Revised: 2 January 2023

Conservation Letters

LETTER

High overexploitation risk due to management shortfall in highly traded requiem sharks

C. Samantha Sherman^{1,2} Eric D. Digel¹ | Patrick Zubick¹ | Jonathan Eged¹ | Alifa B. Haque^{3,4} | Jay H. Matsushiba¹ | Colin A. Simpfendorfer⁵ | Glenn Sant^{2,6} Nicholas K. Dulvy¹

¹Earth to Oceans Research Group, Department of Biological Sciences, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

²TRAFFIC International, Cambridge, UK

³Nature-Based Solutions Initiative, Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

⁴Department of Zoology, University of Dhaka, Dhaka, Bangladesh

⁵Institute of Marine and Antarctic Studies, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia

⁶Australian National Centre for Ocean Resources and Security, University of Wollongong, Wollongong, New South Wales, Australia

Correspondence

C. Samantha Sherman, Earth to Oceans Research Group, Department of Biological Sciences, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada. Email: sammsherman27@gmail.com

Funding information

Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada; Canada Research Chair Program; Shark Conservation Fund

Abstract

Most of the international trade in fins (and likely meat too) is derived from requiem sharks (family Carcharhinidae), yet trade in only two of the 56 species is currently regulated. Here, we quantify catch, trade, and the shortfall in national and regional fisheries management (M-Risk) for all 56 requiem shark species based on 831 assessments across 30 countries and four Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs). Requiem sharks comprise over half (60%) of the annual reported global Chondrichthyan catch with most species (86%) identified in the international fin trade. Requiem sharks are inadequately managed by fisheries, with an average M-Risk of half (50%) of an ideal score, consequently 70% of species are threatened globally. The high catch and trade volume and shortfall in management of these iconic species require worldwide fisheries management for sustainable catch, supported by full implementation of CITES regulations for international trade of this newly listed family.

KEYWORDS

carcharhinidae, CITES, fisheries management, international policy, international trade, shark conservation, shark fin trade, shark meat

1 | INTRODUCTION

While there are promising signs that conservation is working in the oceans, overfishing remains the principal cause of biodiversity loss (Duarte et al., 2020). Fisheries targeting bony fishes are increasingly being brought into sustainability in regions and nations with high capacity for management like Regional Fisheries Management

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

 \circledast 2023 The Authors. Conservation Letters published by Wiley Periodicals LLC.

^{2 of 9} WILEY

Organizations (RFMOs) and developed countries in North America, Europe as well as South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand (Hilborn et al., 2020; Simpfendorfer & Dulvy, 2017). Yet, other species taken in these fisheries, notably sharks and rays, continue to decline in part because of their more sensitive life histories (Myers & Worm, 2005), but also because of a lack of management (Fordham et al., 2022; Juan-Jordá et al., 2017). The catch of shark, ray, and chimaera (Class Chondrichthyes, hereafter "sharks") is poorly monitored globally, with only one-third of reported catch identified beyond Family level (FAO, 2022). Yet sharks provide significant income for small-scale fishers and individual specimens are retained because of the extremely high value of their body parts, such as fins, jaws, skins, and liver oil in the international trade markets (Booth et al., 2021; McClenachan et al., 2016).

The latest comprehensive global Red List assessment of sharks reveals that one-third (37.5%) of all species are threatened with an elevated risk of extinction (Dulvy et al., 2021). Notably, almost two-thirds of coral reef sharks and rays are at risk of extinction (Sherman et al., 2023). The key to halt and reverse the declines of sharks is through improving national fisheries management to ensure sustainable catch. Here, we focus on understanding national fisheries management of sharks that are highly threatened, in part due to international trade demand for meat and fins (Dent & Clarke, 2015; Niedermüller et al., 2021).

The requiem sharks (family Carcharhinidae) are a recent radiation found throughout tropical and subtropical waters, which have historically dominated the shark catches of coastal fisheries (Lam & Sadovy de Mitcheson, 2011). Indeed, this is one of seven priority shark taxa based on the high volume of fisheries catches taken in poorly documented and poorly regulated tropical multispecies fisheries (Dulvy et al., 2017). Further, many species of the family are highly prevalent in the international fin trade (Cardeñosa et al., 2020; Fields et al., 2017).

Here, we ask whether fisheries management is adequate to halt declines and improve the status of requiem sharks. We estimate the risk due to overexploitation based on the current state of global fisheries management for all 56 species from the family Carcharhinidae using a novel rapid assessment of management risk (M-Risk) (Sherman et al., 2022). Specifically, we ask three questions: (1) how prevalent are requiem sharks in global catch and international trade? (2) are requiem sharks adequately managed across their geographic range? and which (if any) species are adequately managed? and (3) which forms of management are most prevalent and which are lacking?

2 | METHODS

2.1 | Selection of management units

Country management units were selected based on their proportional contribution to global shark catch (2010–2019, inclusive) (FAO, 2022). We included the 21 countries that cumulatively report >80% of global Chondrichthyan catch in addition to nine countries with high catch in each FAO fishing region to ensure global representation. In addition to countries, all four tuna Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) were included as management units due to the high volume of shark catch in Areas Beyond National Jurisdictions (total management units = 34) (Murua et al., 2021). Our references to "management units" refer to the jurisdictions and not specific stocks.

2.2 | management risk assessment

Species assessments were completed by scoring management risk against 21 measurable attributes, as fully explained in Sherman et al. (2022) and described in Supplemental Material 1. The 21 Attributes were split into five classes, three scored for all management units (Management System [n = 5 Attributes], Fishing Practices & Catch [n = 5], Compliance, Monitoring & Enforcement [n = 5]), and two that were specific to either a country (n = 4) or RFMO (n = 2).

2.3 | Scoring of attributes

All attributes were scored in an ordinal manner with a narrow range of scores to ensure consistency (i.e., 0-3, 0-4, or 0-5) such that higher scores indicated management with a higher likelihood of sustainable outcomes (for full details see Supplemental Material 1). Assessments were completed through exhaustive internet searches and national fisheries department websites. Where English was not the official language, searches were completed in the official language and documents were translated using Google translate. To accommodate the potential for ambiguous translations, points were generously awarded. However, if no information for an attribute was found, a precautionary score of zero was given. The final "Management Score" was expressed as a percentage of the total possible points. This score indicates progress toward the ideal management (of 100%), therefore, a score greater

than 75% could be considered a well-managed fishery for sharks.

2.4 | Additional catch, trade, and species data

Identification of Carcharhinidae species in international trade was obtained through a thorough literature search (Supplementary Material 2). To determine threat level of all Carcharhinidae, the IUCN Red List Status of all species and species distribution maps were sourced after the 2021-03 update of the IUCN Red List website (www.iucnredlist. org) (Dulvy et al., 2021). Shark catch from all countries and RFMOs was sourced from FishStatJ v4.02.07 (FAO, 2022), and the Sea Around Us (www.seaaroundus.org) (Pauly et al., 2021). A generalized linear model (GLM) comparing volume of shark catch and mean management score was completed (Supplementary Material 3).

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | What is the scale of catch and trade of requiem sharks?

Based on the FAO global catch data from 2010-2019, inclusive, 65.5% of Chondrichthyan catch was reported only as Class (Chondrichthyes), subclass (Elasmobranchii), or superorder (Selachimorpha). Carcharhinidae species accounted for 59.6% of shark catch reported below Order, and 44.2% of reported coastal shark catch (excluding Blue Shark, Prionace glauca; 438,799 and 325,418 metric tons per year, respectively) (FAO, 2022). Over three-quarters of Carcharhinidae species (minimum 80.4%, n = 45 species, to 85.7%, n = 48) have been documented in the international fin trade either through market sampling or shipment seizures (Supplementary Material 2). Based on the underreporting of shark catch to the FAO by up to four times (Clarke et al., 2006), the true volume of Carcharhinidae catch is likely closer to 1,755,200 mt per year and possibly higher if the broad catch reporting includes Carcharhinids.

3.2 | Are requiem sharks adequately managed across their geographic range?

Requiem sharks are inadequately managed worldwide, both by nations and RFMOs, and are globally distributed with hotspots in northern Australia and Southeast Asia (Figure 1a). Across 831 M-Risk assessments from 30 countries spanning all six inhabited continents and four RFMO fishing grounds, the average management risk was high, with only half of the ideal management in place for requiem sharks (50.0% \pm 0.6%, n = 831). Regionally, the management shortfall for requiem sharks was greatest in Africa (mean management score 36.3% \pm 1.5%, n = 88) and Asia (38.6% \pm 0.4%, n = 332; Figures 1b and S1). Both regions were much lower than the remaining regions and RFMO average: Oceania (67.1% \pm 1.2%, n = 122), Europe (62.9% \pm 1.4%, n = 21), North America (60.9% \pm 1.1%, n = 130), RFMOs (60.5% \pm 0.7%, n = 63), and South America (56.7% \pm 0.7%, n = 75) (Figures 1b and c and S1).

Some of the biggest fishing nations of the world have the lowest fisheries management scores including Nigeria $(21.9\% \pm 0.0\%, n = 12)$, India $(30.4\% \pm 0.4\%, n = 25)$, Yemen $(31.5\% \pm 0.3\%, n = 20)$, and Iran $(36.5\% \pm 0.6\%, n = 17)$; Figures 1b and 2). These countries are all among the top 20 shark catching countries globally (Okes & Sant, 2019). Much of their catch is exported through nonstandardized commodity codes, masking catch details (Dent & Clarke, 2015). The countries with the highest scores, and assessments on more than three species, were the United States $(76.8\% \pm 1.2\%, n = 18)$, Australia $(74.1\% \pm 0.5\%, n = 29)$, Spain (65.7% \pm 2.2%, n = 7), and Argentina (61.0% \pm 1.0, n = 5%; Figures 1b and 2). Interestingly, these countries represent four different continents, indicating there are "pockets" with better management scores (above 60%) for requiem sharks. Three of these countries (all except Australia) also rank among the top 20 shark catching countries globally (Okes & Sant, 2019), indicating catch quantity is not a direct result of management. Indeed, there was no relationship between volume of shark catch in each management unit and the respective management scores (GLM, t = 1.46, df = 32, p = 0.153, 95%CI = -2.43 to 1.68; Figure 2b).

3.3 | Which species are adequately managed?

Strictly speaking, any species with an M-Risk score of less than 100% is undermanaged. By that criterion, all species are undermanaged across a total of 831 assessments. The species with the highest mean management score, assessed in three or more countries, are Blacknose Shark (*C. acronotus*: 62.4% \pm 7.0%, n = 4), Atlantic Sharpnose Shark (*Rhizoprionodon terraenovae*: 61.1% \pm 7.4%, n = 3), and Caribbean Reef Shark (*C. perezi*: 60.3% \pm 6.6%, n = 3; Figure 3). These three species have relatively small distributions and occur in the Western Central and Southwest Atlantic Ocean. Status is a function not only of management but also total catch volume, therefore in regions with higher fishing effort and catch like the Western Atlantic (Bell et al., 2017), even higher management scores are not currently effective at ensuring sustainable catch levels for



FIGURE 1 Global maps of (a) species richness of all requiem sharks (Family Carcharhinidae), (b) average management scores for all 56 species of requiem sharks in each country assessed and, (c) in the high-seas, as managed by the four tuna Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs). Abbreviations—ICCAT: International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas; WCPFC: Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission; IOTC: Indian Ocean Tuna Commission; and IATTC: Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals.

the species with slower life histories (Worm et al., 2013). Hence, the Blacknose Shark and Caribbean Reef Shark are both listed as Endangered (EN) as per the IUCN Red List and the Atlantic Sharpnose Shark is Least Concern (LC), in part because of its faster life history.

4 of 9

The lowest scoring species (i.e., the *least* managed), assessed in at least three countries, were the Broadfin Shark (*Lamiopsis temminckii*: $36.1\% \pm 3.4\%$, n = 3), followed by the Blackspot Shark (*C. sealei*: $36.3\% \pm 4.5\%$, n = 3) and Spadenose Shark (*Scoliodon laticaudus*:

 $36.8\% \pm 3.5\%$, n = 3; Figure 3). The first two are listed in threatened categories (EN and Vulnerable [VU], respectively), with the third being Near Threatened (NT), and all occur in the heavily fished waters of the Indian Oceans (Blaber et al., 2009; Pauly et al., 2021).

The variation between the single highest and lowest management score across all management units were 21.9% for all 13 species in Nigeria and 85.0% for Copper Shark (*C. brachyurus*) in the United States, indicating a wide variation in management for species (over 60%).



FIGURE 2 Average management score across different countries and Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) ordered by (a) average management score, and (b) highest volume of shark and ray landings from top to bottom. Abbreviations-ICCAT: International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas; WCPFC: Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission; IOTC: Indian Ocean Tuna Commission; and IATTC: Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals.

Species with intermediate management scores tended to be assessed in a greater number of management units. For example, the Sandbar Shark (C. plumbeus: $50.5\% \pm 3.1\%$), Silky Shark (C. falciformis: $53.6\% \pm 2.9\%$), and Blacktip Shark (C. limbatus: $48.4\% \pm 2.6\%$) were assessed in 22, 27, and 28 different management units, respectively, and are all listed as threatened (EN, VU, and VU, respectively; Figure 3). The three highest and lowest scoring species were only assessed in three or four management units, indicating potential regional areas of management concern (i.e., Northern Indian Ocean) or hope (i.e., Western Atlantic).

3.4 | Which aspects of management are most prevalent and lacking?

Across all assessed management units, the attributes with the highest average scores were lower resolution structural attributes, related to general fisheries management, such as, if a regulatory body was present $(95.7\% \pm 2.5\%)$, engagement with CITES $(93.3\% \pm 2.8\%)$

or Ecosystem Based Fisheries Management (EBFM) for RFMOs (91.7% \pm 2.9%), followed by IUU management $(84.8\% \pm 4.7\%)$; Figure 4a). Attributes with lower average scores were the harder to implement, species-specific fisheries operational attributes including understanding of the species' stock status (18.3% \pm 4.9%), speciesspecific compliance measures to reduce fishing mortality $(21.0\% \pm 3.8\%)$, and taxonomic resolution of landing limits in place or if any limits existed $(21.2\% \pm 4.5\%)$; Figure 4a). These attribute scores indicate that while countries and RFMOs have the foundations in place to incorporate management, this is not yet being directed toward significant catches of threatened species, like the requiem sharks. The pattern of RFMO attribute scoring of species was similar to management units, with greater scores for structural attributes and lower scores for fisheries operational attributes (Figure 4b). For some species, like the CITES-listed Oceanic Whitetip and Silky Sharks (C. longimanus and C. falciformis), landing limits existed more often, and at higher resolution than the average requiem shark (65.6% ± 8.5% and 49.6% ± 9.5%, respectively, vs. $20.0\% \pm 2.9\%$ average of all requiem sharks).





FIGURE 3 Average management score for each species assessed. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals.

4 | DISCUSSION

We have three key findings. First, the global catch of requiem sharks is almost two-thirds of the global reported catch of all sharks reported to a higher resolution than Order with a volume likely above 1.75 million metric tons per year. Requiem sharks are also highly represented in international trade, with up to 86% of species in the Carcharhinidae family identified. Second, the management risk scores for 56 species of requiem sharks from 30 nations and four RFMOs demonstrate they are undermanaged with only half of the ideal management in place across all species. M-Risk is lower in Africa and Asia and higher in Oceania, but there are better managed countries found on each continent, representing pockets of hope. Third, management deficits typically exist in species-specific regulations, while general fisheries structural attributes often scored higher. Taken together, these three catch, trade, and management shortfall issues have likely resulted in high



FIGURE 4 All average attribute scores and calculated management scores for all 56 assessed species of requiem sharks according to (a) different management units and (b) species. Attribute columns are arranged from highest average score to lowest average score. NA values are represented by dark gray squares.

levels of overfishing of the Carcharhinidae family inferred from an elevated risk of extinction. We next consider: (1) how to improve domestic management, (2) improving global fisheries management, (3) the emerging opportunity that trade regulation presents, and (4) the benefits of trade regulation of requiem sharks.

Globally, requiem sharks have minimal species-specific fisheries regulations, including a lack of landing limits, and coarse catch reporting generalized to the genus, class, or often not reported at all. The recognition that many shark species, including requiem sharks, are threatened by overfishing has resulted in increasing national and international efforts to improve their management. However, there is little evidence that these efforts have been able to address the issue in a significant way (Davidson & Dulvy, 2017). In addition to a lack of domestic measures, documentation meant to ensure internationally traded species are caught in a sustainable manner (i.e., catch documentation schemes) is not used for requiem sharks (Mundy-Taylor et al., 2014). Domestic and international regulations have increased in the past decade to eliminate the removal of fins and discarding of carcasses (shark finning) but unsurprisingly have had little effect on reducing the volumes of fins traded, because they do not limit fishing mortality (Ferretti et al., 2020; Lawson & Fordham, 2018). In addition to the fin trade, there has been a recent increase in the international shark meat trade (Dent & Clarke, 2015; Liu et al., 2021). This may be adding to demand and, therefore, incentive for fishers to land sharks, thus additional constraints are urgently needed to ensure catches are sustainable. Management units with higher shark catch volumes are not necessarily better managed but can be used to provide priority areas for management improvement (e.g., Indonesia, which has high shark catch but a lower management score).

Globally widespread species of sharks are subject to fragmented management, requiring a coherent response (Dulvy et al., 2017). The wide-ranging requiem sharks suffer from a patchwork of management and might have lower extinction risk only if a significant part of their range lies within the waters of better managed countries like the United States (Pacoureau et al., 2023). For example, Dusky Shark (C. obscurus) is well-managed in the United States and Australia, but less so elsewhere in its range (Figures 1 and 2). The broad distributions of many species and large volume of requiem sharks in global trade means the need for well-managed fisheries is pertinent to all range states to combat the problem of trade-driven "roving bandit dynamics" (Berkes et al., 2006). Traded shark products often travel through several different countries being aggregated, processed, and then reimported for sale to the general public resulting in poor traceability and species identification and hence ability understand the role of trade in driving local mortality (Haque & Spaet, 2021; Niedermüller et al., 2021). The onus should be on both importers and exporters to ensure traded products are fished sustainably and legally acquired. Improving management and introducing national and/or fishery landing limits for requiem sharks would be an essential part of ensuring sustainable responsible fisheries. However, this must be completed coherently in all countries to ensure future sustainability of requiem shark catches, and this could be achieved through international trade regulation. There is an immediate need for global cooperation in the monitoring, sustainable catch, and trade of these species, which can be achieved through proper implementation of the recent CITES decision to list the Carcharhinidae family on Appendix II.

Listing species on Appendix II of CITES ensures that specimens cannot be traded unless they are legally acquired from a sustainable fishery (i.e., have a positive Non-Detriment Finding [NDF]), and the exporting country must have proper permits (Fernando et al., 2022). The development of tools to assess whether a fishery is detrimental or otherwise has driven investment in monitoring and management of CITES Appendix II listed sharks (Martin, 2007). There are promising signs of progress, even though measuring effectiveness is challenging, and the listings have been comparatively recent relative to the long generation lengths and recovery times of sharks (Friedman et al., 2018). Appendix II CITES listings have led to detectable progress in governance, particularly in major shark fishing nations like Indonesia and Malaysia (Friedman et al., 2018). In Indonesia, implementation of listings resulted in reduced catch and trade of manta rays (Mobula alfredi and M. birostris) (Booth et al., 2020). Here, we identify higher scores in species-specific attributes, like landing limits, for the CITES-listed Oceanic Whitetip and Silky Sharks (C. longimanus and C. falciformis). Requiem shark trade from Indonesia (the top shark catching country in the world) is reported to family level and contributes 51% to their shark production (Prasetyo et al., 2021). This broad level of reporting may be masking serial depletions. Therefore, the new listing of the entire family will minimize enforcement challenges and avoid the complexity of identifying individual requiem shark species by customs officials in shipments (Partin et al., 2022). The obligations of member parties when exporting any products from species listed on CITES Appendix II are to (1) ensure export is not detrimental to the survival of the species (NDF) and (2) ensure specimens were obtained legally (Legal Acquisition Finding). When fully implemented (Fernando et al., 2022), these obligations should halt global declines and set the stage for recovery of requiem sharks and their ecosystem function and services.

Policy relevance: Our findings, published as a bioRxiv preprint, were used to support the recent vote to list all requiem sharks on CITES Appendix II. Our results were: (i) initially cited in the proposal submitted by

WILEY

Panama (CoP19 Prop. 37 - https://cites.org/eng/cop/19/ amendment-proposals), (ii) then communicated to parties via an Information Document submitted by Sri Lanka (CoP19 Inf.79 - https://cites.org/eng/cop/19/informationdocuments), and (iii) presented by the lead author at a CITES CoP side-event. Though two amendments were proposed to exclude (i) 35 lookalike species by Japan or (ii) Blue Shark by Peru, both amendments were not supported and instead the full family listing passed with the necessary greater than two-thirds support (75.2%). The listing was adopted with a 12-month delay to legally coming in to force (i.e., December 2023). In addition to giving time for parties to organize administration, the delay allows for parties to identify and manage stockpiles of products of species that, if internationally traded post-December 2023, would require the issuing of preconvection certificates. Preconvention certificates ensure loopholes are not used to illegally trade newly harvested requiem sharks as though they were harvested prior to the new sustainability and legal requirements offered by CITES listing (Lau and Sant, 2022). We conclude by highlighting the importance of timely open-access research combined with direct communication between scientists, nongovernmental organizations, and government decision-makers, both in the lead-up to and by attendance of the CITES Conference of the Parties to ensure that appropriate, robust, and trusted science underpins policy change.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Brittany Finucci for her comments on study design. We also thank the following people for help finding or understanding legislation in various countries: Maite Pons (Argentina), David Kulka (Canada), Sushmita Mukherji and Zoya Tyabji (India), Aiko Matsushiba (Japan), Sara A.A. Al Mabruk (Libya), Gonzo Araujo and Cat McCann (Malaysia), Brittany Finucci (New Zealand), Leontine Baje and Michael Grant (Papua New Guinea), Andrew Bickell (Sri Lanka), Crystal McRae (Taiwan), and Tobey Curtis and John Carlson (USA).

FUNDING

This work was supported by a grant to GS from the Shark Conservation Fund, a philanthropic collaborative that pools expertise and resources to meet the threats facing the world's sharks and rays. The Shark Conservation Fund is a project of Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors. NKD was supported by the Discovery and Accelerator grants from Natural Science and Engineering Research Council and the Canada Research Chair program.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

ORCID

C. Samantha Sherman D https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7150-1035

REFERENCES

- Bell, J. D., Watson, R. A., & Ye, Y. (2017). Global fishing capacity and fishing effort from 1950 to 2012. *Fish and Fisheries*, 18, 489–505.
- Berkes, F., Hughes, T. P., Steneck, R. S., Wilson, J. A., Bellwood, D. R., Crona, B., Folke, C., Gunderson, L. H., Leslie, H. M., Norberg, J., Nyström, M., Olsson, P., Österblom, H., Scheffer, M., & Worm, B. (2006). Globalization, roving bandits, and marine resources. *Science*, *311*, 1557–1558.
- Blaber, S. J. M., Dichmont, C. M., White, W., Buckworth, R., Sadiyah, L., Iskandar, B., Nurhakim, S., Pillans, R., Andamari, R., Dharmadi, & Fahmi (2009). Elasmobranchs in southern Indonesian fisheries: The fisheries, the status of the stocks and management options. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*, 19, 367–391.
- Booth, H., Pooley, S., Clements, T., Putra, M. I. H., Lestari, W. P., Lewis, S., Warwick, L., & Milner-Gulland, E. J. (2020). Assessing the impact of regulations on the use and trade of wildlife: An operational framework, with a case study on manta rays. *Global Ecology and Conservation*, *22*, e00953.
- Booth, H., Squires, D., Yulianto, I., Simeon, B., Muhsin, L. A, & Milner-Gulland, E. J. (2021). Estimating economic losses to smallscale fishers from shark conservation: A hedonic price analysis. *Conservation Science and Practice*, 2021, e494.
- Cardeñosa, D., Fields, A. T., Babcock, E. A., Shea, S. K. H., Feldheim, K. A., & Chapman, D. D. (2020). Species composition of the largest shark fin retail-market in mainland China. *Scientific Reports*, 10, 12914.
- Clarke, S. C., McAllister, M. K., Milner-Gulland, E. J., Kirkwood, G. P., Michielsens, C. G. J., Agnew, D. J., Piktich, E. K., Nakano, H., & Shivji, M. S. (2006). Global estimates of shark catches using trade records from commercial markets. *Ecology Letters*, 9, 1115– 1126.
- Davidson, L. N. K., & Dulvy, N. K. (2017). Global marine protected areas to prevent extinctions. *Ecology and Evolution*, 1, 1–6.
- Dent, F., & Clarke, S. (2015). State of the global market for shark products. FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Technical Paper (FAO) eng no. 590.
- Duarte, C. M., Agusti, S., Barbier, E., Britten, G. L., Castilla, J. C., Gattuso, J.-P., Fulweiler, R. W., Hughes, T. P., Knowlton, N., Lovelock, C. E., Lotze, H. K., Predragovic, M., Poloczanska, E., Roberts, C., & Worm, B. (2020). Rebuilding marine life. *Nature*, 580, 39–51.

- Dulvy, N. K., Pacoureau, N., Rigby, C. L., Pollom, R. A., Jabado, R. W., Ebert, D. A., Finucci, B., Pollock, C. M., Cheok, J., Derrick, D. H., Herman, K. B., Sherman, C. S., VanderWright, W. J., Lawson, J. M., Walls, R. H. L., Carlson, J. K., Charvet, P., Bineesh, K. K., Fernando, D., ... Simpfendorfer, C. A. (2021). Overfishing drives over one-third of all sharks and rays toward a global extinction crisis. *Current Biology*, *31*, 1–15.
- Dulvy, N. K., Simpfendorfer, C. A., Davidson, L. N. K., Fordham, S. V., Bräutigam, A., Sant, G., & Welch, D. J. (2017). Challenges and priorities in shark and ray conservation. *Current Biology*, *27*, R565–R572.
- FAO (2022). *FishStatJv*.4.02.07. T. Berger, F. Sibeni, & F. Calderini (Eds.). Rome, FAO.
- Fernando, D., Rigby, C., & Sant, G. (2022). The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and Sharks. Shark News: Newsletter of the IUCN SSC Shark Specialist Group. IUCN SSC Shark Specialist Group (SSG), pp. 12–21.
- Ferretti, F., Jacoby, D. M. P., Pfleger, M. O., White, T. D., Dent, F., Micheli, F., Rosenberg, A. A., Crowder, L. B., & Block, B. A. (2020). Shark fin trade bans and sustainable shark fisheries. *Conservation Letters*, 13, e12708.
- Fields, A. T., Fischer, G. A., Shea, S. K. H., Zhang, H., Abercrombie, D. L., Feldheim, K. A., Babcock, E. A., & Chapman, D. D. (2017). Species composition of the international shark fin trade assessed through a retail-market survey in Hong Kong. *Conservation Biology*, *32*, 376–389.
- Fordham, S. V., Lawson, J. M., Koubrak, O., & Cronin, M. R. (2022). Elasmobranch conservation policy: Progress and priorities. In J. Carrier, C. A. Simpfendorfer, M. R. Heithaus, & K. A. Yopak (Eds.), *Biology of sharks and their relatives* (pp. 689–713). CRC Press; Taylor and Francis.
- Friedman, K., Gabriel, S., Abe, O., Nuruddin, A. A., Ali, A., Hassan,
 R. B. R., Cadrin, S. X., Cornish, A., Meulenaer, T. D., Dharmadi,
 F., Anh, L. H. T., Kachelriess, D., Kissol, L. Jr., Krajangdara, T.,
 Wahab, A. R., Tanoue, W., Tharith, C., Torres, F. Jr., Wanchana, W.,
 ... Ye, Y. (2018). Examining the impact of CITES listing of sharks
 and rays in Southeast Asian fisheries. *Fish and Fisheries*, *19*, 662–676.
- Haque, A. B., & Spaet, J. L. Y. (2021). Trade in threatened elasmobranchs in the Bay of Bengal, Bangladesh. *Fisheries Research*, 243, 106059.
- Hilborn, R., Amoroso, R. O., Anderson, C. M., Baum, J. K., Branch, T. A., Costello, C., de Moor, C. L., Faraj, A., Hively, D., Jensen, O. P., Kurota, H., Little, L. R., Mace, P., McClanahan, T., Melnychuk, M. C., Minto, C., Osio, G. C., Parma, A. M., Pons, M., ... Ye, Y. (2020). Effective fisheries management instrumental in improving fish stock status. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, 117, 2218–2224.
- Juan-Jordá, M. J., Murua, H., Arrizabalaga, H., Dulvy, N. K., & Restrepo, V. (2017). Report card on ecosystem-based fisheries management in tuna regional fisheries management organizations. *Fish and Fisheries*, 19(2), 321–339.
- Lam, V. Y. Y., & Sadovy de Mitcheson, Y. (2011). The sharks of South East Asia—Unknown, unmonitored and unmanaged. *Fish and Fisheries*, *12*, 51–74.

- Lau, W., & Sant, G. (2022). Compliance protocol for managing stockpiles of CITES-listed shark fins in Hong Kong SAR. TRAFFIC, WWF, and Bloom.
- Lawson, J. M., & Fordham, S. V. (2018). Sharks ahead: Realizing the potential of the convention on migratory species to conserve elasmobranchs. Shark Advocates International and The Ocean Foundation.
- Liu, C. J. N., Neo, S., Rengifo, N. M., French, I., Chiang, S., Ooi, M., Heng, J. M., Soon, N., Yeo, J. Y., Bungum, H. Z., Ota, K., Koul, A. A., Poh, Y. H., & Wainwright, B. J. (2021). Sharks in hot soup: DNA barcoding of shark species traded in Singapore. *Fisheries Research*, 241, 105994.
- Martin, J. B. (2007). *The price of fame: CITES regulation and efforts towards international protection of the great white shark.* George Washington University.
- McClenachan, L., Cooper, A. B., & Dulvy, N. K. (2016). Rethinking trade-driven extinction risk in marine and terrestrial megafauna. *Current Biology*, *26*, 1–7.
- Mundy-Taylor, V., Crook, V., Foster, S., Fowler, S., Sant, G., & Rice, J. (2014). CITES Non-detriment findings guidance for shark species: A framework to assist Authorities in making Non-detriment findings (NDFs) for species listed in CITES Appendix II. Germany Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (Bundesamt fur Naturschutz, BfN) and TRAFFIC.
- Murua, H., Griffiths, S. P., Hobday, A. J., Clarke, S. C., Cortés, E., Gilman, E. L., Santiago, J., Arrizabalaga, H., de Bruyn, P., Lopez, J., Aires-da-Silva, A. M., & Restrepo, V. (2021). Shark mortality cannot be assessed by fishery overlap alone. *Nature*, 595, E4– 16.
- Myers, R. A., & Worm, B. (2005). Extinction, survival or recovery of large predatory fishes. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B—Biological Sciences*, *360*, 13–20.
- Niedermüller, S., Ainsworth, G., de Juan, S., Garcia, R., Ospina-Alvarez, A., Pita, P., & Villasante, S. (2021). *The shark and ray meat network: A deep dive into a global affair.* WWF.
- Okes, N., & Sant, G. (2019). An overview of major shark traders, catchers and species. TRAFFIC International.
- Pacoureau, N., Carlson, J. K., Kindsvater, H. K., Rigby, C. L., Winker, H., Simpfendorfer, C. A., Charvet, P., Pollom, R. A., Barreto, R., Sherman, C. S., Talwar, B. S., Skerritt, D. J., Sumaila, U. R., Matsushiba, J. H., VanderWright, W. J., Yan, H. F., & Dulvy, N. K. (2023). Conservation successes and challenges for wide-ranging sharks and rays. *PNAS*, 120, e2216891120.
- Partin, T. G., Gonzalez, A. J., & Burnham-Curtis, M. K. (2022). Sharks on a plane: Large shark fin seizure shines light on shark exploitation. Forensic Science International: Animals and Environments, 2, 100055.
- Pauly, D., Zeller, D., & Palomares, M. L. D. (2021). Sea around us concepts, design and data. University of British Columbia. http:// seaaroundus.org
- Prasetyo, A. P., McDevitt, A. D., Murray, J. M., Barry, J., Agung, F., Muttaqin, E., & Mariani, S. (2021). Shark and ray trade in and out of Indonesia: Addressing knowledge gaps on the path to sustainability. *Marine Policy*, 133, 104714.

WILEY

- Sherman, C. S., Sant, G., Simpfendorfer, C. A., Digel, E. D., Zubick, P., Johnson, G., Usher, M., & Dulvy, N. K. (2022). M-Risk: A framework for assessing global fisheries management efficacy of sharks, rays, and chimaeras. *Fish and Fisheries*, 23, 1383–1399.
- Simpfendorfer, C. A., & Dulvy, N. K. (2017). Bright spots of sustainable shark fishing. *Current Biology*, *27*, R83–R102.
- Worm, B., Davis, B., Kettemer, L., Ward-Paige, C. A., Chapman, D., Heithaus, M. R., Kessel, S., & Gruber, S. H. (2013). Global catches, exploitation rates, and rebuilding options for sharks. *Marine Policy*, 40, 194–204.
- Sherman, C. S., Simpfendorfer, C. A., Pacoureau, N., Matsushiba, J. H., Yan, H. F., Walls, R. H. L., Rigby, C. L., VanderWright, W. J., Jabado, R. W., Pollom, R. A., Carlson, J. K., Charvet, P., Bin Ali, A., Fahmi, Cheok, J., Derrick, D. H., Herman, K. B., Finucci, B., Eddy, T. D., & Dulvy, N. K. (2023). Half a century of rising extinction risk of coral reef sharks and rays. Nature Communications, 14(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-35091-x

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of this article.

How to cite this article: Sherman, C. S., Digel, E. D., Zubick, P., Eged, J., Haque, A. B., Matsushiba, J. H., Simpfendorfer, C. A., Sant, G., & Dulvy, N. K. (2023). High overexploitation risk due to management shortfall in highly traded requiem sharks. *Conservation Letters*, e12940. https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12940