

DRAFT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: BIGEYE THRESHER SHARK

Indian Ocean Tuna Commission
Commission des Thons de l'Océan Indien

iotc ctoi

**Status of the Indian Ocean bigeye thresher shark (BTH: *Alopias superciliosus*)****TABLE 1.** Bigeye thresher shark: Status bigeye thresher shark (*Alopias superciliosus*) in the Indian Ocean.

Area ¹	Indicators		2015 stock status determination
Indian Ocean	Reported catch 2014: Not elsewhere included (nei) sharks ² :	0 t 39,820 t	
	Average reported catch 2010–2014: Not elsewhere included (nei) sharks ² :	159 t 51,925 t	
	MSY (1,000 t) (80% CI): F _{MSY} (80% CI): SB _{MSY} (1,000 t) (80% CI): F ₂₀₁₄ /F _{MSY} (80% CI): SB ₂₀₁₄ /SB _{MSY} (80% CI): SB ₂₀₁₄ /SB ₀ (80% CI):	unknown	

¹Boundaries for the Indian Ocean = IOTC area of competence

²Includes all other shark catches reported to the IOTC Secretariat, which may contain this species.

Colour key	Stock overfished (SB _{year} /SB _{MSY} < 1)	Stock not overfished (SB _{year} /SB _{MSY} ≥ 1)
Stock subject to overfishing (F _{year} /F _{MSY} > 1)		
Stock not subject to overfishing (F _{year} /F _{MSY} ≤ 1)		
Not assessed/Uncertain		

TABLE 2. Bigeye thresher shark: IUCN threat status of bigeye thresher shark (*Alopias superciliosus*) in the Indian Ocean.

Common name	Scientific name	IUCN threat status ¹		
		Global status	WIO	EIO
Bigeye thresher shark	<i>Alopias superciliosus</i>	Vulnerable	–	–

IUCN = International Union for Conservation of Nature; WIO = Western Indian Ocean; EIO = Eastern Indian Ocean

Sources: IUCN 2007, Amorim et al. 2009

NOTE: IOTC Resolution 12/09 *On the conservation of thresher sharks (family Alopiidae) caught in association with fisheries in the IOTC area of competence*, prohibits retention onboard, transshipping, landing, storing, selling or offering for sale any part or whole carcass of thresher sharks of all the species of the family Alopiidae².

INDIAN OCEAN STOCK – MANAGEMENT ADVICE

Stock status. There remains considerable uncertainty in the stock status due to lack of information necessary for assessment or for the development of other indicators of the stock (Table 1). The ecological risk assessment (ERA) conducted for the Indian Ocean by the WPEB and SC in 2012 (IOTC–2012–SC15–INF10 Rev_1) consisted of a semi-quantitative risk assessment analysis to evaluate the resilience of shark species to the impact of a given fishery, by combining the biological productivity of the species and its susceptibility to each fishing gear type. Bigeye thresher shark received a high vulnerability ranking (No. 2) in the ERA rank for longline gear because it was characterised as one of the least productive shark species, and highly susceptible to longline gear. Despite its low productivity, bigeye thresher shark has a low vulnerability ranking to purse seine gear due to its low susceptibility for this particular gear. The current IUCN threat status of ‘Vulnerable’ applies to bigeye thresher shark globally (Table 2). There is a paucity of information available on this species and this situation is not expected to improve in the short to medium term. Bigeye thresher sharks are commonly taken by a range of fisheries in the Indian Ocean. Because of their life history

¹ The process of the threat assessment from IUCN is independent from the IOTC and is presented for information purpose only

² Scientific observers shall be allowed to collect biological samples from thresher sharks that are dead at haulback, provided that the samples are part of the research project approved by the Scientific Committee (or the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch).

characteristics – they are relatively long lived (+20 years), mature at 9–3 years, and have few offspring (2–4 pups every year), the bigeye thresher shark is vulnerable to overfishing. There is no quantitative stock assessment and limited basic fishery indicators currently available for bigeye thresher shark in the Indian Ocean therefore the stock status is **uncertain**.

Outlook. Current longline fishing effort is directed to other species, however bigeye thresher sharks is a common bycatch in these fisheries. Hooking mortality is apparently very high, therefore IOTC regulation 10/12 prohibiting retaining of any part of thresher sharks onboard and promoting life release of thresher shark may be largely ineffective for species conservation. Maintaining or increasing effort, with associated fishing mortality, can result in declines in biomass, productivity and CPUE. However there are few data to estimate CPUE trends, in view of IOTC Resolution 12/09 and reluctance of fishing fleet to report information on discards/non-retained catch. The impact of piracy in the western Indian Ocean has resulted in the displacement and subsequent concentration of a substantial portion of longline fishing effort into other areas in the southern and eastern Indian Ocean. It is therefore unlikely that catch and effort on bigeye thresher shark will decline in these areas in the near future, which may result in localised depletion.

Management advice. The prohibition on retention of bigeye thresher shark should be maintain. Mechanisms need to be developed by the Commission to encourage CPCs to comply with their reporting requirement on sharks, so as to better inform scientific advice.

The following key points should also be noted:

- **Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY):** Not applicable. Retention prohibited.
- **Reference points:** Not applicable.
- **Main fishing gear** (2011–14): Handline; Trolling; Longline.
- **Main fleets** (2011–14): Indonesia; Madagascar; Philippines; EU,UK.

APPENDIX I

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

(Information collated from reports of the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch and other sources as cited)

CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES

Bigeye thresher shark in the Indian Ocean are currently subject to a number of Conservation and Management Measures adopted by the Commission:

- Resolution 15/01 *on the recording of catch and effort data by fishing vessels in the IOTC area of competence* sets out the minimum logbook requirements for purse seine, longline, gillnet, pole and line, handline and trolling fishing vessels over 24 metres length overall and those under 24 metres if they fish outside the EEZs of their flag States within the IOTC area of competence. As per this Resolution, catch of all sharks must be recorded (retained and discarded).
- Resolution 15/02 *Mandatory statistical reporting requirements for IOTC Contracting Parties and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties (CPCs)* indicated that the provisions, applicable to tuna and tuna-like species, are applicable to shark species.
- Resolution 11/04 *on a Regional Observer Scheme* requires data on shark interactions to be recorded by observers and reported to the IOTC within 150 days. The Regional Observer Scheme (ROS) started on 1st July 2010.
- Resolution 05/05 *Concerning the conservation of sharks caught in association with fisheries managed by IOTC* includes minimum reporting requirements for sharks, calls for full utilisation of sharks and includes a ratio of fin-to-body weight for shark fins retained onboard a vessel.
- Resolution 12/09 *On the conservation of thresher sharks (family Alopiidae) caught in association with fisheries in the IOTC area of competence* prohibits fishing vessels flying the flag of IOTC Members and Cooperating non-Contracting Parties (CPCs) from retaining on board, transshipping, landing, storing, selling or offering for sale any part or whole carcass of thresher sharks of all the species of the family Alopiidae.

Extracts from Resolutions 15/01, 15/02, 11/04, 05/05 and 12/09

RESOLUTION 15/01 ON THE RECORDING OF CATCH AND EFFORT DATA BY FISHING VESSELS IN THE IOTC AREA OF COMPETENCE

Para. 1. Each flag CPC shall ensure that all purse seine, longline, gillnet, pole and line, handline and trolling fishing vessels flying its flag and authorized to fish species managed by IOTC be subject to a data recording system.

Para. 10 (start). The Flag State shall provide all the data for any given year to the IOTC Secretariat by June 30th of the following year on an aggregated basis.

RESOLUTION 11/04 ON A REGIONAL OBSERVER SCHEME

Para. 10. Observers shall:

b) Observe and estimate catches as far as possible with a view to identifying catch composition and monitoring discards, by-catches and size frequency

Resolution 15/02 MANDATORY STATISTICAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR IOTC CONTRACTING PARTIES AND COOPERATING NON-CONTRACTING PARTIES (CPCs)

Para. 2. Estimates of the total catch by species and gear, if possible quarterly, that shall be submitted annually as referred in paragraph 7 (separated, whenever possible, by retained catches in live weight and by discards in live weight or numbers) for all species under the IOTC mandate as well as the most commonly caught elasmobranch species according to records of catches and incidents as established in Resolution 15/01 *on the recording of catch and effort data by fishing vessels in the IOTC area of competence* (or any subsequent superseding Resolution).

RESOLUTION 05/05 CONCERNING THE CONSERVATION OF SHARKS CAUGHT IN ASSOCIATION WITH FISHERIES MANAGED BY IOTC

Para. 1. CPCs shall annually report data for catches of sharks, in accordance with IOTC data reporting procedures, including available historical data.

Para. 3. CPCs shall take the necessary measures to require that their fishermen fully utilise their entire catches of sharks. Full utilisation is defined as retention by the fishing vessel of all parts of the shark excepting head, guts and skins, to the point of first landing.

RESOLUTION 12/09 ON THE CONSERVATION OF THRESHER SHARKS (FAMILY ALOPIIDAE) CAUGHT IN ASSOCIATION WITH FISHERIES IN THE IOTC AREA OF COMPETENCE

Para. 2 Fishing Vessels flying the flag of an IOTC Member or Cooperating non-Contracting Party (CPCs) are prohibited from retaining on board, transshipping, landing, storing, selling or offering for sale any part or whole carcass of thresher sharks of all the species of the family Alopiidae, with the exception of paragraph 7.

Para. 3 CPCs shall require vessels flying their flag to promptly release unharmed, to the extent practicable, thresher sharks when brought along side for taking on board the vessel.

Para. 4 CPCs shall encourage their fishers to record and report incidental catches as well as live releases. These data will be then

kept at the IOTC Secretariat.

FISHERIES INDICATORS

Bigeye thresher shark: General

Bigeye thresher shark (*Alopias superciliosus*) is found in pelagic coastal and oceanic waters throughout the tropical and temperate oceans worldwide (Fig. 1). Found in coastal waters over the continental shelves, sometimes inshore in shallow waters, and on the high seas in the epipelagic zone far from land; also caught near the bottom in deep water on the continental slopes (Compagno 2001). Bigeye thresher can be found near the surface, and has even been recorded in the intertidal zone, but it is most commonly found at depths greater than 100m, often reaching 500 m and has even been recorded at a depth of 723 m (Compagno 2001, Nakano et al. 2003). There is currently no information on the predation of bigeye thresher sharks, however they may be preyed upon by makos, white sharks, and killer whales. Fishing is the major contributor to adult mortality. This species uses its long tail to attack prey (Compagno 2001, Aalbers et al. 2010). Table 3 outlines some of the key life history traits of bigeye thresher sharks in the Indian Ocean.




Fig. 1. Bigeye thresher shark: The worldwide distribution of the bigeye thresher shark (source: FAO).

TABLE 3. Bigeye thresher shark: Biology of Indian Ocean bigeye thresher shark (*Alopias superciliosus*).

Parameter	Description
Range and stock structure	In the tropical Indian Ocean, the greatest abundance of bigeye thresher shark occurs at depths of 50 to 300 m, in temperatures ranging from 8 to 25°C. It is considered a highly migratory species, however, no published information on horizontal movements of bigeye thresher shark is known for the Indian Ocean. This species exhibits a prominent diurnal pattern in vertical distribution spending daytime at the depth between 200 and 700 m depth and migrating to the upper layers at night. Bigeye thresher shark is a solitary fish however it is often caught in the same areas and habitats as pelagic thresher sharks <i>Alopias pelagicus</i> . Area of overlap with IOTC management area = high. No information is available on stock structure.
Longevity	No ageing studies is known for the Indian Ocean. In the Pacific Ocean (China, Taiwan Province) the oldest bigeye thresher sharks reported were a 19 year old male and a 20 year old female for fish ~ 370 cm TL. Taking into consideration that maximum length is exceed 400 cm longevity is apparently around 25–30 years. In the Eastern Atlantic Ocean, the maximum ages reported in a recent life history study were 22 years for females and 17 years for males.
Maturity (50%)	Age: Sexual maturity is attained at 12–13 years (females), 9–10 years (males). Size: Males mature at 270–300 cm total length (TL) and females at 332–355 cm TL. Size at 50% maturity from the eastern Atlantic Ocean was estimated at 206 cm FL for females (95% CI: 199–213 cm FL), and 160 cm FL for males (95% CI: 156–164 cm FL)
Reproduction	Bigeye thresher shark is an aplacental viviparous with oophagy species. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fecundity: very low (2–4) • Size at birth 130–150 cm TL • Generation time: around 15 years (due to oophagy) • Gestation Period: 12 months • Reproductive cycle: unknown Of the thresher sharks, the Bigeye Thresher has the lowest rate of annual increase, estimated at 1.6% under sustainable exploitation, or 0.002–0.009.
Size (length and weight)	Maximum size is around 461 cm TL. New-born pups are around 64–140 cm TL. Length–weight relationship for both sexes combined in the Indian Ocean is $TW=0.155*10^{-4}*FL^{2.97883}$

Sources: Chen et al. 1997, Lui et al. 1998, Compagno 2001, Nakano et al. 2003, Weng & Block 2004, Amorim et al. 2007, White 2007, Cortés 2008, Dulvy et al. 2008, Smith et al. 2008, Stevens et al. 2010, Fernandez-Carvalho et al. 2011, Fernandez-Carvalho et al. in press

Bigeye thresher shark: Fisheries

Bigeye thresher shark are often targeted by some recreational, semi-industrial and artisanal fisheries and are a bycatch of industrial fisheries (pelagic longline tuna and swordfish fisheries) (**Table 4**). Typically, the size range elected by the fisheries is between 140–210 cm FL or 40-120 kg (Romanov pers comm). In Australia thresher sharks used to be targeted by sport fishermen. Sport fisheries for oceanic sharks are apparently not so common in other Indian Ocean countries.

There is little information on the fisheries prior to the early 1970s. Some countries still fail to collect shark data while others do collect it but fail to report to IOTC. It appears that significant catches of sharks have gone unrecorded in several countries. Furthermore, many existing catch records probably under-represent the actual catches of sharks because they do not account for discards (i.e. do not record catches of sharks for which only the fins are kept or of sharks usually discarded because of their size or condition) or they reflect dressed weights instead of live weights. FAO also compiles landings data on elasmobranchs, but their statistics are limited by the lack of species-specific data and data from the major fleets. Thresher sharks were marketed both locally and in European markets until at least up until early 2011 despite IOTC Resolution 12/09. The practice of shark finning is considered to be regularly occurring and on the increase for this species (Clarke et al. 2006, Clarke 2008). The post-release mortality is unknown but probably high. In longline fisheries bigeye thresher sharks are often hooked by the tail (Compagno 2001, Romanov pers comm) and die soon afterward. Therefore they are usually discarded dead if not retained. In most cases discarded sharks are not recorded in fisheries logbooks. Therefore the current measures (notably Resolution 12/09) appear to have limited conservation effect while contributing to further loss of fisheries data. Other types of conservation efforts such as protected areas should be considered for this species group by the WPEB, taking into account a detailed analysis of catch distribution and ‘hotspots’ of abundance derived from research data.

TABLE 4. Bigeye thresher shark: Estimated frequency of occurrence and bycatch mortality in the Indian Ocean pelagic fisheries.

Gears	PS	LL		BB/TROL/HAND	GILL	UNCL
		SWO	TUNA			
Frequency	absent	Common		rare	unknown	unknown
Fishing Mortality	no	high	high	unknown	unknown	unknown
Post release mortality	N/A	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown

Sources: Boggs 1992, Anderson & Ahmed 1993, Romanov 2002, 2008, Ariz et al. 2006, Peterson et al. 2008, Romanov et al. 2008.

Bigeye thresher shark: Catch trends

The catch estimates for bigeye thresher shark are highly uncertain, as is their utility in terms of minimum catch estimates (Table 5). Sixteen CPCs have reported nominal catch data on sharks for the main species listed in Resolution 15/01 (i.e. Australia, Belize, China, EU (France, Spain, Portugal and United Kingdom), India, Indonesia, and I.R. Iran, Japan, Rep. of Korea, Madagascar, Maldives, Mauritius, Philippines, Seychelles, South Africa and Sri Lanka).

TABLE 5. Bigeye thresher shark: Catch estimates for bigeye thresher shark in the Indian Ocean for 2012 to 2014.

Catch		2012	2013	2014
Most recent catch (reported)	bigeye thresher	465 t	0 t	0 t
	nei-sharks	50,626 t	51,083 t	44,446 t

Note that reported shark catches are incomplete. The catches of sharks are usually not reported and when they are they might not represent the total catches of this species but simply those retained on board. It is also likely that the amounts recorded refer to weights of processed specimens, not to live weights. In 2012, one country reported catches of bigeye thresher sharks in the IOTC area of competence.

A recent project estimated possible thresher shark catches for fleets/countries based on the ratio of shark catch over target species by metier (Murua et al 2013). The estimation was done using target species nominal catch from the IOTC database and assuming that target catches have been accurately declared. The estimated catch from this study highlighted that the possible underestimation of thresher shark in the IOTC database is considerable (i.e. the estimated catch is around 70 times higher than the declared/report and contained in the IOTC database).

Bigeye thresher shark: Nominal and standardised CPUE trends

Data not available at the IOTC Secretariat. There are no surveys specifically designed to assess shark catch rates in the Indian Ocean. Historical research data shows overall decline both in nominal CPUE and mean weight of thresher sharks (Romanov pers comm).

Bigeye thresher shark: Average weight in the catch by fisheries

Data not available.

Bigeye thresher shark: Number of squares fished

Catch and effort data not available.

STOCK ASSESSMENT

No quantitative stock assessment for bigeye thresher shark has been undertaken by the IOTC Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch.

LITERATURE CITED

- Aalbers SA, Bernal D, Sepulveda CA (2010) The functional role of the caudal fin in the feeding ecology of the common thresher shark *Alopias vulpinus*. *J Fish Biol* 76: 1863–1868
- Anderson RC, Ahmed H (1993) The shark fisheries in the Maldives. FAO, Rome, and Ministry of Fisheries, Male, Maldives
- Amorim A, Baum J, Cailliet GM, Clò S, Clarke SC, Fergusson I, Gonzalez M, Macias D, Mancini P, Mancusi C, Myers R, Reardon M, Trejo T, Vacchi M, Valenti SV (2009) *Alopias superciliosus*. In: IUCN 2013. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2013.1. <www.iucnredlist.org>. Downloaded on 15 September 2013
- Ariz J, Delgado de Molina A, Ramos ML, Santana JC (2006) Check list and catch rate data by hook type and bait for bycatch species caught by Spanish experimental longline cruises in the south-western Indian Ocean during 2005. IOTC–2006–WPBy–04
- Boggs CH (1992) Depth, capture time and hooked longevity of longline-caught pelagic fish: timing bites of fish with chips. *Fish Bull* 90: 642–658
- Chen C-T, Liu K-M, Chang Y-C (1997) Reproductive biology of the bigeye thresher shark, *Alopias superciliosus* (Lowe, 1939) (Chondrichthyes: Alopiidae), in the northwestern Pacific. *Ichthyl Res* 44(3): 227–235
- Clarke S (2008) Use of shark fin trade data to estimate historic total shark removals in the Atlantic Ocean. *Aquat Living Res* 21:373–381
- Clarke SC, McAllister MK, Milner-Gulland EJ, Kirkwood GP, Michielsens CGJ, Agnew DJ, Pikitch EK, Nakano H, Shivji MS (2006) Global estimates of shark catches using trade records from commercial markets. *Ecol Lett* 9: 1115–1126
- Compagno LJV (2001) Sharks of the world. An annotated and illustrated catalogue of shark species known to date. Volume 2. Bullhead, mackerel and carpet sharks (Heterodontiformes, Lamniformes and Orectolobiformes). FAO Species Catalogue for Fishery Purposes. No 1. Vol. 2. FAO, Rome (Italy). 269 p
- Cortés E (2008) Comparative life history and demography of pelagic sharks. In: M. Camhi, E.K. Pikitch and E.A. Babcock (eds), *Sharks of the Open Ocean*, pp. 309–322. Blackwell Publishing
- Dulvy NK, Baum JK, Clarke S, Compagno LJV, Cortes E, Domingo A, Fordham S, Fowler S, Francis MP, Gibson C, Martinez J, Musick JA, Soldo A, Stevens JD, Valentih S (2008) You can swim but you can't hide: the global status and conservation of oceanic pelagic sharks and rays. *Aquatic Conservation: Mar Freshw Ecosys* 18: 459–482
- Fernandez-Carvalho J, Coelho R, Erzini K, Santos MN (2011) Age and growth of the bigeye thresher shark, *Alopias superciliosus*, from the pelagic longline fisheries in the tropical Northeastern Atlantic Ocean, determined by vertebral band counts. *Aquat Living Res* 24(4): 359–368
- Fernandez-Carvalho J, Coelho R, Amorim S, Santos MN (2011) Maturity of the bigeye thresher (*Alopias superciliosus*) in the Atlantic Ocean. ICCAT SCRS Doc. 2011/086
- IUCN (2007) IUCN Species Survival Commission's Shark Specialist Group. Review of Chondrichthyan Fishes
- Liu K-M, Chiang P-J & Chen C-T (1998) Age and growth estimates of the bigeye thresher shark, *Alopias superciliosus*, in northeastern Taiwan waters. *Fish Bull* 96: 482–491
- Murua H, Santos MN, Chavance P, Amande J, Seret B, Poisson F, Ariz J, Abascal FJ, Bach P, Coelho R, Korta M (2013) EU project for the provision of scientific advice for the purpose of the implementation of the EUPOA sharks: a brief overview of the results for Indian Ocean. IOTC–2013–WPEB09–19
- Nakano H, Matsunaga H, Okamoto H, Okazaki M (2003) Acoustic tracking of bigeye thresher shark *Alopias superciliosus* in the eastern Pacific Ocean. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 265: 255–261
- Petersen S, Nel D, Ryan P, Underhill L (2008) Understanding and mitigating vulnerable bycatch in southern African trawl and longline fisheries. 225 p. WWF South Africa Rep Ser
- Romanov EV (2002) Bycatch in the tuna purse-seine fisheries of the western Indian Ocean. *Fish Bull* 100:90–105

-
- Romanov EV (2008) Bycatch and discards in the Soviet purse seine tuna fisheries on FAD-associated schools in the north equatorial area of the Western Indian Ocean. *Western Indian Ocean J Mar Sci* 7:163–174
- Romanov E, Bach P, Romanova N (2008) Preliminary estimates of bycatches in the western equatorial Indian Ocean in the traditional multifilament longline gears (1961-1989) IOTC Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch (WPEB) Bangkok, Thailand. 20-22 October, 2008. 18 p
- Stevens JD, Bradford RW, West GJ (2010) Satellite tagging of blue sharks (*Prionace glauca*) and other pelagic sharks off eastern Australia: depth behaviour, temperature experience and movements. *Mar Biol* 157: 575–591
- Weng KC, Block BA (2004) Diel vertical migration of the bigeye thresher shark (*Alopias superciliosus*), a species possessing orbital retia mirabilia. *Fish Bull* 102: 221–229
- White WT (2007) Biological observations on lamnoid sharks (Lamniformes) caught by fisheries in Eastern Indonesia. *J. Mar. Biol. Assoc. United Kingdom* 87: 781–788.