
APPENDIX VIII
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: OCEANIC WHITETIP SHARK (2025)



CITES APPENDIX I species

Table A 1. Status of oceanic whitetip shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*) in the Indian Ocean.

Area[1]	Indicators		2018 stock status determination
Indian Ocean	Catch (2024) (t)	901[2]	
	Catch of NEI sharks (2024) (t)	15,742[3]	
	Mean annual catch (2020-2024) (t)	541	
	Mean annual catch of NEI sharks (2020-2024) (t)	24,929[3]	
	MSY (1,000 t) (80% CI) F_{MSY} (80% CI) SB_{MSY} (1,000 t) (80% CI) $F_{current}/F_{MSY}$ (80% CI) $SB_{current}/SB_{MSY}$ (80% CI) $SB_{current}/SB_0$ (80% CI)	unknown	

[1]Stock boundaries defined as the IOTC area of competence; [2]Proportion of catch fully or partially estimated for 2024: 0%; [3]NEI includes all other shark catches reported to the IOTC Secretariat, which may contain this species, i.e., AG38: Blue shark, shortfin mako, oceanic whitetip shark; RSK: Requiem sharks nei; SKH: Various sharks nei

Colour key	Stock overfished ($SB_{year}/SB_{MSY} < 1$)	Stock not overfished ($SB_{year}/SB_{MSY} \geq 1$)
Stock subject to overfishing ($F_{year}/F_{MSY} > 1$)		
Stock not subject to overfishing ($F_{year}/F_{MSY} \leq 1$)		
Not assessed/Uncertain		

Table A 2. Oceanic whitetip shark: IUCN threat status of oceanic whitetip shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*) in the Indian Ocean.

Common name	**Scientific name**	**IUCN threat status[4]**		
		Global status	**WIO**	**EIO**
Oceanic whitetip shark	*Carcharhinus longimanus*	Critically Endangered	–	–

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

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

Sources: Rigby et al 2019

CITES - In March 2013, CITES agreed to include oceanic whitetip shark to Appendix II to provide further protections prohibiting the international trade; which will become effective on September 14, 2014.

INDIAN OCEAN STOCK – MANAGEMENT ADVICE

Stock status. There remains considerable uncertainty about the relationship between abundance, standardised CPUE series and total catches over the past decade (**Table A 1**). The ecological risk assessment (ERA) conducted for the Indian Ocean by the WPEB and SC in 2018 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 (Murua *et al.* 2018). Oceanic whitetip shark received a medium vulnerability ranking (No. 9) in the ERA rank for longline gear because it was estimated as one of the least productive shark species but was only characterised by a medium susceptibility to longline gear. Oceanic whitetip shark was estimated as being the 11th most vulnerable shark species to purse seine gear, as it was characterised as having a relatively low productive rate, and medium susceptibility to the gear. The current IUCN threat status of 'Critically Endangered' applies to oceanic whitetip sharks globally and the species is now listed on Appendix I of CITES (**Table A 2**). There is a paucity of information available on this species in the Indian Ocean and this situation is not expected to improve in the short to medium term. Oceanic whitetip sharks are commonly taken by a range of fisheries in the Indian Ocean. Because of their life history characteristics – they are relatively long lived, mature at 4–5 years, and have relatively few offspring (<20 pups every two years), the oceanic whitetip shark is likely vulnerable to overfishing. Despite the limited amount of data, recent studies (Tolotti et al., 2016) suggest that oceanic whitetip shark abundance has declined in recent years (2000-2015) compared with historic years (1986-1999). Available pelagic longline standardised CPUE indices from Japan and EU,Spain indicate conflicting trends as discussed in the IOTC Supporting Information for oceanic whitetip sharks. There is no quantitative stock assessment and limited basic fishery indicators currently available for oceanic whitetip sharks in the Indian Ocean therefore the stock status is **unknown** (**Table A**).

Outlook. Maintaining or increasing effort with associated fishing mortality can result in declines in biomass, productivity and CPUE. Piracy in the western Indian Ocean resulted in the displacement and subsequent concentration of a substantial portion of longline fishing effort into certain areas in the southern and eastern Indian Ocean. Some longline vessels have returned to their traditional fishing areas in the northwest Indian Ocean, due to the increased security onboard vessels, with the exception of the Japanese fleet which has still not returned to the levels seen before the start of the piracy threat. It is therefore unlikely that catch and effort on oceanic whitetip sharks declined in the southern and eastern areas and may have resulted in localised depletion there.

Management advice. A cautious approach to the management of oceanic whitetip shark should be considered by the Commission, noting that recent studies suggest that longline mortality at haulback is high (50%) in the Indian Ocean (IOTC-2016-WPEB12-26), while mortality rates for interactions with other gear types such as purse seines and gillnets may be higher.

Mitigation measures should be taken to reduce at-vessel and post release mortality, including consideration of potential gear modifications in longline fleets targeting tuna and swordfish. Noting that a recent study (Bigelow et al. 2021) concluded in WCPFC that banning both shark lines and wire leaders has the potential to reduce fishing mortality by 40.5% for oceanic whitetip shark.

While mechanisms exist for encouraging CPCs to comply with their recording and reporting requirements (Resolution 18/07), these need to be further implemented by the Commission, so as to better inform scientific advice. IOTC Resolution 13/06 *on a scientific and management framework on the conservation of shark species caught in association with IOTC managed fisheries*, prohibits retention onboard, transhipping, landing or storing any part or whole carcass of oceanic whitetip sharks. Given that some

CPCs are still reporting oceanic whitetip shark as landed catch, there is a need to strengthen mechanisms to ensure CPCs comply with Resolution 13/06.

The following key points should be also noted:

- **Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY)**: Not applicable. Retention prohibited.
- **Reference points**: Not applicable.
- **Main fisheries (mean annual retained catch 2020-2024):** oceanic whitetip shark are caught using purse seine (60.4%), followed by line (33.5%) and gillnet (5.7%). The remaining catches taken with other gears contributed to 0.4% of the total catches in recent years (Fig. 1).
- **Main fleets (mean annual retained catch 2020-2024):** the majority of oceanic whitetip shark catches are attributed to vessels flagged to Indonesia (61.7%) followed by Mozambique (26.8%) and Madagascar (5.2%). The 5 other fleets catching oceanic whitetip shark contributed to 6.3% of the total catch in recent years (Fig. 2).
-




Figure 1 . Annual time series of (a) cumulative retained catches (metric tonnes; t) by fishery and (b) individual retained catches (metric tonnes; t) by fishery group for oceanic whitetip shark during 1950-2024. FS = free-swimming school; LS = school associated with drifting floating objects. Purse seine | Other: coastal purse seine, purse seine of unknown association type, ring net; Longline | Other: swordfish and sharks-targeted longlines; Other: all remaining fishing gears.




Figure 2. Mean annual retained catches (metric tonnes; t) of oceanic whitetip shark by fleet and fishery between 2020 and 2024, with indication of cumulative catches by fleet. FS = free-swimming school; LS = school associated with drifting floating objects. Purse seine | Other: coastal purse seine, purse seine of unknown association type, ring net; Longline | Other: swordfish and sharks-targeted longlines; Other: all remaining fishing gears.

Literature Cited

Bigelow, K. and Carvalho, F. 2021. Review of potential mitigation measures to reduce fishing-related mortality on silky and oceanic whitetip sharks (Project 101). WCPFC Scientific Committee 17th Regular Session. WCPFC-SC17-2021/EB-WP-01. Available: https://meetings.wcpfc.int/node/12598

Coelho, R. 2016. Hooking mortality of oceanic whitetip sharks caught in pelagic longline targeting swordfish in the SW Indian Ocean: comments on the efficiency of no-retention measures. IOTC-2016-WPEB12-26

Murua H, Santiago, J, Coelho, R, Zudaire I, Neves C, Rosa D, Semba Y, Geng Z, Bach P, Arrizabalaga, H., Baez JC, Ramos ML, Zhu JF and Ruiz J. (2018). Updated Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) for shark species caught in fisheries managed by the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC). IOTC–2018–SC21–14_Rev_1.

Rigby, C.L., Barreto, R., Carlson, J., Fernando, D., Fordham, S., Francis, M.P., Herman, K., Jabado, R.W., Liu, K.M., Marshall, A., Pacoureau, N., Romanov, E., Sherley, R.B. & Winker, H. 2019. Carcharhinus longimanus. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2019: e.T39374A2911619. https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2019-3.RLTS.T39374A2911619.en. Accessed on 06 December 2023.

Tolotti M.T., Capello M., Bach P., Romanov E., Murua H., Dagorn L. 2016. Using FADs to estimate a population trend for the oceanic whitetip shark in the Indian Ocean. IOTC-2016-WPEB12-25.