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

Thirtieth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 16-21 July 2018

Species specific matters

Aquatic species

Sharks and rays

SUMMARY OF PARTIES' RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION 2018/041 ON THE REQUEST FOR NEW INFORMATION ON SHARK AND RAY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES, INCLUDING LEGISLATION

1. This information document has been submitted by the Secretariat in relation to agenda item 20 on *Sharks and rays*[*].

2. The document attempts to summarize the information contained in Parties' responses to Notification to the Parties No. 2018/041 on the Request for new information on shark and ray conservation and management activities, including legislation, which is contained in full in Annex 1 to document AC30 Doc. 20. To do so, the information contained in the sixteen responses received was organized according to the categories listed in paragraph 6 of notification 2018/041, as follows:

   a) Scientific information concerning sharks and rays, such as the results of stock assessments, management and conservation efforts, and research activities;

   b) Examples of non-detriment findings;

   c) Guidance or methods for making national or regional non-detriment findings;

   d) Challenges faced by Parties in implementing the listings of sharks and rays adopted at CoP17, and progress made to address such challenges;

   e) Status of the development, adoption or implementation of National Plans of Action for Sharks, and information on national or regional regulatory measures concerning the management or conservation of sharks and rays;

   f) Information on trade in sharks and rays, including any issues regarding the reporting of trade in CITES listed species in annual reports; and

   g) Legislation concerning the conservation and management of sharks and rays.

---

[*] *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.*

3. The Secretariat has also summarised the responses of non-Party observers, namely the Florida International University, the Pew Charitable Trusts and the Wildlife Conservation Society.

4. Moreover, the Secretariat has analysed whether Parties and observers have provided information relating to the following categories: “Governance”, “Fisher(y)”, “Stocks”, “Markets” and “Socio-cultural”, loosely following the Fishery Framework developed by FAO (Friedman et al., 2018[1].). 12 Parties reported on issues related to governance, followed by 11 Parties reporting on stocks, 9 on markets, 9 on fisher(y), and 6 on socio-cultural issues. Of the observers’ responses, one reported on all issues and the other two reported on market matters, in particular identification of species in trade.

5. Challenges in implementing the existing and new CITES listings are specifically pointed out in 8 responses (Australia, Belize, Colombia, European Union, Indonesia, Mexico, Peru and Venezuela). Particular challenges mentioned include the lack of data for management, bycatch mitigation, traceability and species identification both at landing and at customs.

6. Measures taken by Parties to address some of the challenges encountered include: regional cooperation, capacity building for authorities and industries; public consultations to collect inputs from all stakeholders; development of reference materials; and scientific assessments of the status of the marine species in question.

7. Six Parties (Australia, Indonesia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru and United States) have reported on domestic activities relating to the making of NDFs. Two countries (New Zealand & United States) have submitted NDFs for uploading to the CITES shark Portal.

8. Eleven Parties (Australia, Belize, China, Colombia, European Union, Indonesia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, United States, Venezuela) have reported on their National or Regional Plans of Action for the Conservation and Management of Shark and Ray species.

9. Several responses make reference to other existing international and regional instruments, most importantly RFMOs, CMS and its Shark MoU.

[1] *https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12281*

a) Scientific information concerning sharks and rays, such as the results of stock assessments, management and conservation efforts, and research activities	
Australia	• National environment legislation requires that an independent assessment of all exporting fisheries and all Australian Government managed fisheries is undertaken, which ensures that fisheries are managed in an ecologically sustainable way. • The Marine Biodiversity Hub of the National Environmental Science Program has a current research theme of 'Improving the management of threatened and migratory species' and a project on establishing the status of Australia's hammerhead sharks which is due to be delivered in December 2018. The project is using tagging and genetic sampling (informing close kin-mark recapture analysis) to see how hammerhead shark populations are connected and to provide a robust contemporary estimate of population size and trend. • The Marine Biodiversity Hub in February 2018 completed a national assessment of the status of white sharks. This project produced the first robust estimates of white shark populations in Australian waters using a unique application of electronic tagging and tracking, collection and archival of tissue samples and a combined genetic and statistical technique (close-kin mark recapture). Published research, including that on sharks and rays, arising from this current and the preceding programme of the Marine Biodiversity Hub of the National Environmental Science Program can be found at: https://www.nespmarine.edu.au/documents-publications and https://www.nespmarine.edu.au/reports
Belize	• Stock assessments of sharks and rays have not been done in Belize. • The main management of sharks is done primarily by regulations established in Statutory Instrument (No. 78 of 2011) which include a closed fishing season. • Shark finning is not allowed. • The Fisheries Department in collaboration with researchers from Florida International University have been collecting catch and biological data from landings at the main landing sites. There is collection of anal fins from landed sharks (anal fins are small, secondary fins that have a low commercial value) as part of a pilot program implemented in 2016-2018 where shark fishermen voluntarily submitted anal fins from their landings to the Fisheries Department. Since many anal fins are visually identifiable and their size is proportional to the shark's body size, these efforts enabled reconstruction of the species and size composition of their catch. These parameters are feeding into initial assessments of these species and, possibly, non-detriment findings for CITES listed sharks.

	• Over the last 5 years, a local non-governmental organization (MarAlliance), has been collecting fishery-independent data on shark species in a few fishing areas of Belize. The data sets are submitted in their annual reports to the Fisheries Department.
China	• China held an implementation symposium after CoP17 and a training course, published updated lists of protected species and a poster thereon to promote public awareness.
Colombia	• Colombia organised national and regional workshops (see details in c) below) and capacity building activities.
European Union	• The conservation and management of sharks falls under the remit of the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) fhttp://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A32013R1380). • The EU is promoting and implementing science based conservation and management of marine biological resources, including sharks, both in EU and non-EU waters, in line with the CFP principles. The conservation and management of shark species are addressed through a number of policy tools, including the retention ban for certain species, strict fins-attached policy, Total Available Catches (TAC) & quotas, technical measures, etc. • The EU is an active and vocal advocate of the conservation and management of sharks, in relevant international fora and in particular in RFMOs which are key organisations for addressing the challenges faced by these species. The EU is active also in other fora with an interest in the conservation of marine species, such as the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) and the Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation of Migratory Sharks (Sharks MoU). • The EU provided financial support to the CITES Secretariat for the implementation of CITES for marine species, for an amount of €900 000 for the period 2017-2020. This builds on a 2013-2016 EU-funded programme and aims to build capacity of developing countries and promote synergies on concrete projects between CITES, the FAO and RFMOs. • Estonia has no scientific information concerning sharks. • A red list for sharks and rays in France was developed by IUCN, in collaboration with the French Scientific authority in 2013. France has two projects: CATaup project, focusing on *Lamna nasus* in the Gascogne Gulf and the Celtic sea, which should be completed in 2019; some studies in French Polynesia and in La Réunion, which do not focus on CITES species.
Indonesia	• Indonesia has conducted research to find management and conservation alternatives for sharks and rays. A list of publications related to sharks and rays research that have been conducted in Indonesia was included. • Indonesian waters have a high diversity of sharks and rays, with at least 118 species belonging to 25 families found throughout the vast archipelago (Dharmadi *et al*., 2015). • In 2017 Indonesia listed 38 published research activities and the number has since grown to 59 research activities. In early 2018, Indonesia conducted a national symposium on sharks and rays that collected

	research papers currently in progress to be published. Based on the research results, they obtained scientific information related to distribution, stock assessment and management and conservation. • In 2009, 11 fisheries management zones were established through the gazetting of a regulation on regional fisheries, facilitating management by the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries. • The Government minimised bycatch through fishing gear modification, and the use of LED in fishing gears and improved bycatch handling for ETP species.
New Zealand	• The Ministry for Primary Industries produced a brief summary of information about commercially exploited fish, including sharks and rays, available online. This gives the most recent year of each stock assessment, the status relative to 4 performance measures and corrective management actions for all stocks that are of unfavourable status relative to the performance measures. • New Zealand drew attention to several recent publications on NZ shark fisheries or written by New Zealand scientists.
Peru	• The Ministry of Environment developed the 'Assessment of the status of the genus *Alopias* spp. and Silky shark (*Carcharhinus faciformis*) in Peru'. • It developed also the 'Assessment and analysis of the fisheries and trade data of freshwater stingrays in Loreto'. • Developed a report on 'The fishery of hammerhead sharks *Shyrna zygaena* and 2018 fisheries projections'. • Has carried out two studies: one on the determination of heavy metals and nitrogenous volatile bases in the muscle of blue shark *Prionace glauca* from the outer triangle of the southern zone of the Peruvian sea; and another on the determination of yield and its relation to the weight and sex of the *Prionace glauca* also from the same region.
USA	• The USA completed a stock assessment of sandbar shark, with an online link provided. ICCAT assessed the North Atlantic shortfin mako shark and based on this NOAA-Fisheries determined there was overfishing. • Oceanic whitetip shark and giant manta ray were listed as threatened species under US Endangered Species Act. • NOAA Fisheries published technical memorandum on a guide to landing shark species with fins naturally attached.

b) Examples of non-detriment findings	
Australia	• Referred to an NDF for the export of shark species listed on CITES and harvested from Australian waters, 2014: http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/wildlife-trade/publications/nondetriment-finding-five-shark-species. • Published an NDF for the freshwater sawfish Pristis microdon (Pristis pristis) developed in 2011 which is available at http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/wildlife-trade/publications/non-detriment-finding-freshwater-sawfish-pristis-microdon. This non-detriment finding was reviewed in 2017 and remains in place.
Indonesia	• Indonesia has finalised NDFs for hammerhead shark and will develop NDFs for oceanic whitetip shark, silky shark, mobula ray or devil ray and thresher shark through a series of broad national consultations.
Mexico	• In the framework of the North American CEC project, Mexico has compiled species data on shark catches and fisheries, with particular emphasis on CITES-listed species. • In April 2017, North America announced a call for tender via CEC aiming to develop: a species-specific shark compendium to guide NDF making; and a strategy for capacity-building in the implementation of CITES for Appendix II-listed sharks. Candidates are currently being screened and the final results of the project will be present within the next three months. • Mexico's Scientific Authority is currently applying Teo *et al.* (2016) information on *Alopias vulpinus* Northeast Pacific stock assessment to the making of NDFs.
New Zealand	• The CITES Scientific Authority of New Zealand submitted four NDFs covering: porbeagle shark, hammerhead sharks, silky shark and spine-tailed devil ray.
Peru	• Has developed an NDF for *Shyrna zygaena* for 2017; for *Alopias vulpinus* for 2018; for *Alopias Pelagicus* for 2018; and for *Alopias superciliosus* for 2018.
USA	• The USA submitted three new examples of NDFs (wild scalloped hammerhead, great hammerhead and smooth hammerhead shark; wild porbeagle shark; and common thresher).

c) Guidance or methods for making national or regional non-detriment findings	
Australia	• All specimens of CITES-listed species exported from Australia for commercial purposes must be sourced from a harvest or propagation program approved by the Minister for the Environment (or delegate) under the EPBC Act, and some NDFs are public published reports. • Australia held three OCEANIA regional workshops in 2013, 2014 and 2017 and now there is methodology and template.

	• Supported the exchange of information on the NDF development process by making the Australian NDF for the harvest and export of hammerhead sharks available through the CITES shark and ray portal at: https://cites.org/prog/shark • Published the Scientific information for the development of this non-detriment finding (http://www.environment.gov.au/system/files/resources/39c06695-8436-49c2-b24fc647b4672ca2/files/cites-listed-sharks.pdf) and Advice on CITES Appendix II shark listings (http://www.environment.gov.au/system/files/resources/39c06695-8436-49c2-b24fc647b4672ca2/files/cites-appendix-ii-shark-listing-advice.pdf).
Belize	• An NDF workshop was held in 2017 and critical information gaps were identified. Attendees agreed on a plan of action and process under the national shark working group, which should be completed in 2018. • Research conducted by the Fisheries Department in collaboration with researchers from Florida International University is feeding into initial assessments of shark species and, possibly, non-detriment findings for CITES listed sharks.
China	• A training course was held to improve the implementation capacity of administration and industry. • Published a newly listed species poster and held a promotional exhibition.
Colombia	• A workshop was held for the development of a proposal for NDF for sharks and preliminary proposal made for hammerhead shark, which was assessed by the ICTES Management Authority and is being adjusted by the Scientific Authorities of Colombia. • Participated in a workshop on methodologies and risk evaluation for marine species in Guatemala in 2017 • Held a regional CITES workshop in November 2017, which recommended the following: o Invites the countries to continue to establish measure for the management, conservation and regulation of commerce of sharks and rays in the framework of CITES. o Recommends that CITES offers support to Parties for strengthening capacity in NDF making. o Recommends Parties to strengthen control and vigilance entities and improve channels for inter-institutional communication. o Invites Parties to improve regional channels of communication. o Invites CITES to work on methodologies that are simpler for the making of NDFs and that they require less information. • Organized virtual and in person meetings on the framework of the Permanent Commission of the South Pacific in 2017 where they discussed the challenges in NDF making when there is little to no information available on Appendix II-listed shark species. • Communication channels strengthened and work spaces to allow for implementation of decisions. Continuous work on unfolding of tax codes for shark resources.

European Union	• Germany supported a training on developing and implementing NDFs for hammerhead and silky sharks on the basis of the Sharks NDF Guidance developed by Germany. The training took place in the framework of a workshop on hammerhead and silky sharks in June 2017 in Colombo, Sri Lanka.
Indonesia	• Indonesia has undertaken broad national consultations and two national workshops were conducted to discuss NDFs for CITES Appendix II sharks and rays in 2017. • There is now a proposed format of the NDF template to be used by Indonesia in developing national NDFs for CITES-listed species, and the guidelines are based on the: Mundy-Taylor, V., Crook. V., Foster, S., Fowler, S., Sant, G. and Rice, J. (2014). CITES Non-Detriment Findings Guidance for Shark Species (2nd, Revised Version); A Framework to assist Authorities in making Non-detriment Findings (NDFs) for species listed in CITES Appendix II. Report prepared for the Germany Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (Bundesamt für Naturschutz, BfN). • The Indonesia Science Institute is developing guidance on NDF for other species of sharks.
Mexico	• See information on Mexico under b).
Peru	• The Scientific Authority has developed NDFs resorting to Mundy-Taylor et al. (2014) NDF guidance for shark species.
USA	• Referred to Part 23 Subpart D findings, section 23.61 (included in the US report), which provides factors considered in making an NDF, including: purpose, types of detriment, general factors, risk assessment, status and origin of species.
Venezuela	• The Center for Sharks Research (CIT) has undertaken population assessments of Venezuela's sharks in the Caribbean and in the Centro-Occidental Atlantic, resulting in the recording of 15 species caught in the artisanal commercial longline fishery operating in Venezuela's oceanic islands.

d) Challenges faced by Parties in implementing the listings of sharks and rays adopted at CoP17, and progress made to address such challenges	
Australia	• Identified traceability and species identification by border authorities as a specific challenge. Therefore, Australia is working with border authorities to ensure they have training and access to species identification guides, and with industry to continually improve robust traceability mechanisms.
Belize	• Identified the following as challenges for scalloped and great hammerheads: (1) the lack of time series data that would enable determination of population trends, (2) the inability of fishers to avoid

	catching these species or release them alive when conducting shark fishing operations using gillnets or longlines, (3) general lack of biological and catch information on these two species in Belize.
Colombia	• Organized virtual and in person meetings on the framework of the Permanent Commission of the South Pacific in 2017 where they discussed the challenges in the realization of NDF when there is little to no information or data on the species of sharks listed in Appendix II.
European Union	• The Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management is currently developing a knowledge-building program of measures, to address existing knowledge gaps and obtain better information on possible management measures. • In cooperation with the Swedish Species Information Centre, The Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management has produced an identification guide for sharks, rays and skates in Swedish waters, with the aim to encourage increased reporting by fishermen and fishery inspectors and to inform on the status of the threatened species. • When it comes to international trade from and to the EU, Sweden believes that for cartilaginous fish species a closer look on how trade is reported might be interesting.
Indonesia	• The Government is experiencing socio-economic pressure at local and national level related to the shark and ray trade considering that Indonesia has the highest shark landings as well as one of the major shark fin exporters (Dent & Clarke 2015). Therefore, any policies related to sharks and rays conservation and management need to consider the socio economic pressure. • There is insufficient data in making policy decisions related to sharks and rays conservation and management. • Sharks and rays have various derivative products that require further identification with advance method such as DNA testing to determine the listed species which is quite costly and time consuming. • National data production for sharks and rays are not recorded in specific species, but in larger group, which has implications for the accuracy of species-based data for creating NDFs for new listing species. • Information on critical habitat (nursery and mating areas) of sharks and rays is limited. • Indonesia is developing alternative livelihood for former sharks and rays fishermen wishing to migrate to other economic activities. • The Government has been working closely with universities, research agencies, and non-governmental organizations to improve data collection and assessment related to population status, distribution, population trend, harvest, and other biological and ecological factors, trade information, including organising a national symposium. • There are collaboration efforts between the Government of Indonesia and the Eijkman Institute, University of Udayana, and Bogor Agricultural University for DNA testing to strengthen domestic and international trade monitorings as well as product traceability.

	• The SOP on National Standardized Data Collection is now available and highlights that sharks and rays data collection shall be conducted up to species level. • Critical habitats have been identified in several locations and these areas have been incorporated under local MPA management. • Any assistance to strengthen the capacity and knowledge of the regarding the NDFs development would be greatly appreciated to improve the conservation and management measures as well as compliance mechanism on international trade of endangered species of wild fauna and flora.
Mexico	• Noted that the making of NDFs for species listed following CoP17 is challenging. However, regional collaborative projects and inter-institutional and private sector synergies are currently being developed to strengthen this. • Challenges related to species identification include the necessary infrastructure for shipment checking; advanced technology to overcome the lag-period between the identification of a shipment and the time taken for laboratorial analysis; inter-institutional coordination; staff's operational capacity (number of staff and knowledge) for shipment checking. • To address these challenges, reference materials have been developed to help customs officials with shark and ray identification. Moreover, in close collaboration with academia, cooperation mechanisms have been established to ensure that the collection of samples and their laboratorial analysis for identification enable law enforcement. • Efforts have been put into ensuring that authorities intervening in the checking of shipments for export develop more efficient procedures on a shipment-type basis.
Peru	• Identified challenges include: o Limited identification capacity for continental ray species and some shark species. To address this, Peru has implemented a technical capacity building programme targeting different official authorities, and intends to develop identification guides to strengthen monitoring and surveillance. o Insufficiency of biological-fisheries data on certain traded shark and continental ray species. To address this, research is planned for certain Amazonian freshwater stingrays; and an assessment of the current status of biological, fisheries and populations aspects of Peru's shark and rays species is also planned. o Limited fisheries management measures for traded shark and continental ray species. The research indicated above aims to contribute to addressing this challenge.
Venezuela	• The lack of data poses a great difficulty in assessing sharks status.

e) Status of the development, adoption or implementation of National Plans of Action for Sharks, and information on national or regional regulatory measures concerning the management or conservation of sharks and rays	
Australia	• Australia is now implementing its second National Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks, which is based on objectives of IPOA Sharks and provides updated assessment of conservation and management issues concerning sharks. Its performance is currently being assessed. • There is national environment law, which requires the government to assess environmental performance of fisheries. Independent assessment of all export and government managed fisheries is required. There are also guidelines to do this assessment, guidelines for the ecologically sustainable management of fisheries. • Noted that shark finning is not allowed in fisheries managed by the government or state and territory governments. Shark fin that complies with quarantine import conditions can be imported. Products derived from shark species protected under CITES are subject to strict import and export protocols.
Belize	• Finalized its National Plan of Action for Sharks, to be released in May 2018. Belize is seeking support for implementation of its NPOA Sharks.
China	• They are developing a National Plan of Action for Sharks.
Colombia	• Focused on capacity building activities and did not provide information on National Plans of Action for Sharks nor on regulatory measures.
European Union	• An EU Plan of Action (EUPOA) was adopted in 2009 aiming at broadening the knowledge both on shark fisheries and on shark species and their role in the ecosystem, ensuring that directed fisheries for shark are sustainable and that by-catches of shark resulting from other fisheries are properly regulated, and encouraging a coherent approach between the internal and external EU fishery policy for sharks. • The Netherlands continues working to improve the status of sharks and rays within the framework of the European Common Fisheries Policy and the Marine Strategy Framework Directive. • Estonia has no action plans or guidance concerning sharks. • In Sweden, fishing of piked dogfish, common skate, basking shark, small-spotted catshark, porbeagle and thornback skate is not allowed. Nearly all cartilaginous fish species that occur in Sweden are red listed. • Sweden has signed the MOU Sharks under the CMS. • France implements the EU-POA-Shark Plan, and will take part into the Caribbean R-POA-Shark Plan.
Indonesia	• Indonesia finalized its National Plan of Action after undertaking broad national consultations with related stakeholders, which is being implemented from 2016 to 2020.

Mexico	• In 2017, the North American region finalized a project financed by CEC aimed at identifying currently traded Appendix-II species and developing recommendations to promote their legal, sustainable and traceable use and trade. The results of the project were presented at AC29. An Action Plan for North America Sustainable Trade in Sharks is now available. • In 2017, CEC approved a follow-up project that will focus on the implementation of priority actions for sharks.
New Zealand	• New Zealand produced its original NPOA-Sharks in 2008, and this was updated in 2013 (https://fs.fish.govt.nz/Page.aspx?pk=165). A second review is underway at present.
Peru	• The Action Plan PAN Tiburón – Perú approved in 2014 established 4 strategic action fronts with 10 activities and 19 specific actions that are being implemented from 2014 until 2019. The status of the development of this Action Plan is summarized below: o Peru is collecting data on landings and commercialization of Chondrichthyans, including through *in-situ* observers. o Materials aiming to help with shark identification have been published, as well as materials on good practice regarding safety and traceability. o Scientific research on *P. glauca* has been carried out. o Several shark fisheries management measures have been established. o In 2017, sensibilization meetings targeting freshwater stingray traders were carried out. o In 2017 and 2018, workshops were carried out with the support of NGOs to strengthen shark identification and the capacity of customs authorities. o A guiding manual on the identification of headless sharks with economic importance in Peru has been developed.
USA	• The USA developed the US National Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks in 2001. In response to Notification 2017/031, a report published in 2014 presents some of the achievements of this action plan. • Between 2017 and 2018 NOAA Fisheries adopted several measures including ICCAT shortfin mako management measures; and emergency interim final rule on shortfin mako fish. A final report on quotas, retention limits and season opening times was published in 2017.
Uruguay	• Two new resolutions have been adopted regarding the conservation of chondrichthyans: o Res. CTMFM 13-17, which prohibits trawler fisheries for the conservation of cartilaginous fish. o Res. CTMFM 18-17, which established a total allowable catch and management measures for ray species for 2018.
Venezuela	• In 2013 an action plan for the conservation of sharks was developed to ensure the sustainable use and conservation of these species in Venezuela.

f) Information on trade in sharks and rays, including any issues regarding the reporting of trade in CITES listed species in annual reports	
Australia	• Silky sharks and mobula rays are protected under the EPBC Act, and cannot be legally exported from Australia. • Noted a minor take of thresher sharks in Government managed waters, so consistent with CITES requirements, a non-detriment finding will need to be made before any export will be permitted once the listing comes into effect. • International trade data for the three hammerhead species from September 2014 (the date of listing) to March 2017 indicates that exported hammerhead product was almost entirely made up of fins of scalloped, great and smooth hammerhead shark. A small number (12 specimens) of live scalloped hammerhead shark were exported from Australia to the United Arab Emirates during this period. • The quantity of great hammerhead fin exported has shown an increasing trend (141.04 kg in 2014/15, 550.05kg in 2015/16 and 721.04kg in 2016/17). Exports of smooth hammerhead fin occurred in 2015/16 (65.67kg) and 2016/17 (5.55kg). Exports of scalloped hammerhead fin are only recorded as occurring in 2016/17 (141.41kg). The harvested amount falls well below the limits set under the 2014 Australian hammerhead shark NDF. • Informed that most products from Australian fisheries, except for CITES listed species and species protected under the EPBC Act, are exempt from export permit requirements.
Belize	• Informed of the approach taken with Florida University on how to collect information on species and size composition of fishery: using DNA barcoding, which suggests that great and scalloped hammerheads are morphologically distinctive. This enables robust visual identification by a trained analyst using a morphological key. Suggested this approach could be of use to Parties. They have identified further research into this using length based assessment methods.
Colombia	• Continued work on the unfolding of tax codes for shark resources with special emphasis on CITES Appendix II-listed species of, with the purpose of having the tools for better traceability of exports and imports of products and sub-products of sharks and rays in Colombia. From this effort, there is the unfolding of tax codes specific to species included in CoP16 (2013), which are already included in what was established in the national Decree 2153 from December 26 of 2016.
China	• China verified pre-Convention stock of newly listed species imported between October and November 2017, which included fins, leather and cartilage (29000kg) and no manta specimens were involved. The stock was then registered and regulated for trade.
Indonesia	• Shark and ray products traded from Indonesia consist of live shark, whole shark, fins, meat, bone and oil liver, with China, Hong Kong, Japan, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand as the main importing countries. The total export of shark product to these countries in 2014 was 594,113 kg, and 26,132 kg in 2015. The total export in 2016 increased and reached 522,730 kg; whilst in 2017 the

	exports have improved significantly to 8.316.935,39 kg. The latter figure not only implies that sharks and rays have remarkable economic contribution but also emphasises that there is progress in sharks and rays data recording, particularly on international trade. The Government of Indonesia, through Fish Quarantine Agency, will continue the commitment to monitor the domestic and international trade of sharks and rays.
Mexico	• The preliminary results from the workshop on law enforcement in the framework of the North American CEC (Commission for Environmental Cooperation) project (Vancouver, 10-12 July 2017) will be presented at the 30th meeting of the CITES Animals Committee. The workshop aimed to increase shark fin identification capacity, the detection of illegal trade in fins and to identify regional strategies to address illegal trade through collaborative efforts within North America. • Between January 2017 and May 2018, 3.2 tonnes of dry fin of *A. vulpinus*, 6.1 of *C. falciformis*, 4.5 of *S. lewini* and 12.3 of *S. zygaena* were exported. The difference in export figures of shark fins between the data presented by WCMC and those reported by the CITES Management Authority of Mexico and the Mexican Law Enforcement Authority are due to that not all exports that are authorized through CITES permits end up being exported (some permits are not used in their entirety or are canceled by the holders after they have been authorized).
New Zealand	• There have been no applications for permits to export any CITES-listed shark species from New Zealand since their various listings on Appendix II. Porbeagle shark is covered by the NZ quota management system, with catch limits (129 tonnes per year) and robust reporting and monitoring systems, but although processors reported 84 tonnes of landings in 2014-15 and 46 tonnes in 2015-16, none of this has apparently been exported.
Peru	• Peru issued 4, 38 and 72 CITES permits/certificates for export, import and re-export of CITES-listed sharks and freshwater stingrays during the years 2016, 2017 and 2018, respectively.
USA	• The USA referred back to previous Annual Report Submission to CITES.
Venezuela	• In 2016, the shark fisheries production was 880.7 tonnes, with around 21 species being exploited. • For the first 6 months of 2017, 17 species were reported, with *Mustelus higmani* and *Rhizoprionodon porosus* being the resources with highest production. • In recent years, finning has significantly reduced and during 2016 no finning was reported in the context of the national framework that regulates this resource and the provisions of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) on this matter.

g) Legislation concerning the conservation and management of sharks and rays	

Australia	• The EPBC Act gives effect to CITES requirements, and under which Environment Minister issues NDFs.
	• Each State and Territory also has its legislation:
	  ○ Queensland Fisheries Act; Queensland Nature Conservation Act. Currently none of the CITES listed species of sharks and rays are listed as threatened species form a major component of any Queensland managed fishery.
	  ○ Northern Territory Fisheries Act
	  ○ Western Australian Fish Resources Management Act
	  ○ New South Wales Fisheries Management Act
	  ○ Victorian Fisheries Act

Belize	• The new Fisheries Act should be passed into law by the end of 2018. They currently use regulations established in Statutory Instrument NO. 78 of 2011, which includes a closed fishing season. • Shark finning is not allowed. • Provided information on how to obtain fishing licenses and the penalties for acting outside the regulations.
China	• The newly revised Wildlife Protection Law will be complemented by supporting regulations to regulate domestic markets.

European Union	• EU regulations assigning the annual fishing "quotas" in EU waters and for EU vessels provide for the prohibition to fish for and land species that are listed in these regulations:
	  ○ Council Regulation (EU) 2016/2285 of 12 December 2016 fixing for 2017 and 2018 the fishing opportunities for Union fishing vessels for certain deep-sea fish stocks and amending Council Regulation (EU) 2016/72 - http://eur- lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:32016R2285;
	  ○ Council Regulation (EU) 2018/120 of 23 January 2018 fixing for 2018 the fishing opportunities for certain fish stocks and groups of fish stocks, applicable in Union waters and, for Union fishing vessels, in certain non-Union waters - http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/?qid= 152639971Ġ104&uri=CELEX:32018R0120; Council Regulation (EC) 1185/2003 amended by Regulation (EU) 605/2013 providing for a finning ban and a shark fins naturally attached policy (FNAP).
	• Estonia has no legislation concerning sharks.
	• France implements EU legislation on the subject. Regarding French Polynesia, all shark species are strictly protected, and fishing as well as commercial and non-commercial uses are prohibited, as well as in New Caledonia for all Elasmobranchii species.

Indonesia	• Indonesia is currently enacting the following laws and their implementing regulations:
	  ◦ Act No. 5/1990 concerning Conservation of Living Resource s and Their Ecosystems
	  ◦ Act No.31/2004 jo Law No.45/2009 about Fisheries
	  ◦ Government Regulation No 7/1999 Concerning Preservation of Wild Flora and Fauna
	  ◦ Government Regulation No 8/1999 Concerning Wild Animals and Plants Species Utilization
	  ◦ Government Regulation No 60/2007 about Fish Resources Conservation
	  ◦ Ministerial Regulation of MMAF No. 4/2010 concerning Procedures of Fish and Fish Genetic Utilization
	  ◦ Ministerial Regulation of MMAF No. 12/2012 about Fishing Effort in High Seas
	  ◦ Ministerial Regulation of MMAF No. 30/2012, No. 26/2013 and No. 57/2014 about Fishing Effort in Fisheries Management Zone in Indonesia.
	  ◦ Ministerial Regulation of MMAF No. 35/2013 and No. 49/2016 about the Procedure to Determine the Protection Status of Fish Species.
	  ◦ Ministerial Decree of Ministry of Forestry No. 447/2003 concerning the Administration Directive of Harvest and Capture and Distribution of the SPecixmes of Wild Plants and Animals Species
	  ◦ Ministerial Decree oif MMAF No. 18/2013 about Determination of Full Protection Status of Whale Shark
	  ◦ Ministerial Decree of MMAF No. 4/2014 about Determination of Full Protection Status of Manta rays
	  ◦ Ministerial Regulation of MAAF No.48/2014 about Fishing Log Book
	  ◦ Ministerial Regulation Number 33/2017 concerning Public Service outlines that every sharks and rays trades must have recommendation from MMAF
	  ◦ Ministerial Regulation of MMAF No. 5 /201 8 about Export Prohibition of Oceanic Whitetip Shark and Hammerhead Shark from Indonesia to Overseas.

Mexico	• The regulation NOM-PESC-029, in force since 2007 and aiming to promote the sustainable use of sharks and rays, as well as contribute to the conservation and protection of elasmobranchs and other species that are bycaught, is currently undergoing technical review.
New Zealand	• The Trade in Endangered Species Order 2017 of 20 February 2017 added silky shark *Carcharhinus falciformes*, thresher sharks *Alopias* spp. and devil rays *Mobula* spp. to Schedule 2 of the Trade in Endangered Species Act 1989.
Peru	• The Action Plan PAN Tiburón – Perú was approved in 2014. • The Supreme Decree N° 021-2016-PRODUCE, modified in 2017, establishes measures for the management of shark fisheries.

	• The Directorial Resolution N° 073-2016-PRODUCE/DGSF, updated in 2017 and in 2018, approved a list of landing points for shark fisheries destined to direct consumption. • The Ministerial Resolution N° 331-2017-PRODUCE imposes regulations on whale shark in Peruvian waters. • The Ministerial Resolutions N° 082-2017-PRODUCE and N° 208-2017-PRODUCE allow exploratory shark fishing in order to enable the Peruvian institute of the Sea to develop a shark identification manual to guide identification of headless sharks. • The Ministerial Resolutions N° 008-2016-PRODUCE, N° 129-2017-PRODUCE and N° 188-2018-PRODUCE established capture limits for hammerhead sharks in the artisanal fleet for the years 2016, 2017 and 2018.
USA	• There is no new legislation. Referred back to 17 May 2017 information in response to notification 2017/031.
Uruguay	• See information under e).
Venezuela	• Finning is prohibited in all national territory for any shark species, as are any captures in the waters of the archipelagos of Los Roques and Las Aves, except for the case of dogfish, rays and chimeras or for resident fishermen.

Responses of observers

Florida International University	• Referred to Resolution Conf. 12.6 (Rev. CoP17) on Conservation and management of sharks, where the CITES CoP recommended that Parties "share experiences with, and knowledge of, forensic means to efficiently, reliably and cost- effectively identify shark products in trade", pursuant to which FIU has developed a DNA test that can identify products from 9 of 12 CITES listed sharks in the field, using a low-footprint mobile laboratory. This approach allows rapid initial detection of products from these species and a positive result provides sufficient cause to detain the product(s) for further evidentiary analysis**.**
The Pew Charitable Trusts	• Pew has helped to develop two quick reference posters and a more detailed shark fin identification guide, which can be downloaded at www.identifyingsharkfins.org to aid governments in establishing probable cause in enforcement settings (available in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Portuguese, Spanish, and Bengali). • A DNA manual is currently being finalized and will be made available at the Animals Committee meeting.

	• Since CoP17, Pew has helped support regional workshops in Oceania, Latin America and Caribbean, West Africa, South Asia, Middle East, training Parties on shark and ray CITES implementation and the policy options needed to properly implement their obligations. • Pew attended or supported experts to attend national workshops in Sri Lanka, Dominican Republic, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Senegal, Philippines, Fiji, India and Bangladesh, focusing on the development of national policies for shark management and the development of NDFs.
Wildlife Conservation Society	• WCS submitted a report of its Indonesia Programme • Stock assessment show overfished stock for *Sphyrna lewini, Carcharinus falciformis, Rhynchobatus australiae*, and *Isurus paucus*; fully fished stock for *Alopias pelagicus, Alopias superciliosus, Carcharinus albimarginatus*, and *Carcharinus obscurus*; underfished stock for *Sphyrna mokarran, Isurus oxyrinchus, Mobula japanica,* and *Himantura jenkinsii*. • In 2017, WCS-IP produced 3 technical reports. • In 2017, WCS-IP assisted the Government of Indonesia to develop NDFs for 3 species of hammerhead sharks and oceanic white tip, but only the one for hammerheads sharks has been finalised. They are now developing an NDF for silky shark. WCS-IP and LIPI has used these to produce guideline on developing NDFs. • Identified the following challenges: socio economic pressure; insufficient data; vary derivative products; national data production for sharks and rays are recorded in group level; and limited information on critical habitat. • WCS is working on revising Act no. 5 concerning the Conservation of Living Resources and Their Ecosystems and updating the annex of GR No. 8/1999 which consists of Indonesian protected species. • WCS has reviewed the implementation of its NPOA for 2016-2020 and found that it has conducted activities towards seven of its eight targets, that is, in relation to all targets except capacity building.