## ADDENDUM 1

## SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL COMMENTS

## (arising from ScC-SC6)

## PROPOSAL FOR THE INCLUSION OF THE SAND TIGER SHARK (*Carcharias taurus*)

## IN APPENDIX I AND II OF THE CONVENTION

## UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.31.4.9

***(ScC-SC6 Agenda Item 13.4.9)***

**RECOMMENDATIONS TO COP14**

* ScC-SC6 concluded that the species meets the criteria for inclusion in Appendix I and II with reference to its regular and cyclical migratory condition associated with seasonal and reproductive events in most areas along its range distribution, as well as to its conservation status as a globally Critically Endangered species.
* However, the Committee did not reach consensus on whether the two Australian populations qualify as migratory in accordance with the CMS definition.

**GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE DOCUMENT**

* For the review of this listing proposal the ScC-SC6 also took into consideration the analysis of listing proposals provided by the Sharks MOU Advisory Committee (Sharks AC) contained in [UNEP/CMS/ScC-SC6/Inf. 13.4](https://www.cms.int/en/document/analysis-proposals-inclusion-shark-and-ray-species-appendices-convention-conservation)andwelcomed their overall findings and comments provided.
* It was agreed that evidence for transboundary movements exists for most populations across its range distribution, including in the Northwest Atlantic, the West Africa/Mediterranean Sea and the Southwest Atlantic, and also in South Africa. But there was a lack of information for some other populations, such as for the Arabian Sea and Persian Gulf, Japan, Southeast Asia/Papua New Guinea and Australia.
* It was agreed there was no evidence whether individuals of the two genetically distinct subpopulation from Australian border would leave the Australian EEZ, but concerns were raised that the species might be already too depleted to obtain sufficient data to prove migratory behavior. It should be taken into account that even highly depleted populations can retain high levels of genetic diversity, for example the Magenta Petrel. However, it was pointed out that there is evidence for shark species having low genetic diversity despite being highly migratory - for example great white sharks and basking sharks.[[1]](#footnote-2)
* It was noted that the genetic studies undertaken to date demonstrate that the two Australian populations are genetically isolated from all other studied populations and there is no regular movement outside of these populations. Records from neighboring countries are rare and are considered as either misidentification or vagrant records, possibly indicating a dispersal movement by a very limited number of individuals.
* It was noted that listing in Appendix II of CMS requires that the species would benefit from international cooperation and that internal migrants that do not leave national waters would require national protection but would not benefit from international cooperation. In this context it was noted that the species is strictly protected in Australia by national environmental law.
* Some members of the Sessional Committee considered it would be appropriate to recommend the reduction of the proposal to exclude the Australian populations from the listing proposal, while some others were not supportive or suggested only including the Australian populations in Appendix II.
* ScC-SC6 recommended that the proponents should consult with Australia to discuss a way forward.

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

* The proposal states, in paragraph 3 of the ‘overview’ and in paragraph 1 of the section 4.2 ‘population (estimates and trends)’ that the west coast of Australia population has shown “signs of the onset of recovery where management measures have been in place to some time...” The Sharks MOU Advisory Committee noted this is likely incorrect. The AC referred to Bradford et al. (2018) which provides evidence for possible recovery of the east coast Australian population.
1. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308134029_Low_genetic_diversity_of_sharks_natural_patterns_or_induced_by_exploitation> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)