Position Statement

On Shark Control Programs and Shark Culls



IUCN SSC
Shark Specialist Group

POSITION STATEMENT ON SHARK CONTROL PROGRAMS AND SHARK CULLS

The IUCN Species Survival Commission (SSC) is aware that lethal approaches to reducing the risk of human-shark interactions are increasingly being adopted around the world. Several governments either have active shark control programs (i.e., bather protection programs) or frequently implement shark culls in response to actual or perceived risk to humans. Hereby, the SSC outlines its position in relation to existing shark control programs and culls and provides context to allow

rewards (e.g., through wildlife tourism or recreational fishing activities). However, sharks can also lose responsiveness to stimuli (e.g., smell of fish products) if not associated with sufficient food reward[16]. Therefore, learnt behaviors are less likely in migratory species that temporarily frequent tourism sites (e.g., White Shark, Tiger Shark). Importantly, even when behavioral change occurs, the extent to which it increases the risk or probability of shark bites is unknown.

The response to shark bites (one incident or a spate of incidents within an area) by some communities and governments has been the establishment of shark hazard mitigation strategies, including lethal and non-lethal control programs[4, 7, 17]. Lethal methods are usually a combination of gear placed in areas to reduce local populations of potentially dangerous species and include shark nets (sometimes referred to as beach meshing), drumlines (i.e., large, baited hooks), longlines, and/or targeted fishing (i.e., culls)[18, 19]. On the other hand, non-lethal alternatives rely on various technologies and early detection, monitoring, and warning systems. These mitigation measures have been deployed in various parts of the world and include, but are not limited to, physical barriers such as swimming enclosures, aerial surveillance (including fixed-wing, helicopter, and unmanned aircraft or drones), Shark-Management-Alert-in-Real-Time (SMART) drumlines, in-water and land-based detection with spotters, real-time detection of telemetry-tagged sharks via listening stations and public alerts through mobile technology, or changing human behavior by requesting water users to avoid times and locations with high probability of relatively higher shark abundance[9, 11, 12, 20, 21]. In some countries, personal deterrents are also used to mitigate risk. They include electric, magnetic, olfactory, and visual deterrents that aim to disorient an approaching shark and discourage it from biting by overwhelming its sensory organs[22, 23, 24]. Lastly, novel puncture- and tear-resistant fabrics and wetsuits are also being developed to reduce the severity of injuries when other mitigation measures cannot prevent shark bites[23, 25]. Each of these approaches come at varying economic costs to governments and/or individuals to ensure they are developed, operated, and maintained over long periods[19].

Shark culls have been the most controversial of these approaches, with those concerned about ensuring the safety of humans by removing animals from particular areas meeting resistance from those opposing the use of lethal methods. Some studies have suggested that lethal approaches are likely to have successfully reduced the incidences of interactions, injuries, and fatalities in certain locations, but not eliminated them[e.g., 18]. Other research highlights that is no change in bite rates after culling programs are implemented[26]. Overall, the efficacy of lethal approaches and any other shark control programs is still often debated, partly due to the low incidence of shark bites and resulting difficulty in showing any statistically significant effect of mitigation measures. Recent studies highlight a shift in public sentiment with surveys showing their increasing preference for non-lethal measures[7, 17, 27].

Worldwide, populations of many shark species have been declining over the last few decades. An estimated 31.2% of sharks are listed in a threatened category (Critically Endangered, Endangered, or Vulnerable) on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species[28]. Reducing populations of top predators in aquatic environments can have broader ecological consequences[29]. Sharks play a critical role in regulating trophic webs and maintaining ecosystem balance and structure, controlling abundance and distribution of prey populations, and promoting ecosystem connectivity. Therefore, their removal from the environment may have unpredictable impacts on aquatic ecosystems. Lethal methods are often unselective and can substantially impact populations of already threatened and/or protected species of sharks and other non-target marine animals - impacts have been reported for rays, turtles, dugongs, dolphins, and whales[e.g., 11, 30]. Indeed, in instances where lethal methods are used, mortality rates for all animals, including sharks, are high (>60%). Furthermore, most sharks impacted by these shark control programs are species that do not pose a threat to human life, such as the Tawny Nurse Shark *Nebrius ferrugineus* or the Scalloped Hammerhead *Sphyrna lewini* (Vulnerable and Critically Endangered on the IUCN Red List, respectively)[11, 28].

Generally, the applicability of human-shark mitigation measures will vary depending on environmental and socio-economic considerations as well as their ability to reduce the risk of interactions with sharks. However, education and outreach are essential for stakeholders to understand risks, possible responses (i.e., applying suitable first aid), and to develop pro-conservation attitudes[31]. In fact, surveys of ocean users in Australia highlight that developing effective strategies to improve and enhance public perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors towards sharks in areas with high incident rates, should be a priority[31, 32].

C oncl s on

Human-wildlife conflict is one of the greatest challenges to the effective conservation of wildlife species and resolution and management actions need to consider coexistence[33]. The available evidence and expert opinion

suggest human-shark interactions are likely to continue increasing due to growing coastal populations and the use of aquatic environments, as well as shifting shark habitat and prey availability. Before considering implementing human-shark mitigation measures that involve lethal approaches as a response to a shark bite, it is essential to thoroughly examine the situation and potential causes of interactions in an area. The use of lethal approaches for managing the risk of shark bites is a poor solution given their considerable environmental impacts and economic costs compared to the alternative non-lethal methods now available[19]. Encouraging safer behaviors among individuals who engage with the ocean is likely to be more impactful when dealing with human wildlife conflicts[10]. Based on existing evidence, the use of non-lethal approaches in shark bite mitigation is the preferred management option.

Le a e ce d

[1] Ebert DA, Fowler S, Dando M. 2021. Sharks of the World. Princeton University Press, Plymouth, UK

[2] Huveneers, C., Meekan, M., Apps, K., Ferreira, L.C., Pannell, D., Vianna, G.M.S. 2017. The economic value of shark-diving tourism in Australia. Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries. 27: 665–680. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11160-017-9486-x

[3] Mustika, P.L.K., Ichsan, M., Booth, H. 2020. The economic value of shark and ray tourism in Indonesia and its role in delivering conservation outcomes. Frontiers in Marine Science. 7: 261. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2020.00261

[4] McPhee, D.P. 2014. Unprovoked shark bites: are they becoming more prevalent? Oceans and Coastal Management 42: 478–492. https://doi.org/10.1080/08920753.2014.942046

[5] Sabatier, E. & Huveneers, C. 2018. Changes in media portrayal of human-wildlife conflict during successive fatal shark bites. Conservation and Society 16: 338-350. https://doi.org/10.4103/cs.cs_18_5

[6] Simmons, P. and Mehmet, M.I. 2018. Shark management strategy policy considerations: community preferences, reasoning and speculations. Marine Policy, 96, pp.111-119. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2018.08.010

[7] Pepin-Neff, C. and Wynter, T. 2019. Save the sharks: reevaluating and (re)valuing feared predators. Human Dimensions of Wildlife, 24: 87–94. https://doi.org/10.1080/10871209.2018.1539887

[8] International Shark Attack File. 2023. Yearly worldwide shark attack summary. https://www.floridamuseum.ufl.edu/shark-attacks/yearly-worldwide-summary/ Accessed 30 June 2023

[9] Riley, M., Meagher, P., Huveneers, C., Leto, J., Peddemors, V.M., Slip, D., West, J., Bradshaw, C.J. 2022. The Australian Shark-Incident Database for quantifying temporal and spatial patterns of shark-human conflict. Scientific Data 9, 378. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-022-01453-9

[10] Ferretti F., Jorgensen, S., Chapple, T., De Leo, G. and Micheli, F. 2015. Reconciling predator conservation with public safety. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 13(8): 412–417. https://doi.org/10.1890/150109

[11] Guyomard, D., Perry, C., Tournoux, P. U., Cliff, G., Peddemors, V., Jaquemet, S. 2019. An innovative fishing gear to enhance the release of non-target species in coastal shark-control programs: the SMART (smart management alert in real-time) drumline. Fisheries Research, 216: 6–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2019.03.011

[12]Bradshaw, C.J., Meagher, P., Thiele, M.J., Harcourt, R.G. and Huveneers, C. 2021. Predicting potential future reduction in shark bites on people. The Royal Society of Open Science, 8(3), p.201197. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.201197

[13] Simpfendorfer, C. A., Heupel, M. R., & Kendal, D. 2021. Complex human-shark conflicts confound conservation action [Perspective]. Frontiers in Conservation Science, 2(35):692767. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcosc.2021.692767

[14] Barnett, A., Fitzpatrick, R., Bradley, M., Miller, I., Sheaves, M., Chin, A., Smith, B., Diedrich, A., Yick, J.L., Lubitz, N. and Crook, K. 2022. Scientific response to a cluster of shark bites. People and Nature, 4(4): 963–982. https://doi.org/10.1002/pan3.10337

[15] Meyer, L., Barry, C., Araujo, G., Barnett, A.,