## ADDENDUM 1

In-session version

## SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL COMMENTS

## (arising from ScC-SC6)

## PROPOSAL FOR A CONCERTED ACTION FOR THE

## BLUE SHARK (*Prionace glauca*) ALREADY LISTED

## IN APPENDIX II OF THE CONVENTION

## UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.32.3.7

***(ScC-SC6 Agenda Item 14.3.7)***

**RECOMMENDATIONS TO COP14**

* SC6 recommended the proposal for adoption, but with amendments as provided below.

**GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE DOCUMENT**

* It was noted with concern that many activities were directed to Parties and that Concerted Action should not be an alternative way of giving mandates to Parties and the Secretariat without going through the normal procedures for resolutions and decisions. Especially if an NGO develops a Concerted Action proposal with implications for Parties, those Parties should be consulted before the document is submitted.
* It was also noted that a number of proposed activities are beyond the mandate of CMS and should be dealt with in the competent fora such as CITES and RFMOs.
* It was agreed that with regards to the timeline of activities related to the protection and identification of critical sites needs adjustment as sites must first be known before they can be protected.
* It was recommend to add wording about close cooperation with the Sharks MOU.
* Law of the Wild offered support with the legal gap analyses.

**COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC SECTIONS/ INCLUDING POSSIBLE PROPOSALS FOR TEXT REVISION**

* SC6 recommended the following amendments to be made to the list of activities and to align other relevant text parts accordingly :

**ANNEX**

**Activity list under this Concerted Actions for blue shark. This detailed activity list is intended to guide positive change for the species under CMS and can be expanded and molded into a conservation action plan for the species.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Expected Outcomes** | **Timeframe** | **Entity responsible for implementation** | **Indicators for success** |
| **Management** | | | | |
| 1. Encourage Parties to continue engaging with other MEAs, RFBs, and other relevant entities to enhance blue shark management including the development of the IUCN SSC SSG Conservation Strategy and Action Plan for Pelagic Sharks and Rays.. | ??? | 2024-2026 | NGOs, experts | ?? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Area-based management/critical habitats** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | routes |  |  |  |
| **International cooperation** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Expected Outcomes** | **Timeframe** | **Entity responsible for implementation** | **Indicators for success** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Sustainable tourism** |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Develop guidelines from countries with established blue shark tourism (e.g. Azores, UK, South Africa). | Protocols for responsible blue shark tourism interaction established | 2024 | CMS Parties | All Parties with tourism activities implementing or incorporating the implementation of good  practices into their tourism management plans |
| **Research** | | | | |
| 10. Support the assessment into the impacts of fisheries on blue shark interactions (fisheries-induced mortality, discards to design mitigation strategies | * Interactions incidence and mortality rates determined; * Effects of fisheries interaction on blue   shark populations assessed | 2024 – 2026 | CMS Parties | Party Range States developing research on interactions and catch risk. |
| 11. Support the identification of sub-population and genetic differences (to support regional  TACs through fisheries-independent data) | Sub-populations identified | 2025 | CMS Parties (and non-Party Range  States) | All management units  /populations/ stocks genetically identified. |
| 12. Support the assessment of post-release mortality of blue sharks across regions, demographics and fishing gears  Suggested to be merged with 10 | Post-release survival for blue sharks determined. | 2024 – 2026 | CMS Parties (and non-Party Range States) | Good knowledge of species- specific post-release survival across gears and regions. |
| 13. Identify inconsistencies in the level of protection ensured by different Party Range  States. | Protection gap analysis undertaken. | 2024 | NGOs | All of Party Range States with gaps identified |
| 14. Identify critical habitats and understand the connectivity and migrations | * Critical areas identified; * Migratory routes identified; | 2024 – 2025 | NGOs/Research groups/ISRAs? | A global database of blue shark key habitats and key migratory routes  PACs identified. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Expected Outcomes** | **Timeframe** | **Entity responsible for implementation** | **Indicators for success** |
|  | − Priority areas for conservation (PAC) identified. |  |  |  |
| 15. Support assessments into the impacts of climate change on blue sharks by stock or region | Vulnerability and impacts of climate change on blue  shark populations better understood. | 2025 | NGOs/Research groups | Risk assessments done to define blue sharks’  vulnerability to climate change |