed and unprocessed products, for meat, cartilage, skin and fins, and to distinguish imports, exports and re-exports. Wherever possible these data should be species-specific.

3. Recognising the importance of ongoing work, the Conference of the Parties adopted at its 14th meeting (The Hague, 2004) a further 17 Decisions (14.101 to 14.117) concerning sharks, directed to Parties, the Secretariat and the Animals Committee.

4. These Decisions included direction for the Animals Committee to undertake the following tasks:

a) Consider progress by Parties on the implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.6, particularly concerning the use of their commodity codes, where they exist, for traded fish products in order to differentiate between fresh/chilled, frozen and dried, processed and unprocessed, shark meat, oil, skin, cartilage and fin products (Decisions 14.104 and 14.106).

b) Continue activities specified under Resolution Conf. 12.6, including refinement of the list of shark species of concern, in collaboration with FAO, taking account of those referenced in Annex 3 to document CoP14 Doc. 59.1; and consider and report information from Parties on the fisheries, environmental and international trade management measures adopted, levels of landings and exports, and the status of these stocks and fisheries (Decisions 14.107 and 14.108).

c) Consider the outputs of a proposed Workshop on South American freshwater stingrays and, in consultation with workshop participants, shall make any necessary species-specific recommendations to range States and to the Conference of the Parties at its 15th meeting on improving the conservation status and regulation of international trade in these taxa (Decisions 14.109 and 14.110).

d) Consider the recommendations arising from a capacity-building workshop on the conservation and management of sharks. This workshop was proposed to be organised, subject to external funding, by the Secretariat in liaison with FAO and regional fishery bodies (Decision 14.114).

e) Consider progress by Parties in improving the monitoring and reporting of catch, bycatch, discards, market and international trade data, at the species level where possible; and establishing systems to provide verification of catch information (Decision 14.115).

f) Examine and report on linkages between the international trade in shark fins and meat and IUU shark fishing activities, including where possible the main species of sharks taken by IUU fishing; and the relative importance of fins compared to meat in international trade arising from IUU fishing (Decision 14.117).

Commodity Codes

5. The importance of more detailed international trade data on shark products has been recognised by the Animals Committee. These data would provide a stronger basis for CITES deliberations on shark trade and would also augment sources of information that can assist with shark fisheries monitoring, management and stock assessments. Chief among these are the use of customs codes for shark fin products that distinguish between dried, wet, processed and unprocessed fins.

6. At its 23rd meeting the Committee considered responses received to a Notification (2008/058) issued by the Secretariat in fulfilment of Decision 14.106 seeking information on commodity codes used by Parties. Parties responding (Argentina, Australia, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, the European Union, Grenada, Malaysia) used a variety of systems as described in documents AC23 Doc. 15.1 and Doc. 15.1 Addendum. The Committee acknowledges the benefits of a more universal tracking system, and has agreed that this would improve implementation of CITES with respect to both plant and animal species.
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However, it also recognizes the practical difficulties associated with developing uniform customs codes amongst all CITES Parties. In light of these difficulties, it notes with appreciation the approach highlighted by Canada in Doc. AC23 Inf. 2 (Conservation Biology 2008; Vol. 22(1), p. 4-7, "Monitoring international wildlife trade with coded species data", http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/119406136/HTMLSTART), but agreed that this approach may entail technical and practical matters that could not be fully assessed by the Animals Committee.

7. Accordingly, at its 23rd Meeting, the Animals Committee recommended that:

   a) The Secretariat is requested to monitor discussions within the World Customs Organization regarding the development of a Customs data model, and the inclusion therein of a data field to report trade at a species level, and to notify Parties regarding the existence of these discussions and significant developments therein;

   b) The Standing Committee is encouraged to identify and assess options for developing a more universal tracking system, including but not limited to the approach highlighted in document AC23 Inf. 2;

   c) Parties are encouraged to develop and utilize Customs codes for shark fin products that distinguish between dried, wet, processed and unprocessed fins;

Shark Species of Concern

8. The Animals Committee has considered a number of potential species of concern submitted by Party representatives and other members of AC Working Groups on sharks during the period since COP14. The list considered by Parties at COP 14 (Annex 3 of CoP14 Doc. 59.1) was refined, at the 24th Meeting of the Committee using the list in AC24 Doc.14.1 submitted by the United States of America, along with Annex IV of document AC24 Inf. 6, submitted by the FAO. This FAO Document is the draft Report of the Technical Workshop on the Status, Limitations and Opportunities for Improving the Monitoring of Shark Fisheries and Trade held in Rome, 3−6 November 2008. That Workshop recommended that countries should identify a list of primary species requiring special attention for monitoring and management purposes.

9. The lists of priority shark species identified in these two documents and in Annex 3 of CoP14 Doc. 59.1 overlap significantly (Table 1); FAO and CITES both agree that it is necessary to take action to improve data collection, management, conservation and trade monitoring for these species, although it was noted that other species would likely have been identified in AC14 Inf.6 if additional FAO Members had attended their workshop. Parties are asked to note the preliminary analysis of requiem and pelagic sharks presented in document AC24 Doc. 14.1.

10. For these species, the Animals Committee recommends that Parties improve data collection, management and conservation, which could be implemented, enhanced and enforced through domestic, bilateral, Regional Fisheries Management Organisations, or other international measures, including under Resolution Conf. 12.6.

11. Possible future actions by the Animals Committee under Resolution Conf. 12.6 and Decision 14.107 were also considered by AC24. These might include, where appropriate and if necessary, refinement of the list of species of concern, particularly if additional data become available. Table 1 below provides a basis for that future work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species listed in CoP14 Doc. 59.1 and/or AC24 Doc.14.1.</th>
<th>FAO’s list of primary species for monitoring of fisheries and trade¹</th>
<th>Action taken under CITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spiny dogfish shark <em>Squalus acanthias</em></td>
<td>Nominated by Spain, Argentina, Japan</td>
<td>Considered and rejected for listing in Appendix II at CoP14; have entered range State consultation prior to consideration at CoP15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porbeagle shark <em>Lamna nasus</em></td>
<td>Nominated by Spain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Potamotrygonidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawfishes Family Pristidae</td>
<td>Nominated by the United States of America</td>
<td>Listed in the CITES Appendices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulper sharks genus <em>Centrophorus</em></td>
<td>Nominated by Sri Lanka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School, tope, or soupfin shark <em>Galeorhinus galeus</em></td>
<td>Nominated by Argentina</td>
<td>Decision 14.114 not yet implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guitarfishes, shovelnose rays <em>Order Rhinobatiformes</em></td>
<td>Four species nominated by West African CSRP (Commission sous-régionale des pêches) (7 States)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requiem and pelagic sharks</td>
<td>Many species nominated</td>
<td>Some reviewed in AC24 Doc. 14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devil rays Family <em>Mobulidae</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopard sharks <em>Triakis semifasciata</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species reviewed in AC24Doc. 14.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammerhead sharks <em>Sphyrna spp</em></td>
<td>Nominated by eight States &amp; West African CSRP (7 States), China (Hong Kong SAR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dusky shark <em>Carcharhinus obscurus</em></td>
<td>Nominated by the United States of America</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thresher sharks <em>Alopias spp.</em></td>
<td>Nominated by Panama, Sri Lanka, Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortfin mako <em>Isurus oxyrinchus</em></td>
<td>Nominated by Hong Kong, Spain, the United States of America, Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silky shark <em>Carcharhinus falciformis</em></td>
<td>Nominated by China (Hong Kong SAR), Sri Lanka, Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanic whitetip shark <em>Carcharhinus longimanus</em></td>
<td>Nominated by Panama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue shark <em>Prionace glauca</em></td>
<td>Nominated by China (Hong Kong SAR), Spain, Panama, Ghana, the United States of America, Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandbar shark <em>Carcharhinus plumbeus</em></td>
<td>Nominated by China (Hong Kong SAR), the United States of America</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull shark <em>Carcharhinus leucas</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger shark <em>Galeocerdo cuvier</em></td>
<td>Nominated by Ghana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. As requested under Decision 14.109, the Secretariat convened a workshop on freshwater stingrays in the week prior to AC24 (15–17 April 2009) in Geneva. The Workshop included, *inter alia*, participation by representatives of range states, ornamental fish industry representatives, and IUCN Species Survival

¹ AC24 Inf. 6. Report of the FAO Technical Workshop on Status, Limitations and Opportunities for Improving the Monitoring of Shark Fisheries and Trade (Advance copy). FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Report No. 897. Appendix IV
Commission, who, along with the Secretariat, prepared AC24 Doc.14.2, the interim draft report of the workshop. Issues raised included the shortage of data from many range States on the level of commercial exploitation for food and for ornamental markets, and on quantities of these products in international trade. The value and potential shortcomings of an Appendix III listing for these species was explored, as were the potential risks to the South American ornamental freshwater fish industry posed by captive breeding outside the region, and the potential for addressing these through restrictions on exports of adult stingrays for breeding purposes.

13. The Committee recommends that:

a) Range States take note of the workshop’s findings and conclusions, and increase their efforts to improve data collection on the scale and impact of the threats facing stingray species and populations from collection for ornamental trade, commercial fisheries for food, and habitat damage.

b) Range States consider implementing or reinforcing national regulations regarding the management and reporting of capture and international trade of freshwater stingrays for all purposes, including commercial fisheries for food and ornamental trade, and standardizing these measures across the region, for example through existing South American intergovernmental bodies.

c) Range States be encouraged to consider the listing of endemic and threatened species of freshwater stingrays (Potamotrygonidae) in CITES Appendix III as needing the cooperation of other Parties in the control of trade. This would additionally serve to support domestic management measures for species entering international ornamental trade and to improve and enhance trade data collection.

Capacity Building Workshop

14. The FAO convened a Technical workshop on the status, limitations and opportunities for improving the monitoring of shark fisheries and trade of sharks in Rome in November 2008. AC24 was able to consider an advance copy (submitted by FAO) of the report of this workshop which had been chaired by the United States of America and Japan (AC24 Inf. 6). Its findings reinforce many of the conclusions regarding sharks that appear in documents of the CITES Animals Committee and Conference of Parties. The report outlined possible reasons for the poor implementation of the FAO IPOA–Sharks. Suggestions for improving this situation include greater use of existing management measures and regulations, adopting a more pragmatic, step-by-step approach when developing and implementing National Shark Plans, and improving stakeholder participation.

15. The Committee endorsed the conclusions of the report of the FAO workshop and recommends that Parties note them.

Monitoring and Reporting

16. The Animals Committee that Parties which are shark fishing States but have not yet implemented a National Shark Plan (NPOA) develop their own NPOAs at the earliest opportunity and take steps to improve research and data collection on both fisheries and trade as a first step towards their Shark Plans. Parties should also improve their outreach to RFMOs. This may be achieved by greater consultation between the Fisheries and Environment Departments of Contracting Parties, in order to ensure that CITES’ recommendations are discussed by these bodies.

17. The Committee recommends that:

Parties which were shark fishing States but had not yet implemented a National Shark Plan (NPOA) develop their own NPOAs at the earliest opportunity and take steps to improve research and data collection on both fisheries and trade as a first step towards their Shark Plans. Parties should also improve their outreach to RFMOs. This may be achieved by greater consultation between the Fisheries and Environment Departments of Contracting Parties, in order to ensure that CITES recommendations were discussed by these bodies.

Linkages between International Trade in Shark Fins, Meat and IUU Fishing

18. AC24 discussed document AC24 Doc.14.3 and document AC24 Inf. 2, submitted by Australia, prepared and presented to the Working Group by TRAFFIC. These documents conclude, inter alia, that the key impediment to better understanding and quantification of this issue is lack of species-specific data on shark
catch (landings and discards) and trade, and the difficulty of reconciling available catch, production and trade data. The meeting agreed that IUU fishing was an important issue and that improved data and tracking of products was required, thereby reinforcing conclusions already reached concerning commodity codes and implementation of the IPOA-Sharks.

19. Document AC24 Doc14.3 concluded that:

a) illegal shark fishing is occurring globally but the available information suggests ‘hot spots’ are found off Central/South America and in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean;

b) most illegal fishing of sharks is carried out in national waters by both foreign and national vessels;

c) illegal foreign fishing of sharks in national waters often derives from neighbouring countries;

d) illegal foreign fishing can result from either unauthorised access or breaches of conditions of access;

e) most of the identified illegal fishing involves the retention of fins;

f) most of the reported instances and estimates of IUU shark fishing do not specify the species of sharks taken;

g) the most frequently cited species taken in illegal fishing are hammerhead sharks Sphyrna spp. and silky shark Carcharhinus falciformis; and

h) long-lining and gill-netting are the most frequently cited methods used in illegal shark fishing.

20. The Committee recommends that:

a) Parties are encouraged to undertake or facilitate continued research to improve understanding of the situation and identify the linkages between international trade in shark fins and meat, and IUU fishing. It is necessary to improve the collection of catch and trade data at the lowest taxonomic level possible (ideally by species). In this context, close cooperation with FAO and RFMOs is encouraged in order to further clarify the nature of IUU fishing. In addition, studies of trade in shark meat, including prices in major fish markets, are also encouraged in order to better identify the shark products that are driving IUU fishing.


c) The Animals Committee is asked, in consultation consult with FAO, to assess any benefits that may be gained by discussing elements of Article 11.2.2 of these Guidelines, for example catch and trade certification schemes (paragraphs 8 & 9), with the involvement of representatives from Parties, relevant regional fisheries organizations and the fishing industry, the shark product industry, retailers and the IUCN Shark Specialist Group and other specialists and stakeholders.

Other Matters

21. The Animals Committee tasks related to Conservation and management of sharks included further examination of the results of Notification to the Parties No. 2008/058 and the outcomes of the Non Detriment Finding Workshop held in Mexico in November 2008. The Notification requested the following information from Parties:

a) Parties should report progress in identifying endangered shark species that require consideration for inclusion in the Appendices, if their management and conservation status does not improve [paragraph b) of Decision 14.104];

b) Parties landing and exporting products from shark species of concern identified by the Animals Committee (see Annex 3 to document CoP14 Doc. 59.1) should report on the fisheries, environmental and international trade management measures adopted, levels of landings and exports, and the status of these stocks and fisheries [paragraph c) of Decision 14.108]; and
c) shark fishing and trading entities, particularly the major fishing or trading entities [Indonesia, the European Community, India, Spain, Taiwan (province of China), Mexico, Argentina, the United States of America, Thailand, Pakistan, Japan, Malaysia, France, Brazil, Sri Lanka, the Islamic Republic of Iran, New Zealand, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Nigeria and Portugal*] are strongly encouraged to identify opportunities to: improve, in cooperation with FAO and relevant fishery management bodies, the monitoring and reporting of catch, bycatch, discards, market and international trade data, at the species level where possible and to establish systems to provide verification of catch information [paragraph c) of Decision 14.115].

22. The Committee considered the responses and the information assessed by the NDF Workshop and factored these into its recommendations under “species of concern” and “monitoring and reporting” above.

23. At AC24, the Committee also considered a report on Sharks: Conservation, Fishing and International Trade submitted to AC24 (AC24. Inf. 5) by the Spanish Scientific Authority. This report summarises the considerations that are needed for making NDFs for shark species and proposes some general guiding principles. Copies are available in English and Spanish from the Spanish Scientific Authority.

24. At the same meeting the Committee was briefed on other FAO activities related to sharks and by a representative of the Secretariat of the Convention on Migratory Species on the activities on sharks underway within CMS (including through MoUs and Joint Work Programmes with CITES and FAO). Some CMS Parties are currently negotiating an MoU for a global shark instrument, backed by an Action Plan, to promote the collaborative management of migratory shark species. The intention is to promote global integration of conservation and management actions in coordination with other instruments (including FAO, RFMOs and CITES).

Recommendations

25. The Animals Committee recommends that:

a) Commodity codes
   i) The Secretariat is requested to monitor discussions within the World Customs Organization regarding the development of a Customs data model, and the inclusion therein of a data field to report trade at a species level, and to notify Parties regarding the existence of these discussions and significant developments therein;
   ii) The Standing Committee is encouraged to identify and assess options for developing a more universal tracking system, including but not limited to the approach highlighted in document AC23 Inf. 2;
   iii) Parties are encouraged to develop and utilize Customs codes for shark fin products that distinguish between dried, wet, processed and unprocessed fins;

b) Species of concern
   i) For the species identified in Table 1 of this document, Parties improve data collection, management and conservation, which could be implemented, enhanced and enforced through domestic, bilateral, Regional Fisheries Management Organisations, or other international measures, including under Resolution Conf. 12.6.
   ii) The Animals Committee is requested to continue activities under Resolution Conf. 12.6, including, where appropriate and if necessary, refinement of the list of species of concern, particularly if additional data become available.

c) Freshwater stingrays
   i) Range States note the findings and conclusions of the freshwater stingrays workshop (AC24 Doc. 14.2), and increase their efforts to improve data collection on the scale and impact of the threats facing stingray species and populations from collection for ornamental trade, commercial fisheries for food, and habitat damage.
ii) Range States consider implementing or reinforcing national regulations regarding the management and reporting of capture and international trade of freshwater stingrays for all purposes, including commercial fisheries for food and ornamental trade, and standardizing these measures across the region, for example through existing South American intergovernmental bodies.

iii) Range States are encouraged to consider the listing of endemic and threatened species of freshwater stingrays (Potamotrygonidae) in CITES Appendix III as needing the cooperation of other Parties in the control of trade. This would additionally serve to support domestic management measures for species entering international ornamental trade and to improve and enhance trade data collection.

d) FAO Technical Workshop

Parties note the conclusions of the Technical workshop on the status, limitations and opportunities for improving the monitoring of shark fisheries and trade of sharks convened by FAO in Rome in November 2008 (AC24.Inf 6).

e) Monitoring and reporting

Parties which are shark fishing States but have not yet implemented a National Shark Plan (NPOA) develop their own NPOAs at the earliest opportunity and take steps to improve research and data collection on both fisheries and trade as a first step towards their Shark Plans. Parties should also improve their outreach to RFMOs. This may be achieved by greater consultation between the Fisheries and Environment Departments of Contracting Parties, in order to ensure that CITES recommendations are discussed by these bodies.

f) Linkages between International Trade in Shark Fins, Meat and IUU Fishing

i) Parties are encouraged to undertake or facilitate continued research to improve understanding of the situation and identify the linkages between international trade in shark fins and meat, and IUU fishing. It is necessary to improve the collection of catch and trade data at the lowest taxonomic level possible (ideally by species). In this context, close cooperation with FAO and RFMOs is encouraged in order to further clarify the nature of IUU fishing. In addition, studies of trade in shark meat, including prices in major fish markets, are also encouraged in order to better identify the shark products that are driving IUU fishing.


iii) The Animals Committee is asked, in consultation with FAO, to assess any benefits that may be gained by discussing elements of Article 11.2.2 of these Guidelines, for example catch and trade certification schemes (paragraphs 8 & 9), with the involvement of representatives from Parties, relevant regional fisheries organizations and the fishing industry, the shark product industry, retailers and the IUCN Shark Specialist Group and other specialists and stakeholders.

COMMENTS FROM THE SECRETARIAT

A. The Secretariat welcomes the recommendations by the Animals Committee on conservation and management of sharks and stingrays. The draft decisions provide a useful way forward, but the Secretariat suggests that they should be restructured and simplified.

B. Regarding the specific recommendations from the Animals Committee (shown in italics below), the Secretariat would comment as follows:

Commodity codes

i) The Secretariat is requested to monitor discussions within the World Customs Organization regarding the development of a Customs data model, and the inclusion therein of a data field to
report trade in sharks at a species level, and to notify Parties regarding the existence of these discussions and significant developments therein;

As this appears to be an ongoing activity, it should be incorporated into Resolution Conf. 12.6 rather than in a Decision.

   ii) The Standing Committee is encouraged to identify and assess options for developing a more universal tracking system, including but not limited to the approach highlighted in document AC23 Inf. 2;

The Secretariat believes that this recommendation should be considered under agenda item 39 which deals specifically with Taxonomic Serial Number of the Integrated Taxonomic Information System referred to in document AC23 Inf. 2

   iii) Parties are encouraged to develop and utilize Customs codes for shark fin products that distinguish between dried, wet, processed and unprocessed fins;

Although the Secretariat has some doubts that this activity would "provide a stronger basis for CITES deliberations on shark trade" as claimed in the present document, as it appears to be an ongoing activity, it should be incorporated into Resolution Conf. 12.6 rather than in a Decision if it is to be accepted.

Species of concern

   iv) For the species identified in Table 1 of this document, Parties improve data collection, management and conservation, which could be implemented, enhanced and enforced through domestic, bilateral, Regional Fisheries Management Organisations, or other international measures, including under Resolution Conf. 12.6.

The Secretariat notes that the list considered by Parties at CoP 14 was substantially refined and several species from the list are being proposed for inclusion in Appendix II at the present meeting (Carcharhinus longimanus, C. plumbeus, C. obscurus, Lamna nasus, Squalus acanthias, Sphyrna lewini, S. mokarran and S. zygaena). The term 'requiem sharks' usually refers to species in the family Carcharhinidae, some of which are referred to elsewhere in Table 1 of the document, indicating a degree of duplication. The recommendation would appear to be an ongoing action and therefore would be best incorporated into Resolution Conf. 12.6.

   v) The Animals Committee is requested to continue activities under Resolution Conf. 12.6, including, where appropriate and if necessary, refinement of the list of species of concern, particularly if additional data become available.

The Animals Committee needs no mandate to continue activities which are already the subject of an instruction from the Conference of the Parties.

Freshwater stingrays

   vi) Range States note the findings and conclusions of the freshwater stingrays workshop (AC24 Doc. 14.2), and increase their efforts to improve data collection on the scale and impact of the threats facing stingray species and populations from collection for ornamental trade, commercial fisheries for food, and habitat damage.

   vii) Range States consider implementing or reinforcing national regulations regarding the management and reporting of capture and international trade of freshwater stingrays for all purposes, including commercial fisheries for food and ornamental trade, and standardizing these measures across the region, for example through existing South American intergovernmental bodies.

   viii) Range States are encouraged to consider the listing of endemic and threatened species of freshwater stingrays (Potamotrygonidae) in CITES Appendix III as needing the cooperation of other Parties in the control of trade. This would additionally serve to support domestic management measures for species entering international ornamental trade and to improve and enhance trade data collection.
The recommendations emanating from the South American freshwater stingray workshop (Geneva, April 2009) were based on a review of circumstances prevailing at the time and would therefore probably be better turned into a Decision directed to the range States concerned with time constraints.

**FAO Technical Workshop**

- **ix)** Parties note the conclusions of the Technical workshop on the status, limitations and opportunities for improving the monitoring of shark fisheries and trade of sharks convened by FAO in Rome in November 2008 (AC24.Inf 6).

The final version of the conclusions of this technical workshop is yet to be published by FAO, but Parties could be encouraged to note the conclusions in Resolution Conf. 12.6.

**Monitoring and reporting**

- **x)** Parties which are shark fishing States but have not yet implemented a National Shark Plan (NPOA) develop their own NPOA at the earliest opportunity and take steps to improve research and data collection on both fisheries and trade as a first step towards their Shark Plans. Parties should also improve their outreach to RFMOs. This may be achieved by greater consultation between the Fisheries and Environment Departments of Contracting Parties, in order to ensure that CITES recommendations are discussed by these bodies.

If agreed, these longer term recommendations should be incorporated into Resolution Conf. 12.6.

**Linkages between International Trade in Shark Fins, Meat and IUU Fishing**

- **xi)** Parties are encouraged to undertake or facilitate continued research to improve understanding of the situation and identify the linkages between international trade in shark fins and meat, and IUU fishing. It is necessary to improve the collection of catch and trade data at the lowest taxonomic level possible (ideally by species). In this context, close cooperation with FAO and RFMOs is encouraged in order to further clarify the nature of IUU fishing. In addition, studies of trade in shark meat, including prices in major fish markets, are also encouraged in order to better identify the shark products that are driving IUU fishing.

If agreed, these longer term recommendations should be incorporated into Resolution Conf. 12.6.


Parties could be encouraged to note these guidelines in Resolution Conf. 12.6.

- **xiii)** The Animals Committee is asked, in consultation with FAO, to assess any benefits that may be gained by discussing elements of Article 11.2.2 of these Guidelines, for example catch and trade certification schemes (paragraphs 8 & 9), with the involvement of representatives from Parties, relevant regional fisheries organizations and the fishing industry, the shark product industry, retailers and the IUCN Shark Specialist Group and other specialists and stakeholders.

The Guidelines for Responsible Fish Trade are designed to provide general advice in support of the implementation of two articles (Article 11.2: Responsible international trade and Article 11.3: Laws and regulations relating to fish trade) of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. Article 11.2.2 of the Code of Conduct is entitled *International trade in fish and fishery products should not compromise the sustainable development of fisheries and responsible utilization of living aquatic resources* and consequently would appear to be pertinent to the implementation of CITES. The role of the Convention is mentioned in the introduction to the Guidelines. However, its provisions apply to all fish species and not just sharks and the policy implications of catch and trade certification schemes would appear to be mostly a matter for the Standing Committee in the first instance. The Secretariat suggests that the Animals Committee’s recommendation be turned into a draft decision.

C. The Secretariat has incorporated the Animals Committee’s recommendations into a number of draft decisions and a draft revision of Resolution Conf. 12.6 which can be found below. The Secretariat has
taken the opportunity to delete or revise information in Resolution Conf. 12.6 which has become out of date with the passage of time. Other than this the Secretariat has made no substantive changes to the proposals by the Animals Committee or Resolution Conf. 12.6. The Secretariat believes that a working group to discuss the Animals Committees’ proposals may be required at the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties and will make its advice on the substance of the matter available at this time.

DRAFT DECISIONS OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

Directed to range States of species in the family Potamotrygonidae (South American freshwater stingrays)

15.xx Range States of species in the family Potamotrygonidae are encouraged to:

a) Note the findings and conclusions of the freshwater stingrays workshop (AC24 Doc. 14.2), and increase their efforts to improve data collection on the scale and impact of the threats facing stingray species and populations from collection for ornamental trade, commercial fisheries for food, and habitat damage.

b) Consider implementing or reinforcing national regulations regarding the management and reporting of capture and international trade of freshwater stingrays for all purposes, including commercial fisheries for food and ornamental trade, and standardizing these measures across the region, for example through existing South American intergovernmental bodies.

c) Consider the listing of endemic and threatened species of freshwater stingrays (Potamotrygonidae) in CITES Appendix III as needing the cooperation of other Parties in the control of trade.

Directed to the Standing Committee

15.xx The Standing Committee shall, in consultation with the Animals Committee and FAO, assess any benefits that may be gained by discussing elements of Article 11.2.2 of these Guidelines, for example catch and trade certification schemes, with the involvement of representatives from Parties, relevant regional fisheries organizations and the fishing industry, the shark product industry, retailers and the IUCN Shark Specialist Group and other specialists and stakeholders.
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO RESOLUTION CONF. 12.6 OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

Conf. 12.6 (Rev. CoP15) Conservation and Management of Sharks (Class Chondrichthyes)

RECOGNIZING that sharks are particularly vulnerable to overexploitation owing to their late maturity, longevity and low fecundity;

RECOGNIZING that there is a significant international trade in sharks and their products;

RECOGNIZING that unregulated and unreported trade is contributing to unsustainable fishing of a number of shark species;

RECOGNIZING the duty of all States to cooperate, either directly or through appropriate sub-regional or regional organizations in the conservation and management of fisheries resources;

NOTING that IUCN – The World Conservation Union’s Red List of Threatened Species (2000) (2009.2) lists 181 shark taxa (from the 10 per cent of taxa for which Red List assessments have been made);

RECOGNIZING that the International Plan of Action on the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA-sharks) was prepared by FAO in 1999 and that all States whose vessels conduct directed fisheries or regularly take sharks in non-directed fisheries are encouraged by COFI to adopt a National Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Shark Stocks (NPOA-Sharks);


NOTING that, through the adoption of Resolution Conf. 9.17 and Decisions 10.48, 10.73, 10.74, 10.93, 10.126, 11.94 and 11.151_12.47-12.49_13.42, 13.43 and 14.101-117, Parties to CITES have previously recognized the conservation threat that international trade poses to sharks;

NOTING that two shark species are currently listed in Appendix III of CITES the increasing number of shark species included in the CITES Appendices;

WELCOMING the report adopted at the 18th meeting of the Animals Committee that noted that CITES should continue to contribute to international efforts to address shark conservation and trade concerns;

NOTING that States were encouraged by FAO to have prepared NPOAs for sharks by the COFI 24th session held in 2001;

NOTING that there is a significant lack of progress with the development and implementation of NPOAs;

CONCERNED that insufficient progress has been made in achieving shark management through the implementation of IPOA-Sharks except in States where comprehensive shark assessment reports and NPOA-Sharks have been developed;

CONCERNED that the continued significant trade in sharks and their products is not sustainable;

THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION

AGREES that a lack of progress in the development of the FAO IPOA-Sharks is not a legitimate justification for a lack of further substantive action on shark trade issues within the CITES forum;

INSTRUCTS the CITES Secretariat to raise with FAO concerns regarding the significant lack of progress in implementing the IPOA-Sharks, and to urge FAO to take steps to actively encourage relevant States to develop NPOA-Sharks;
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;

ENCOURAGES Parties to obtain information on implementation of IPOA-Sharks from their fisheries departments, and report directly on progress to the CITES Secretariat and at future meetings of the Animals Committee;

URGES FAO COFI and Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) to take steps to undertake the research, training, data collection, data analysis and shark management plan development outlined by FAO as necessary to implement the IPOA-Sharks;

ENCOURAGES Parties to contribute financially and technically to the implementation of the IPOA-Sharks;

URGES Parties which are shark fishing States but have not yet implemented a NPOA-Sharks, to develop their own NPOAs at the earliest opportunity and take steps to improve research and data collection on both fisheries and trade as a first step towards their Shark Plans, particularly the necessity to improve the collection of catch and trade data at the lowest taxonomic level possible (ideally by species);

FURTHER URGES Parties to improve their outreach to RFMOs and achieve by greater consultation between their Fisheries and Environment Departments in order to ensure that CITES recommendations are discussed by these bodies.

ENCOURAGES Parties to improve data collection, management and conservation for species included in the Annex to the present Resolution implementing, enhancing and enforcing these actions through domestic, bilateral, Regional Fisheries Management Organizations or other international measures;

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;

RECOMMENDS that Parties continue to identify endangered shark species that require consideration for inclusion in the Appendices, if their management and conservation status does not improve;

REQUESTS Management Authorities to collaborate with their national Customs authorities to expand their current classification system to allow for the collection of detailed data on shark trade including, where possible, separate categories for processed and unprocessed products, for meat, cartilage, skin and fins, and to distinguish imports, exports and re-exports and between shark fin products that are dried, wet, processed and unprocessed fins. Wherever possible these data should be species-specific.

INSTRUCTS the Secretariat to monitor discussions within the World Customs Organization regarding the development of a Customs data model, and the inclusion therein of a data field to report trade in sharks at a species level, and to issue Notifications to the Parties concerning any significant developments;

ENCOURAGES Parties, in close cooperation with FAO and RFMOs, to undertake or facilitate continued research to improve understanding of the nature of illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing concerning sharks identify the linkages between international trade in shark fins and meat, and IUU fishing; and

ENCOURAGES Parties, intergovernmental and non-governmental bodies to undertake studies of trade in shark meat, including prices in major fish markets in order to better identify the shark products that are driving IUU fishing.
# Shark species of concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genus</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Squalus</em></td>
<td>acanthias</td>
<td>Spiny dogfish shark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lamna</em></td>
<td>nasus</td>
<td>Porbeagle shark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Potamotrygonidae</td>
<td>Freshwater stingrays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Pristidae</td>
<td>Sawfishes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genus <em>Centrophorus</em></td>
<td>Gulper sharks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Galeorhinus</em></td>
<td>galeus</td>
<td>School, tope, or soupfin shark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Rhinobatiformes</td>
<td>Guitarfishes, shovel-nose rays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Mobulidae</td>
<td>Devil rays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Triakis</em></td>
<td>semifasciata</td>
<td>Leopard sharks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sphyma</em></td>
<td>spp.</td>
<td>Hammerhead sharks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carcharhinus</em></td>
<td>obscurus</td>
<td>Dusky shark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alopias</em></td>
<td>spp.</td>
<td>Thresher sharks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Isurus</em></td>
<td>oxyrinchus</td>
<td>Shortfin mako</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carcharhinus</em></td>
<td>falciformis</td>
<td>Silky shark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carcharhinus</em></td>
<td>longimanus</td>
<td>Oceanic whitetip shark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Prionace</em></td>
<td>glauca</td>
<td>Blue shark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carcharhinus</em></td>
<td>plumbeus</td>
<td>Sandbar shark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carcharhinus</em></td>
<td>leucas</td>
<td>Bull shark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Galeocerdo</em></td>
<td>cuvier</td>
<td>Tiger shark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>