GLOBAL CONSERVATION STATUS OF THE WORLD'S MOST PROMINENT FORAGE FISHES (TELEOSTEI: CLUPEIFORMES)

Birge, T.L.[a,b], Ralph, G.M [a,b], Di Dario, F.[c], Munroe, T.A.[d], Bullock, R.W.[b,e] Maxwell, S.M.[f], Santos, M.D.[g], Hata, H.[h], Carpenter, K.E.*[a,b]

a. IUCN Marine Biodiversity Unit, Biological Sciences, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA, USA
b. Member of IUCN Species Survival Commission
    1. The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of IUCN.
    2. The designation of geographical entities in this paper, and the presentation of the material, do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IUCN concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.
c. Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), Instituto de Biodiversidade e Sustentabilidade (NUPEM). CP 119331, CEP 27910-970, Macaé, RJ, Brazil
d. National Systematics Laboratory, NMFS/NOAA/OS&T, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., USA
e. The Deep, Tower Street, Hull HU1 4DP. England
f. School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Science, University of Washington, Bothell, Bothell, WA USA
g. National Fisheries Research and Development Institute, 101 Mother Ignacia St., Quezon City 1103 Philippines
h. Center for Molecular Biodiversity Research, National Museum of Nature and Science, Tsukuba, 305-0005 Japan

*Corresponding Author: Kent E. Carpenter, +1 (757) 683-4197, kcarpent@odu.edu, IUCN Marine Biodiversity Unit, Biological Sciences, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA 23529-0266, USA.

HIGHLIGHTS

- Clupeiforms have the lowest percentage of elevated conservation concern species (11%), but the highest percentage of species evaluated as Data Deficient (28%), compared to other fish groups assessed.
- Global species richness of Clupeiforms is highest in the Indo-Malay- Philippine Archipelago and the Caribbean.
- Major threats include overexploitation, pollution, and habitat modifications from dams.
- Increased and improved fisheries management measures and intensive habitat restoration is urgent.

ABSTRACT

Understanding the extinction risk of taxonomic groups increases our ability to prioritize efforts to address biodiversity loss. Over 400 species of herrings, shads, sardines, anchovies, menhadens, and relatives belong to the Order Clupeiformes and include many of the most important forage fishes. These small, schooling fishes are ecologically, economically, and culturally significant. However, despite their global contribution to fisheries and our increasing reliance on them for food and modern commodities, we lack critical information regarding basic biology and population trends for most species. We applied the IUCN Red List methodology, a comprehensive and systematic approach to assess extinction risk, to all clupeiform species. The best estimate suggests nearly 11% of species are of elevated conservation concern, although this could be as high as 36%. Two regions, the Caribbean and the Indo-Malay-Philippine Archipelago have high concentrations of threatened and Data Deficient species and are areas of conservation concern. Major threats include overexploitation, pollution, and habitat modification. Immediate conservation priorities include: 1) increasing research and mitigative action directed toward species assessed as threatened or Data Deficient; 2) improving fisheries management regulations for the understudied but heavily exploited species, and 3) promoting local, intensive habitat restoration to reduce pollution and remove dams. These extinction risk assessments and subsequent analyses should be used as an informative tool for fisheries and conservation managers and to monitor conservation progress.

Keywords: Extinction, baitfish, Red List, threatened

1. INTRODUCTION

Forage fishes are a crucial link between primary production and keystone predators in aquatic environments (Pikitch et al., 2014). These typically abundant small- to medium-sized pelagic species feed at the base of the food web and serve as a predominate prey source for numerous larger predators, such as piscivorous fishes, mammals, squids, and seabirds, many of which are commercially important (Cury et al., 2011; Smith et al., 2011; Pikitch et al., 2014; Hilborn et al., 2017). Forage fishes include a diverse array of bony fishes and invertebrates such as krill and squid (Pikitch et al., 2014; Rountos, 2016). Many species also support the global economy by directly and indirectly sustaining several fisheries (Pikitch et al., 2014) and contribute 20-30% to the annual global marine catch (Alder et al., 2008; Smith et al., 2011, Pikitch et al., 2014).

Species of the Clupeiformes (Teleostei), commonly known as herrings, shads, menhadens, sardines, anchovies, and their relatives, are a major component of forage fishes in coastal ecosystems and dominate worldwide forage fish landings (Tacon and Metian, 2009a; FAO, 2020). Additional to providing ecological and economic support, clupeiforms contribute to global food security given their abundance, easy access, and exceptionally high nutrient content (FAO, 2018). In some human communities, clupeiforms comprise the major or the sole protein source (Alder et al., 2008; Mohanty et al., 2019). Historically, clupeiform presence has been associated with persistent human settlement, growth, and survival (e.g., Bloch, 1809; Thornton et al., 2010; Levin et al., 2016). To meet the needs of a rising human population (United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, 2017), demand for fisheries resources is expected to continue growing (FAO, 2018). Given the overall ecological, cultural, nutritional, and economic importance of clupeiforms worldwide, their conservation status warrants greater attention.

The Clupeiformes includes 415 species that are globally distributed with tropical, temperate, and sub-Arctic representatives (Whitehead, 1985; Whitehead et al., 1988; Lavoué et al., 2013). Clupeiform fishes are ecologically diverse and span all aquatic habitats, including coastal and open marine environments, oceanic islands, estuaries, and freshwater rivers and lakes (Whitehead, 1985; de Pinna and Di Dario, 2003; Lavoué et al., 2013; Bloom and Egan, 2018). Species can be restricted to marine, estuarine, or fresh waters, or they can be euryhaline, where a subset exhibit diadromy (Whitehead, 1985). Strictly marine clupeiforms (33.7% of all species) are distributed in every ocean, except for the Southern Ocean (Whitehead, 1985), while strictly freshwater species (17.8% of all species) are found on every continent except for Antarctica (Bloom and Lovejoy, 2012, 2014; Bloom and Egan, 2018).

Despite the global importance of clupeiforms, basic biological information, fisheries data, and management efforts are severely deficient compared to those of other commercially important fishes, such as tunas and billfishes. This disparity may be due in part to perception of extinction resistant traits or may result from the taxonomic complexity of clupeiforms (Whitehead, 1985; Alder et al., 2008). Value per pound for clupeiforms is also far less than that for other commercial fishes, which may further disincentivize the contribution of resources to research and conservation for the clupeiforms. For example, the average commercial landed value of all tunas in the U.S. for 2017 was about USD $2.8/pound, while the average value for clupeiforms was roughly USD $0.09/pound (NOAA Fisheries, 2019). The paradox between worldwide clupeiform importance and lack of available resources and reliable data reinforces the need to invest effort into understanding the current conservation status of the members of this group.

The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List of Threatened Species provides a key starting point for highlighting and addressing conservation needs for species (Mace et al., 2008). The IUCN Red List, an open-access repository of species-specific assessments, categorizes a species conservation status by interpreting its risk to extinction (Rodrigues et al., 2006; Vié et al., 2009). Red List assessments are the most widely accepted standard for species-level risk evaluations (Hoffman et al., 2008). By illuminating gaps in conservation knowledge for species, assessments can be used to inform and influence decisions regarding biodiversity conservation (Rodrigues et al., 2006; Mace et al., 2008; Vié et al., 2009).

Limited species-specific conservation information on clupeiforms hampers our ability to proactively manage and conserve these essential components of aquatic food webs. To address this gap, we applied the IUCN Red List methodology to assess the extinction risk of the 415 valid clupeiform species. The assessments and accompanying data were used to evaluate: 1) variability in the proportion of species at an elevated risk of extinction as a function of family, and habitat; 2) major threats; and 3) spatial patterns in species richness. These analyses provide a baseline from which to monitor changes in conservation status and are used to identify conservation priorities and research needs.

2. METHODS

2.1 Taxonomic Scope

Phylogenetic relationships among the main groups of the Clupeiformes are contentious, resulting in different proposals of taxonomic classifications (e.g., Di Dario, 2002, 2009; Miyashita, 2010; Lavoué et al., 2014). Overall, the order is divided into the Denticipitoidei, with a single living representative (*Denticeps clupeoides*) in the Denticipitidae, and the Clupeoidei (Grande, 1985), which includes all remaining 414 species of the Clupeiformes assessed here. The Clupeoidei has been traditionally divided into four families: the Chirocentridae, Pristigasteridae, Engraulidae, and the Clupeidae (e.g., Whitehead, 1985). However, morphological characters and molecular evidence indicates that the Clupeidae, which includes about half of all currently valid species of the Clupeiformes (Nelson et al., 2016), is not a monophyletic group (summarized in Lavoué et al., 2014). To partially acknowledge that, we provisionally accept the classification of Lavoué et al. (2014), which includes *Dussumieria*, *Etrumeus*, *Spratelloides*, and *Jenkinsia*, in a distinct family (Dussumieriidae). *Sundasalanx* is a paedomorphic genus of freshwater clupeiforms of unknown relationships within the Clupeoidei (Siebert, 1997; Lavoué et al., 2013, 2014). The genus is generally regarded as a member of the Clupeidae (Siebert, 1997; Lavoué et al., 2014; Nelson et al., 2016), but given its controversial position in the Clupeoidei, the Sundasalangidae is also provisionally recognized as a distinct family (Van der Laan et al. 2014). In this arrangement, the Clupeidae includes 188 species. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, seven families of the Clupeiformes are recognized:

Denticipitidae (1 species), Pristigasteridae (37 species), Engraulidae (161 species), Chirocentridae (2 species), Clupeidae (188 species), Dussumieriidae (19 species), and Sundasalangidae (7 species).

2.2 Quantifying Extinction Risk

We compiled a species list based on the online version of the Catalog of Fishes up to March 2020 (Fricke et al. 2020) and in consultation with taxonomic experts. Individual clupeiform species' assessments were based on available information from peer-reviewed and grey literature regarding geographic distribution, population status, life history, utilization and quality of habitat, potential threats, and known conservation measures. The assessment process included involvement from 132 international experts from more than 20 countries with regional or species expertise. We identified potential experts to be involved in the assessments from the authors of peer-reviewed publications, FAO fisheries identification guides, and through the IUCN Species Survival Commission network. All 415 species were assessed against the IUCN Red List criteria (Mace et al., 2008; IUCN 2012) at workshops and through online collaborations. Draft assessments go through multiple rounds of review by species experts and the Red List process prior to publication. As of July 2020, all species assessments included in this analysis are published on the Red List website (www.iucnredlist.org).

The IUCN Red List includes eight global levels of extinction risk: Extinct (EX), Extinct in the Wild (EW), Critically Endangered (CR), Endangered (EN), Vulnerable (VU), Near Threatened (NT), Least Concern (LC), and Data Deficient (DD: IUCN, 2012). A taxon is considered EX when there is no reasonable doubt the last individual has died or is EW if it is only known to survive in cultivation, captivation, or in naturalized populations outside of its historic range (IUCN 2012). A species can reasonably be presumed EX or EW when exhaustive surveys fail to report it (IUCN 2012). To qualify for a threatened category (CR, EN, VU) a species must meet at least one of the five quantitative thresholds under IUCN Criteria (A – E: Mace et al., 2008). The criteria evaluate population decline (A), restricted geographic distribution (B), small population size and decline (C), very small or restricted population size (D), and the high probability of potential extinction (E: Akçakaya et al., 2000; Mace et al., 2008).

For each assessment, experts evaluated the species-specific data available against all five Red List Criteria (IUCN, 2001; 2012). Almost all species were assessed under criteria A (population decline) or B (restricted geographic range). Data required to assess a species under the remaining criteria (C, D or E) were often unavailable. Species were assigned to the highest threat category for which the available data met or exceeded the associated thresholds and conditions (IUCN, 2001; 2012; IUCN Standards and Petitions Subcommittee, 2016). A category of NT was applied if the quantified estimates of population decline or geographic range size nearly meet the thresholds for assigning a threatened category under at least one of the criteria. A species was listed as LC if it did not qualify for a threatened or NT listing based on the available data. Finally, the DD category was applied if a species is known from few specimens, lacks information to assess under any of the criteria, or there is uncertainty regarding its taxonomic status (IUCN, 2001; 2012; IUCN Standards and Petitions Subcommittee, 2016). This category was also applied if declines were likely due to a known but unquantified threat (e.g., fishing pressure), such that a more appropriate category could not be assigned.

Direct threats impacting each species were identified from the published literature (peer-reviewed and grey), verified by species or regional experts, and categorized within each species assessment using the standardized IUCN Threat Classification Scheme (version 3.2: IUCN-CMP, 2016). These coded threats and full bibliographies are available as part of the assessment for each species. Major threats were summarized across species as a function of primary habitat system (marine, euryhaline, freshwater). The proportion of species listed as threatened (CR, EN, VU) and NT, herein referred to as species of elevated concern, was also explored as a function of family and major habitat system. The proportion of species of elevated concern is expressed using both a midpoint and a range to address the uncertainty surrounding the true status of DD species. The midpoint was calculated by removing the species listed as DD, whereas the lower and upper bounds were calculated by excluding or including the DD species with the threatened and NT, respectively. The lower boundary assumes that none of the DD species are of an elevated concern, while the upper boundary assumes that all DD species are of an elevated concern (IUCN, 2016).

A species was assigned a major habitat category using the information in the Red List assessments. Given the known or suspected tolerance for salinity fluctuations exhibited by many clupeiforms, we modified the IUCN Red List system classification scheme from two aquatic categories (freshwater, including inland estuarine waters; and marine, including coastal estuarine waters) to three categories. Therefore, the freshwater system includes those species known to occupy only freshwater environments and the marine system includes species restricted to marine waters. The third, euryhaline category includes estuarine species, diadromous species, and species known or suspected to tolerate changes in salinity.

2.3 Distribution Maps and Spatial Analyses

Maps were created for each species using ArcMap 10.3 based on occurrence records, habitat preferences, and depth limits and were reviewed by species experts. As marine clupeiforms are primarily coastal, the distribution polygons for strictly marine species were standardized using a base map that represents either the 200 m bathymetric line or 100 km from the shore, whichever was further from the coast. Bathymetric layers were extracted from two global level sources, the National Geophysical Data Center's ETPO1 (Amante and Eakins, 2009) and the General Bathymetric Chart of the Oceans (GEBCO: IOC et al., 2003). Maps for freshwater species were created using hydrobasins, because these areas are considered as minimum management units for freshwater conservation (Lévêque et al., 2008; Carrizo et al., 2013). For species that utilize both marine and freshwater habitats (e.g., diadromous species), maps separately followed the marine and freshwater protocols, and were combined to encompass the entirety of the species' range.

Global maps of overall species richness, DD richness, and richness of elevated concern species were also created using ArcMap 10.3. Species with a freshwater distribution were summarized within the Global HydroBASINS (Lehner and Grill, 2013), using the largest river basins of each continent. Species with a marine distribution were summarized within the

Marine Ecosystems of the World at the province level (Spalding et al., 2007). This shapefile was modified to include a region for the Caspian Sea, as it is excluded from the Global HydroBASINS and Marine Ecosystems of the World.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Global IUCN Red List Status of Clupeiforms

The best estimate of the proportion of clupeiforms of elevated concern is 11%. Given the uncertainty of an appropriate Red List Category for all DD species, the true proportion of elevated concern species could lie between 8 – 36%. Of all species (n = 415), three (0.7%) are listed as CR, 11 (2.7%) as EN, 13 (3.1%) as VU, and five (1.2%) as NT. No species were listed as EX or EW. Species are primarily listed as elevated concern either due to a restricted range size with an ongoing threat (criterion B; n = 17) or due to population decline (criterion A; n = 10); two species (*Sardinella tawilis* and *Alosa vistonica*) are listed under both criteria A and B. Three species are listed as VU given a very restricted range and a serious plausible future threat (criterion D). Of the remaining 383 species, 267 (64.3%) are categorized as LC, and 116 (28.0%) are considered DD.

Among families of the Clupeiformes, the Denticipitidae consists of only one species, *Denticeps clupeoides*, which is listed as VU. As such, this family has the highest proportion of elevated concern species overall (Fig. 1). Excluding *D. clupeoides*, the Clupeidae has the highest proportion of elevated concern species (25 of 188 species; midpoint = 16.7%), followed by the Engraulidae (5 of 161 species; midpoint = 4.9%), and the Pristigasteridae (1 of 37 species; midpoint = 3.8%). None of the Chirocentridae (n = 2), Dussumieriidae (n = 19) or Sundasalangidae (n = 7) are listed as threatened. However, the high proportion of DD species, especially within the Sundasalangidae, may be obscuring the actual conservation status of these families.

Species classified as euryhaline (i.e., diadromous or estuarine) constituted nearly half of all clupeiforms (n = 201; 48.4%), followed by marine (n = 140; 33.7%) and freshwater species (n = 74; 17.8%) (Fig. 2). Euryhaline habitats harbor the largest proportion of LC species (n = 147; 73.1%) followed by marine habitats (n = 80; 57.1%), and then freshwater habitats (n = 40; 54.1%). Despite having the lowest number of representatives, freshwater clupeiforms have the highest proportion of elevated concern species (16 of 74 species; midpoint = 28.6%), more than three times the proportion in marine environments (7 of 140 species; midpoint = 8.0%), and four times the proportion of elevated concern species found in euryhaline environments (9 of 201 species; midpoint = 5.7%). Additionally, all species assessed as CR (n = 3), the highest threat level, are found in freshwater habitats.

3.2 Major threats

Of the 415 species, 144 have at least one identified threat. The remaining 271 species have either no major threats causing significant impacts, or threats to these species are unknown. The most prominent threat to clupeiforms in all habitats is overexploitation, impacting 107 species overall (Fig. 3). Pollution and natural system changes (e.g., dams) impact nearly the same number of species (47 and 42, respectively). However, despite having the highest proportion of LC species (Fig. 2), the majority of species impacted by pollution or natural system changes are euryhaline (Fig. 3). Of the species impacted by at least one threat, roughly the same proportions of freshwater and euryhaline species are impacted by pollution and natural system changes overall (84 and 76%, respectively). The proportion of marine species impacted by climate change (36%) is more than two times the proportion of euryhaline (11%) and freshwater (6%) species, while invasive species impact a higher proportion of freshwater species (18%) relative to the proportion of marine and euryhaline species (11% and 7%, respectively).

3.3 Spatial Analyses

Global species richness of clupeiforms follows two distribution patterns; a longitudinal gradient, where the highest tropical richness is within the Indo-West Pacific, and a latitudinal gradient where richness decreases with increasing distance from the tropics. The highest species richness of all clupeiforms is along coastal India and throughout the Indo-West Pacific from the eastern Andaman Sea, east to the Philippines, Indonesia, and northeastern Papua New Guinea (Fig. 4A). High richness also occurs in the central eastern Pacific from Mexico to northern Peru, and the central western Atlantic from the greater Caribbean to northern Brazil. Areas of lowest species richness are within the northern and southernmost limits of the global range for clupeiforms (e.g., the Arctic and north of the Southern Ocean), in inland rivers, and off Polynesian Islands.

In general, DD species richness closely follows that of the total species richness (Fig. 4B). However, DD species richness is higher in northern Australian rivers relative to the total species richness. In contrast, the high species richness in Europe, eastern United States, and South American rivers is not mirrored by high DD species richness.

Conversely, the highest richness of species of elevated concern (n = 32) occurs within the greater Caribbean (Fig. 4C). Other areas of high richness for species of elevated concern are along the western Pacific continental coast (Russia south to Indonesia), and inland areas including the Caspian Sea and the Congo River in Central Africa. A low richness of elevated concern species is scattered along regions such as the northeastern United States, the eastern and southern coasts of South America, western Africa, and parts of Europe and Asia.

4. DISCUSSION

Major threats to clupeiforms are similar to those found for other groups of fishes (e.g., Roberts and Hawkins, 1999; Reynolds et al., 2005; Dulvy et al., 2009; Harnik et al., 2012), with overexploitation as the leading threat for all clupeiforms in all habitats. While overexploitation may be the most prolific threat by impacting the highest number of clupeiforms, pollution may be the most detrimental, as it affects greater numbers of CR species. When compared to other economically and ecologically important fish groups globally assessed using the IUCN Red List methodology, clupeiforms have the lowest estimated percentage of threatened and NT species overall. Using the midpoint of species evaluated as elevated concern, roughly 11% are currently at high risk compared to approximately 22% of tunas and billfishes (Collette et al., 2011), 19%

of sparids (Comeros-Raynal et al., 2016), and 19% of groupers (Sadovy de Mitcheson et al., 2020).

The lower proportion of threatened species in clupeiforms may be a function of uncertainty and is likely an underestimate of the true conservation status for many of these species. The high percentage of DD clupeiforms (28%) surpasses that of the tunas and billfishes (Collette et al., 2011), sparids (Comeros-Raynal et al., 2016), and groupers (Sadovy de Mitcheson et al., 2020), each with less than 20% of those species evaluated as DD. A DD listing is most often related to taxonomic uncertainty, low number of known specimens, unknown geographical range, or inability to quantify a threat or decline in population (IUCN, 2012), all of which are common within the Clupeiformes. Continued taxonomic research will likely identify additional cryptic species (e.g., recent revisions of species of *Sardinella*, *Stolephorus* and *Encrasicholina* – Thomas et al., 2014; Hata and Motomura 2019a,b,c), clarifying our current understanding of the complex taxonomy and biodiversity of this group and influencing the assessments of some species.

If the DD species were evenly distributed relative to total richness, we would expect that all areas would have about 28% DD species. Instead, we found high variation in both the numbers and proportion of DD species. For example, a few freshwater river basins (in eastern and northwestern Africa; southern U.S. and northern Mexico; and Borneo) are, or are nearly 100% DD. However, these areas are characterized by low clupeiform richness, with only one or two species occurring in each of these regions. The highest number of clupeiform species evaluated as DD generally coincides with geographic areas of both high clupeiform biodiversity and areas of low per-capita income. For example, the Coral Triangle is the epicenter of marine biodiversity (Carpenter and Springer 2005; Sanciangco et al., 2013) and is a hotspot for clupeiform species (up to 81), which are heavily relied on for subsistence in local fisheries.

In general, global biodiversity is unevenly distributed; the most biodiverse places are often areas of high human populations of relatively low per capita income (Baille et al., 2004; Brooks et al., 2006) and tend to have the highest number of threatened species (Hoffmann et al., 2010; Baille et al., 2004). Countries with high human populations and high biodiversity are less likely to have financial resources available for research and conservation purposes (Baille et al., 2004), and may rely more heavily on local marine resources for livelihood (Creel 2003; Ferrol-Schulte et al., 2015). In contrast, countries such as those in the advanced economies of Europe invest substantially in conservation research and management and have few globally threatened species (Baille et al., 2004), including those among the clupeiforms where both the number and proportion of threatened and DD are very low.

In many parts of the world, particularly in highly biodiverse areas, clupeiform stock assessments and fishery effort data are lacking or are unreported. Where data are available, it is often in the form of raw fishery landings (FAO, 2016) or reconstructed catches (Pauly and Zeller, 2016a). These landings frequently aggregate several species because those that co-occur often school together and are difficult to identify (e.g., species of sardines and anchovies: Bakun and Cury, 1999). Teasing apart landings from multi-species fisheries is a difficult task and identifications that contain many errors can lead to false estimations of species-specific catch data (Gaichas et al., 2012). Overexploitation is a major threat to over 25% of clupeiform species, but this likely underestimates the impact given uncertainties in landings and the population status of species evaluated as DD. Clupeiforms also contribute to many unreported artisanal fisheries (Whitehead, 1985; Whitehead et al., 1988), represent a significant portion of bycatch in other industrial trawl fisheries (e.g., Stobutzki et al., 2001), and are taken in illegal, unreported and unregulated fisheries (IUU: Agnew et al., 2009). Accidental and IUU fishing, along with aggregated landings, adversely affect our ability to quantify global fishing pressure on these species. It can further impact conclusions drawn regarding population trends by underestimating true catches (Pauly and Zeller, 2016b), which ultimately impacts the efficacy of conservation or management decisions.

The highest concentration of threatened species is centered in the Caribbean region; however, the highest species richness overall and of DD species is concentrated in the central Indo-West Pacific region. Therefore, only about one-tenth of the Caribbean species are assessed as DD compared to roughly one-third of Indo-West Pacific species, highlighting our increased knowledge of Caribbean species. Currently, clupeiforms in the Caribbean would benefit most from threat mitigation, while emergent research to fill in our knowledge gaps in the Indo-West Pacific region should be prioritized. As more data become available to adequately assess species currently listed as DD, it is likely that we may find a higher proportion of elevated concern species within the Indo-West Pacific, relative to that reported from the Caribbean.

In addition to the high proportion of DD species, traditional perceptions of intrinsic life history traits have impeded the conservation of clupeiforms. Their typically high fecundity, multiple spawning, and early age of maturation are regarded as resilience factors, even though these traits often do not reflect lower vulnerability to extinction (Jennings et al., 1998; Kindsvater et al., 2016; Sadovy, 2001; Juan-Jorda et al., 2012; Comeros-Raynal et al., 2016). For example, the widely distributed Pacific herring (*Clupea pallasii*) is exploited to varying degrees throughout a large portion of its range. In some regions where this species has experienced drastic declines, subpopulations have not recovered even decades after fishing pressure has ceased (see Hay et al., 2001 for description of Yellow Sea and Hokkaido – Sakhalin herring). Overall, intrinsic life history characteristics of many clupeiforms and likely other important forage groups may provide a buffer against extinction (compared to long-lived taxa such as sharks, rays, tunas, billfishes, and groupers), but this buffer does not hold for all clupeiform subpopulations.

Synergistic influences of threats can be detrimental to the survival of a population (Brook et al., 2008). Often, freshwater and euryhaline clupeiforms are threatened by both pollution and natural system modifications, indicating a potential for increased cumulative effects. Many anadromous representatives in genera such as *Alosa* and *Tenualosa* appear to be most negatively impacted by one or both threats (e.g., Freyhof and Kottelat, 2008a; NatureServe, 2013; Di Dario, 2018; Mohd Arshaad et al., 2018). In line with previous studies of other freshwater fishes (e.g., Collen et al., 2014), freshwater clupeiforms have roughly four times the proportion of elevated concern species compared with that among marine and euryhaline representatives within the group. Given that all species listed as CR are freshwater clupeids, the responses to multiple stresses by all freshwater clupeids should be examined more closely. Additionally, the freshwater denticle herring, *Denticeps clupeoides*, is the only member of the Denticipitoidei, a very distinct and presumably old (ca. 126–121 Mya) lineage of clupeiform fishes (Malabarba and Di Dario, 2017). This species is a relict that inhabits a few isolated coastal streams of West Africa (Teugels, 2003), a region heavily impacted by agricultural and urban developments (Lalèyè et al., 2010). Immediate implementation of strategies aimed at the conservation of *D. clupeoides* and other threatened freshwater clupeiforms is highly recommended.

5. CONCLUSION

Despite the relatively lower percentage of threatened species compared to that of other fish groups of similar economic value, the overall ecological importance of clupeiform fishes and their ubiquity as an essential fishery resource warrants conservation concern. At a local level, species with limited ranges, such as *Alosa killarnensis*, *Denticeps clupeoides*, and *Sardinella tawilis*, may require stringent protection and improvement of habitat quality (Freyhof and Kottelat, 2008b; Lalèyè et al., 2010; Santos et al., 2018). Additionally, though some species threatened with overexploitation have localized management and monitoring in place, such as *Sardinella lemuru* in the southern Philippines (Rola et al., 2018), the efficacy of current measures need to be evaluated. An increase in species-specific landings and catch statistics, coupled with effort data, would also further improve future assessments of exploited species, especially in developing countries. Large-scale industrial fisheries, such as those for the Peruvian anchoveta (*Engraulis ringens*) and the Pacific herring (*Clupea pallasii*), may benefit from increased multi-national cooperative regulations. Species of elevated conservation concern are also potential targets for improved and more stringent monitoring. Given the limited resources available, research and conservation prioritization can be difficult in areas of high biodiversity; however, mitigation of anthropogenic stressors in these areas where elevated concern species are distributed is critical. Fishery managers and funding agencies in regions with large proportions of exploited DD species may also consider prioritizing research initiatives to fill gaps in our understanding of these species.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project was funded by the Toyota Motor Corporation with additional funding and workshop logistical support provided by the Philippines' Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources. This research was conducted as part of the master's thesis of T. Birge. The statements made herein are solely the responsibility of the authors. We thank Christi Linardich for contributions to data collection and workshop facilitation. This project could not have been completed without the 132 species and regional experts who contributed to the completion and review of the Red List assessments. We thank the IUCN Red List Unit, particularly Janet Scott, for reviewing the Red List assessments. Additionally, we thank two anonymous reviewers for their comments that improved this manuscript.

REFERENCES

Agnew, D.J., Pearce, J., Pramod, G., Peatman, T., Watson, R., Beddington, J.R., Pitcher, T.J., 2009. Estimating the worldwide extent of illegal fishing. PLoS ONE 4. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0004570.

Akçakaya, H.R., Ferson, S., Murgman, M.A., Keith, D.A., Mace, G.M., Todd, C.R., 2000. Making consistent IUCN classifications under uncertainty. Conservation Biology 14, 1001-1013. doi: 10.1046/j.1523-1739.2000.99125.x.

Alder, J., Campbell, B., Karpouzi, V., Kaschner, K., Pauly, D., 2008. Forage Fish: From Ecosystems to Markets. Annual Review of Environment and Resources 33, 153-166. doi: 10.1146/annurev.environ.33.020807.

Amante, C., Eakins, B.W., 2009. ETOPO1 1 Arc-Minute Global Relief Model: Procedures, Data Sources and Analysis NOAA Technical Memorandum NESDIS NGDC-24. doi:10.7289/V7285C8276M: National Geophysical Data Center, NOAA.

Baille, J. Hilton-Taylor, C., Stuart, S.N., 2004. 2004 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species: A Global Species Assessment. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.

Bakun, A., Cury, P., 1999. The 'school trap': A mechanism promoting large-amplitude out-of-phase population oscillations of small pelagic fish species. Ecology Letters 2, 349-351. doi: 10.1046/j.1461-0248.1999.00099.x.

Bloch, M., 1809. Natural history of the herring. The Belfast Monthly Magazine 2, 241-245.

Bloom, D.D., Egan, J.P., 2018. Systematics of Clupeiformes and testing for ecological limits on species richness in a trans-marine/freshwater clade. Neotropical Ichthyology 16, e180095. doi: 10.1590/1982-0224-20180095.

Bloom, D.D., Lovejoy, N.R., 2012. Molecular phylogenetics reveals a pattern of biome conservatism in New World anchovies (family Engraulidae). Journal of Evolutionary Biology 25, 701 - 775. doi: 10.1111/j.1420-9101.2012.02464.x.

Bloom, D.D., Lovejoy, N.R., 2014. The evolutionary origins of diadromy inferred from a time-calibrated phylogeny for Clupeiformes (herring and allies). Proceedings of the Royal Society B 281, 20132081. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2013.2081.

Brook, B.W., Sodhi, N.S., Bradshaw, C.J.A., 2008. Synergies among extinction drivers under global change. Trends in Ecology and Evolution 23, 453 – 460. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2008.03.011.

Brooks, T.M., Mittermeier, R.A., da Fonseca, G.A.B., Gerlach, J., Hoffmann, M., Lamoreux, J.F., Mittermeier, C.G., Pilgrim, J.D., Rodrigues, A.S.L., 2006. Global biodiversity conservation priorities. Science 313, 58-61. doi: 10.1126/science.1127609.

Carpenter, K.E., Springer, V.G., 2005. The center of the center of marine shore fish biodiversity: the Philippine Islands. Environmental Biology of Fishes 72, 467 – 480.

Carpenter, K.E., Abrar, M., Aeby, G., Aronson, R.B., Banks, S., Bruckner, A., . . . Wood, E., 2008. One-third of reef-building corals face elevated extinction risk from climate change and local impacts. Science 321, 560-563. doi: 10.1126/science.1159196.

Carrizo, S.F., Smith, K.G., Darwall, W.R.T., 2013. Progress towards a global assessment of the status of freshwater fishes (Pisces) for the IUCN Red List: application to conservation programmes in zoos and aquariums. International Zoo Yearbook 47, 46 – 64. doi: 10.1111/izy.12019.

Collen, B., Whitton, F., Dyer, E.E., Baillie, J.E.M., Cumberlindge, N., Darwall, W.R.T., Pollock, C., Richman, N.I., Soulsby, A.-M., Böhm, M., 2014. Global patterns of freshwater species diversity, threat and endemism. Global Ecology and Biogeography 23, 40 – 51. doi: 10.1111/geb.12096.

Collette, B.B., Carpenter, K.E., Polidoro, B.A., Juan-Jordá, M.J., Boustany, A., Die, D.J., ... Yáñez, E., 2011. High value and long life-double jeopardy for tunas and billfishes. Science 333, 291-292.

Comeros-Raynal, M.T., Polidoro, B.A., Broatch, J., Mann, B.Q., Gorman, C., Buxton, C.D., Goodpaster, A.M., Iwatsuki, Y., MacDonald, T.C., Pollard, D., Russell, B., Carpenter, K.E., 2016. Key predictors of extinction risk in sea breams and porgies (Family: Sparidae). Biological Conservation 202, 88 – 98. doi: 10.1016/j.biocon.2016.08.027.

Creel, L., 2003. Ripple effects: population and coastal regions. Population Reference Bureau. Washington, D.C. 1 – 7.

Cury, P.M., Boyd, I.L., Bonhommeau, S., Anker-Nilssen, T., Crawford, R.J.M., Furness, R.W., Mills, J.A., Murphy, E.J., Osterblom, H., Paleczny, M., Piatt, J.F., Roux, J.-P., Shannon, L., Sydeman, W.J., 2011. Global seabird response to forage fish depletion -- one-third for the birds. Science 334, 1703-1706. doi: 10.1126/science.1212928.

de Pinna, M.C.C, Di Dario, F. 2003. *Family Pristigasteridae (Pristigasterids)*, in: R. E. Reis, S. O. Kullander, C. Ferraris. (Org.). Check List of Freshwater Fishes of South and Central America. Porto Alegre: EDIPUCRS, p. 43-45.

Di Dario, F., 2018. *Tenualosa toli* (errata version published in 2019). The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2018: e.T187944A143832449. doi: 10.2305/IUCN.UK.2018-2.RLTS.T187944A143832449.en.

Dulvy, N.K., Pinnegar, J.K., Reynolds, J.D., 2009. Holocene extinctions in the sea. Chapter 6, in: Turvey, S.T. (Ed.) Holocene Extinctions. Oxford Biology. Oxford University Press, pp. 129 – 150.

FAO, 2016. Fishery and Aquaculture Statistics. Global capture production 1950-2014 (FishStatJ). FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department [online or CD-ROM], Rome. Updated 2016. http://www.fao.org/fishery/.

FAO, 2018. The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2018 – Meeting the sustainable development goals. Rome. License: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

FAO, 2020. The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2020. Sustainability in action. Rome. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO. http://doi.org/10.4060/ca9229en.

Ferrol-Schulte, D., Gorris, P., Baitoningsih, W., Adhuri, D.S., Ferse, S.C.A., 2015. Coastal livelihood vulnerability to marine resource degradation: a review of the Indonesian national coastal and marine policy framework. Marine Policy 52 (2015): 163 – 171.

Freyhof, J., Kottelat, M., 2008a. *Alosa immaculata*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2008. e.T907A13093654. doi: 10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T907A13093654.en.

Freyhof, J., Kottelat, M., 2008b. *Alosa killarnensis*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2008. e.T135582A4152432. doi: 10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T135582A152432.en.

Fricke, R., Eschmeyer, W.N., Van der Laan, R. (eds)., 2020. Catalog of Fishes: genera, species, references. Accessed March 2020. http://researcharchive.calacademy.org/research/ichthyology/catalog/fishcatmain.asp.

Gaichas, S., Gamble, R., Fogarty, M., Benoit, H., Essington, T., Fu, C., Koen-Alonso, M., Link, J., 2012. Assembly rules for aggregate-species production models: simulations in support of management strategy evaluation. Marine Ecology Progress Series 459, 275 – 292. doi: 10.3354/meps09650.

Grande, L., 1985. Recent and fossil clupeomorph fishes with materials for revision of the subgroups of clupeoids. Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History 181 (2), 231 - 372

Hata, H., Motomura, H., 2019a. A new species of sardine, *Sardinella pacifica* from the Philippines (Teleostei, Clupeiformes, Clupeidae). ZooKeys 829: 75 – 83. https://doi.org/10.3897/zookeys.829.30688.

Hata, H., Motomura, H., 2019b. A new species of sardine, *Sardinella electra* (Teleostei: Clupeiformes: Clupedidae), from the Ryukyu Islands, Japan. Zootaxa 4565(2): 274 – 280. https://doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.4565.2.11.

Hata, H., Motomura, H., 2019c. *Sardinella alcyone* n. sp., a new sardine (Teleostei: Clupeiformes: Clupeidae) from the northwestern Pacific Ocean. Zootaxa 4702(1): 019 – 025. https://doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.4702.1.6.

Hay, D.E., Torensen, R., Stephenson, R., Thompson, M., Claytor, R., Funk, F., Ivshina, E., Jakobsson, J., Kobayashi, T., McQuinn, I., Melvin, G., Molloy, J., Naumenko, N., Oda, K.T., Parmanne, R., Power, M., Radchenko, V., Schweigert, J., Simmonds, J., Sjöstrand, B., Stevenson, D.K., Tanasichuk, R., Tang, Q., Watters, D.L., Wheeler, J., 2001. Taking Stock: An Inventory and Review of World Herring Stocks in 2001. Herring: Expectations for a New Millennium. Alaska Sea Grant College Program. AK-SG-01-04.

Harnik, P.G., Lotze, H.K., Anderson, S.C., Finkel, Z.V., Finnegan, S., Lindberg, D.R., Liow, L.H., Lockwood, R., McClain, C.R., McGuire, J.L., O'Dea, A., Pandolfi, J.M., Simpson, C., Tittensor, D. P., 2012. Extinctions in ancient and modern seas. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 27, 608-617. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2012.07.010

Hilborn, R., Amoroso, R.O., Bogazzi, E., Jensen, O.P., Parma, A.M., Szuwalski, C., Walters, C.J., 2017. When does fishing forage species affect their predators? Fisheries Research 191, 211-221. doi: 10.1016/j.fishres.2017.01.008.

Hoffmann, M., Brooks, T.M., da Fonseca, G.A., Gascon, C., Hawkins, A.F.A., James, R.E., Langhammer, P., Mittermeier, R.A., Pilgrim, J.D., Rodrigues, A.S.L., Silva, J.M.C., 2008. Conservation planning and the IUCN Red List. Endangered Species Research 6, 113-125.

Hoffmann, M., Hilton-Taylor, C., Angulo, A., Böhm, M., Brooks, T.M., Butchart, S.H., … Darwall, W.R., 2010. The impact of conservation on the status of the world's vertebrates. Science 330, 1503-1509.

IOC, IHO, BODC, 2003. Centenary Edition of the GEBCO Digital Atlas, published on CD-ROM on behalf of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission and the International Hydrographic Organization as part of the General Bathymetric Chart of the Oceans. British Oceanographic Data Centre, Liverpool.

IUCN, 2001. IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria: Version 3.1. First edition. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.

IUCN, 2012. IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria: Version 3.1. Second edition. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK, pp. 32.

IUCN, 2016. Guideline for Appropriate Uses of IUCN Red List Data. Annex 1. Guidelines for Reporting on Proportion Threatened. Version 1.1. Adopted by the IUCN Red List Committee on October 2016.

https://nc.iucnredlist.org/redlist/content/attachment_files/Guidelines_for_Reporting_Proportion_Threatened_ver1_1.pdf

IUCN-CMP, 2016. Unified Classification of Direct Threats. Version 3.2. https://www.iucnredlist.org/resources/threat-classification-scheme.

IUCN Standards and Petitions Subcommittee, 2016. Guidelines for using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria. Version 12. Prepared by the Standards and Petitions Subcommittee.

Jennings, S., Reynolds, J.D., Mills, S.C., 1998. Life history correlates of responses to fisheries exploitation. Proceedings of the Royal Society B 265, 333–339.

Juan-Jorda, M.J., Mosquiera, I., Freire, J., Dulvy, N.K., 2012. Life history correlates of marine fisheries vulnerability: a review and a test with tunas and mackerel species, in: Briand, F. (Ed.), Marine extinctions – patterns and processes. CIESM Workshop Monograph 45, 113 – 128. CIESM Publisher, Monacao.

Kindsvater, H.K., Mangel, M., Reynolds, J.D., Dulvy, N.K., 2016. Ten principles from evolutionary ecology essential for effective marine conservation. Ecology and Evolution 6, 2125–2138. doi: 10.1002/ece3.2012.

Lalèyè, P., Moelants, T., Olaosebikan, B.D. 2010. *Denticeps clupeoides*. *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species* 2010: e.T182459A7890688. https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2010-3.RLTS.T182459A7890688.en. Downloaded on 08 May 2020.

Lavoué, S., Miya, M., Musikasinthorn, P., Chen, W.-J., Nishida, M., 2013. Mitogenomic evidence for an Indo-West Pacific origin of the Clupeoidei (Teleostei: Clupeiformes). PLoS ONE 8, e56485. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0056485.

Lavoué, S., Konstantinidis, P., Chen, W.-J. 2014. Progress in clupeiform systematics, in: Ganias, K. (Ed.), Biology and ecology of sardines and anchovies. Boca Raton: CRC Press, 3– 42.

Lehner, B., Grill, G., 2013. Global river hydrography and network routing: baseline data and new approaches to study the world’s large river systems. Hydrological Processes 27, 2171 – 2186. doi: 10.1002/hyp.9740. Data is available at www.hydrosheds.org.

Lévêque, C., Oberdorff, T., Paugy, D., Stiassny, M.L.J., Tedesco, P.A., 2008. Global diversity of fish (Pisces) in freshwater. Hydrobiologia 595, 545 – 567. doi: 10.1007/s10750-007-9034-0.

Levin, P.S., Francis, T.B., Taylor, N.G., 2016. Thirty-two essential questions for understanding the social-ecological system of forage fish: the case of Pacific Herring. Ecosystem Health and Sustainability 2, e01213. doi:10.1002/ehs2.1213.

Mace, G.M., Collar, N.J., Gaston, K.J., Hilton-Taylor, C., Akcakaya, H.R., Leader-Williams, N., Milner-Gulland, E.J., Stuart, S.N., 2008. Quantification of Extinction Risk: IUCN's system for classifying threatened species. Conservation Biology 22, 1424-1442. doi: 10.1111/j.1523-1739.2008.01044.x

Malabarba, M. C., Di Dario, F. 2017. A new predatory herring-like fish (Teleostei: Clupeiformes) from the Early Cretaceous of Brazil, and implications for the relationships in the Clupeoidei. Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society 180: 175-194.

Mohanty, B.P., Ganguly, S., Mahanty, A., Mitra, T., Patra, S., Karunakaran, D., Mathew, S., Chakraborty, K., Paul, B.N., Sarma, D., Dayal, S., Singh, S., Ayyappan, S., 2019. Fish in human health and nutrition. Advances in Fish Research 7, 189 – 218.

Mohd Arshaad, W., Gaughan, D., Munroe, T.A., 2018. *Tenualosa macrura* (errata version published in 2019). The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2018: e.T98842673A143840186. doi: 10.2305/IUCN.UK.2018-2.RLTS.T98842673A143840186.en.

NatureServe, 2013. *Alosa aestivalis*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2013: e.T201946A2730890. doi: 10.2305/IUCN.UK.2013-1.RLTS.T201946A2730890.en.

NOAA Fisheries, 2019. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration: Commercial landings. https://foss.nmfs.noaa.gov/apexfoss/f?p=215:200:11056708372560

Pauly, D., Zeller, D., 2016a. Sea Around Us Concepts, Design and Data. Available at: seaaroundus.org.

Pauly, D., Zeller, D., 2016b. Catch reconstructions reveal that global marine fisheries catches are higher than reported and declining. Nature Communications 7, 1 – 9. doi: 10.1038/ncomms10244.

Pikitch, E.K., Rountos, K.J., Essington, T.E., Santora, C., Pauly, D., Watson, R., Sumalia, U.R., Boersma, P.D., Boyd, I.L., Conover, D.O., Cury, P., Heppell, S.S., Houde, E.D., Mangel, M., Plaga´nyi, E., Sainsbury, K., Steneck, R.S., Geers, T.M., Gownaris, N., Munch, S.B., 2014. The global contribution of forage fish to marine fisheries and ecosystems. Fish and Fisheries 15: 43-64. doi: 10.111/faf.12004.

Polidoro, B.A., Carpenter, K.E., Collins, L., Duke, N.C., Ellison, A.M., Ellison, J.C., Farnsworth, E.J., Fernando, E.S., Kathiresan, K., Koedam, N.E., Livingstone, S.R., Miyago, T., Moore, G.E., Ngoc Nam, V., Eong Ong, J., Primavera, J.H., Salmo, S.G., Sanciangco, J.C., Sukardjo, S., Wang, Y., Hong Yong, J.W., 2010. The loss of species: mangrove extinction risk and geographic areas of global concern. Public Library of Science One 5, e10095. doi: 10.131/journal.pone.0010095.

Rola, A.C., Narvaez, T.A., Naguit, M.R.A., Elazegui, D.D., Brilloa, B.B.C., Paunlagui, M.M., Jalotjot, H.C., Cervantes, C.P. 2018 Impact of the closed fishing season policy for sardines in Zamboanga Peninsula, Philippines. Marine Policy. 40 – 50. doi: 10.1016/j.marpol.2017.09.029.

Reynolds, J.D., Dulvy, N.K., Goodwin, N.B., Hutchings, J.A., 2005. Biology of extinction risk in marine fishes. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 272, 2337-2344.

Roberts, C.M., Hawkins, J.P., 1999. Extinction risk in the sea. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 14, 241-246. doi: 10.1016/S0169-5347(98)01584-5.

Rodrigues, A.S.L., Pilgrim, J.D., Lamoreux, J.F., Hoffmann, M., Brooks, T.M., 2006. The value of the IUCN Red List for conservation. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 21, 71-76. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2005.10.010.

Rountos, K., 2016. Defining forage species to prevent a management dilemma. Fisheries 41 (1), 16-17. doi.org/10.1080/03632415.2015.1110791.

Sadovy. Y., 2001. The threat of fishing to highly fecund fishes. Journal of Fish Biology 59, 90 – 108. doi: 10.1006/jfbi.2001.1760.

Sadovy de Mitcheson, Y., Linardich, C., Barreiros, J.P., Ralph, G.M., Aguilar-Perera, A., Afonso, P., . . . Craig, M.T., 2020. Valuable but vulnerable: Over-fishing and under-management continue to threaten groupers so what now? Marine Policy 116, 1 – 10. doi: 10.1016/j.marpol.2020.103909.

Sanciangco, J.C., Carpenter, K.E., Etnoyer, P.J., Moretzsohn, F., 2013. Habitat availability and heterogeneity and the Indo-Pacific warm pool as predictors of marine species richness in the tropical Indo-Pacific. PLoS ONE 8(2): e56245. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0056245.

Santos, M., Munroe, T.A., Di Dario, F., Hata, H., Torres, F., Quilang, J.P., 2018. *Sardinella tawilis* (errata version published in 2019). The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2018: e.T98836352A143839946. doi: 10.2305/IUCN.UK.20182.RLTS.T98836352A143839946.en.

Schipper, J., Chanson, J.S., Chiozza, F., Cox, N.A., Hoffmann, M., Katariya, V., . . . Young, B.E., 2008. The status of the world's land and marine mammals: Diversity, threat, and knowledge. Science 322, 225-230. doi: 10.1126/science.1165115.

Short, F.T., Polidoro, B., Linvingstone, S.R., Carpenter, K.E., Bandeira, S., Bujang, J.S., Calumpong, H.P., Carruthers, T.J.B., Coles, R.G., Dennison, W.C., Erftemeijer, P.L.A., Fortes, M.D., Freeman, A.S., Jagtap, T.G., Kamal, A.H.M., Kendrick, G.A., Kensworthy, W.J., La Nafie, Y.A., Nasution, I.M., Orth, R.J., Prathep, A., Sanciangco, J.C., van Tussenbroek, B., Vergara, S.G., Waycott, M., Zieman, J.C., 2011. Extinction risk assessment of the world's seagrass species. Biological Conservation 144, 1961 – 1971.

Siebert, D. J., 1997. Notes on the anatomy and relationships of *Sundasalanx* Roberts (Teleostei, Clupeidae), with descriptions of four new species from Borneo. Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History London (Zool.) 63(1), 13-26.

Smith, A.D.M., Brown, C.J., Bulman, C.M., Fulton, E.A., Johnson, P., Kaplan, I.C., Lozano-Montes, H., Mackinson, S., Marzloff, M., Shannon, L.J., Sjin, Y.-J., Tam, J., 2011. impacts of fishing low-trophic level species on marine ecosystems. Science 333, 1147 – 1150. doi: 10.1126/science.1209395.

Spalding, M.D., Fox, H.E., Allen, G.R., Davidson, N., Ferdaña, Z.A., Finlayson, M., . . . Robertson, J., 2007. Marine ecoregions of the world: A bioregionalization of coastal and shelf areas. BioScience 57, 573-583. doi: 10.1641/b570707.

Stobutzki, I., Miller, M., Brewer, D., 2001. Sustainability of fishery bycatch: a process for assessing highly diverse and numerous bycatch. Environmental Conservation 28, 167 – 181. doi: 10.1017/S0376892901000170.

Tacon, A.G.J., Metian, M., 2009a. Fishing for feed of fishing for food: increasing global competition for small pelagic forage fish. AMBIO: A Journal of the Human Environment 38, 294-302.

Teugels, G. 2003. Denticipitidae, in: D. Paugy; C. Lévêque & Teugels, G.G. (Eds.), Poissons d'eaux douces et saumâtres de l'Afrique de l'Ouest. Tome I. Collection Faune et Flore tropicales 40. Institut de Recherche pour le Développement, and Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris, France; Musée Royal de l'Afrique Centrale, Tervuren, Belgique. Paris.

Thomas Jr., R.C., Willette, D.A., Carpenter, K.E., Santos, M.D., 2014. Hidden diversity in sardines: genetic and morphological evidence for cryptic species in the Goldstripe Sardinella, *Sardinella gibbosa*, (Bleeker, 1849). PLoS ONE 9(1): e84719. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0084719

Thornton, T.F., Moss, M.L., Butler, V.L., Hebert, J., Funk, F., 2010. Local and traditional knowledge and the historical ecology of Pacific herring in Alaska. Journal of Ecological Anthropology 14, 81 – 88.

United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, 2017. World population prospects: The 2017 Revision, World Population 2017 Wallchart. AT/ESA/SER.A/398.

Vié, J.-C., Hilton-Taylor, C., Stuart, S.N., 2009. Wildlife in a Changing World - An analysis of the 2008 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

Whitehead, P.J.P., 1985. FAO species catalogue. Vol. 7. Clupeoid fishes of the world (suborder Clupeioidei). An annotated and illustrated catalogue of the herrings, sardines, pilchards, sprats, shads, anchovies and wolf-herrings. Part 1 - Chirocentridae, Clupeidae and Pristigasteridae. Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) Fisheries Synopsis, Rome, Italy.

Whitehead, P.J.P., Nelson, G.J., Wongratana, T., 1988. FAO species catalogue. Vol. 7. Clupeoid fishes of the world (Suborder Clupeoidei). An annotated and illustrated catalogue of the herrings, sardines, pilchards, sprats, shads, anchovies and wolf-herrings. Part 2 - Engraulididae. Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) Fisheries Synopsis, Rome, Italy.

FIGURES

Figure 1 color and grayscale versions should be 1.5 columns (color version **only** for online version).



Fig. 1. Proportion of species listed in Red List Categories partitioned by family. Abbreviations of Red List Categories are as follows: EC = elevated concern (includes species evaluated as Critically Endangered, Endangered, Vulnerable, or Near Threatened), LC = Least Concern and DD = Data Deficient. The total number of species in each family is represented by the number at the top of each bar. The midpoint is represented by the black bar and was calculated by the following equation: (CR + EN + VU + NT)/ (Total – DD).



Fig. 1. Proportion of species listed in Red List Categories partitioned by family. Abbreviations of Red List Categories are as follows: EC = elevated concern (includes species evaluated as Critically Endangered, Endangered, Vulnerable, or Near Threatened), LC = Least Concern and DD = Data Deficient. The total number of species in each family is represented by the number at the top of each bar. The midpoint is represented by the black bar and was calculated by the following equation: (CR + EN + VU + NT)/ (Total – DD).

Figure 2 color and grayscale versions should be one column (color version **only** for online version).



Fig. 2. Proportion of species listed in Red List Categories by major habitat system (freshwater, euryhaline, or marine). Abbreviations of Red List Categories are as follows: EC = elevated concern (includes species evaluated as Critically Endangered, Endangered, Vulnerable, or Near Threatened), LC = Least Concern and DD = Data Deficient. The total number of species in each family is represented by the number at the top of each bar. The midpoint is represented by the black bar and was calculated by the following equation: (CR + EN + VU + NT)/ (Total – DD).



Fig. 2. Proportion of species listed in Red List Categories by major habitat system (freshwater, euryhaline, or marine). Abbreviations of Red List Categories are as follows: EC = elevated concern (includes species evaluated as Critically Endangered, Endangered, Vulnerable, or Near Threatened), LC = Least Concern and DD = Data Deficient. The total number of species in each family is represented by the number at the top of each bar. The midpoint is represented by the black bar and was calculated by the following equation: (CR + EN + VU + NT)/ (Total – DD).

Figure 3 color and grayscale versions should be 1.5 columns (color version **only** for online version).



Fig. 3. Number of clupeiform species impacted by major threats. Each threat is represented by the number of species impacted separated by major habitat system (freshwater, euryhaline, or marine). Threats impacting less than ten species (Mining, Development, Human intrusion, and Transportation) are excluded.



Fig. 3. Number of clupeiform species impacted by major threats. Each threat is represented by the number of species impacted separated by major habitat system (freshwater, euryhaline, or marine). Threats impacting less than ten species (Mining, Development, Human intrusion, and Transportation) are excluded.

Figure 4 color and grayscale should be two columns (color version **only** for online version).



Fig. 4. Number of clupeiform species in each Large Marine Ecoregion and freshwater hydrobasin for A) All species, B) all Data Deficient species, and C) all species of elevated concern (Critically Endangered, Endangered, Vulnerable, Near Threatened). Colors correspond to numbers of species listed at the bottom of each map. The Marine Ecosystems of the World at the province level (Spalding et al., 2007) was used for marine species, Global HydroBASINS at level three (Lehner and Grill, 2013) was used for freshwater species. The freshwater and marine extents were created separately and merged to represent the total global extent for euryhaline species.



Fig. 5. Number of clupeiform species in each Large Marine Ecoregion and freshwater hydrobasin for A) All species, B) all Data Deficient species, and C) all species of elevated concern (Critically Endangered, Endangered, Vulnerable, Near Threatened). Colors correspond to numbers of species listed at the bottom of each map. The Marine Ecosystems of the World at the province level (Spalding et al., 2007) was used for marine species, Global HydroBASINS at level three (Lehner and Grill, 2013) was used for freshwater species. The freshwater and marine extents were created separately and merged to represent the total global extent for euryhaline species.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Table A1. List of all 415 clupeiform species alphabetical by family and then by species name. The global IUCN Red List categories and criteria are listed: CR = Critically Endangered, EN = Endangered, VU = Vulnerable, NT = Near Threatened, LC = Least Concern, DD = Data Deficient, NE = Not Evaluated. Criterion A = population decline in the past, present or future, B = restricted range, C = small population size and decline, D = very small or restricted population, E = quantitative analysis of extinction probability. For further information available on categories and criteria, visit the IUCN Red List website (www.iucnredlist.org). The preferred habitat system is also listed; F = Freshwater, M = Marine, E = Euryhaline which includes estuarine species and diadromous species.

FAMILY	SPECIES NAME	GLOBAL CATEGORY & CRITERIA	SYSTEM
Chirocentridae	*Chirocentrus dorab*	LC	M
Chirocentridae	*Chirocentrus nudus*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Alosa aestivalis*	VU A2b	E
Clupeidae	*Alosa agone*	LC	F
Clupeidae	*Alosa alabamae*	NT A2ac	E
Clupeidae	*Alosa algeriensis*	DD	E
Clupeidae	*Alosa alosa*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Alosa braschnikowi*	DD	E
Clupeidae	*Alosa caspia*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Alosa chrysochloris*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Alosa curensis*	DD	E
Clupeidae	*Alosa fallax*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Alosa immaculata*	VU B2ab(v)	E
Clupeidae	*Alosa kessleri*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Alosa killarnensis*	CR B1ab(iii)	F
Clupeidae	*Alosa macedonica*	VU D2	F
Clupeidae	*Alosa maeotica*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Alosa mediocris*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Alosa pontica*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Alosa pseudoharengus*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Alosa sapidissima*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Alosa saposchnikowii*	DD	E
Clupeidae	*Alosa sphaerocephala*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Alosa suworowi*	DD	E
Clupeidae	*Alosa tanaica*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Alosa vistonica*	CR A2ace; B1ab(iii,v)	F
Clupeidae	*Alosa volgensis*	EN B2ab(iii,v)	E
Clupeidae	*Amblygaster clupeoides*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Amblygaster indiana*	DD	M

FAMILY	SPECIES NAME	GLOBAL CATEGORY & CRITERIA	SYSTEM
Clupeidae	*Amblygaster leiogaster*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Amblygaster sirm*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Anodontostoma chacunda*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Anodontostoma selangkat*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Anodontostoma thailandiae*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Brevoortia aurea*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Brevoortia gunteri*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Brevoortia patronus*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Brevoortia pectinata*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Brevoortia smithi*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Brevoortia tyrannus*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Clupanodon thrissa*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Clupea harengus*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Clupea pallasii*	DD	M
Clupeidae	*Clupeichthys aesarnensis*	LC	F
Clupeidae	*Clupeichthys bleekeri*	VU B1ab(iii)	F
Clupeidae	*Clupeichthys goniognathus*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Clupeichthys perakensis*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Clupeoides borneensis*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Clupeoides hypselosoma*	DD	F
Clupeidae	*Clupeoides papuensis*	DD	F
Clupeidae	*Clupeoides venulosus*	VU B2ab(iii,v)	F
Clupeidae	*Clupeonella abrau*	CR B1ab(ii,iii,v)+2ab(ii,iii,v)	F
Clupeidae	*Clupeonella caspia*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Clupeonella cultriventris*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Clupeonella engrauliformis*	EN A2bde	M
Clupeidae	*Clupeonella grimmi*	EN A2bde	M
Clupeidae	*Clupeonella muhlisi*	EN B1ab(iii)+2ab(iii)	F
Clupeidae	*Clupeonella tscharchalensis*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Congothrissa gossei*	DD	F
Clupeidae	*Corica laciniata*	DD	F
Clupeidae	*Corica soborna*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Dayella malabarica*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Dorosoma anale*	LC	F
Clupeidae	*Dorosoma cepedianum*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Dorosoma chavesi*	NT B1ab(iii)	F
Clupeidae	*Dorosoma petenense*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Dorosoma smithi*	DD	F
Clupeidae	*Ehirava fluviatilis*	DD	E
Clupeidae	*Escualosa elongata*	DD	M

FAMILY	SPECIES NAME	GLOBAL CATEGORY & CRITERIA	SYSTEM
Clupeidae	*Escualosa thoracata*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Ethmalosa fimbriata*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Ethmidium maculatum*	DD	M
Clupeidae	*Gilchristella aestuaria*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Gonialosa manmina*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Gonialosa modesta*	DD	E
Clupeidae	*Gonialosa whiteheadi*	DD	E
Clupeidae	*Gudusia chapra*	LC	F
Clupeidae	*Gudusia variegata*	LC	F
Clupeidae	*Harengula clupeola*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Harengula humeralis*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Harengula jaguana*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Harengula thrissina*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Herklotsichthys blackburni*	DD	E
Clupeidae	*Herklotsichthys castelnaui*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Herklotsichthys collettei*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Herklotsichthys dispilonotus*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Herklotsichthys gotoi*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Herklotsichthys koningsbergeri*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Herklotsichthys lippa*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Herklotsichthys lossei*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Herklotsichthys ovalis*	DD	M
Clupeidae	*Herklotsichthys punctatus*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Herklotsichthys quadrimaculatus*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Herklotsichthys spilurus*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Hilsa kelee*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Hyperlophus translucidus*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Hyperlophus vittatus*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Konosirus punctatus*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Laeviscutella dekimpei*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Lile gracilis*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Lile nigrofasciata*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Lile piquitinga*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Lile stolifera*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Limnothrissa miodon*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Limnothrissa stappersii*	DD	F
Clupeidae	*Microthrissa minuta*	VU D2	F
Clupeidae	*Microthrissa royauxi*	LC	F
Clupeidae	*Microthrissa whiteheadi*	LC	F
Clupeidae	*Minyclupeoides dentibranchialus*	LC	E

FAMILY	SPECIES NAME	GLOBAL CATEGORY & CRITERIA	SYSTEM
Clupeidae	*Nannothrissa parva*	LC	F
Clupeidae	*Nannothrissa stewarti*	EN B1ab(v)	F
Clupeidae	*Nematalosa arabica*	DD	M
Clupeidae	*Nematalosa come*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Nematalosa erebi*	LC	F
Clupeidae	*Nematalosa flyensis*	DD	F
Clupeidae	*Nematalosa galatheae*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Nematalosa japonica*	DD	M
Clupeidae	*Nematalosa nasus*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Nematalosa papuensis*	DD	F
Clupeidae	*Nematalosa persara*	DD	M
Clupeidae	*Nematalosa resticularia*	DD	M
Clupeidae	*Nematalosa vlaminghi*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Odaxothrissa ansorgii*	LC	F
Clupeidae	*Odaxothrissa losera*	DD	F
Clupeidae	*Odaxothrissa mento*	LC	F
Clupeidae	*Odaxothrissa vittata*	LC	F
Clupeidae	*Opisthonema berlangai*	VU D2	M
Clupeidae	*Opisthonema bulleri*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Opisthonema libertate*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Opisthonema medirastre*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Opisthonema oglinum*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Pellonula leonensis*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Pellonula vorax*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Platanichthys platana*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Poecilothrissa centralis*	LC	F
Clupeidae	*Poecilothrissa congica*	LC	F
Clupeidae	*Poecilothrissa moeruensis*	VU B1ab(v)	F
Clupeidae	*Potamalosa richmondia*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Potamothrissa acutirostris*	LC	F
Clupeidae	*Potamothrissa obtusirostris*	LC	F
Clupeidae	*Potamothrissa whiteheadi*	DD	F
Clupeidae	*Ramnogaster arcuata*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Ramnogaster melanostoma*	LC	F
Clupeidae	*Rhinosardinia amazonica*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Rhinosardinia bahiensis*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Sardina pilchardus*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Sardinella albella*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Sardinella alcyone*	DD	E
Clupeidae	*Sardinella atricauda*	LC	M

FAMILY	SPECIES NAME	GLOBAL CATEGORY & CRITERIA	SYSTEM
Clupeidae	*Sardinella aurita*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Sardinella brachysoma*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Sardinella brasiliensis*	DD	E
Clupeidae	*Sardinella dayi*	DD	M
Clupeidae	*Sardinella electra*	DD	M
Clupeidae	*Sardinella fijiense*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Sardinella fimbriata*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Sardinella gibbosa*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Sardinella goni*	DD	M
Clupeidae	*Sardinella hualiensis*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Sardinella jussieui*	DD	M
Clupeidae	*Sardinella lemuru*	NT A2bd	M
Clupeidae	*Sardinella longiceps*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Sardinella maderensis*	VU A2d	M
Clupeidae	*Sardinella marquesensis*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Sardinella melanura*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Sardinella neglecta*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Sardinella pacifica*	DD	M
Clupeidae	*Sardinella richardsoni*	DD	M
Clupeidae	*Sardinella rouxi*	DD	M
Clupeidae	*Sardinella sindensis*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Sardinella tawilis*	EN A2bd; B1ab(iii,v)+2ab(iii,v)	F
Clupeidae	*Sardinella zunasi*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Sardinops sagax*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Sauvagella madagascariensis*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Sauvagella robusta*	EN B2ab(iii)	F
Clupeidae	*Sierrathrissa leonensis*	LC	F
Clupeidae	*Spratellomorpha bianalis*	DD	E
Clupeidae	*Sprattus antipodum*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Sprattus fuegensis*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Sprattus muelleri*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Sprattus novaehollandiae*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Sprattus sprattus*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Stolothrissa tanganicae*	LC	F
Clupeidae	*Strangomera bentincki*	LC	M
Clupeidae	*Tenualosa ilisha*	LC	E
Clupeidae	*Tenualosa macrura*	NT B2ab(iii)	E
Clupeidae	*Tenualosa reevesii*	DD	E
Clupeidae	*Tenualosa thibaudeaui*	VU A2bcd	F

FAMILY	SPECIES NAME	GLOBAL CATEGORY & CRITERIA	SYSTEM
Clupeidae	*Tenualosa toli*	VU B2ab(iii,v)	E
Clupeidae	*Thrattidion noctivagus*	DD	F
Denticipitidae	*Denticeps clupeoides*	VU B2ab(iii)	F
Dussumieriidae	*Dussumieria acuta*	LC	M
Dussumieriidae	*Dussumieria elopsoides*	LC	M
Dussumieriidae	*Etrumeus acuminatus*	LC	M
Dussumieriidae	*Etrumeus golanii*	DD	M
Dussumieriidae	*Etrumeus jacksoniensis*	LC	M
Dussumieriidae	*Etrumeus makiawa*	LC	M
Dussumieriidae	*Etrumeus micropus*	LC	M
Dussumieriidae	*Etrumeus sadina*	LC	M
Dussumieriidae	*Etrumeus whiteheadi*	LC	M
Dussumieriidae	*Etrumeus wongratanai*	DD	M
Dussumieriidae	*Jenkinsia lamprotaenia*	LC	M
Dussumieriidae	*Jenkinsia majua*	LC	M
Dussumieriidae	*Jenkinsia parvula*	DD	M
Dussumieriidae	*Jenkinsia stolifera*	LC	M
Dussumieriidae	*Spratelloides atrofasciatus*	LC	M
Dussumieriidae	*Spratelloides delicatulus*	LC	M
Dussumieriidae	*Spratelloides gracilis*	LC	M
Dussumieriidae	*Spratelloides lewisi*	LC	M
Dussumieriidae	*Spratelloides robustus*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Amazonsprattus scintilla*	LC	F
Engraulidae	*Anchoa analis*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoa argentivittata*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Anchoa belizensis*	LC	F
Engraulidae	*Anchoa cayorum*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Anchoa chamensis*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Anchoa choerostoma*	EN B1ab(v)+2ab(v)	M
Engraulidae	*Anchoa colonensis*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Anchoa compressa*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoa cubana*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoa curta*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoa delicatissima*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoa eigenmannia*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Anchoa exigua*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Anchoa filifera*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoa helleri*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Anchoa hepsetus*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoa ischana*	LC	M

FAMILY	SPECIES NAME	GLOBAL CATEGORY & CRITERIA	SYSTEM
Engraulidae	*Anchoa januaria*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoa lamprotaenia*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Anchoa lucida*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoa lyolepis*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Anchoa marinii*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoa mitchilli*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoa mundeola*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoa mundeoloides*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoa nasus*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Anchoa panamensis*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoa parva*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoa pectoralis*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoa scofieldi*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoa spinifer*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoa starksi*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoa tricolor*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoa trinitatis*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Anchoa walkeri*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchovia clupeoides*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchovia landivarensis*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Anchovia macrolepidota*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchovia surinamensis*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoviella alleni*	LC	F
Engraulidae	*Anchoviella balboae*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Anchoviella blackburni*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoviella brevirostris*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoviella carrikeri*	LC	F
Engraulidae	*Anchoviella cayennensis*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoviella elongata*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoviella guianensis*	LC	F
Engraulidae	*Anchoviella hernanni*	LC	F
Engraulidae	*Anchoviella jamesi*	LC	F
Engraulidae	*Anchoviella juruasanga*	LC	F
Engraulidae	*Anchoviella lepidentostole*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoviella manamensis*	LC	F
Engraulidae	*Anchoviella miarcha*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoviella perezi*	DD	F
Engraulidae	*Anchoviella perfasciata*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Anchoviella sanfranciscana*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Anchoviella vaillanti*	LC	F

FAMILY	SPECIES NAME	GLOBAL CATEGORY & CRITERIA	SYSTEM
Engraulidae	*Cetengraulis edentulus*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Cetengraulis mysticetus*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Coilia borneensis*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Coilia coomansi*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Coilia dussumieri*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Coilia grayii*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Coilia lindmani*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Coilia macrognathos*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Coilia mystus*	EN A2bd	E
Engraulidae	*Coilia nasus*	EN A2bd	E
Engraulidae	*Coilia neglecta*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Coilia ramcarati*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Coilia rebentischii*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Coilia reynaldi*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Encrasicholina auster*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Encrasicholina gloria*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Encrasicholina heteroloba*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Encrasicholina intermedia*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Encrasicholina macrocephala*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Encrasicholina oligobranchus*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Encrasicholina pseudoheteroloba*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Encrasicholina punctifer*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Encrasicholina purpurea*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Engraulis albidus*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Engraulis anchoita*	NT A2bd	M
Engraulidae	*Engraulis australis*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Engraulis capensis*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Engraulis encrasicolus*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Engraulis eurystole*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Engraulis japonicus*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Engraulis mordax*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Engraulis ringens*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Jurengraulis juruensis*	LC	F
Engraulidae	*Lycengraulis batesii*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Lycengraulis figueiredoi*	LC	F
Engraulidae	*Lycengraulis grossidens*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Lycengraulis limnichthys*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Lycengraulis poeyi*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Lycothrissa crocodilus*	LC	F
Engraulidae	*Papuengraulis micropinna*	DD	E

FAMILY	SPECIES NAME	GLOBAL CATEGORY & CRITERIA	SYSTEM
Engraulidae	*Pseudosetipinna haizhouensis*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Pterengraulis atherinoides*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Setipinna breviceps*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Setipinna brevifilis*	DD	F
Engraulidae	*Setipinna melanochir*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Setipinna paxtoni*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Setipinna phasa*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Setipinna taty*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Setipinna tenuifilis*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Setipinna wheeleri*	DD	F
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus advenus*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus andhraensis*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus apiensis*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus babarani*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus baganensis*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus bataviensis*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus baweanensis*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus bengalensis*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus brachycephalus*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus carpentariae*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus chinensis*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus commersonnii*	LC	M
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus continentalis*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus dubiosus*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus holodon*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus indicus*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus insignus*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus multibranchus*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus nelsoni*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus oceanicus*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus pacificus*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus ronquilloi*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus shantungensis*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus tamilensis*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus teguhi*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus tri*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Stolephorus waitei*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Thryssa adelae*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Thryssa aestuaria*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Thryssa baelama*	LC	E

FAMILY	SPECIES NAME	GLOBAL CATEGORY & CRITERIA	SYSTEM
Engraulidae	*Thryssa brevicauda*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Thryssa chefuensis*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Thryssa cultella*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Thryssa dayi*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Thryssa dussumieri*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Thryssa encrasicholoides*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Thryssa gautamiensis*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Thryssa hamiltonii*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Thryssa kammalensis*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Thryssa kammalensoides*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Thryssa malabarica*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Thryssa marasriae*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Thryssa mystax*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Thryssa polybranchialis*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Thryssa purava*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Thryssa rastrosa*	EN B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)+2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	F
Engraulidae	*Thryssa scratchleyi*	DD	E
Engraulidae	*Thryssa serena*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Thryssa setirostris*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Thryssa spinidens*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Thryssa stenosoma*	DD	M
Engraulidae	*Thryssa vitrirostris*	LC	E
Engraulidae	*Thryssa whiteheadi*	LC	M
Pristigasteridae	*Chirocentrodon bleekerianus*	LC	E
Pristigasteridae	*Ilisha africana*	LC	E
Pristigasteridae	*Ilisha amazonica*	LC	F
Pristigasteridae	*Ilisha compressa*	LC	M
Pristigasteridae	*Ilisha elongata*	LC	E
Pristigasteridae	*Ilisha filigera*	DD	E
Pristigasteridae	*Ilisha fuerthii*	LC	E
Pristigasteridae	*Ilisha kampeni*	LC	E
Pristigasteridae	*Ilisha lunula*	DD	E
Pristigasteridae	*Ilisha macrogaster*	DD	E
Pristigasteridae	*Ilisha megaloptera*	LC	E
Pristigasteridae	*Ilisha melastoma*	LC	E
Pristigasteridae	*Ilisha novacula*	LC	F
Pristigasteridae	*Ilisha obfuscata*	DD	M
Pristigasteridae	*Ilisha pristigastroides*	DD	E
Pristigasteridae	*Ilisha sirishai*	DD	M

FAMILY	SPECIES NAME	GLOBAL CATEGORY & CRITERIA	SYSTEM
Pristigasteridae	*Ilisha striatula*	DD	E
Pristigasteridae	*Neoopisthopterus cubanus*	VU B2ab(i,ii,iii)	E
Pristigasteridae	*Neoopisthopterus tropicus*	LC	E
Pristigasteridae	*Odontognathus compressus*	LC	E
Pristigasteridae	*Odontognathus mucronatus*	LC	E
Pristigasteridae	*Odontognathus panamensis*	LC	E
Pristigasteridae	*Opisthopterus dovii*	LC	E
Pristigasteridae	*Opisthopterus effulgens*	DD	E
Pristigasteridae	*Opisthopterus equatorialis*	LC	M
Pristigasteridae	*Opisthopterus macrops*	LC	M
Pristigasteridae	*Opisthopterus tardoore*	LC	E
Pristigasteridae	*Opisthopterus valenciennesi*	DD	E
Pristigasteridae	*Pellona castelnaeana*	LC	E
Pristigasteridae	*Pellona dayi*	DD	M
Pristigasteridae	*Pellona ditchela*	LC	E
Pristigasteridae	*Pellona flavipinnis*	LC	F
Pristigasteridae	*Pellona harroweri*	LC	E
Pristigasteridae	*Pliosteostoma lutipinnis*	LC	E
Pristigasteridae	*Pristigaster cayana*	LC	F
Pristigasteridae	*Pristigaster whiteheadi*	LC	F
Pristigasteridae	*Raconda russeliana*	LC	E
Sundasalangidae	*Sundasalanx malletti*	DD	F
Sundasalangidae	*Sundasalanx megalops*	DD	F
Sundasalangidae	*Sundasalanx mekongensis*	LC	F
Sundasalangidae	*Sundasalanx mesops*	DD	F
Sundasalangidae	*Sundasalanx microps*	DD	F
Sundasalangidae	*Sundasalanx platyrhynchus*	DD	F
Sundasalangidae	*Sundasalanx praecox*	LC	F

832