



*“Working within CITES for the protection and conservation of species in international trade”*

## **Sharks at CITES CoP 15**

### Reasons for the Latin American and Caribbean region to support Proposal 17 and Proposal 18

#### Porbeagle (*Lamna nasus*) and Spiny dogfish (*Squalus acanthias*) For inclusion in Appendix II

- These proposals are for Appendix II, so international trade would be regulated, not banned.
- Many countries in the LAC region would not be impacted by this listing, since they are not range States and/or do not have fishing fleets in areas of the world where these species occur. Most do not trade internationally in the products of these species.
- The EU has been criticized with regard to inadequate management of these species. However, in December 2009, the EU agreed on a 90% reduction in catch of *S. acanthias* and a zero quota for *L. nasus*. While the EU has acted, listing in Appendix II is needed to ensure that takes in other areas are sustainable.
- Fish of these species are caught for their meat, and are therefore landed in a form that allows fishers to identify them. Combined with an Appendix II listing, this will provide increased opportunities for accurate stock assessments and the collection of catch and landings data.
- An Appendix II listing will also help with the collection of international trade data.
- Appendix II listings for these species will encourage stronger regional and national management measures and contribute to the implementation of the UN FAO International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks.
- The FAO Ad Hoc Panel that convened to analyze these proposals agreed that *L. nasus* meets the criteria for inclusion in Appendix II. While the Panel agreed that international trade in *S. acanthias* is the key driver of exploitation in most areas, it did not agree that all populations of *S. acanthias* meet the criteria, mainly because the data for some regions are inadequate. However, *S. acanthias* is one of the least productive species of fish, and populations that may appear to be healthy can collapse within a few years when targeted or when subject to high levels of bycatch, as has been seen in a number of regions. Furthermore, the FAO Panel advised against “split-listing” of the species at CoP14, since it would be difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish imports in terms of which population they came from.
- The proponents are proposing an 18 month delay prior to the entry into effect of the proposed listing, to allow Parties to resolve any technical and administrative issues that may arise. Inexpensive and relatively fast genetic identification tools are already available. Guides and other technical support will be developed before the end of that period.