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

Twenty-fourth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva, (Switzerland), 20-24 April 2009

Conservation and management of sharks and stingrays

OTHER ANIMALS COMMITTEE TASKS RELATED TO CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF SHARKS

1. This document has been prepared by the Secretariat.

2. At its 14th meeting (CoP14, The Hague, 2007), the Conference of the Parties adopted a number of wide-ranging Decisions on sharks and stingrays (Decisions 14.101-227). They fall within the very broad mandate of the Parties, the Animals Committee, the Secretariat and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) to take actions concerning the management and conservation of sharks, pursuant to Resolution Conf. 12.6 on Conservation and management of sharks.

3. Tasks addressed to the Animals Committee in some Decisions or other issues related to the Committee that are not covered by separate agenda items for the present meeting are summarized in the present document.

4. At CoP14, the Conference of the Parties agreed that Parties should report on a number of subjects related to sharks with a view to facilitating discussions at the present meeting.

5. For ease of reference, the Secretariat listed the following reporting obligations related to sharks in Notification to the Parties No. 2008/058 of 24 September 2008:

   i) 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];

   ii) 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

   iii) 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[1]] are strongly encouraged to identify opportunities to: improve, in cooperation with

---

[1] *Based on the FAO 2004 data, the top 20 shark fishing areas and entities, in descending order of catch.*

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 b) of Decision 14.115].

6. By the reporting deadline of 15 November 2008, the Secretariat had received responses to Notification to the Parties No. 2008/058 from the European Union (on behalf of 25 Parties), Canada, Thailand, the United Kingdom and the United States. The summary of responses from Parties is provided in Annex 1 to the present document and the full text of responses in Annex 2[2]. On 4 February 2009, Spain sent to the Secretariat a comprehensive report on *Sharks: Conservation, Fishing and International trade*. The information from this report is not included in the present document.

7. Decision 14.114 states the following:

The Secretariat shall liaise with FAO and regional fishery bodies to explore the organization of and seek external funding for a capacity-building workshop on the conservation and management of sharks. This workshop should:

a) consider the outputs of the Mexican international expert workshop on non-detriment findings;

b) use Galeorhinus galeus as a case study for stock assessment and management measures for internationally-traded transboundary migratory coastal shark stocks, and develop recommendations for improving the monitoring, regulation and management of international trade in this and other shark species;

c) consider tools and approaches for the development of assessments and non-detriment findings for shark species and for the monitoring and regulation of international trade in these species;

d) consider tools and approaches to determine whether specimens are of legal origin; and

e) develop recommendations for consideration at the 23rd or 24th meeting of the Animals Committee.

8. No external funds have been raised for the envisaged workshop but, prior to the international Mexican expert workshop on non-detriment findings, the Secretariat took part in the FAO *Technical Workshop on the Status, Limitations and Opportunities for Improving the Monitoring of Shark Fisheries and Trade*, which was held in Rome from 3 to 6 November 2008.

9. This workshop considered global and country-specific information on shark fisheries and trade, and its aim was to identify limitations and strategies for improving their monitoring. Reports from a selected number of main shark fishing and trading nations described the status of shark fisheries and the efforts toward the development of their National Plan of Action for Sharks (NPOA-Sharks). The workshop recommended actions to promote the implementation of the NPOA-Sharks and to address specific problems affecting catch and trade monitoring, including lack of specificity in data, underestimated catch volumes and limitations in the Customs codes used in trade monitoring.

10. The workshop report was not available at the time of preparation of the present document (February 2009). This report will be accessible as an information document as soon as it will be published by the FAO.

11. The Committee is invited to note the content of the present document and to consider the responses to Notification to the Parties No. 2008/058, the outcome of the *International expert workshop on non-detriment findings* and outputs from the FAO *Technical Workshop on the Status, Limitations and Opportunities for Improving the Monitoring of Shark Fisheries and Trade*.

---

[2] *The geographical designations employed in this Annex 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.*

Summary of responses to Notification to the Parties No. 2008/058

European Union	Canada	Thailand	United Kingdom	United States
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]				
No species identified. The European Commission is participating in the inter-sessional shark working group	At present, no Canadian shark species require consideration for inclusion in the Appendices.	There are no other shark species in Thailand to be included in the Appendices	No species to add at this stage	The status of several species of sharks was assessed recently, but none appeared to warrant further consideration for inclusion in the Appendices at this time. However, the estimate of population status would classify the U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico stock of dusky sharks as 'Critically Endangered' according to IUCN criteria and some hammerhead sharks as 'Endangered' globally.
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]				
European Union	**Canada**	**Thailand**	**United Kingdom**	**United States**
The European Commission proposed new Council Regulation with Total Allowable Catch (TAC) and Quotas for 2009. Currently, it is prohibited for Community vessels to retain on board, to	In Canada, it is not possible to quantify species-specific exports of shark but it can be assumed that the majority of catches enter international trade.	Thailand does not land or export the shark species of concern identified by the Animals Committee and sharks are not a target species of fisheries in Thailand. Shark fishing	A Shark finning permit is required as a management measure. Also under the United Kingdom permit scheme, separate landing and transhipment of fins is	Among the species identified by the Animals Committee, the spiny dogfish (*Squalus acanthias)* is currently not overfished in the United States waters according to the existing biomass

European Union	Canada	Thailand	United Kingdom	United States
tranship and to land the basking shark (*Cetorhinus maximus*) and the great white shark (*Carcharodon carcharias*). Total catch by the European Union (25 countries) of the species identified by the Animals Committee as recorded by EUROSTAT, is presented in Annex 2.	Average annual landings of shark species of concern identified by the Animals Committee is generally lower than the TAC. For *Isurus oxyrinchus*, *Lamna nasus* ans *Squalus acanthias* there is targeted commercial fisheries regulated under the NPOA–Sharks and IFMPs (Integrated Fisheries Management Plans) There is also a directed commercial fishery on *Prionace glauca*. Stocks assessment has been made only for species that are subject to targeted fisheries.	represents only 0.19 % of the total catch in Thai waters. There are no shark specific management policies, except for *Rhincodon typus*. However, the Thai Department of Fisheries regulates this fishery through the established fishing methods and conservation areas.	prohibited. In 2007, shark catch landings of United Kingdom vessels outside of European Union waters (mostly of blue sharks and makos) totalled about 2260 metric tonnes, including 76 mt of fins.	threshold. For northwest Atlantic porbeagle (*Lamna nasus*), due to unit stock, the United States applied the Canadian assessment and reduced its TAC of porbeagle accordingly. The only sawfish species [Smalltooth sawfish (*Pristis pectinata*)] is protected by the Endangered Species Act. There are no data available for gulper sharks (*Centrophorus* spp.). The U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) completed the Large Coastal Shark (LCS) stock assessment and it determined that it is inappropriate to assess this complex as a whole. The requiem shark (Carcharhinidae) complex is relatively analogous to LCS and species in this category should be assessed individually where possible. No estimates are available on guitar fishes (Rhinobatiformes), and devil rays (Mobulidae). The United States is currently examining a possible Appendix-III listing to help curtail illegal trade in these species.

European Union	Canada	Thailand	United Kingdom	United States
Shark fishing and trading entities, particularly the major fishing or trading entities are strongly encouraged to identify opportunities to: improve, in cooperation with FAO and relevant fishery management bodies, the monitoring and reporting of catch, by catch, discards, market and international trade data, at the species level where possible and to establish systems to provide verification of catch information [paragraph b) of Decision 14.115].				
European Union	**Canada**	**Thailand**	**United Kingdom**	**United States**
The European Commission intends to adopt a European Community Plan of Action for the conservation and management of sharks. Its main objectives will be: - Broadening the knowledge on shark fisheries and species and their role in the ecosystem. - Ensuring that directed fishing of shark is sustainable and that by-catches of shark resulting from other fisheries are properly regulated. - Encouraging a coherent approach between the internal and external EC fishery policy for sharks. The EC reported that some tuna Regional Fishery Management Organizations have requirements to provide certain information regarding the capture of sharks. The Standing Committee on Research and Statistics of the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas performed a stock	Since 2007, Canada has had a *National Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks* (NPOA-Sharks) which was developed in accordance with the provisions of the FAO *International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks* (IPOA- Sharks). Canada also has a number of legislative measures which are relevant to managing and maintaining the long-term sustainable fishing of shark populations and fisheries. For shark species of primary commercial interest, Canada developed several *Integrated Fisheries Management Plans*.	Thailand adopted its NPOA - Sharks in 2006. For monitoring and reporting of catch, Thailand developed and published a standard method of shark classification in taxonomic level and field sheets on identification of shark species, as a manual for fisheries scientists and fishermen. The survey and data collection will be managed by fisheries scientists and enumerators. The biggest shark landing sites in the Gulf of Thailand are the Samut Prakhan province and the Songkhla province, while the Phuket province is the biggest landing site in The Andaman Sea.	The United Kingdom supports the use of cooperative enforcement provisions within the Resolutions of Regional Fishery Management Organizations and within European Union Fishery Partnership agreements. The United Kingdom provides information on its territorial waters/vessels and overseas territories (including data on shark issues) directly to the European Commission. This information is then used in formulation of common policy decisions of the European Union.	At the international level, the United States. led the development of IPOA-Sharks. In 2005, the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization adopted a proposal from the United States and the European Union prohibiting shark finning, release of live by-catch, reporting data for all shark catches and calling parties to undertake research identifying selective fishing gear and nursery areas. In 2007, the United States introduced a measure in the Sustainable Fisheries Resolution of the UN General Assembly which calls upon regional fisheries management organizations and States to adopt and implement measures to further the conservation and sustainable management of sharks.

European Union	Canada	Thailand	United Kingdom	United States
assessment of blue shark (*Prionace glucea)* and shortfin mako (*Isurus oxyrinchus)*. Ecological risk assessments (ERA) were also conducted for nine additional priority species of pelagic elasmobranchs, for which available data are very limited (*Isurus paucus, Alopias vulpinus, Carcharhinus longimanus, C. falciformis; Lamna nasus, Spyrna lewini, Spyrna zygaena,* and *Pteroplatytrygon violacea).*				

Response from Canada

Environment Canada Environnement Canada

Canadian Wildlife Service
Ottawa, ON
K1A 0H3

December 1, 2008

Mr. Willem Wijnstekers
Secretary-General, CITES Secretariat
15, chemin des Anemones
CH-1219 CHATELAINE – Geneva
Switzerland

Dear Mr. Wijnstekers :

Canadian Response to CITES Notification 2008/058 *Information to be submitted for consideration at the next meetings of the Animals and Plants Committees*

In response to CITES Notification 2008/058 concerning information to be submitted for consideration at the next meetings of the Animals and Plants Committees, Canada is pleased to provide the following response.

In regards to part a) Sharks i): At the present time, no Canadian shark species require consideration for inclusion in the Appendices.

In regards to part a) Sharks ii): With respect to the shark species of concern identified by the Animals Committee (in Annex 3 to document CoP14 Doc. 59.1), please refer to Table 1 for details regarding only those species found in Canadian waters.

Canada

www.ec.gc.ca

Table 1. Shark spp. of concern identified by the Animals Committee as related to Canada.

Species	Total Allowable Catch (tonnes)	Avg. Annual Landings (tonnes)	Status of Fishery in Canada	Status of Stocks in Canada
Sphyrna zygaena (only *Sphyrna* sp. in Canadian waters)		<< 1 (bycatch)	No directed fishery. Managed under the NPOA-Sharks[1].	not assessed
Carcharhinus obscurus		<< 1 (bycatch)	No directed fishery. Managed under the NPOA-Sharks.	not assessed
Alopias vulpinus (only *Alopias* sp. in Canadian waters)		<<1 (bycatch)	No directed fishery. Managed under the NPOA-Sharks.	not assessed
Isurus oxyrinchus	250	112 (including 60-80 t of landed bycatch)	Directed commercial fishery. Managed under the NPOA-Sharks and the IFMP-Sharks[2].	Abundance stable but mean size has decreased; 'Threatened' as per COSEWIC[3]
Carcharinus longimanus		0	No directed fishery. Managed under the NPOA-Sharks.	not assessed
Prionace glauca	250	29 (including ~1 t landed bycatch)	Directed recreational fishery is catch and release except 4-6 authorized derbies per year. Managed under the NPOA-Sharks and the IFMP-Sharks[2].	Population trend is unclear but mean size has decreased; 'Special Concern' as per COSEWIC
Galeocerdo cuvier		0	No directed fishery. Managed under the NPOA-Sharks.	not assessed
Lamna nasus	185 (135 directed and 50 bycatch)	142	Directed commercial fishery. Managed under the NPOA-Sharks and the IFMP-Sharks[2].	Abundance is low but stable; Endangered' as per COSEWIC
Squalus acanthias	2500 (Atlantic fishery) 15000 (Pacific fishery)	2388 (Atlantic fishery) 3578 (Pacific fishery)	Directed commercial fishery. Managed under the NPOA-Sharks (Atlantic) and the IFMP-Groundfish[4] (Pacific).	In the Atlantic, dogfish are abundant and biomass is considered very high. Pacific population is considered abundant but has not been formally assessed.

[1] *NPOA-Sharks: Canadian National Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks*
[2] *IFMP-Sharks: Canadian Atlantic Pelagic Shark Integrated Fisheries Management Plan*
[3] *COSEWIC: Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada*
[4] *IFMP-Groundfish: Integrated Fish Management Plan – Groundfish (Pacific Region)*

In Canada, it is not possible to quantify species-specific exports of shark. However, it is reasonable to assume that the majority of landed catches enter international trade as the market for shark in Canada is small.

Since March 2007, Canada has had a *National Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks* (NPOA-Sharks) [http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/npoa-pan/npoa-pan/npoa-sharks-eng.htm] which was developed in accordance with the principles and provisions of the *International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks* (IPOA-Sharks), as developed by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

Canada's NPOA-Sharks will continue to improve the conservation and management of sharks as well as ensure their long-term sustainable use within directed and non-directed fisheries based on ecological sustainability, integrated fisheries management, and the precautionary approach. Along with its NPOA-Sharks, Canada also has a number of legislative measures which are relevant to managing and maintaining the long-term sustainability of shark populations and fisheries. These legislative instruments, along with the policies and programs that support them, are consistent with the principles of the IPOA-Sharks as well as the FAO *Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries*.

For shark species of primary commercial interest (e.g. porbeagle, blue, shortfin mako, and spiny dogfish), the *Canadian Atlantic Pelagic Shark Integrated Fisheries Management Plan* (IFMP-Sharks) [http://www.dfompo.gc.ca/communic/fish_man/ifmp/shark-requin/index_e.htm] and the *Pacific Region Integrated Fisheries Management Plan - Groundfish* (IFMP-Groundfish) [http://www.ops2.pac.dfompo.gc.ca/xnet/xIndex.cfm?pg=welcome&lang=en&targetPage=content/mplans/mplans.htm&targetURLParams=&StopCookieTest=1] aim to establish these fisheries as a biologically and commercially sustainable resource which supports a self-reliant fishery. Conservation will not be compromised however, and a precautionary approach guides all decision-making.

In regards to part e) *Cedrela odorata, Dalbergia retusa, D. granadillo, and D. Stevensonii*

ii) A.:

The following information is based on available Canadian re-export shipment reports for (tropical) logs and sawn wood from Bolivia, Brazil, Columbia, Guatemala, Peru, and Mexico from Jan 1 2007 to Oct 15 2008 for the species *Cedrela odorata, Dalbergia retusa, D. stevensonii* and *D. granadillo*. Source and precise quantity data are not available. Information is presented on number of re-export shipments for species in question and rough estimate of quantities over the time period.

For species *Cedrela odorata*:

Bolivia:	20 shipments, volume range 2 m^3 to 34 m^3, average 10 m^3 per shipment
Brazil:	30-40 shipments, volume range 1 m^3 to 40 m^3, average 16 m^3 per shipment
Guatemala:	5 to 10 shipments
Peru:	15 - 20 shipments, volumes in range of 20 m^3 per shipment

All shipments were re-exports from the United States
Additionally:
Peru: 4 shipments of Spanish Cedar identified as *Cedrela fissilis* , also identified as *Cedrela* spp.

For species *Dalbergia retusa* and *D. stevensonii*:

Brazil:	2 shipments, small quantities
Guatemala:	3 to 5 shipments, small quantities
Mexico:	20 shipments, volumes less than 5 m^3 per shipment

Note: *D. granadillo* was not observed.

With exception of Mexico data, all shipments were re-exports from the United States.

Please contact the CITES Scientific Authority at +1 819 953 1429 or cites-science@ec.gc.ca if you have any questions.

Yours sincerely,

Carolina Caceres
A/Manager, Species Assessment
Canadian Wildlife Service

cc. Mary Taylor, CITES Management Authority
Sylvie Lapointe, CITES Management Authority, Fisheries and Oceans Canada

Response to CITES Notification 2008/058 by the European Community

Information to be submitted for consideration at the next meeting of the Animals and Plants Committee

a) Sharks

i) 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];

The EC is member of the inter-sessional sharks Working Group of the Animals Committee, which is currently considering this issue.

ii) 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];

1. The Commission will propose to the Council a new Council Regulation with TACs and Quotas for 2009, which includes the following:

   - A zero TAC for porbeagle and spurdogs for all stocks in all ICES zones.

   - New TACs for rays and skates extending the coverage area from the North sea to Skagerrak (III), the Celtic Seas (VI, VII) and the Bay of Biscay and the Azores region (VIII, IX and X) and special restrictions for Common skates (*Dipturus batis*), undulate ray (*Raja undulata*) and white skate (*Rostroraja alba*) by which individuals must be promptly released. Fishermen are encouraged to use techniques and equipment to facilitate the rapid and safe release of these species.

   - Special provisions for angel sharks (*Squatina spp.*) in all EC waters. This species may not be retained on board and its catches shall be promptly released unharmed to the extent practicable.

2. The Council will decide on the above proposals by the end of December 2008.

3. Currently, it is prohibited for Community vessels to retain on board, to tranship and to land in any waters (Community or non-Community waters) two listed species, Basking shark (*Cetorhinus maximus*) and white shark (*Carcharodon carcharias*). Furthermore the EC Wildlife Trade Regulation, implementing CITES in the EU includes in its Annexes the shark species listed in the CITES Appendices.

The total catches by the European Union (25 countries) of the species identified by the Animals Committee (Annex 3 to document CoP14 Doc.59.1) in all fishing areas, as recorded by EUROSTAT, are attached.

iii) 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].*

FAO IPOA

The European Commission intends to adopt in January 2009 a Communication with an European Community Plan of Action for the conservation and management of sharks.

The main objectives of the Community action plan will be:

(1) Broaden the knowledge both on shark fisheries and on shark species and their role in the ecosystem.

(2) Ensure that directed fisheries for shark are sustainable and that by-catches of shark resulting from other fisheries are properly regulated.

(3) Encourage a coherent approach between the internal and external EC fishery policy for sharks.

RFMOs

Some tuna RFMOs have requirements to provide certain information regarding the capture of sharks, and the technical measures that should be followed in cases of incidental catches. The ICCAT Standing Committee on Research and Statistics performed a stock assessment of blue shark (*Prionace glucea)* and shortfin mako (*Isurus oxyrinchus)* at its last meeting in September 2008. Ecological risk assessments (ERA) were also conducted for nine additional priority species of pelagic elasmobranchs, for which available data are very limited (*Isurus paucus; Alopias vulpinus, Carcharhinus longimanus; C. falciformis; Lamna nasus; Spyrna lewini; Spyrna zygaena;* and *Pteroplatytrygon violacea).*

The assessment results presented high levels of uncertainty due to data limitations. An increased research and data collection are required to enable the Committee to improve the advice it can offer. The ICCAT stock assessment for porbeagle shark (*Lamna nasus*) is due to be undertaken in 2009.

Further information can be obtained from the various tuna RFMOs regarding the individual stock assessments which are provided as public documents on the respective web-sites, as appropriate.

The websites are as follows:

http://www.iccat.int/en/

http://www.iattc.org/HomeENG.htm

http://www.iotc.org/English/index.php

http://www.wcpfc.int/

http://www.ccsbt.org/

We would advise CITES Secretariat to contact the FAO and various RFMOs involved in the issue (in particular RFMOs charged with tuna and tuna like species, including sharks) in order to receive information on recent stock assessments and information provided by Parties to these RFMOs in order to avoid the duplication of work.

e) *Cedrela odorata*, *Dalbergia retusa*, *D. granadillo* and *D. stevensonii*

ii) All Parties shall:

A. compile the information on the import and export of the species, including origin (wild or cultivated), volumes and products, indicating the country of origin and final destination;

In order to be able to report on information on imports of these species, the European Community has included *Cedrela spp, Dalbergia retusa, D. granadillo* and *D. stenvensonii* in Annex D of Regulation EC (No) 338/97, except for the species/populations included in Annex C (comparable with Appendix III of CITES). The Annexes were adopted on 31 March 2008 and came into force on 11 April 2008.

Annex D listing requires the prior presentation of an import notification at the border customs office at the point of introduction which allows to monitor importing levels.

The EU annexes to Regulation EC (No) 338/97 contain therefore the following species:

Annex C: Cedrela odorata (from populations of Peru, Colombia, Guatemala)

Annex D: all other Cedrela spp, not listed in Annex C.

Annex C: Dalbergia retusa, D. stevensonii (from populations of Guatemala)

Annex D: Dalbergia retusa, D. stevensonii (except populations included in Annex C)

Annex D: Dalbergia granadillo

All these listings are annotated to for Logs, sawn wood and veneer sheets

Please find attached an annex with data of directs import of Cedrela species into the EU for the years 2000 – 2007.

Catches - Total all fishing areas

			dgs	gag	gup	man	por	guz	gtf	saw
			Picked dogfish - Squalus acanthias (tonnes)	Tope shark - Galeorhinus galeus (tonnes)	Gulper shark - Centrophorus granulosus (tonnes)	Mantas - Mobulidae (tonnes)	Porbeagle - Lamna nasus (tonnes)	Guitarfishes nei - Rhinobatos spp (tonnes)	Guitarfishes etc, nei - Rhinobatidae (tonnes)	Sawfishes - Pristidae (tonnes)
eu25	***European Union (25 countries)***	***2004***	*6900*	*1048*	*674*	*:*	*1033*	*1*	*41*	*:*
		2005	*4867*	*890*	*171*	*:*	*676*	*1*	*24*	*:*
		2006	*2509*	*1070*	*264*	*:*	*495*	*0*	*34*	*:*
es	**Spain**	**2004**	28	600	11	:	488	:	:	:
		2005	101	467	7	:	354	:	:	:
		2006	105	592	3	:	258	:	:	:
fr	**France**	**2004**	1132	310	:	:	410	:	:	:
		2005	1098	290	:	:	276	:	:	:
		2006	850	333	:	:	213	:	:	:
it	**Italy**	**2004**	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
		2005	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
		2006	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
pt	**Portugal**	**2004**	9	52	182	:	63	1	:	:
		2005	6	45	110	:	10	1	:	:
		2006	10	45	128	:	6	0	:	:
gr	**Greece**	**2004**	:	:	:	:	:	:	41	:
		2005	:	:	:	:	:	:	24	:
		2006	:	:	:	:	:	:	34	:
uk	**United Kingdom**	**2004**	5070	81	481	:	24	:	:	:
		2005	3132	81	40	:	24	:	:	:
		2006	1206	93	133	:	12	:	:	:

*The statistical methodology and definitions under this database i.e. the catches are expressed in the **live weight equivalent of the landings**.*
As such they exclude all quantities caught but not landed (for example: discarded fish, fish consumed on board).
The unit used is the metric ton. The nominal catch data are normally derived from the landed quantities of the fishery products, the landed weight being converted to the live weight equivalent (nominal catch)
by the application of factors.

Response from Thailand

No. AC. 0510.2/

Department of Fisheries
Phaholyothin Road,
Kasetsart University Campus,
Bangkok 10900, THAILAND
Tel : (662) 5614689
FAX : (662) 5614689

21 November B.E. 2551 (2008)

Subject: Information for the consideration of the next meetings of AC.

(Respon to Notification 2008/058)

Dear Sir or Madam,

On the request of Notification No. 2008/058, Thailand would like to submit following information for consideration at 24th meeting of the Animals Committee to CITES Secretariat.

Sharks

i) There are no other sharks species in Thailand need to be included in the Appendices.
ii) Thailand do not land or export the shark species of concern identified by the Animals Committee.
iii) Thailand adopted National Plan of Action (NPOA) for the conservation and management of sharks in 2006. The implementation of the NPOA as below

For monitoring and report of catch

1. Developed and published standard method of shark classification in taxonomic level and field sheet on identification of shark species, as a manual for fisheries scientists who in charge with this project and fishermen.

2. The survey and data collection by Marine Fisheries research and development bureau The survey and data collection will be managed by fisheries scientists and enumerators. The biggest shark landing sites in the gulf of Thailand are Samut Prakhan province and Songkhla province while Phuket province is the biggest landing site in The Andaman sea.

Although, there were many kinds of the fishing boats landed in sampling site such as pair trawler, otter board trawler, gill netter, push netter and purse seiner, but the data collection on shark fisheries in Thailand were only recorded from otter board trawler and pair trawler which are the main fishing gears for catching shark. However, Sharks caught from these two gears are only 0.19 percent of total fish landing.

Annual data showed the shark catch in the Gulf of Thailand were 8,315.82 kg or 0.10 percent whereas in the Andaman Sea were 13,547 kg or 0.44 percent of the total catch. From the result it could be concluded that the catch of shark was only 0.19 percent of the total landing in Thai waters. In general, it could be implied that shark is not the target species of fisheries in Thai waters.

Management policy

Thailand has implemented various regulation through the Fisheries Act of 1947, revise in 1953 and 1985. However, there are no existing management policies which concerning to shark, except a whale shark species (*Rhincodon typus*). The impotant regulations of this Act are as follows:

- The Department of Fisheries of Thailand has established the regulations to prohibit fishing by trawlers and push netters within a distance of 3,000 m from the shoreline and within a perimeter of 400 m of any stationary gear.

- The number of new entry trawler is limited and push netter is banned.

- A conservation area in the Gulf of Thailand about 26,000 km^2 is decleared to protect fish during their spawning and breeding seasons from February 15 to May 15 each year. This regulation prohibits all types and sizes of trawlers except beam trawlers, all type of purse seiner and encircling gill netters with less than 4.7 cm mesh size in area along the coastline of Prachuap Khirikhan, Chumphon and Surat Thani as well as Khanom District in Nakhon Sri Thamarat. And this regulation was extended to the Andaman Sea by declearation of 1,800 km^2 in Phangnga and Krabi.

iv) Commodity codes for Shark products:

Please see Annex I of this letter: Harmonized System Code for Shark Products of Thailand (Valid from Jan.1, 2008).

Annex I

Harmonized system Code for Shark products of Thailand

Product Code	Product name
03026500000	Dogfish and other sharks, excluding livers and roes, fresh or chilled
03037500000	Dogfish and other sharks, excluding livers and roes, frozen
03055910000	Sharks's fins, dried, whether or not salted
16042011000	Sharks' fins, prepared and ready for use in airtight containers
16042019000	Sharks' fins, prepared and ready for use

Yours sincerely,

Bancha Sukkaew
Director of License and Fisheries
Management Section
for Director General
Department of Fisheries of Thailand
CITES MA of Thailand for aquatic fauna

Response from the United Kingdom

No. 20087/058 - Information to be submitted for the consideration of the next meetings of the Animals and Plants Committees

At its 14th meeting, the Conference of the Parties agreed that Parties would report on a number of subjects with a view to facilitating discussions at the forthcoming 24th meeting of the Animals Committee or 18th meeting of the Plants Committee.

For ease of reference the Secretariat lists these below.

a. Sharks

i) 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];

Answer: Nothing to add at this stage

ii) 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];

Answer:

Management Measures:

All over 10 metre vessel owners are regularly issued with a notice which sets out the circumstances in which a shark finning permit is required. In 2007 15 vessels were given special permits by the UK authorities. Under the UK permit scheme separate landing and transhipment of fins and bodies is prohibited. Whilst the UK allows the separation of the bodies and fins on board vessels which hold a permit, we have chosen not to derogate from separate landing and transhipment provisions. Failure to comply with the conditions of a permit can lead to the permit being withdrawn.

We have conducted 17 inspections at sea and 12 in port. One vessel was detained in port for a full landing inspection and is the subject of an ongoing investigation. The inspections have found no evidence that shark bodies are being finned and discarded in any of these fisheries.

Levels of landings and exports:

In 2007 shark catch landings outside of the EU were confined to the coastal states of Namibia (Walvis Bay), South Africa (Durban), Mauritius (Port Louis) and Indonesia (Jakarta). Landings totalled about 2260 metric tonnes (live weight), about 76 metric tonnes of fins. These landings were predominantly of Blue sharks followed by Makos. (*data provided by Alison Aitken of Marine & Fisheries – have we any corresponding data on level of catch in North Atlantic/ EU waters?)*

iii) 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]; and

Answer: The UK actively pursue enforcement opportunities and the exchange of information with 3rd country fishing authorities. We support the use of cooperative enforcement provisions within the Resolutions of Regional Fishery Management Organisations and within EU Fishery Partnership

agreements. Where UK authorities have not received regular notifications from vessels outside the EU, we investigate the individuals and advise the fleet in general. In addition through our membership of the EU, we supply information on our territorial waters/vessels and our overseas territories (including data on shark issues) direct to the EC which is circulated and used to inform policy decisions

iv) Parties should provide details of their commodity codes for fish products (e.g. fresh/chilled, frozen and dried, processed and unprocessed, meat, oil, skin, cartilage and fins), imports, exports and re-exports, for both CITES-listed and non-listed species (Decision 14.106).

Answer: The UK use the Market and International trade data "Business Link" for common codes; this is the level of trade data (10 digit code) (*the only specific import code I have been made aware of is for Squalus acanthis – 0302 652 000 – please advise if this is correct or if a different "code" is being sought)*

b. Cistanche deserticola, Dioscorea deltoidea, Nardostachys grandiflora, Picrorhiza kurrooa, Pterocarpus santalinus, Rauvolfia serpentina and Taxus wallichiana

Range States of the above species should report on progress in the implementation of regionally coordinated actions should improve the management of and prevent illegal trade in these seven species, including, *inter alia,* measures to combat illegal trade, regional capacity-building workshops and harmonisation of regulations and legislation [paragraph b) of decision 14.20].

Answer: The UK is not a range state for any of the seven species listed in this decision.

c. Orchidaceae spp.

Countries of export and import of Orchidaceae spp included in Appendix II should provide results of efforts to prepare identification material on further exemptions for artificially propagated hybrids of these orchids, taking into consideration the capacities of countries to implement and control such exemptions effectively [Decision 14.133].

Answer: Noel McGough of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew (UK Scientific Authority on Plants) has responded separately on this issue.

d. Bigleaf Mahogany

Bigleaf mahogany range states should report progress on the implementation of a regional strategy for the species with timelines to address: non-detriment findings, legal origin, and compliance and enforcement issues. The strategy should include the 15 recommendations made in the report of the BMWG (document PC16 Doc. 19.1.1) and mechanisms to ensure adequate implementation and enforcement [paragraph 4 of the Action Plan adopted through Decision 14.145].

Answer: The UK is not a range state for Bigleaf mahogany

e. Cedrela odorata, Dalbergia retusa, D.grandillo and D. Stevensonii

i) Range States of the above-mentioned species shall:
   A. complete and update the available information on these;
   B. assess their populations, taking into account *inter alia* the distribution, cover, density, size structure, regeneration dynamics and changes in land use;
   C. report the existence, extent and type of forest plantations of the species; and
   D. compile the information related to export of the species, including volumes and products, indicating the percentage from plantations [paragraph 1 of the Action Plan adopted through Decision 14.146].

ii) All Parties shall:
   A. Compile the information on the import and export of the species, including origin (wild or cultivated), volumes and products, indicating the country of origin and final destination; and

B. Report the existence, extent and type of forest plantations of these species, including exported volumes and products [paragraph 2 of the Action Plan adopted through Decision 14.146].

Answer: Mainland UK is not a range state to any of the listed species, however three of our overseas territories are. Namely British Virgin Islands; Monseratt, and Cayman Islands. Reports for each territory are attached separately as Annex A, B and C.

The UK has issued permits for the import and re-export of Cedrela odorata as follows:

Imports Licences issued:

Date	Country of Export	Net Mass
11/10/2002	Brazil	30.804 m□
07/11/2002	Brazil	41.586 m□
07/11/2002	Brazil	34.157 m□
08/11/2002	Brazil	34.157 m□
08/11/2002	Brazil	34.157 m□
08/11/2002	Brazil	34.157 m□
08/11/2002	Brazil	33.522 m□
15/01/2003	Brazil	34.456 m□
15/01/2003	Brazil	62.199 m□
15/01/2003	Brazil	85.166 m□
28/09/2005	Brazil	34.246 m□
03/07/2007	Peru	30.521 m□

Re-export Permits Issued:

Date of Issue	Country of Import	Purpose Code
30/07/2002	USA	T
05/05/2006	China	Q
10/10/2006	GB	Q
16/07/2008	USA	Q

Annex A

Action plan for *Cedrela odorata, Dalbergia retusa, Dalbergia granadillo* and *Dalbergia stevensonii*

Cedrela odorata

British Virgin Islands

a) Distribution, cover & density:

Found on the island of Tortola within Sage Mountain National Park (Acevedo-Rodriguez, 2008; Clubbe, pers. comm.. 2008)

b) Size structure

No information available

c) Regeneration dynamics & changes in land use:

No information available

d) Plantations – none known

e) Exports – no known exports

f) Progress in reporting - None

g) Inclusion of populations in App III - populations are not in trade

h) UK Imports – None

i) UK re-exports - None

References

Acevedo-Rodriguez, P. (2008) Flora of West Indies: Catalogue of Seed Plants of the West Indies http://persoon.si.edu/antilles/westindies/catalog.htm

Clubbe, C. (2008). Head, UK Overseas Territories Team, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. Pershttp://www.cites.org/eng/notif/2008/E058.pdfonal communication.

Annex B

Action plan for *Cedrela odorata, Dalbergia retusa, Dalbergia granadillo* and *Dalbergia stevensonii*

Cedrela odorata

1. Monseratt

a) Distribution, cover & density:

Native to Monseratt. Two areas that can support *Cedrela odorata* are the dry to mesic forest in the Centre Hills (locally common in dry forest and lower elevations of mesic forest of Centre Hills) and the Roches Estate (Acevedo-Rodriguez, 2008; Howard, 1974)

b) Size structure

Mesic forests - medium/Large tree dominated vegetation >5m tall in lower elevations with low rainfall. Typical taxa: *Capparis* spp., *Bursera simaruba*, *Tabebuia* spp., Apocynaceae, *Casearia* spp., *Hymenaea courbaril*, *Samanea saman*, *Bunchosia* spp., *Swietenia* spp., *Chiococca alba*, *Guaiacum officinale*, *Cedrela odorata* (Young, 2008)

c) Regeneration dynamics & changes in land use:

There is no specific data relating to *Cedrela odorata* on Monseratt with a crucial point to note is that any assessment of threats to its habitat in particular the Centre Hills is severely limited by lack of monitoring data. Currently, habitat destruction in the Lesser Antilles is primarily driven by pressure for tourist and urban development, and for agricultural land. In the Centre Hills of Montserrat, however, forest destruction has been minimal in recent years. Since 2000, the core area of the Centre Hills forest at mid to upper elevations has received statutory protection under the Protected Forest Order and Forest Reserve Order of the Forestry, Wildlife, National Parks and Protected Areas Act. The boundary of the forest reserve was demarcated in 2002 encompassing an area of 11.3 square kilometres. Land within the reserve is owned by private individuals and estates (60%) and by the Crown (40%). Through the Orders, restrictions are placed on activities within the forest boundary, including on clearing of land, cutting trees, grazing livestock and littering, and there are provisions for the establishment of management agreements with landowners. However no management plan has ever been implemented for the Centre Hills and the Department of Environment, which has a mandate over protected areas, has no regulations or enforcement codes under which to effectively manage activities within the forest boundary. Furthermore, much of the contiguous area of the Centre Hills forest at lower elevations lies outside of this forest reserve boundary, particularly on the eastern flank of the hills. Due to lower rainfall at these elevations, this tends to be dry forest which is vulnerable to further clearance and over-grazing. Minor incursions for building development during the post-volcano reconstruction have caused relatively small-scale forest loss on the west and north-west flanks of the hills outside of the reserve boundary, as have agricultural clearances. Conversely, there has been considerable forest regeneration (reverting from agricultural land) in the east of the Centre Hills during the last ca.20 years (J. Daley & P. Murrain *pers. comm*.). It is important to point out that there has hitherto been no monitoring of landcover in the Centre Hills area, so there is no quantitative information on changes in forest cover.

Habitat on Montserrat is also subject to both hurricanes and volcanic eruptions. The ongoing eruption of the Soufrière Hills volcano since 1996 has caused many major ash-falls in the Centre Hills, as well as acid rain. During late 1996 to early 1998, ashfalls were very frequent. The specific risks posed by anthropogenic climate change to the Centre Hills ecosystem are largely unknown. In refreshing contrast to many forest areas in the tropics, Montserrat's Centre Hills do not appear to be in imminent danger of conversion for human use. Of much greater immediate concern is historic, ongoing and perhaps accelerating degradation by alien invasive species. Urgent attention to the potentially catastrophic threat to the forest from feral pigs is required. There are no historical data-sets, or current monitoring programmes which permit changes in forest cover, forest habitat types, or alien species to be detected (Young, 2008)

d) Plantations – none known

e) Exports – no known exports

f) Progress in reporting - None

g) Inclusion of populations in App III - populations are not in trade

h) UK Imports - None

i) UK Exports - None

References

Acevedo-Rodriguez, P. (2008) Flora of West Indies: Catalogue of Seed Plants of the West Indies http://persoon.si.edu/antilles/westindies/catalog.htm

Howard, R.A. (1974) Flora of the Lesser Antilles; Leeward and Windward Islands. Jamaica Plain, Mass., Arnold Arboretum. 6 vols, 1974-1989 & Flora of West Indies (2008)

Young, R. P. (ed.) (2008). *A biodiversity assessment of the Centre Hills, Montserrat*. Durrell Conservation Monograph No.1. Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust, Jersey, Channel Islands.

Annex C

Action plan for *Cedrela odorata, Dalbergia retusa, Dalbergia granadillo* and *Dalbergia stevensonii*

Cedrela odorata

Cayman Islands

a) Distribution, cover & density:

The National Red List status for this species in the Cayman Islands is Critically Endangered (CR A2bcde + 3bce + 4). Many of the finest cedars throughout the West Indies were harvested centuries ago. A few cedars survive in remote rocky woodlands on Grand Cayman and Cayman Brac and occasionally a few individuals survive in more populated areas. No populations exist on the island of Little Cayman (Acevedo-Rodriguez, 2008; Burton, in press; Proctor, 1984)

b) Size structure

No information available

c) Regeneration dynamics & changes in land use:

No information available

d) Plantations – none known

e) Exports – no known exports

f) Progress in reporting - None

g) Inclusion of populations in App III - populations are not in trade

h) UK Imports –None

i) UK re-exports - None

References

Acevedo-Rodriguez, P. (2008) Flora of West Indies: Catalogue of Seed Plants of the West Indies http://persoon.si.edu/antilles/westindies/catalog.htm

Burton, F.J. (in press). Threatened Plants of the Cayman Islands: The Red List

Proctor, George R. (1984) Flora of the Cayman Islands Series/Edition Kew Bulletin Additional Series XI, London, HMSO -Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew

Response from the United States

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Washington, D.C. 20240

IN REPLY REFER TO:
FWS/DSA/Notification 2008-58

NOV 14 2008

Ms. Milena Sosa Schmidt, Scientific Officer
CITES Secretariat
15, chemin des Anémones
CH 1219 CHATELAINE-Genève
Switzerland

ACTION COPY
27 Nov. 2008
REPLY . . . FILE

VIA FACSIMILE: +(4122) 797 3417

Dear Ms. Schmidt:

This letter responds to paragraphs a), c), and e) of Notification to the Parties No. 2008/058 of September 24, 2008. We have consulted with our colleagues in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (USDA/APHIS), the agency responsible for inspection and clearance of live CITES-listed plants entering the United States, in preparing this response.

With regard to the information requested in paragraph a), please refer to Enclosure 1. With regard to the information requested in paragraph c), the United States does not have any additional information to provide at this time. With regard to paragraph e) i), the United States does not have any updated information to provide. With regard to paragraph e) ii), please refer to Enclosure 2.

If you have questions regarding the information we have provided, please feel free to contact me at 703-358-2095 or via email: noddy_gabel@fws.gov.

Sincerely,

for Robert R. Gabel, Chief
Division of Management Authority

Enclosures

Cc: Sra. M. Clemente, Chair of the Plants Committee
Mr. Thomas Althaus, Chair of the Animals Committee

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

Enclosure 1

Notification to the Parties No. 2008/058

Information to be submitted for the consideration of the next meetings of the Animals and Plants Committees: SHARKS

1. Report on progress in identifying endangered shark species that require consideration for inclusion in the Appendices (Decision 14.104).

The status of several species of sharks was assessed recently under the requirements of the United States (U.S.) Atlantic Consolidated Highly Migratory Species (HMS) Fishery Management Plan (FMP). These species include blacktip shark, *Carcharhinus limbatus*, sandbar shark, *C. plumbeus*, dusky sharks, *C. obscurus*, the large coastal shark (LCS) complex, blacknose shark, *C. acronotus*, finetooth shark, *C. isodon*, Atlantic sharpnose shark, *Rhizoprionodon terraenovae*, and bonnethead, *Sphyrna tiburo*. Of all of these species, none appeared to warrant further consideration for inclusion in the Appendices at this time. However, an assessment of dusky sharks (*Carcharhinus obscurus*) found that the northwest Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico population has declined by at least 80% from virgin population levels. This estimate of population status would classify the U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico stock of dusky sharks as Critically Endangered according to IUCN criteria. The dusky shark was designated as a candidate for listing under the U.S. Endangered Species Act (ESA) in 1997 and has been listed as a prohibited species to fisheries (i.e. no commercial or recreational harvest permitted) in U.S. North Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico waters since 2000. Despite being prohibited, dusky sharks are regularly caught in commercial longlines targeting sharks and incidentally caught on a variety of other gears such as surface pelagic longline gear targeting tunas and tuna-like species and bottom longline gear targeting groupers and snappers. The dusky shark is also among the most highly desired species in the international shark fin trade, which could promote illegal harvest.

Based on the results of stock assessments on various Atlantic sharks done in 2005 and 2006, the United States amended the Atlantic Consolidated HMS FMP. This amendment (Amendment 2 to the Atlantic Consolidated HMS FMP) changed many shark regulations including, but not limited to, reducing commercial quotas, establishing a low trip limit, creating a shark research fishery, and requiring fins be naturally attached through landing. Amendment 2 was implemented on July 24, 2008. With the implementation of Amendment 2 to the Consolidated HMS FMP, we anticipate that dusky shark discards will decrease by 73% compared to pre-Amendment 2 regulations.

Hammerhead sharks, primarily *Sphyrna lewini*, *Sphyrna mokarran*, and *Sphyrna zygaena*, are caught in a variety of fisheries but are generally not a target species. Hammerhead sharks are highly valued among Hong Kong fin traders and are one of the most valuable fin types in the market. The only stock assessment available is for *Sphyrna lewini* from the northwest Atlantic Ocean (Hayes 2007) that found the population to have declined by about 83% from unexploited biomass. In addition, the most recent IUCN red list assessments list the Sphyrnidae as Endangered globally. There are no known species-specific conservation or management

measures in place for the Sphyrnidae either domestically or within a Regional Fishery Management Body.

2. Parties landing and exporting products from shark species of concern identified by the Animals Committee (see CoP14 Doc. 59.1, Annex 3) should report on fisheries, environmental and international trade management measures adopted, levels of landing and export, and the status of these stocks and fisheries (Decision 14.108).

At the 23rd meeting of the Animals Committee, a working group was established with the mandate to examine information in document AC23 Doc.15.2 and other available relevant documents, with a view to identifying key species and examining these for consideration and possible listing under CITES. While some progress was made at the meeting (AC23 WG6 Doc.1), the United States was asked to head an intercessional group on the implementation of Decision 14.107 and to prepare a paper for discussion at AC24, which will include progress on previous recommendations and prioritize future actions for species of concern. While work is still in progress on that document, of the shark species noted in Annex 3 to document CoP14 Doc.59.1 as being species of concern, the following are relevant to fisheries managed by the United States Government:

a. Spiny dogfish

Based on the existing biomass threshold, the spiny dogfish stock is not currently overfished. The current estimated stock size of mature females (>80cm) is 106,000mt. The current fishing mortality rate on fully recruited females exceeds the existing overfishing threshold and the existing rebuilding target. Despite the much lower level of landings since 2001, fishing mortality rates on fully recruited females have remained above the rebuilding mortality rate. Spawning female biomass decreased from about 260,000mt in 1989 to about 50,000mt in 1998, and remained below 100,000mt until 2005. Biomass of mature female spiny dogfish is expected to continue increasing through 2008 and 2009 as fish <80cm grow into mature size ranges. Subsequently, the biomass should decline due to the low number of recruits that were born during 1997-2003. If recruitment returns to levels consistent with expected size-specific reproduction, the biomass should begin to rebound again by 2015.

U.S. commercial landings dominated the catch from 1979 to 2000, peaking in 1996 at about 27,000mt. Total landings have declined steadily from 22,500mt in 1998 to around 3,000-4,000mt during 2003-2005.

b. Porbeagle shark

Canada conducted stock assessments on porbeagle sharks in 2005 where the status was determined to have declined by up to 90%. Reduced Canadian porbeagle quotas in 2002 brought the 2004 exploitation rate to a sustainable level. The United States deems the Canadian porbeagle stock assessment to be the best available science and uses this assessment for U.S. domestic management purposes because northwest Atlantic porbeagle sharks are a unit stock that extends into U.S. waters. While U.S. fishing vessels took only a small proportion of the porbeagle sharks harvested in the northwest Atlantic, in 2007, the United States proposed prohibiting the retention and harvest of porbeagle sharks to prevent an increase in fishing effort in the future and to minimize porbeagle shark mortality and bycatch, to the extent practicable.

The United States has since reduced the total allowable catch of porbeagle sharks from 92mt to 11.3mt, and implemented a commercial quota of 1.7mt dressed weight under Amendment 2 to the Consolidated HMS FMP.

c. Sawfishes

Smalltooth sawfish, the only sawfish species currently found in the United States, are listed as endangered under the ESA. The prohibitions of Section 9 of the ESA, in part, make it illegal for any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States: to import into, or export from the United States; to take within the United States, the territorial sea of the United States, or on the high seas; to ship in interstate or foreign commerce in the course of a commercial activity; or to sell or offer for sale in interstate or foreign commerce any endangered wildlife. To possess, sell, deliver, carry, transport, or ship endangered wildlife that has been taken illegally is also prohibited.

d. Gulper sharks

Although gulper sharks are likely caught in deep-sea fisheries, no landings data are currently available for these sharks.

e. Requiem sharks

U.S. Atlantic shark fisheries are managed under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. In the 2005/2006 Large Coastal Shark (LCS) stock assessment completed by the U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), it was determined that it is inappropriate to assess the LCS complex as a whole due to the variation in life history parameters, different intrinsic rates of increase, and different catch and abundance data for species included in the complex. Based on these results, NMFS changed the status of the LCS complex from overfished to unknown. We believe that the requiem shark category on the CITES list of shark species affected by trade (CoP14 Doc. 59.1, Annex 3) is somewhat analogous to the U.S. LCS complex in that species in this category should be assessed individually where possible. It is likely that many species in the requiem shark category, with the exception of blacktip and sandbar sharks, would fit the unknown category.

Recently, blue sharks and shortfin mako sharks were assessed under the auspices of the International Committee for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT 2008). For both North and South Atlantic blue shark populations, the biomass was estimated to be above the biomass that would support maximum sustainable yield. Estimates of stock status for the North Atlantic shortfin mako were much more variable. Multiple model outcomes indicated stock depletion to about 50% of virgin biomass and levels of fishing mortality above those resulting in maximum sustainable yield. However, other models estimated considerably lower levels of depletion and no overfishing. New biological information obtained since the last assessment indicates that increases in age of maturity lower the productivity, which increases the probability that the stock could be below the biomass that supports maximum sustainable yield.

f. Guitar fishes, shovelnose rays

Little harvest of guitar fishes occurs in U.S. waters. No estimates are available on landings or trade.

g. Devil rays

Little harvest of devil rays occurs in U.S. waters. No estimates are available on landings or trade. In some U.S. states, devil rays are prohibited from commercial and recreational harvest.

h. Leopard sharks

In the State of California, which covers nearly all of the U.S. range of this species, nearly all harvest of leopard sharks is from recreational fishers. Estimated recreational landings were about 138t per year during the period from 1980 to 1995. Commercial landings reached a high of 46t in 1983 but have been significantly curtailed due to gillnet bans in California waters. Although current regulations and harvest levels appear to be protective of the California population of leopard sharks, in January 2006 six men were indicted by a federal grand jury with conspiracy to harvest thousands of illegal undersized (under 92cm in length) leopard sharks from the San Francisco Bay with the intent to sell them to U.S. and international pet trade distributors (http://www.usdoj.gov/usao/can/press/html/2006_02_08_leopardshark.htm). The United States is currently examining the feasibility of an Appendix-III listing to help curtail this illegal trade.

3. Shark fishing and trading entities are 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 (Decision 14.115).

The United States led the development of the 1999 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks and completed the corresponding U.S. National Plan of Action in early 2001. In 2005, the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization adopted a proposal from the United States and the European Union prohibiting shark finning, encouraging the release of live sharks caught as bycatch, requiring parties to report data for all shark catches, and calling upon parties to undertake research identifying selective fishing gear and shark nursery areas. The United States played a major role in the adoption of a measure strengthening the call for parties to submit available data (on catch, effort, discard and trade) and establishing a process for ICCAT's scientific body to ensure it has the best available data to conduct shark stock assessments. In 2007, the United States introduced a measure in the Sustainable Fisheries Resolution at the United Nations General Assembly. The measure calls upon regional fisheries management organizations and States with the competence to regulate fisheries in which sharks are taken directly or as bycatch to adopt and implement measures, in accordance with the precautionary approach, ecosystem approaches, and international law and guidance to further the conservation and sustainable management of sharks.

The FAO is hosting a workshop in November 2008 to bring together fisheries experts from a representative number of main shark fishing and trading countries to discuss and agree upon the main limitations and opportunities for improving the monitoring of shark fisheries and international trade in shark products. The United States will participate in this workshop.

References

Hayes, C. G. 2007. Investigating single and multiple species fisheries management: stock status evaluation of hammerhead (Sphyrna spp.) sharks in the western North Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico. Thesis. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.