

Report of the

**TECHNICAL WORKSHOP ON THE STATUS, LIMITATIONS AND
OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVING THE MONITORING OF SHARK
FISHERIES AND TRADE**

Rome, 3-6 November 2008



The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the *legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities*, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of FAO.

ISBN 978-92-5-106435-1

All rights reserved. Reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product for educational or other non-commercial purposes are authorized without any prior written permission from the copyright holders provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of material in this information product for resale or other *commercial purposes is prohibited without written permission of the copyright holders*. Applications for such permission should be addressed to:

Chief
Electronic Publishing Policy and Support Branch
Communication Division
FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy
or by e-mail to:
copyright@fao.org

© FAO 2009

PREPARATION OF THIS DOCUMENT

This report documents the discussions and conclusions of the Technical Workshop that was held to evaluate the current limitations in the monitoring of shark fisheries and the trade in shark products and to recommend strategies for improving the situation. The Technical Workshop was held in Rome from 3 to 6 November 2008 and was funded by the Japan-funded Trust Fund Project on “CITES and commercially-exploited aquatic species, including the evaluation of listing proposals”.

FAO.

Report of the Technical Workshop on the Status, Limitations and Opportunities for Improving the Monitoring of Shark Fisheries and Trade. Rome, 3–6 November 2008.

FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Report. No. 897. Rome, FAO. 2009. 152p.

ABSTRACT

The Technical Workshop on the Status, Limitations and Opportunities for Improving the Monitoring of Shark Fisheries and Trade considered global and country specific information on shark fisheries and trade 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 towards the development of a National Plan of Action for Sharks. The workshop recommended actions to promote the implementation of National Plans of Action for Sharks and to address specific problems affecting catch and trade monitoring, including lack specificity in data, underestimated catch volumes, and limitations in the customs codes used in trade monitoring.

CONTENTS

	Page
BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF THE WORKSHOP	1
PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES	3
OPENING	3
WORKSHOP PROGRAMME	3
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	4
National Plan of Action for Sharks (NPOA-Sharks)	4
Lack of specificity in data	5
Volume of catches	6
Trade limitation	7
Illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (IUU)	7
APPENDIXES	
1. Agenda	9
2. List of participants	11
3. Welcome speech by Mr Ichiro Nomura, Assistant Director-General, FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department	15
4. Provisional list of primary species of elasmobranchs for the monitoring of fisheries and trade	16
5. List of available field guides and other identification tools for elasmobranch species	17
6. Shark statistics in the FAO capture database	19
7. Country reports:	
Argentina (in Spanish only)	23
Ghana	58
China, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (SAR)	67
Indonesia	71
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	78
Italy	84
Japan	98
Panamá (in Spanish only)	104
Sénégal (in French only)	111
Spain	122
Sri Lanka	132
United States of America	142
8. Five years of implementation of the project: “Strengthening the Sub-regional Plan of Action for the Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Shark Populations within the « <i>Commission sous-régionale des pêches</i> » (CSP): outcomes and perspectives”	151

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF THE WORKSHOP

Concerns about the expanding catches of sharks¹ and their potential negative impacts on shark populations have led to an increased level of international attention to the management of shark fisheries, particularly during the last decade. FAO developed the International Plan of Action for Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA–Sharks) in 1999 with the objective to ensure the conservation and long-term sustainable use of sharks, including species that are target and non-target of fisheries. Central to the objective of the IPOA–Sharks is the effective implementation of National Plans of Action by States which conduct direct fisheries for sharks or that regularly catch sharks in non-directed fisheries.

In 2005, FAO organized an Expert Consultation² that evaluated progress in the implementation of the IPOA–Sharks. The consultation concluded that few countries had had a successful record of conservation and management of elasmobranch resources and that the problem of depleted and threatened stocks and species continued to increase. A number of possible reasons for that were identified, including:

- the low economic importance of shark fisheries in many countries, and the correspondingly low priority they receive in the allocation of management resources (funds and experts);
- the weak or lack of political will to address the problems of elasmobranch population within management jurisdictions;
- the lack of expertise needed to determine which management actions are required and to rank their importance and expedite their implementation;
- insufficient funding and/or human resources to address the problems posed by the management requirements of national elasmobranch resources;
- the dependency of national initiatives on funds provided by donors.

Other particular concerns identified as factors hampering the implementation of effective management of elasmobranch fisheries included:

- the lack of appropriate taxonomic guides to identify species;
- the lack or insufficient information on the population biology of elasmobranch species, both targeted and bycatch species;
- scarce or lacking data, particularly for catch and fishing effort, to inform management decision making.

The twenty-seventh session of COFI in 2007 concurred that despite efforts by some countries to implement the IPOA–Sharks, further intensive work was required. The most recent information available to FAO at the time of the workshop indicated that of the 31 top shark fishing nations (accounting for 90 percent of world elasmobranch catches) only ten had developed National Plans of Action for Sharks.

International trade in shark products (including fins and meat) has been recognized as a major driver for the exploitation of some shark species. Increased concerns about the threatened status of shark species targeted for international trade has led to proposals for listing shark species in the Appendices of CITES (Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora). The whale shark, *Rhincodon typus*, and the basking shark, *Cetorhinus maximus*, were included in CITES Appendix II (controlled trade) in 2002. The white shark, *Carcharodon carcharias*, was included in CITES Appendix II in 2004. All species of sawfishes (Family Pristidae) were included in CITES Appendix I (no trade allowed) in 2007.³ In addition, two proposals concerning important commercially-exploited sharks (*Squalus acanthias* and *Lamna nasus*) were proposed but rejected by CITES Parties in 2007.

¹ For the purposes of this document, the term “shark” is taken to include all species of sharks, skates, rays and chimaeras (class Chondrichthyes).

² FAO. 2006. Report of the FAO Expert Consultation on the Implementation of the FAO International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks. Rome, 6–8 December 2005. FAO Fisheries Report. No. 795. FAO, Rome. 24p.

³ The only exception being *Pristis microdon*, listed in Appendix II.

Informed by the results of the FAO Expert Consultation, and based on the work of the Sharks Working Group of the CITES Animals Committee, the Animals Committee elaborated draft decisions concerning future activities of CITES on sharks which were revised and adopted at the fourteenth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (The Hague, June 2007). With regards to the IPOA–Sharks,⁴ Parties were 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;
- establish systems to provide verification of catch information; and
- implement the FAO IPOA–Sharks as a matter of priority, where they have not done so.

In addition, Parties that are members of a regional fishery management organization were strongly encouraged to request through FAO and regional fishing management organizations, where appropriate, that these organizations develop and implement regional shark plans and associated measures to assist in species identification and monitoring, as called for in the IPOA–Sharks, by mid-2009 in order to report at the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of Parties.

The need for improving information on shark fisheries and trade

One of the primary goals of quantifying the volume of species of fish taken in commercial fishing activities is to obtain the information required to develop and monitor the implementation of fishery management plans. Information about the status of commercially-harvested species provides an important indicator of the sustainability of a fishery. This information can come from different sources, including the monitoring of the fishing activity (e.g. landing, catch and effort data), biological surveys and information from resource users. Often the only data available to infer the status of a fishery resource in a particular location are the landings or catches in weight or number of the targeted species.

It has been noted that while there are major concerns about the conservation, species diversity and the potential local extinction of shark species, the quality of the landings statistics in many countries is insufficient to confidently monitor or measure changes in taxonomic composition of the catch at an appropriate level.^{5,6} According to the 2006 data compiled by FAO from country submissions and other sources, only approximately 30 percent of the world shark catches are reported at the species or genus level and another 13 percent at the family level.

Illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing further complicates the ability of States to properly monitor the status of shark resources. A recent analysis of the global shark fin trade indicated, for instance, that the estimated shark biomass in the fin trade can be three to four times higher than shark catch figures reported in FAO fisheries statistics database.⁷ The difference may be attributable to factors such as unrecorded shark landings, shark catches recorded in non-chondrichthyan-specific categories (e.g. marine fish *nei*), and/or a high frequency of shark finning and carcass disposal at sea, a practice that is prohibited in several countries and regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs).

Considering the importance of international trade as a driver for the exploitation of many shark species, accurate information on the volume of trade in shark products is also crucial to determine the relative importance of trade as a threat to sharks species and to examine the potential role of trade regulation (e.g. CITES) as a complementary measure for the conservation and sustainable use of sharks. In cases where species are mainly harvested for international trade, trade volumes can also be an auxiliary indicator of the scale of shark catches. Estimating the volume and trend of international trade in shark species is complicated by different factors, such as discrepancies between data sources (e.g. production, exports and imports), lack

⁴ Decisions 14.115 and 14.116 (available at www.cites.org/eng/dec/valid14/14_101-117.shtml).

⁵ Shotton, R. (ed.). 1999. Case studies on the management of elasmobranch fisheries. FAO Fisheries Technical Paper. 378/1. Rome. FAO.

⁶ FAO. 2006. FAO Expert Consultation on the Implementation of the FAO International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks. Rome, 6–8 December 2005. FAO Fisheries Report. No. 795. Rome, FAO. 24p.

⁷ Clarke *et al.* 2006. Global estimates of shark catches using trade records from commercial markets. *Ecology Letters* 9: 1115–1126.

of accuracy and species breakdown of reporting, and most importantly, by the lack of species-specific reporting codes.

It is clear that the improvement of the monitoring of shark fisheries and trade can make a considerable contribution to the successful implementation of national, regional and international efforts to promote shark conservation and sustainable use.

The Technical Workshop on Status, Limitations and Opportunities for Improving the Monitoring of Shark Fisheries and Trade was held at FAO headquarters in Rome, from 3 to 6 November 2008, with the objective to obtain a better understanding of the current situation and the limitations in the monitoring of shark fisheries and trade in selected fishing nations, and based on that, to identify opportunities for future improvement. The workshop was sponsored by the Japan-funded Project on “CITES and commercially-exploited aquatic species including the evaluation of listing proposals”.

PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES

Fisheries experts from a selected number of countries were invited to participate in the workshop. Countries were selected based on their importance as the main shark fishing or trading nations, the level of development of NPOA-sharks and geographical representation. Participants from Argentina, China, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (China, Hong Kong SAR), Ghana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Japan, Panama, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka and the United States of America attended the workshop. Although participants from Nigeria, Pakistan and Singapore confirmed their attendance, they were unable to attend due to reasons beyond their control.

In addition, the workshop was attended by representatives of the Permanent Secretariat of the Subregional Fisheries Commission (SRFC), CITES Secretariat, World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) and Traffic International. The list of participants can be found in Appendix 2.

OPENING

Mr Ichiro Nomura, Assistant Director-General, FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department, and Dr K. Cochran, Chief, FAO Fisheries Management and Conservation Service, welcomed participants to FAO headquarters and stressed the importance of the meeting in identifying a strategy to improve the information on the catches of sharks and on the trade in shark products. It was noted that such improvement was essential to the successful implementation of the IPOA-Sharks and of other instruments aimed at the conservation and management of sharks. It was also noted that despite the progress in the implementation of NPOAs made in recent years by some countries, intensive work was still required to improve the overall level of implementation of the programme. The technical workshop was viewed as an important step towards this goal. The text of Mr Nomura’s statement is reproduced in Appendix 3.

Mr John Carlson was elected Chair of the workshop and Mr Hideki Moronuki was elected Vice-Chair. The adopted agenda of the meeting is reproduced in Appendix 1.

WORKSHOP PROGRAMME

Presentations by FAO on the first day of the workshop provided an overview of the components of the IPOA-Sharks and reviewed the status of global statistics on shark catches and trade reported to FAO. Common problems in the reported shark statistics were identified, including the lack of specificity in data and the uncertainties about the actual volume caught and traded. Despite the growing awareness on the need for better shark data raised by the IPOA-Sharks and the improvements in the species breakdown by some countries, it was concluded that significant improvements in data collection and reporting were still needed to make the management of shark fisheries effective. See Appendix 6 for detailed information on shark statistics in the FAO capture database.

Country reports presented by participants provided background information on the shark fisheries in their respective countries and highlighted the main limitations of the fishery and trade monitoring systems. Country reports are included in Appendix 7 of this report. In addition a presentation by the representative of

the Subregional Fisheries Commission (SRFC) highlighted the main outcomes of a project to strengthen the Sub-Regional Plan of Action for Sharks (Appendix 8). Discussions following the presentations centred on three themes:

- Impediments to the implementation of National Plan of Action for Sharks.
- Limitations and strategies for improving the level of reporting and monitoring of shark catches.
- Limitations and strategies for improving the reporting and monitoring of international trade in shark products.

Discussions held on these themes led to a series of conclusions about the limiting factors that are hampering the proper monitoring of shark fisheries and trade and to recommendations to improve the situation, which are reported in the following section.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

After reviewing the global and country specific situation, the Workshop agreed on the following issues and approaches to improve the monitoring on catches and trade of sharks:

National Plan of Action for Sharks (NPOA–Sharks)

The workshop reconfirmed that the slow progress in the development and implementation of NPOA for sharks was a major impediment to the improvement of management and monitoring of shark fisheries in some of the main shark fishing nations. Several common obstacles were identified in developing and implementing of NPOA–Sharks among different settings:

– Shark management requires good coordination and collaboration between agencies responsible for fisheries management and species conservation. However, the communication and collaboration between different national agencies are often inadequate. Some NPOA–Sharks have been developed by agencies responsible for species conservation with no or very limited consultation and communication with agencies responsible for fisheries management. In such cases, the resulting plans may not reflect the actual fishery situation and be hard to implement in the context of fishery management.

– The consultations with and participation of key stakeholders in the development process of the NPOAs were also limited. Adequate understandings on the objectives and planned actions among all stakeholders are essential for the NPOAs to be effective. Although managers, fishers, processors, dealers and traders are considered as primary stakeholders, sharks also have a considerable value for many other sectors, including tourism, recreational fisheries and general public. It was noted the need to sensitize managers and all stakeholders on the importance of establishing management and conservation efforts for sharks. These efforts should be developed in a participatory manner.

– In general, sharks represent only a low proportion of the total catch, are often caught as bycatch and have low commercial value, except for their fins. These characteristics make it difficult to get appropriate management attention as well as adequate resources and funds for their monitoring. Nevertheless, their life history characteristics coupled with the importance of international trade as a driver for the exploitation of some species, are compelling reasons for countries to develop NPOAs for sharks. In addition, it was highlighted that through the adoption of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and the IPOA–Sharks, countries have already committed to develop sustainable management plans for its fisheries resources, including sharks.

– The requirements outlined in the IPOA–Sharks and in the FAO guidelines for its implementation⁸ were considered complex and demanding, and for this reason many countries were unable to fully meet all requirements in the IPOA at the same time. While recognizing that the ultimate goal for countries involved in the capture of sharks would be to cover all the elements of the IPOA–Sharks, the implementation of the programme could be facilitated if a more pragmatic, step by step, approach towards the ultimate goal was adopted.

⁸ FAO Marine Resources Service. Fisheries management. 1. Conservation and management of sharks. *FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries*. No. 4, Suppl. 1. Rome, FAO. 2000. 37p.

In the context of developing and implementing the NPOAs, the Workshop recommended that countries:

- improve communication among different agencies, especially between those responsible for fishery management and for species conservation;
- ensure key stakeholders are well sensitized on the importance of shark management through improved communication;
- utilize a participatory approach with the involvement of all stakeholders, as broad as practical; and
- make plans as realistic and achievable as possible, including taking a step by step approach towards their full implementation.

The workshop identified that the first priority step towards an NPOA, especially for those countries which struggle with low monitoring and management capacity, is to improve information about catches and life history parameters on a limited number of their primary shark species. Those primary species should be identified based on: their quantity taken as capture (i.e. contribution to food security), their socio-economic importance to fishing communities, and other specific needs such as conservation concerns, including those species listed in the Appendices of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). A preliminary list of such species was developed during the workshop and is included in Appendix 4. It was suggested that a working group be formed during the twenty-eighth session of COFI in 2009 to refine the preliminary list included in this report. All countries should make every effort to monitor and collect catch and trade information for their agreed list of primary species, as appropriate.

The workshop considered that the above-mentioned step is a minimum initial requirement. Countries with better monitoring and management capacity should take further steps towards developing and implementing an NPOA in the full context of IPOA–Sharks, including the identification of main weaknesses in monitoring of shark fisheries and trade and the adoption of actions to overcome these limitations to realize the full monitoring of catch, bycatch, discards, and trade, both in terms of quantity and species composition.

The workshop recommended FAO to encourage countries fishing for sharks to take the above steps towards the development of NPOAs and to report on progress made at the twenty-ninth session of COFI in 2011. The workshop also recommended FAO to contact those countries who have initiated shark fisheries or trade after the adoption of the IPOA–sharks in 1999, to ensure that all relevant countries are developing and implementing NPOAs. It was noted that some countries have already developed management plans without developing NPOAs. In these cases countries could adapt their management plans into NPOAs.

The workshop noted that regional coordination could play a critical role in the monitoring and management of shark fisheries and trade, especially in those areas where fishers can easily migrate and land their catches in neighbouring countries. Countries already participating in regional fishery bodies (RFBs) are encouraged to provide information on shark catches and to develop regional coordination and collaboration for the monitoring and management of sharks through the relevant RFBs. In the cases of no existing RFBs, such coordination should be sought in consultation with FAO.

The workshop recognized the need for additional resources, especially trained personnel and funds. It indicated that the capacity building, especially in shark identification, should be recognized as a priority area for international aid to shark fishing nations with low monitoring and management capacity. The need to create incentives to foster the development of NPOAs for sharks was discussed. Such incentive could include the need to ensure sustainability of resources and the need to avoid the loss of consumer confidence.

Lack of specificity in data

Most of the data on catch and trade of elasmobranchs reported to FAO were in highly taxonomically aggregated categories (e.g. “sharks and rays”). The Workshop agreed that aggregation as well as misidentification of species causes critical obstacles for monitoring of shark fisheries and trade. In principle, efforts should be made to obtain data at the highest taxonomic resolution possible. It is however recognized that there are too many species of sharks being caught and that it will be impossible in many instance for

inspectors, observers, port samplers and fishers to be able to identify and monitor the totality of shark species in addition to the more commercially important species. As a starting point to move forward, the Workshop recommended that countries should identify a list of primary species requiring special attention for monitoring and management purposes (see Appendix 4 as an example).

It was noted that in many cases the data available in national databases have a higher taxonomic resolution than the data reported to and available in the FAO database. It was clarified that the FAO request for data indicated clearly for countries to provide data with the most detailed species breakdown. FAO also stressed that it accepts any format in reporting to avoid restricting the level of aggregation of data reporting. However, the workshop recommended FAO to further communicate with countries to ensure the most detailed best quality data to be stored in the FAO global database.

Many participants reported the lack of appropriate taxonomic lists, field guides and other identification tools for sharks. The tools include not only those for identification of whole animals but also for the identification of species from parts and products, from the capture to the final commercialization. In order to assist in identifying existing gaps and priority areas that need particular attention, participants listed field guides and other available tools in their respective countries, organizations and regions (Appendix 5). As a matter of priority, the workshop recommended FAO to finalize and disseminate Volumes 1 and 2 of the species synopsis for sharks as well as to develop additional synopsis for batoids and chimaeras.⁹

The monitoring of fisheries should include the collection of biological information, such as length, sex and reproductive condition, as well as the collection of samples required for biological studies, in addition to the total quantity and species composition of the catch. Such information is often used as a basis to establish appropriate management measures, e.g. introduction of size limits of catch, setting closed area and season, and gear regulations. It was noted that fishery independent surveys as well as observer programmes would be additional important sources of such biological information. Considering the overall lack of biological information on shark species, the workshop strongly encouraged countries to include sharks as priority research areas for academic and fishery research institutes.

The lack of compatibility of the taxonomic resolution across the market chain, from catches to exports, was considered a limiting factor to allow the verification of catch and trade information. Similarly, the lack of capacity of fishery and customs officers to identify species was recognized as an important limitation. In this regard, countries should encourage the participation of the majority of the stakeholders in capacity building workshops for species identification. It was noted these training workshops should be done on a regular basis.

Volume of catches

The workshop felt that the volume of reported shark catches would very often underestimate the actual amount of removals. First, the capture monitoring generally focuses on landings and does not incorporate the portion discarded at sea. Also, even at landing sites, bycatch species with low commercial value tends to get less attention and be underreported.

Despite the adoption of no-finning regulations, the practice of discarding carcasses is considered to still exist especially when shark meat has no commercial value or use. With rare exceptions, the discarded component of catches remains unreported or underestimated. Strategies that have been used to obtain the information about discards include:

- monitoring by onboard observers adequately trained to identify shark species;

⁹ Compagno, L.J.V. (In preparation a). Sharks of the world. An annotated and illustrated catalogue of the shark species known to date. Volume 1. Hexanchiformes, Squaliformes, Squatiniformes and Pristiophoriformes. *FAO Species Catalogue for Fisheries Purposes*. No.1, Vol.1. Rome. FAO.

Compagno, L.J.V. (In preparation b). Sharks of the world. An annotated and illustrated catalogue of the shark species known to date. Volume 3. Carcharhiniformes. *FAO Species Catalogue for Fisheries Purposes* No.1. Vol.3. Rome. FAO.

Species Identification and Data Programme (SIDP), Fisheries and Aquaculture Department, FAO. (In preparation). Catalogue of batoids of the world. Rome. FAO.

- regulations to prevent discards (e.g. mandatory landing of both carcass and fins);
- mandatory reporting of discards, including introduction of special logbooks on discarded sharks (that require independent evaluation of reports); and
- estimates of species compositions from fishery independent surveys.

All of those procedures should be applied, where appropriate, to enhance knowledge on the discarded portion of shark catches. In addition, countries are also encouraged to use or develop gears and regulation that minimize the bycatch of sharks, including time/area closures. It was recognized that further work is needed to better define conversion factors from body parts to the live equivalent body weight. Countries are encouraged to examine existing materials in this regard.

Trade limitation

The main limitation in monitoring trade was the codes used at customs that aggregate all shark species and lack clear separation of processed commodities. This indicated that even when catches were monitored at species level, such information would be lost once entering trade.

The existing global Harmonized System (HS) has no specific code for rays, no separate code for cured shark products and no way to separate shark fins from other shark products. Participants were informed that FAO has currently tabled a proposal to the World Customs Organization (WCO) to establish separate codes for shark fins by four different product types: fresh, frozen, dried and cured. This proposal would be discussed at the forthcoming WCO meeting on 18 and 19 November 2008. Participants were urged to communicate with their national responsible agencies to support this proposal.

Regardless of the conclusion taken by the WCO, the Workshop recommended CITES and FAO to encourage countries to amend their national codes to enable clear separation of shark fins and shark meat as a minimum initial step to improve monitoring capability and traceability of shark products in trade. When appropriate and feasible, it also encouraged countries to incorporate codes to separate different type of shark fin products, e.g. dried, wet, and cured, with corresponding conversion factor to live-equivalent weight. Countries were requested to report to FAO the amended national codes, together with the corresponding data, whenever such amendments would be incorporated.

Caution was raised in interpreting shark fin trade quantities in terms of production estimates, recognizing that fins were transferred among multiple countries through processing over multi-years. It was suggested that additional data on product types would improve traceability in the whole process.

Illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing

The workshop did not agree on any specific measures under this issue. Feasibility and effectiveness of licensing for shark fin traders and export certificates were briefly discussed. Although both measures may have potential in improving monitoring of shark fin trade, the Workshop recognized that the feasibility of implementation would vary widely according to national legislation systems. Also, such measures may cause difficulties in application if considered to induce trade barriers, unless they are based on international agreements (e.g. CITES). However, countries could implement such measures voluntarily.

APPENDIX 1

Agenda

<i>Monday 3 November. Introduction and Country Reports.</i>	
08.30 – 09.00	Registration
09.00 – 10.00	1. Opening of the Workshop 2. Adoption of agenda 3. Workshop background and objectives
10.00 – 10.30	Coffee break
10.30 – 11.00	The IPOA-Sharks and the role of fisheries and trade monitoring in the management and conservation of shark resources. M. Vasconcellos.
11.00 – 11.30	Elasmobranch statistics in the FAO capture database. S. Tsuji.
11.30 – 12.00	Elasmobranch trade statistics in the FAO database. S. Vannuccini.
12.00 – 13.30	Lunch
13.30 – 16.00	Country reports: Status of shark fisheries and trade.
16.00 – 16.30	Coffee Break
16.30 – 18.00	Country reports: Status of shark fisheries and trade.
18.00	End of day one
<i>Tuesday 4 November. Status and progress of the NPOA-Sharks</i>	
09.00 – 10.00	Summary of country reports and plenary discussions on the main limitations for the implementation of NPOA-Sharks
10.00 – 10.30	Plenary discussions: continued
10.30 – 11.00	Coffee break
11.00 – 12.00	Plenary discussions: continued
12.00 – 13.30	Lunch
13.30 – 16.00	Plenary discussions: continued
16.00 – 16.30	Coffee Break
16.30 – 18.00	Plenary discussions: continued
18.00	End of day two
<i>Wednesday 5 November. Shark fisheries monitoring</i>	
09.00 – 10.00	Summary of country reports and plenary discussions on the main limitations for the monitoring of shark fisheries
10.00 – 10.30	Plenary discussions: continued
10.30 – 11.00	Coffee break
11.00 – 12.00	Plenary discussions: continued
12.00 – 13.30	Lunch
13.30 – 16.00	Plenary discussions: continued
16.00 – 16.30	Coffee Break
16.30 – 18.00	Plenary discussions: continued
18.00	End of day three

<i>Thursday 6 November. Monitoring of trade in shark products</i>	
09.00 – 10.00	Summary of country reports and plenary discussions on the main limitations for the monitoring of trade in shark products
10.00 – 10.30	Plenary discussions: continued
10.30 – 11.00	Coffee break
11.00 – 12.00	Plenary discussions: continued
12.00 – 13.30	Lunch
13.30 – 16.00	Plenary discussions: continued
16.00 – 16.30	Coffee Break
16.30 – 17.30	Adoption of workshop conclusions and recommendations
17.30 – 18.00	Workshop closure

APPENDIX 2**List of participants****ARGENTINA**

Ramiro Pedro SANCHEZ
 Director de Planificación Pesquera
 Subsecretaría de Pesca y Acuicultura
 Paseo Colón 892
 Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires
 Tel.: +54 11 4349 2590
 Fax: +54 11 4349 2594
 E-mail: rasanc@mecon.gov.ar
sanchez.ramiro@speedy.com.ar

Elisa CALVO
 Fishery Economy Section
 Subsecretaría de Pesca y Acuicultura
 Paseo Colón 892
 Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires
 Tel.: +54 11 43492476
 Fax: +54 11 434992594
 E-mail: elical@mecon.gov.ar

CHINA HONG KONG SPECIAL ADMINISTRATIVE REGION

Alfred K.C. WONG
 Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation
 Department
 6/F., Cheung Sha Wan Government
 Offices,
 303 Cheung Sha Wan Road,
 Kowloon, Hong Kong.
 Tel.: +852 2150 6982
 Fax: +852 23774413
 E-mail: alfred_kc_wong@afcd.gov.hk

GHANA

Paul BANNERMAN
 Fish Stocks and Statistics Section
 Marine Fisheries Research Division (MFRD)
 Ministry of Fisheries
 PO Box BT 62
 Tema
 Tel.: +233 22202346
 Fax: +233 22206627
 E-mail: paulbann@hotmail.com

INDONESIA

FAHMI
 Marine Resources Division
 Research Centre for Oceanography
 Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI)
 Jl. Pasir Putih No. 1
 Ancol Timur, Jakarta Utara
 Tel.: +62 21 64713850 – ext. 210
 Fax: +62 21 64711948
 E-mail: fahmi@lipi.go.id

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Tooraj VALINASSAB
 Head of Marine Resource Management
 Division
 Iranian Fisheries Research Organization
 297, West Fatemi Avenue
 PO Box 14155–6116
 Tehran
 Tel.: +98 21 66945145
 Fax: +98 21 66420732
 E-mail: t_valinassab@yahoo.com

ITALY

Fabrizio SERENA
 ARPAT (Environmental Protection Agency –
 (Tuscany Region)
 Head of Marine Service
 Via Marradi 114
 57100 Livorno
 Tel.: +39–0586–263496
 Fax: +39–0586–263477
 Mobile: + 39 3204391149
 E-mail: f.serena@arpat.toscana.it

JAPAN

Hideki MORONUKI
 Assistant Director
 Ecosystem Conservation Office
 Fisheries Agency
 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
 Tokyo 100-8950
 Tel.: +81 3 35028487
 Fax: +81 3 35021682
 E-mail: hideki_moronuki@nm.maff.go.jp

Hideki NAKANO
 Chief, planning and Coordination Section
 National Research Institute of Far Seas
 Fisheries
 Project Management Division
 5-7-1 Orido Shimizu, Shizuoka 424-8633
 Tel.: +81 54 3366013
 Fax: +81 54 3359642
 E-mail: hnakano@affrc.go.jp

PAKISTAN

Muhammad MOAZZAM KHAN
 Director Planning and Statistics
 Marine Fisheries Department
 Government of Pakistan
 Fish Harbour, West Wharf
 Karachi
 Tel.: +92 21 2316535
 Fax: +92 21 2316539
 Mobile: 0300 2114066
 E-mail: mmoazzamkhan@gmail.com

PANAMA

Yehudi Nafisa RODRÍGUEZ ARRIATTI
 Departamento de Ordenamiento de la
 Dirección
 General de Ordenación y Manejo
 Integral
 Vía Simón Bolívar, Transistmica; Edificio paso
 elevado, segunda Planta
 Tel.: +507 5116000 – ext: 115
 Fax: +507 5116065
 E-mail: yehudi@uabcs.mx

SENEGAL

Lamine MBAYE
 Ministère de l'économie maritime
 Direction des pêches maritimes
 Division Gestion et aménagement des
 pêches
 1, rue Joris, B.P. 289
 Dakar
 Tel.: +33 821 04 43
 Fax: +33 821 47 58
 Mobile: +77 558 39 39
 E-mail: lemzo67@hotmail.com

SPAIN

Gabriel MOREY
 Dirección General de Pesca
 Gouvernement des îles Baléares
 c/o Foners, 10
 07006 Palma de Mallorca
 E-mail: gmorey@dgpescas.caib.es

SRI LANKA

Champa AMARASIRI
 Director
 National Aquatic Resources Research and
 Development Agency (NARA)
 Crow Island - Mattakkuliya
 Colombo 15
 Tel.: +94 602075087
 Fax: +94 112521932
 E-mail: champa@nara.ac.lk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

John CARLSON
 Research Fishery Biologist
 NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service
 3500 Delwood Beach Road
 Panama City, FL 32408
 Tel.: +1 850 2346541 ext. 221
 Fax: +1 850 2353559
 E-mail: john.carlson@noaa.gov