SCALLOPED HAMMERHEAD SHARK

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

CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES

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 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 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.

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

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.

FISHERIES INDICATORS

Scalloped hammerhead shark: General

Scalloped hammerhead shark (*Sphyrna lewini*) is widely distributed and common in warm temperate and tropical waters (Fig. 1). It is also found in estuarine and inshore waters. In some areas, the scalloped hammerhead shark forms large resident populations while in other areas large schools of small-sized sharks are known to make seasonal migrations polewards. Their aggregating behaviour makes large schools highly vulnerable to fishing and therefore high CPUEs may be recorded even when stocks are severely depleted (Baum et al. 2007). An assessment of the population rebound potential of 26 shark species in the Pacific Ocean ranked *Sphyrna lewini* as one of the species with
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the poorest ability to recover from increased mortality (Smith et al. 1998). Scalloped hammerhead sharks feed on pelagic fishes, rays and occasionally other sharks, squids, lobsters, shrimps and crabs. TABLE 1 outlines some of the key life history traits of scalloped hammerhead shark in the Indian Ocean.

Fig. 1. Scalloped hammerhead shark: The worldwide distribution of the scalloped hammerhead shark (source: www.iucnredlist.org).

TABLE 1. Scalloped hammerhead shark: Biology of Indian Ocean scalloped hammerhead shark (*Sphyra lewini*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range and stock structure</td>
<td>The scalloped hammerhead shark is widely distributed and common in warm temperate and tropical waters down to 900 m. It is also found in estuarine and inshore waters. In some areas, the scalloped hammerhead shark forms large resident populations. In other areas, large schools of small-sized sharks are known to migrate seasonally polewards. Area of overlap with IOTC management area = high. There is no information available on stock structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth and Longevity</td>
<td>The maximum age for Atlantic Ocean scalloped hammerheads is estimated to be over 30 years with the largest individuals reaching over 310 cm TL. In the Eastern Indian Ocean, females are reported to reach 350 m TL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity (50%)</td>
<td>Males in the Indian Ocean mature at around 140-165 cm TL. Females mature at about 200-220 cm TL. In the northern Gulf of Mexico females are believed to mature at about 15 years and males at 9–10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction</td>
<td>The scalloped hammerhead shark is viviparous with a yolk sac-placenta. Litters consist of 13–41 pups, varying by area. The reproductive cycle is annual and the gestation period is 9–10 months. The nursery areas are in shallow coastal waters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fecundity: medium (~41 pups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Generation time: 17–21 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Gestation Period: 9–10 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reproductive cycle is annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (length and weight)</td>
<td>The maximum size for Atlantic Ocean scalloped hammerheads is estimated to be over 310 cm TL. In the Eastern Indian Ocean, females are reported to reach 350 m TL. New-born pups are around 45–50 cm TL at birth in the eastern Indian Ocean.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Scalloped hammerhead shark: Fisheries

Scalloped hammerhead sharks are often targeted or taken as an incidental bycatch by some semi-industrial, artisanal and recreational fisheries and often for industrial fisheries (pelagic longline tuna and swordfish fisheries and purse seine fishery) (TABLE 2). There is little information on the fisheries prior to the early 1970s, and some countries do not collect shark data while others collect it but do not report it to IOTC. It appears that significant catches of sharks have gone unrecorded in several countries. Furthermore, many 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

---

1 Map of distribution in the Indian Ocean is not correctly represent species distribution, which is much wider, including Madagascar, Seychelles – whole Mascarene shoals and islands chain (E. Romanov pers. comm.) and to Maldives (Randall and Anderson 1993).
Scalloped hammerhead shark

Updated: December 2016

live weights. FAO also compiles landings data on elasmobranchs, but the statistics are limited by the lack of species-specific data and data from the major fleets.

The IUCN assessment for each of the major geographic regions where the scalloped hammerhead occurs (Baum et al. 2007), suggests a 64% decline in abundance over the study period, based largely on the observations by De Bruyn et al. (2005) and Dudley & Simpfendorfer (2006) which indicate that in localised areas of the western Indian Ocean CPUE of Sphyrna lewini declined significantly from 1978–2003 in shark net catches off the beaches of Kwa-Zulu Natal, South Africa. It observed that Sphyra lewini is captured throughout much of its range in the Indian Ocean, including illegal targeting of the species in several areas. Landings reported to FAO by Oman, surveys of landings sites in Oman and interviews with fishers also suggest that catches of Sphyra lewini have declined substantially (IUCN 2007, Baum op. cit. 2007). The species faces heavy fishing pressure in the region, and similar declines in abundance are also inferred in other areas of its range. Papers presented at the IOTC WPEB in 2013 and 2016 show harvesting of scalloped hammerhead neonates and juvenile pups in the artisanal fisheries of both Kenya and Indonesia (Kiilu, 2016).

The practice of shark finning is considered to be regularly occurring and on the increase for this species (Clarke et al. 2006, Clarke 2008, Holmes et al. 2009) and the bycatch/release injury rate is unknown but probably high.

**TABLE 2.** Estimated frequency of occurrence and bycatch mortality in the Indian Ocean pelagic fisheries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gears</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>BB/TROL/HAND</th>
<th>GILL</th>
<th>UNCL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SWO</td>
<td>TUNA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>rare</td>
<td>common</td>
<td>absent</td>
<td>common</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Mortality</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post release mortality</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Scalloped hammerhead shark: Catch trends**

The catch estimates for scalloped hammerhead (**TABLE 3**) are highly uncertain as is their utility in terms of minimum catch estimates. Five CPCs have reported detailed data on sharks (i.e. Australia, EU (Spain, Portugal and United Kingdom), I.R. Iran, South Africa, and Sri Lanka) while thirteen CPCs have reported partial data or data aggregated for all species (i.e. Belize, China, Rep. of Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia, Oman, Seychelles, Mauritius, Philippines, UK-territories, Vanuatu).

**TABLE 3.** Catch estimates for scalloped hammerhead shark* in the Indian Ocean for 2013 to 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catch</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most recent catch (reported)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalloped hammerhead shark</td>
<td>119 t</td>
<td>33 t</td>
<td>52 t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nei-sharks</td>
<td>52,043 t</td>
<td>43,062 t</td>
<td>58,454 t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Nei-sharks: sharks not elsewhere included

Note that the catches recorded for sharks are thought 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 2015 four countries reported catches of scalloped hammerhead sharks in the IOTC region.

A recent project estimated possible hammerhead 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 oceanic whitetip shark in the IOTC database is considerable (i.e. the estimated catch is around 80 times higher than the declared/report and contained in the IOTC database). Although this figure needs to be further investigated, it gives a global figure of the level of underreporting for scalloped hammerhead shark in the Indian Ocean.

**Scalloped hammerhead shark: Nominal and standardised CPUE trends**

Data not available at the IOTC Secretariat. However, Indian longline research surveys, in which scalloped hammerhead sharks contributed up to 6% of regional catch, demonstrate declining nominal catch rates over the period 1984–2006 (John & Varghese 2009). Nominal CPUE in South African protective net shows steady decline from 1978.

**Scalloped hammerhead shark: Average weight in the catch by fisheries**

Data not available.

**Scalloped hammerhead shark: Number of squares fished**
Catch and effort data not available.

**STOCK ASSESSMENT**

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