

## APPENDIX 22 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: BIGEYE THRESHER SHARK (2023)



**Table 1.** Status bigeye thresher shark (*Alopias superciliosus*) in the Indian Ocean

Area <sup>1</sup>	Indicators		Stock status determination
Indian Ocean	Reported catch 2022 (t)	< 1	Unknown
	Not elsewhere included (nei) sharks <sup>2</sup> 2022 (t)	37,497	
Thresher sharks nei 2022 (t)	5,209		
Average reported catch 2018-22 (t)	< 1		
Av. Not elsewhere included (nei) sharks <sup>2</sup> 2018-22 (t)	35,865		
Av. Thresher sharks nei 2018-22 (t)	4,859		
	MSY (1,000 t) (80% CI)	unknown	
	F <sub>MSY</sub> (80% CI)		
	SB <sub>MSY</sub> (1,000 t) (80% CI)		
	F <sub>current</sub> /F <sub>MSY</sub> (80% CI)		
	SB <sub>current</sub> /SB <sub>MSY</sub> (80% CI)		
	SB <sub>current</sub> /SB <sub>0</sub> (80% CI)		

<sup>1</sup>Boundaries for the Indian Ocean = IOTC area of competence

<sup>2</sup>Includes all other shark catches reported to the IOTC Secretariat, which may contain this species (i.e., SKH: Various sharks nei;THR: Thresher sharks nei; MSK: Mackerel sharks,porbeagles nei).

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

**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 <sup>3</sup>		
		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

<sup>3</sup>The process of the threat assessment from IUCN is independent from the IOTC and is presented for information purpose only

Sources: IUCN Red List 2020, Rigby et al 2019

## 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 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). Bigeye thresher shark received a high vulnerability ranking (No. 4) 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 to 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 characteristics – they are relatively long lived (+20 years), mature at 3–9 years, and have few offspring (2–4 pups every year), the bigeye thresher shark is vulnerable to overfishing. There has been no quantitative stock assessment and limited basic fishery indicators are available for bigeye thresher shark in the Indian Ocean. Therefore, the stock status is **unknown**.

**Outlook.** Current longline fishing effort is directed at other species, however, bigeye thresher sharks are commonly taken as bycatch in these fisheries. Hooking mortality is apparently very high, therefore IOTC Resolution 12/09 prohibiting retaining of any part of thresher sharks onboard and promoting live release of thresher shark may be largely ineffective for species conservation. Maintaining or increasing effort can result in declines in biomass, productivity and CPUE. However, there are few data to estimate CPUE trends and a reluctance of fishing fleets to report information on discards/non-retained catch. Piracy in the western Indian Ocean 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. 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 bigeye thresher shark declined in the southern and eastern areas over that time period, potentially resulting in localised depletion.

**Management advice.** The prohibition on retention of bigeye thresher shark should be maintained. 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 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 *Alopiidae*<sup>1</sup>. The following key points should also be noted:

- **Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY):** Not applicable. Retention prohibited.
- **Reference points:** Not applicable.
- **Main fishing gear (2018–22):** No report after 2012. (reported previously as discard from gillnet and longline).

---

<sup>1</sup> 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).

- **Main reporting fleets** (2018–22): India; (reported as discarded/released alive by United Kingdom, South Africa, Indonesia, Korea, EU, France,).

#### LITERATURE CITED

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., Pacoureaux, N., Romanov, E., Sherley, R.B. & Winker, H. 2019. *Alopias superciliosus*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2019: e.T161696A894216. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2019-3.RLTS.T161696A894216.en>. Accessed on 06 December 2023.