



**CONVENTION ON  
MIGRATORY  
SPECIES**

UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.25.6.3

10 October 2025

Original: English

15<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES  
Campo Grande, Brazil, 23-29 March 2026  
Agenda Item 25.6.3

**SHARKS AND RAYS**

*(Prepared by the Secretariat)*

Summary:

This document reports on progress to implement Decisions 14.101–14.105 *Single Species Action Plan for the Angelshark (*Squatina squatina*) in the Mediterranean Sea*, Decisions 14.114–14.116 *Implementation of the CMS Appendix I-Listing for the Oceanic Whitetip Shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*)* and Decision 14.236 (b) concerning a list of shark and ray species that meet the criteria for inclusion in CMS Appendices. It also contains new draft Decisions for adoption.

The attached draft Decisions would support the achievement of Targets 1.1–1.3, 3.1, 4.3 and 5.1 of the Samarkand Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2024–2032.

## SHARKS AND RAYS

1. This document contains the following sections:
  - A. Single Species Action Plan for the Angelshark (*Squatina squatina*) in the Mediterranean Sea
  - B. Implementation of the CMS Appendix I-listing for the oceanic whitetip shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*)
  - C. List of shark and ray species that meet the criteria for listing on CMS Appendices
2. It integrates COP14 mandates relating to sharks and rays, except for those dealing with bycatch and area-based conservation. For these exceptions, see Decisions 14.117-14.118 *Chondrichthyan Species (Sharks, Rays, Skates and Chimaeras)*, which are addressed in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.25.1.2](#) *Bycatch of Chondrichthyan Species (Sharks, Rays, Skates and Chimaeras)*, and Decisions 14.61-14.64 *Important Shark and Ray Areas (ISRAs)*, which are addressed in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.25.3.1](#) *Priorities for Area-based Conservation of Marine Migratory Species*.

### **A. Single Species Action Plan for the Angelshark (*Squatina Squatina*) in the Mediterranean Sea**

#### Background

3. At COP14, Parties adopted [Resolution 14.12](#) *Single Species Action Plan for the Angelshark (*Squatina squatina*) in the Mediterranean Sea*.
4. COP14 also adopted the following Decisions on this issue:

#### **Decision 14.101 Directed to the Parties**

*Parties that are Range States to the species are requested to:*

- a) *undertake, to the extent possible, those actions of the Single Species Action Plan for the Angelshark (*Squatina squatina*) in the Mediterranean Sea (SSAP Angelshark Med) specified for immediate and short-term implementation and for delivery within three years as a matter of priority, continue ongoing and medium-term activities, and start implementation of long-term activities within five years;*
- b) *provide relevant information and materials to update Annex III of the SSAP Angelshark Med Legislation relevant to the conservation of Angelshark (*Squatina squatina*), and to develop Annex IV, Tools and Guidelines to Support Implementation of the SSAP;*
- c) *establish a governance structure, including a Working Group of Range States, as required, to support and monitor implementation and to facilitate cooperation and communication among Range States;*
- d) *consider establishing additional national Working Groups, as required, to ensure active collaboration between stakeholders within each Range State to maximize the effective use of resources and expertise;*
- e) *provide a brief report on the implementation of the SSAP Angelshark Med in time for the last meeting of the Sessional Committee before the 15th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP15) using a template provided by the Secretariat;*
- f) *review information provided by Range States on the implementation of the SSAP Angelshark Med and prepare a brief summary and analysis;*
- g) *make recommendations on the further implementation of the SSAP Angelshark Med to COP15; and*
- h) *encourage non-Party Range States to adopt the SSAP Angelshark Med for their use.*

**Decision 14.102 Directed to the non-Party Range States**

*Non-Party Range States are requested to engage with Party Range States in the implementation of activities outlined in the SSAP Angelshark Med.*

**Decision 14.103 Directed to intergovernmental organizations**

*Intergovernmental organizations, in particular the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) and the Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation of Migratory Sharks and its Advisory Committee, are encouraged to continue to engage with the implementation of activities outlined in the SSAP Angelshark Med.*

**Decision 14.104 Directed to non-governmental organizations and experts**

*Non-governmental organizations, the Angel Shark Conservation Network (ASCN) and other experts are encouraged to provide technical support to Range States for the implementation of the Action Plan and the development of Annex IV, Tools and Guidelines to Support Implementation of the SSAP.*

**Decision 14.105 Directed to the Secretariat**

*The Secretariat shall:*

- a) encourage non-Party Range States to adopt the SSAP Angelshark Med;*
- b) assist Range States in the establishment of a governance structure and monitoring system and provide a platform for communication upon request and subject to the availability of resources;*
- c) develop a simple reporting form, in collaboration with the Range States Working Group, to enable assessment of progress in the implementation of the SSAP Angelshark Med, and disseminate this to Range States to facilitate reporting in advance of COP15; and*
- d) convene, subject to the availability of external resources, a meeting of Range States to stimulate implementation of priority actions and facilitate coordination across the region.*

**Implementation**

5. The [1<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Working Group on the Implementation of the Single Species Action Plan for the Angelshark \(\*Squatina squatina\*\) in the Mediterranean Sea \(Angelshark Med WG1\)](#) took place online on 29 and 30 April 2025. The full meeting report is available as [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.25.6.3a](#). The meeting discussed institutional matters, established a governance structure to support the implementation of the SSAP, discussed funding and coordination arrangements, set up a reporting mechanism, and reviewed implementation reports from Range States as well as Annexes III and IV of the SSAP. Consultations on meeting outputs continued after the meeting.
6. The Range States established the Working Group and endorsed a draft governance structure to support implementation, which can be found in Annex 1 of this document. A list of the members of the Working Group can be found in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.25.6.3b](#). The draft governance structure builds on an earlier version discussed in 2022. It has been significantly streamlined to reduce the workload for governments and increase cost efficiency.
7. The development of Annex IV to the SSAP *Toolbox for Implementation of the SSAP Angelshark Med* was funded by the German Government and the Principality of Monaco under the Migratory Species Champion Programme. The toolbox provides a compilation of existing guidance materials and will be updated periodically. The materials aim to

support governments with the implementation of the SSAP. Annex IV was reviewed and updated by Range States, and is available as [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.25.6.3c](#).

8. Annex III to the SSAP *Legislation relevant to the conservation of angelshark* was updated based on the reports on implementation that were submitted and on comments received by Range States. It is available as [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.25.6.3d](#).
9. To help assess progress in the implementation of the SSAP, the Secretariat developed a reporting format, which was shared with Parties on 28 February 2025 through [Notification 2025/009](#). Reports were received from ten Range States (Albania, Algeria, Croatia, Cyprus, France, Greece, Malta, Montenegro, Spain and Syria) and the European Union. The summary and recommendations from the implementation reports are contained in Annex 2 of this document. A full analysis is available as [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.25.6.3e](#).
10. Furthermore, the Secretariat developed *Advice for Spatial Management of Angelsharks in the Mediterranean* ([UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.25.6.3f](#)), which was reviewed by the Working Group. It analyses overlaps between key angelshark areas and Marine Protected Areas, offering expert guidance on spatial management.
11. At the Range State meeting, it was noted that there are only two available tools for compiling and accessing information on angelshark: (1) the Angel Shark Sightings Map; and (2) the T-Shark tracking platform. As the SSAP calls for the collation of data from both historic and contemporary sources to improve knowledge of the species, the meeting requested the Secretariat to develop a data-sharing protocol to facilitate data sharing among Range States.

#### Discussion and analysis

12. Since COP14, key conservation actions have progressed. Range States have set up a governance structure, updated the SSAP Angelshark Med, and developed spatial management guidance. Next steps include the election of a Chair and Vice-Chair and the hiring of a Coordinator to support the Working Group, for which the Principality of Monaco has provided funding.
13. Draft Decisions on the implementation of the SSAP Angelshark Med are contained in Annex 4 of this document.

#### **B. Implementation of the CMS Appendix I-listing for the oceanic whitetip shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*)**

##### Background

14. Analysis of CITES Trade Database records from 2021 to 2023 indicates that eight CMS Parties, Benin, Ghana, Kenya, Senegal, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, the United Arab Emirates, and Yemen, were involved in international trade of *C. longimanus*, acting either as exporting or origin countries.

15. COP14 adopted the following Decisions on this issue:

**Decision 14.114 Directed to the Parties**

*Parties are requested to provide to the CMS Secretariat information on their domestic and regional management measures for the oceanic whitetip shark by the 56th Meeting of the Standing Committee, clarifying how they meet the objectives and obligations of the CMS Appendix I listing.*

**Decision 14.115 Directed to the Standing Committee**

*The Standing Committee is requested to review the compilation of information provided by the Secretariat in fulfilment of Decision 14.116, and to both report progress, and make recommendations for further action, to the Conference of the Parties at its 15th meeting.*

**Decision 14.116 Directed to the Secretariat**

*The Secretariat is requested to:*

- a) *issue a notification to seek information from Parties in fulfilment of Decision 14.114; and*
- b) *collate the information provided by the Parties in response to Decision 14.114, and to transmit this information by 31 May 2024 to allow submission to the Standing Committee for review at its 56th meeting.*

**Implementation**

16. On 18 April 2024, the Secretariat issued [Notification 2024/007](#) requesting Parties to complete a survey on domestic and regional management measures for the oceanic whitetip shark. Responses were received from 14 Parties, including the European Union.
17. These responses, along with a summary and analysis, were submitted to the 56<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee (StC56), as contained in document [UNEP/CMS/StC56/Doc.16](#). To compile further evidence, particularly in view of the low response rate, the StC instructed the Secretariat to seek additional responses, review further data sources and report findings to COP15, while continuing to encourage Parties to respond.
18. In response, [Notification 2025/015](#) was issued, resulting in seven more responses from Belgium, Dominican Republic, Iran, Israel, Mozambique, Togo and the United Kingdom. These were compiled and accompanied by a renewed analysis and recommendations, available as [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.25.6.3g](#).
19. The Secretariat analysed international trade in oceanic whitetip shark products by CMS Parties using CITES records from 2021–2023. For fisheries data, it requested catch, discard, release and landing information for 2021–2023 from Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs). Responses were received from the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) and Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC). The Secretariat also included an analysis of FAO data records in its assessment, which were obtained from the [report of the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Sharks MOU Advisory Committee \(Sharks AC4\)](#).
20. A summary of the Secretariat's analysis and recommendations is contained in Annex 3 of this document. The full assessments are available as [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.25.6.3h](#).

### Discussion and analysis

21. Information submitted by CMS Parties, combined with trade and fisheries data, shows that the oceanic whitetip shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*) continues to be caught and utilized despite the prohibition on taking under CMS Article III (5). While some Parties report strong legislative and monitoring frameworks, others face persistent challenges such as weak enforcement, limited data collection, or the absence of specific measures, and in one case the lack of legislation to prohibit the taking.
22. Between 2021 and 2023, CMS Parties were involved in the trade of more than 22,000 kg of *C. longimanus* products, consisting mainly of fins but also skins and whole specimens, with exports directed primarily to China, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (SAR) and Singapore. Yemen was identified as the largest exporter, with Senegal, Seychelles, Benin, Kenya, Sri Lanka and the United Arab Emirates also participating, mainly as exporters or origin countries.
23. Catch and landing data reported by Parties further underscore the scale of exploitation. According to FAO landings data, French Polynesia and Fiji together reported 699 metric tonnes of landings during 2021 and 2022 in the Pacific region, while Iran reported an additional 41 metric tonnes from the Indian Ocean region. Data from the IOTC recorded retained catches by several CMS Parties, including instances where dead specimens were documented by observers.
24. In conclusion, these findings highlight significant gaps between actual practices and the goal of the Convention to strictly protect all Appendix I-listed species, such as *C. longimanus*, from taking. This leaves the species highly vulnerable to overexploitation.
25. To address this issue, it is essential that Parties end the use of incidentally caught Appendix I-listed species by strengthening legislation, as well as by enforcing and monitoring existing measures and ensuring the full implementation of Articles III (5) and III (4c). National legislation should explicitly include the prohibition of the taking of the oceanic whitetip shark, and Parties are encouraged to apply the recommendations set out in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.25.1.1](#), including the proposed amendments to Resolution 12.22 *Bycatch*.
26. Parties may consider taking further actions in response to the information provided by Parties in response to the survey, and the outcomes of the assessments of trade and fisheries data.
27. Annex 4 contains draft Decisions regarding the implementation of the Appendix I-listing of the oceanic whitetip shark.

### **C. List of shark and ray species that meet the criteria for listing on CMS Appendices**

28. This document reports only on the implementation of paragraph (b) of Decision 14.236. Other elements of the Decision are addressed in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.29.4](#) *Species that meet the criteria for listing on CMS Appendices*.

29. COP14 adopted the following Decision on this issue:

**14.236 Directed to the Scientific Council**

*The Scientific Council is requested, subject to the availability of resources, to:*

*b) develop equivalent lists for other taxonomic groups for adoption at COP15;*

30. The development of a list of shark and ray species that meet the criteria for listing on CMS Appendices and Annex 1 of the Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation of Migratory Sharks (Sharks MOU) has been commissioned by the Secretariat, using funding provided by the Principality of Monaco under the Migratory Species Champion Programme. Work on the list is currently under way and will be finalized in 2026. Due to the short intersessional period, the document could not be made available in time for consideration by COP15. The development of the list is guided by the COP-appointed Councillor for Marine Fish and the Sharks MOU Advisory Committee.

31. To inform the development of proposals for the inclusion of species of sharks and rays in CMS Appendices at COP16, the Secretariat proposes an intersessional review process, which is outlined in the draft Decisions in Annex 4.

Recommended actions

32. The Conference of the Parties is recommended to:

- a) adopt the *Governance Structure to Support the Implementation of the SSAP Angelshark Med* contained in Annex 1 of this document;
- b) note the summary and recommendations of the *Analysis of Implementation Reports on the SSAP Angelshark Med* contained in Annex 2 of this document;
- c) note the summary and recommendations of the *Implementation of the CMS Appendix I-listing for the oceanic whitetip shark* contained in Annex 3 of this document;
- d) adopt the draft Decisions contained in Annex 4 of this document; and
- e) delete Decisions 14.101–14.105, 14.114–14.116 and 14.235–14.236.

## ANNEX 1

### GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE TO SUPPORT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SINGLES SPECIES ACTION PLAN FOR THE ANGELSHARK (*SQUATINA SQUATINA*) IN THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA

**Endorsed by the Range States at their 1<sup>st</sup> meeting on 29 and 30 April 2025**

#### Introduction

1. The draft governance structure outlined here is designed to support the effective implementation of the Single Species Action Plan (SSAP) for the Angelshark (*Squatina squatina*) in the Mediterranean Sea. Its primary goal is to establish a framework that helps Range States identify key priorities and opportunities for angelshark conservation within their respective territories. This structure aims to foster collaboration through an international Working Group (WG), strengthening coordination and monitoring the progress of SSAP implementation across all Range States.
2. This governance structure will ensure that efforts are aligned and that challenges faced by different Range States are addressed in a cohesive and coordinated manner. The framework provides clear roles, responsibilities and mechanisms for ongoing review and monitoring of progress.

#### Coordination Working Group

3. As requested under Action 4.2 of the SSAP, an International Working Group for the Mediterranean was established following a call by the Secretariat (CMS Notification 2024/008: Implementation of the Single Species Action Plan for the Angelshark in the Mediterranean Sea Region (SSAP Angelshark Med), dated 15 May 2024). The WG is composed of one representative from each Range State, who will serve as the national government Focal Point, along with one national expert per Range State. The WG also comprises experts from the Angel Shark Conservation Network (ASCN) and may consider inviting international stakeholders, either as full members or as observers, to contribute to discussions and implementation efforts. A list of WG members is provided in UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.25.6.3b.
4. To coordinate the work of the WG, a Chair and a Co-Chair will be elected on a voluntary basis. These individuals will be responsible for overseeing the coordination and progress of the WG's activities, ensuring that the WG functions efficiently and that its efforts align with the objectives of the SSAP.
5. The CMS Secretariat will provide administrative and logistical support for the WG but will not assume a leadership role in coordinating the implementation of the SSAP.
6. The Chair of the WG will be supported by a designated Coordinator, who will be responsible for the day-to-day coordination and management of the activities of the WG. The Chair's role will primarily be to oversee the work of the Coordinator. The Chair will provide strategic guidance and ensure that communication between WG members is coordinated effectively, while the Coordinator will handle the operational aspects, including organizing meetings and reviewing the annual reports submitted by Range States.
7. On a triennial basis, the Chair and Co-Chair will also oversee the review of the SSAP, synthesize feedback on the challenges faced by Range States, and compile

recommendations to the Conference of the Parties (COP) to address these challenges effectively.

### Implementation

8. Following its establishment, the WG should agree upon a Programme of Work (POW) covering a COP triennium, focused on prioritizing key actions for angelshark conservation. The draft Programme of Work for 2025 and 2026, as presented in document UNEP/CMS/Angelshark WG1/Doc.7.1, should serve as the starting point for this process. The POW should be a living document, publicly accessible and annually updated by the WG members as progress is made. The POW will outline specific actions, timelines and responsibilities, ensuring clear accountability and measurable outcomes.
9. To facilitate ongoing collaboration, the WG will have access to an online platform containing the SSAP, relevant supporting documents, and regular updates such as progress reports and meeting minutes. The Secretariat will support the WG by providing the technical tools necessary to enable efficient collaboration and document sharing.

### Meetings of the Working Group

10. The WG should hold an annual meeting to assess progress in implementing SSAP actions across the Range States. These meetings will serve as an opportunity to share updates, discuss challenges and plan next steps.
11. In the lead-up to a Conference of the Parties, the WG should hold a dedicated meeting to review both the progress of the WG and to conduct an in-depth review of the SSAP. This review should inform the decisions and priorities for the upcoming COP.
12. The CMS Secretariat will assist in organizing these meetings upon the request of the WG Chair. Typically, these meetings will be held virtually and conducted in English.

### Funding

13. The responsibility for securing funding for the implementation of the SSAP at the national level will lie with the individual Range States. Each State is encouraged to identify and secure financial resources to support conservation efforts within their jurisdiction.
14. Additionally, Range States may consider providing funds directly to partner organizations, particularly those within the Angel Shark Conservation Network, to support the implementation of specific activities outlined in the SSAP. This approach could facilitate more targeted and efficient conservation actions, leveraging the expertise and local knowledge of these partner organizations.
15. In particular, the draft Programme of Work for 2025 and 2026 presents several key actions that could be supported by such direct funding, including research, capacity-building, public awareness campaigns and on-the-ground conservation activities. By channelling financial resources to trusted, experienced partners, Range States can enhance the overall effectiveness of conservation efforts, ensuring that funds are used where they are most needed and can make the greatest impact.

16. Furthermore, Range States may explore the possibility of establishing a dedicated fund to support SSAP activities, particularly to assist developing countries and non-governmental organizations in implementing key actions. This fund could be used to provide financial support for capacity-building, research, and other essential activities outlined in the SSAP.

### Monitoring

17. To ensure effective tracking of progress and accountability, a light monitoring framework will be employed. This will involve Range States submitting annual reports outlining their progress in implementing each action outlined in the SSAP. A standardized reporting template<sup>1</sup> will be provided to facilitate consistency and comparability in these reports. The reports will be uploaded to a shared, accessible online platform, ensuring transparency and facilitating information-sharing among Range States and stakeholders. The Secretariat will ensure that the reporting platform remains functional and user-friendly, regularly updating it with relevant templates and guidance to support Range States in their reporting obligations.
18. In addition to the annual reports, every three years, the Chair of the WG will conduct a thorough analysis of the national reports. This analysis will include a detailed assessment of the progress towards the SSAP's objectives, identifying trends, challenges and areas where additional efforts may be required. This will provide an evidence-based understanding of the status of conservation actions across the Mediterranean. The analyses will be instrumental in determining where resources should be prioritized, and which Range States might require additional support.
19. The Coordinator, under the oversight of the Chair, will be responsible for compiling the results of these analyses into a consolidated progress report. The Coordinator will highlight key successes, common challenges and gaps in implementation. This report will include recommendations for addressing issues identified across the Range States, with a focus on providing practical solutions and actions that can accelerate progress. The report will also serve as a foundation for discussions during WG meetings and provide valuable input into the overall strategy for the SSAP's continued implementation.

### Documentation

20. The outcomes of each WG meeting, including decisions and action points, will be documented in meeting reports. These reports will be prepared by the Coordinator, who will work closely with the Chair and the Secretariat to ensure accuracy and completeness. The Secretariat will ensure that these reports are prepared in a timely manner.
21. All documents related to the implementation of the SSAP, including meeting documents, national reports on implementation and meeting reports, will be made publicly available via the CMS website, ensuring that key information is shared openly.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the current reporting cycle, the Secretariat has already developed a [reporting template](#) that aligns with the structure of the SSAP, ensuring that information is captured for each specific activity. This reporting format was shared with Range States in February 2025 and has already been used by Range States to submit their reports in preparation for this meeting. The template was designed to gather detailed, activity-specific information, making it easier to track progress across the various actions outlined in the SSAP and identify areas that may need additional focus or support.

## ANNEX 2

## IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SSAP ANGELSHARK MED REPORTED BY RANGES STATES: SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPLEMENTATION

The full report can be found in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.25.6.3e](https://www.unep.org/cms/cop15/inf.25.6.3e)

1. The Secretariat has summarized the status of implementation of each Range State in **Table 1**, using a traffic light system. The areas shaded grey for the EU indicate that competency for those actions lies with EU Member States and are thus not applicable to the EU as a whole. Significant efforts were made by Range States in species-level protection, identification of sites and habitats, scientific studies and data collection, and resource allocation and international coordination. The implementation of the SSAP shows varying levels of progress among Range States. While some countries have made significant strides in legislation, awareness and data collection, others face challenges due to conflict, funding and capacity limitations.

### *Species-Level Protection (SSAP Objective 1)*

2. Croatia, Cyprus and Greece adhere to EU legislation prohibiting the capture, retention and sale of angelsharks. Albania, Algeria, Croatia, Malta, Montenegro and Spain have national measures in place for species protection, while Cyprus, Greece and Syria lack specific national legislation. Croatia has legislation strictly protecting *S. squatina* and *S. oculata*, while *S. aculeata* is not included due to its absence in the Adriatic. Malta and Montenegro both strictly protect *S. squatina*, *S. oculata* and *S. aculeata*. Syria has not addressed this action due to ongoing conflict. Awareness and educational programmes have been initiated in eight Range States, focusing on stakeholder engagement and species identification. Monitoring and enforcement measures are in place in Algeria, Croatia, Cyprus, the EU, Greece, Malta and Spain, with varying levels of implementation and effectiveness.

### *Identification of Sites and Habitats (SSAP Objective 2)*

3. Significant data-collection efforts have been implemented by all reporting Range States. Algeria, Cyprus, Greece, France and Spain have made progress in identifying critical habitats, while other Range States have not addressed this action. Croatia, France and Spain have conducted eDNA analysis to confirm the presence of angelsharks. Croatia, France and Spain have used non-invasive visual survey methods to monitor angelsharks. Efforts to integrate angelshark conservation into Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) are ongoing in Croatia, Cyprus, France, Greece and Spain.

### *Scientific Studies and Data Collection (SSAP Objective 3)*

4. Existing frameworks in Algeria, Croatia, Cyprus, France, Greece and Spain include elasmobranch monitoring, with specific efforts for angelsharks in Algeria, France and Spain. Monitoring and enforcement related to angelshark catch data are reported by Algeria, Croatia, Cyprus, France, Greece and Spain. Reporting and awareness efforts are in place in Algeria, Croatia, Cyprus, France, Greece and Spain. There are also reporting requirements under the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) framework that are applicable to all contracting partners and cooperating non-contracting partners (thus all EU Member States in the region). Engagement of recreational fishers and divers in angelshark conservation is ongoing in Algeria, Croatia, Cyprus, France, Greece and Spain. Pilot monitoring programmes have been implemented in Greece and Spain. Tagging efforts are reported by France, Greece and Spain, with challenges in expanding these efforts.

*Resource Allocation and International Coordination (SSAP Objective 4)*

5. Cyprus and Spain have made progress in securing funds for angelshark conservation. Research on angelsharks can be funded through the EU's grant to the GFCM as well as through European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund projects. Other states face challenges. Algeria, Cyprus, Greece, Montenegro and Spain support the establishment of an international working group for angelshark conservation. Efforts to expand MPA networks to include Critical Angel Shark Areas (CASAs) are ongoing in Greece and Spain.

Conclusions and recommendations

6. The implementation of the SSAP shows encouraging progress in some Range States, but others continue to face significant challenges, particularly due to conflict, funding shortages, lack of data and limited capacity. The differences in progress among Range States underscore differences in the legal and social context, and the need for continued support, resource mobilization, and stronger collaboration at the regional and transnational level.
7. Increased efforts are needed to secure additional funding and to build national capacity, particularly for activities related to monitoring, enforcement and scientific research. Strengthening these areas will enable Range States to implement the SSAP more effectively.
8. The establishment and sustained support of the Working Group, under an efficient governance structure, is crucial. It will offer an effective forum for coordinated action, promote knowledge exchange, and help maintain momentum in implementing the SSAP across the region.
9. Where CASAs have been identified, Range States should work towards integrating these areas into existing or new MPAs. This step will help safeguard key habitats and support the long-term recovery of angelshark populations.
10. By taking these actions, Range States can strengthen their conservation efforts for the angelshark in the Mediterranean and contribute to the successful and coordinated implementation of the SSAP.

**Table 1.** Overview of information submitted by the Range States in response to Decision 14.101(e) on the implementation of relevant activities for the Single Species Action Plan for the Angelshark (*Squatina squatina*) in the Mediterranean (green: fully implemented; yellow: partially implemented; red: not addressed yet; grey: not applicable).

	European Union	Albania	Algeria	Croatia	Cyprus	Greece	France	Malta	Montenegro	Spain	Syria
<b>Action</b>											
1.1 Prohibition in fisheries regulations	Green	Red	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red
1.2 Species protection	Grey	Red	Red	Green	Green	Red	Red	Green	Green	Green	Red
1.3 Awareness programmes	Green	Red	Red	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Red
1.4 Monitoring and enforcement	Green	Red	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Red	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Red
2.1 Data collation	Green	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red
2.2 Habitat modelling	Grey	Red	Yellow	Red	Green	Green	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Red
2.3 Environmental DNA (eDNA) sampling	Grey	Red	Red	Green	Red	Red	Green	Red	Red	Yellow	Red
2.4 Non-destructive site sampling	Grey	Red	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Green	Red
2.5 Role of current MPA network	Grey	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Red
3.1 Scientific monitoring	Green	Red	Green	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Red	Red	Yellow	Red
3.2 Commercial fishery-dependent catch-per-unit-effort data	Grey	Red	Green	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Red	Red	Red	Red
3.3 Recreational fishery	Green	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Red
3.4 Citizen science	Grey	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Red
3.5 Fishery-independent survey trends	Grey	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Red
3.6 Quantification and characterization of discarded angelshark survival and options for minimizing discard mortality	Grey	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Red

	European Union	Albania	Algeria	Croatia	Cyprus	Greece	France	Malta	Montenegro	Spain	Syria
3.7 Tagging											
3.8 Population structure and connectivity											
3.9 Life-history studies											
3.10 Longer-term, historical population dynamics											
4.1 Provide resources											
4.2 Establish an International Working Group for the Mediterranean region											
4.3 Appraise protected areas											

## ANNEX 3

## IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CMS APPENDIX I-LISTING FOR THE OCEANIC WHITETIP SHARK: SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. This Annex consists of two parts:
  - A. Key outcomes of the survey, summarizing information provided by Parties.
  - B. Assessment of international trade and fisheries data.

### A. Key outcomes of the survey

The full report can be found in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.25.6.3g](https://www.unep.org/cms/cop15/inf25.6.3g)

2. Of the 133 Parties to the Convention, 21 Parties, including the European Union (EU), responded to Notifications 2024/007 and 2025/015. Table 1 includes an overview of information provided by Parties regarding their status as Range States for *C. longimanus*, and information on catches, utilization and exceptions made under CMS Article III (5) over the past five years.
3. Seventeen Parties reported being a Range State to *C. longimanus*. Among these, ten reported catching *C. longimanus* within their jurisdiction or by their flagged vessels over the past five years. The EU reported that between 2018 and 2022, its Member States caught and released 942 specimens alive and discarded 300 dead in the IOTC<sup>2</sup> region. In the ICCAT<sup>3</sup> region, the EU Member States caught and discarded one tonne alive in both 2021 and 2022, one tonne dead in 2019, and none in 2018 and 2020. Additionally, the EU noted that the EU-FRA purse seine fleet reported catching 0.12 tonnes. In the WCPFC<sup>4</sup> area, the EU reported catches of 1.26 tonnes for all gear types from 2018 to 2022, with no catches retained. The fate of the specimens after release or discard is unknown. Minor catches were reported by Australia, New Zealand and Nigeria. Brazil, Kenya, Pakistan and Senegal noted that catches occurred or likely occurred but did not provide specific catch levels. Australia further mentioned that they have provided education and identification resources to fisheries to ensure that all protected shark species, including those listed on CMS Appendix I, are not retained. UK reported that in the Cayman Islands incidental recreational or artisanal illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) catch may occur. Mozambique recorded a total of 78 interactions with *C. longimanus*, noting that all individuals were safely released. While the Dominican Republic noted that no catches have been reported, sporadic bycatches do occur but are not used for commercial purposes. Seven Parties indicated that no catch reports were available.
4. Of the ten Parties reporting catch, six (Brazil, Kenya, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal and the United Kingdom (Overseas Territories)) reported utilization or possible utilization of whole animals or parts within the past five years. Kenya reported international commercial trade under CITES, exporting a total of 315 kg of dried fins to China. Brazil mentioned a limited market for meat and the possibility of illegal fin trade, noting that regular inspection operations are conducted to combat such illegal activities. Nigeria reported trade and consumption. Pakistan reported a lack of detailed information but indicated that a few instances of bycatch and illegal consumption (shark meat as fried finger fish and skins as poultry feed) and trade might have occurred. Senegal reported that fins were exported to Asia and carcasses either consumed domestically or exported

<sup>2</sup> Indian Ocean Tuna Commission

<sup>3</sup> International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas

<sup>4</sup> Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission

to other African countries. The UK reported using specimens for scientific purposes and that for the Cayman Islands incidental take by recreational/artisanal fishers cannot definitively be ruled out.

5. Brazil reported: “*the exception is the taking for scientific purposes, enhancing the propagation or survival of the species, accommodating the needs of traditional subsistence users and shall be subject to authorization by the competent body, in accordance with current legislation.*”
6. It should be noted that the CMS Secretariat did not receive any formal notification from any Party prior to this survey concerning exceptions taken with respect to the taking of oceanic whitetip shark pursuant to Article III (7) of the Convention: “The Parties shall as soon as possible inform the Secretariat of any exceptions made pursuant to paragraph 5 of this Article.”

#### Domestic legislation to prohibit taking and other domestic or regional measures to address taking

7. Seventeen Parties reported having domestic legislation (including EU legislation) that prohibits the taking of *C. longimanus*. Among these, Argentina noted that it has relevant legislation in place even though it does not consider itself a Range State. Nigeria indicated that while national laws exist, enforcement in coastal communities remains weak and fishers catch *C. longimanus* intentionally. Australia noted that no *C. longimanus* can be exported from their fisheries. Togo prohibits taking and in the event of accidental capture, the fisher must release the animals if they are still alive or report them to the competent authorities when they are dead. Belgium reported on a newly enforced (EU) 2025/202 regulation in the IATTC<sup>5</sup> Convention area. New Zealand reported that it prohibits the taking not only within national jurisdiction, but on any New Zealand flagged vessel.
8. Senegal reported that harvesting of *C. longimanus* is permitted but requires a CITES permit for export as the species is listed in Appendix II of CITES.
9. Ten Parties reported having specifically banned retention on board, and in several cases also banned trans-shipping, landing, storing, selling or offering for sale any part or whole carcass of *C. longimanus* after its capture. In many instances, these measures were implemented in accordance with obligations under various Regional Fishery Management Organizations (RFMOs), including ICCAT, IOTC, WCPFC and IATTC. Several Parties also reported domestic regulations in place to ensure compliance with CITES.
10. Several Parties reported technical and operational measures to reduce unintentional capture and/or to facilitate the safe release of *C. longimanus* after capture:
  - Australia reported a ban on the use of wire traces to reduce shark retention. Additionally, all tuna longline vessels are required to carry line cutters and de-hookers to ensure safe release, improving post-capture survival.
  - Brazil prohibits the use of steel slings or any material other than monofilament nylon by longline vessels in the Environmental Protection Area of the São Pedro and São Paulo Archipelago.
  - Panama requires the mandatory use of an approved fishing log format for the reporting of catch data for fishing fleet with longline fishing gear.

<sup>5</sup> Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission

- The EU implements WCPFC Conservation and Management Measure 2022-04, which prohibits the use of wire traces between 20°N and 20°S to minimize incidental catches.
11. Other actions to address the taking of *C. longimanus* include Kenya’s development of a recovery plan and training of law enforcement personnel in shark identification, Panama’s introduction of mandatory reporting and logbook protocols, and Brazil’s and Panama’s requirement that all shark fins remain attached to carcasses upon landing to enforce the ban on finning.
  12. Finland, Iran and Iraq reported having no domestic legislation to prohibit the taking of *C. longimanus*. Finland stated that it is not a Range State of *C. longimanus*.

**Table 1.** Overview of information submitted by Parties in response to Notification 2024/007 regarding their status as Range States for *Carcharhinus longimanus*, including data on catches, utilization and exceptions made under CMS Article III(5) over the past five years. The data is aggregated and adapted from the original responses included in Annex 2 of UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.25.6.3g.

<b>Party</b>	<b>Range State to <i>C. longimanus</i></b>	<b><i>C. longimanus</i> catches within the past 5 years</b>	<b>Utilization of <i>C. longimanus</i> within the past 5 years</b>	<b>Exceptions from Art III (5) made</b>
Argentina	Unclear <sup>6</sup>	No	-	-
Australia	Yes	A small number (<5 individuals) were retained in the Coral Sea Fishery in 2021–22. Additional education and identification resources have been provided to this fishery to ensure that all protected shark species (including those listed on CMS Appendix I) are not retained.	No	No
Belgium	No	No	-	No
Brazil	Yes	Historically captured in pelagic longline fisheries; bycatch continues to occur; reporting requirements have changed and this has affected reported catch	Limited market for meat, possible illegal fin trade, regular inspection operations to repress trafficking	Yes <sup>7</sup>
Dominican Republic	Yes <sup>8</sup>	No, but sporadic cases of bycatch, these catches are not used for commercial purposes and are managed according to established procedures for protected species. <sup>8</sup>	- <sup>8</sup>	- <sup>8</sup>
European Union	Yes	IOTC (total of individuals, all gears, for the period 2018-2022): 942 released alive; 300 discarded dead. No retained catches. WCPFC: (in metric tonnes, all gears, for the period 2018-2022): 1.26 t. No retained catches. No information on the	No	No

<sup>6</sup>“Although the species has been sighted in Argentina, there are few records of confirmed presence of this species in the Argentine Exclusive Economic Zone and the Argentine Uruguayan Common Fishing Zone. Currently, there are no occurrences of the species in research campaigns carried out by INIDEP, landing samplings in Argentine ports and records of fisheries research assistants (i.e. observers on board).”

<sup>7</sup>“Taking for scientific purposes, enhancing the propagation or survival of the species, accommodating the needs of traditional subsistence users and [...] subject to authorization by the competent body, in accordance with current legislation.”

<sup>8</sup> Manual insertion by the Secretariat of the official response, submitted as continuous text by the Dominican Republic

Party	Range State to <i>C. longimanus</i>	<i>C. longimanus</i> catches within the past 5 years	Utilization of <i>C. longimanus</i> within the past 5 years	Exceptions from Art III (5) made
		status of the shark when released/discarded. ICCAT: Data published in Standing Committee Research and Statistics reports are in rounded tons of discard (2022 = 1t live, 2021 = 1t live, 2019 = 1t dead, 2018/2020 = none). In addition, catch data reported: 0.12t by EU-FRA purse seine fleet.		
Finland	No	No	No	No
Iran	Yes <sup>2</sup>	Information not available <sup>2</sup>	Information not available <sup>2</sup>	Information not available <sup>2</sup>
Iraq	No	No	No	No
Israel	Yes <sup>2</sup>	No <sup>2</sup>	Information not available <sup>2</sup>	Information not available <sup>2</sup>
Kenya	Yes	Yes	Between 2018 and June 2021: Three export permits for commercial trade in/exports of dried fins, total 315 kg (exported to China). One permit for 6 pieces of fin for education/training purposes (Re-exported to UAE).	No
Madagascar	Yes	Information not available	Information not available	Information not available
Mozambique	Yes	78 in total, all safely released	No	No
New Zealand	Yes	Two observed incidental bycatches in the bottom longline Ling ( <i>Genypterus blacodes</i> ) fishery	No	No
Nigeria	Yes	One each in 2019 and 2020, two in 2023	Trade and consumption	-
Pakistan	Yes	No formal reports	Information not available, possible few incidents of bycatch and illegal consumption (shark meat as fried finger fish and skins as poultry feed) and trade.	No
Panama	Yes <sup>9</sup>	Not intentionally caught; not retained in the past five years.	No	No <sup>10</sup>
Senegal	Yes	Yes, but data is not well known; follow-up under way since May 2024	Fins are exported to Asia; carcasses are consumed in Senegal or exported to Africa	No

<sup>9</sup> Response from Panama: "Although this species does not inhabit the exclusive economic zone of the Republic of Panama, vessels flying the Panamanian flag under the protection of RFMOs may carry out their activities in the area of the convention, coinciding with the area of distribution of this species."

<sup>10</sup> The established prohibitions are described in UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.25.6.3g (Table 2)

<b>Party</b>	<b>Range State to <i>C. longimanus</i></b>	<b><i>C. longimanus</i> catches within the past 5 years</b>	<b>Utilization of <i>C. longimanus</i> within the past 5 years</b>	<b>Exceptions from Art III (5) made</b>
Togo	Yes	No	No	No
United Kingdom	Yes, in UK Overseas Territories	No, but incidental recreational or artisanal IUU catch may occur	Only scientific utilization in UK; in Cayman Islands incidental take by recreational/artisanal fishers cannot definitively be ruled out	No
Uruguay	Yes	No	-	No

## **B. Assessment of International Trade and Fisheries Data in Oceanic Whitetip Shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*): Summary and Recommendations**

The full report can be found in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.25.6.3h](https://www.unep.org/cms/cop15/inf/25.6.3h)

### International trade data assessment

13. The Secretariat conducted an assessment of international trade in oceanic whitetip shark products by CMS Parties based on CITES Trade Database records from 2021-2023. CITES trade data for *C. longimanus* were downloaded from the CITES Trade Database using the 'Comparative Tabulation' option on the web page. Data from 2021-2023 was only available for the period after the inclusion of the species in CMS Appendix I. The results include only those transactions where at least one CMS Party was involved, either as importer, exporter or country of origin.
14. Analysis of CITES Trade Database records from 2021 to 2023 indicates that eight CMS Parties, Benin, Ghana, Kenya, Senegal, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, the United Arab Emirates, and Yemen, were involved in international trade of *C. longimanus*, acting either as exporting or origin countries 2021 and 2023.
15. Primary destinations included Hong Kong SAR, followed by China, Singapore and Ghana. The majority of trade involved fins, either dried or fresh, and in two instances, shark skins and whole specimens.
16. All reported transactions were for commercial purposes (purpose code T), and most specimens were sourced from the wild (source code W), with shipments listed as specimen taken from "the marine environment not under the jurisdiction of any State" (source code X), indicating capture in areas beyond national jurisdiction.
17. The international trade in *C. longimanus* recorded between 2021 and 2023 raises concerns regarding potential non-compliance with Article III (5) of the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS). Despite the species' listing on CMS Appendix I, which prohibits the taking of listed species by Party Range States, substantial volumes (19,540.64 kg of wet fins, 8,372.1 kg of dried fins, 463.8 kg of shark skin and 18 specimens) were traded internationally, with individual shipments ranging from under 36 kg to nearly 12,000 kg.
18. It should also be noted that CITES requires a Legal Acquisition Finding for international trade in CITES Appendix II-listed species, according to Article IV of CITES. Furthermore, several Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs)<sup>11</sup> have adopted a retention ban for *C. longimanus*. The scale and persistence of these trades suggest a pattern of potential non-compliance with legal obligations under CMS and warrants attention from the Secretariat.

---

<sup>11</sup> These are the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT), the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC), and the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC).

### Fisheries data assessment

19. The Secretariat requested the assistance of the Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) in providing data on catches, discards, releases and landings reported by their members states for *C. longimanus* for the period 2021-2023. Data were received from the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) and Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC). In addition, the Secretariat extracted data from the [report of the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Advisory Committee of the Sharks MOU](#), which had analysed landings data for species listed in CMS Appendix I from the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO).
20. The analysis of the fishery data reveals significant and ongoing international use in *C. longimanus* products, despite the species' listing under CMS Appendix I, CITES Appendix II, and retention bans under Regional Fisheries Management Organizations. FAO-reported landings for 2021–2022 show considerable catches, particularly in the Pacific region, with countries such as French Polynesia and Fiji reporting 456 and 243 metric tonnes respectively.

### Conclusions

21. Information submitted by CMS Parties, together with trade and fisheries data, indicates that the oceanic whitetip shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*) continues to be caught and utilized despite the prohibition on taking under CMS Article III (5). While some Parties report having robust legislative and monitoring systems, many face challenges such as weak enforcement, insufficient data collection or absence of measures.
22. Trade records confirm that between 2021 and 2023, CMS Parties were actively involved in the international trade of more than 22,000 kg of *C. longimanus* products, primarily fins, but also skins and whole specimens, exported mainly to China, Hong Kong SAR and Singapore. Yemen was the most significant exporter, with Senegal, Seychelles, Benin, Kenya, Sri Lanka and the United Arab Emirates also involved. Catch and landing reports from CMS Parties to the FAO and the IOTC further highlight the scale of exploitation.
23. Taken together, these findings demonstrate that CMS Parties continue to exploit and trade the species at a notable scale, raising concerns about the effectiveness of current legal, regulatory and reporting frameworks. The lack of alignment between obligations under Appendix I and reported practices highlights significant implementation gaps, leaving *C. longimanus* highly vulnerable to overexploitation.

### Recommendations

24. Parties are reminded of their obligations under Article III (5) to prohibit the taking of all Appendix I-listed species and under Article III (4c) to endeavour to prevent, reduce or control factors that endanger, or are likely to further endanger, such species. To strengthen implementation, Parties are urged to establish national legislation prohibiting the taking of *C. longimanus*, including measures to mitigate bycatch both in national waters and in areas beyond national jurisdiction, and to participate in the CMS National Legislation Programme where required.

25. In addition, Parties are strongly encouraged to adopt the proposed changes to Resolution 12.22 *Bycatch and Other Fisheries-Induced Mortality*, as set out in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.25.1.1](#). These amendments seek to reduce mortality by requiring the safe handling and release of incidentally caught *C. longimanus*, prohibiting retention on board, trans-shipment and landings, and thereby eliminating any incentives for retaining or utilizing specimens that are caught alive
26. Parties are further urged to strengthen enforcement and monitoring of domestic legislation and regional obligations to ensure the full implementation of Articles III (5) and III(4c).
27. Finally, Parties may wish to take further action as required to follow up on the issues identified.

## ANNEX 4

## DRAFT DECISIONS

**SINGLE SPECIES ACTION PLAN FOR THE ANGELSHARK (*Squatina squatina*) IN THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA*****Directed to Parties***

15.AA Parties that are Range States to the species are requested to:

- a) undertake, to the extent possible, those actions of the Single Species Action Plan for the Angelshark (*Squatina squatina*) in the Mediterranean Sea (SSAP Angelshark Med) specified for immediate and short-term implementation and for delivery within two years as a matter of priority, continue ongoing and medium-term activities, and start implementation of long-term activities within four years;
- b) apply the recommendations from the summary of reports on the implementation of the SSAP Angelshark Med provided in Annex 2 of UNEP/CMS/COP15/25.6.3;
- c) provide a brief report on the implementation of the SSAP Angelshark Med in time for the last meeting of the Sessional Committee before the 16<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP16) using a template provided by the Secretariat.

***Directed to non-Party Range States***

15.BB Non-Party Range States are requested to engage with Party Range States in the implementation of activities outlined in the SSAP Angelshark Med.

***Directed to intergovernmental organizations***

15.CC Intergovernmental organizations, in particular the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean and the Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation of Migratory Sharks and its Advisory Committee, are encouraged to continue to engage with the implementation of activities outlined in the SSAP Angelshark Med.

***Directed to the Secretariat***

15.DD The Secretariat shall:

- a) encourage non-Party Range States to adopt the SSAP Angelshark Med;
- b) in collaboration with the Angel Shark Conservation Network, develop a data-sharing protocol to facilitate data sharing among Range States in the Mediterranean Sea region;
- c) convene, subject to the availability of resources, a meeting of Range States to stimulate implementation of priority actions and facilitate coordination across the region; and
- d) compile reports on implementation provided by Range States under 15.AA (c).

## **IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CMS APPENDIX I-LISTING FOR THE OCEANIC WHITETIP SHARK (*Carcharhinus longimanus*)**

### ***Directed to Parties***

15.AA Parties are requested to:

- a) establish national legislation to prohibit the taking of *C. longimanus*, including measures to mitigate bycatch, both in national waters and in areas beyond national jurisdiction, and participate in the National Legislation Programme if not already doing so;
- b) require the safe handling and release of *C. longimanus* caught in fisheries and prohibit retention on board to make every effort to remove incentives for the retention of incidentally caught specimens that are still alive; and
- c) strengthen enforcement and monitoring of existing domestic legislation and regional obligations to fully implement Articles III (5) and III (4c); and
- d) consider taking further actions in response to the information provided by Parties and the outcomes of the assessments of trade and fisheries data as required.

## **LIST OF SHARK AND RAY SPECIES THAT MEET THE CRITERIA FOR INCLUSION IN CMS APPENDICES**

### ***Directed to the Scientific Council***

15.AA The Scientific Council is requested to review the *List of shark and ray species that meet the criteria for listing on CMS* and provide advice on species that would benefit from listing at the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Sessional Committee of the Scientific Council (ScC-SC).

### ***Directed to the Standing Committee***

15.BB The Standing Committee is requested to review and adopt the *List of shark and ray species that meet the criteria for listing on CMS* at an intersessional meeting before COP16.

### ***Directed to the Secretariat***

15.CC The Secretariat is requested to develop a *List of shark and ray species that meet the criteria for listing on CMS* for the consideration of the Scientific Council, and subsequently forward to the ScC-SC for review, and then to the Standing Committee for review and adoption at an intersessional meeting before COP16.