## Stock Annex: WGNSSK - Norway pout

Stock-specific documentation of standard assessment procedures used by ICES.

| Stock | Norway pout in the North Sea and Skagerrak (ICES <br> area 4 and 3.a); nop-27.3a4_SA |
| :--- | :--- |
| Working Group | WG on the Assessment of Demersal Stocks in the <br> North Sea and Skagerrak |
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## A. General

## A.1. Stock definition

Norway pout is a small, short-lived gadoid species, which rarely grows older than five years (Nielsen et al., 2012; Lambert, Nielsen et al., 2009). It is distributed from the west of Ireland to Kattegat, at the Faroe Islands, and from the North Sea to the Barents Sea. The distribution for this stock is in the northern North Sea $\left(>57^{\circ} \mathrm{N}\right)$ and in Skagerrak at depths between 50 and 250 m (Raitt, 1968; Sparholt, Larsen and Nielsen, 2002b; Lambert, Nielsen et al., 2009).

The stock distribution and density patterns as well as maturity, spawning, spawning distribution and migration relevant to the stock distribution and delineation are described in detail in Nielsen (2016; Annex 1). In general, highest densities of Norway pout of all age groups are found in the northern North Sea. Densities by year vary according to strong cohorts in the stock. The strong cohorts observed in the period are the 1986, 1989, 1991, 1994, 1996, 1999, 2008, 2009, 2012, and 2014 year classes. There seems to be a tendency towards the young fish density has decreased in the later period compared to the previous period before and after year 2000 (see Section 1, Figures $1 \& 2$ of Annex 1).

At present, there is no evidence of separating the North Sea component into smaller stock units (Lambert et al., 2009; Nash et al., 2012). ICES Advisory Committee for Fisheries Management (ACFM) asked in October 2001 the ICES Working Group on the Assessment of Demersal Stocks in the North Sea and Skagerrak (ICES, WGNSSK) to verify the justification of treating ICES Division 6.a as a management area for Norway pout (and sandeel) separately from ICES areas 4 and 3.a. Preliminary results from an analysis of regionalized survey data on Norway pout maturity, presented in a Working Document to the 2000 meeting of the ICES WGNSSK Working Group (Larsen, Lassen, Nielsen and Sparholt, 2001 in ICES C.M.2001/ACFM:07), gave no evidence of a stock separation in the whole northern area. This conclusion is supported by the results from maturity and spawning analyses presented in Lambert, Nielsen et al. (2009) and Nash et al. (2012) as well as Huse et al. (2008). Here it was found that spawning in the North Sea takes place mainly in the northern part in the area between Shetland and Norway in coastal waters along the 120 m isocline (Lambert et al., 2009). The results from Nash et al. (2012) also suggest one main spawning area and accordingly only occurrence of one stock component in the whole northern area on the shelf area.

Norway pout in the eastern Skagerrak is only to a very small degree a self-contained stock and adults migrate out of the Skagerrak and the Kattegat to spawn, because there is no evidence of spawning there (Poulsen, 1968). The main bulk drifts as larvae
southeastwards from more western areas to which they return mainly during the latter part of their second year of life before becoming mature (Poulsen, 1968; Lambert et al., 2009; Nash et al., 2012). Otherwise there is no indication of adult migration. The species is not generally considered to have specific nursery grounds, but pelagic 0 -group fish remain widely dispersed in the northern North Sea close to spawning grounds (Lambert et al., 2009).

Also, the conclusion on one stock component is supported by the depth distribution limits of the species (Poulsen, 1968; Albert, 1994; Sparholt et al., 2002b; Lambert et al. 2009; Nielsen et al., 2012), i.e. there is no indication that the species migrate outside the shelf areas into deeper waters than 200 m depth. For the Norwegian Trench Albert (1994) found Norway pout deeper than 200 m , but very few deeper than 300 m . Few Norway pout are caught at depths greater than 200 m in the North Sea and Skagerrak on shrimp trawl survey (Sparholt et al., 2002b; Johnsen and Søvik, 2016, WD5). Based on IBTS data, the main aggregations of settled fish are distributed around the 150 m contour, with a slight preference for deeper water for the older fish (Sparholt et al., 2002b).

Details on stock delineation according to stock distribution and density patterns as well as maturity, spawning, spawning distribution and migration can be found in Nielsen (2016; Annex 1 Sections 2-4).

## A.2. Fishery

The Norway pout fishery is a mixed commercial, small-meshed fishery. Norway pout is caught in small-meshed trawls ( $16-31 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) in a mixed fishery among other with blue whiting, i.e. in addition to the directed Norway pout fishery by Denmark and Norway, the species is also taken as bycatch in the Norwegian blue whiting fishery. Norway pout is landed for reduction purposes (fishmeal and fishoil).

During the 1960s a significant small-mesh fishery developed for Norway pout in the northern North Sea. The fishery is nearly exclusively carried out by Danish and Norwegian (large) vessels using small-mesh trawls in the northwestern North Sea especially at the Fladen Ground and along the edge of the Norwegian Trench in the northeastern part of the North Sea (Nielsen et al., 2016, Annex 2 Tables 1-2; Figures 12 DK fishery; Figure $3 \mathrm{DK}+\mathrm{N}$ fishery). Main fishing seasons are 3rd and 4th quarters of the year with also some catches in 1st quarter of the year especially previous to 2002 (Nielsen et al., 2016, Annex 2, Tables 3-4). The quarterly spatial distribution of the Norway pout catches for the Danish small-mesh fishery for reduction purposes is shown in Nielsen et al. (2016, Annex 2) Figure 4 during a twenty year period from 1987-2015, and in Figure 5 as a quarterly average during a ten year period from 19942003 for the combined Danish and Norwegian fishery. An overview of quarterly landings for the period 1989-2014 is given for the Danish small-meshed fishery for reduction purposes in Figure 6, and for the combined Danish and Norwegian smallmeshed fisheries in Figure 7.

The fishery in more recent times is mainly carried out by Denmark and Norway at fishing grounds in the northern North Sea especially at Fladen Ground and along the edge of the Norwegian Trench. The share of the catches between Denmark and Norway varies over time, sometimes Denmark have the major yearly catches, sometimes Norway, without any trends over time. The long-term average show rather equal catches between the two countries. There is a tendency towards the more recent Danish landings mainly originates from the Fladen Ground area compared to the Norwegian Trench area.

The total international landings have been lower (well below 100 kt per year) since 2001 compared to previous landings well above 100 kt per year (Nielsen et al., 2016, Annex 2, Tables 1-4). The landings in 2010 and 2013 were above and close to 100 kt , respectively, because of the strong 2009 and 2012 year classes. Landings in 2015 were also high because of the very strong 2014 year class. The 2003-2004 landings were the lowest on record, and also effort in 2003 and 2004 were historically low and well below the average of the five previous years. The targeted Norway pout fishery was closed in 2005, in the first half year of 2006, all of 2007, and during the first half year 2011 and 2012. In the periods of closures there have in some years been set bycatch quotas for Norway pout in the Norwegian mixed blue whiting fishery, as well as in a small experimental fishery in 2007. The fishery was open for the second half year of 2006 and in all of 2008 to 2010 based on the strong 2007-2009 year classes being around or above the long-term average level. However, the Norwegian part of the Norway pout fishery was only open from May to August in 2008 during that year. In the open periods of 2008, 2009, and 2011 the fishing effort and catches have been low, but have been at higher level in 2010, 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015. The fishery has in these periods mainly been based on the 2008, 2009, 2012 and 2014 year classes being around or above the long-term average level.

The Danish Norway pout fishery in the North Sea and Skagerrak is described in detail in Nielsen et al. (2016, Annex 2). This includes details on the targeted fishery, its distribution and sampling from it. It also provides details on bycatches, gear selectivity, and discards as well as fishery efficiency according to vessel categories and catch and effort data used in the assessment. Finally it provides details on relevant fishery regulations for the Norway pout fishery and quota uptake in the Norway pout fishery. The Norwegian Norway pout fishery is described in Johnsen et al. (2016, Annex 3) with information on distribution of the fishery, catch composition and vessel categories involved in the fishery, as well as relevant fishery regulations.

With present fishing mortality levels the status of the stock is more determined by natural processes and less by the fishery. The Norway pout fishery is regulated by technical measures such as minimum mesh size in the trawls, fishing area closures such as the Norway pout box in the northwestern part of the North Sea and certain bank areas in Norwegian waters, and bycatch regulations to protect other species. An overview of relevant technical regulations for the Norway pout fishery and stock as well as mixed fisheries issues including by catch and discard in the fishery is given in Nielsen et al. (2016, Annex 2) and in Johnsen et al. (2016, Annex 3).

In Nielsen et al. (2016; Annex 2, Sections A4 and A5) there is given a detailed description and evaluation of bycatches in the Norway pout fishery and the gear selectivity herein as well as the discard of Norway pout in fisheries for consume purposes. This includes description of mixed fisheries issues in relation to the Norway pout fishery.

## Bycatches in the Norway pout fishery and gear selectivity: fisheries impacts on the ecosystem

During the 1960s a significant small-mesh fishery developed for Norway pout and blue whiting in the northern North Sea. This fishery was characterized by relatively large bycatches, especially of haddock and whiting.

Bycatch of herring, saithe, cod, haddock, whiting, and monkfish at various levels in the small-meshed fishery in the North Sea and Skagerrak directed towards Norway pout has been documented (e.g. Degel et al., 2006, ICES CM 2007/ACFM:35, (WD 22 and Section 16.5.2.2)). Especially bycatch of juvenile haddock and cod as well as larger saithe has been in focus. Recent bycatch levels in the Danish and Norwegian small-
meshed fisheries are given in Section A. 1 of WD2 (Annex 3). Bycatches of these species have been low in the recent decade, and in general, the bycatch levels of these gadoids have decreased in the Norway pout fishery over the years to a present very low level of bycatch of other species ( $5-10 \%$ ). WD2 (Annex 3) also presents the bycatch and relative species distribution as proportion of Norway pout, haddock and whiting in the in the Danish and Norwegian small-meshed fisheries for reduction purposes targeting Norway pout in the North Sea for the longer period 1974 to 2005 as estimated in 2007 (data from ICES, 2007).

The Danish fishery has historically used two types of trawls which gives significantly different catch rates and of Norway pout and herring. Some fishermen conduct a rather clean Norway pout fishery where they use more wide trawl gears with lower gap (trawl opening height) where they catch more Norway pout and only very few herring. Other fishermen conduct a more mixed fishery targeting Norway pout and herring where they use more pelagic trawl types with larger gap and less wideness which are more efficient towards herring.

With the aim of protecting other species (cod, haddock, saithe, whiting, and herring as well as mackerel, monkfish, squids, flatfish, gurnards, Nephrops) a row of management measures are in force for the small-meshed fishery in the North Sea such as the area closures, bycatch regulations (bycatch quotas of herring and maximum bycatch percentages for gadoids and herring), minimum mesh size, selective grids/panels in the small-meshed gears, and minimum landing size as described under regulations in Section 3 in WD2 (Annex 3). Technical measures to protect the above mentioned bycatch species have been maintained or improved in the directed Norway pout fishery.

## Gear selective devices to reduce bycatch

Review of scientific documentation show that gear selective devices can be used in the Norway pout fishery, significantly reducing bycatches of juvenile gadoids, larger gadoids, and other non-target species (Eigaard and Holst, 2004; Nielsen and Madsen, 2006, ICES CM 2007/ACFM:35, WD 23 and Section 16.5.2.2; Eigaard and Nielsen, ICES CM2009/M:22; Eigaard, Hermann and Nielsen, 2012). Sorting grids are at present used in the Norwegian and Danish fishery (partly implemented as management measures for the larger vessels), but modification of the selective devices and their implementation in management is ongoing.

From 2010 grids have been used in the Norwegian fishery. From 15th October 2012 it has been obligatory for all Danish vessels participating in the targeted Norway pout fishery in the North Sea and Skagerrak-Kattegat to use a 35 mm grid in the smallmeshed trawl gears used in the fishery (typically with codend mesh sizes 16-31 mm). The introduction of the sorting grid in the Danish fishery (see below) has led to a reduction in catch rates of $5-10 \%$. The grid reduced the bycatch of gadoids by around $50 \%$ in biomass, but it remains difficult to avoid small gadoids (Eigaard et al., 2012); it also resulted in a reduction of herring bycatch. For the Norwegian fishery, area closures have had an effect on reducing bycatches in the combined Norway pout and blue whiting fishery. Introduction of selective grids in the Norwegian trawls used for this fishery has furthermore had an effect on bycatches, but some vessels do not always use this grid in the fishery (not mandatory in a part of the fishery).

Existing technical measures such as the closed Norway pout box, minimum mesh size in the fishery, and bycatch regulations to protect other species have been maintained.

In general the fishing mortality on 0-group Norway pout is low (Nielsen et al., 2012; ICES, WGNSSK Reports).

## Studies on selectivity in the Norway pout fishery

Early Scottish and Danish attempts to divide haddock, whiting and herring from Norway pout by using separator panels, square mesh windows, and grids were all relatively unsuccessful. More recent Faroese experiments with grid devices have been more successful. A $74 \%$ reduction of haddock was estimated (Zachariassen and Hjalti, 1997) and $80 \%$ overall reduction of the bycatch (Anon., 1998).

Investigations of gear specific selective devices and gear modifications to reduce unwanted bycatch in the small-meshed Norway pout fishery in the North Sea and Skagerrak have been made during sea trials in year 2000 and reported through an EU Financed Project (EU, 2002), and the results from here have been followed up upon in a scientific paper from DIFRES and CONSTAT, DK (Eigaard and Holst, 2004). Previous investigations of size selective gear devices in the Norway pout trawl fishery in the North Sea was performed by IMR Norway during sea trials in 1997-1999 also published in a scientific paper (Kvalsvik et al., 2006), as well as in a number of other earlier studies on the issue. Main results of previous investigations have been reviewed and summarized in Working Document No. 23 to the WGNSSK (2006) by Nielsen and Madsen (2006).

Danish-Norwegian fishing trials and pilot investigations were performed in autumn 2005 in order to explore bycatch levels in the small-meshed industrial trawl fishery in the North Sea targeting Norway pout. The results are given in Working Document No. 22 to the WGNSSK (2006) by Degel, Nedreaas and Nielsen (2006). The results were noisy and showed variable bycatch levels for different species. The investigations indicated spatio-temporal differences in catch levels by species in the commercial small-meshed fishery for Norway pout as well as an effect of targeting and use of fishing method on the bycatches. However, these patterns are only based on results from pilot investigations. Existing logbook data and knowledge of spatio-temporal patterns in catch rates of target species and bycatch species in the fishery are at present not adequate, and with high enough spatial and temporal resolution to implement management measures with respect to regulations on spatio-temporal allocation of fishing effort to reduce bycatches. With regard to diurnal differences in the catch rates of Norway pout and bycatches of other species, the few pilot investigation results indicated significant lower bycatch of Blue whiting during night hauls.

Eigaard and Holst (2004) and EU (2002) found that when testing a trawl gears with a sorting grid with a 24 mm bar distance in combination with a 108 mm (nominal) square mesh window through experimental, commercial fishery the results showed improved selectivity of the commercial trawl with catch weight reductions of haddock and whiting of 37 and $57 \%$, but also a $7 \%$ loss of Norway pout. The study showed that application of these reduction percentages to the historical level of industrial bycatch in the North Sea lowered on average the yearly haddock bycatch from 4.3 to $2.7 \%$ of the equivalent spawning-stock biomass. For whiting the theoretical reduction was from 4.8 to $2.1 \%$. The purpose of the sorting grid was to remedy the bycatch of juvenile gadoids in the industrial fishery for Norway pout, while the purpose of square mesh window was to retain larger marketable consume fish species otherwise sorted out by the grid. Bycatches in this study were mainly evaluated for haddock, whiting and cod, i.e. not for all above mentioned bycatch species of concern in the Norway pout fishery. However, the experiments have shown that the bycatch of important human consumption species in the industrial fishery for Norway pout
can be reduced substantially by inserting a grid system in front of the codend. The study also demonstrated that it is possible to retain a major part of the larger marketable fish species like whiting and haddock and at the same time maintain substantial reductions of juvenile fish of the same species. The study finally gave clear indications that further improvement of the selectivity is possible. This can be obtained by adjusting the bar distance in the grid and the mesh size in the selective window, but further research would be necessary in order to establish the optimal selective design.

The results reported in Kvalsvik et al. (2006) include results for more species of concern in the Norway pout fishery. They carried out experimental fishing with commercial vessels first testing a prototype of a grid system with different mountings of guiding panel in front of the grid and with different spacing ( 25,22 and 19 mm ) between bars, and then, second, testing if the mesh size in the grid section and the thickness of the bars influenced the selectivity of the grid system. Two different mesh sizes and three different thicknesses of bars were tested. Based on the first experiments, only a bar space of 22 mm were used in the later experiments. These showed respectively that a total of $94.6 \%$ (weight) of the bycatch species was sorted out with a $32.8 \%$ loss of the industrial target species, where the loss of Norway pout was around $10 \%$, and respectively that $62.4 \%$ of the bycatch species were sorted out and the loss of target species was $22 \%$, where the loss of Norway pout was around $6 \%$. When testing selectivity parameters for haddock, the main bycatch species, the parameters indicated a sharp size selection in the grid system.

In conclusion, the older experiments indicate that there is no potential in using separator devices and square mesh panels. Recent and comprehensive experiments with grid devices indicate a loss of Norway pout at around $10 \%$ or less when using a grid with a $22-24 \mathrm{~mm}$ bar distance. It is also indicated that there is a considerable loss of other industrial species being blue whiting, Argentine and horse mackerel. A substantial bycatch reduction of saithe, whiting, cod, ling, hake, mackerel, herring, haddock and tusk have been observed. The reduction in haddock bycatch is, however, lowered by the presence of smaller individuals. The Danish experiment indicates that it is possible to retain larger valuable consume fish species by using a square mesh panel in combination with the grid. Selectivity parameters have been estimated for haddock, whiting and Norway pout. These can be used for simulation scenarios including estimates of the effect of changing the bar distance in the grid. Selectivity parameters for more bycatch species would be relevant. However, the grid devices have shown to work for main bycatch species. A general problem encountered by implementing sorting grids in industrial fisheries is the very large catches handled. Durability and strength of the grid devices used under fully commercial conditions are consequently very important and needs further attention. Furthermore, handling of heavy grid devices can be problematic from some vessels. Grid devices are, nevertheless, used in most shrimp fisheries, where catches often are large.

Sorting grids in combination with square mesh panels have been shown to reduce bycatches of whiting and haddock by $57 \%$ and $37 \%$, respectively (Eigaard and Holst, 2004; Nielsen and Madsen, 2006 (ICES CM 2006/ACFM:35); Eigaard and Nielsen, 2009).

The most recent study on bycatch reduction by use of selective devices in the Danish Norway pout fishery is published in Eigaard, Hermann and Nielsen, 2012. Here a lightweight sorting grid was developed to reduce bycatch in the Danish smallmeshed trawl fishery ( 22 mm full mesh in the codend) for Norway pout in the North Sea. Experimental fishing with the grid demonstrated the possibility to capture Nor-
way pout with only a minimum of unintended bycatch. Fishing with two different grid orientations, backwards and forwards leaning, in distinct day and night hauls, resulted in an estimated release of between 88.4 and $100 \%$ of the total number of haddock (Melanogrammus aeglefinus) and whiting (Merlangius merlangus) entering the trawl. However, bycatch reductions were not significantly different between day and night or between grid orientations, indicating that the grid rejection of haddock and whiting is not influenced by fish behaviour. The loss of the target species, Norway pout, was low (between $5.6 \%$ and $13.7 \%$ ) compared with the bycatch excluded, and clearly length dependent. Consequently, loss of target species would vary with the size structure of the population fished. Although results were not statistically significant, length-based analyses indicated that the grid rejection likelihood for particularly smaller Norway pout ( $<16 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) was higher when fishing with the forwards-leaning grid during the night; this might be explained by behavioural and visual aspects of the fish-grid encounter process for Norway pout.

## Discard of Norway pout in fisheries for consume purposes

Discard levels of Norway pout in international fisheries are low as shown in Table 6 and Figure 10 of WD2 (Annex 3). It should be noted that Norway is not conducting discard sampling because of their discard ban, so the discard of Norway pout in Norwegian fisheries are not known. This is the case for both Norwegian fisheries for consume purposes and small-meshed fisheries for reduction purposes. With respect to the latter there are in general no discarding in the small-meshed fisheries for reduction purposes in Denmark and Norway.

Norway pout is only caught in small-meshed fisheries for reduction purposes conducted by Denmark and Norway with typically 16-31 mm mesh size in the trawl codend (i.e. the DEF_16-31_0_0 or DEF_16-31_2_35 or DEF_16-31_X_X métiers) or in crustacean (shrimp and Nephrops) fisheries in the northern North Sea or in Skagerrak conducted by several countries. Table 6 in WD2 (Annex 3) gives an overview of discard of Norway pout by year, métier and country during the period 2002-2015 based on imported data from InterCatch August 2016. The discard data cover fisheries for human consumption purposes, which mainly are crustacean fisheries, as there is no discard of Norway pout in small-meshed fisheries (métiers) for reduction purposes conducted by Denmark and Norway. Other countries do not have small-meshed fisheries for Norway pout or do not sample them. Because of the discard ban there is no discard tabulated for the Norwegian fisheries. Figure 10 in WD2 (Annex 3) gives an overview of absolute (tons) and relative (\%) proportion between discard of Norway pout in fisheries for human consumption purposes and the total landings of Norway pout in the small-meshed fisheries for reduction purposes (with no discard in the latter) divided by year in the period 2002-2014. The total landings data originates from the ICES evaluated total landings of Norway pout by year as presented in the September 2015 Norway pout assessment in the ICES WGNSSK Report 2015. As can be seen then discard rates are generally very low in years where there have been conducted significant Norway pout fishery.

## A.3. Ecosystem aspects

## General

Norway pout is a short-lived species and most likely a one-time spawner. The population dynamics of Norway pout in the North Sea and Skagerrak are very dependent on changes caused by recruitment variation and variation in predation (or other natu-
ral) mortality, and less by the fishery (Nielsen et al., 2012; Sparholt et al., 2002a; 2002b; Lambert et al., 2009; ICES, WGSAM 2011). Recruitment is highly variable and influences SSB and total-stock biomass (TSB) rapidly because of the short lifespan of the species. Furthermore, $20 \%$ of age 1 is estimated mature and is included in the SSB. Therefore, the recruitment in the year after the assessment year influences the SSB in the following year. Also, Norway pout is to a limited extent exploited from age 0. However, in general the fishing mortality on 0-group Norway pout is low. Only limited knowledge is available on the influence of environmental factors, such as temperature, on the recruitment. On this basis Norway pout should be managed as a short-lived species.

Previously, it has been evaluated that around $10 \%$ of the Norway pout reach maturity already at age 1, and that most individuals reach maturity-at-age 2. Results in Lambert et al. (2009) show that the maturity rate for the 1-group is close to $20 \%$ in average (varying between years and sex) with an increasing tendency over the last 20 years. Furthermore, the average maturity rate for 2- and 3-groups in 1st quarter of the year was observed to be around $90 \%$ and $95 \%$, respectively, as compared to $100 \%$ used in the assessment.

Norway pout natural mortality is likely influenced by spawning and maturity having implications its age-specific availability to predators in the ecosystem and the fishery (Nielsen et al., 2012).

A comprehensive review of ecosystem impacts and the Norway pout population dynamics and ecological role in the North Sea and Skagerrak is given in Nielsen (2016, Annex 1). Parts of this are summarised below.

## Multispecies information and considerations in relation to the species ecological role

Norway pout natural mortality is likely influenced by spawning and maturity having implications for its age-specific availability to predators in the ecosystem and to the fishery (Nielsen et al., 2012).

In previous ICES stock assessments it has under ecosystem consideration been noted that there is a need to ensure that the Norway pout stock remains high enough to provide food for a variety of predator species (e.g. ICES, WGNSSK 2011a). This stock is among other important as food source for the species saithe, haddock, cod, whiting, and western mackerel and predation mortality is significant (ICES, WGSAM 2014 with most recent 2013 SMS Key Run; ICES, WGSAM 2011; ICES, SGMSNS 2006). Especially the more recent high abundance of saithe predators and the more constant high stock level of western mackerel as likely predators on smaller Norway pout in the North Sea are likely to significantly affect the Norway pout population dynamics.

The ICES inter-benchmark assessment in spring 2012 (IBPNorwayPout, ICES, 2012c) evaluated multispecies considerations in relation to the natural mortality population dynamics parameters in the benchmarking for Norway pout stock in the North Sea and Skagerrak including predation mortality. In the 2012 inter-benchmark, a series of assessment scenarios were run with different parameter settings of natural mortality. Natural mortality has been derived from analysis of total mortality rates estimated from IBTS survey catch rates (cpue from IBTS Q1 and Q3) using the approach described in Nielsen et al. (2012); Lambert et al. (2009) and Sparholt et al. (2002a,b). Furthermore, natural mortalities derived from the multispecies SMS model from the 2011 SMS key run were used in one of the exploratory scenarios (Scenario 4) in the benchmarking. This is described under natural mortality in Section 3.6.4 of the IBPNorwayPout report (ICES, 2012c).

The 2012 inter-benchmark introduce revised estimates of maturity and natural mortality and maturity-at-age used in the Norway pout stock assessment. The background and rationale behind the revision of the natural mortality and maturity parameters is described in the IBPNorwayPout report (ICES, 2012c) and primary literature (e.g. Nielsen et al., 2012; Lambert et al., 2009; ICES, WGSAM 2011)). A follow up on this analysis is presented in Nielsen (2016; Section 3 in WD1, Annex 3) with the same conclusions.

The inter-benchmark (IBPNorwayPout, ICES, 2012c) group did not recommend revised reference points for the stock at this stage, but concluded that higher escapement targets could be considered in future based on the importance of Norway pout as a forage species in the ecosystem. The consumption amount of Norway pout by its main predators should be evaluated in relation to production amount in the Norway pout stock under consideration of consumption and production of other prey species for those predators in the North Sea ecosystem. There most likely is difference in preference and switching between prey species and size groups by different predator species, and in different areas and seasons having different communities and foodwebs. Those factors and their variability needs to be taken into account when trying to establish target reference levels for Norway pout based on estimating necessary Norway pout biomass to be available for predators in the North Sea and Skagerrak. This should be considered for all prey species together for those predators and not only for Norway pout isolated.

The WGNSSK Assessment Review Group (WGNSSK 2007) asked the WGNSSK to provide guidance on how to deal with the objective of keeping a certain amount of biomass for predators. Here it was noted that if a minimum biomass is found to be required, then natural mortality could not be kept constant in the prediction (as it does during the assessment period).
It should be noted that natural mortality levels by age and season used in the stock assessment reflect the predation mortality levels estimated for this stock in the most recent multispecies stock assessment performed by ICES. Natural mortality levels by age and season used in the stock assessment do include the predation mortality levels estimated for this stock (ICES, WGSAM 2014; ICES, WGSAM 2011; ICES, SGMSNS 2006), and in the 2012 Inter-benchmark assessment revised values for natural mortality have been used which also include the estimated levels of predation mortality in the 2011 and 2013 SMS key/baseline run multispecies assessments (ICES, WGSAM 2011; 2014).
a) Intraspecific dynamics

Interspecific and intraspecific density patterns in Norway pout mortality has been documented (e.g. Nielsen et al., 2012; Nash et al., 2012; Lambert et al., 2009; Kempf et al., 2009; Cormon et al., 2016).

Concerning intraspecific interactions and potential density-dependence then the juvenile growth rate is higher when the stock density is low and results in a reduced age at $50 \%$ maturity (Lambert et al., 2009). The study by Lambert et al. (2009) showed only weak intraspecific density-dependence in growth and maturity, as well as in age and length-at-maturity, but the general trend found was that both these parameters decreased with the number of fish in a cohort. Although these correlations could highlight a phenomenon of density-dependence linked to local aggregation (as for herring; Engelhard and Heino, 2004) or food availability, perhaps the reductions can be explained by density- and size-dependent juvenile mortality (Lambert et al., 2009).

Nielsen et al. (2012) found that natural mortality (M) is significantly correlated with sexual maturity, sex, growth, and intraspecific stock density. According to Nielsen et al. (2012) the density-dependence, either intra- or interspecific, of NP mortality showed a distinct pattern. They found that mortality was significantly positively correlated with intraspecific population density. The NP population dynamics seemed, therefore, to be influenced by density-dependence, which resulted in a lower growth rate and maturation when the stock was at a relatively high level. Thus, bringing together the varied information pertaining to NP mortality, it is likely that lower stock densities contribute to higher growth rates and higher maturity ratios and, consequently, greater mortality rates, which are most likely caused by spawning. Kempf et al. (2009) found no intraspecific relationship between NP SSB in the year of birth and the IBTS age 1 recruitment index of the following year, whereas the interannual variability of age 1 recruitment was found to be correlated with the Q2 sea surface temperature when taking predation impact into consideration. However, this was not highly significant and included the removal of years characterized as outliers. Although the analyses of Nielsen et al. (2012) indicated density-dependent mortality which could be associated with spawning and that available documentation on predation could not explain the observed increase in Z at age, it was difficult to disentangle density-dependent mortality and size-selective mortality (Nielsen et al. 2012). Size-selective mortality will usually result in greater mortality of the smallest (youngest) fish, but for Norway pout, greater mortality rates for the largest (oldest) fish were observed, and that spawning was not only associated with age, but also with size. Nielsen et al. (2012) found evidence of spawning mortality where the fastest growing individuals mature faster and therefore spawn and die faster, but also found that there may be other reasons for such reversal size-selective mortality, e.g. densitydependence. They argued that density-dependence probably did not influence mortality directly, but rather indirectly as explained above, and can also be influenced by size-selective mortality other than spawning mortality, so no rigorous conclusions can be made on this.
b) Interspecific dynamics

Besides intraspecific patterns, the growth rates show interspecific links to stock sizes of the important predators: cod, haddock, and whiting (Lambert et al. 2009). Especially interspecific density-dependent patterns in Norway pout growth and maturity were found in relation to North Sea cod and whiting stock abundance (Lambert et al., 2009). The interspecific density-dependence in growth of Norway pout found by Lambert et al. (2009) revealed a positive correlation between whiting SSB and growth, and a negative one with cod and haddock SSB. Cod and haddock being larger species probably target larger prey, whereas whiting likely target smaller Norway pout. However, other factors could influence these observations. Raitt and Adams (1965) compared the feeding habits of Norway pout and whiting and showed an extensive overlap between what 0 -group whiting and adult Norway pout were eating. Therefore, even if adult whiting are important predators on small Norway pout (Jones et al., 1954; Daan and Welleman, 1998), the positive correlation between both could be due to simple food availability and the effects of competition for food lowering the MWA for Norway pout and whiting recruits. Depending on the strength of the stockrecruitment relationship for whiting, this could affect the relationship between Norway pout growth and whiting SSB (Lambert et al., 2009).

Interspecific density-dependence and predation were not significant factors influencing Norway pout mortality based on the available data at the scale of the study by Nielsen et al. (2012), and additional studies are necessary on more disaggregated cov-
erage and overlapping distribution and density patterns between Norway pout and its main predators by age or size group, especially during the spawning period (Nielsen et al., 2012). With regard to the overlap between NP and important predators in the North Sea, Rindorf et al., (2010) found low predated biomass and predation mortality in the main spawning areas during the spawning season. Kempf et al. (2009, Figure 10) found no strong correlation between the spatial overlap of NP age 1 abundance and certain NP predators (saithe, haddock, and mackerel) in the IBTS Q3 survey. However, strong predator-prey relationships do exist between some commercially important North Sea stocks and Norway pout (e.g. Cormon et al., 2016; Kempf et al., 2009; Huse et al., 2008). Early studies found that adult whiting is an important predator of small Norway pout (Jones, 1954; Daan and Welleman, 1998).

Based on stomach-content data analyses disaggregated to ICES statistical square (area) and quarter of the year in the North Sea (1991), Rindorf et al. (2010) calculated biomass eaten and local predation mortality indices. They found that predated biomass (and predation mortality) of Norway pout by cod, whiting, haddock, and saithe was high in the second half of the year (Q4 and Q3) and low in the first half (Q2 and Q1). In Q1, the small Norway pout biomass eaten occurred in the most northern areas west of Orkney and south of Shetland. Based on Rindorf et al. (2010, Figures 2b and $5 b$ ), the areas of highest biomass predated and highest predation mortality were not in the main spawning areas during the spawning season (Q1) that were identified by Lambert et al. (2009, e.g. Figure 1) and Nash et al. (2012), i.e. the areas to be in proximity to the 120 m isobaths in ICES Roundfish Area 1 (RFA1) and RFA3 near Viking Bank along the Norwegian Trench and along the Scottish east coast (and in RFA7) in quarter 1 (Q1). Consequently, predated biomass and predation mortality was low in the main spawning areas and during the spawning season, indicating that increased mortality cannot be explained by predation mortality.

According to Huse et al. (2008) several hypotheses have been advanced to explain heavy larval mortality, including predation by planktivorous fish owing to their potentially high densities and efficient foraging on fish larvae. Accordingly, a negative relationship between pelagic fish abundance and recruitment of demersal fish has been suggested for the North Sea. The recent poor recruitment in many North Sea stocks has coincided with a large herring stock, which raises the question of predatory interactions (Huse et al., 2008). Low recruitment of Norway pout could be due to predation by herring, because there is potential for spatial overlap between the two stocks, although there is no information available on stomach content analysis to suggest such an interaction (Huse et al., 2008). Herring (Clupea harengus) has been suggested to be a major predator on fish larvae in the North Sea, and Huse et al. (2008) investigated possible interactions between herring and Norway pout using a simple statistical analysis and a modified stock-recruit relationship. They found a significant negative relationship (linear regression) between total herring biomass and recruitment of Norway pout. The spawning stock of Norway pout is typically dominated by 2 year-olds, and there was a strong negative relationship (linear regression) between herring biomass and Norway pout spawning-stock biomass (SSB) two years later (Huse et al., 2008). A Beverton-Holt model fitted by Huse et al. (2008) to stock-recruit data of Norway pout produced a rather poor correlation. However, when only the Norway pout SSB not overlapping with herring was considered the fit between the model and the stock-recruit data improved. These analyses indicated a negative impact by herring on recruitment of Norway pout, the most plausible cause for this being herring predation on Norway pout larvae, but field studies are needed to verify such predation (Huse et al., 2008).

According to Cormon et al. (2016) recent assessments of the North Sea saithe Pollachius virens, a major top predator in the area, suggested a decrease in spawning-stock biomass along with a decline in saithe mean weight-at-ages. In this context, Cormon et al. (2016) investigated North Sea saithe growth characteristics at the population level: First, saithe annual weight increments and age-length relationships were studied. Then, modelling of saithe age-length relationships was carried out using (1) the traditional von Bertalanffy growth function model, (2) the Verhulst logistic model, and (3) an empirical linear model. Second, the effects of environmental factors on saithe growth were investigated. The explanatory environmental factors included in the study were food availability, represented by the total biomass of Norway pout (Trisopterus esmarkii); intraspecific competition, i.e. density-dependence, represented by saithe abundance; and temperature. The study of Cormon et al. (2016) indicated that the Verhulst logistic model was the best descriptor of saithe growth and that density-dependence and food availability had significant effects on the saithe growth coefficient, while no effect of temperature was shown. On this basis, the authors suggested that reduced food availability and increased competition may explain the recent decrease in the saithe growth coefficient. It should here be noted that the agelength keys of Norway pout survey data from the ICES IBTS surveys used in the study by Cormon et al. (2016) were not scrutinized and analysed on a disaggregated seasonal and area basis as the results from Lambert et al. (2009) revealed were necessary to obtain realistic growth data and parameters for this Norway pout stock.

The interplay between temperature-related processes and predation in determining age-1 recruitment strength between 1992 and 2006 was analysed for North Sea cod (Gadus morhua) and Norway pout (Trisopterus esmarkii) by Kempf et al. (2009). For this purpose, a predation impact index (PI) was calculated out of IBTS survey data. PI was assumed to depend on the abundance of the predators and on the spatial overlap between predator and prey populations. Generalized additive models (GAMs) were created with spawning-stock biomass (SSB) and sea surface temperature (SST) in the respective spawning and nursery areas and PI as explaining variables. Intraspecific SSB had no significant impact on recruitment during this time period for both species. SSTs during spring and PI explained together the interannual variability of recruitment strength to a large extent ( $88 \%$ of the total variance for cod and $68 \%$ for Norway pout). The SST during spring determined the overall level of recruitment. At SSTs above a certain level, however, the effect on recruitment was no longer significant. In these temperature ranges, predation was the dominant effect. On this basis, Kempf et al. (2009) stated that the fate of North Sea cod and Norway pout stocks under globalwarming conditions will be strongly influenced by the status of the North Sea foodweb.

When scrutinizing mean predation mortality (M2) caused by predator species and age groups partly in a table with predation by predator species and age on Norway pout per age group (Nielsen, 2016, Annex 1, Table 4) and a table with predation by predator species in total per Norway pout age group (Table 5, Annex 1), as well as graphs of Norway pout relative importance (share) in diet per predator size group from the SMS 2013 baseline run then it is possible to assess the most important predators by species and age on Norway pout in the North Sea (Table 6, Annex 1, with examples). All this information is necessary to evaluate the importance of Norway pout in the diet for the different predators and predator age groups as a high M2 can be caused by partly a large proportion of Norway pout in the diet but also by a high predator (by age) biomass / abundance. Therefore, the partial M2 is not necessarily a good measure for importance of Norway pout in the diet. Accordingly, it is also nec-
essary to analyse graphs of Norway pout relative (share) importance in diet per predator size group.

In Nielsen (2016, Annex 1, Section 6) the relationship between predator spawningstock biomass and total-stock biomass for North Sea cod, haddock, saithe and whiting is shown as function of the Norway pout (prey) total-stock biomass estimated as three year running means during the period 1983-2014. The results indicate that there is a moderate positive correlation between cod spawning-stock biomass and Norway pout total-stock biomass, while there is no correlation between whiting and haddock spawning-stock biomasses and Norway pout total-stock biomass, and there is even a slight negative correlation between saithe spawning-stock biomass and Norway pout total-stock biomass. There are moderate positive correlations between North Sea cod, whiting and haddock total-stock biomasses and Norway pout total-stock biomass, while there is no (or even with negative tendency) correlation between North Sea saithe total-stock biomass and Norway pout total-stock biomass.

In Nielsen (2016, Annex 1, Section 6) growth rates of predators vs. prey biomass are given as three years running means for different main Norway pout predators during the period 1983 to 2014. The growth rates are calculated as change in mean weight-atage (MWA) of the predators where MWA values in the stock are obtained from the ICES WGNSSK spring 2016 assessments. The growth rates are calculated on cohort basis for the main age groups of the predators with respect to predation on Norway pout and where there are a large number of observations on MWA available. The MWA is calculated as:

$$
\mathrm{MWA}=w_{a, t}-w_{a-1, t-1}
$$

The results indicate that for all the predator species (cod, haddock, whiting and saithe) and their main cohorts predating on Norway pout in the North Sea there is no correlation between their growth rate in mean weight-at-age and total-stock biomass of Norway pout, except for a weak positive correlation between mean weight-at-age for 1 cohort (age 3-4) of haddock and Norway pout total-stock biomass.

## Ecosystem drivers

Only limited knowledge is available on the influence of environmental factors, such as temperature, on the Norway pout recruitment.

The interplay between temperature-related processes and predation in determining age-1 recruitment strength between 1992 and 2006 was analysed for North Sea cod and Norway pout by Kempf et al. (2009). For this purpose, a predation impact index (PI) was calculated out of IBTS survey data. PI was assumed to depend on the abundance of the predators and on the spatial overlap between predator and prey populations. Generalized additive models (GAMs) were created with spawning-biomass (SSB) and sea surface temperature (SST) in the respective spawning and nursery areas and PI as explaining variables. Intraspecific SSB had no significant impact on recruitment during this time period for both species. SSTs during spring and PI explained the interannual variability of recruitment strength to a large extent $(88 \%$ of the total variance for cod and $68 \%$ for Norway pout). The SST during spring determined the overall level of recruitment. At SSTs above a certain level, however, the effect on recruitment was no longer significant. In these temperature ranges, predation was the dominant effect. On this basis, Kempf et al. (2009) stated that the fate of North Sea cod and Norway pout stocks under global-warming conditions will be strongly influenced by the status of the North Sea foodweb.

The data used for the analyses in Kempf et al. (2009) was IBTS survey data: North Sea wide (including the Skagerrak (ICES areas 4and 3.a)), age-recruitment indices (RI) were calculated for cod and Norway pout from age-based, first-quarter IBTS data from 1992 to 2006 (ICES, 1999, see Kempf et al., 2009). According to Kempf et al. (2009) the Skagerrak was added because North Sea and Skagerrak subpopulations show high exchange rates and are treated as one stock in standard fish stock assessments. The average number of age-1 recruits caught in the first quarter in each ICES rectangle ( 0.58 latitude 18 longitude) was calculated for each species analysed whenever more than one haul was conducted in a certain year. Later, the average catch numbers were summed over all ICES rectangles to get an age-1 recruitment index for the North Sea and Skagerrak area. Because the coverage for ICES areas 4 and 3.a was complete in all years after 1991, the summation of the mean catches per ICES rectangle introduced no bias due to interannual changes in the number of ICES rectangles surveyed (Kempf et al., 2009).

It should again here be noted that the age-length keys of Norway pout survey data from the ICES IBTS surveys used in the study by Kempf et al. (2009) were not scrutinized and analysed on a disaggregated seasonal and area basis as the results from Lambert et al. (2009) revealed were necessary to obtain precise age readings and growth data and parameters on a spatio-temporal disaggregated basis for this Norway pout stock. This can also influence recruitment estimates.

According to Kempf et al. (2009) the IBTS age-1 recruitment index for Norway pout varied considerably between the years until the year 2000. From 2000 to 2006, the recruitment index was always at a low level and less variable than in previous time periods. The time-series of first-quarter SST north of 58.8 N showed a significant increasing trend from 1994 onwards (Kempf et al., 2009). The SST value was outstandingly low in 1994 and extremely high in 1998. The SST during the second quarter also increased over the analysed time period; however, the trend was not found significant. As in the spawning and nursery areas of cod, the years 1992 and 1996 deviated from the general trend. SSTs during the third quarter were higher in the last third of the time-series than in the previous periods. The PI values were mainly in the range of 20000 to 60000 . In single years, however, the index was <20 000 (in 1991) or $>100000$ (in 2000). Kempf et al. (2009) did not find an obvious temporal trend. Furthermore, there was found no significant relationship between SSB in the year of birth and the IBTS age-1 recruitment index of the following year. High and low recruitment index values occurred at any part of the analysed SSB spectrum. SST in the first, second, and third quarters had no significant effect on recruitment strength of Norway pout in the models with SSB and SST as the only explaining variables. The SST in the 2nd quarter, however, had the strongest relationship with the recruitment index and was close to being significant (Kempf et al., 2009), however, the effect of secondquarter SST became significant when PI was added as an explaining variable. As with cod, the age- 1 recruitment index of Norway pout was higher after the cold years (1994 and 1996) than after the warmer years. For temperatures $>8.5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, no clear effect on the recruitment index could be recognized (Kempf et al., 2009). PI had a significant negative linear effect on the Norway pout recruitment index. The final model was able to explain the recruitment of Norway pout to a satisfying extent (Kempf et al., 2009). Both variables together explained $68 \%$ of the recruitment index from 1992 to 2006. A large part of the interannual variability, however, could not be resolved with PI and SST as explaining variables. The low recruitment in 2005, especially, could not be explained; this datapoint appeared as an outlier in the residual plot. When fitting the model without the recruitment index for 2005 , the fit became better $(\mathrm{R} 2=0.75)$ and
the effects of SST and PI on recruitment were more significant. No significant correlation was found between the explaining variables, and no significant autocorrelation of the model variables was detected at any lag. Also, the residuals were not distributed differently from a normal distribution (Kempf et al., 2009).

## Fisheries impacts on the ecosystem

In order to protect other species (cod, haddock, saithe, whiting, and herring as well as mackerel, monkfish, squids, flatfish, gurnards, Nephrops) there is a row of technical management measures in force for the small-meshed fishery in the North Sea such as the closed Norway pout box, bycatch regulations, minimum mesh size, and minimum landing size (see sections on fishery). Bycatch of saithe, cod, haddock, whiting, and other species at various levels in the small-meshed fishery in the North Sea and Skagerrak directed towards Norway pout has been documented (see sections on fishery). Bycatches of these species have been low in the recent decade, and in general, the bycatch levels of these gadoids have decreased in the Norway pout fishery over the years.

## B. Data

## B.1. Commercial catch and effort data

## Catch-quality, misreporting, discards

The industrial fishery for Norway pout in the North Sea is mainly carried out by Denmark and Norway in a mixed fishery using demersal trawls with small-meshed codend (Nielsen et al., 2016, Annex 2; Johnsen et al., 2016, Annex 3). Most of the fishery takes place at fishing grounds in the northern North Sea mostly at Fladen Ground and along the edge of the Norwegian Trench. Bycatch of other species is of a main concern in this fishery, and area closures have been implemented in both EU and Norwegian waters to reduce the bycatch of other gadoids and herring. In addition, selection grids have been used to reduce the bycatch of larger gadoids. Norway pout is landed for reduction purposes (fishmeal and fishoil), which makes it demanding to estimate the species composition in the landings; other species have been wrongly reported as Norway pout. The quality of the landings statistics in Denmark and Norway is described in Nielsen et al. (2016, Annex 2) and Johnsen et al. (2016, Annex 3 ); the quality seems to be relatively constant during the last 20 years and of a higher quality than in the years before. The discard level of Norway pout in the North Sea fisheries is considered to be low (Nielsen et al. (2016, Annex 2).

No commercial fishery tuning fleet and data are used in the SESAM assessment conducted from 2016 onwards. There are several reasons for this described in the ICES WKPOUT Report 2016 where the main reasons are the following:

## Commercial cpue data

- Earliest datapoints affected the assessment, because there were concerns about their accuracy. These concerns regarded correct species identification of the catches and missing observations of weight-at-age in the catches in 1983. For these reasons the benchmark group recommend an assessment, which excludes data from 1983.


## Fishing power changes over years:

- Enormous changes in fleet composition and vessel size over the years
- Enormous developments in fish technological fish search equipment over years
- Gear developments over years
- Selective devices introduced from 2007.
o Mandatory since 2012 in Danish fishery.
o In Norway there are exceptions for use of the devices in the Blue Whiting fishery
o Different devices with different bar widths used (N: 40 mm ; DK: 35 mm)
- Commercial tuning fleet does not cover the big Norway pout Box


## Commercial catch and effort data in previous to 2016 SXSA Assessments

The assessment uses the combined catch and effort data from the commercial Danish and Norwegian small-meshed trawler fleets fishing mainly in the northern North Sea. Denmark, Sweden, Germany, Faroe Islands and UK provide catch and effort data to ICES InterCatch in standardized format for the stock. It is recommended that Norway do the same.

Standardized effort data for both the Norwegian and Danish commercial fishery vessels are included in the assessment commercial fishery tuning fleet up until 2006.

For the Danish and Norwegian commercial landings sampling procedures of the commercial landings, which vary between the countries, were described in detail in the report of the WGNSSK meeting in September 2004 (ICES, WGNSSK (2005) ICES C.M. 2005/ACFM:07).

From 2002 onwards, an EU regulation (1639/2001) was endorsed which affects the market sampling procedures. First, each country is obliged to sample all fleet segments, including foreign vessels landing in their country. Second, a minimum number of market samples per tonnes of landing are required. The national market sampling programmes have been adjusted accordingly. In general there is set a level of minimum one sample per 1000 tonnes landed for Norway pout in the North Sea and Skagerrak

Sampling and reporting from Norwegian vessels fishing Norway pout and blue whiting has been slightly changed in 2009 and onwards. Previously, all catch reported as Norway pout included bycatch of other species which was used as input in the assessment. These data were also the basis for the Norwegian official catch statistics reported to among other ICES. The procedure up until 2009 was that if a catch (landing) from a fishing trip consisted of more than $50 \%$ of Norway pout in weight then the full catch consisting of all species was reported as Norway pout for this landing, i.e. bycatch was included in the reported Norway pout catch. In 2009 and onwards, each catch (landing) per trip is evaluated (sorted) according to species, and the actual catch per species for each landing is reported. This makes the actual catch numbers of Norway pout from Norway more precise. Norway pout caught both in the Norway pout fishery as well as in the blue whiting fishery are from 2009 included in the assessment, and bycatch of other species are excluded. There has not been made an analysis and thorough evaluation of the effect of this change in Norwegian sampling procedure with respect to relative change in the reported catch-at-age and weight-atage. However, the Norwegian assessment experts evaluate that this will have only minor effect on the catch-at-age in number and the weight-at-age used in the assess-
ment as the bycatch and the actual catch has balanced each other out previously. With respect to effort data (see below), only effort is reported for Norwegian trips with landings consisting of more than $50 \%$ Norway pout in weight for 2009 and onwards. Consequently, the procedure in estimating and reporting (average) effort data from Norway has remained unchanged according to previous years' standard procedure for estimating effort data.

## Method of effort standardization of the commercial fishery tuning fleet (assessments previous to 2016)

Results and parameter estimates by period from the yearly regression analysis on cpue vs. GRT for the different Danish vessel size categories are used in the effort standardization of both the Norwegian and Danish commercial fishery vessels included in the assessment tuning fleet with data up until 2006.

Background descriptions of the commercial fishery tuning series used (including data up to 2006) and methods of effort standardization of the commercial fishery between different vessel size categories and national commercial fleets are given in the 2004 working group report (ICES, WGNSSK (2005) ICES CM 2005/ACFM: 07) and the 1996 working group report (ICES CM 1997/Assess:6). Previous to the 2001 assessment the effort has been standardized by vessel category (to a standard 175 GRT vessel) only using the catch rate proportions between vessel size categories within the actual year. In 2002, a new regression standardization method was introduced (see methodological description below), and the assessment was run both with and without the new standardization method (regression). The differences in results of output SSB, TSB and F between the two assessment runs were small.

With respect to further exploration of the effect of using effort standardization and using a combined Danish and Norwegian commercial fishery tuning fleet in the Norway pout assessment (including data up to 2006) different analyses have been made in relation to this in the benchmark assessment in 2004. This was done to investigate alternative standardization methods and alternative division of the commercial fishery assessment tuning fleet used in the assessment. The results of these analyses were presented to and discussed by the working group in 2004 and presented in the 2004 working group report in Section 12 (ICES CM 2005/ACFM:07).

Since 2002, the assessments have used output of the regression analyses using timeseries from 1987(1994)-most recent assessment year, where the regressions have been applied to the Danish and Norwegian commercial fishery. Effort standardization of both the Danish and the Norwegian part of the commercial fishery tuning series is performed by applying standardization factors to reported catch and effort data for the different vessel size categories. The standardization factors are obtained from regression of cpue indices by vessel size category over years of the Danish commercial fishery tuning fleet. The number of small vessels in the Danish Norway pout fishing fleet has decreased significantly and the relative number of large vessels has increased in the more recent years. Furthermore, there were found no trends in cpue between vessel categories over time. For these reasons the cpue indices used in the regression has been obtained from pooled catch and effort data over the years 1994present assessment year by vessel category in order to obtain and include estimates for all vessel categories also for the latest years where no observations exists for the smallest vessels groups.

The conclusion of the discussion in the working group of these analysis results was that further analysis and exploration of data is necessary before suggesting an alter-
native standardization method and alternative division of commercial fishery tuning fleets (potentially) to be used in the assessment. This should be done in a coming benchmark assessment of the stock. Among other it should be further investigated whether it is possible to split the Danish and Norwegian commercial tuning fleet, and also effects of excluding the commercial tuning fleets from the assessment should be further exploited. See also comments to future benchmarking further below.
Parameter estimates from regressions of $\ln$ (cpue) vs. $\ln$ (average GRT) by period together with estimates of standardized cpue to the group of Danish 175 GRT industrial fishery trawlers is shown for the period 1994-2006 in this quality control handbook below.

The regression model used in effort standardisation is the following:

$$
\text { Regression models: cpue }=\mathrm{b}^{*} \mathrm{GRT}^{\mathrm{a}}=>\ln (\text { cpue })=\ln (\mathrm{b})+\mathrm{a}^{*} \ln ((\mathrm{GRT}-50))
$$

Parameter estimates from regressions of $\ln$ (cpue) vs. $\ln$ (average GRT) by period together with estimates of standardized cpue to the group of Danish 175 GRT industrial fishery trawlers is used to standardize effort in the commercial fishery tuning fleet used in the Norway pout assessment. Parameter estimates for the period 1994-2006 is the following:

| YEAR | SLOPE | INTERCEPT | R-SQUARE | CPUE(175 TONNES) |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1994-2006$ | 0.18 | 14.05 | 0.77 | 32.76 |

## Norwegian effort data (assessment previous to 2016)

In 1997, Norwegian effort data were revised as described in Sections 13.1.3.1 and 1.3.2 of the 1997 working group report (ICES CM 1998/Assess:7). Furthermore, in the 2000 assessment Norwegian average GRT and Effort data for 1998-1999 were corrected because data from ICES area 2.a were included for these years in the 1998-1999 assessments. Observed average GRT and effort for the Norwegian commercial fleets are given in the input data to the yearly performed assessment. This information has been put together in the report of the ICES WGNSSK meeting in 2004 (ICES, WGNSSK (2005), ICES CM 2005/ACFM:07). No Norwegian effort data exist for the commercial fishery tuning fleet in 2005, the first part of 2006, and in 2007 due to closure of the fishery. Norwegian effort data for the directed Norway pout fishery in 2008 have not been prepared because the fishery has been on low level, and data for 2010-2013 have not been prepared because of introduction of selective grids in the Norwegian fishery since 2010. See also comments on benchmarking further below.

## Danish effort data (assessment previous to 2016)

In each yearly assessment the input data as cpue data by vessel size category and year for the Danish commercial fishery in area $4 . \mathrm{a}$ is given. This is based on fishing trips where total catch included at least $70 \%$ Norway pout and blue whiting per trip, and where Norway pout was reported as main species in catch in the logbook per fishing day and fishing trip. There has been a relative reduction in the number and effort of small vessels and an increase for the larger vessels in the fleet in the latest years. Furthermore, it appears clearly that there is big difference in cpue (as an indicator of fishing power) between different vessel size categories (BRT). Accordingly, standardization of effort is necessary when using a combined commercial fishery tuning fleet in the assessment including several vessel categories. Minor revisions (updating) of the Danish effort and catch data used in the effort standardization and
as input to the tuning fleets have been made for the 2001 assessment. No Danish effort data exist for the commercial fishery tuning fleet in 2005, the first part of 2006, and in 2007 as well as the first part of 2011 and 2012 due to closure of the fishery.

Exploration of methods for effort standardization (assessment previous to 2016)
With respect to further exploration of the effect of using effort standardization and using a combined Danish and Norwegian commercial fishery tuning fleet in the Norway pout assessment (including data up until 2006) different analyses have been made in relation to the benchmark assessment in 2004. This was done to investigate alternative standardization methods and alternative division of the commercial fishery assessment tuning fleet used in the assessment. The results of these analyses were presented to the working group and were discussed here in 2004 (ICES CM 2005/ACFM:07).

Analysis of variance (GLM-analyses) of catch, effort and log transformed cpue data on trip basis for the Danish commercial fishery for Norway pout during the period 1986 to 2004 showed statistical significant differences in catch rates between different GT-groups, years, quarters of years (seasons), and fishing areas, as well as statistical significant first order interaction effects between all of these variables. The detailed patterns in this variation are not clear and straightforward to conclude on.
It has so far not been possible to obtain disaggregated effort and catch data by area and vessel size (GT-group) from the Norwegian Norway pout fishery to perform similar analyses for the Norwegian fishery.

Also it is not possible to regenerate the historical time-series (before 1996) of catch numbers-at-age in the commercial fishery tuning fleet by nation which is only available for the combined Danish and Norwegian commercial tuning fleet. The reason for this is partly that there is no documentation of historical allocation of biological samples (mean weight-at-age data) to catch data (catch in weight) in the tuning fleet in order to calculate catch number-at-age for the period previous to 1996 for both nations, and partly because it seems impossible to obtain historical biological data for Norway pout (previous to 1996) from Norway. Alternative division of the commercial fishery tuning fleet would, thus, need new allocation of biological data to catch data for both the Danish and Norwegian fleet, and result in a significantly shorter Norwegian commercial fishery tuning fleet time-series, and a historically revised Danish commercial fishery tuning fleet with new allocation of biological data to catch data. Revision of the tuning fleet would, furthermore, need analyses of possible variation in biological mean weight-at-age data to be applied to different fleets, as well as of the background for and effect of this possible variation.
Future benchmark should evaluate usefulness of including recent commercial fishery tuning time-series in the assessment from Danish and Norwegian commercial fishery. This should take into consideration influence on cpue and targeting in the Norway pout fishery based on the several fishing closures (several real-time management closures) in recent years, introduction of selective devices in recent years being different for Norwegian and Danish fishery, different targeting in Danish and Norwegian Norway pout fisheries (Norway pout, blue whiting), as well as yearly changes in fleet efficiency given changes in vessel sizes targeting Norway pout over time.

## Standardized effort data (assessment previous to 2016)

The resulting combined and standardized Danish and Norwegian effort for the commercial fishery used in the assessment is presented in the input data to the yearly
performed assessment, as well as the combined cpue indices by age and quarter for the commercial fishery tuning fleet.
The seasonal variation in effort data is one of the reasons for performing a seasonal VPA.

## B.2. Biological data

## Mortality

The ICES inter-benchmark assessment in spring 2012 (IBPNorwayPout, ICES, 2012c) introduced revised estimates of natural mortality and maturity-at-age used in the Norway pout stock assessment. The background and rationale behind the revision of the natural mortality and maturity parameters is described in the IBPNorwayPout report (ICES, 2012c) and primary literature (e.g. Nielsen et al., 2012; Lambert et al., 2009; ICES, WGSAM 2011), as well as summarised below. A follow up on this analysis is presented in Nielsen (2016, Annex 1, Section 5) with the same conclusions.

Instead of using a constant natural mortality set to 0.4 for all age groups in all seasons as used in the previous assessments, variable natural mortality between ages have been introduced in the 2012 Inter-benchmark assessment and used in all following assessments. The revision of the natural mortality parameter was based on results in Nielsen et al. (2012) and the ICES, WGSAM 2011 multispecies assessment report. It should be noted that natural mortality levels by age and season used in the stock assessment reflect the predation mortality levels estimated for this stock in the multispecies stock assessment performed by ICES. The revised values are shown in Table B.2.1.

Table B.2.1. Norway pout $4 \& 3 . a N$ (Skagerrak). Mean weight-at-age in the stock, proportion mature and natural mortality used in the assessment from 2012 onwards. (Inter-Benchmark 2012 assessment scenario 2 settings).

| Age | Weight (g) |  |  |  | Proportion <br> mature | M |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Q 1 | Q 2 | Q 3 | Q 4 |  | Quarterly |  |
|  | - | - | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0,29 |  |
| 1 | 9 | 14 | 28 | 28 | 0,2 | 0,29 |  |
| 2 | 26 | 25 | 38 | 40 | 1 | 0,39 |  |
| 3 | 43 | 38 | 51 | 58 | 1 | 0,44 |  |

## Evaluations performed in the IBPNorway pout

The ICES IBPNorwayPout inter-benchmark exercise evaluated alternative biological inputs in the stock assessment for natural mortality, sexual maturity and growth (mean weight-at-age in the stock) for the Norway pout stock in the North Sea and Skagerrak. The natural mortality, maturity, and mean weight used in the scenarios evaluated in the benchmarking process originate in results published in Nielsen et al. (2012); Lambert et al. (2009); Sparholt et al. (2002a,b), as well as from the multispecies assessment working group ICES, WGSAM 2011. In particular, natural mortality estimates for Norway pout originating in the key run of the multispecies SMS model (2011) were applied. Five scenarios were considered, a Baseline Scenario following
the current assessment approach and four additional scenarios which explored alternative biological inputs as presented in Table B.2.2 and summarized below.

Baseline:
The May 2011 Norway pout assessment was selected as the Baseline assessment. The settings of the Baseline were constant natural mortality by quarter and age fixed at $0.4,10 \%$ maturity for the 1 -group and $100 \%$ mature for the $2+$ group, and constant MWA assumed in stock. The following alternative scenarios were tested in the benchmark exercise:

Scenario1:
Natural mortality (M) change: Average Z-at-age used as a proxy for M, computed for ages 1-3 in the years 2004, 2005, 2007 and 2008 (years with low fishing mortality) based on Q1 IBTS ICES NP indices from the standard ICES NP index area (calculated from Q1-Q1 cohorts as averages for these 4 years based on the approach in Nielsen et al. (2012, Figure 1). Yearly Ms were divided by 4 to obtain quarterly Ms, and M-at-age 0 was set equal to that for age 1 . In Scenario 1 the same maturity ogive and mean weight-at-age was used as in the Baseline assessment.

## Scenario 2:

Natural mortality (M) change: Same M inputs as Scenario 1. Maturity ogive change: Maturity-at-age 1 was set to 0.2 from Lambert et al., 2009, Figure 4. Maturity-at-age 2 was set to $100 \%$. Mean weight-at-age in stock (MWA) change: The settings were based on results from commercial fishery during the period 1983 to 2006 as presented in Lambert et al. (2009, Figure 8.). The long-term trends in MWA were calculated for the period 1983 to 2011 by quarter and area for the Danish commercial fishery and compared to Lambert et al. (2009) Figure 8 values and were found to be consistent. The revised Mean Weight-at-Age (MWA) in the stock used in the benchmark assessment were for the 1-, 2 - and 3- groups taken as the long-term averages from the commercial data. Data for MWA by quarter for age 0 were kept constant as used in the Baseline. MWA was recorded from commercial fishery catch data, but not during the IBTS, from which only length data are available.

## Scenario 3:

Natural mortality (M) change: Average Z-at-age (being a proxy for $M$ ) for ages 1-3 for the full year range 1983-2005 from Q1-Q1 IBTS revised indices from Nielsen et al. (2012) Figure 1 (as presented in Table 3). Yearly Ms divided by 4 to obtain average quarterly M's. M-at-age 0 set equal to that for age 1 . Maturity ogive change and mean weight-at-age (MWA) change: Same as in Scenario 2.

## Scenario 4:

Natural mortality (M) change: M1+M2 from the multispecies SMS model from 2011 key run presented in the ICES WGSAM 2011 Report. Averages of the SMS estimates of quarterly M1+M2 have been used for the full year range used in the SMS key run (2011). Maturity ogive change and mean weight-at-age (MWA) change: Same as in Scenario 2.

Table B.2.2. Norway pout 4 \& 3.aN (Skagerrak). Mean weight-at-age in the stock, proportion mature and natural mortality used in the assessment. Baseline settings and Scenario 1-4 settings for population dynamics parameters. New parameter settings are in red.


## Results of the evaluations performed in the IBPNorway pout

The change in natural mortality in Scenario 1, where survey based average Zs in the four years with very low or no fishing mortality has been used as a proxy for M , resulted in applying M-values of similar magnitude by age and quarter (around 0.3 for age 0 and 1 and 0.4 for age 2 and 3 ) as the age and quarter invariant values used in the Baseline assessment ( 0.4 by age and quarter). The total mortality on the cohort (and the age-specific variation herein) determines the recruitment, the number of survivors and the biomass. The slightly lower natural mortality for the 0-group fish, for which the fishing mortality was very low, and the slightly higher natural mortality for the oldest fish (age 3 at 0.44 ) resulted in a slightly lower total-stock biomass
(TSB) and R and nearly the same SSB and $\mathrm{Fbar}(1-2)$ as the Baseline. This was expected given these modest age specific changes in $M$ between Baseline and Scenario 1. The maturity ogive in Scenario 1 was the same as the Baseline with only $10 \%$ of age 1 mature, resulting in SSB similar to the Baseline. Because the catch-at-age data used in the Baseline and in all tested scenarios were the same, and because natural mortality on the main fished part of the population, i.e. age $1-3$, was slightly lower for age 1 at 0.29 and slightly higher for age 3 at 0.44 in Scenario 1 (and 2)), this resulted in the recruitment being a little bit lower while fishing mortality was similar comparing Scenario 1 (and Scenario 2) with the Baseline. The same perception of the stock dynamics (fluctuations) over time was observed for Scenario 1 and the Baseline.

Scenario 2 had the same natural mortality change used as in Scenario 1 but the maturity ogive and MWA vector were different. The maturity ogive was changed to $20 \%$ mature of the 1-group, and the revised MWA in the stock was applied, obtained from long-term averages measured from the commercial fishery catch. The changes in MWA were minor compared to the Baseline and did not have much impact. The change in the maturity ogive, where $20 \%$ are mature compared to value of $10 \%$ in the Baseline resulted in a higher SSB in Scenario 2 compared to the Baseline (and Scenario 1) as would be expected. The same trends in R and TSB as well as F were observed in Scenario 2 as in Scenario 1 and the reason for this was the same as described above under Scenario 1. Also recruitment was somewhat lower under Scenario 2. In combination, higher SSB and lower R under Scenario 2 implied a lower overall recruitment rate (R/SSB). Overall, the same perception of the stock dynamics (fluctuations) over time was observed for Scenario 2 and the Baseline.

Scenario 3 operated with bigger changes in mortality by age compared to the baseline. In this scenario the M -value for the 0 - and 1 -groups was around 0.25 and the M for the older age groups were significantly higher (around 0.55 for age 2 and 0.7 for age 3). The same maturity ogive and MWA vector was in Scenario 3 as was used in Scenario 2. Much greater mortality on the old, large fish together with fishing mortality resulted in a high total mortality on the older fish, and consequently, there needed to be more recruits to sustain this mortality (as the same number of fish was caught in all scenarios). This resulted in higher R, and a much higher TSB and SSB, and a perceived lower fishing mortality. Because of the significant change in M in this scenario the stock dynamics and perception of the stock and recruitment for Scenario 3 were different over time compared to the Baseline.

Scenario 4 used the multispecies model estimates of $M$ where the quarterly mortality was higher on the young fish and lower on the older fish, i.e. around 0.65 for age 0 , 0.4 for age $1,0.35$ for age 3 and 0.3 for age 3 . This resulted in similar TSB and SSB as the Baseline but a perception of slightly higher recruitment and fishing mortality.

## Conclusions on the evaluations performed in the IBPNorway pout

The independent reviewers considered that the new values for biological inputs constituted an improvement to the assessment of Norway pout and they supported the use of Scenario 2 as the new Baseline for the stock assessment. They expressed some concern regarding the estimation of mortality rates from survey data without accounting for the survey catchability at age. Ideally natural mortality should be estimated within the stock assessment model simultaneously with estimates of survey catchability, but in most cases the data are inadequate to do this. Evidence of densi-ty-dependence in Norway Pout mortality, growth and maturation rates suggested that using fixed estimates in stock assessments could lead to biases and this was worthy of further investigation. The reviewers noted that the stock-recruit scatter was
relatively uninformative but considered that the values being used for biological reference point should still apply. Consideration could also be given to a higher target escapement level given the importance of Norway Pout as a forage species in the ecosystem.
The Benchmark group concluded that revisions to natural mortality, maturity and mean weight-at-age should be included in the final benchmark assessment based on the approach in Lambert et al. (2009) and Nielsen et al. (2012). It was not recommended that Z values be used as proxies for M values for the full year range since 1983 (Scenario 3) as this average included fishing mortality which, especially in the early part of the period, was relatively high, i.e. this gave a biased overestimation of M. Both Scenarios 2 and 4 were found worthy of further consideration in the Benchmark. The results of Scenarios 2 and 4 were not significantly different from the baseline scenario, and both scenarios gave the same perception of the stock dynamics (fluctuations) over time was observed for the baseline.

The population dynamic parameters and approach used in Scenario 2 have been documented in Nielsen et al. (2012) and in Lambert et al. (2009). SMS estimates of mortality on A1 were higher than those based on $Z$ estimates from the IBTS index. This difference in perception could occur if the catchability on A1 was low. The above cited papers investigate and argue that the catchability of the 1 -group Norway pout was not lower than for the older age groups (although this was somewhat contrary to the catchability estimates at age for IBTS coming out of both the Baseline and the Scenario 2 SXSA assessment model estimates), and that there was no age-specific migration out of the assessment area (being the whole North Sea and SkagerrakKattegat).

Scenario 4 used results of M from the SMS model assessment which had a number of characteristics and assumptions as well. The SMS assumed constant residual mortali-ty-at-age (M1), i.e. natural mortality due to other reasons than predation. This was in contradiction to potential spawning mortality as discussed in Nielsen et al. (2012) which would result in M increasing with age. Also, the SMS smoothed mortality out between ages 1-3, i.e. did not fully consider potential differences in natural mortality between these ages, because the model used rather wide size intervals in its preypredator preference model (ICES, 2011b; Pers. Comm. Morten Vinther and Anna Rindorf, DTU Aqua, March 2012). This meant that the mortalities between age 1, age 2 and age 3 tended to be equalized in the model. In the SMS a main predator on Norway pout age 1 to age 3 was saithe, and the SMS assessment results are sensitive to biomass estimates of saithe in the North Sea. The SMS used the saithe (predator) biomass estimates from the ICES, WGNSSK single-stock assessment (ICES, WGNSSK 2011), and this assessment was very uncertain. Consequently, the SMS natural mortality estimates on Norway pout were dependent on uncertain assessment estimates of saithe in the North Sea which also influenced age-specific mortalities on Norway pout. Compared with the analysis of IBTS survey data, SMS estimates of total yearly $M$ (and also Z) were higher for age 0 and 1 and lower for age 2 and 3 Norway pout (Nielsen et al., 2012). Even if the catchability in the surveys was lower for age group 1 then it was difficult to explain the lower mortalities estimated by the SMS for age 2 and age 3 compared to the observed age 2 and age 3 survey based mortality estimates. In Nielsen et al. (2012) it was argued that migration in or out of the area was very unlikely, so the lower estimates of $Z$ from SMS at age 2 and especially age 3 compared to estimates from the IBTS data (Nielsen et al., 2012) was difficult to explain.

In conclusion the benchmark group agreed that Scenario 2 was preferred based on the available information, and recommended Scenario 2 be used as the new baseline assessment for the Norway Pout stock from 2012 onwards.

## Natural mortalities from multispecies assessments

In Nielsen (2016, Annex 1, Figure 26) the total mortality $(Z)$ and natural predation mortality (M2) of Norway pout by age for the period 1983-2013 is shown as estimated by the SMS model in the 2013 baseline run. The yearly values are shown, but the SMS does also estimate quarterly mortalities. The natural mortalities, M, from the SMS run is variable by year and quarter. If the variable natural mortality values from SMS are used in the Norway pout assessment the following points should be taken into consideration:
a) The SMS does not take into account likely spawning mortality (see also the 2012 inter-benchmark conclusions above).
b ) The natural mortalities of Norway pout from SMS are very dependent on uncertain predator assessment biomasses (both from single species assessments and multispecies assessments), especially for saithe, but also for Northeast Atlantic mackerel (see also the 2012 inter-benchmark conclusions above). Furthermore, the migration patterns (and extension of distribution) of Northeast Atlantic mackerel into the North Sea is very variable between years and over the whole period, and this is not well estimated.
c ) The SMS is not updated every year and the last SMS key run is for 2013. Accordingly, M values for Norway pout need to be assumed or taken as constant mean averages anyway in the last three terminal assessment years (2014-2016). Accordingly, we will not have yearly and quarterly variable values available anyway from SMS on M to include into the SXSA for the latest three years which are the most important years in assessment and forecast context. The SMS key runs are made every third to fourth year, and the experience is that the $M$ values changes drastically every time a key run is made (e.g. from the 2011 key run to the 2013 key run). This means that we have to assume the M values anyway for the recent and most important years in the assessment (as it is only three age classes that are important in the assessment), and that the $M$ values will change every time a new SMS key run is made.
d) If we change the absolute biomass / abundance of Norway pout in the single-stock benchmark assessment significantly then the $M$ values for Norway pout in the SMS are "not correct" as the SMS estimates and assessment of Norway pout biomass is adjusted to fit the single-stock assessment biomass ("adjusted to match the single-stock assessment").

In general, the SMS estimates the natural mortality higher for 0- and 1-group Norway pout compared to the estimates for the same age groups in Nielsen et al. (2012). However, this is not the case in the period 1990-2000 where the estimates of M for age 0 and 1 are at the same level in the SMS and in Nielsen et al. (2012). The natural mortality is lower in the SMS for age 2 and 3 compared to the estimates for the same age groups in Nielsen et al. (2012). This difference is due to SMS not taking into account potential spawning mortality increasing the M with age as estimated in Nielsen et al. (2012).

In the Ecopath with Ecosim Model (EwE) the total mortality and the predation mortality (M2) for Norway pout is not estimated by age group but combined for all age groups (and combined for juvenile and adult) of Norway pout. In Nielsen (2016, Annex 1, Figure 27) the yearly total mortality ( $Z$ ) and the yearly predation mortality (M2) from the EwE is shown for the period 1991 to 2013 based on the latest EwE key run in 2015. The values are total for all age groups and both juveniles and adults of Norway pout.

The EwE estimates the predation mortality rather high at the start of the period from 1991-2013 at levels around 2, but with a decreasing tendency over time to a level around 1.5 at the end of the period. The latter level is in accordance with the general level of M2 in the SMS and in Nielsen et al. (2012).

Many of the above aspects mentioned in relation to the SMS is also the case with respect to EwE estimates of natural mortality (predation mortality) for Norway pout.

## Previous benchmark analyses of natural mortality

Possible revision of the natural mortality parameter in the assessment was also evaluated in the September 2006 benchmark assessment in response to the wish from ACFM RG 2006 on a separate description of natural mortality aspects for Norway pout in the North Sea. In summary no conclusions could be reached from the exploratory runs then using different natural mortalities from previous primary literature (Sparholt et al., 2002a,b; ICES, 2006) as the mortality between age groups was contradictive and inconclusive between periods (variable) from the different sources used showing different trends with no obvious biological explanation. On that basis it was decided in the 2006 benchmark assessment that the final assessment continues using the constant values for natural mortality-at-age. The background for these conclusions and the benchmarking in 2006 was that exploratory runs of the SXSA model was presented in the 2001 and 2002 assessment reports as well as in the 2004 and 2006 assessments (Norway pout benchmark assessments) with revised input data for natural mortality by age based on the results from two papers presented to the working group in 2001, (later published in Sparholt et al., 2002a,b) as well as natural mortality estimates from the North Sea MSVPA model (ICES, SGMSNS 2006) in the 2006 assessment (ICES CM 2006/ACFM:35). These revised natural mortalities were given in the 2004 ICES, WGNSSK Report (ICES, WGNSSK (2005); ICES CM 2005/ACFM:07) and the ICES, WGNSSK 2006 report including the described inter-benchmark assessments. Furthermore, estimates of total mortality based on the SURBA assessment model estimates (2005 SURBA run for Norway pout, ICES CM 2006/ACFM:35) using all survey time-series included in the baseline assessment (ICES CM 2007/ACFM:18 and 30) covering the period 1983-2005 indicated that for the period up to 1990-1995 the $Z$ estimated from SURBA and Sparholt et al., 2002a,b was at the same level for both the 1-2 group and 2-3 group, and there also seems to be age-specific differences in Z. In the period from 1995 and onwards the Z-estimates from SURBA were lower compared to the constant M values obtained from Sparholt et al., 2002a,b. In later years from 2002-2003, the SURBA estimates of $Z$ increased again compared to the period 1995-2001. In conclusion, the exploratory runs gave very much similar results and showed no differences in the perception of the stock status and dynamics. Previous evaluation of total mortality Z , in years where fishing mortality has been very low and where total mortality accordingly approximately equals natural mortality, was conducted and presented in the September 2007 WGNSSK Report (ICES CM 2007/ACFM:18 and 30, Table 5.2.12). This evaluation was based on catch curve analysis on recent (IBTS Q1 and Q3) survey estimates for Norway pout. The results indi-
cated somewhat different levels of Z between different survey time-series mirroring the results from the 2006 benchmark assessment.

## Maturity

According to Lambert et al. (2009) and Nielsen et al. (2012), 20\% of age 1 is estimated mature and is included in the SSB. Therefore, the recruitment in the year after the assessment year influences the SSB already in the following year and very much in the second year. Recruitment is highly variable and influences SSB and total-stock biomass (TSB) rapidly because of the short lifespan of the species. Consequently, the population dynamics of Norway pout in the North Sea and Skagerrak are very dependent on changes caused by spawning and recruitment variation as well as variation in predation (or other natural) mortality, and less by the fishery (Nielsen et al., 2012; Lambert et al., 2009; Sparholt et al., 2002a; 2002b; Lambert et al., 2009).
The ICES inter-benchmark assessment in spring 2012 (IBPNorwayPout, ICES, 2012c) introduced revised estimates of maturity and natural mortality-at-age used in the Norway pout stock assessment. The background and rationale behind the revision of the natural mortality and maturity parameters is described in the IBPNorwayPout report (ICES, 2012c) and primary literature (e.g. Nielsen et al., 2012; Lambert et al., 2009; ICES, WGSAM 2011)). See above conclusions from this under Morality. A follow up on this analysis is presented in Nielsen (2016, Annex 1, Section 5) with the same conclusions.

The same proportion mature and natural mortality are used for all years in the assessment. The proportion mature used is $0 \%$ for the 0 -group, $20 \%$ of the 1 -group and $100 \%$ of the $2+$-group independent of sex. The revisions of the maturity ogive which have been implemented in the 2012 inter-benchmark assessment and following assessments, based on results from Lambert et al. (2009), indicate that the maturity rate for the 1 -group is close to $20 \%$ in average (varying between years and sex) with an increasing tendency over the last 20 years. Furthermore, the average maturity rate for 2 - and 3 -groups in 1st quarter of the year was observed to be only around $95 \%$ as compared to $100 \%$ used in the assessment.

## Weight and growth

## Age reading

Previous to 2016 there have been no reports of age-reading problems of Norway pout otoliths, and no indications of low quality of the age-length keys used in the assessment of this stock. However, age-reading consistency between Danish and Norwegian age readings from landings has been checked.
a) Check of age readings of Norway pout in the North Sea between Denmark and Norway

Davies et al. (2016, Annex 4) presents a preliminary age-reading check conducted in 2016 of otoliths from Norway pout in the North Sea made between Danish and Norwegian age readers at DTU Aqua (DK) and IMR (N). In order to provide some information on the quality of the Norway pout age readings, a preliminary check was initiated in order to investigate whether there are any age-reading issues between the countries reading otoliths of Norway pout caught in the commercial Norway pout fishery in the North Sea and Skagerrak-Kattegat areas (nop34 ICES Area 4 and 3.a stock). Age readings from the Danish and Norwegian commercial fishery are directly used in the Norway pout stock assessment to estimate catch, mean weight, maturity
and mortality-at-age. Also, the age readings from the IBTS survey in first and third quarter of the year are used in several stock assessment tuning fleets to obtain catch per unit of effort (cpue) indices by age in several assessment tuning time-series. The age determination of otoliths from the IBTS surveys involves additional institutes.
The results from the age-reading check are directly relevant to the ICES benchmark assessment for the Norway pout stock conducted in August 2016, ICES, WKPOUT 2016. However, as a full-scale exchange is already planned under the remits of ICES WGBIOP and results should be available by September 2017 these preliminary results are only to indicate that there are discrepancies in the age estimations provided by the participating laboratories.

The investigations are subdivided into two main sections with initial otolith check material and indicative results and time plan for the current full-scale otolith exchange programme.
b ) Initial otolith check material and indicative results
During 2015-2016, a small-scale otolith exchange check for Norway pout in the North Sea was arranged between Denmark and Norway (DTU Aqua Denmark and IMR Norway). Denmark and Norway are the only nations having targeted Norway pout commercial fishery with small-meshed trawls for reduction purposes in the North Sea and Skagerrak. The Danish Norway pout commercial fishery is at present mainly conducted in the Northern North Sea at Fladen Ground, and the Norwegian commercial Norway pout fishery is mainly conducted in the Norwegian zone (EEZ) in the North Sea. Only a limited fishery is conducted in Skagerrak.

Accordingly, there were 127 otoliths selected from the Danish commercial fishery and 100 otoliths from the Norwegian commercial fishery to be checked. The selected otoliths covered the fishery in the respective main fishing areas in autumn 2014 (and additionally a few otoliths from spring 2015). Furthermore, the otoliths covered the full individual fish length range of Norway pout observed in the North Sea fishery and surveys during that period, i.e. covered a very broad length and age range in both samples.

The otoliths were first read by the sampling institute. They were then sent to the sister institute with only indication of fish number, length and date of capture for a cross age-reading check at the other institute. Consequently, the age reading of the other party was not known to the age reader when reading the otoliths from the other institute. After the cross check age-reading period ended in spring 2016, the otoliths and age readings were compiled for initial analyses.
Below are the results of these initial analyses presented.
Sample Overview:

|  | AREA | Quarter | Year | Length rance | No. of Fish |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Denmark | $4 \mathrm{~A} / 45 \mathrm{FO}$ | 4 | 2014 | $9-18 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 40 |
|  | $4 \mathrm{~A} / 45 \mathrm{FO}$ | 4 | 2014 | $9-18.5 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 44 |
|  | $4 \mathrm{~A} / 49 \mathrm{FO}$ | 4 | 2014 | $8.5-17.5 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 43 |
| Norway | $4 \mathrm{~A} / 42-05$ | 3 | 2015 | $15-20 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 14 |
|  | $4 \mathrm{~A} / 42-23$ | 4 | 2014 | $13.5-18 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 50 |
|  | $4 \mathrm{~A} / 42-23$ | 4 | 2014 | $9-15.5 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 36 |

## Results

Danish samples
The readers agreed on $77 \%$ of the samples, with $100 \%$ agreement at age 0 and a decrease in agreement with an increase in age. The table below shows the reader comparison matrix; both countries agree that there are 46 fish which are age 0,46 fish which are aged 1 and six fish which are age 2 . Where there is disagreement, there is a tendency for Norway to estimate the ages of the fish to be one year older compared with Denmark. This is indicated by the red boxes where Norway has estimated one fish to be 1 year old compared with an age of 0 estimated by the Danish reader. In addition, Norway has estimated 28 fish to be age 2 where Denmark has estimated age 1.

|  | Age DK |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age N | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 0 | 46 |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 46 |  |
| 2 |  | 28 | 6 |

## Norwegian samples

The readers agreed on $65 \%$ of the samples, with $100 \%$ agreement at age 0 and a decrease in agreement with an increase in age. A similar pattern in seen where Norway will estimate the fish to be older compared with Denmark, see the table below. Both countries agree that there are 19 fish which are 0 years old, 40 aged 1 and 6 aged 2 . The values in red indicated where Norway has estimated 22 fish to be aged 2 when Denmark has estimated them to be 1, five fish have been assigned an age of 3, and eight an age of 4 when Denmark ages these fish to be just two years old.

The lower level of agreement in the Norwegian sample set coincides with a broader length distribution with fish $18-20 \mathrm{~cm}$ included in the exchange set.

|  | Age DK |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age N | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 0 | 19 |  |  |
| 1 |  | 40 |  |
| 2 |  | 22 | 6 |
| 3 |  |  | 5 |
| 4 |  |  | 8 |

It appears that especially for the larger fish there are discrepancies in the otolith readings and ageing of the Norway pout. As the exchange was carried out without the inclusion of otolith images for the readers to record their otolith interpretations on it is difficult to identify where the discrepancies in the age determinations are. However, as Norway pout grow very quickly in the first year the centre of the otoliths are highly opaque which may cause problems when identifying the first winter ring. In addition, the subsequent growth zones are much narrower in comparison, and it is likely that the interpretation of these narrow growth zones at the edge may also contribute to the differences in the ages estimated by the two countries, especially in respect to the older fish.
The results from the pre-calibration exercise between Denmark and Norway clearly show discrepancies between the readers involved; the overall agreement of $72 \%$ is below $80 \%$ and thus there is a need to carry out a full-scale otolith exchange where images are provided for the readers to annotate.
c ) Future full-scale otolith exchange programme
Based on the above results it seems necessary, and it is recommended, that the planned full-scale otolith exchange programme is carried out as soon as possible for the Norway pout stock in the North Sea and Skagerrak-Kattegat.

A full-scale exchange and calibration workshop is currently underway, according to WGBIOP standards and will include all relevant laboratories supplying age data to ICES on the Norway pout.

The recommended plan for such a full-scale otolith exchange programme is the following:

- Photographing the material for exchange: July-September 2016;
- Exchange of otoliths and cross reading: September-December 2016;
- Analysis of exchange otolith readings and results by the exchange coordinator and selected colleagues: January-March 2017;
- Results and potential correction of data in relation to assessment (catch-atage, tuning and survey fleets, etc.): April-July 2017;
- Implementation in the Norway pout assessment or potential Interbenchmark Assessment: August-September 2017.


## Age compositions

Age compositions by age and quarter of year are available from Norway and Denmark (except for Norway in 2007 and 2008). Only very few biological samples were taken from the low Norway pout catches in 2005 and 2011, as well as in first half year 2006, 2007, and 2012. Danish data are in the InterCatch database and in relation to the

2016 Benchmark assessment also Norwegian data are partly in the InterCatch database. As no age composition data for Norwegian landings have been provided for 2007 and 2008 because of small catches, the catch-at-age numbers from the Norwegian fishery are calculated from Norwegian total catch weight divided by mean weight-at-age from the Danish fishery for those years. As no age composition data for the Danish landings in first half year 2010 have been sampled because of very small catches the catch-at-age numbers from the Danish fishery is calculated from Danish total catch weight divided by mean weight-at-age from the Norwegian fishery in 2010.

## Weight-at-age

a ) Mean weight-at-age in the stock
The Inter-benchmark assessment in spring 2012 (IBPNorwayPout, ICES, 2012c) introduce revised estimates of mean weight-at-age in the stock used in the Norway pout assessment. The background and rationale behind the revision of mean weight-at-age in the stock is described in the IBPNorwayPout report (ICES, 2012c) and primary literature (e.g. Lambert et al., 2009). See above conclusions from this under Mortality. A follow up description of this analysis is presented in Nielsen (2016, Annex 1, Section 5) with the same conclusions.

The same mean weight-at-age in the stock is used for all years, and mean weight-atage in catch is partly used as estimator of weight in the stock. This has resulted in slightly changed levels of constant mean weight-at-ages in the stock which have been calculated partly from long-term averages of mean weight-at-age in the catch. No major revision of mean weight-at-age in the stock has been performed compared to the values used in previous assessments.

The revised Mean Weight-at-age (MWA) in the stock used in the benchmark assessment were for the 1-, 2- and 3- groups taken as the long-term averages from the commercial data. Data for MWA by quarter for age 0 were kept constant as used in the Baseline. MWA was recorded from commercial fishery catch data, but not from the IBTS, from which only length data are available. The revised MWA in the stock was applied in assessment scenario runs as obtained from long-term averages measured from the commercial fishery catch. The changes in MWA were minor compared to the Baseline and did not have much impact on the assessment results.
b) Mean weight-at-age in the catch

The mean weight-at-age in the catch is based on observations, i.e. samplings from commercial fishery (see Nielsen et al., 2016; Annex 2, Sampling Section A.3), since 1984. Mean weight-at-age in the catch is estimated as a weighted average of Danish and Norwegian data. Mean weight-at-age in the catch is shown in the yearly assessment reports including the historical levels, trends and seasonal variation in this. Mean landings weight-at-age from Danish and Norwegian fishery from 2005-2008 as well as for 2011 are uncertain because of few observations. Missing values have been filled in using a combination of sources, values from 2004, from adjacent quarters and areas, and from other countries within the same year, for the period 2005-2008, and in first half year 2010, and for 2011 there has also been used information from other quarters. Also, mean weight-at-age information from Norway has in 2011 involved survey estimates. The assumptions of no changes in weight-at-age in catch in these years do not affect assessment output significantly because the catches in the same period were low. Mean weight-at-age data are available from both Danish and Nor-
wegian fishery in 2009, second half 2010, second half 2011, second half 2012, and all of 2013, 2014 as well as in 2015 and 2016.

The mean weight-at-age used in the commercial tuning fleet by quarter for the period 1983-2006 in the assessments from 2006-2015 (where the commercial tuning fleet has been used in the assessment) are shown in the yearly assessment reports. It appears that mean weight-at-age in the commercial tuning for fleet 1 for age group 2 in 4th quarter of the year is very low.

As the abundance (number of individuals) in the tuning indices as well as the number of fish in the catches by age group (catch numbers) are calculated by raising the weights of the samples with the total catch weights, the catch in numbers and the numbers of individuals in the indices are influenced directly by the mean weight-atage estimates used. Accordingly, if the mean weight-at-age is too low then this will positively bias the abundance estimates used as input in the assessments (numbers-at-age in catch and cpue in the indices).

Nielsen and Berg (2016, Annex 6) describes the model used to calculate mean weights-at-age the catches for the purposes of providing a catch forecast. See also under the section with Short-term projections.
c ) Mean weight-at-age in the catch in assessments previous to 2016
Mean weight-at-age in the catch is estimated as a weighted average of Danish and Norwegian data. In general, the mean weights-at-age in the catches are variable between seasons of year. Historical levels and variation in mean weight-at-age in catch by quarter of year is shown in Figure 12.2.1 in the 2004 benchmark assessment in the 2004 ICES WGNSSK Report (ICES, WGNSSK (2005), ICES CM 2005/ACFM:07) and has been yearly/half yearly updated since then (ICES, WGNSSK Reports).

## B.3. Assessment tuning fleet data and indices (general)

An overview over the tuning data time-series and fleets included and used in the assessment during different time periods (by year and age) in the assessment is given in the Table B.3.1 below.

In the assessment from 2016 onwards there is only used survey tuning fleets and accordingly not any commercial tuning fleet.

Table B.3.1. Norway pout 4 \& 3.aN (Skagerrak). Tuning fleets and indices used in the final 2004 benchmark assessment, in the 2005-2015 assessments, as well as in the 2016 assessment, compared to the 2003 assessment. (Changes from previous period marked with grey).

|  |  | 2003 ASSESSMENT | 2004, 2005, April 200 | Sept. 2006 ASSESSMENT | 2007 -15 ASSESSMENTS | 2016-ASSESSMENTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recruiting sason |  | 3 3d duater | 2nd quater (SXSA) | 3rd quate (SMS): 2nd quate (SXSA | 2nd quarter (SXSA), autumn assessm. 2nd quarter (SXSA), autumn assessm. $4+$ (SXSA) | 3rd quarter SESAM (1984-2016) <br> 3 rd quarter SESAM (1984-2016) <br> $3+$ (SESAM) (1984-2016) |
| Last season in last year |  | 3 3rd quater | 2nd quarter (SXSA) | 3rd quarte (SMS): 2nd quater (SXSA |  |  |
| Plusgoup |  | $4+$ | 4+ (SXSA) | None (SMS); 4+(SXSA) |  |  |
| FLT01: comm Q1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Year range | 1988-2003 | 1988-2004 | 1988-2004 | 1983-2004, 2006 | NOT USED |
|  | Quarter | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |
|  | Ages | 1-3 | 1-3 | 1-3 | 1-3 |  |
| FLT01: comm Q2 |  |  | NOT USED | NOT USED | NOT USED | NOT USED |
|  | Year range | 1982-2003 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Quarter |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Ages | 1-3 |  |  |  |  |
| FLT01: comm Q3 |  |  |  |  |  | NOT USED |
|  | Year range | 1982-2003 | 1982-2004 | 1988-2004 | 1983-2004, 2006 |  |
|  | Quarter | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |  |
|  | Ages | $0 \cdot 3$ | 1-3 | 1-3 | 1-3 |  |
| FLTO1: comm Q4 |  |  |  |  |  | NOT USED |
|  | Year range | 1982-2003 | 1982-2004 | 1982-2004 | 1983-2004, 2006 |  |
|  | Quarter | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  |
|  | Ages | 0.3 | 0-3 | 0-2 (SMS); 0-3(SXSA) | 0.3(SXSA) |  |
| FLTo2: ibsq1 |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1984-2016 } \\ & 1 \\ & 1-3 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Year range | 1982-2003 | 1982-2006 | 1982-2006 | 1983-2015 |  |
|  | Quarter | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
|  | Ages | 1-3 | 1-3 | 1-3 | 1-3 |  |
| FLTO3: effs |  |  |  |  |  | 1992-2016 |
|  | Year range | 1982-2003 | 1992-2005 | 1992-2005 | 1992-2015 |  |
|  | Quarter | 3 | Q3 - Q 2 | Q 3 - Q 2 | Q 3 - Q 2 | 3 |
|  | Ages | 0-3 | 0.1 | $0-1$ | 0-1 | 0-1 |
| FLT04: sff |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Year range | 1982-2003 | 1998-2006 | 1999-2006 | 1998-2015 | 1998-2016 |
|  | Quarter | 3 | Q3-> Q2 | Q3-> Q2 | Q3-> Q2 | 3 |
|  | Ages | 0-3 | 0.1 | $0-1$ | $0-1$ | 0.1 |
| FLT05: ibsta ${ }^{\text {3 }}$ |  | NOT USED |  |  |  | 1991-2015 |
|  | Year range |  | 1991-2005 | 1991-2005 | 1991-2014 |  |
|  | Quarter |  | 3 | 3 | Q3 | 3 |
|  | Ages |  | $2 \cdot 3$ | 2-3 | $2 \cdot 3$ | 2-3 |

## B.4. Survey data

Description of catch, effort and research vessel data used in the assessment is given in Nielsen (2016, Annex 1) and in Nielsen et al. (2016, Annex 2) and is summarised below.

## Survey tuning time-series used in the Norway pout assessment (2016 onwards)

Trawl survey index time-series of abundance of Norway pout by age and quarter are for the assessment period available from the ICES International Bottom-trawl Survey (IBTS Q1 and Q3) and the English Groundfish Survey (EGFS Q3 being a part of IBTS Q3) and the Scottish Groundfish Survey (SGFS Q3 being a part of IBTS Q3). An overview of the survey tuning time-series included used by year and age in the assessment during different assessment periods is shown in Table B.3.1 above.

The survey trawl survey indices for Norway pout are in form of standard abundance and density indices estimated as the catch per unit of effort (cpue in number of fish per hour) by age for the international bottom-trawl surveys coordinated by ICES and conducted according to ICES standard survey and sampling design (www.ices.dk).

1) The IBTS Q1 tuning fleet has remained unchanged compared to previous years' assessments and benchmark assessments.

It should be noted that in the 2014 IBTS Q1 survey, less hauls were conducted in the northern part of the North Sea than usual. This did not result in change in the log residual stock numbers, the log inverse catchabilities, and the weighting factors for computing survivors in the assessment for this survey.
2) The SGFS Q3 for age group 0 and 1 for the period 1998 and onwards has been used as tuning fleet in the assessment. The short time-series is due to the change in survey design for SGFS.

The SGFS data from 1998 onwards should be used with caution due to new survey design (new vessel from 1998 and new gear and extended survey area from 1999). The 0-group indices from this survey have accordingly not been used in the assessment tuning fleet for this survey prior to the 2004 benchmark assessment. The index for the 0-group from SGFS changed with an order of magnitude in the years after the
change in survey design compared to previous years (Table 12.2.8, ICES, WGNSSK (2005)).

From 2009 onwards the SGFS changed its survey area slightly with a few more hauls in the northern North Sea and a few less hauls in the German Bight. This is not evaluated to influence the indices significantly as the indices are based on weighted subarea averages.
In 3rd quarter 2015 and 2016 test trials were conducted in the international third quarter IBTS with 15 minute duration hauls compared to 30 minute duration hauls. The new 15 minute test hauls have been included in the index calculation for 3rd quarter 2015 and 2016, and will potentially affect the Norway pout indices for the SGFS, the EGFS and the combined IBTS Q3 index. It has been necessary to include the 15 minute hauls in the SGFS 2015 and 2016 as extensive areas (of the total SGFS survey area) are only covered with this type of hauls. Analyses of this are ongoing and nothing conclusive is available at present concerning potential significant impacts of this on the indices. Preliminary analyses indicate no significant differences in catch rates of Norway pout between the 15 minute hauls and the 30 minute hauls in the SGFS; however, the variability is very high and there are only very few observations available.

For the September assessments up to and including 2015 the quarter 3 0-group and 1group survey indices for SGFS is back-shifted to the final season of the assessment in the terminal year, i.e. to quarter 2 of the assessment year in order to include the most recent 0 -group estimate in the assessment. From 2016, with use of the SESAM model including quarter 3 information in the terminal assessment year, this back shifting is not necessary.
3) The EGFS Q3 for age group 0 and 1 for the period 1992 and onwards has been used as tuning fleet in the assessment. The shorter time-series is due to the change in survey design for EGFS. Furthermore, there is a good argument for excluding the age 2-3 of the EGFS as the within survey correlation between the age groups $1-2$ and $2-3$ is very poor while the within correlation between age groups $0-1$ is good.
The EGFS data prior to 1992 should be used with caution as the survey design shifted in 1992. This change in survey design has until 2004 been accounted for by simply multiplying all indices with a factor 3.5 for all age groups in the years prior to 1992 in order to standardize it to the later indices. The EGFS survey indices for Norway pout has been revised in the 2004 assessment compared to the previous years' assessments for the 1996, 2001, 2002, and 2003 indices. In previous years' assessments (before 2004) the full EGFS survey time-series for all age groups have been included as an assessment tuning fleet.

In September 2015, the EGFS survey indices were revised to incorporate the relevant primes within the Norway pout area following the IBTS Manual (2015), i.e. in the selection of the prime stations to be included in the Norway pout index calculation. The revision is described in detail in an ICES working document to ICES, WGNSSK 2015 (Silva, 2015). This has changed the EGFS indices for Norway pout for all years and ages since 1992. Especially, the indices for the 0-group have changed significantly without any obvious trends over time. However, the perception of the dynamics in the stocks (e.g. strong year classes as 0-group and also as older ages in the cohorts) seems not to have changed in relative terms. Consequently, there is consistency in this to the previous EGFS indices and in relation to the other survey indices also for Norway pout. The log inverse catchabilities in the September 2015 SXSA assessment
have increased slightly for the EGFS in 2015 compared to previous years' assessments, while the weighting factors for computing survivors in the September 2015 SXSA assessment were quite similar to those from previous years' SXSA assessments. Also, this seems not to have affected the log residual stock numbers.
In 3rd quarter 2015 and 2016, test trials were conducted in the international third quarter IBTS with 15 min duration hauls compared to 30 minute duration hauls. The new 15 minute test hauls have been included in the index calculation for 3rd quarter 2015 and 2016, and will potentially affect the Norway pout indices for the SGFS, the EGFS and the combined IBTS Q3 index. Only one 15 minute test haul was included in the EGFS 2015. Analyses of this are ongoing and nothing conclusive is available at present concerning potential significant impacts of this on the indices.

For the September assessments up to and including 2015 the quarter 30 -group and 1group survey indices for EGFS is back-shifted to the final season of the assessment in the terminal year, i.e. to quarter 2 of the assessment year in order to include the most recent 0-group estimate in the assessment. From 2016 with use of the SESAM model including quarter 3 information in the terminal assessment year this back shifting is not necessary.
4) Time-series for the combined IBTS Q3 survey are only available from 1991 and onwards. The IBTS Q3 for the period 1991-onwards has been included in the assessment. This survey has a broader coverage of the Norway pout distribution area compared to the EGFS and SGFS isolated. The 3rd quarter IBTS and the EFGS and SGFS are not independent of each other as the two latter is a part of the first. Accordingly, the below changes have been made for the survey tuning index series in the 2004 benchmark assessment.

As the combined IBTS Q3 survey index is not available for the most recent year (terminal assessment year) to be used in the September seasonal assessment it has been chosen to exclude the 0 - and 1-group indices from the IBTS Q3 in order to allow inclusion of the 0 - and 1-group indices from the SGFS and EGFS which are available for the most recent year in the September assessment. (Not relevant in relation to spring assessments conducted up to 2015). Accordingly, the IBTS Q3 tuning fleet for age 2 and age 3 has been included in the assessment as a new tuning fleet. The SXSA assessment model (used up to and including 2015) demands at least two age groups in order to run, which is one reason for including both age 0 and age 1 under the EGFS and SGFS tuning fleets and not including age 1 in the IBTS Q3 tuning fleet.

In 3rd quarter 2015 and 2016 test trials were conducted in the international third quarter IBTS with 15 minute duration hauls compared to 30 minute duration hauls. The new 15 minute test hauls have been included in the index calculation for 3rd quarter 2015 and 2016, and will potentially affect the Norway pout indices for the SGFS, the EGFS and the combined IBTS Q3 index. Analyses of this are ongoing and nothing conclusive is available at present concerning potential significant impacts of this on the indices.

## Revision of assessment tuning fleets (survey cpue data and commercial fishery cpue data) in the 2004 benchmark assessment

Revision of the Norway pout assessment tuning fleets was performed during the 2004 benchmark assessment. The background for this, the results, and the conclusions from the analyses in relation to this are described in this Stock Annex (stock quality handbook) as well as in the benchmark assessment in the working group report from 2004.

Revision of the Norway pout assessment tuning fleets during benchmark assessment have been based partly on cohort analyses and analyses of correlations within and between the different tuning fleet indices by age group, as well as on the results from a row of exploratory assessment runs described under Section 12.3 of the 2004 benchmark assessment (ICES, WGNSSK (2005)) which analyses the performance of the different tuning fleets in the assessment. The exploratory assessment runs also give indications of possible catchability patterns and trends in the fishery over time within the assessment period. The analyses of the tuning fleet indices are presented in the benchmark assessment 2004 (ICES, WGNSSK (2005) Figures 12.2.3-12.2.8 and Tables 12.2.9-12.2.12).

## Overview of Norway pout distribution and density patterns from IBTS Q1 and Q3 surveys

In Nielsen (2016, Annex 1) and Nielsen et al. (2016, Annex 2) a comprehensive overview and mapping of Norway pout distribution and density patterns in the North Sea and Skagerrak areas are presented and evaluated based on ICES IBTS Q1 and Q3 surveys.

## Summary of Norwegian survey

Annual shrimp swept-area surveys have been conducted by the Institute of Marine Research since 1984 in Skagerrak and the Norwegian Deep in the eastern side of the Norwegian trench in the North Sea (Johnsen and Søvik, 2016, Annex 5). The main objective of the survey is to monitor abundance and distribution of the northern shrimp (Pandalus borealis) stock. In addition to northern shrimp, the catch of fish, Norway lobster and sea cucumber have been sorted to species where the total weight and abundance, the individual length and/or weight have been recorded for each species. The depth ( $100-550 \mathrm{~m}$ ) and geographical distribution of the trawl positions of the shrimp survey do not overlap with the positions covered by the International Bottom-trawl Surveys organized by ICES; however, Norway pout is a very common species in the catches for both the IBTS surveys and the Norwegian trawl survey despite the non-overlapping survey areas.

Johnsen and Søvik (2016, Annex 5) analyse the shrimp survey data with the purpose of establishing an additional fishery-independent survey time-series that may be used as a future input in the stock assessment of Norway pout in the Skagerrak and North Sea. Despite the shortcomings in the analyses caused by the lack of age reading and short time-series, the results clearly indicate that the survey estimates are in line with the IBTS survey time-series. Therefore, the full survey time-series (from 1984) should be estimated when data are available, and more advanced methods used to estimate ages based on length distributions, before the survey time-series can be tested as an input to the Norway pout stock assessment.

## B.5. Commercial cpue data

In the assessments from 2016 onwards there is only used survey tuning fleets and accordingly not any commercial tuning fleet.

## Assessments previous to 2016

Combined cpue indices by age and quarter for the Danish and Norwegian commercial fishery tuning fleet (including data up to 2006) is calculated from effort data obtained from the method of effort standardization of the commercial fishery tuning fleet described under Section B.1 (and B.3) and vessel category specific catches by
area. Cpue is estimated on a quarterly basis for the Danish and Norwegian commercial fleets.

The resulting combined, commercial fishery cpue data by age and quarter is presented in the input data to the yearly performed assessment. The commercial fleet data (up to 2006) are used in tuning of the assessment based on the combined and standardized Danish and Norwegian effort data and on the catch data for the commercial fishery.

See also Section B. 1 and B3 concerning the commercial fishery tuning fleet.

## Commercial fishery tuning fleets (assessments previous to 2016)

In addition to the analyses of the commercial fishery assessment tuning fleet (including data up to 2006) as described above (effort standardization) the quarterly cpue indices of the commercial fishery tuning fleet were analysed during the 2004 benchmark assessment:

1) The indices for the 0-group in 3rd quarter of the year have been excluded from the commercial fishery tuning fleet. The main argumentation for doing that is that this age group indicate clear patterns in trends in catchability over the assessment period as shown in the single fleet/quarter assessment runs in Section 12.3 (Figure 12.3.7), ICES, WGNSSK (2005). Second, there is no correlation between the commercial fishery 3rd quarter 0-group index and the commercial fishery 4th quarter 0-group index, and no correlation between the 3rd quarter commercial fishery 0 -group index in a given year with the 1-group index of the 3rd quarter commercial fishery the following year.
2) The 2 nd quarter indices for all age groups have been excluded from the commercial fishery tuning fleet. This is mainly because of indications of strong trends in catchability over time in the assessment period for this part of the tuning fleet for all age groups as indicated by single fleet tuning runs in the Section 12.3 (Figure 12.3.7), ICES, WGNSSK (2005). Also, the within quarter and between quarter correlation indices are in general relatively poor. The cohort analyses of the 2nd quarter commercial fishery indices indicate as well relative changes over time.

Revision of assessment tuning fleets (survey cpue data and commercial fishery cpue data) in the 2004 benchmark assessment (see also Section B. 1 and B. 5 concerning the commercial fishery tuning fleet):

Revision of the Norway pout assessment tuning fleets was performed during the 2004 benchmark assessment. The background for this, the results, and the conclusions from the analyses in relation to this are described here in the stock quality handbook as well as in the benchmark assessment in the working group report from 2004.

Revision of the Norway pout assessment tuning fleets during benchmark assessment have been based partly on cohort analyses and analyses of correlations within and between the different tuning fleet indices by age group, as well as on the results from a row of exploratory assessment runs described under Section 12.3 of the 2004 benchmark assessment (ICES WGNSSK (2005)) which analyses the performance of the different tuning fleets in the assessment. The exploratory assessment runs also give indications of possible catchability patterns and trends in the fishery over time within the assessment period. The analyses of the tuning fleet indices are presented in the benchmark assessment 2004 (ICES, WGNSSK (2005)) Figures 12.2.3-12.2.8 and Tables 12.2.9-12.2.12.

## C. Assessment: data and method

Assessment Model and Software used (2016 assessment and onwards; ICES WKPOUT 2016 Benchmark)

A seasonal extension to the state-space Assessment Model (SAM) was evaluated during this benchmark for Norway pout and compared with the model previously used (Seasonal XSA). This new model (SESAM) estimated very similar trends in SSB and fishing mortality compared to SXSA. The SESAM model was preferred by the group due to its ability to incorporate process and observation error and estimate uncertainties in all quantities, including the forecast.

The method is described in detail in Nielsen and Berg (2016, Annex 6), and the source code is available online at www.stockassessment.org under "NorPoutBench2016".

In brief, the model is the same as the SAM model, except that the time-step used is one quarter of a year rather than a full year. As in the SXSA, recruitment is assumed to occur in quarter 3 only. The logarithm of the fishing mortality-at-age and quarter is assumed to follow a multivariate random walk with lag 4 and correlated increments, i.e. the $\log \mathrm{F}$-at-age in a given quarter is given by the $\log \mathrm{F}$-vector in the same quarter one year earlier plus a correlated noise term with mean zero.

The observation equations in SESAM are also extended to deal with zero observations (both surveys and catches), which are usually treated as missing values in SAM. This is done by introducing a detection limit for each fleet, and defining the likelihood of a zero observation to be the probability of obtaining a value less than the detection limit. The detection limit is set to 0.5 times the smallest positive observation by fleet.

A special option was included to down-weight the influence of large jumps in log F on the estimated random walk variance due to periods where the fishery was closed. This option reduced the estimated log F process variance considerably.

## Benchmark assessment with the new model (ICES WKPOUT 2016 Benchmark)

The data used were those used in the May 2014 assessment of Norway pout. Nine different configurations of the SESAM model and the input data were examined. These are reported in Nielsen and Berg (2016, Annex 6). In summary, these cases were:

1) Base run. Commercial cpue series omitted. Detection limit set to 0.5 times the smallest positive observation by fleet. Excluding the years 2005-2008 from the log $F$ random walk variance estimation.
2) As the base run but with commercial cpue series included.
3) As the baserun but detection limit set to 0.99 times the smallest positive observation by fleet.
4) As the baserun but detection limit set to 2 times the smallest positive observation by fleet.
5) As the baserun but excluding data from 1983 and 1984.
6) As the baserun but with 0.5 times the natural mortality.
7) Final run. As the baserun but excluding data from 1983.
8) As the base run but excluding data from 1983, 1984, and 1985.
9) As the base but using same F RW variance in all years.

The WKPOUT benchmark group recommended to omit the commercial cpue series, because this dataseries is not independent from the catches, although this is assumed by the model, and independent survey data are available, which is to be preferred. The assessment performed well when leaving out the commercial cpue, and the observed trends were similar.

Run 2 and 3 examined the sensitivity of the model to the assumed detection limit, and it was found to be quite insensitive.

Run 5, 7, and 8 examined how the earliest datapoints affected the assessment, because there were concerns about their accuracy. These concerns regarded correct species identification of the catches and missing observations of weight-at-age in the catches in 1983.

For these reasons the group recommend run 7, which excludes data from 1983, and the figures in the following are from run 7.

The residuals (Figure C.5) did not exhibit signs of systematic errors, and the retrospective diagnostic looks acceptable (Figure C.6). A comparison of predicted vs. observed total catch weight by quarter and year is shown in Figure C.7.

The minimum of the estimated SSB time-series by quarter, i.e. the Blim, is given in Table C.1. Table C. 2 summarises recruitment, SSB and $\mathrm{F}_{(1-2)}$.


Figure C.1. Quarterly estimated SSB and confidence interval from SESAM (blue) and SXSA (green, quarter 1 only, connecting lines are interpolations).


Figure C.2. Average fishing mortality (ages 1-2). Blue is quarterly values from SESAM, cyan is the yearly average from SESAM, green is yearly average from SXSA.


Figure C.3. Estimated recruitment. Blue is SESAM, green is SXSA.


Figure C.4. Stock-recruitment from SESAM. SSB in quarter 1. The corresponding plot with SSB in quarter 4 is similar. Colours are associated with the year (blue for earliest to red for most recent).


Figure C.5. One step ahead residuals from SESAM by fleet.


Figure C.6. Retrospective diagnostic for SESAM.


Figure C.7. Total catch weight observed vs. predicted by quarter (top) and year (bottom).

Table C.1. The minimum of the estimated SSB time-series by quarter.

| SSB | QUARTER |  | YEAR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 72101.23 | 1 | 2005 |  |
| 55109.70 | 2 | 2005 |  |
| 57961.80 | 3 | 2005 |  |
| 39447.18 | 4 | 2005 |  |

Table C.2. Estimated recruitment, spawning-stock biomass (SSB), and average fishing mortality for ages 1 to 2 (F12). Note, F values are yearly means, and therefore the values for 2014 are not shown because this year is incomplete.

| Time | Recruits | Low | High | SSB | Low | High | F12 | Low | High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1984 |  |  |  | 348992 | 198372 | 499611 | 1.382 | 0.918 | 2.079 |
| 1984.25 |  |  |  | 218915 | 124966 | 312865 |  |  |  |
| 1984.5 | 41144 | 26581 | 63685 | 229810 | 128306 | 331314 |  |  |  |
| 1984.75 |  |  |  | 105632 | 53912 | 157352 |  |  |  |
| 1985 |  |  |  | 188435 | 110185 | 266685 | 1.374 | 0.883 | 2.139 |
| 1985.25 |  |  |  | 109063 | 61709 | 156417 |  |  |  |
| 1985.5 | 26675 | 17588 | 40458 | 119137 | 67429 | 170846 |  |  |  |
| 1985.75 |  |  |  | 55560 | 26841 | 84279 |  |  |  |
| 1986 |  |  |  | 101005 | 57502 | 144507 | 0.936 | 0.573 | 1.527 |
| 1986.25 |  |  |  | 62992 | 34496 | 91488 |  |  |  |
| 1986.5 | 58290 | 37337 | 91001 | 72403 | 40595 | 104212 |  |  |  |
| 1986.75 |  |  |  | 39645 | 19650 | 59641 |  |  |  |
| 1987 |  |  |  | 122584 | 75034 | 170134 | 0.936 | 0.532 | 1.644 |
| 1987.25 |  |  |  | 88173 | 51406 | 124939 |  |  |  |
| 1987.5 | 12747 | 8101 | 20057 | 113597 | 65634 | 161560 |  |  |  |
| 1987.75 |  |  |  | 69938 | 37104 | 102773 |  |  |  |
| 1988 |  |  |  | 147915 | 71632 | 224198 | 0.583 | 0.352 | 0.964 |
| 1988.25 |  |  |  | 91039 | 41679 | 140399 |  |  |  |
| 1988.5 | 45207 | 29892 | 68370 | 97703 | 45320 | 150086 |  |  |  |
| 1988.75 |  |  |  | 58000 | 24436 | 91564 |  |  |  |
| 1989 |  |  |  | 100932 | 59721 | 142144 | 0.694 | 0.416 | 1.158 |
| 1989.25 |  |  |  | 79658 | 46155 | 113160 |  |  |  |
| 1989.5 | 48951 | 32399 | 73959 | 95305 | 55773 | 134837 |  |  |  |
| 1989.75 |  |  |  | 58537 | 32146 | 84928 |  |  |  |
| 1990 |  |  |  | 175035 | 104497 | 245574 | 0.637 | 0.387 | 1.048 |
| 1990.25 |  |  |  | 118470 | 69255 | 167684 |  |  |  |
| 1990.5 | 66575 | 43766 | 101271 | 129717 | 73370 | 186064 |  |  |  |
| 1990.75 |  |  |  | 79614 | 41762 | 117466 |  |  |  |
| 1991 |  |  |  | 220656 | 130571 | 310742 | 0.574 | 0.349 | 0.945 |
| 1991.25 |  |  |  | 150325 | 85811 | 214839 |  |  |  |
| 1991.5 | 93518 | 62737 | 139400 | 172470 | 97152 | 247787 |  |  |  |
| 1991.75 |  |  |  | 106765 | 56026 | 157503 |  |  |  |
| 1992 |  |  |  | 312686 | 186387 | 438985 | 0.570 | 0.351 | 0.925 |
| 1992.25 |  |  |  | 215978 | 125705 | 306250 |  |  |  |
| 1992.5 | 48558 | 32380 | 72821 | 251936 | 146275 | 357597 |  |  |  |
| 1992.75 |  |  |  | 154021 | 83605 | 224438 |  |  |  |
| 1993 |  |  |  | 357862 | 202997 | 512727 | 0.655 | 0.363 | 1.184 |
| 1993.25 |  |  |  | 229863 | 124280 | 335446 |  |  |  |
| 1993.5 | 43151 | 27901 | 66735 | 240384 | 127682 | 353086 |  |  |  |
| 1993.75 |  |  |  | 133350 | 59979 | 206721 |  |  |  |
| 1994 |  |  |  | 219996 | 109786 | 330206 | 0.519 | 0.293 | 0.919 |


| Time | RECRUITS | Low | High | SSB | Low | High | F12 | Low | High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1994.25 |  |  |  | 148390 | 68250 | 228530 |  |  |  |
| 1994.5 | 122325 | 77384 | 193366 | 158702 | 74518 | 242886 |  |  |  |
| 1994.75 |  |  |  | 94072 | 38371 | 149772 |  |  |  |
| 1995 |  |  |  | 281013 | 151769 | 410258 | 0.349 | 0.192 | 0.634 |
| 1995.25 |  |  |  | 218606 | 114379 | 322833 |  |  |  |
| 1995.5 | 51114 | 31730 | 82341 | 271795 | 140893 | 402697 |  |  |  |
| 1995.75 |  |  |  | 180756 | 88183 | 273329 |  |  |  |
| 1996 |  |  |  | 502611 | 246336 | 758886 | 0.312 | 0.168 | 0.580 |
| 1996.25 |  |  |  | 340110 | 161029 | 519191 |  |  |  |
| 1996.5 | 103014 | 63180 | 167962 | 368834 | 172770 | 564898 |  |  |  |
| 1996.75 |  |  |  | 219710 | 88839 | 350580 |  |  |  |
| 1997 |  |  |  | 380415 | 188170 | 572661 | 0.305 | 0.162 | 0.574 |
| 1997.25 |  |  |  | 292755 | 142257 | 443252 |  |  |  |
| 1997.5 | 26311 | 16316 | 42429 | 335067 | 168445 | 501689 |  |  |  |
| 1997.75 |  |  |  | 211021 | 96873 | 325169 |  |  |  |
| 1998 |  |  |  | 445703 | 209556 | 681849 | 0.267 | 0.144 | 0.493 |
| 1998.25 |  |  |  | 303260 | 138036 | 468484 |  |  |  |
| 1998.5 | 47477 | 29893 | 75406 | 314371 | 140845 | 487898 |  |  |  |
| 1998.75 |  |  |  | 193030 | 77565 | 308494 |  |  |  |
| 1999 |  |  |  | 237289 | 112190 | 362388 | 0.321 | 0.170 | 0.605 |
| 1999.25 |  |  |  | 183342 | 85223 | 281460 |  |  |  |
| 1999.5 | 94836 | 58847 | 152834 | 190559 | 91456 | 289661 |  |  |  |
| 1999.75 |  |  |  | 119615 | 52964 | 186267 |  |  |  |
| 2000 |  |  |  | 295683 | 152522 | 438843 | 0.306 | 0.159 | 0.588 |
| 2000.25 |  |  |  | 228771 | 117182 | 340360 |  |  |  |
| 2000.5 | 23818 | 14724 | 38530 | 275652 | 141783 | 409522 |  |  |  |
| 2000.75 |  |  |  | 182925 | 89044 | 276805 |  |  |  |
| 2001 |  |  |  | 398720 | 185848 | 611593 | 0.229 | 0.117 | 0.450 |
| 2001.25 |  |  |  | 269432 | 120551 | 418313 |  |  |  |
| 2001.5 | 26614 | 16435 | 43098 | 282329 | 124625 | 440032 |  |  |  |
| 2001.75 |  |  |  | 185154 | 78637 | 291670 |  |  |  |
| 2002 |  |  |  | 203672 | 91403 | 315941 | 0.335 | 0.158 | 0.709 |
| 2002.25 |  |  |  | 152314 | 65580 | 239047 |  |  |  |
| 2002.5 | 19946 | 11710 | 33977 | 152271 | 68182 | 236361 |  |  |  |
| 2002.75 |  |  |  | 95599 | 39329 | 151869 |  |  |  |
| 2003 |  |  |  | 144204 | 61904 | 226504 | 0.202 | 0.091 | 0.447 |
| 2003.25 |  |  |  | 105988 | 44806 | 167169 |  |  |  |
| 2003.5 | 9649 | 5627 | 16543 | 114006 | 49409 | 178604 |  |  |  |
| 2003.75 |  |  |  | 72883 | 28630 | 117137 |  |  |  |
| 2004 |  |  |  | 113008 | 46822 | 179193 | 0.161 | 0.068 | 0.380 |
| 2004.25 |  |  |  | 82125 | 33389 | 130862 |  |  |  |
| 2004.5 | 9616 | 5738 | 16113 | 85721 | 35797 | 135645 |  |  |  |
| 2004.75 |  |  |  | 55438 | 21622 | 89254 |  |  |  |
| 2005 |  |  |  | 72101 | 30166 | 114036 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.001 |
| 2005.25 |  |  |  | 55110 | 23285 | 86934 |  |  |  |


| Time | Recruits | Low | High | SSB | Low | High | F12 | Low | High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2005.5 | 33690 | 20098 | 56474 | 57962 | 25768 | 90155 |  |  |  |
| 2005.75 |  |  |  | 39447 | 17736 | 61158 |  |  |  |
| 2006 |  |  |  | 92574 | 48641 | 136507 | 0.285 | 0.111 | 0.733 |
| 2006.25 |  |  |  | 74969 | 39087 | 110851 |  |  |  |
| 2006.5 | 23229 | 13589 | 39707 | 91470 | 46988 | 135953 |  |  |  |
| 2006.75 |  |  |  | 62375 | 30605 | 94146 |  |  |  |
| 2007 |  |  |  | 159445 | 67777 | 251113 | 0.030 | 0.015 | 0.063 |
| 2007.25 |  |  |  | 116563 | 50368 | 182757 |  |  |  |
| 2007.5 | 36598 | 21586 | 62049 | 132963 | 58296 | 207629 |  |  |  |
| 2007.75 |  |  |  | 90811 | 39362 | 142261 |  |  |  |
| 2008 |  |  |  | 178479 | 87550 | 269407 | 0.063 | 0.031 | 0.128 |
| 2008.25 |  |  |  | 137876 | 68118 | 207634 |  |  |  |
| 2008.5 | 67194 | 39186 | 115220 | 155036 | 77108 | 232965 |  |  |  |
| 2008.75 |  |  |  | 104769 | 50784 | 158753 |  |  |  |
| 2009 |  |  |  | 260569 | 131341 | 389797 | 0.108 | 0.048 | 0.246 |
| 2009.25 |  |  |  | 202838 | 103059 | 302617 |  |  |  |
| 2009.5 | 82785 | 48640 | 140899 | 240532 | 122024 | 359040 |  |  |  |
| 2009.75 |  |  |  | 157658 | 74263 | 241053 |  |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  |  | 414051 | 203174 | 624929 | 0.118 | 0.056 | 0.250 |
| 2010.25 |  |  |  | 313605 | 155391 | 471819 |  |  |  |
| 2010.5 | 9245 | 5378 | 15893 | 360294 | 177270 | 543319 |  |  |  |
| 2010.75 |  |  |  | 236288 | 109206 | 363370 |  |  |  |
| 2011 |  |  |  | 438426 | 201293 | 675559 | 0.055 | 0.025 | 0.120 |
| 2011.25 |  |  |  | 310881 | 143122 | 478640 |  |  |  |
| 2011.5 | 17517 | 10523 | 29157 | 318424 | 146342 | 490505 |  |  |  |
| 2011.75 |  |  |  | 208080 | 92904 | 323256 |  |  |  |
| 2012 |  |  |  | 178035 | 83755 | 272314 | 0.151 | 0.064 | 0.356 |
| 2012.25 |  |  |  | 141694 | 66769 | 216620 |  |  |  |
| 2012.5 | 82408 | 48438 | 140199 | 131318 | 64059 | 198577 |  |  |  |
| 2012.75 |  |  |  | 86189 | 42109 | 130269 |  |  |  |
| 2013 |  |  |  | 183982 | 95056 | 272909 | 0.247 | 0.103 | 0.594 |
| 2013.25 |  |  |  | 155141 | 80095 | 230186 |  |  |  |
| 2013.5 | 32187 | 16305 | 63540 | 197688 | 100381 | 294995 |  |  |  |
| 2013.75 |  |  |  | 137518 | 67510 | 207525 |  |  |  |
| 2014 |  |  |  | 364881 | 154561 | 575201 |  |  |  |
| 2014.25 |  |  |  | 259887 | 111916 | 407858 |  |  |  |

## Conclusions from External Reviewers' comments on the WKPOUT benchmark 2016

The benchmark supports the move from SXSA to SESAM.
Among the advantages of SESAM over SXSA is its ability to incorporate process and observation error, including relaxing the assumption that catches are exact, and its ability to estimate uncertainties in all quantities, including the forecast, a feature lacking in SXSA. Propagating assessment uncertainty into the forecast allows an evaluation of the probability of SSB falling below Blim immediately following the fishing season, an important feature of SESAM.

The benchmark supports the omission of the commercial cpue data from the SESAM assessment.

The principle reason for this is that the commercial cpue dataseries is not independent of the catches, because there is substantial overlap between the two dataseries. This is problematic because the model assumes such independence, and if used, these data will have greater weight in the model fit relative to other data sources as a result, potentially biasing the assessment. Independent survey data are available for the same period, so the model does not rely on the commercial cpue data and performs well without them, with observed trends with and without these data being similar.

The benchmark supports the omission of 1983 from the assessment.
This is because there was concern regarding missing observations of weight-at-age in the catch for 1983, which casts doubt on the accuracy of the numbers-at-age in the catch for that year. However, support for the omission was not unanimous, and had to go to a vote.

The benchmark supports the use of the SSB at the start of quarter 4 as the basis for deriving Blim.

It was felt that the reference point had to align with the start of the fishing season (1 November to 31 October), and the closest match to this as an output from the model was the SSB at the start of quarter 4 (1 October); any attempt to calculate a Blim aligned exactly with the start of the fishing season would require interpolation and further assumptions, and it was felt that the quarter 4 SSB was adequate and avoided these further assumptions.

The benchmark did not have access to the model estimates needed to derive Blim, so discussed the principles for its derivation only; there was also insufficient time to discuss the forecast in detail, although an example forecast was provided.

## Previous SXSA Assessment Model and Software used (assessments previous to 2016)

The SXSA (Seasonal Extended Survivors Analysis: Skagen (1993)) has been used to estimate quarterly stock numbers and fishing mortalities for Norway pout in the North Sea and Skagerrak as the standard assessment method. The catch-at-age analysis was carried out according to the specifications given in the present stock quality handbook. The SXSA program is available from ICES. This model is used for the final assessment up to 2015 as standard software.
The assessment is analytical using catch-at-age analysis based on quarterly catch and cpue data. The assessment is considered appropriate to indicate trends in the stock and immediate changes in the stock, because of the seasonal assessment taking into
account the seasonality in fishery, use seasonal based fishery-independent information, and using most recent information about recruitment. The seasonal variation in effort data is one reason for performing a seasonal VPA. The assessment provides stock status and year-class strengths of all year classes in the stock up to the first quarter of the assessment year (spring assessment) and second quarter of the assessment year (autumn assessment). The real-time assessment method with update every half year also gives a good indication of the stock status the 1 January the following year based on projection of existing recruitment information in 3rd quarter of the assessment year.

## SXSA Model Options chosen (current assessment)

In the options chosen in the SXSA for the Norway pout assessment the catchability, r, per age and quarter and fleet is assumed to be constant within the assessment period where the estimated catchability is a geometric mean over years by age, quarter and tuning fleet. In the 2004 benchmark assessment exploration of trends in tuning fleet catchabilities was investigated by single fleet runs with the SXSA. The accepted assessment with revised tuning fleets in the 2004 benchmark assessment assume constant catchability.

Tuning is performed over the period 1983 to present producing log residual $(\log (\mathrm{Nhat} / \mathrm{N}))$ stock numbers and survivor estimates by year, quarter, age and tuning fleet. The contributions from the various age groups to the survivor estimates by year and quarter and fleet are in the SXSA combined to an overall survivors estimate, shat, estimated as the geometric mean over years of $\log$ (shat) weighted by the exponential of the inverse cumulated fishing mortality as described in Skagen (1993).

The parameter settings and options of the SXSA and SMS have been the same in all recent years of the assessment, except that recruitment season to the fishery has been backshifted from 3rd quarter of the year to 2 nd quarter of the year when running SXSA in autumn in order to gain benefit from the most recent 0 -group indices from the 3rd quarter surveys (SGFS and EGFS as explained above) in the assessment. This procedure is still followed. This was not necessary in the SMS assessment. (In the May 2007 assessment with SXSA this backshifting has not been performed).

No time taper or shrinkage is used in the catch-at-age analysis in general. The four surveys and the seasonally (by quarter) divided commercial fleets (the latter only including data up to year 2006) in are all used in the tuning.

The following parameters are used:

| Year range: | $1983-$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Seasons per year: | 4 |
| The last season in the last year is season: | 3 |
| Youngest age: | 0 |
| Oldest true age: | 3 |
| Plus group: | No |
| plus group in SMS (4+-group in SXSA) | 3 |
| Recruitment in season: | Yes, number of species $=1$ |

The following tuning fleets are included:

```
Fleet 1: Q1:Age1-3; Q2:None; Q3:Age1-3; Q4:Age0-2) commercial q134
Fleet 2: ibtsq1 (Age 1-3)
Fleet 3:
Fleet 4
Fleet 5: m
```

Data are input from the following files:

| Catch in numbers: | canum.qrt |
| :--- | :--- |
| Weight in catch: | weca.qrt |
| Weight in stock: | west.qrt |
| Natural mortalities: | natmor.qrt |
| Maturity ogive: | propmat.qrt |
| Tuning data (cpue): | tun.....xsa |
| Weighting for rhats: | rweigh.xsa |

## SXSA: In the SXSA the following options are / were used:

The following options were used:
1: Inv. catchability:
(1: Linear; 2: Log; 3: Cos. filter)
2: Indiv. shats:
(1: Direct; 2: Using z)
3: Comb. shats:
(1: Linear; 2: Log.)
4: Fit catches:
(0: No fit; 1: No SOP corr; 2: SOP corr.)
5: Est. unknown catches:
(0: No; 1: No SOP corr; 2: SOP corr; 3: Sep. F)
6: Weighting of rhats:
(0: Manual)
7: Weighting of shats: 2
(0: Manual; 1: Linear; 2: Log.)
8: Handling of the plus group:
(1: Dynamic; 2: Extra age group)
Factor (between 0 and 1) for weighting the inverse catchabilities at the oldest age vs. the second oldest age (factor 1 means that the catchabilities for the oldest age are used as they are): 0

Specification of minimum value for the survivor number (this is Used instead of the estimate if the estimate becomes very low): 0

Iteration until convergence (setting 0):

Input data types and characteristics:

| TYPE | Name | Year range | Age range | Variable from year to year Yes/No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Caton | Catch in tonnes | Not relevant in SXSA | $0-3+$ | Yes |
| Canum | Catch-at-age in numbers | 1983-present ${ }^{\text {I }}$ | $0-3+$ | Yes |
| Weca | Weight-at-age in the commercial catch | 1983-present \| | 0-3+ | Yes |
| West | Weight-at-age of the spawning stock at spawning time. | 1983-present \| | 0-3+ | No |
| Mprop | Proportion of natural mortality before spawning | Not relevant in SXSAI |  |  |
| Fprop | Proportion of fishing mortality before spawning | Not relevant in SXSAI | 0-1 | Yes |
| Matprop | Proportion mature at age | 1983-present \| | $1-3+$ | No, 10\%age 1, 100\% 2+ |
| Natmor | Natural mortality | 1983-present ${ }^{\text {I }}$ | 0-3+ | No, 0.4 per quarter per age group |

The SMS program available from Morten Vinther, DIFRES, Copenhagen (Exploratory run, 2004 and 2005, April 2006 and September 2006). Used in exploratory runs.

The XSA program from ICES. Used in exploratory runs.
The SURBA program available from Coby Needle, MARLAB, Aberdeen; Used in an exploratory run, 2005.

The XSA and SURBA models and software cannot perform quarterly based assessment.

SMS model used as the standard assessment model during the period 2005-2007 with the fol-
lowing options

SMS-Model (2005-2007): The following tuning fleet options were used in the SMS model (summary from fleet_info.dat):

Minimum CV of cpue observations: 0.2
Fleet specific options:
1-2, First year last year,
3-4. Alpha and beta - the start and end of the fishing period for the fleet given as fractions of the season (or year if annual data are used)
5-6 First and last age,
7. last age with age dependent catchability,
8. last age for stock size dependent catchability (power model), -1 indicated no ages uses power model
9. season for survey,
10. number of variance groups for estimated catchability by species and fleet
$\left.\begin{array}{llllllllllll}1 & \text { commercial q1: } \\ 1 & \text { commercial q3: } \\ 1 & \text { commercial } & \text { q4: }\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{lllllll}1983 & 2004 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 3\end{array}-1 \begin{array}{l}1983 \\ 2004 \\ 2\end{array}\right)$

-1 13
3 EGFS q 3: $\quad 1992200501011$
-1 32
4 SGFS q3: $\quad 1998200600011$
-1 32
5 ibts_q3: $\quad 1991200501233$
-1 32
Variance groups:
Fleet: 1 season 1: 123
Fleet: 1 season 3: 123
Fleet: 1 season 4: 012
Fleet: 2: 123
Fleet: 3: 01
Fleet: 4: 01
Fleet: 5: 23
SMS-Model: The following SMS model settings were used in the SMS model (2005-2007) - (summary from SMS.dat):

SSB/R relationship: Geometric mean
Object function weighting:
First=catch observations 1.0
Second=cpue observations 1.0
Third=SSB/R relations 1.0
Minimum CV of commercial catch-at-age
observations option min.catch.CV): 0.20
Minimum CV of S/R relation (option min.SR.CV): 0.20
No. of separate catch sigma groups by species: 4 (one variance group by age)
Exploitation pattern by age and season:

If tuning survey index has the value 0 then $5 \%$ of the average of the rest of the observations are used because the logarithm to zero cannot be taken: Minimum "observed" catch, negative value gives percentage (-10 ~ 10\%) of average catch in age-group if option>0 and catch=0 then catch=option
if option<0 then catch=average(catch-at-age)*(-option)/100 -5
Assuming fixed exploitation pattern by age and season
Number of years with zero catch:
$2(2005,2006)$

SMS model used as the standard assessment model during the period 2005-2007
SMS (Stochastic Multi Species model; Lewy and Vinther, 2004) is an age-structured multispecies assessment model which includes biological interactions. However, the model can be used with one species only. In "single species mode" the model can be fitted to observations of catch-at-age and survey cpue. SMS uses maximum likelihood to weight the various data sources assuming a lognormal error distribution for both data sources. The likelihood for the catch observation is then as defined below:

$$
L_{C}=\prod_{a, y, q} \frac{1}{\sigma_{\text {catch }}(a a) \sqrt{2 \pi}} \exp \left(-(\ln (C(a, y, q))-\ln (\hat{C}(a, y, q)))^{2} /\left(2 \sigma_{\text {catch }}^{2}(a a)\right)\right)
$$

where $C$ is the observed catch-at-age number, $\hat{C}$ is expected catch-at-age number, $y$ is year, $q$ is quarter, $a$ is age group, and $a a$ is one or more age groups.

SMS is a "traditional" forward running assessment model where the expected catch is calculated from the catch equation and $F$-at-age, which is assumed to be separable into an age selection, a year effect and a season (year, half-year, quarter) effect.

As an example, the $F$ model configuration is shown below for a species where the assessment includes ages $0-3+$ and quarterly catch data and quarterly time-step are used:

$$
F=F\left(a_{a}\right) \times F\left(y_{y}\right) \times F\left(q_{q}\right),
$$

with $F$-components defined as follows:
$F(a):$

| Age 0 | $\mathrm{FA}_{0}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Age 1 | $\mathrm{Fa}{ }_{1}$ |
| Age 2 | $\mathrm{Fa}_{2}$ |
| Age 3 | $\mathrm{Fa}_{3}$ |

$F(q):$

|  | Q 1 | Q 2 | Q 3 | Q 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Age 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Fq | 0.25 |
| Age 1 | $\mathrm{Fq}_{1,1}$ | $\mathrm{Fq}_{1,2}$ | $\mathrm{Fq}_{1,3}$ | 0.25 |
| Age 2 | $\mathrm{Fq}_{2,1}$ | $\mathrm{Fq}_{2,2}$ | $\mathrm{Fq}_{1,3}$ | 0.25 |
| Age 3 | $\mathrm{Fq}_{3,1}$ | $\mathrm{Fq}_{3,2}$ | $\mathrm{Fq}_{3,3}$ | 0.25 |

$F(y):$

| Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | Y4 | Y5 | Y6 | Y7 | Y8 | Y9 | $\ldots$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Fy2 | Fy3 | Fy4 $_{4}$ | Fy5 $_{5}$ | Fy6 $^{2}$ | Fy7 $_{7}$ | Fy8 | Fy9 | $\ldots$. |

The parameters $F\left(a_{a}\right), F\left(y_{y}\right)$ and $F\left(q_{q}\right)$ are estimated in the model. $F\left(q_{q}\right)$ in the last quarter and $F\left(y_{y}\right)$ Fy in the first year are set to constants to obtain a unique solution. For annual data, the $F\left(q_{q}\right)$ is set to a constant 1and the model uses annual time-steps.

One $F(a)$ vector can be estimated for the whole assessment period, or alternatively, individual $F(a)$ vectors can be estimated for subsets of the assessment periods. A separate $F(q)$ matrix is estimated for each $F(a)$ vector.

For the cpue time-series the expected cpue numbers are calculated as the product of an assumed age (or age group) dependent catchability and the mean stock number in the survey period.

The likelihood for cpue observations, $L s$, is similar to $L c$, as both are assumed lognormal distributed. The total likelihood is the product of the likelihood of the catch and the likelihood for cpue ( $L=L c^{*} L_{\text {cpue, }}$ ). Parameters are estimated from a minimisation of $-\log (L)$.

The estimated model parameters include stock numbers the first year, recruitment in the remaining years, age selection pattern, and the year and season effect for the separable $F$ model, and catchability-at-age for cpue time-series.

SMS is implemented using ADmodel builder (Otter Research Ltd.), which is a software package to develop non-linear statistical models. The SMS model is still under development, but has extensively been tested in the last year on both simulated and real data.

SMS can estimate the variance of parameters and derived values like average $F$ or SSB from the Hessian matrix. Alternatively, variance can be estimated by using the builtin functionality of the AD-Model builder package to carry out Markov Chain Monte Carlo simulations (Gilks et al., 1996), MCMC, to estimate the posterior distributions of the parameters. For the historical assessment, period uniform priors are used. For prediction, an additional stock-recruitment relation including CV can be used.

## Comparison of SXSA and SMS model output and assessment model evaluation

The September 2006 limited benchmarking considered the most appropriate assessment model to be used and considered in order to describe the dynamics of the stock.

Previously, the SXSA (Seasonal Extended Survivors $\underline{\text { Annalysis) model has been used in }}$ the assessment of Norway pout. The method is described in the quality control handbook.

The SMS is like the SXSA a seasonally based model being able to deal with assessment of a short-lived species (where there are only few age groups in the VPA) and seasonality in fishing patterns.

The SMS (Stochastic MultiSpecies model; see Section 1.3.3 and the stock quality handbook) objective functions (in "single species mode") for catch-at-age numbers and survey indices at age time-series are minimized assuming a lognormal error distribution for both data sources. The expected catch is calculated from the catch equation and F-at-age, which is assumed to be separable into a year effect, an age selection, and an age-season selection. The SMS assumes constant seasonal and agedependent F-pattern. SMS uses maximum likelihood to weight the various data sources. For years with no fishery (here 2005 and 2006 in this assessment) SMS simply set F to zero and exclude catch observations from the objective function. In such case
only the survey indices are used in the model. The SXSA needs catch input for all quarters, all years, and in years with no catch infinitive small catch values have to be put into the model as an approximation. SXSA handles catch-at-age observation as exact, i.e. the SXSA does not rely on the assumption of constant exploitation pattern in catch-at-age data as for example the SMS does. As a stochastic model, SMS uses catch observations as observed with noise, but assumes a separable F. Both assumptions are violated to a certain degree.

SMS being a stochastic model can estimate the variance of parameters and derived values like average F and SSB. The SXSA is a deterministic model.

The Norway pout assessment includes normally catches from the first and second quarter of the assessment year. SMS uses survey indices from the third quarter of the assessment year under the assumption that the survey is conducted the very beginning of the third quarter. SXSA model has not that option and data from the third quarter of the assessment year can only be used by "back-shifting" the survey one quarter back in time.

The SMS model has so far assumed recruitment in 3rd quarter of the year and not in the start of the 2nd quarter of the year which the SXSA use. Actual recruitment is in the 2nd quarter of the year. Consequently, the assumed natural mortality of 0.4 for the 0 -group in first and second quarter of the year is not included in the SMS compared to use of this in 2nd quarter of the year for the SXSA for the 0-group.

The diagnostics and results of the exploratory runs for comparison between SXSA and SMS assessment are shown in the WGNSSK September 2006 report (ICES, WGNSSK 2007). The models give comparable results and the same perception of the Norway pout stock dynamics, which have been documented in the 2004 benchmark assessment, the September 2005 and April 2006 update assessments (see above), as well as in the September 2006 exploratory runs. However, as SMS is a stochastic model it also provides uncertainties of the results. Accordingly, SMS was in September 2006 chosen as the new standard assessment model for Norway pout. However, it was decided that near future assessments should also include a comparative, exploratory SXSA assessment.

## Comparison of output from a seasonal based assessment model (the SXSA model) and an annual based model (the XSA model)

In the 2004 benchmark assessment of the Norway pout stock a comparison of the output, performance and weighting of tuning fleets of the seasonal based SXSA model and the annually based XSA model was performed. The results are in detail presented in the 2004 ICES, WGNSSK Report (ICES, WGNSSK (2005)). The differences in results of output SSB, TSB and F between the two assessment runs were small. Both model runs gave in general similar weighting to the different tuning fleets used. This was based on comparison of runs of the accepted assessment (by the WG and ACFM) in 2003.

## Summary of conclusions from the exploratory catch-at-age analyses in the 2004 benchmark assessments

A number of exploratory runs were carried out as part of the benchmark assessment in 2004 in order to evaluate performance of stock indices as tuning fleets and also to compare performance of the seasonal XSA (SXSA) to the 'conventional' XSA. The exploratory runs are described in the 2004 working group report. The conclusions of the explorative runs in the 2004 benchmark assessment were the following:

1) Catch and cpue data for the assessment of Norway pout are very noisy, but internally consistent. The assessment, using SMS, gave very similar results irrespective of the cpue time-series used. Four of the seven cpue series are data from the commercial fishery and these data are already included in the catch data. Therefore, these commercial fleets will not give a signal very different from the catch data. None of the scientific surveys had a clear signal different form the signal in the catch data.
2) A comparison of the revised 2004 assessment with new tuning fleets compared to the previous 2003 assessment showed that the estimates of the SSB, recruitment and the average fishing mortality of the 1- and 2-group for the revised, accepted assessment were in general consistent with the estimates of previous years' assessment. Only historical F seemed to slightly deviate from the previous years' assessment.
3) The overall performance and output for the XSA model was similar to the SXSA model, so the working group in 2004 decided to continue using SXSA. Both methods did overall not show insensible to the tuning fleet indices used in the assessment.

In the update assessment in 2005 output of the SXSA model was compared to output from the SMS and SURBA model to evaluate the use of the SXSA model in a situation with having zero catches in the terminal year of the assessment. The results showed similar output of the different models and the same perception of the stock. The results are in detail presented in the 2005 ICES WGNSSK Report (ICES, WGNSSK (2006)).

Analysis of output from SXSA and SMS and to evaluate the effect on the assessment of no catches in 2005 and 2006

Due to closure of the Norway pout fishery and no catches in 2005 and in the first part of 2006 there has been made exploratory and comparative assessment runs using different assessment models (SXSA, SMS) to evaluate the effect on the assessment of this situation during the April 2006 assessment. This has been considered necessary to evaluate the effect of the absolute value of the artificial catch numbers on the on the SXSA output and to use a modified version of SMS that allows for no fishing at the end of the assessment period, where the SMS assessment uses identical input data as the SXSA assessment. Also the aim has been to evaluate how the SMS reacts to a situation with several years of no catches.

In the April 2006 assessments exploratory runs of SXSA was made where the artificial catch numbers in 2005 and 2006 was four-doubled (but still low, from 400 t per quarter of year to 1600 t per quarter) compared to the very low catch levels used in the accepted assessment. The results of these comparative runs are not shown, however, the resulting output of the assessments were identical giving the same perception of the stock status and dynamics. Furthermore, in the September 2005 update assessment a SXSA assessment was performed with the change of using catch numbers in the first and second quarter of 2005 corresponding to $50 \%$ of the 2004 quarter 1 and 2 catch numbers (instead of $10 \%$ of the catches in the accepted assessment). The results of these comparative runs are shown in Figure 5.3.8 of the September 2005 report (ICES, WGNSSK 2006). The resulting outputs of these assessments were identical giving the same perception of the stock status and dynamics. From these SXSA runs it can be concluded that the absolute values of the artificial (small) catches does not practically affect the assessment output.

In April 2006 a SMS run was made with an assumption of no catches in 2005-2006. SMS was modified to exclude the likelihood of catch observation for 2005-2006 (and 2007) from the objective function. Cpue observations for 2005 and 2006 were, however, used in the model and objective function. By letting the model include 2007 as terminal year it is possible to forecast stock status under the assumption of no fishery in 2006-2007, and recruitments that follows the SMS recruitment function (geometric mean).

It appeared that the diagnostics of the SMS looked very similar to the one produced for the 2005 assessment As it was also shown in the 2004 benchmark assessment, the SMS model results in a rather similar weighting of the catch-at-age data as well as the tuning fleets as the SXSA model does. As seen in the previous years' assessments, the SMS model tends to estimate lower SSB and higher F compared to results of the SXSA model, however, the perception of the stock status and dynamics are very much similar from the results of both model runs. Recruitment estimates of the two models cannot be directly compared as the SMS gives recruitment in third quarter of the year while the SXSA gives recruitment in the second quarter of the year.

## D. Short-term projections

## Model and Software used in 2016 assessment and onwards

The short-term forecast is stochastic, which allows the probability of SSB being below Blim to be evaluated immediately following the fishing season. The stochastic forecast is conducted with the SESAM model described above and in Nielsen and Berg (2016, Annex 6). The SESAM is, like the SXSA, a quarterly based model estimating biomass at the start of each quarter of the year. As explained under next section concerning biological reference points the WKPOUT benchmark group (2016) has decided that the $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{lim}}=\mathrm{B}_{\text {loss }}$ should be the lowest SSB estimated in quarter 4, because this is closest to the beginning of the fishing season (1st November), and would be the most appropriate to use as a Blim reference point, because the probability of SSB being below Blim can then be evaluated immediately after the fishing season for which a TAC is being calculated. It was argued that the quarter 4 SSB (an existing output of the SESAM model) was adequate for this purpose because any attempt to calculate an SSB corresponding to 1 November would require further assumptions and would effectively only be an interpolation between the quarter 4 and subsequent quarter 1 SSBs, thus unnecessarily complicating the calculation of the SSB. The forecast provides a TAC advice according to a calculated yield in the forecast year where the probability of SSB being below $\mathrm{B}_{\lim }$ by 1st October in the forecast year is less than $5 \%$, i.e. the forecast estimates the yield according to SSB that meets the $5 \%$ criterion at the Blim date which is 1 October as explained above. Accordingly, it is recommended that this TAC is used for the management year 1 November- 31 October. This is an approximation and will be sustainable unless radical changes occur in the seasonal fishing pattern used in the forecast. In the period between 1 October and 1 November in the forecast year, there will be provided a new assessment.

Short-term projections are carried out as follows:

1) Assume values for $M$, weight-at-age in the catches and in the stock, and maturity-at-age for the projection period. Since all of those quantities except weight-at-age in the catches are assumed constant over time, only weight-at-age in the catch requires special treatment. A procedure for forecasting catch weights is described in Nielsen and Berg (2016, Annex 6) and is summarised below.
2) Draw K samples from the joint posterior distribution of the states $(\log \mathrm{N}$ and $\log$ F) in the last year with data, and the recruitment in all years.
3) Assume that $\log \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{t}}=\log \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{t}-4}+\log \mathrm{Gt}$, for all future values of t where Gt is some chosen vector of multipliers of the F-process. If $\mathrm{Gt}=1$ for all t this corresponds to assuming the same level and quarterly pattern in F for all future time-steps as in the last data year.
4) Create K forecasting trajectories starting from the samples of joint posterior distribution of the states. The is done by sampling K recruitments from the vector of historic recruitments obtained in step 2, and then projecting the states forward in time using the stock equation with randomly sampled process errors from their estimated distribution.
5) Find Gt such that the fifth (or any other) percentile of the catches (total mass) in the projections equal some desired level such as $B_{\lim }$ (optional).

## Forecasting weight-at-age in the catches

There is substantial variation in weight-at-age in the commercial catches from year to year, which means that usual methods of using running averages will be quite sensitive to the bandwidth of the running average. This is important, since TAC estimates calculated in step 5 above depend directly on the catch weight-at-age.
The following models is used:

$$
E\left(\sqrt{C W_{a, q, t}}\right)=\mu_{a, q}+s(\text { cohort }, a)+U_{t}
$$

where $\mu_{a, q}$ is a mean for each combination of quarter and age, $s()$ is tensor product smoothing spline, and $U_{t}$ are normal distributed random effects. There square root transform is used to achieve variance homogeneity in the residuals. See Figure 1 in Nielsen and Berg (2016, Annex 6).

## Example forecast

The assessment developed during the benchmark was based on the same data as used in the May 2014 assessment (see under assessment), so the forecast example is consistent with this. The example itself is therefore not how it will actually appear in a September assessment (it is shifted to a different period), but is given to demonstrate how the forecast will actually look (albeit for a different period).
Table D. 1 illustrates a forecast that would be associated with a May 2014 assessment, where the $B_{\text {lim }}$ is the $B_{\text {loss }}$ estimated in quarter $2\left(B_{\text {lim }}=B_{\text {loss }}\right.$ in quarter $2=55.110$ thousand tonnes; see Table C.1), for the $5 \%$ Blim forecast option. The catch forecast for a May assessment and forecast would then simply be summing up the catches for quarters 2014.25 (Q2, 2014), 2014.5 (Q3, 2014), 2014.75 (Q4, 2014) and 2015 (Q5, 2015). Tables D. 2 and D. 3 provide corresponding forecasts for zero $F$ and a status quo $F$ options.

A September forecast would be similar, but with Blim consistent with a Bloss estimated in quarter 4 ( $\mathrm{Blim}_{\mathrm{lim}}=\mathrm{Bloss}$ in quarter $4=39.447$ thousand tonnes) and catches summed for consecutive quarters 4, 1, 2 and 3, starting in the year the assessment is conducted.

Table D.1. Forecast with F scaled such that the fifth percentile of the SSB distribution one year ahead equals Blim. SSB and catches are in thousands of tonnes.

|  | F12 | SSB | SSB 5TH QUANTILE | MEDIAN CATCH |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014.25 | 0.16 | 260.19 | 162.84 | 42188.57 |
| 2014.5 | 0.59 | 272.22 | 160.85 | 115141.67 |
| 2014.75 | 2.46 | 153.18 | 81.47 | 204881.51 |
| 2015 | 0.01 | 151.75 | 68.02 | 1483.05 |
| 2015.25 |  | 121.36 | 55.11 |  |
| Sum |  |  | 363694.80 |  |

Table D.2. Forecast with zero F.

|  | F12 | SSB | SSB 5TH QUANTILE | MEDIAN CATCH |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2014.25 | 0.00 | 260.19 | 162.84 | 0.00 |
| 2014.5 | 0.00 | 292.04 | 185.00 | 0.00 |
| 2014.75 | 0.00 | 200.82 | 127.20 | 0.00 |
| 2015 | 0.00 | 279.34 | 179.11 | 0.00 |
| 2015.25 |  | 215.88 | 137.41 |  |
| Sum |  |  |  | 0.00 |

Table D.3. Forecast with status quo F.

|  | F12 | SSB | SSB 5TH QUANTILE | MEDIAN CATCH |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014.25 | 0.05 | 260.19 | 162.84 | 14067.58 |
| 2014.5 | 0.19 | 285.38 | 177.84 | 44996.32 |
| 2014.75 | 0.77 | 183.20 | 110.78 | 115300.17 |
| 2015 | 0.00 | 226.71 | 130.00 | 722.54 |
| 2015.25 |  | 177.80 | 101.60 |  |
| Sum |  |  |  | 175086.61 |

Model and Software used previous to 2016 assessment
A deterministic short-term forecast was given for the stock up to (and including) 2015. This was done for the Norway pout stock for the first time in 2004. From April 2006 deterministic short-term prognoses were performed for the Norway pout stock. From 2006 and onwards there have been given seasonal (real-time) short-term forecast.

The purpose of the forecast is to calculate the catch of Norway pout in the forecast year which would result in SSB at or above $\mathbf{B}_{\mathrm{pa}}=$ MSY Bescapement $(=150000 \mathrm{t})$ the following 1 January. The forecast is based on an escapement management strategy but also providing output for the long-term fixed E or F management strategy and a longterm fixed TAC strategy for Norway pout (see ICES, WGNSSK Report ICES CM 2007/ACFM:30 Section 5.3, and ICES, AGNOP Report ICES CM 2007/ACFM:39, and the ICES, AGSANNOP Report ICES CM 2007/ACFM:40, and Vinther and Nielsen (2012; 2013), as well as Section 5.10 and 5.11 of the ICES, WGNSSK Reports).

Intermediate year assumptions:
The forecast was calculated as a stock projection up to the 1 January following the forecast year using full assessment information for the assessment year (and first part of forecast year).
Initial stock size:
The projection up to 1 of January following the forecast year is based on the SXSA assessment estimate of stock numbers-at-age in the assessment year and the start of the forecast year.
Stock-recruitment model used:
The forecast is using the geometric mean recruitment for the stock-recruitment relationship. However, usually the recruitment in the year after the assessment year is assumed to be at $25 \%$ level ( 25 percentile) of the long-term geometric mean of the SXSA recruitment estimates. This level has been chosen to take into account that the frequency of strong year classes seems to have decreased in the recent 10-15 year period compared to previously.

Exploitation pattern:
The forecast uses relevant recent exploitation pattern according to temporal changes in this, i.e. according to changes in exploitation between seasons and between ages. The forecast has previously assumed a forecast year fishing pattern scaled to longterm seasonal exploitation pattern for 1991-2004 (standardized with yearly Fbar to $F(1,2)=1$ ) which has been used in e.g. the 2007 and 2008 ICES, WGNSSK Reports (ICES, CM 2007/ACFM:30; ICES CM 2008/ACOM:09) and in the ICES, AGNOP Report as well (ICES CM 2007/ACFM:39). The 2012 forecast (May 2012) assumes a forecast year fishing pattern scaled to the average standardized exploitation pattern ( F ) for 2008, 2009 and 2010 (all years included and standardized with yearly $F_{b a r}$ to $F(1,2)=1$ ). The forecast in September 2012 and April 2013 assumes a forecast year fishing pattern scaled to the long-term (1983-2011) average standardized exploitation pattern (F) (F from all years included except for the closure periods and standardized with yearly $F_{b a r}$ to $F(1,2)=1$ ) and observed fishing mortality from SXSA for the assessment year (and first part of forecast year). The background for selecting the long-term average exploitation pattern is that the exploitation pattern between seasons (and ages) has been variable over years also between recent years with strong year classes, and the long-term exploitation pattern indicate that main catches are taken in quarter 4 which is also the case for the most recent period. The same long-term exploitation pattern has been used in the management strategy evaluations of Norway pout long-term management plans performed with the SMS model in autumn 2012 and spring 2013. See further details of the settings in the ICES, WGNSSK Report. The forecasts in 2014 and 2015 have used previous years' exploitation pattern (i.e. 2013 and 2014 exploitation patterns, respectively). This is because those recent years exploitation pattern is considered most realistic for the forecast year in a situation with the fishery open all year and with strong incoming year classes (2012 and 2014), as well as also most realistic with respect to general level of the fishery (effort) and the seasonal distribution of the fishery (effort), where the latter has shown and increasing tendency towards the fishery being more concentrated in quarter 4 of the year in more recent years.

Natural mortality:
A 2012 Inter-benchmark assessment revised the values for the natural mortality, ma-turity-at-age and weight-at-age used in the assessment and the forecast (see above
and ICES, 2012c). Accordingly, the mortality-at-age in the stock age used in the SXSA assessment has also been used in the forecast for the forecast year.

## Maturity:

A 2012 Inter-benchmark assessment revised the values for the natural mortality, ma-turity-at-age and weight-at-age used in the assessment and the forecast (see above and ICES, 2012c). Accordingly, the revised maturity-at-age used in the SXSA assessment has also been used in the forecast for the forecast year. Twenty percent of age 1 is mature and is included in SSB. Therefore, the recruitment in the year after the assessment year does influence the SSB in the following year.

Weight-at-age in the catch:
Observed mean weights-at-age from the sampling and assessment are used for the assessment year. Mean weight-at-age in the catch in the forecast year (as well as in the assessment year where direct observations are not available from the SXSA and sampling) there has been estimated quarterly and age based average means of mean weight-at-age in catch from recent running five year averages (for the five latest years with covering observations).

Weight-at-age in the stock:
A 2012 Inter-benchmark assessment revised the values for the natural mortality, ma-turity-at-age and weight-at-age used in the assessment and the forecast (see above and ICES, 2012c). Accordingly, the revised constant weight-at-age in the stock by year and quarter of year used in the SXSA assessment has also been used in the forecast for the forecast year.

Management table and projections:
A management table is presented from the forecast. The objective set in relation to this, is to set the fishing mortality and catch on a level that maintain spawning-stock biomass above $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{MSY}}=$ MSY $\mathrm{B}_{\text {escapement }}=\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{pa}}$ by 1 of January one-two years after the assessment year with a high probability ( $95 \%$ level).

Catch predictions for 0 - and 1-groups are important as the fishery to some extent (traditionally) target the 0-group already in 3rd and 4th quarter of the year as well as the 1-group in the 1st quarter of the following year. In the 2004 benchmark assessment, it was shown that survey indices in the 3rd quarter seems to predict strong 0 group year classes relatively well when comparing with 0-group indices from commercial fishery (4th quarter) and to 1-group survey indices in surveys and fishery the following spring (year).

The deterministic forecast is naturally affected by that: (a) the potential catches are largely dependent on the size of a few year classes, (b) the large dependence on the strength of the recruiting 0 -group year classes, (c) precision of the used mean weight-at-ages, and d) the added uncertainty (in assessment and potential forecast) arising from variations in natural mortality. However, the forecast is not dependent on any assumption about the strength of the new year class.

## E. Biological reference points

## E.1. Reference points

## Reference points from 2016 onwards

Table F.1. Reference points, values, and their technical basis.

| Framework | Reference point | Value | Technical basis | Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MSY approach | MSY Bescapment | Not defined |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {MSY }}$ | Not defined |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {cap }}$ | Not defined |  |  |
| Precautionary approach | Blim | $39450 \text { t, }$ <br> 4th quarter | Blim $=$ Bloss, the lowest observed biomass in 2005. | ICES (2016b) |
|  | $\mathrm{Bp}_{\text {pa }}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 65000 \mathrm{t}, \\ \text { 4th quarter } \end{array}$ | $=\operatorname{Blim} \mathrm{e}^{0.3 \times 1.65}$ | ICES (2016b) |
|  | Flim | Not defined |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{pa}}$ | Not defined |  |  |
| Management plan | SSBmat | Not applicable |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {мGt }}$ | Not applicable |  |  |

The ICES MSY approach for short-lived species deviates from a standard ICES Fmsy approach. The reason is that the SSB for short-lived species is largely determined by incoming recruitment and that the natural mortality is high. So instead of selecting a fishing mortality that producers the highest long-term yield, the strategy is to allow for exploitation such that the stock is annually fished down to a certain level. This level is the SSB where probability of being above Blim is high (95\%). Since the SESAM model (Nielsen and Berg, 2016, Annex 6) delivers a stochastic forecast it is possible to predict the TAC that will result in a forecasted SSB being above Blim with $95 \%$ certainty. Thus, only relevant reference point to decide on is $\mathrm{Blim}_{\mathrm{lim}}$ as $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{pa}}$ and Flim are not applicable to short-lived stocks.

Based upon stock-recruitment plots, the WKPOUT benchmark group (2016) found that the stock-recruitment plot of Norway pout equalled a type 5 Stock-recruitment (ICES, 2016). A type 5 stock is defined as "Stocks with no evidence that recruitment has been impaired or with no clear relation between stock and recruitment (no apparent $S-R$ signal)." This implies that $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{lim}}=\mathrm{B}_{\text {loss, }}$ and hence the new $\mathrm{Blim}_{\mathrm{lim}}$ value will be set equal to Bloss taken from the 2016 benchmark run.

The WKPOUT benchmark group (2016) decided that the Bloss should be the lowest SSB estimated in quarter 4, because this is closest to the beginning of the fishing season (1 November), and would be the most appropriate to use as a Blim reference point, because the probability of SSB being below $B_{\text {lim }}$ can then be evaluated immediately after the fishing season for which a TAC is being calculated. It was argued that the quarter 4 SSB (an existing output of the SESAM model) was adequate for this purpose because any attempt to calculate an SSB corresponding to 1 November would require further assumptions and would effectively only be an interpolation between the quarter 4 and subsequent quarter 1 SSBs , thus unnecessarily complicating the calculation of the SSB.

According to Table C.1, Blim $=39$ 447t (Bloss value in quarter 4, 2005).

Reference points from 2010-2015

From 2010 to 2015.

|  | Type | Value | Technical basis |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MSY | MSY <br> Bescapement | 150000 t | $=\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{pa}}$ |
| Approach | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {MSY }}$ | Undefined | None advised |
| Precautionary <br> Approach | Blim | 90000 t | $B_{\text {lim }}=B_{\text {loss, }}$ the lowest observed biomass level except for the very extreme lows in 1983 and 2005 |
|  | $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{pa}}$ | 150000 t | $=\mathrm{B}_{\lim } \mathrm{e}^{0.3^{*} 1.65}$ |
|  | Flim | Undefined | None advised |
|  | $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{pa}}$ | Undefined | None advised |

(unchanged since: 2010).

Biomass based reference points have been unchanged since 1997 given BMSY $=$ MSY $B_{\text {escapement }}=B_{p a}$. No F-based reference points are advised for this stock.

Norway pout is a short-lived species and most likely a one-time spawner. The population dynamics of Norway pout in the North Sea and Skagerrak are very dependent on changes caused by recruitment variation and variation in predation (or other natural) mortality, and less by the fishery. Recruitment is highly variable and influences SSB and TSB rapidly due to the short lifespan of the species. (Basis: Nielsen et al., 2012; Sparholt et al. 2002a,b; Lambert et al., 2009). Furthermore, $20 \%$ of age 1 is considered mature and is included in SSB (Lambert et al., 2009). Therefore, the recruitment in the year after the assessment year does influence the SSB in the following year. Also, Norway pout is to limited extent exploited already from age 0 . All in all, the stock is very dependent of yearly dynamics and should be managed as a shortlived species.

On this basis $B_{p a}$ is considered a good proxy for a SSB reference level for MSY $B_{\text {escape- }}$ ment. Blim is defined as Bloss and is based on the observations of stock developments in SSB set to 90000 t (being the lowest observed biomass level except for the very extreme lows in 1983 and 2005). MSY Bescapement $=B_{p a}$ has been calculated from:

$$
\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{pa}}=\mathrm{B}_{\lim } \mathrm{e}^{0.3^{*} 1.65}(\mathrm{SD}) .
$$

A SD estimate around $0.3-0.4$ is considered to reflect the real uncertainty in the assessment. This SD-level also corresponds to the level for SD around 0.2-0.3 recommended to use in the manual for the Lowestoft PA Software (Cefas, 1999). The relationship between the $B_{l i m}$ and MSY Bescapement $=B_{p a}(90000$ and $150000 t)$ is 0.6.
An Inter-benchmark in spring 2012 (IBPNorwayPout, ICES, 2012c) used revised estimates of natural mortality, maturity-at-age and mean weight-at-age in the assessment. The benchmark group did not recommend revised reference points for the stock at this stage, but concluded that higher escapement targets could be considered in future based on the importance of Norway pout as a forage species in the ecosystem. The consumption amount of Norway pout by its main predators should be evaluated in relation to production amount in the Norway pout stock under consideration of consumption and production of other prey species for those predators in the ecosystem.

A segmented regression with current data was fit in relation to the benchmarking process (ICES, 2012c). It is obvious that the Norway pout, being a short-lived species,
has no well-defined breakpoint (inflection) in the SSB-R relationship and therefore there is not a clear point at which impaired recruitment can be considered to commence (i.e. SSB does not impact R negatively, and that there is a relatively high recruitment observed at Bloss as well as more observations above than below the inflection point). The statistics from the segmented regression (ICES, 2012c) shows that the inflection point is rather badly estimated (high value of $b$ ), poor convergence, and that the maximum likelihood method cannot estimate the inflection (and the slope before inflection) well. Results therefore suggest that Bloss be retained as the Blim reference point $=90 \mathrm{kt}$ and $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{pa}}$ as MSY Bescapement reference point $=150 \mathrm{kt}$.

Higher escapement targets could be considered in future based on the importance of Norway pout as a forage species in the ecosystem (see also above).

The $B^{\lim }=B_{\text {loss }}=90 \mathrm{kt}$ is based on the lowest observed biomass levels except for the very extreme lows in 1983 and 2005. Although lower biomasses (SSB) were observed for the stock in 2005 then the ICES WGNSSK working group in 2004-2006 advised not to change the reference points because of the status of Norway pout being an important forage fish species in the North Sea. In the scenario 2 benchmark assessment (ICES, 2012a,c) a B ${ }^{\lim }$ set to 110 kt was discussed instead of the 90 kt , which would result in a MSY $B_{\text {escapement }}=B_{p a}=180 \mathrm{kt}$ instead of 150 kt where $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{pa}}=\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{lim}}$ e0.3*1.65 and Blim $=B_{\text {loss }}=110 \mathrm{kt}$. However, given the above there was no objective basis available at that time for making such change in the reference levels.

Reference points previous to 2010
Precautionary approach reference points.

| ICES CONSIDERS THAT: | ICES PROPOSES THAT: |
| :--- | :--- |
| Blim is 90000 t | $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{pa}}$ be established at 150000 t. Below this <br> value the probability of below average <br> recruitment increases. |
| Note: |  |

Technical basis

| $\mathrm{B}_{\text {LIM }}=\mathrm{B}_{\text {Loss }}=90000$ T. | $\mathrm{B}_{\text {PA }}=\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{LIM}} \mathrm{E}^{0.3-0.4^{* 1.65}}(\mathrm{SD})$. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Flim $^{\text {None advised. }}$ | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {pa }}$ None advised. |

Biomass based reference points have been unchanged since 1997.
Blim is defined as Bloss and is based on the observations of stock developments in SSB set to 90000 t being the lowest observed biomass levels except for the very extreme lows in 1983 and 2005. Bpa has been calculated from:

$$
\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{pa}}=\mathrm{B}_{\lim } \mathrm{e}^{0.3-0.4^{*} 1.65}(\mathrm{SD}) .
$$

A SD estimate around $0.3-0.4$ is considered to reflect the real uncertainty in the assessment. This SD-level also corresponds to the level for SD around 0.2-0.3 recommended to use in the manual for the Lowestoft PA Software (Cefas, 1999). The relationship between the $B_{\lim }$ and $B_{\mathrm{pa}}(90000$ and 150000 t$)$ is 0.6.
$B \lim$ is $90000 t$ the lowest observed biomass.
Flim None advised.
$\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{pa}}$ None advised.

## E.2. Management

## Management objectives

An overview of recent relevant management measures and regulations for the Norway pout fishery and the stock can be found in Nielsen et al. (2016, Annex 2) and in Johnsen et al. (2016, Annex 3) to this stock annex.

There is no specific management objective set for this stock. With present fishing mortality levels the status of the stock is more determined by natural processes and less by the fishery.

The European Community has decided to apply the MSY (Maximum Sustainable Yield) approach (earlier the PA, precautionary approach) in taking measures to protect and conserve living aquatic resources, to provide for their sustainable exploitation and to minimise the impact of fishing on marine ecosystems.

In recent years the escapement strategy has been practised in reality in management although there is no decision on management strategy on the stock or recommendation of a specific strategy from the Industry side (see also below under Long-Term Management Strategy Evaluation).
Norway pout is a short-lived species and most likely a one-time spawner. The population dynamics of Norway pout in the North Sea and Skagerrak are very dependent on changes caused by recruitment variation and variation in predation (or other natural) mortality, and less by the fishery. Recruitment is highly variable and influences SSB and TSB rapidly due to the short lifespan of the species. (Basis: Section A. 3 of this stock annex; Nielsen et al., 2012; Sparholt et al. 2002a,b; Lambert et al., 2009).

On this basis $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{pa}}$ is considered a good proxy for a SSB reference level for MSY Bescapement. (See also the Inter-benchmark assessment from 2012, ICES, 2012c as well as the follow up on this in the 2016 benchmark in the ICES, WKPOUT Report 2016).

There is a need to ensure that the stock remains high enough to provide food for a variety of predator species. Natural mortality levels by age and season used in the stock assessment reflects the predation mortality levels estimated for this stock from the most recent multispecies stock assessment performed by ICES (ICES, WGSAM 2014; ICES, WGSAM 2011; ICES, SGMSNS 2006). See also under Section A. 3 of this stock annex as well as Nielsen (2016, Annex 1).

The fishery is targeting Norway pout and blue whiting. Bycatch of herring, saithe, cod, haddock, whiting, and monkfish at various levels in the small-meshed fishery in the North Sea and Skagerrak directed towards Norway pout has been documented, and recent bycatch levels are low (See Section A. 2 of this stock annex including Nielsen et al., 2016, Annex 2 and Johnsen et al., 2016, Annex 3). Historically, the fishery includes bycatches especially of haddock, whiting, saithe, and herring. In managing this fishery, bycatches of cod, haddock, whiting, saithe, herring, and blue whiting should be taken into account, and existing technical measures to protect these bycatch species should be maintained or improved. Bycatches of these species have been low in the recent decade, and in general, the bycatch levels of these gadoids have decreased in the Norway pout fishery over the years. The declining tendency to present very low level of bycatch of other species in the Norway pout fishery appears from the WGNSSK Reports as well as from this stock annex Section A. 2 including Nielsen et al., 2016, Annex 2 and Johnsen et al., 2016, Annex 3). Review of scientific documen-
tation show that gear selective devices can be used in the Norway pout fishery, significantly reducing bycatches of juvenile gadoids, larger gadoids, and other nontarget species (Nielsen et al., 2016, Annex 2; Eigaard and Holst, 2004; Nielsen and Madsen, 2006, ICES CM 2007/ACFM:35, WD 23 and Section 16.5.2.2; Eigaard and Nielsen, ICES CM2009/M:22; Eigaard, Hermann and Nielsen, 2012). Sorting grids are at present used in the Norwegian and Danish fishery, but modification of the selective devices and their implementation in management is ongoing. The sorting grids have been implemented in the Danish fishery since October 2012, and are partly implemented in the Norwegian fishery (especially in the larger vessels). ICES suggests that these devices (or modified forms of those) are used in the fishery. The introduction of these technical measures should be followed up by adequate control measures of landings or catches at sea to ensure effective implementation of the existing bycatch measures. Existing technical measures such as the closed Norway pout box, minimum mesh size in the fishery, and bycatch regulations to protect other species have been maintained.

## E.3. Long-term management strategies

## Long-term management strategy evaluations (MSEs)

After the 2016 WKPOUT Benchmark Assessment in August 2016, there has not been conducted any long-term management strategy evaluations on basis of the new assessment year, the new assessment model, and the forecast model introduced and used since then. ICES has in May 2017 received a request based on EU-NorwayNegotiations to conduct a future long-term management strategy evaluation considering different levels for Minimum and Maximum TACs as well as F-cap levels based on the new assessment and assessment year. ICES is currently in the process of evaluating this request and MSE will likely be initiated in 2017 and conducted during 2018 to be available for the September 2018 advice.

Long-term management strategy evaluations (MSEs) previous to the 2016 Benchmark
Long-term management strategies have previously been evaluated for this stock by ICES based on the SXSA assessments as described below.

There is consistent biannual information available to perform real-time monitoring and management of the stock. This can be carried out both with fishery-independent and fishery-dependent information as well as a combination of those. Real-time advice (forecast) and management has been carried out every half year from 2006-2014. There is performed a May assessment and forecast followed up by an in year September assessment and forecast. From 2015 there is only made a September (in year) assessment and forecast. The sustainability of the advice based on the September assessment and forecast is checked up upon in the following spring WGNSSK working group. If it is found to be outside the sustainability objectives of the MSY escapement strategy then a revised spring advice shall be considered.

In recent years the escapement strategy has been practised in reality in management although there is no decision on management strategy on the stock or recommendation of a specific strategy from the industry side.

Long-term management strategies and management plans evaluations 2006-2007 and 20122013

ICES has evaluated and commented on three management strategies in 2007, following requests from managers; fixed fishing mortality ( $\mathrm{F}=0.35$ ), Fixed TAC (50 000 t ),
and a variable TAC escapement strategy. The 2007 evaluation showed that all three management strategies are capable of generating stock trends that stay at or above $B_{p a}$ $=$ MSY Bescapement, i.e. away from Blim with a high probability in the long term and are, therefore, considered to be in accordance with the MSY and precautionary approach. ICES did not recommend any particular one of the strategies.

- ICES in September-October 2012 and again in April-May 2013 (Vinther and Nielsen, 2012; 2013) evaluated and commented on long-term management strategies for the stock using updated stock information.
- In September 2012 ICES evaluated three additional management strategies within the escapement strategy (Vinther and Nielsen, 2012): 1) A long-term minimum TAC $>0$ together with a maximum TAC (only with one yearly assessment in September) with the result that a minimum TAC up to 27 kt (revised to 20 kt in the 2013 evaluation) and a maximum TAC of 100-250 kt will be long-term sustainable; 2) A long-term fixed initial TAC the first six months of the year followed by a date where the TAC for the whole year is set based on a fixed F (only with one yearly September assessment) with the result that an initial TAC between $25-50 \mathrm{kt}$ and a fixed $\mathrm{F}=0.35$ (corresponding to median catch of 60 kt ) is long-term sustainable; 3) Similar to 2 , but here with a within year update assessment and advice based on the escapement strategy, and the result here is that an initial TAC of up to 50 kt is sustainable when having a within year update assessment. The difference between the MSE 1 and 2-3 is that the initial fixed TAC is assumed to be taken (or possibly lost) within the first six months of the year (MSE 2-3), while the minimum TAC in MSE 1 can be applied all year.
- As a follow up on this, ICES evaluated in April 2013 one additional management strategy within the escapement strategy (Vinther and Nielsen, 2013): 4) A long-term minimum TAC $>0$ and a maximum TAC, but where the TAC year is from 1st November-31st October rather than from 1st January to 31st December, and one annual advice from the September assessment, with the result that a minimum TAC up to 20 kt with maximum TAC of 100 kt ( $\mathrm{F}_{\max } / \mathrm{cap}=0.8$ ) or with maximum TAC of 200 kt ( $\mathrm{F}_{\max } / \mathrm{cap}=0.6$ ) will be long-term sustainable with some level of F control according to those $\mathrm{F}_{\text {cap }}$ levels.


## Summary of the management plan evaluations performed in 2006-2007

In autumn 2006 and during 2007 the management plans and harvest control rules for Norway pout were evaluated by ICES based on an EU request with respect to bycatches in the fishery and evaluation of recent initiatives to introduce more selective fishing methods in the Norway pout fishery. See addendum below to this Stock Quality Handbook (stock annex).

On this basis, ICES has evaluated and commented on three management strategies, following requests from managers; fixed fishing mortality ( $\mathrm{F}=0.35$ ), Fixed TAC (50 000 t ), and a variable TAC escapement strategy. The evaluation shows that all three management strategies are capable of generating stock trends that stay at or above $B_{p a}=$ $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{pa}}=$ MSY Bescapement $=\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{MSY}}$, i.e. away from Blim with a high probability in the long term and are, therefore, considered to be precautionary. ICES does not recommend any particular one of the strategies. The choice between different strategies depends on the requirements that fisheries managers and stakeholders have regarding stability in catches or the overall level of the catches. The variable TAC escapement strategy as
evaluated in 2007 has higher long-term yield compared to the fixed fishing mortality strategy (and the fixed TAC strategy), but at the cost of a substantially higher probability of having closures in the fishery. If the continuity of the fishery is an important property, the fixed F (equivalent to fixed effort) strategy will perform better.
There should be no shift in management strategies between years. In recent years the escapement strategy has been practised.
A detailed description of the long-term management strategies and management plan evaluations can be found in the stock annex and in the ICES, AGNOP 2007 (ICES CM 2007/ACFM:39), ICES, WGNSSK 2007 (ICES CM 2007/ACFM:30) and the ICES, AGSANNOP (ICES CM 2007/ACFM:40) reports as well as in Vinther and Nielsen (2012; 2013).

## Background

On the basis of an joint EU and Norwegian Requests in autumn 2006 with respect to Norway pout management strategies and bycatches in the Norway pout fishery, as well as on the basis of the work by ICES WGNSSK in autumn 2006 and spring 2007 during the ICES, AGNOP 2007 (ICES CM 2007/ACFM:39) ACFM has already by May 2007 evaluated detailed output from management plans and harvest control rules evaluations considering two different management strategies for Norway pout, i.e. the real-time escapement management strategy and the long-term fixed F or E management strategy. This has been based on use of advanced stochastic simulation models and results from here supplied by DTU-Aqua. The fixed TAC long-term management strategy was not evaluated in depth by the ICES, AGNOP as it was not considered realistic at that time because of substantial loss in yield, but has later in autumn 2007 associated to the ICES WGNSSK in autumn 2007 (ICES CM 2007/ACFM:30) been evaluated and presented with the two other management strategies. Furthermore, in addition to the ICES response on the EC and Norway joint request on management measures for Norway pout, Denmark has, in autumn 2007, requested ICES to provide a full evaluation of the fixed TAC strategy for Norway pout including an estimation of the long-term TAC which would be sustainable with a low probability ( $5 \%$ ) of the stock falling below Blim. An ICES, ACFM subgroup considered the documentation during autumn 2007 ACFM meeting and found that some further studies would be required in order to provide a well-documented answer. All this was provided through the ICES, AGSANNOP Report (ICES CM 2007/ACFM:40).

## Long-term harvest control rules

ICES and DTU-Aqua have now provided comprehensive evaluation for three types of long-term management strategies for the stock which all have been accepted by ICES:

- Escapement strategy;
- Long-term fixed fishing mortality or fishing effort strategy; and
- Long-term fixed TAC strategy.

The conclusions from the evaluation methods used for the three strategies are the following:

## Escapement strategy

ICES evaluated an escapement strategy defined as follows: 1) an initial TAC that would be set for the first half of the TAC year, based on a recruitment index, and 2) a TAC for the second half of the year which would be based on a survey assessment conducted in the first half of the TAC year and the setting TAC for the second half of the year based on an SSB escapement rule. This escapement strategy shall generally assure an SSB above $B_{p a}$, i.e. with a target of obtaining an SSB that is truly above Blim with a high probability ( $95 \%$ ). In practice this Harvest Control Rule (HCR) is an escapement strategy with an additional maximum effort. The conclusion is that the equilibrium median yield is around 110 kt , and there is a $50 \%$ risk for a closure of the fishery in the first half-year and a $20-25 \%$ risk of a closure in the second half-year. The distribution of F shows that the fishery will mostly alternate between a low and a high effort situation. When the fishery has been closed in the second half-year, there is around $20 \%$ probability for another closure in the following year.

The robustness of the HCR to uncertainties in stock size indicates that annual assessment might not be necessary for this stock; an annual survey index could be sufficient.

Caveats to the evaluation of the escapement strategy:

- The sensitivity of the parameters in the HCR used for TAC in the first half-year has not been fully evaluated;
- Non-random distribution of residuals in the surveys may give biased perceptions and need to be included in the evaluation.


## Effort control strategy

The effort control scenario with a fixed F indicates that an F of around 0.35 is expected to give a low (5\%) probability of the stock going below Blim. The scenario appears robust to implementation uncertainties, and a target F below 0.35 and an implementation noise CV around $25 \%$ is expected to give a long-term yield around 90 kt and no closures of the fishery would be needed. This management strategy is not dependent on a yearly assessment because it assumes a direct link between fishing effort and fishing mortality which is also apparent from the historical assessment of this stock.

Caveats to the evaluation of the effort control strategy:

- A regime shift towards a lower recruitment level will not be detected by this approach and there is a risk of overfishing in such a situation with a fixed effort approach;
- Implementation of a fixed standardized effort (which is not measurable) can be difficult;
- Effort management in bycatch fisheries (e.g. bycatch of Norway pout in blue whiting fishery) is difficult to regulate;
- Effort-F relationships are known to suffer from technological creep and this aspect needs to be tested in the evaluation.


## Fixed TAC strategy

The scenario with fixed TAC indicates that a long-term TAC on around 50 kt will be sustainable with a low (5\%) probability of the stock going below Blim. ICES concludes that a fixed TAC rule for Norway pout would be in accordance with the precaution-
ary approach provided the fixed TAC is not greater than 50 kt and F does not exceed the value of 0.5 , and provided measures are in place to reduce TAC in the exceptional case of a low recruitment in a number of consecutive years. The evaluations indicate that if a target TAC below 50 kt is implemented no closures of the fishery would be needed.

Caveats to the evaluation of the fixed TAC strategy:

- A regime shift towards a lower recruitment level will not be detected by this approach and there is a risk of overfishing in such a situation with a fixed TAC approach;
- For a short-lived species with highly variable recruitment such as Norway pout, a catch-stabilizing strategy (fixed TAC) is likely to imply a substantial loss in long-term yield compared to other strategies if the risk of SSB falling below Blim is to remain reasonably low. This strategy is also sensible in relation to potential risks of regime shifts in the stock-recruitmentrelationship.


## Conclusions from the 2007 management strategy evaluations

Not any particular of the management strategies presented above is recommended. All strategies that have a low risk of depleting the stock below Blim are considered to be in accordance with the precautionary approach and being sustainable. The choice between different strategies depends on the requirements that fisheries managers and stakeholders have regarding stability in catches or the overall level of the catches. It should be noted that this is a long-term management strategy evaluation and it is accordingly not possible to switch between strategies from year to year. Often switching between different long-term strategies will be in conflict with the basic assumptions behind the evaluations of them.

The evaluation shows that all three types of management strategies (escapement, fixed effort, fixed TAC) are capable of generating stock trends that stay away from Blim with a high probability.
The escapement strategy has a higher long-term yield (110 kt) compared to the fixed effort strategy ( 90 kt ) and the fixed TAC strategy ( 50 kt ) but at the cost of having closures in the fishery with a substantially higher probability. If the continuity of the fishery is an important property, then the fixed effort strategy performs better.
The simulations deal with observation error and implementation error of the management strategies but do not take into account process error in relation to natural mortality, maturity-at-age, or mean weight-at-age in the stock, which could have a significant impact.
The fixed effort strategy does not rely critically on the results of stock assessment models in any particular year. On the other hand, that strategy is very dependent on the possibility of actually implementing an effort scheme, including an account of the bycatch fisheries (e.g. for blue whiting) and ways to deal with effort creep.

The fixed effort strategy and the fixed TAC strategy are likely to imply a substantial loss in long-term yield compared to the escapement strategy if the risk of SSB falling below Blim is to remain reasonably low. These strategies are also sensible in relation to potential risks of regime shifts in the stock-recruitment-relationship.

## Summary of the management plan evaluations performed in 2012-2013

ICES in September-October 2012 and again in April-May 2013 (Vinther and Nielsen, 2012; 2013) evaluated and commented on long-term management strategies for the stock using updated stock information.

## Background

ICES in September-October 2012 and again in April-May 2013 (Vinther and Nielsen, 2012; 2013) evaluated and commented on long-term management strategies for the stock using updated stock information.

On basis of an additional request from the EU Commission and Norway 8th February 2012 received by ICES in final form in May 2012 (EU, 2012) there is proposed and asked for additional evaluations of modified and alternative harvest control rules for Norway pout in the North Sea and Skagerrak.

## Request 2012

The European Union and Norway jointly requested ICES in autumn 2012 to give advice on the management of Norway Pout in ICES Subarea 4 (North Sea) and ICES Division 3.a (Skagerrak-Kattegat) and to evaluate the following options:

1) Whether a management strategy is precautionary if TAC is constrained to be within the range of $20000-250000$ tonnes, or another range suggested by ICES, based on the existing escapement strategy;
2) A management strategy with a fixed initial TAC in the range of 20 000-50 000 tonnes. The final TAC is to be set by adding to the preliminary TAC around $(50 \%)$ of the amount that can be caught in excess of 50000 tonnes, based on a target $F$ of 0.35 ;
3) A management strategy with a fixed initial TAC in the range of 20 000-50 000 tonnes. The final TAC is to be set by adding to the preliminary TAC around ( $50 \%$ ) of what can be caught in excess of 50000 t , based on the escapement strategy.

## Interpretation of the request from 2012

The request from the EU Commission and Norway is not clear, but ICES has interpreted the request in the following way:

1) Management Strategy 1: Here it is asked to evaluate a Management Strategy (MS) on the basis on the existing ICES escapement strategy for Norway pout; however with absolute TAC constraints that include a minimum TAC higher than zero and a ceiling of the TAC. The present management system is based on two yearly assessments (advices) from ICES; one in September with survey indices from the IBTS Quarter 3 survey including 0-group index, and one in May with updates from the IBTS Quarter 1 survey. The timing of the actual use of the advice into TAC regulations has varied in the most recent years. In some years the September advice has been used in regulation of the (in year) 4th quarter fishery while the process in other years has been delayed such that the September assessment will just be used for the TAC in the 1st half year. The May advice has been used in regulation of the (in year) 3rd quarter (and in some years the 4th quarter) fishery.

ICES has chosen just to evaluate the option where the September assessment is used for advice for the next calendar year. This option is the less robust of the two
alternatives as TAC for the fourth quarter is set from the May assessment without knowing the recruitment index from the third quarter.
2) Management Strategy 2: This MS has a fixed initial TAC for the first six months of the year followed by an update of the TAC for the full year by the end of June. This TAC advice will be based on the ICES assessment of Norway pout made in May. The TAC for the whole year is based on a fixed F strategy.
By having a fixed TAC for the first six months irrespective of the state of the stock, there is no reason to update (simulate) the assessment in September.
3) Management Strategy 3: As MS2, but here the within year update is based on the escapement strategy.

The difference between MS1 and MS3 is mainly the use of the initial fixed TAC in MS3, which is assumed to be taken (or possible lost) within the first six months of the year for MS3. However, it is assumed that the (minimum) TAC from MS1 is valid for the whole calendar year, irrespective of the May assessment results.

## Request 2013

On basis of a request from the EU Commission 8th February 2013 there is proposed and asked for additional evaluations of modified and alternative harvest control rules for the Norway pout stock in the North Sea and Skagerrak.

## EU request to ICES on changing the TAC year for Norway pout

In 2012, the EU and Norway submitted a request to ICES to evaluate various measures for the management of Norway pout. ICES responded to this request in October 2012.

The first option that ICES evaluated was a management strategy based on the existing ICES escapement strategy for Norway pout (catch should not exceed an amount that allows stock biomass to be above 150000 tonnes at the beginning of the following year), modified to include absolute constraints on the annual TAC (a minimum TAC higher than zero and a ceiling on the TAC).

For this management strategy, ICES evaluated only the option whereby the September assessment is used for the TAC for the next calendar year (with an in-year update in May, but not in September). It was noted that this option, where the TAC for quarter 4 is set from the May assessment without knowing the recruitment indices from the third quarter, is less robust than the alternative, which has an additional in-year update in September.

In this light, ICES is asked to evaluate again a management strategy for the Norway pout stock based on the existing ICES escapement strategy, but where the TAC year is changed to 1 November- 31 October rather than from 1 January- 31 December. In this case, the TAC for quarter 4 and for quarters 1 to 3 of the following year would be fixed on the basis of the September assessment, with no update in May.

## Interpretation of the request from 2013

The request from the EU Commission is not clear. After consultation with the Commission (e-mail Gilles Doignon, 19 March 2013) ICES has interpreted the request in the following way:

It is requested to evaluate a Management Strategy (MS) on the basis on the existing ICES escapement strategy for the Norway pout stock; however with absolute TAC constraints that include a minimum TAC higher than zero and a ceiling of the TAC as included in the 2012 request. The TAC year is requested to be 1 November-31 October rather than 1 January-31 December. The advice is annually and will be based on the ICES assessment and advice in September-October.

The request specifies that the TAC should be set in accordance with the ICES escapement strategy, which targets a SSB at spawning time above the MSY Bescapement after the fishery has taken place. For Norway pout it is assumed that spawning takes place at the beginning of quarter 1 which has been documented by Lambert et al. (2009) and Nielsen et al. (2012). The proposed TAC year (Year, ...), 1 November-31 October, includes thereby one spawning period, but SSB in the following year is highly dependent on the fishery in January-October in the TAC year. By having a TAC year that does not align to the annual life cycle for the species the default ICES escapement strategy cannot be used. We have, however, considered several alternative methods to set the TAC with the aim of having SSB above Blim at spawning time (start of Q1, i.e. 1 January) with a high ( $95 \%$ ) probability (see the next section).

## Long-term harvest control rules evaluated and methods for evaluation

In September 2012 ICES evaluated three additional management strategies within the escapement strategy (Vinther and Nielsen, 2012):

1) A long-term minimum TAC $>0$ together with a maximum TAC (only with one yearly assessment in September);
2) A long-term fixed initial TAC the first six months of the year followed by a date where the TAC for the whole year is set based on a fixed F (only with one yearly September assessment);
3) Similar to 2 , but here with a within year update assessment and advice based on the escapement strategy.

The difference between the MSE 1 and 2-3 is that the initial fixed TAC is assumed to be taken (or possibly lost) within the first six months of the year (MSE 2-3), while the minimum TAC in MSE 1 can be applied all year.

As a follow up on this ICES evaluated in April 2013 one additional management strategy within the escapement strategy (Vinther and Nielsen, 2013):
4) A long-term minimum TAC $>0$ and a maximum TAC, but where the TAC year is from 1 November-31 October rather than from 1 January to 31 December, and one annual advice from September assessment.

## Method used for the MSE in 2012 and 2013

The proposed harvest control rules of a management plan for Norway pout in the North Sea and Skagerrak were evaluated using a simulation framework (SMS) in accordance with the ICES guidelines (ICES, 2008; ICES, 2013) for management strategy evaluation. The SMS has previously been used for Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) of the short-lived species sandeel and Norway pout (ICES, 2007a,b; ICES, 2012c) and multispecies assessments (ICES, 2008). The SMS allows the use of quarterly time-steps, which is not the case for the standard software packages used in ICES MSE.

The SMS does not include a full assessment cycle with an explicit stock assessment and a short-term forecast using a Harvest Control Rule (HCR) to calculate the TAC.

Instead, it is assumed that the true stock size can be "observed" with some bias and noise and it is this "perceived" stock that makes the basis for the use of a HCR and estimation of a TAC. The true stock size is assumed known in the first projection year and is later updated annually by recruitment and catches derived from application of the HCR on the "perceived" stock.

The SMS method has been extended with options to mimic the requested HRC. Appendix, Chapter 6, Section 1 gives an overview of the extensions.

Risk to $\mathrm{Blim}_{\lim }$ (the probability of real SSB being below $\mathrm{Blim}_{\mathrm{lim}}$ ) is calculated in both the short and long term. For the individual years 2014-2017 the risk to Blim is calculated as the number of times, across 10000 iterations, that SSB in year y is below $\mathrm{B}_{\lim }$ (1 January) divided by number of iterations (10000). This is referred to as prob1 (risk type 1 ) in the ICES guidelines to MSE (ICES, 2013). Long-term risk is defined as the maximum probability that SSB is below Blim, where the maximum (of the annual probabilities) is taken over the years 2017-2028 (Prob3, risk type 3 in the ICES MSE guidelines).

## Conclusions from management strategy evaluations

In September 2012 ICES evaluated three additional management strategies within the escapement strategy (Vinther and Nielsen, 2012): 1) A long-term minimum TAC >0 together with a maximum TAC (only with one yearly assessment in September) with the result that a minimum TAC up to 27 kt (revised to 20 kt in the 2013 evaluation) and a maximum TAC of 100-250 kt will be long-term sustainable; 2) A long-term fixed initial TAC the first six months of the year followed by a date where the TAC for the whole year is set based on a fixed F (only with one yearly September assessment) with the result that an initial TAC between $25-50 \mathrm{kt}$ and a fixed $\mathrm{F}=0.35$ (corresponding to median catch of 60 kt ) is long-term sustainable; 3) Similar to 2 , but here with a within year update assessment and advice based on the escapement strategy, and the result here is that an initial TAC of up to 50 kt is sustainable when having a within year update assessment. The difference between the MSE 1 and 2-3 is that the initial fixed TAC is assumed to be taken (or possibly lost) within the first six months of the year (MSE 2-3), while the minimum TAC in MSE 1 can be applied all year. As a follow up on this ICES evaluated in April 2013 one additional management strategy within the escapement strategy (Vinther and Nielsen, 2013): 4) A long-term minimum TAC $>0$ and a maximum TAC, but where the TAC year is from 1 November- 31 October rather than from 1 January to 31 December, and one annual advice from September assessment, with the result that a minimum TAC up to 20 kt with maximum TAC of $100 \mathrm{kt}\left(\mathrm{F}_{\max } / \mathrm{cap}=0.8\right.$ ) or with maximum TAC of $200 \mathrm{kt}\left(\mathrm{F}_{\max } / \mathrm{cap}=0.6\right)$ will be longterm sustainable with some level of F control according to those Fcap levels.

The 2012-2013 evaluation showed that management strategies 2-4 are capable of generating stock trends that stay at or above $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{pa}}=$ MSY Bescapement, i.e. away from Blim with a high probability in the long term and are, therefore, considered to be in accordance with the MSY and precautionary approach. ICES does not recommend any particular one of the strategies 2-4.

## Main results from the 2012 MSE (Vinther and Nielsen, 2012)

The proposed Management Strategies (Options 1, 2 and 3) from the 2012 evaluations are in accordance with the sustainability criteria under the precautionary approach given a minimum TAC of maximum 27 kt (revised to 20 kt in the 2013 evaluation) and an assumption about future fishing mortality or fishing effort within the range of the values observed for the last decade.

Application of an initial TAC up to 50 kt , is possible for option 2 and 3. This higher initial TAC (compared to the minimum TAC under option 1) is mainly due to the scenario assumption that the initial TAC for option 2 and 3 has to be taken within the first half-year while the minimum TAC can be taken within the full year for option 1. With the assumption of an upper limit on realised fishing mortality (Cap F) by halfyear, the realised catch can be higher with option 1 which increases the risk of overfishing in years with a low stock size.

The risk for SSB below Blim for option 1 and 3 is not sensitive to the choice of maximum TAC. However, both a high minimum TAC and a high maximum TAC make the risk to Blim more sensitive to the scenario assumption of a Cap F. A high minimum TAC in combination with a high maximum TAC might require effort management to ensure that fishing mortality remains within the range of the values observed for the last decade.

The management strategy evaluations and simulations confirm the general observation that a fixed F strategy will provide a lower long-term yield than an escapement strategy for such a short-lived species like Norway pout. The "cost" of the escapement strategy is a much more variable fishing mortality from one year to the next. Stability in landings is also lower for the escapement strategy.

MS1: The long-term performance of MS1 is robust to the choice of minimum TAC given a maximum TAC at 200 kt and a Cap F at 0.6. The probability of a SSB below Blim is in the range $0-10 \%$ for fixed TACs in the range $0-50 \mathrm{kt}$, and a higher than $5 \%$ long-term probability for SSB below $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{lim}}$ is estimated for a minimum TAC of around 27 kt (revised to 20 kt in the 2013 evaluation). Realized long-term F, SSB and yield is not sensitive to the choice of minimum TAC option giving values of long-term SSB around $175 \mathrm{kt}, \mathrm{F}$ around 0.45 and yield around 90 kt . Given a minimum TAC at 27 kt (revised to 20 kt in the 2013 evaluation), the actual choice of maximum TAC affect the $\operatorname{Prob}\left(\mathrm{SSB}<\mathrm{Blim}_{\mathrm{lim}}\right.$ ) very little and is less than $5 \%$ for the range $100-250 \mathrm{kt}$ of maximum TAC. The highest long-term median yield is obtained with a maximum TAC at around 100 kt , however the highest long-term mean yield is obtained with a maxi-
 to the assumption of a Cap F at 0.6 , while e.g. a maximum TAC at 100 kt is robust to that assumption.

MS2: The long-term performance of MS2 has a probability of $\mathrm{SSB}<\mathrm{Blim}$ of more than $5 \%$, irrespective of the minimum TAC, if $100 \%$ of the TAC for the second half year, based on fixed F at 0.35 , is applied. If around $70 \%$ of the predicted catch calculated for second half year is applied as the TAC, there is a prob(SSB<Blim) of less than $5 \%$. Given the $70 \%$ of calculated catch used for TAC in the second half year, the MS2 is not sensitive to the choice of the initial TAC in the first half-year in the range of $25 \mathrm{kt}-$ 50 kt . The long-term values of SSB, yield and F, using the 25 kt initial TAC and $70 \%$ of the predicted catch (annual $\mathrm{F}=0.35$ ) applied for the second half year is a median yield at 60 kt , a median F at 0.26 , with low variation from one year to the next. This option is not sensitive to the actual choice of Cap F for an initial TAC at 25 kt , but very sensitive for an initial TAC at 50 kt .

MS3: The long-term performance of MS3 with fixed initial TAC for the first half-year only, and TAC for the second half-year based on the escapement strategy, is not sensitive to the choice of initial TAC (up to 50 kt ) but sensitive to the assumptions about Cap F. Application of the higher initial TAC is more sensitive to the assumption of a Cap F. Long-term yield have a median value at 90 kt and a median F at 0.46 , with large variations between years.

The MSE simulations presented are based on a long row of assumptions of constant values for key parameters such as the fishing pattern, mean weights, maturity and natural mortality-at-age. Likewise, it is assumed that the estimated stock-recruitment relationship is valid for future recruitments. However, this represents the normal ICES procedure to MSE and we have not made additional sensitivity analyses. Given these assumptions the presented scenario results should be regarded more as a sensitivity analysis than as absolute performance in relation to e.g. yield and the probability of SSB above Blim.

The applicability of the fixed minimum TAC within the precautionary framework depends on the assumption on when the fishery will actually cease due to low catch rates (and stock size). In this evaluation of the management strategies it has been assumed that the real fishing mortality cannot exceed values of fishing mortalities (Cap $\mathrm{F}=0.6$ ) observed for the last ten years. The sensitivity to the value of Cap F is in general moderate for the presented options, but it is obvious that if the fleet makes a determined attempt to catch the full minimum TAC although the catch rates are low and the state of the stock is poor, the management strategy will not be precautionary. Given the good historical relation between fishing effort and fishing mortality in the Norway pout fishery, an upper limit on effort will effectively set an upper limit on fishing mortality.

Norway pout is a semi-pelagic species which is widely and rather evenly distributed in the Northern North Sea, and it does not show very dense schooling behaviour. The fact that the stock does not occur in large, very dense schools lowers the risk for continuation of the fishery at low stock size, i.e. it is likely impossible to maintain high catch rates at low stock size. This indicates that the fishery will stop at low stock size.
The Norway pout box (EU Regulation 850/98 Article 26) also contributes to protection of a low Norway pout stock as this box covers a significant part of the distribution area of the stock. This protection supports the validity of the assumption of a Cap F, as Norway pout cannot be fished within that area. Bycatch regulation (EU Regulation 850/98 Article 26) including maximum bycatch rates of other gadoids will also limit the fishery of Norway pout at a low stock size.

Main results from the 2013 MSE (Vinther and Nielsen, 2013)
The proposed Management Strategy (4) is in accordance with the sustainability criteria under the precautionary approach given a minimum TAC of maximum 20 kt and an assumption about future fishing mortality (and fishing effort) stays within the range of the values observed $[0.0 ; 0.6]$ for the last decade.

A maximum TAC can be sat at levels up to around 200 kt . Such high maximum TAC is however very sensitive to the assumption of an upper limit on realised fishing mortality (Cap F at 0.6) and will require a strict effort control, especially if the present effort level is increased significantly.
A maximum on F used in setting the TAC from the escapement strategy might be an alternative to effort control. Such maximum F should be around 0.6 for an HCR with maximum TAC at 200 kt or up to 0.8 if a maximum TAC at 100 kt is chosen. Median yield is almost the same for the two options.

The changes in the TAC year to 1 November-31 October could not be implemented fully in the Management Strategy Evaluation. However the present evaluation (using a TAC year 1 October- 30 September) is considered sufficient to show that the sug-
gested shift in TAC year has a very limited influence on long-term yield, stock sizes and risk to Blim.

The MSE simulations presented are based on a long row of assumptions of constant values for key parameters such as the fishing pattern, mean weights, maturity and natural mortality-at-age. Some of the assumptions have been documented in Lambert et al. (2009) and Nielsen et al. (2012). Likewise, it is assumed that the estimated stockrecruitment relationship is valid for future recruitments. However, this represents the normal ICES procedure to MSE and we have not made additional sensitivity analyses. Given these assumptions the presented scenario results should be regarded more as a sensitivity analysis than as absolute performance in relation to e.g. the probability of SSB above Blim.

Some general conclusion from the evaluation of the option 4 can, however, be made in relation to sustainability according to the precautionary approach for the different management strategies. The applicability of the fixed TAC within the precautionary framework depends on the assumption on when the fishery will actually cease due to low catch rates (and stock size). This is implemented as a Cap F option in the MSE scenarios. The sensitivity to the value of CAP F is in general low for the different presented options, but it is obvious that if the fleet makes a determined attempt to catch the full minimum TAC although the catch rates are low and the state of the stock is poor, then the MS will not be precautionary.

Norway pout is a semi-pelagic species which is widely and rather evenly distributed in the Northern North Sea (Lambert et al., 2009; Nielsen et al., 2012; Sparholt et al., 2002a,b; ICES, 2012a incl. stock annex). It does not show very dense schooling behaviour. The fact that the stock does not occur in large, very dense schools lower the risk for continuation of the fishery at low stock size, i.e. it is likely impossible to maintain high catch rates at low stock size. This indicates that the fishery will stop at low stock size.

The present fishery regulation will also contribute to maintain a low fishing mortality at low stock sizes. The Norway pout box in the northwestern part of the North Sea (closure to reduce bycatch rates of other gadoids) contains a significant proportion of the Norway pout stock which is out of reach of the fishery. In addition, the present bycatch regulation to protect other species including maximum bycatch rates of other gadoids will be difficult to obey with low stock size of Norway pout and probably bring the fishery to an end in such situations. Furthermore, selective devices have been introduced in the fishery to reduce bycatches of other species (Eigaard et al., 2012).

The main fishery for Norway pout is a targeted fishery where Norway pout constitutes the main catch (ICES, 2012a, incl. stock annex). Although Norway pout is caught together with blue whiting in deep waters in some years in the Norwegian fishery, the bycatch of Norway pout has not been high in the Blue whiting fishery historically (including years when the Norway pout fishery has been closed) (ICES, 2012a). Bycatch of Norway pout can therefore be ignored.

The sensitivity analyses presented show in general that SSB is maintained above $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{lim}}$ with a high ( $95 \%$ ) probability. This is partly because the assumed assessment uncertainty is lower than the uncertainty used to set $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{pa}}$ from $\mathrm{Blim}_{\mathrm{lim}}$. The ratio between $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{lim}}$ and $B_{p a}$ reflects that given a CV at $30 \%$ of the estimate of SSB, there will be less than $5 \%$ risk that the real SSB is below Blim for an assessment estimate of SSB at Bpa. This is a rather high uncertainty margin given the very stable assessment with limited retrospective noise (ICES, 2012a). Assessment results using the SMS models show that SSB
in the first year after the terminal year can be estimated with a CV at $18-20 \%$. This value was used in the simulations and is lower than the assumed $30 \% \mathrm{CV}$.

The limited time-gap, three months, between the most recent assessment estimates and the TAC period contributes also to the robustness of the scenarios. Most TAC advice from ICES make use of one so-called "intermediate year", which is the time period between the last assessment year and the TAC year. For Norway pout the TAC advice is mainly given with a shorter delay between the terminal year of the assessment and the TAC period.

## Comparison with the 2012 MSE

The results from the scenarios presented in this paper follow the results from the MSE evaluations made in autumn 2012 (Vinther and Nielsen, 2012). The minimum sustainable TAC in the most recent evaluation is around 20 kt whereas the minimum TAC in the 2012 evaluation was around 27 kt for comparable options. The difference is probably due to the shift in the TAC year and the fact that the SSB at the 1 January (after fishing in November-December on the TAC for November-October) is not used in setting the TAC. This might increase the risk to Blim, such that a decrease in the minimum TAC becomes necessary. Using the SSB after having taken the TAC in the second calendar year (January-October) as target in the escapement strategy seems however to work quite well.

## F. Other issues

## Suggestions for future investigations

1) Future investigations should evaluate potential age reading problems and agereading discrepancies between countries / institutes.
2) From WKPOUT 2016: There still seem to be some issues with mean growth (size-at-age and the derived weight-at-age) in how it affects model estimation. More work is required here, both in terms of the sampling accuracy and precision achieved under the current design and the most statistically rigorous way to impute values for years where these data are missing or in question.
3) From WKPOUT 2016: A suite of diagnostic tools must be developed for the SESAM model as soon as possible. Because SESAM is a new model, few standard diagnostic tools for performance exist. The WKPOUT review team recommends developing some additional diagnostic tools such as: (i) a better format for displaying and interpreting standardized model residuals over time (the bubble plots that were shown to us were horizontally compressed and very difficult to read and interpret); (ii) performance statistics based on prediction skill (e.g. how well does the model predict when a datapoint is removed?); (iii) likelihood profiles (if there is tension in the model, where does it occur?); (iv) some depictions of any gradient problems that may exist; (v) summary tables with AIC/BIC values for models using the same data (i.e. documentation of all intermediate models tested before arriving at the final choice of parameter coupling); (vi) statistics for model goodness-of-fit; and, (vii) plots showing retrospective patterns (and patterns when earlier years are left out). NB: This is not an exhaustive list per se.
4) From WKPOUT 2016: Additional sensitivity runs should probably be included in the next assessment, in particular the assumptions of time invariant growth, maturity and natural mortality may need to be considered. For the short term, projections that include different ways to handle mean weight-at-age, including
projecting forward with specified uncertainty, should be more fully explored (smoothed historic time-series, average over some recent time period, etc.).
5) From WKPOUT 2016: The SESAM model appears to be very flexible, but currently estimating relatively few parameters. The Norway pout assessment exhibits coherent indices and generally behaves well. The reviewers were left with the impression that some additional parameters might be estimable. We suggest that the assessment working group spend some time considering what might be worth investigating in future assessments. For example, a clear linkage between states of maturity and natural mortality.
6) From WKPOUT 2016: There are currently two recruit indices (age 0) being used in model parameter estimation. To avoid duplicative information being introduced into the assessment, a method should be developed that combines the Scottish and the English indices into a single robust index. In general, there were a number of problems and questions regarding error variances of the data that were not ultimately addressed that had to do with sampling mechanics, sampling theoretics and sampling designs for both fishery-independent data, and for those obtained from the fleets. It would make sense to conduct a thorough design analyses of these data at the earliest possible time, and to ensure that re-analyses are performed after every data collection period so that precision is maximised for use in assessment modelling.
7) New research findings on developments in bycatch reducing gear devices should be further evaluated under ecosystem aspects and fisheries aspects in relation to future benchmark assessment.
8) The consumption amount of Norway pout by its main predators should be evaluated in relation to production amount in the Norway pout stock under consideration of consumption and production of other prey species for those predators in the ecosystem. This also implies need for information on prey switching dynamics of North Sea fish predators which also are foraging on Norway pout. Biological interactions with respect to intraspecific and interspecific relationships for Norway pout stock dynamics and important predator stock dynamics have been reviewed and further analysed in Nielsen (2016; Section 6) and there is referred to the general conclusions here.

## Data needs

1) Full-scale otolith exchange programme;
2) Additional relevant information: There are no major data deficiencies identified for this stock, whose assessment is usually of high quality. However, some detailed information on distribution of different life stages will be very welcome. For example precise indications on spawning sites and spawning periods (i.e. observations of fish with running roe or just post-spawned fish); information/data on detailed distribution changes of different size groups e.g. on the Fladen Ground (outer bank, inner bank according to age; schools of size groups or mixing; vertical distribution patterns) over the fishing seasons and changes herein will be welcome (especially 1,3 and 4 quarter). Potential distribution patterns regarding when and where it is possible to obtain the cleanest Norway pout fishery, i.e. with minimum bycatch would be important, as well as information on potential diurnal changes in distribution, density, and availability. Potential changes in the southern borders of its distribution range in the North Sea would also be relevant to obtain according to a potential temperature effect of climate driven sea warming. Detailed sampling of Norway pout individuals from the
commercial fishery in quarter 1 and quarter 4 will be welcome in order to establish more precisely the exact spawning sites (areas) and precise spawning time based on biological examination of maturity stages of these sampled individuals. The above information will demand self-sampling by the fishermen in their quarter 1, 2 and quarter 4 fishery covering all fishing areas and the whole season. In general fishing effort is higher in second half year compared to 1 half-year.
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# Norway pout population dynamics and ecological role in the North Sea and Skagerrak 

J. Rasmus Nielsen, DTU Aqua

## 1. Introduction

This working document presents Norway pout population dynamics and the ecological role of the Norway pout stock in the North Sea and Skagerrak (ICES Area IV and IIIa), nop34, relevant for the ICES benchmark assessment for the stock in August 2016, ICES WKPOUT.

The working document is subdivided into 7 main sections with different ecosystem aspects and considerations.

1. Introduction
2. Stock distribution and density patterns
3. Maturity, spawning, spawning distribution and migration
4. Stock delineation and definition
5. Mortality life history aspects (in relation to growth and maturity)
6. Multi-species information and considerations in relation to its ecological role
7. Environmental drivers
8. Annexes A. 1 and A. 2

## 2. Stock Distribution and Density patterns

## Stock distribution and density patterns

Norway pout is distributed from the west of Ireland to Kattegat, at the Faroe Islands, and from the North Sea to the Barents Sea. The distribution for this stock is in the northern North Sea $\left(>57^{\circ} \mathrm{N}\right)$ and in Skagerrak at depths between 50 and 250 m (Raitt 1968; Sparholt et al. 2002b; Lambert et al. 2009).

The Norway pout distribution and density patterns by age group in different periods over a 30 year period up to 2016 in the North Sea and Skagerrak-Kattegat (ICES Divisions IV and IIIa) are shown in Figures 1-2. More detailed figures of yearly distribution patterns are shown in Appendix A. 1 and A. 2 to the present working document. The figures show geographical distribution and density patterns of Norway pout as the catch per unit of effort (CPUE in number of fish per hour) by age and for all age groups combined in the ICES International Bottom Trawl Surveys (ICES IBTS) in $1^{\text {st }}$ and $3^{\text {rd }}$ quarter of the year for a 30 year period from 1985 to 2016. The data originates from downloads/extracts from the ICES DATRAS database in August 2016. The IBTS Surveys only cover areas within the 200 m depth zone. However, very few Norway pout are caught at depths greater than 200 m in the North Sea and Skagerrak on shrimp trawl survey (Sparholt et al. 2002b). For the Norwegian Trench, Albert (1994) found Norway pout at depths greater than 200 m , but very few deeper than 300 m .

The distribution in Figure 1 and Appendix A. 1 is as observed in the Quarter 1 North Sea IBTS surveys by longer period or year, (quarter), and ICES rectangle for the period 1985-2016 for age groups of

Norway pout. The distribution of stock density patterns are shown on the maps as survey catch per unit of effort (CPUE), i.e. catch rates in number of individuals per trawl hour (no of fish caught). The data used for the calculations are CPUE per age group per survey trawl haul as extracted and downloaded from the ICES DATRAS database. The mean CPUE as number per trawl hour per age group (or summed over age groups) by survey (i.e. by year and quarter) is calculated for each ICES rectangle as the mean number per hour of all hauls performed in each rectangle. The mean CPUE per rectangle are either calculated as averages per year (Appendix A.1) or as averages over several years, i.e. in longer periods (Figure 1). The same is shown in Figure 2 and Appendix A. 2 but for the $3^{\text {rd }}$ quarter in the Quarter 3 IBTS survey for the period 1991-2015 and also including the age group 0 which is observed representatively in the third quarter IBTS survey as well.

The IBTS mean CPUE (numbers per hour) by quarter as an average for the full period 1991-2004 is shown in Figure 3 where the boundary between the EU and the Norwegian EEZ are included on the map as well.

Finally, the positions fished at the International Bottom Trawl Survey (IBTS) first quarter and the mean CPUE (numbers) of Norway pout by rectangle for the full period 1981-1999 is shown in Figure 4. The standard area used to calculate abundance indices and the 200 m depth contour is also shown.

In general, highest densities of Norway pout of all age groups are found in the northern North Sea. Densities by year varies according to strong cohorts in the stock. The strong cohorts observed in the period are the 1986, 1989, 1991, 1994, 1996, 1999, 2008, 2009, 2012, and 2014 year classes. There seems to be a tendency towards the young fish density has decreased in the later period compared to the previous period before and after year 2000.


Figure 1. Catch per unit of effort (No/h) of Norway pout by age, ICES rectangle, (quarter) and time period for the IBTS Quarter 1 survey (IBTS Q1) in the period 1985-2016. Furthermore, the difference in CPUE per time period is shown in the figure on the next page. The "Norway pout box" is shown on the maps.


Figure 1. (Continued).


Figure 1. (Continued).


Figure 1. (Continued).


Figure 1. (Continued).


Figure 1. (Continued)


Figure 2. Catch per unit of effort (No/h) of Norway pout by age, ICES rectangle, (quarter) and time period for the IBTS Quarter 3 survey (IBTS Q3) in the period 1991-2015. Furthermore, the difference in CPUE per time period is shown in the figure on the next page. The "Norway pout box" is shown on the maps.
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Figure 2. (Continued).



Figure 3. IBTS mean CPUE (numbers per hour) by quarter during the period 1991-2004. The area of the circles is proportional to CPUE. The IBTS surveys do only cover areas within the 200 m depth zone. The "Norway pout box" and the boundary between the EU and the Norwegian EEZ are shown on the map. The maps are scaled individually. (From EU 2007).


Figure 4. Positions fished at the International Bottom Trawl Survey (IBTS) first quarter and mean CPUE (numbers) of Norway pout by rectangle, 1981-1999. The standard area used to calculate abundance indices and the 200 m depth contour is also shown (from Sparholt et al., 2002b).

## 3. Maturity, spawning, spawning distribution and migration

## Maturity and spawning

Previously, it has been evaluated that around $10 \%$ of the Norway pout reach maturity already at age 1, and that most individuals reach maturity at age 2. Results in Lambert et al (2009) show that the maturity rate for the 1 -group is close to $20 \%$ in average (varying between years and sex) with an increasing tendency over the last 20 years (Figure 5). Furthermore, the average maturity rate for 2 - and 3-groups in $1^{\text {st }}$ quarter of the year was observed to be around $90 \%$ and $95 \%$, respectively, as compared to $100 \%$ used in the assessment (Figures 6-7).


Figure 5. Temporal variability in the maturity ratio of Norway pout during Q1 at ages 1 (left) and 2 (right) from 1983-2006. (From Lambert et al. 2009).


Figure 6. Percentage of each maturity stage (1-4) of Norway pout per age and quarter, based on data collected in Roundfish areas 1-4 and 7 in the North Sea between 1991-1997. (From Lambert et al. 2009)


Figure 7. Maturity ratios for Norway pout in Q1 (left) and Q3 (right) after 1991: interaction age area for males (bottom) and females (top). (From Lambert et al. 2009).
Sexual differences in maturity, growth, and numbers are expected from indications in the literature, and previous to 2009 the maturity of the stock has not been studied systematically, and the differences between the sexes were not known (Lambert et al. 2009). Female Norway pout are larger than males (Raitt, 1968), and several authors (e.g. Heesen and Kuiter, 1982; Cooper, 1983; ICES, 2007b) have reported a numerical dominance of females which, according to Cooper (1983), increases with age. According to Lambert et al. (2009) growth is variable, with a tendency for male maximum length to be smaller than that of females (Figures 8-10), and immature fish to be smaller than mature ones in each age group. Sex ratios indicate that males mature younger than females (age-at-50\%-maturity, respectively, 1.2 and 1.5 years) and there is a decrease in the $2+$-group maturity ratios as well as in weight and female length from before to after spawning (Figures 11-12). Among other these results indicate spawning mortality, and that Norway pout is most likely a short-lived one-time spawning species (Lambert et al. 2009; Nielsen et al. 2012; see also under Section 5 below).


Figure 8. Top panels: quarterly evolution of MWA at ages 1 and 2 in areas 4ae (eastern North Sea), 4aw (western North Sea), and SK (Skagerrak-Kattegat), based on data for the period 1983-2004. Bottom panels: evolution of mean length-at-quarterly-age (MLA by quarter, where age 1 in Q1 $=1.00$, and age 1 in Q2 $=1.25$, etc.) for males and females in the North Sea and Skagerrak and Kattegat, based on data for the period 1991-1996. (From Lambert et al. 2009).


Figure 9. Temporal trends in growth increment for each cohort from age to age +1 ( cm per year), A50, and L50, by sex. Black dots and dashed lines, males; white circles and continuous lines, females. (From Lambert et al. 2009).


Figure 10. Correlation between A50 (left) or L50 (right) and MLA for age 1 in Q1. Black dots and dashed lines, males; white circles and continuous lines, females. (From Lambert et al. 2009).


Figure 11. Relationships between the percentage of mature fish and MLA in mm (age 1 Q1 males $\mathrm{p}<0,001$, females $\mathrm{p}<0,001$; age 2 Q 1 males not significant, females $\mathrm{p}<0,001$; age 1 Q3 males not significant, females not significant, age 2 Q3 males not significant, females $\mathrm{p}<0,001$ ). Black dots and dashed lines males; white circles and continuous lines females. (From Lambert et al. 2009).


Figure 12. Fraction mature as functions of age [logit $(\mathrm{p})=\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b} \times$ age] (left) and length $[\operatorname{logit}(p)=a+b \times$ length] (right). Females, continuous lines; males, dashed lines; LC, length class. Vertical lines represent the age at 25,50 , and $75 \%$ maturity. (From Lambert et al. 2009 \& Nielsen et al. 2012).

The actual decrease in the maturity ratio from Q1 to Q3 in age groups 2+ reinforces the hypothesis of spawning being mainly in the first quarter, and followed by significant spawning mortality (Lambert et al. 2009; Nielsen et al. 2012). If there was no spawning mortality, higher frequencies (than actually observed) of spawning (M3 or M4) fish would be expected from the fishery or observed at least once during the long time series of surveys throughout the North Sea in Q1, which was not the case (Lambert et al. 2009; Nielsen et al. 2012). The scarcity of M4 Norway pout in Q2 and Q3 and the total absence of M4 in Q4 can also be explained by spawning mortality, but a return to M2 cannot be excluded as a potential explanation. This means that the possibility of misidentifying M2 and M4 gonad stages also has to be considered (Lambert et al. 2009). Compared with age 1, there was a notable decrease in MWA in the western North Sea from Q1 to Q2 for age 2, which was obviously linked to spawning (Lambert et al. 2009). In general, the lack of growth in weight from Q1 to Q2 and the observed decline in MLA from Q1 to Q2 likely indicate spawning mortality because the spawning and the loss of spawning products will affect the largest fish most, resulting in a decreased MLA (Lambert et al. 2009). If the loss in weight was due, for instance, to food scarcity (perhaps leading to mortality), one would not expect a decrease in MLA because of greater mortality among the bigger fish. The analyses in Lambert et al. (2009) did not give strong evidence of spawning mortality, but the results are still indicative of this, especially for females. Male Linf was in general smaller than female Linf,, in accord with Raitt (1968), and immature fish were generally smaller than mature fish. However, the growth rates, computed with the von Bertalanffy growth equation, could not be distinguished between the sexes. This would explain why males attain maturity before females and why males dominated the maturity ratio at age 1 in Q1 (to some 70\%) (Lambert et al. 2009).

With respect to intra-specific interactions and potential density dependency, the juvenile growth rate is higher when the stock density is low (Figures 13-14) and results in a reduced age-at-50\%-maturity (Lambert et al. 2009; Nielsen et al. 2012; Figures 15-17). When density is high at age 0 in Q4, the maturity ratio tends to be lower in the subsequent quarter, i.e. at age 1 in Q1 of the succeeding year (Lambert et al. 2009). The percentage of mature fish by sex, weighted by CPUE indices, gives an indication of the ratio of mature fish in the stock. Lambert et al. (2009) found that these percentages of mature females and males aged 2 in Q1 compared well with the pattern observed at age 1. The slope decreased significantly for males at age 2 when recruitment increases. Even if the other relationships tested (e.g. age group 1 by sex, with recruitment from the previous quarter, for instance) were not significant, they showed the same trend of decreasing maturity corresponding to an increase in the levels of recruitment. (Lambert et al. 2009).


Figure 13. Relationship ( $\mathrm{p}, 0.01$ ) between MWA at age 2 in Q1 and the number of fish from the same cohort in the previous quarter (MWA at age 1 in Q4). (From Lambert et al. 2009).


Figure 14. Mean length-at-age in Q1 of age 1 (left) and of age 2 in Q1 (right) vs. year-class strength [recruitment (R) of a cohort] showing statistically significant intraspecific densitydependence. Females, white circles and continuous lines; males, black dots and dashed lines; cohorts in millions. (From Lambert et al. 2009 and Nielsen et al. 2012).


Figure 15. Maturity ogives by age (top) and length (bottom), and comparison between weak and strong year classes for each sex. Dotted lines, weak year classes; long-dashed lines, strong year classes; LC, length class. (From Lambert et al. 2009).


Figure 16. Statistically significant intraspecific relationship between maturity ratio at age 1 in Q1 and the number of fish aged 0 in the previous quarter (sexes combined), and between maturity ratio at 2 in Q1 and recruitment of the current cohort (subdivided by sex). Black dots and dashed lines, males; white circles and continuous lines, females. (From Lambert et al. 2009).


Figure 17. Correlations between L50 or A50 and recruitment number of the previous (top) and current (bottom) cohorts. Black dots and dashed lines, males; white circles and continuous lines, females. (From Lambert et al. 2009).

According to the above, $20 \%$ of age 1 is estimated mature and is included in the SSB. Therefore, the recruitment in the year after the assessment year influences the SSB already in the following year and very much in the second year. Recruitment is highly variable and influences SSB and total stock biomass (TSB) rapidly because of the short life span of the species. Consequently, the population dynamics of Norway pout in the North Sea and Skagerrak are very dependent on changes caused by spawning and recruitment variation as well as variation in predation (or other natural) mortality, and less by the fishery (Nielsen et al., 2012; Lambert et al. 2009; Sparholt et al., 2002a, 2002b; Lambert et al., 2009).

The ICES inter-benchmark assessment in spring 2012 (IBPNorwayPout, ICES 2012c) introduce revised estimates of maturity and natural mortality at age used in the Norway pout stock assessment. The background and rationale behind the revision of the natural mortality and maturity parameters is described in the IBPNorwayPout report (ICES, 2012c) and primary literature (e.g. Nielsen et al., 2012; Lambert et al., 2009; ICES WGSAM 2011)).

The same proportion mature and natural mortality are used for all years in the assessment. The proportion mature used is $0 \%$ for the 0 -group, $20 \%$ of the 1 -group and $100 \%$ of the $2+$-group independent of sex. The revisions of the maturity ogive which have been implemented in the 2012 interbenchmark assessment and following assessments based on results from Lambert et al. (2009) indicating that the maturity rate for the 1-group is close to $20 \%$ in average (varying between years and sex) with an increasing tendency over the last 20 years. Furthermore, the average maturity rate for 2 - and 3-groups in $1^{\text {st }}$ quarter of the year was observed to be only around $95 \%$ as compared to $100 \%$ used in the assessment.

## Spawning distribution

Figures 1 and 2 and Appendix A. 1 and A. 2 show geographical distribution of the stock by age group obtained from the ICES IBTS surveys. The IBTS Surveys only cover areas within the 200 m depth zone. For the Norwegian Trench, Albert (1994) found Norway pout at depths greater than 200 m , but very few deeper than 300 m . It appears from Figure 2 and Appendix A. 2 that age group 0 observed in the third quarter of the year (IBTS Q3) has high density in the Northern part of the North Sea between Shetland and Norway, as well as relative high density in the Skagerrak area in the third quarter, where the 0 -group is a very important part of the catches.

The results in Lambert et al. (2009) have contributed to a more detailed understanding of spawning time and area for Norway pout in the North Sea and Skagerrak. In Figure 18 the distribution of spawning Norway pout is shown as observed in the ICES IBTS surveys between 1983 and 2007 given as sums of all fish observed for all quarters (Lambert et al. 2009). Such direct observations of spawning give information on spawning areas, but are only indicative of overall general spawning intensity. This analysis of historical IBTS data indicate main spawning in the northern North Sea and revealed that most of the spawners sampled (Figure 18) were around the Viking Bank (mainly in Roundfish areas 1 and 3, Figure 185) and along the eastern Scottish coast during Q1 (Lambert et al. 2009). However, the area of observation did not include the Norwegian coast. Throughout the 15 years of surveys, only few spawning Norway pout were found in the Skagerrak and the Kattegat, indicating that although spawning may take place in the area, it is certainly not an important spawning ground. It has been assumed until now that spawning is negligible there (Poulsen, 1968) and that the adult part of the stock migrates out of that area to spawn (Poulsen, 1968; Albert, 1994). From the results in Lambert et al. (2009) it appears that age 1 spawning only takes place in shallower water along the north coast of England. The found distribution indicates that there might be some combined depth- and age-dependent patterns in spawning. A number of authors (e.g. Poulsen, 1968; Raitt and Mason, 1968) has stated that the preferred depth of occurrence for Norway pout increases with age. This is consistent with the results in Lambert et al. (2009).


Figure 18. Distribution and numbers of spawning Norway pout collected during the ICES IBTS surveys (GOV and GRT Trawls) between 1983and 2007 (values are sums of all fish observed for all quarters). (From Lambert et al. 2009).

The distribution of spawning (and 0-group) Norway pout from the IBTS surveys was in Lambert et al. (2009) compared with the results from northern North Sea ichthyoplankton surveys (ICES, 2007a), which confirm the general spatio-temporal patterns of spawning. Norway pout larvae were found in the North Sea during surveys from 18 February to 23 March 2004. Their eggs, observed over a large area of the northern North Sea, were found for 2 weeks, and the newly hatched larvae were not caught after 30 days. Furthermore, Munk et al. (1999) surveyed juvenile abundance of gadoids in the central North Sea and Skagerrak-Kattegat during annual surveys conducted in May from 1991 to 1994 by three international research vessels. Although there was great variation between years, juvenile Norway pout were generally abundant everywhere in the surveyed areas, so it may be assumed that the larvae found in the Skagerrak were brought there by south-flowing currents from a spawning area around the Viking Bank. Consequently, Lambert et al. (2009) believe it is reasonable to assume that most spawning takes place in Q1, possibly in mid-February, because no evidence of later spawning has been found, and along the $120-\mathrm{m}$ isobath off Norway (along the Norwegian Trench) and the Scottish Coast (ICES, 2007a; Lambert et al. 2009). In Figure 19 the 120 isocline in the North Sea area is shown (present study).


Figure 19. GIS Chart of the distribution of the 120 m isocline in the northern North Sea and the deeper area outside the North Sea shelf. (Present study).

Based on IBTS data, the main aggregations of settled fish are distributed around the 150 m contour, with a slight preference for deeper water for the older fish (Lambert et al. 2009).

The above results supports earlier indications in literature of Norway pout spawning stating that Norway pout spawn in the North Sea between January and March mainly over the deeper parts of the northern North Sea ( $>100 \mathrm{~m}$ ), with a peak in spawning occurring between March and April (Ehrenbaum, 1905-09 cited in Russell, 1976; Hislop, 1984), with the more northern populations (off the northwest coast of Norway) starting to spawn in late March and continuing through to June (Baranenkova and Khokhlina 1968 cited in Nash et al. 2012 ).

Huse et al. (2008) investigated correlation between Norway pout recruitment and herring spawning stock biomass in the North Sea through analyses of the spatial distributions and overlap of abundances
of herring and Norway pout. The distribution of Norway pout recruits were estimated from survey indices of mature fish per ICES rectangle derived from the quarter 1 International Bottom Trawl Survey (IBTS) for the period 1982-2006. According to Huse et al. (2008), the survey takes place in February just before the peak in hatching of Norway pout, in early April (Heath, 2007), and is therefore relevant to estimating overlap between Norway pout eggs and larvae and potential predators. On this basis Huse et al. (2008) indicate a main spawning area of Norway pout in the North Sea as shown in Figure 20 below.


Figure 20. Distribution of Norway pout in the North Sea and indication of Norway pout spawning area in the North Sea according to Huse et al. (2008). The 200-m isobath is shown (from Huse et al. 2008).

Consequently, a number of authors state that Norway pout in the North Sea have spawns from midFebruary/March to April (Raitt and Mason, 1968; Albert, 1994; Lambert et al. 2009) and mainly in the northern North Sea between Shetland and Norway. Lambert et al. (2009) suggest that the eggs and larvae drift away from the western spawning grounds generally towards the south and east. As Norway pout spawn in the water column and there is no clear evidence of large spawning aggregations (Lambert et al. 2009), ichthyoplankton surveys may offer a more reliable approach for mapping spawning locations (Nash et al. 2012). Both ichthyoplankton and trawl survey data have been used to map the distribution of spawning aggregations (ICES, 2006, 2007a). However, as eggs and larvae can be dispersed by currents, the identification of spawning areas is reliant on the correct identification of early stage eggs (Nash et al. 2012 and references herein). According to Nash et al. (2012) conducting comparative analyses of ICES ichthyoplankton and IBTS surveys the distribution of Norway pout stage I eggs in 2009 revealed the distribution of spawning in the North Sea and showed that it was similar to the distribution of $2+$ Norway pout taken during the International Bottom Trawl Surveys (IBTS) over the same period covering the whole North Sea. The larvae sampled in 2010 were largely in the same area (Nash et al. 2012); however, larger larvae occurred to the south-east of the survey area, suggesting advection of young stages from the principal spawning areas in the north-western North Sea to the south-east and toward the Skagerrak (Nash et al. 2012).

By apportioning the number of Norway pout eggs as determined through molecular analyses to the total number of stage I gadoid eggs subsampled at plankton stations in the above ICES ichthyoplankton
surveys, Nash et al. (2009) regenerated the distribution of Norway pout spawning locations in 2009 These data were compared with the distribution of age $2+$ (potential spawning) Norway pout in January/March of the same year from IBTS surveys to assess whether trawl surveys do give a true indication of spawning extent. The links between adult and larval distribution were examined in 2010 based on the distribution of age $2+$ Norway pout in January/March and then larvae were sampled in May (Nash et al. 2012). The results showed that the he highest concentrations of adultNorway pout in January/March 2009 were to the east and south-east of the Shetland Isles, with additional elevated concentrations occurring on the edge of the Norwegian trench to the south-west of Norway (Figure 21a). The highest concentrations of eggs matched the distribution of adults to the east and south-east of Shetland (Figure 21b; Nash et al. 2012). Eggs occurred along the western slope of the Norwegian trench; however, the distribution to the east is unknown as no sampling was carried out over the deep water along the Norwegian coast. Tests indicated that the egg and age $2+$ density distributions were similar at the ICES rectangle scale. The pattern of adult Norway pout in January/March 2010 was similar to that of the previous year, again with elevated concentrations to the east and south-east of Shetland and to the south-west of Norway (Figure 22a; Nash et al. 2012). Similar to the egg distributions in 2009, the higher concentrations of larvae in 2010 were to the north and west of the survey region in the south and east vicinity of the Shetland and the Orkney Isles (Figure 22b). No larvae occurred in samples in the eastern section toward the entrance to the Skagerrak. (Nash et al. 2010).


Figure 21. The distribution of Norway pout (Trisopterus esmarkii). (a) Adults (age $2+$ ) and (b)stage I eggs in the northern North Sea in January/March 2009. The size of the dot reflects the abundance on a logarithmic scale. Smallest (black) dots represent a complete absence. Depth contours are shaded. (From Nash et al. 2012).


Figure 22. The distribution of Norway pout (Trispoterus esmarkii). (a) Adults (age $2+$ ) in January/March 2010 and (b) larvae in April/May 2010 in the northern North Sea. The size of the dot reflects the abundance on a logarithmic scale. Smallest (black) dots represent a complete absence. Depth contours are shaded. (From Nash et al. 2012).

## Nursery areas

Larvae and juvenile distribution: The species is not generally considered to have specific nursery grounds, but pelagic 0-group fish remain widely dispersed in the northern North Sea close to spawning grounds (Poulsen 1968; Lambert et al., 2009; present study Figures 2-3 and Appendix A.2). The main bulk drifts as larvae from more western areas to which they return mainly during the latter part of their second year of life before becoming mature (Poulsen 1968). In terms of the distribution of larvae and juveniles, Norway pout are generally not considered to have specific nursery grounds, but pelagic 0group fish have been reported as being widely dispersed in the northern North Sea close to the spawning grounds (Poulsen, 1968). Most of the larvae seemingly drift from the more western areas to which they return mainly during the latter part of their second year of life before maturing (Poulsen, 1968).

The IBTS CPUE maps (Figures 2-3 and Appendix A.2) shows, however, a relative high CPUE in the Skagerrak area in the third quarter, where the 0-group is a very important part of the catches. Nash et al. (2012) found that larger larvae occurred to the south-east of the survey area, suggesting advection of young stages from the principal spawning areas in the north-western North Sea to the south-east and toward the Skagerrak.

In general, this species is not considered to have specific nursery grounds (Lambert et al. 2009).

## Adult (spawning) migration

There is an adult spawning migration out of Skagerrak and Kattegat to spawn because there is no evidence of spawning there (Poulsen 1968; Lambert et al. 2009). Sex ratios indicate that males, which mature younger than females (age-at-50\%-maturity, respectively, 1.2 and 1.5 years), migrate out of the Skagerrak-Kattegat to the spawning grounds before females (Lambert et al. 2009). Albert (1994) stated that the negative winter growth in the Skagerrak reported by Ursin (1963) and Poulsen (1968) could be explained by emigration of the species. Otherwise there is no indication of adult migration (Lambert et al. 2009).

Lambert et al. (2009) showed that males dominated the maturity ratio at age 1 in Q1 (to some $70 \%$ ). This maturity ratio was not spatially equitably distributed: the Skagerrak and the Kattegat remain the
areas with the lowest maturity ratios, reinforcing our theory of a spawning migration that is sexdependent. The migration is especially obvious when studying the temporal evolution of the MLA from Q3 to Q2. The decrease in length in the Skagerrak-Kattegat suggests that mature fish leave for the spawning grounds (Ursin, 1963; Albert, 1994). As males mature before females and the sex ratio tends to decrease from Q1 to Q3 in the Skagerrak-Kattegat and to increase from Q3 to Q1, whereas the opposite phenomenon occurs in the northern North Sea, one hypothesis would be that males migrate to spawn before females and that neither return, possibly as a result of spawning mortality. Even if this suggestion is logical, however, one cannot be definitive because the weighted mean sex ratios computed in Lambert et al. (2009) show high deviance and the results cannot prove what was assumed by Cooper (1983), who stated that there was an increasing numerical dominance of females with age. Moreover, these sex ratios found in Lambert et al. (2009) can be skewed by vertical migrations, as already recorded for other gadoids, such as cod (Armstrong et al., 2004).

## 4. Stock delineation and definition

Norway pout is a small, short-lived gadoid species, which rarely gets older than 5 years (Nielsen et al., 2012, Lambert et al, 2009). It is distributed from the west of Ireland to Kattegat, at the Faroe Islands, and from the North Sea to the Barents Sea. The distribution for this stock is in the northern North Sea $\left(>57^{\circ} \mathrm{N}\right)$ and in Skagerrak at depths between 50 and 250 m (Raitt 1968; Sparholt et al., 2002b). At present, there is no evidence for separating the North Sea component into smaller stock units (Lambert et al. 2009; Nash et al. 2012). ICES Advisory Committee for Fisheries Management (ACFM) asked in October 2001 the ICES Working Group on the Assessment of Demersal Stocks in the North Sea and Skagerrak (ICES WGNSSK) to verify the justification of treating ICES Division VIa as a management area for Norway pout (and sandeel) separately from ICES areas IV and IIIa. Preliminary results from an analysis of regionalized survey data on Norway pout maturity, presented in a Working Document to the 2000 meeting of the ICES WGNSSK Working Group (Larsen et al. 2001 in ICES C.M.2001/ACFM:07), gave no evidence for a stock separation in the whole northern area. This conclusion is supported by the results from the maturity and spawning analyses presented in Lambert et al. (2009) and Nash et al. (2012) as well as Huse et al. (2008). Here it was found that spawning in the North Sea takes place mainly in the northern part in the area between Shetland and Norway in coastal waters along the 120 m isocline (Lambert et al., 2009). The results from Nash et al. (2012) also suggest one main spawning area and accordingly only occurrence of one stock component in the whole northern area on the shelf area.

Norway pout in the eastern Skagerrak is only to a very small degree a self-contained stock and adults migrate out of the Skagerrak and the Kattegat to spawn, because there is no evidence of spawning there (Poulsen 1968). The main bulk drifts as larvae south-east-wards from more western areas to which they return mainly during the latter part of their second year of life before becoming mature (Poulsen 1968; Lambert et al. 2009; Nash et al. 2012).

Also, the conclusion on one stock component is supported by the depth distribution limits of the species (Poulsen 1968; Albert 1994; Sparholt et al., 2002b; Lambert et al. 2009; Nielsen et al. 2012), i.e. there is no indication that the species migrate outside the shelf areas into deeper waters than 200 m depth. For the Norwegian Trench Albert (1994) found Norway pout deeper than 200 m, but very few deeper than 300 m. However, very few Norway pout are caught at depths greater than 200 m in the North Sea and Skagerrak on shrimp trawl survey (Sparholt et al. 2002b).

## 5. Mortality life history aspects (in relation to growth and maturity)

Norway pout is a small, short-lived gadoid species, which rarely gets older than 5 years (Nielsen, Lambert, Bastardie, Sparholt and Vinther, 2012; Lambert, Nielsen, Larsen and Sparholt, 2009). The mortality patterns of Norway pout (NP) are not well understood. It is most likely a one-time spawner with high spawning mortality (Nielsen et al. 2012). The population dynamics of Norway pout in the North Sea and Skagerrak are very dependent on changes caused by recruitment variation and variation in predation (or other natural) mortality, and less by the fishery. Norway pout is only to a very limited extent exploited from age 0 . On this basis Norway pout should be managed as a short-lived species.

Nielsen et al. (2012) suggested that NP undergo heavy spawning mortality. The very low-absent fishing activity in the recent years provided a unique opportunity to analyse the natural life-history traits of cohorts in the NP stock in the North Sea (Nielsen et al. 2012). Based on the ICES trawl survey abundance indices, cohort mortality was found to significantly increase with age. The authors argued that this cannot be explained by selectiveness in the fishery, potential size-specific migrations out of the area, higher predation pressure on older individuals, or differences in survey catchability by NP age from before to after spawning and that it is higher in the main spawning areas than outside. They found that natural mortality $(\mathrm{M})$ is significantly correlated with sexual maturity, sex, growth, and intraspecific stock density. All of this is consistent with a greater mortality occurring mainly from the first to the second quarter of the year, i.e. spawning mortality, which is discussed as being a major direct and indirect cause of stock mortality (Table 1; Figure 23; Figure 24; Figure 25).

Table 1. Total mortality (Z) calculated based on IBTS cpue data according to ICES standard calculation procedures and according to the revised calculation procedure (Nielsen et al. 2012; Lambert et al. 2009).

| Cohort | $\mathbf{Z}_{1-2}$ ICES | $\mathbf{Z}_{1-2}$ (revised) | $\mathbf{Z}_{2-3}$ ICES | $\mathbf{Z}_{2-3}$ (revised) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1981 | - | - | 2.07 | 2.52 |
| 1982 | 0.83 | 0.84 | 2.60 | 2.56 |
| 1983 | 1.25 | 1.23 | 4.27 | 4.08 |
| 1984 | 1.81 | 1.74 | 1.84 | 1.91 |
| 1985 | 1.46 | 1.37 | 3.47 | 3.56 |
| 1986 | 1.48 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.58 |
| 1987 | -0.72 | -0.55 | 1.88 | 1.89 |
| 1988 | 0.99 | 1.03 | 1.75 | 1.35 |
| 1989 | 0.60 | 0.52 | 3.10 | 3.14 |
| 1990 | 1.02 | 0.96 | 1.23 | 1.26 |
| 1991 | 0.65 | 0.67 | 3.69 | 3.60 |
| 1992 | 1.97 | 1.89 | 1.58 | 1.53 |
| 1993 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 1.24 | 1.31 |
| 1994 | 0.81 | 0.84 | 1.37 | 1.44 |
| 1995 | -0.47 | 0.26 | 1.72 | 1.75 |
| 1996 | 0.60 | 0.66 | 2.08 | 2.08 |
| 1997 | 0.53 | 0.60 | 2.22 | 2.14 |
| 1998 | 0.83 | 0.71 | 1.88 | 1.91 |
| 1999 | 1.04 | 1.02 | 1.18 | 1.18 |
| 2000 | 0.48 | 0.64 | 2.15 | 2.10 |
| 2001 | 1.14 | 1.00 | 2.83 | 2.81 |
| 2002 | 1.19 | 0.96 | 2.32 | 2.47 |
| 2003 | 1.92 | 1.79 | 1.58 | 1.81 |
| 2004 | 1.55 | 1.59 | - | - |



Figure 23. Total mortality ( $Z$ ) by age over a 23-year period calculated according to Equation (1) based on revised IBTS Q1 cpue data in Nielsen et al. 2012. The negative value from 1988 age 1 was omitted from the calculation. (From Nielsen et al. 2012).


Figure 24. Seasonal total mortalities (Z) by sex and age for strong and weak year classes based on revised IBTS Q1 and Q3 cpue data. Z is calculated according to Equation (1) in Nielsen et al. (2012). Error bars represent the standard deviations. (From Nielsen et al. 2012).


Figure 25. Total mortality ( Z ) of females (black dots) and males (white dots) as a function of the fraction mature for age groups 1 and $2 . \mathrm{Z}$ is calculated according to Equation (1) and based on the revised IBTS cpue data. Regression t-test statistics: $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ for females and $\mathrm{p}=0.058$ for males. (From Nielsen et al. 2012).

Nielsen et al. (2012) found that the ratio of mature individuals declined significantly from before to after spawning, and only very few post-spawning Norway pout have ever been observed despite extensive surveying and fishing in the North Sea. For the youngest age classes, the proportion of mature individuals was higher for males than for females, and total male mortality is higher. This is in accordance with Cooper (1983), who found an increasing numerical dominance of Norway pout females with age. Maturity and growth dynamics (Lambert et al. 2009) strongly indicate greater mortality in the spawning areas and during the spawning season.

Geographical maturity patterns showed a significantly higher percentage of mature individuals in spawning areas RFA1 and RFA3, in which there were significant decreases in the maturity ratio from Q1 to Q3, and where more than $90 \%$ of the spawners were recorded in Q1 (Nielsen et al. 2012; and Figures 2 and 3 and Table 3 in Lambert et al., 2009). This indicates that the larger, more mature individuals disappear after spawning. It was also observed that total mortality was significantly correlated with the percentage of mature fish (Nielsen et al. 2012). Mortality cannot be directly calculated in the spawning areas during and just after the spawning period, but the results showed that the yearly total mortality for both sexes was significantly positively correlated with the overall maturity ratio assessed during the spawning season (Nielsen et al. 2012). Also, this indicated a higher natural mortality associated with spawning.

The IBPNorwayPout revisions of natural mortality, weight, and maturity parameters at age included in the assessment
The ICES inter-benchmark assessment in spring 2012 (IBPNorwayPout, ICES 2012c) introduced revised estimates of maturity and natural mortality at age used in the Norway pout stock assessment. The background and rationale behind the revision of the natural mortality and maturity parameters is described in the IBPNorwayPout report (ICES, 2012c) and primary literature (e.g. Nielsen et al., 2012; Lambert et al., 2009; ICES WGSAM 2011), as well as summarised below.

Instead of using a constant natural mortality set to 0.4 for all age groups in all seasons as used in the previous assessments then variable natural mortality between ages have been introduced in the 2012 Inter-benchmark assessment and used in all following assessments. The revision of the natural mortality parameter was based on results in Nielsen et al. (2012) and the ICES WGSAM 2011 multispecies assessment report. It should be noted that natural mortality levels by age and season used in the stock assessment reflect the predation mortality levels estimated for this stock in the multispecies stock assessment performed by ICES. The revised values are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Norway pout IV \& IIIaN (Skagerrak). Mean weight at age in the stock, proportion mature and natural mortality used in the assessment from 2012 onwards. (Inter-Benchmark 2012 assessment scenario 2 settings).

| Age | Weight (g) |  |  |  |  | Proportion <br> mature | M |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Q 1 | Q 2 | Q 3 | Q 4 |  | Quarterly |  |
| 0 | - | - | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0,29 |  |
| 1 | 9 | 14 | 28 | 28 | 0,2 | 0,29 |  |
| 2 | 26 | 25 | 38 | 40 | 1 | 0,39 |  |
| 3 | 43 | 38 | 51 | 58 | 1 | 0,44 |  |

## Evaluations performed in the IBPNorway pout

The ICES IBPNorwayPout inter-benchmark exercise evaluated alternative biological inputs in the stock assessment for natural mortality, sexual maturity and growth (mean weight at age in the stock) for the Norway pout stock in the North Sea and Skagerrak. The natural mortality, maturity, and mean weight used in the scenarios evaluated in the benchmarking process originate from results published in Nielsen et al. (2012), Lambert et al. (2009), Sparholt et al. (2002a,b), as well as from the multi-species assessment working group ICES WGSAM 2011. In particular, natural mortality estimates for Norway pout originating from the key run of the multi-species SMS model (2011) were applied. Five scenarios were considered, a Baseline Scenario following the current assessment approach and four additional scenarios which explored alternative biological inputs as presented in Table $\mathbf{3}$ and summarized below.

## Baseline:

The May 2011 Norway pout assessment was selected as the Baseline assessment. The settings of the Baseline were constant natural mortality by quarter and age fixed at $0.4,10 \%$ maturity for the 1 -group and $100 \%$ mature for the $2+$ group, and constant MWA assumed in stock. The following alternative scenarios were tested in the benchmark exercise:

## Scenario1:

Natural mortality (M) change: Average Z at age used as a proxy for M , computed for ages 1-3 in the years 2004, 2005, 2007 and 2008 (years with low fishing mortality) based on Q1 IBTS ICES NP indices from the standard ICES NP index area (calculated from Q1-Q1 cohorts as averages for these 4 years based on the approach in Nielsen et al. (2012, Fig. 1). Yearly Ms were divided by 4 to obtain quarterly Ms , and M at age 0 was set equal to that for age 1 . In Scenario 1 the same maturity ogive and mean weight at age was used as in the Baseline assessment.

## Scenario 2:

Natural mortality (M) change: Same M inputs as Scenario 1. Maturity ogive change: Maturity at age 1 was set to 0.2 from Lambert et al. 2009, Fig. 4. Maturity at age 2 was set to $100 \%$. Mean weight at age in stock (MWA) change: The settings were based on results from commercial fishery during the period

1983 to 2006 as presented in Lambert et al. (2009, Fig. 8.). The long term trends in MWA were calculated for the period 1983 to 2011 by quarter and area for the Danish commercial fishery and compared to Lambert et al. (2009) Fig. 8 values and were found to be consistent. The revised Mean Weight at Age (MWA) in the stock used in the benchmark assessment were for the 1-, 2 - and 3- groups taken as the long term averages from the commercial data. Data for MWA by quarter for age 0 were kept constant as used in the Baseline. MWA was recorded from commercial fishery catch data, but not during the IBTS, from which only length data are available.

## Scenario 3:

Natural mortality (M) change: Average $Z$ at age (being a proxy for $M$ ) for ages 1-3 for the full year range 1983-2005 from Q1-Q1 IBTS revised indices from Nielsen et al. (2012) Figure 1 (as presented in Table 3). Yearly Ms divided by 4 to obtain average quarterly M's. M at age 0 set equal to that for age 1. Maturity ogive change and mean weight at age (MWA) change: Same as in Scenario 2.

## Scenario 4:

Natural mortality (M) change: M1+M2 from the multi-species SMS model from 2011 key run presented in the ICES WGSAM 2011 Report. Averages of the SMS estimates of quarterly M1+M2 have been used for the full year range used in the SMS key run (2011). Maturity ogive change and mean weight at age (MWA) change: Same as in Scenario 2.

Table 3. Norway pout IV \& IIIaN (Skagerrak). Mean weight at age in the stock, proportion mature and natural mortality used in the assessment. Baseline settings and Scenario 1-4 settings for population dynamics parameters. New parameter settings are in red.

| Age | Weight (g) |  |  |  | Proportion mature | M <br> Quarterl <br> y | M values evaluated (Explorat ory run) | Baseline |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | - | - | 4 | 6 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ 0.1 \end{gathered}$ | 0.4 | 0.25 | Scenario 1 |
| 1 | 7 | 15 | 25 | 23 |  | 0.4 | 0.25 |  |
| 2 | 22 | 34 | 43 | 42 | 1 | 0.4 | 0.55 |  |
| 3 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 58 | 1 | 0.4 | 0.75 |  |
| Age | Weight (g) |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Proportion } \\ \text { mature } \end{gathered}$ | M |  |  |
|  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |  | Quarterl <br> y |  |  |
| 0 | - | - | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0.29 |  |  |
| 1 | 7 | 15 | 25 | 23 | 0.1 | 0.29 |  |  |
| 2 | 22 | 34 | 43 | 42 | 1 | 0.39 |  |  |
| 3 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 58 | 1 | 0.44 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Proportion |  |  | Scenario 2 |
|  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |  | Quarterl y |  |  |
| 0 | - | - | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0.29 |  |  |
| 1 | 9 | 14 | 28 | 28 | 0.2 | 0.29 |  |  |
| 2 | 26 | 25 | 38 | 40 | 1 | 0.39 |  |  |
| 3 | 43 | 38 | 51 | 58 | 1 | 0.44 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Proportion | M |  | Scenario 3 |
|  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |  | Quarterl y |  |  |
| 0 | - | - | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0.26 |  |  |
| 1 | 9 | 14 | 28 | 28 | 0.2 | 0.26 |  |  |
| 2 | 26 | 25 | 38 | 40 | 1 | 0.54 |  |  |
| 3 | 43 | 38 | 51 | 58 | 1 | 0.71 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Proportion |  |  | Scenario 4 |
|  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |  | Quarterl y |  |  |
| 0 | - | - | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0.65 |  |  |
| 1 | 9 | 14 | 28 | 28 | 0.2 | 0.41 |  |  |
| 2 | 26 | 25 | 38 | 40 | 1 | 0.35 |  |  |
| 3 | 43 | 38 | 51 | 58 | 1 | 0.29 |  |  |

## Results of the evaluations performed in the IBPNorway pout

The change in natural mortality in Scenario 1, where survey based average Zs in the 4 years with very low or no fishing mortality has been used as a proxy for M , resulted in applying M -values of similar magnitude by age and quarter (around 0.3 for age 0 and 1 and 0.4 for age 2 and 3 ) as the age and quarter invariant values used in the Baseline assessment ( 0.4 by age and quarter). The total mortality on the cohort (and the age specific variation herein) determines the recruitment, the number of survivors and the biomass. The slightly lower natural mortality for the 0-group fish, for which the fishing mortality was very low, and the slightly higher natural mortality for the oldest fish (age 3 at 0.44) resulted in a slightly lower total stock biomass (TSB) and R and nearly the same SSB and Fbar(1-2) as the Baseline. This was expected given these modest age specific changes in M between Baseline and Scenario 1. The maturity ogive in Scenario 1 was the same as the Baseline with only $10 \%$ of age 1
mature, resulting in SSB similar to the Baseline. Because the catch at age data used in the Baseline and in all tested scenarios was the same, and because natural mortality on the main fished part of the population, i.e. age 1-3, was slightly lower for age 1 at 0.29 and slightly higher for age 3 at 0.44 in Scenario 1 (and 2)), this resulted in the recruitment being a little bit lower while fishing mortality was similar comparing Scenario 1 (and Scenario 2) with the Baseline. The same perception of the stock dynamics (fluctuations) over time was observed for Scenario 1 and the Baseline.

Scenario 2 had the same natural mortality change used as in Scenario 1 but the maturity ogive and MWA vector were different. The maturity ogive was changed to $20 \%$ mature of the 1 -group, and the revised MWA in the stock was applied, obtained from long term averages measured from the commercial fishery catch. The changes in MWA were minor compared to the Baseline and did not have much impact. The change in the maturity ogive, where $20 \%$ are mature compared to value of $10 \%$ in the Baseline resulted in a higher SSB in Scenario 2 compared to the Baseline (and Scenario 1) as would be expected. The same trends in R and TSB as well as F were observed in Scenario 2 as in Scenario 1 and the reason for this was the same as described above under Scenario 1. Also recruitment was somewhat lower under Scenario 2. In combination, higher SSB and lower R under Scenario 2 implied a lower overall recruitment rate ( $\mathrm{R} / \mathrm{SSB}$ ). Overall, the same perception of the stock dynamics (fluctuations) over time was observed for Scenario 2 and the Baseline.

Scenario 3 operated with bigger changes in mortality by age compared to the baseline. In this scenario the M -value for the 0 - and 1 -groups was around 0.25 and the M for the older age groups were significantly higher (around 0.55 for age 2 and 0.7 for age 3 ). The same maturity ogive and MWA vector was in Scenario 3 as was used in Scenario 2. Much higher mortality on the old, large fish together with fishing mortality resulted in a high total mortality on the older fish, and consequently, there needed to be more recruits to sustain this mortality (as the same number of fish was caught in all scenarios). This resulted in higher R, and a much higher TSB and SSB, and a perceived lower fishing mortality. Because of the significant change in $M$ in this scenario the stock dynamics and perception of the stock and recruitment for Scenario 3 were different over time compared to the Baseline.

Scenario 4 used the multi-species model estimates of M where the quarterly mortality was higher on the young fish and lower on the older fish, i.e. around 0.65 for age $0,0.4$ for age $1,0.35$ for age 3 and 0.3 for age 3. This resulted in similar TSB and SSB as the Baseline but a perception of slightly higher recruitment and fishing mortality.

## Conclusions on the evaluations performed in the IBPNorway pout

The independent reviewers considered that the new values for biological inputs constituted an improvement to the assessment of Norway pout and they supported the use of Scenario 2 as the new Baseline for the stock assessment. They expressed some concern regarding the estimation of mortality rates from survey data without accounting for the survey catchability at age. Ideally natural mortality should be estimated within the stock assessment model simultaneously with estimates of survey catchability, but in most cases the data are inadequate to do this. Evidence of density dependence in Norway Pout mortality, growth and maturation rates suggested that using fixed estimates in stock assessments could lead to biases and this was worthy of further investigation. The reviewers noted that the stock-recruit scatter was relatively uninformative but considered that the values being used for biological reference point should still apply. Consideration could also be given to a higher target escapement level given the importance of Norway Pout as a forage species in the ecosystem.
The Benchmark group concluded that revisions to natural mortality, maturity and mean weight at age should be included in the final benchmark assessment based on the approach in Lambert et al. (2009) and Nielsen et al. (2012). It was not recommended that $Z$ values be used as proxies for $M$ values for the full year range since 1983 (Scenario 3) as this average included fishing mortality which, especially in the early part of the period, was relatively high, i.e. this gave a biased over-estimation of M. Both Scenarios

2 and 4 were found worthy of further consideration in the Benchmark. The results of Scenarios 2 and 4 were not significantly different from the baseline scenario, and both scenarios gave the same perception of the stock dynamics (fluctuations) over time was observed for the baseline.

The population dynamic parameters and approach used in Scenario 2 have been documented in Nielsen et al. (2012) and in Lambert et al. (2009). SMS estimates of mortality on A1 were higher than those based on Z estimates from the IBTS index. This difference in perception could occur if the catchability on A1 was low. The above cited papers investigate and argue that the catchability of the 1-group Norway pout was not lower than for the older age groups (although this was somewhat contrary to the catchability estimates at age for IBTS coming out of both the Baseline and the Scenario 2 SXSA assessment model estimates), and that there was no age specific migration out of the assessment area (being the whole North Sea and Skagerrak-Kattegat).

Scenario 4 used results of M from the SMS model assessment which had a number of characteristics and assumptions as well. The SMS assumed constant residual mortality at age (M1), i.e. natural mortality due to other reasons than predation. This was in contradiction to potential spawning mortality as discussed in Nielsen et al. (2012) which would result in M increasing with age. Also, the SMS smoothed mortality out between ages 1-3, i.e. did not fully consider potential differences in natural mortality between these ages, because the model used rather wide size intervals in its prey-predator preference model (ICES 2011b; Pers. Comm. Morten Vinther and Anna Rindorf, DTU Aqua, March 2012). This meant that the mortalities between age 1, age 2 and age 3 tended to be equalized in the model. In the SMS a main predator on Norway pout age 1 to age 3 was saithe, and the SMS assessment results are sensitive to biomass estimates of saithe in the North Sea. The SMS used the saithe (predator) biomass estimates from the ICES WGNSSK single stock assessment (ICES WGNSSK 2011), and this assessment was very uncertain. Consequently, the SMS natural mortality estimates on Norway pout were dependent on uncertain assessment estimates of saithe in the North Sea which also influenced age specific mortalities on Norway pout. In comparison with the analysis of IBTS survey data, SMS estimates of total yearly M (and also Z ) were higher for age 0 and 1 and lower for age 2 and 3 Norway pout (Nielsen et al. 2012). Even if the catchability in the surveys was lower for age group 1 then it was difficult to explain the lower mortalities estimated by the SMS for age 2 and age 3 compared to the observed age 2 and age 3 survey based mortality estimates. In Nielsen et al. (2012) it was argued that migration in or out of the area was very unlikely, so the lower estimates of Z from SMS at age 2 and especially age 3 compared to estimates from the the IBTS data (Nielsen et al. 2012) was difficult to explain.

In conclusion the benchmark group agreed that Scenario 2 was preferred based on the available information, and recommends Scenario 2 be used as the new baseline assessment for the Norway Pout stock from 2012 onwards.

## Natural mortalities from multi-species assessments

In Figure 26 below the total mortality $(\mathrm{Z})$ and natural predation mortality (M2) of Norway pout by age for the period 1983-2013 is shown as estimated by the SMS model in the 2013 baseline run. The yearly values are shown, but the SMS does also estimate quarterly mortalities. The natural mortalities, M, from the SMS run is variable by year and quarter. If the variable natural mortality values from SMS are used in the Norway pout assessment the following points should be taken into consideration:
a) The SMS does not take into account likely spawning mortality (see also the 2012 interbenchmark conclusions above).
b) The natural mortalities of Norway pout from SMS area very dependent on uncertain predator assessment biomasses (both from single species assessments and multi-species assessments), especially for saithe, but also for western Mackerel (see also the 2012 inter-
benchmark conclusions above). Furthermore, the migration patterns (and extension of distribution) of western mackerel into the North Sea is very variable between years and over the whole period, and this is not well estimated.
c) The SMS is not up-dated every year and the last SMS key run is for 2013. Accordingly, M values for Norway pout need to be assumed or taken as constant mean averages anyway in the last 3 terminal assessment years (2014-2016). Accordingly, we will not have yearly and quarterly variable values available anyway from SMS on $M$ to include into the SXSA for the latest 3 years which are the most important years in assessment and forecast context. The SMS key runs are made every third to fourth year, and the experience is that the $M$ values changes drastically every time a key run is made (e.g. from the 2011 key run to the 2013 key run). This means that we have to assume the M values anyway for the recent and most important years in the assessment anyway (as it is only 3 age classes that are important in the assessment), and that the $M$ values will change every time a new SMS key run is made.
d) If we change the absolute biomass / abundance of Norway pout in the single stock benchmark assessment significantly then the M values for Norway pout in the SMS are "not correct" as the SMS estimates and assessment of Norway pout biomass is adjusted to fit the single stock assessment biomass ("fiddled to match the single stock assessment").

In general, the SMS estimates the natural mortality higher for 0- and 1-group Norway pout compared to the estimates for the same age groups in Nielsen et al. (2012). However, this is not the case in the period 1990-2000 where the estimates of M for age 0 and 1 are at the same level in the SMS and in Nielsen et al. (2012). The natural mortality is lower in the SMS for age 2 and 3 compared to the estimates for the same age groups in Nielsen et al. (2012). This difference is due to the SMS do not take into account potential spawning mortality increasing the M with age as estimated in Nielsen et al. (2012).

In the Ecopath w. Ecosim Model (EwE) the total mortality and the predation mortality (M2) for Norway pout is not estimated by age group but combined for all age groups (and combined for juvenile and adult) of Norway pout. In Figure 27 below the yearly total mortality ( $Z$ ) and the yearly predation mortality (M2) from the EwE is shown for the period 1991 to 2013 based on the latest EwE key run in 2015. The values are total for all age groups and both juveniles and adults of Norway pout.

The EwE estimates the predation mortality rather high in the start of the period from 1991-2013 at levels around 2 , but with a decreasing tendency over time to a level around 1.5 in the end of the period. The latter level is in accordance with the general level of M2 in the SMS and in Nielsen et al. (2012).

Many of the above aspects mentioned in relation to the SMS is also the case with respect to EwE estimates of natural mortality (predation mortality) for Norway pout.


Figure 26. Total mortality (Z) and natural predation mortality (M2) of Norway pout by age for the period 1983-2013 as estimated by the SMS in the 2013 baseline run.


Figure 27. Total mortality (Z) and natural predation mortality (M2) of Norway pout by age for the period 1991-2013 as estimated by the EwE in the 2015 baseline run.

## Previous benchmark analyses of natural mortality

Possible revision of the natural mortality parameter in the assessment was also evaluated in the September 2006 benchmark assessment in response to the wish from ACFM RG 2006 on a separate description of natural mortality aspects for Norway pout in the North Sea. In summary no conclusions could be reached from the exploratory runs then using different natural mortalities from previous primary literature (Sparholt et al., 2002a,b; ICES 2006) as the mortality between age groups was contradictive and inconclusive between periods (variable) from the different sources used showing different trends with no obvious biological explanation. On that basis it was in the 2006 benchmark assessment decided that the final assessment continues using the constant values for natural mortality at age. The background for these conclusions and the benchmarking in 2006 was that exploratory runs of the SXSA model was presented in the 2001 and 2002 assessment reports as well as in the 2004 and 2006 assessments (Norway pout benchmark assessments) with revised input data for natural mortality by age based on the results from two papers presented to the working group in 2001, (later published in Sparholt et al., 2002a,b) as well as natural mortality estimates from the North Sea MSVPA model (ICES SGMSNS 2006) in the 2006 assessment (ICES CM 2006/ACFM:35). These revised natural mortalities were given in the 2004 ICES WGNSSK Report (ICES WGNSSK (2005); ICES CM2005/ACFM:07) and the ICES WGNSSK 2006 report including the described inter-benchmark assessments. Furthermore, estimates of total mortality based on the SURBA assessment model estimates ( 2005 SURBA run for Norway pout, ICES C.M. 2006/ACFM:35) using all survey time series included in the baseline assessment (ICES CM 2007/ACFM:18 and 30) covering the period 1983-2005 indicated that for the period up to 1990-1995 the Z estimated from SURBA and Sparholt et al., 2002a,b wass at the same level for both the 1-2 group and 2-3 group, and there also seems to be age specific differences in Z . In the period from 1995 and onwards the Z-estimates from SURBA were lower compared to the constant M values obtained from Sparholt et al., 2002a,b. In later years from 2002-03, the SURBA estimates of Z increased again compared to the period 1995-2001. In conclusion, the exploratory runs gave very much similar results and showed no differences in the perception of the stock status and dynamics. Previous evaluation of total mortality $Z$, in years where fishing mortality has been very low and where total mortality accordingly approximately equals natural mortality, was conducted and presented in the September 2007 WGNSSK Report (ICES CM 2007/ACFM:18 and 30, Table 5.2.12). This evaluation was based on catch curve analysis on recent (IBTS Q1 and Q3) survey estimates for Norway pout. The results indicated somewhat different levels of Z between different survey time series mirroring the results from the 2006 benchmark assessment.

## 6. Biological interactions

Norway pout natural mortality is likely influenced by spawning and maturity having implications for its age specific availability to predators in the ecosystem and to the fishery (Nielsen et al., 2012).

In previous ICES stock assessments it has under ecosystem consideration been noted that there is a need to ensure that the Norway pout stock remains high enough to provide food for a variety of predator species (e.g. ICES WGNSSK 2011a). This stock is among other important as food source for the species saithe, haddock, cod, whiting, and W. mackerel and predation mortality is significant (ICES-WGSAM 2014 with most recent 2013 SMS Key Run; ICES-WGSAM 2011, ICES-SGMSNS 2006). Especially the more recent high abundance of saithe predators and the more constant high stock level of western mackerel as likely predators on smaller Norway pout in the North Sea are likely to significantly affect the Norway pout population dynamics.

The ICES inter-benchmark assessment in spring 2012 (IBPNorwayPout, ICES 2012c) evaluated multispecies considerations in relation to the natural mortality population dynamics parameters in the benchmarking for Norway pout stock in the North Sea and Skagerrak including predation mortality. In
the 2012 inter-benchmark a series of assessment scenarios were run with different parameter settings of natural mortality. Natural mortality has been derived from analysis of total mortality rates estimated from IBTS survey catchrates (cpue from IBTS Q1 and Q3) using the approach described in Nielsen et al. (2012); Lambert et al. (2009) and Sparholt et al. (2002a,b). Furthermore, natural mortalities derived from the multispecies SMS model from the 2011 SMS key run were used in one of the exploratory scenarios (Scenario 4) in the benchmarking. This is described under natural mortality in Section 3.6.4 of the IBPNorwayPout report (ICES 2012c).

The 2012 inter-benchmark introduce revised estimates of maturity and natural mortality and maturity at age used in the Norway pout stock assessment. The background and rationale behind the revision of the natural mortality and maturity parameters is described in the IBPNorwayPout report (ICES, 2012c) and primary literature (e.g. Nielsen et al., 2012; Lambert et al., 2009; ICES WGSAM 2011)). A follow up on this analysis is presented in Nielsen (2016; Appendix 1, Section 3) with the same conclusions.

The inter-benchmark (IBPNorwayPout, ICES 2012c) group did not recommend revised reference points for the stock at this stage, but concluded that higher escapement targets could be considered in the future based on the importance of Norway pout as a forage species in the ecosystem. The consumption amount of Norway pout by its main predators should be evaluated in relation to production amount in the Norway pout stock under consideration of consumption and production of other prey species for those predators in the North Sea ecosystem. There most likely is difference in preference and switching between prey species and size groups by different predator species, and in different areas and seasons having different communities and food webs. Those factors and their variability needs to be taken into account when trying to establish target reference levels for Norway pout based on estimating necessary Norway pout biomass to be available for predators in the North Sea and Skagerrak. This should be considered for all prey species together for those predators and not only for Norway pout isolated.

The WGNSSK Assessment Review Group (WGNSSK 2007) asked the WG to provide guidance on how to deal with the objective of keeping a certain amount of biomass for predators. Here it was noted that if a minimum biomass is found to be required, then natural mortality could not be kept constant in the prediction (as it does during the assessment period).

It should be noted that natural mortality levels by age and season used in the stock assessment reflect the predation mortality levels estimated for this stock in the most recent multispecies stock assessment performed by ICES. Natural mortality levels by age and season used in the stock assessment do include the predation mortality levels estimated for this stock (ICES-WGSAM 2014; ICES-WGSAM 2011; ICESSGMSNS 2006), and in the 2012 Inter-benchmark assessment revised values for natural mortality have been used which also include the estimated levels of predation mortality in the 2011 and 2013 SMS key/baseline run multi-species assessments (ICES-WGSAM 2011; 2014).

## Intraspecific dynamics

Interspecific and intraspecific density patterns in Norway pout mortality has been documented (e.g. Nielsen et al., 2012; Nash et al. 2012; Lambert et al. 2009; Kempf et al. 2009; Cormon et al. 2016).

Concerning intraspecific interactions and potential density dependency then the juvenile growth rate is higher when the stock density is low (Figures 13-14) and results in a reduced age-at-50\%-maturity (Figures 15-17; Lambert et al. 2009). The study by Lambert et al. (2009) showed only weak intraspecific density-dependence in growth and maturity, as well as in age and length at maturity, but the general trend found was that both these parameters decreased with the number of fish in a cohort. Although these correlations could highlight a phenomenon of density-dependence linked to local aggregation (as
for herring; Engelhard and Heino, 2004) or food availability, perhaps the reductions can be explained by density- and size-dependent juvenile mortality (Lambert et al. 2009).

Nielsen et al. (2012) found that natural mortality (M) is significantly correlated with sexual maturity, sex, growth, and intraspecific stock density. According to Nielsen et al. (2012) the density dependence, either intra- or interspecific, of NP mortality showed a distinct pattern. They found that mortality was significantly positively correlated with intraspecific population density (Figure 28). The NP population dynamics seemed, therefore, to be influenced by density-dependence, which resulted in a lower growth rate and maturation when the stock was at a relatively high level. Thus, bringing together the varied information pertaining to NP mortality, it is likely that lower stock densities contribute to higher growth rates and higher maturity ratios and, consequently, greater mortality rates, which are most likely caused by spawning. Kempf et al. (2009) found no intraspecific relationship between NP SSB in the year of birth and the IBTS age 1 recruitment index of the following year, whereas the inter-annual variability in age 1 recruitment was found to be correlated with the Q2 sea surface temperature when taking predation impact into consideration. However, this was not highly significant and included the removal of years characterized as outliers. Although the analyses of Nielsen et al. (2012) indicated density-dependent mortality which could be associated with spawning and that available documentation on predation could not explain the observed increase in $Z$ at age, it was difficult to disentangle density-dependent mortality and size-selective mortality (Nielsen et al. 2012). Size-selective mortality will usually result in greater mortality of the smallest (youngest) fish, but for Norway pout, greater mortality rates for the largest (oldest) fish were observed, and that spawning was not only associated with age, but also with size. Nielsen et al. (2012) found evidence of spawning mortality where the fastest growing individuals mature faster and therefore spawn and die faster, but also found that there may be other reasons for such reversal size-selective mortality, e.g. density-dependence. They argued that density-dependence probably did not influence mortality directly, but rather indirectly as explained above, and can also be influenced by size-selective mortality other than spawning mortality, so no rigorous conclusions can be made on this.


Figure 28. Total mortality ( $Z$ ) based on revised IBTS Q1 cpue at age 1 vs. NP age 1 stock number ( $\mathrm{SN} ; \mathrm{r} 2 \mathrm{f}=0.08, \mathrm{p}=0.222$; $\mathrm{r} 2 \mathrm{~m}=0.14, \mathrm{p}=0.106$ ), spawning-stock number ( SSN ; $\mathrm{r} 2 \mathrm{f}=0.11$, $\mathrm{p}=0.145 ; \mathrm{r} 2 \mathrm{~m}=0.10, \mathrm{p}=0.178)$, $\mathrm{SSB}(\mathrm{t} ; \mathrm{r} 2 \mathrm{f}=0.00, \mathrm{p}=0.807 ; \mathrm{r} 2 \mathrm{~m}=0.00, \mathrm{p}=0.942)$, total stock number (TSN; $22 \mathrm{f}=0.09, \mathrm{p}=0.177 ; \mathrm{r} 2 \mathrm{~m}=0.15, \mathrm{p}=0.096$ ), and total-stock biomass (TSB; t ) ( $\mathrm{r} 2 \mathrm{f}=0.12$, $\mathrm{p}=0.117$; $\mathrm{r} 2 \mathrm{~m}=0.15, \mathrm{p}=0.089$ ). Female figures at left, and male figures at right; regression lines are shown; numbers in millions and biomass in tonnes ( t ). Z is calculated according to Equation (1). (From Nielsen et al. 2012)

## Interspecific dynamics

Besides intraspecific patterns, the growth rates show interspecific links to stock sizes of the important predators: cod, haddock, and whiting (Lambert et al. 2009). Especially interspecific density dependent patterns in Norway pout growth and maturity were found in relation to North Sea cod and whiting stock abundance (Lambert et al., 2009). The interspecific density-dependence in growth of Norway pout found by Lambert et al. (2009) revealed a positive correlation between whiting SSB and growth, and a negative one with cod and haddock SSB (Figure 29). Cod and haddock being larger species probably target larger prey, whereas whiting likely target smaller Norway pout. However, other factors could influence these observations. Raitt and Adams (1965) compared the feeding habits of Norway pout and whiting and showed an extensive overlap between what 0-group whiting and adult Norway pout were eating. Therefore, even if adult whiting are important predators on small Norway pout (Jones et al., 1954; Daan and Welleman, 1998), the positive correlation between both could be due to simple food availability and the effects of competition for food lowering the MWA for Norway pout and whiting recruits. Depending on the strength of the stock-recruitment relationship for whiting, this could affect the relationship between Norway pout growth and whiting SSB (Lambert et al. 2009).


Figure 29. Statistically significant interspecific density-dependence for other species than Norway pout in MWA (top panels) and MLA (bottom panels). (From Lambert et al. 2009).

Interspecific density-dependence and predation were not significant factors influencing Norway pout mortality (Figure 30) based on the available data at the scale of the study by Nielsen et al. (2012), and additional studies are necessary on more disaggregated coverage and overlapping distribution and density patterns between Norway pout and its main predators by age or size group, especially during the spawning period (Nielsen et al. 2012). With regard to the overlap between NP and important predators in the North Sea, Rindorf et al. (2010) found low predated biomass and predation mortality in the main spawning areas during the spawning season. Kempf et al. (2009; Figure 10) found no strong correlation between the spatial overlap of NP age 1 abundance and certain NP predators (saithe, haddock, and mackerel) in the IBTS Q3 survey. However, strong predator-prey relationships do exist
between some commercially important North Sea stocks and Norway pout (e.g. Cormon et al. 2016; Kempf et al. 2009; Huse et al. 2008). Early studies found that adult whiting is an important predator of small Norway pout (Jones, 1954; Daan and Welleman, 1998).


Figure 30. Total mortality $(Z)$ based on revised IBTS Q1 cpue at age 1 (top panels) and age 2 (bottom panels) vs. SSBs ( t ) of three main predators on 1 January. Regression lines of the relationships shown for cod (Cod; age 1, r2=0; age 2, r2=0.08), saithe (Sai; age 1, r2= 0.04 ; age 2, r2=0), and haddock (Had; age 1, r2=0.06; age 2, r2=0.03). Z is calculated according to Equation (1). (From Nielsen et al. 2012).

Based on stomach-content data analyses disaggregated to ICES statistical square (area) and quarter of the year in the North Sea (1991), Rindorf et al. (2010) calculated biomass eaten and local predation mortality indices. They found that predated biomass (and predation mortality) of Norway pout by cod, whiting, haddock, and saithe was high in the second half of the year (Q4 and Q3) and low in the first half (Q2 and Q1). In Q1, the small Norway pout biomass eaten occurred in the most northern areas west of Orkney and south of Shetland. Based on Rindorf et al. (2010, Figures $2 b$ and $5 b$ ), the areas of highest biomass predated and highest predation mortality were not in the main spawning areas during the spawning season (Q1) that were identified by Lambert et al. (2009, e.g. Figure 1) and Nash et al. (2012) see Section 3 - i.e. the areas to be in proximity to the 120-m isobaths in RFA1 and RFA3 near Viking Bank along the Norwegian Trench and along the Scottish east coast (and in RFA7) in Q1. Consequently, predated biomass and predation mortality was low in the main spawning areas and during the spawning season, indicating that increased mortality cannot be explained by predation mortality.
Several hypotheses have been advanced to explain heavy larval mortality (reviewed by Chambers and Trippel, 1997), including predation by planktivorous fish owing to their potentially high densities and efficient foraging on fish larvae. Recruitment of many fish stocks in the North Sea has been exceptionally poor recently (ICES, 2007b -see Huse et al. 2008), and this has led to a re-examination of the hypotheses about different factors affecting fish recruitment (Huse et al. 2008). A negative relationship
between pelagic fish abundance and recruitment of demersal fish has been suggested for the North Sea, specifically because the so-called "gadoid outburst" during the 1960s coincided roughly with a collapse in North Sea herring and mackerel stocks (Cushing, 1980; Daan et al., 1985, 1994). However, the timing of various events in the 1950s and 1960s does not fully support a negative relationship between biomass levels of pelagic fish and recruitment of gadoids (Hislop, 1996). On the other hand, the recent poor recruitment to many North Sea stocks has coincided with a large herring stock, which again raises the question of predatory interactions (Huse et al. 2008). Low recruitment of Norway pout could be due to predation by herring, because there is potential for spatial overlap between the two stocks, although there is no information available on stomach content analysis to suggest such an interaction (Huse et al. 2008). Herring (Clupea harengus) has been suggested to be a major predator on fish larvae in the North Sea, and Huse et al. (2008) investigated possible interactions between herring and Norway pout using a simple statistical analysis and a modified stock-recruit relationship. They found a significant negative relationship (linear regression) between total herring biomass and recruitment of Norway pout. The spawning stock of Norway pout is typically dominated by 2 -year-olds, and there was a strong negative relationship (linear regression) between herring biomass and Norway pout spawning-stock biomass (SSB) 2 years later (Huse et al. 2008). A Beverton-Holt model fitted by Huse et al. (2008) to stock-recruit data of Norway pout produced a rather poor correlation. However, when only the Norway pout SSB not overlapping with herring was considered the fit between the model and the stock-recruit data improved. These analyses indicated a negative impact by herring on recruitment of Norway pout, the most plausible cause for this being herring predation on Norway pout larvae, but field studies are needed to verify such predation (Huse et al. 2008). For herring, the estimated total-stock biomass was taken from the final assessment in the Report of the Herring Assessment Working Group for the Area South of 628N (Huse et al. 2008). For Norway pout, estimates of SSB, recruitment (numbers of fish aged 0 in quarter 3), proportion mature-at-age, mean weights-at-age, and stock numbers-at-age in the North Sea and Skagerrak were taken from ICES (2007c; the working group report that was the basis for the ICES advice in spring 2007). The spatial distributions of herring and Norway pout were estimated based on abundance indices per ICES rectangle, derived from the quarter 1 International Bottom Trawl Survey (IBTS) for the period 1982-2006 (Huse et al. 2008).

According to Cormon et al. (2016) recent assessments of the North Sea saithe Pollachius virens, a major top predator in the area, suggested a decrease in spawning stock biomass along with a decline in saithe mean weight-at-ages. In this context, Cormon et al. (2016) investigated North Sea saithe growth characteristics at the population level: First, saithe annual weight increments and age-length relationships were studied. Then, modelling of saithe age-length relationships was carried out using (1) the traditional von Bertalanffy growth function model, (2) the Verhulst logistic model, and (3) an empirical linear model. Second, the effects of environmental factors on saithe growth were investigated. The explanatory environmental factors included in the study was food availability, represented by the total biomass of Norway pout Trisopterus esmarkii; intraspecific competition, i.e. density dependence, represented by saithe abundance; and temperature. The study of Cormon et al. (2016) indicated that the Verhulst logistic model was the best descriptor of saithe growth and that density dependence and food availability had significant effects on the saithe growth coefficient, while no effect of temperature was shown. On this basis, the authors suggested that reduced food availability and increased competition may explain the recent decrease in the saithe growth coefficient. It should here be carefully noted that the age length keys of Norway pout survey data from the ICES IBTS surveys used in the study by Cormon et al. (2016) were not scrutinized and analysed on a disaggregated seasonal and area basis as the results from Lambert et al. (2009) revealed were necessary to obtain realistic growth data and parameters for this Norway pout stock.

The interplay between temperature-related processes and predation in determining age- 1 recruitment strength between 1992 and 2006 was analysed for North Sea cod (Gadus morhua) and Norway pout (Trisopterus esmarkii) by Kempf et al. (2009). For this purpose, a predation impact index (PI) was calculated out of IBTS survey data. PI was assumed to depend on the abundance of the predators and
on the spatial overlap between predator and prey populations. Generalized additive models (GAMs) were created with spawning stock biomass (SSB) and sea surface temperature (SST) in the respective spawning and nursery areas and PI as explaining variables. Intraspecific SSB had no significant impact on recruitment during this time period for both species. SSTs during spring and PI explained together the interannual variability in recruitment strength to a large extent $(88 \%$ of the total variance for cod and $68 \%$ for Norway pout). The SST during spring determined the overall level of recruitment. At SSTs above a certain level, however, the effect on recruitment was no longer significant. In these temperature ranges, predation was the dominant effect. On this basis, Kempf et al. (2009) stated that the fate of North Sea cod and Norway pout stocks under global-warming conditions will be strongly influenced by the status of the North Sea food web. See more detailed results of this study in Section 7 on environmental drivers below.

When scrutinizing mean predation mortality (M2) caused by predator species and age groups partly in a table with predation by predator species and age on Norway pout per age group (Table 4) and a table with predation by predator species in total per Norway pout age group (Table 5), as well as graphs of Norway pout relative importance (share) in diet per predator size group from the SMS 2013 baseline run then it is possible to assess the most important predators by species and age on Norway pout in the North Sea (Table 6 with examples). All this information is necessary to evaluate the importance of Norway pout in the diet for the different predators and predator age groups as a high M2 can be caused by partly a high proportion of Norway pout in the diet but also by a high predator (by age) biomass / abundance. Therefore, the partiel M2 is not necessarily a good measure for importance of Norway pout in the diet. Accordingly, it is also necessary to analyse graphs of Norway pout relative (share) importance in diet per predator size group.

Table 4. Average (1974-2013) partial predation mortality (M2) from SMS of Norway pout by age group of Norway pout and predator (SMS 2013 baseline run).

| Species / Age | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Cod | 0,0803 | 0,1620 | 0,1222 | 0,0940 | 0,0000 |
| Fulmar | 0,0033 | 0,0027 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 |
| G. gurnards | 0,1075 | 0,0640 | 0,0167 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 |
| GBB, Gull | 0,0007 | 0,0004 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 |
| Gannet | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 |
| Greyseal | 0,0000 | 0,0014 | 0,0018 | 0,0018 | 0,0000 |
| Guillemot | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 |
| H. porpoise | 0,0011 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 |
| Haddock | 0,1136 | 0,1374 | 0,0762 | 0,0429 | 0,0000 |
| Hake | 0,0561 | 0,0894 | 0,0894 | 0,0894 | 0,0000 |
| Her. Gull | 0,0025 | 0,0013 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 |
| Kittiwake | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 |
| N. mackerel | 0,0118 | 0,0012 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 |
| N. horsemac | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 |
| Puffin | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 |
| R. radiata | 0,0337 | 0,0133 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 |
| Razorbill | 0,0000 | 0,0009 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 |
| Saithe | 0,1954 | 0,5428 | 0,5428 | 0,5428 | 0,0000 |
| W. mackerel | 0,3373 | 0,0129 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 |
| W. horsemac | 0,0018 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 |
| Whiting | 0,4672 | 0,3447 | 0,2324 | 0,1633 | 0,0000 |

Table 5. Average 1974-2013) partial predation mortality from SMS by age group (0-3) of Norway pout (NP Age) and predator age group (0-10) by predator. (SMS 2013 baseline run).

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \& Pred. Age \& 0 \& 1 \& 2 \& 3 \& 4 \& 5 \& 6 \& 7 \& 8 \& 9 \& 10 <br>
\hline NP Age \& Predator \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{8}{*}{0

1} \& Cod \& 0,000 \& 0,044 \& 0,017 \& 0,010 \& 0,005 \& 0,003 \& 0,001 \& 0,001 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline \& G. gurnards \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,086 \& 0,022 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline \& Haddock \& 0,000 \& 0,046 \& 0,030 \& 0,019 \& 0,009 \& 0,004 \& 0,002 \& 0,001 \& 0,001 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline \& Hake \& 0,000 \& 0,002 \& 0,024 \& 0,029 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline \& Saithe \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,062 \& 0,042 \& 0,029 \& 0,021 \& 0,015 \& 0,010 \& 0,007 \& 0,009 <br>
\hline \& W. mackerel \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,030 \& 0,060 \& 0,061 \& 0,052 \& 0,134 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline \& Whiting \& 0,348 \& 0,058 \& 0,034 \& 0,017 \& 0,006 \& 0,002 \& 0,001 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline \& Cod \& 0,000 \& 0,068 \& 0,046 \& 0,024 \& 0,013 \& 0,006 \& 0,003 \& 0,001 \& 0,001 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline \multirow{6}{*}{1} \& G. gurnards \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,026 \& 0,038 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline \& Haddock \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,061 \& 0,039 \& 0,019 \& 0,009 \& 0,004 \& 0,003 \& 0,001 \& 0,000 \& 0,001 <br>
\hline \& Hake \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,055 \& 0,034 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline \& Saithe \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,159 \& 0,114 \& 0,082 \& 0,058 \& 0,042 \& 0,029 \& 0,020 \& 0,038 <br>
\hline \& W. mackerel \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,002 \& 0,011 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline \& Whiting \& 0,000 \& 0,181 \& 0,091 \& 0,045 \& 0,018 \& 0,006 \& 0,002 \& 0,001 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{7}{*}{2} \& Cod \& 0,000 \& 0,028 \& 0,046 \& 0,024 \& 0,013 \& 0,006 \& 0,003 \& 0,001 \& 0,001 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline \& G. gurnards \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,017 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline \& Haddock \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,039 \& 0,019 \& 0,009 \& 0,004 \& 0,003 \& 0,001 \& 0,000 \& 0,001 <br>
\hline \& Hake \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,055 \& 0,034 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline \& Saithe \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,159 \& 0,114 \& 0,082 \& 0,058 \& 0,042 \& 0,029 \& 0,020 \& 0,038 <br>
\hline \& W. mackerel \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline \& Whiting \& 0,000 \& 0,069 \& 0,091 \& 0,045 \& 0,018 \& 0,006 \& 0,002 \& 0,001 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{7}{*}{3} \& Cod \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,046 \& 0,024 \& 0,013 \& 0,006 \& 0,003 \& 0,001 \& 0,001 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline \& G. gurnards \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline \& Haddock \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,013 \& 0,014 \& 0,007 \& 0,004 \& 0,003 \& 0,001 \& 0,000 \& 0,001 <br>
\hline \& Hake \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,055 \& 0,034 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline \& Saithe \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,159 \& 0,114 \& 0,082 \& 0,058 \& 0,042 \& 0,029 \& 0,020 \& 0,038 <br>
\hline \& W. mackerel \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline \& Whiting \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,091 \& 0,045 \& 0,018 \& 0,006 \& 0,002 \& 0,001 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 \& 0,000 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 6. Main predator age groups of Norway pout by species, i.e. age groups where Norway pout has high importance as prey, according to the latest (2013) multi-species SMS model baseline run for the North Sea.

| Species | Main importance | Focus ages in analyses |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cod | Age 2 and older | Age 2-4 |
| Whiting | Age 2 and older | Age 2-4 |
| Haddock | Age 3 and older | Age 3-4 |
| Saithe | Age 2 and older | Age 2-4 |
| Pollack | Age 2 and older | Age 2-4 |
| W. mackerel | Age 2 and older | Age 2-6 |
| G. gurnard | Age 3 and older | Age 3-4 |

In Figures 31-32 the relationship between predator spawning stock biomass (Fig. 31) and total stock biomass (Fig. 32) for North Sea cod, haddock, saithe and whiting is shown as function of the Norway pout (prey) total stock biomass in the North Sea and Skagerrak estimated as 3 year running means during the period 1983-2014.

The results indicate that there is a moderate positive correlation between cod spawning stock biomass and Norway pout total stock biomass, while there is no correlation between whiting and haddock spawning stock biomasses and Norway pout total stock biomass, and there is even a slight negative correlation between saithe spawning stock biomass and Norway pout total stock biomass. There are moderate positive correlations between North Sea cod, whiting and haddock total stock biomasses and Norway
pout total stock biomass, while there is no (or even with negative tendency) correlation between North Sea saithe total stock biomass and Norway pout total stock biomass.

| Prey-Predator Biomass Correlation | Prey-Predator Biomass Correlation |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| Prey-Predator Biomass Correlation | Prey-Predator Biomass Correlation |

Figure 31. Relationship between cod predator spawning stock biomass in first quarter of the year as function of Norway pout prey Total Stock Biomass (TSB) in third quarter of the year. The values are 3 year running means for the period 1983-2014. Data originates from the (predators) ICES WGNSSK Stock Assessment autumn 2015 (NP) and spring 2016 (predators).


Figure 32. Correlation between predator Total Stock Biomass (TSB) in first quarter of the year as 3 year running mean values and Norway pout Total Stock Biomass (TSB) in third quarter of the year as 3 year running mean values for the period 1983 to 2014. Data from ICES

WGNSSK Single Stock Assessments in the spring 2016 (predators) and autumn 2015 (Norway pout).
Growth rates of predators versus prey biomass are given as 3 years running means for different main Norway pout predators during the period 1983 to 2014 in Figures 33-36. The growth rates are calculated as change in mean weight at age (MWA) of the predators where MWA values in the stock are obtained from the ICES WGNSSK spring 2016 assessments. The growth rates are calculated on cohort basis for the main age groups of the predators with respect to predation on Norway pout and where there are a high number of observations on MWA are available. The MWA is calculated as:

$$
\delta w_{a_{t}}=w_{a_{t}}-w_{a-1_{t-1}}
$$



Figure 33. Correlation between Cod Mean Weight at Age (MWA) in quarter 1 from the ICES WGNSSK spring 2016 single stock assessment and Total Stock Biomass (TSB) of Norway pout in the third quarter. The values are 3 year running means of cohort growth for the period 1983-2014.


Figure 34. Correlation between Haddock Mean Weight at Age (MWA) in quarter 1 from the ICES WGNSSK spring 2016 single stock assessment and Total Stock Biomass (TSB) of Norway pout in the third quarter. The values are 3 year running means of cohort growth for the period 1983-2014.


Figure 35. Correlation between Saithe Mean Weight at Age (MWA) in quarter 1 from the ICES WGNSSK spring 2016 single stock assessment and Total Stock Biomass (TSB) of Norway pout in the third quarter. The values are 3 year running means of cohort growth for the period 1983-2014.


Figure 36. Correlation between Whiting Mean Weight at Age (MWA) in quarter 1 from the ICES WGNSSK spring 2016 single stock assessment and Total Stock Biomass (TSB) of Norway pout in the third quarter. The values are 3 year running means of cohort growth for the period 1983-2014.

The results indicate that for all the predator species (cod, haddock, whiting and saithe) and their main cohorts predating on Norway pout in the North Sea there is no correlation between their growth rate in mean weight at age and total stock biomass of Norway pout, except for a weak positive correlation between mean weight at age for 1 cohort (age 3-4) of haddock and Norway pout total stock biomass. Accordingly, growth and mean weight-at-age for a row of important predators on Norway pout in the North Sea seems not very dependent on the stock size of Norway pout.
Predator assessments in the ICES WGNSSK single stock assessments in recent years for important predators on Norway pout do not indicate serious changes in their MWA or condition and accordingly there is no indication that they starve with current level harvests of Norway pout (F-cap of 0.6 set now and max F in last 10 years at 0.5).

It should be noted that Denmark back in 2008 or so (Naturstyrelsen) have made a MSFD indicator on Saithe growth (MLA) in relation to industrial species abundance. However, this does not go specific on Norway pout but industrial or prey species in general.

## 7. Environmental drivers

Only limited knowledge is available on the influence of environmental factors, such as temperature, on the Norway pout recruitment.

The interplay between temperature-related processes and predation in determining age- 1 recruitment strength between 1992 and 2006 was analysed for North Sea cod (Gadus morhua) and Norway pout (Trisopterus esmarkii) by Kempf et al. (2009). For this purpose, a predation impact index (PI) was calculated out of IBTS survey data. PI was assumed to depend on the abundance of the predators and on the spatial overlap between predator and prey populations. Generalized additive models (GAMs) were created with spawning stock biomass (SSB) and sea surface temperature (SST) in the respective spawning and nursery areas and PI as explaining variables. Intraspecific SSB had no significant impact on recruitment during this time period for both species. SSTs during spring and PI explained the interannual variability in recruitment strength to a large extent ( $88 \%$ of the total variance for cod and $68 \%$ for Norway pout). The SST during spring determined the overall level of recruitment. At SSTs above a certain level, however, the effect on recruitment was no longer significant. In these temperature ranges, predation was the dominant effect. On this basis, Kempf et al. (2009) stated that the fate of North Sea cod and Norway pout stocks under global-warming conditions will be strongly influenced by the status of the North Sea food web.

The data used for the analyses in Kempf et al. (2009) was IBTS survey data: North Sea wide (including the Skagerrak (ICES areas IVand IIIa)), age-recruitment indices (RI) were calculated for cod and Norway pout from age-based, first-quarter IBTS data from 1992 to 2006 (ICES 1999 - see Kempf et al. 2009). The Skagerrak was added because North Sea and Skagerrak subpopulations show high exchange rates and are treated as one stock in standard fish stock assessments (Kempf et al. 2009). The average number of age- 1 recruits caught in the first quarter in each ICES rectangle ( 0.58 latitude 18 longitude) was calculated for each species analysed whenever more than one haul was conducted in a certain year. Later, the average catch numbers were summed over all ICES rectangles to get an age-1 recruitment index for the North Sea and Skagerrak area. Because the coverage for ICES areas IV and IIIa was complete in all years after 1991, the summation of the mean catches per ICES rectangle introduced no bias due to inter-annual changes in the number of ICES rectangles surveyed (Kempf et al. 2009).

It should again here be noted that the age length keys of Norway pout survey data from the ICES IBTS surveys used in the study by Kempf et al. (2009) were not scrutinized and analysed on a disaggregated seasonal and area basis as the results from Lambert et al. (2009) revealed were necessary to obtain precise age readings and growth data and parameters on a spatiotemporal disaggregated basis for this Norway pout stock. This can also influence recruitment estimates.

According to Kempf et al. (2009) the IBTS age-1 recruitment index for Norway pout varied considerably between the years until the year 2000. From 2000 to 2006, the recruitment index was always at a low level and less variable than in previous time periods. The time series of first-quarter SST north of 58.8 N showed a significant increasing trend from 1994 onwards (Kempf et al. 2009). The SST value was outstandingly low in 1994 and extremely high in 1998. The SST during the second quarter also increased over the analysed time period; however, the trend was not found significant. As in the spawning and nursery areas of cod, the years 1992 and 1996 deviated from the general trend. SSTs during the third quarter were higher in the last third of the time series than in the previous periods. The PI values were mainly in the range of 20000 to 60000 . In single years, however, the index was <20 000 (in 1991) or >100 000 (in 2000). Kempf et al. (2009) did not find a obvious temporal trend. Furthermore, there was found no significant relationship between SSB in the year of birth and the IBTS age-1 recruitment index of the following year. High and low recruitment index values occurred at any part of the analysed SSB spectrum. SST in the first, second, and third quarters had no significant effect on recruitment strength of Norway pout in the models with SSB and SST as the only explaining variables. The SST in the 2nd quarter, however, had the strongest relationship with the recruitment index and was close to being
significant (Kempf et al. 2009), however, the effect of second-quarter SST became significant when PI was added as an explaining variable. As with cod, the age-1 recruitment index of Norway pout was higher after the cold years (1994 and 1996) than after the warmer years. For temperatures $>8.5$ 8C, no clear effect on the recruitment index could be recognized (Kempf et al. 2009). PI had a significant negative linear effect on the Norway pout recruitment index. The final model was able to explain the recruitment of Norway pout to a satisfying extent (Kempf et al. 2009). Both variables together explained $68 \%$ of the recruitment index from 1992 to 2006. A large part of the interannual variability, however, could not be resolved with PI and SST as explaining variables. The low recruitment in 2005, especially, could not be explained; this data point appeared as an outlier in the residual plot. When fitting the model without the recruitment index for 2005 , the fit became better $(R 2=0.75)$ and the effects of SST and PI on recruitment were more significant. No significant correlation was found between the explaining variables, and no significant autocorrelation of the model variables was detected at any lag. Also, the residuals were not distributed differently from a normal distribution (Kempf et al. 2009).
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Figure A.1.1. Distribution of Norway pout by age group (ages 1-5) and year in the first quarter of the year as indicated by catch per unit of effort (CPUE) in numbers per trawl hour (N/h) estimated from the ICES IBTS Q1 survey during the period 1985-2016.
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Figure A.2.1. Distribution of Norway pout by age group (ages 0-4) and year in the first quarter of the year as indicated by catch per unit of effort (CPUE) in numbers per trawl hour (N/h) as estimated from the ICES IBTS Q3 survey during the period 1991-2015.
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By J. Rasmus Nielsen, Jeppe Olsen, Kirsten Birch Håkonsson, Josefine Egekvist and Jørgen Dalskov. Technical University of Denmark, National Institute of Aquatic Resources, DTU Aqua.

## Introduction

This working document presents the Danish Norway pout fishery in the North Sea and Skagerrak (ICES Area IV and IIIa), nop34, relevant for the ICES benchmark assessment for the stock in August 2016, ICES WKPOUT.

The working document is subdivided into 3 main sections with different ecosystem aspects and considerations.

1. The Danish Norway pout fishery and its distribution

A1. International targeted Norway pout fishery with focus on Danish fishery
A2. Distribution of the Danish targeted Norway pout fishery
A3. Sampling of the Danish Targeted Norway pout fishery
A4. By-catches in the Norway pout fishery and gear selectivity
A5. Discard of Norway pout in fisheries for consume purposes
A6. Commercial fishery efficiency by year, quarter, metier and vessel category
A. 7 Commercial catch and effort fishery data used in the assessment up to 2016
2. Distribution of the Norway pout stock in relation to the fishery

B1. Distribution of the stock in relation to the fishery based on survey data and survey tuning time series used in the assessment
3. Relevant fishery regulations for the Norway pout fishery
4. Quota up-take in the Norway pout fishery
5. Mean weight at ages used in the catch and in the commercial tuning fleet

## 1. The Danish Norway pout fishery and its distribution

## A. 1. International targeted Norway pout Fishery with focus on Danish Fishery

The Norway pout fishery is a mixed commercial, small meshed fishery. Norway pout is caught in small meshed trawls ( $16-31 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) in a mixed fishery among other with blue whiting, i.e. in addition to the directed Norway pout fishery by Denmark and Norway, the species is also taken as by-catch in the Norwegian blue whiting fishery. Norway pout is landed for reduction purposes (fish meal and fish oil).

During the 1960s a significant small-mesh fishery developed for Norway pout in the northern North Sea. The fishery is nearly exclusively carried out by Danish and Norwegian (large) vessels using small-mesh trawls in
the north-western North Sea especially at the Fladen Ground and along the edge of the Norwegian Trench in the north-eastern part of the North Sea (Tables 1-2; Figures 1-2 DK fishery; Figure 3 DK+N fishery). Main fishing seasons are $3^{\text {rd }}$ and $4^{\text {th }}$ quarters of the year with also some catches in $1^{\text {st }}$ quarter of the year especially previous to 2002 (Tables 3-4). The quarterly spatial distribution of the Norway pout catches for the Danish small meshed fishery for reduction purposes is shown in Figure 4 during a twenty year period from 1987-2015, and in Figure 5 as a quarterly average during a ten year period from 1994-2003 for the combined Danish and Norwegian fishery. An overview of quarterly landings for the period 1989-2014 is given for the Danish small meshed fishery for reduction purposes in Figure 6, and for the combined Danish and Norwegian small meshed fisheries in Figure 7.

The fishery in more recent times is mainly carried out by Denmark and Norway at fishing grounds in the northern North Sea especially at Fladen Ground and along the edge of the Norwegian Trench. The share of the catches between Denmark and Norway varies over time, sometimes Denmark have the major yearly catches, sometimes Norway, without any trends over time. The long term average show rather equal catches between the two countries. There is a tendency towards the more recent Danish landings mainly originates from the Fladen Ground area compared to the Norwegian Trench area.

The total international landings have been lower (well below 100 kt per year) since 2001 compared to previous landings well above 100 kt per year (Tables 1-4). The landings in 2010 and 2013 were above and close to 100 kt , respectively, because of the strong 2009 and 2012 year classes. Landings in 2015 were also high because of the very strong 2014 year class. The 2003-2004 landings were the lowest on record, and also effort in 2003 and 2004 were historically low and well below the average of the 5 previous years. The targeted Norway pout fishery was closed in 2005, in the first half year of 2006, all of 2007, and during the first half year 2011 and 2012. In the periods of closures there have in some years been set by-catch quotas for Norway pout in the Norwegian mixed blue whiting fishery, as well as in a small experimental fishery in 2007. The fishery was open for the second half year of 2006 and in all of 2008 to 2010 based on the strong 2007-2009 year classes being around or above the long term average level. However, the Norwegian part of the Norway pout fishery was only open from May to August in 2008 during that year. In the open periods of 2008, 2009, and 2011 the fishing effort and catches have been low, but have been at higher level in 2010, 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015. The fishery has in these periods mainly been based on the 2008, 2009, 2012 and 2014 year classes being around or above the long term average level.

## A.2. Distribution of the Danish Targeted Norway pout Fishery

Below is given the total landings of Norway pout by year and country as well as the distribution of the Danish commercial industrial fishery landings (=catches) of Norway pout using the species distribution in all industrial fishery by Denmark obtained from the described standardized Danish samplings of the small meshed fisheries for reduction purposes in Section A.3. Accordingly, the landings include all Danish small meshed fishery for reduction purposes where Norway pout is caught including by-catches of Norway pout in other industrial fishery targeting e.g. sprat and sandeel, i.e. not only landings where Norway pout has been among the target species in the small meshed fisheries. The tabulated landings originates from the last accepted Norway pout assessment in September 2015 from the ICES WGNSSK Report 2015. Consequently, only landings up to $3^{\text {rd }}$ quarter 2015 are included in the Tables. The landings distributions in the Figures 1,2, 4, 7 and 8 below originates from data extracted from relevant databases in Summer 2016 after completion of the data call for the Norway pout benchmark assessment in August 2016 and, accordingly, includes data for all of 2015 as well as previous years.
The yearly distributions are given in Figure 1 and the quarterly distribution is given in Figure 4 of the Danish Norway pout landings (=catches) in the small meshed fishery for reduction purposes during a twenty year period from 1987-2015. The quarterly distributions of the landings are also given by fishery (= metier) in Figure 4. The final part of Figure 4 shows the average landings by metier for the period 2004-2015 in the Danish small meshed fishery targeting Norway pout for respectively the North Sea and the Skagerrak-Kattegat areas. It should be noted here that the overall dominant metiérs in the Danish small meshed fishery targeting Norway
pout up to 2012 is bottom otterboard trawlers for demersal fish fishing with mesh-sizes $16-31 \mathrm{~mm}$ in the trawl cod-end (OTB_DEF_16-31_0_0 metiér) without selective grids, and from 2012 onwards the same fishery fishing with a selective grid mounted in front of the cod-end in the trawl and with a bar width of 35 mm , which became mandatory to use for all vessels targeting Norway pout according to regulations implemented from the $15^{\text {th }}$ October 2012 onwards (OTB_DEF_16-31_2_35 metiér) - see also under regulations in Section 3. The Figure 5 shows the quarterly average landings during a ten year period from 1994-2003 for the combined Danish and Norwegian fishery, while there in Figure 6 is given an overview of the quarterly landings by year for the period 1989-2014 for the Danish small meshed fishery for reduction purposes, and in Figure 7 the quarterly landings by year for the same period for the combined Danish and Norwegian fisheries. The distribution of fishing power and catch efficiency of different vessel groups (as a comparison between those) is shown in Figure 8. This is presented as catch rates (ton/fishing day) for the small meshed Danish industrial fishery for of Norway pout by year, quarter, ICES rectangles, metier, and engine horse power class for the period 1987-2015.

The Danish metiérs catching Norway pout covers small meshed bottom otterboard trawlers for demersal fish which are used for reduction purposes (OTB_DEF_<16_0_0, OTB_DEF_16-31_0_0, OTB_DEF_16-31_2_35), midwater pair trawlers fishing small pelagic fish such as sprat (PTM_SPF_16-31_0_0; PTM_SPF_32-69_0_0), small meshed bottom otterboard trawlers fishing shrimp (crustaceans) for consume purposes (OTB_CRU_3269_0_0) or for small pelagic fish (OTB_SPF_<16_0_0, OTB_SPF_16-31_0_0, OTB_SPF_16-31_2_35), or to less extent for mixed crustaceans (Nephrops) and demersal fish (OTB_MCD_90-119_0_0, OTB_MCD_>=120_0_0), bottom pair trawlers fishing for small pelagic fish (PTB_SPF_32-69_0_0), small meshed midwater otterboard trawlers fishing for small pelagic fish (OTM_SPF_16-31_0_0) and very seldom anchored seine fishery for demersal fish (SDN_DEF_90-119_0_0).

The main engine horse power categories for the fishing vessels used are the following main engine categories: 0$500 \mathrm{hp}, 500-1000 \mathrm{hp}, 1000-1500 \mathrm{hp}, 1500-2000 \mathrm{hp},>=2000 \mathrm{hp}$.

Table 1 NORWAY POUT IV \& IIIa. Nominal landings ('000 tonnes) from the North Sea and Skagerrak / Kattegat, ICES areas IV and IIIa in the period 2003-2014, as officially reported to ICES and EU. By-catches of Norway pout in other (small meshed) fishery included.

${ }^{*}$ Preliminary.

| Country | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Denmark | 10.762 | 941*** | 39.531 | 59 | 32.158 | 19.226 | 71.032 | 4.038 | 24.829 * | 31.376 | 27.894 * |
| Faroe Is lands | 1.085 | 24 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Netherlands | - | - | - | - | - | 22 | 18 | - | - | - | - |
| Germany | - | - | 15 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Norway | 4.953 | 311 | 13.618 | 4.712 | 6.650 | 36.961 | 64.303 | 3.189 | 4.528 * | 46.187 | 18.725 * |
| Sweden | - | - | - | - | 10 | - | + | 1 | 3 * | 4 | 1 * |
| UK(Scotland) | - | - | - | - | - | - | 29 | - | 6 * | - | 8* |
| Total | 16.800 | 1.092 | 53.164 | 4.771 | 38.818 | 56.209 | 135.353 | 7.228 | 29.360 | 77.567 | 46.620 |
| ${ }^{*}$ Preliminary. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Norway pout ICES area IVb |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Country | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
| Denmark | 473 | - | 394 | - | 244 | 595 | 229 | 32 | 611 * | 43 | 16 * |
| Faroe Is lands | 29 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Germany | - | - | 19 | - | - | 75 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Netherlands | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Norway | - | - | 2 | - | - | 82 | 620 | 21 | 59 * | 615 | 8 * |
| Sweden | 88 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 * |
| UK (E/W/NI) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| UK (Scotland) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6* |
| Total | 590 | 0 | 415 | 0 | 244 | 752 | 849 | 53 | 670 | 658 | 30 |

*Preliminary.

*reliminary.

## Norway pout Sub-area IV and IIIa (Skagerrak) combined

| Country | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Denmark | 11.345 | 941*** | 39.943 | 83 | 32.558 | 19.821 | 71.312 | 4.072 | 25.558 | 38.364 | 28.448 |
| Faroe Islands | 1.159 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Norway | 4.994 | 311 | 13.622 | 4.712 | 6.650 | 37.252 | 65.634 | 3.210 | 4.587 | 46.949 | 18.742 |
| Sweden | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 |
| Netherlands | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Germany | 54 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 4 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UK | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Total nominal landings | 17.640 | 1.252 | 53.599 | 4.795 | 39.222 | 57.170 | 136.974 | 7.283 | 30.148 | 85.318 | 47.198 |
| By-catch of other species and other | -4.140 | - | -6.973 | - | -3.084 | -2.670 | -11.019 | -759 | -3.075 | -3.218 | -3.028 |
| ICES estimate of total landings (IV+IllaN | 13.500 | - | 46.626 | - | 36.138 | 54.500 | 125.955 | 6.524 | 27.073 | 82.100 | 44.170 |
| Agreed TAC | 198.000 | $0^{* * * *}$ | 95.000 | $0^{* * * *}$ | 114.616 x | 116.279 x | 162.950 x | $4.500 \times$ | 70.683 x | 167.500 x | 128.250 x |
| * provisional / preliminary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ** provisional / preliminary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *** 781 ton from trial fishery (directed fishery); 160 ton from by-catches in other fisheries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **** A by-catch qouta of 5000 t has been set. |
| ***** 681 t taken in trial fishery; 1300 t in <br> + Landings less than 1 <br> n /a not available <br> x EU TAC | by-catche | in other | nall me | d) fishe |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 2
NORWAY POUT IV \& IIIa. Annual landings ('000 t) in the North Sea and Skagerrak (not incl. Kattegat, IIIaS) by country, for 1961-2014 (Data provided by ICES WGNSSK Working Group members). (Norwegian landing data include landings of by-catch of other species). Includes by-catch of Norway pout in other (small meshed) fisheries).

| Year | Denmark |  | Faroes | Norway | Sweden | UK | Others | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | (Scotland) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | North Sea | Skagerrak |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1961 | 20,5 | - | - | 8,1 | - | - | - | 28,6 |
| 1962 | 121,8 | - | - | 27,9 | - | - | - | 149,7 |
| 1963 | 67,4 | - | - | 70,4 | - | - | - | 137,8 |
| 1964 | 10,4 | - | - | 51 | - | - | - | 61,4 |
| 1965 | 8,2 | - | - | 35 | - | - | - | 43,2 |
| 1966 | 35,2 | - | - | 17,8 | - | - | + | 53,0 |
| 1967 | 169,6 | - | - | 12,9 | - | - | + | 182,5 |
| 1968 | 410,8 | - | - | 40,9 | - | - | + | 451,7 |
| 1969 | 52,5 | - | 19,6 | 41,4 | - | - | + | 113,5 |
| 1970 | 142,1 | - | 32 | 63,5 | - | 0,2 | 0,2 | 238,0 |
| 1971 | 178,5 | - | 47,2 | 79,3 | - | 0,1 | 0,2 | 305,3 |
| 1972 | 259,6 | - | 56,8 | 120,5 | 6,8 | 0,9 | 0,2 | 444,8 |
| 1973 | 215,2 | - | 51,2 | 63 | 2,9 | 13 | 0,6 | 345,9 |
| 1974 | 464,5 | - | 85,0 | 154,2 | 2,1 | 26,7 | 3,3 | 735,8 |
| 1975 | 251,2 | - | 63,6 | 218,9 | 2,3 | 22,7 | 1 | 559,7 |
| 1976 | 244,9 | - | 64,6 | 108,9 | + | 17,3 | 1,7 | 437,4 |
| 1977 | 232,2 | - | 48,8 | 98,3 | 2,9 | 4,6 | 1 | 387,8 |
| 1978 | 163,4 | - | 18,5 | 80,8 | 0,7 | 5,5 | - | 268,9 |
| 1979 | 219,9 | 9 | 21,9 | 75,4 | - | 3 | - | 329,2 |
| 1980 | 366,2 | 11,6 | 34,1 | 70,2 | - | 0,6 | - | 482,7 |
| 1981 | 167,5 | 2,8 | 16,4 | 51,6 | - | + | - | 238,3 |
| 1982 | 256,3 | 35,6 | 12,3 | 88 | - | - | - | 392,2 |
| 1983 | 301,1 | 28,5 | 30,7 | 97,3 | - | + | - | 457,6 |
| 1984 | 251,9 | 38,1 | 19,11 | 83,8 | - | 0,1 | - | 393,01 |
| 1985 | 163,7 | 8,6 | 9,9 | 22,8 | - | 0,1 | - | 205,1 |
| 1986 | 146,3 | 4 | 2,5 | 21,5 | - | - | - | 174,3 |
| 1987 | 108,3 | 2,1 | 4,8 | 34,1 | - | - | - | 149,3 |
| 1988 | 79 | 7,9 | 1,3 | 21,1 | - | - | - | 109,3 |
| 1989 | 95,7 | 4,2 | 0,8 | 65,3 | + | 0,1 | 0,3 | 166,4 |
| 1990 | 61,5 | 23,8 | 0,9 | 77,1 | + | - | - | 163,3 |
| 1991 | 85 | 32 | 1,3 | 68,3 | + | - | + | 186,6 |
| 1992 | 146,9 | 41,7 | 2,6 | 105,5 | + | - | 0,1 | 296,8 |
| 1993 | 97,3 | 6,7 | 2,4 | 76,7 | - | - | + | 183,1 |
| 1994 | 97,9 | 6,3 | 3,6 | 74,2 | - | - | + | 182 |
| 1995 | 138,1 | 46,4 | 8,9 | 43,1 | 0,1 | + | 0,2 | 236,8 |
| 1996 | 74,3 | 33,8 | 7,6 | 47,8 | 0,2 | 0,1 | + | 163,8 |
| 1997 | 94,2 | 29,3 | 7,0 | 39,1 | + | + | 0,1 | 169,7 |
| 1998 | 39,8 | 13,2 | 4,7 | 22,1 | - | - | + | 57,7 |
| 1999 | 41 | 6,8 | 2,5 | 44,2 | + | - | - | 94,5 |
| 2000 | 127 | 9,3 | - | 48 | 0,1 | - | + | 184,4 |
| 2001 | 40,6 | 7,5 | - | 16,8 | 0,7 | + | + | 65,6 |
| 2002 | 50,2 | 2,8 | 3,4 | 23,6 | - | - | - | 80,0 |
| 2003 | 9,9 | 3,4 | 2,4 | 11,4 | - | - | - | 27,1 |
| 2004 | 8,1 | 0,3 | - | 5 | - | - | 0,1 | 13,5 |
| 2005 | 0.9* | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1,9 |
| 2006 | 35,1 | 0,1 | - | 11,4 | - | - | - | 46,6 |
| 2007 | 2.0** | - | - | 3,7 | - | - | - | 5,7 |
| 2008 | 30,4 | - | - | 5,7 | + | - | + | 36,1 |
| 2009 | 17,5 | - | - | 37,0 | + | - | + | 54,5 |
| 2010 | 64,9 | 0,2 | - | 60,9 | + | + | + | 126,0 |
| 2011 | 3,3 | - | - | 3,2 | + | + | + | 6,5 |
| 2012 | 22,3 | 0,1 | - | 4,6 | + | + | + | 27,0 |
| 2013 | 29,0 | 6,2 | - | 46,9 | + | + | + | 82,1 |
| 2014 | 25,0 | 0,5 | - | 18,7 | + | + | + | 44,2 |

* 781 t taken in a trial fishery; 160 t in by-catches in other (small meshed) fisheries.
** 681 t taken in trial fishery; 1300 t in by-catches in other (small meshed) fisheries.

Table 3 NORWAY POUT IV \& IIIa. National landings (‘000 tonnes) by quarter of year 1997-2015. (Data provided by Working Group members. Norwegian landing data include landings of by-catch of other species). (By-catch of Norway pout in other (small meshed) fisheries included).

| Year | Quarter <br> Area | Denmark |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Norway |  | Total <br> Div. IV + IIIaN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | IIIaN | Illas | Div. Illa | IVaE | IVaw | Ivb | IVc | Div. IV | Div. IV + IllaN | IVaE | Div. IV |  |
| 1998 | 1 | 1.117 | 317 | 1.434 | 7.111 | 2.292 | - | - | 9.403 | 10.520 | 8913 | 8913 | 19.433 |
|  | 2 | 3.881 | 103 | 3.984 | 131 | 5 | 124 | - | 259 | 4.140 | 7885 | 7885 | 12.025 |
|  | 3 | 6.011 | 406 | 6.417 | 7.161 | 1.763 | 2.372 | - | 11.297 | 17.308 | 3559 | 3559 | 20.867 |
|  | 4 | 2.161 | 677 | 2.838 | 1.051 | 17.752 | 77 | - | 18.880 | 21.041 | 1778 | 1778 | 22.819 |
|  | Total | 13.171 | 1.503 | 14.673 | 15.454 | 21.811 | 2.573 | - | 39.838 | 53.009 | 22.135 | 22135 | 75.144 |
| 1999 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 15 | 2.769 | 1.246 | 1 | - | 4.016 | 4.020 | 3021 | 3021 | 7.041 |
|  | 2 | 1.568 | 36 | 1.605 | 953 | 361 | 418 | - | 1.731 | 3.300 | 10321 | 10321 | 13.621 |
|  | 3 | 3.094 | 109 | 3.203 | 7.500 | 3.710 | 2.584 | - | 13.794 | 16.887 | 24449 | 24449 | 41.336 |
|  | 4 | 2.156 | 517 | 2.673 | 3.577 | 16.921 | 928 | 1 | 21.426 | 23.583 | 6385 | 6385 | 29.968 |
|  | Total | 6.822 | 674 | 7.496 | 14.799 | 22.237 | 3.931 | 1 | 40.968 | 47.790 | 44.176 | 44176 | 91.966 |
| 2000 | 1 | ${ }_{929}$ | 11 15 | 12 944 | 3.726 684 | 1.038 | 227 | $:$ | 4.764 933 | 4.765 1.862 | 5440 9779 | 5440 9779 | 10.205 11.641 |
|  | 3 | 7.380 | 139 | 7.519 | 1.708 | 5.613 | 515 | - | 933 7.836 | 1.862 15.216 | 28428 | 28428 | 11.641 43.644 |
|  | 4 | 947 | 209 | 1.157 | 1.656 | 111.732 | 76 | - | 113.464 | 114.411 | 4334 | 4334 | 118.745 |
|  | Total | 9.257 | 375 | 9.631 | 7.774 | 118.406 | 818 | - | 126.998 | 136.255 | 47.981 | 47981 | 184.236 |
| 2001 | 1 |  |  | 302 | 7.341 | 9.734 | 103 | 72 | 17.250 | 17.250 | 3838 | 3838 | 21.088 |
|  | 2 |  |  | 2.174 | 31 | 30 | 269 | - | 330 | 330 | 9268 | 9268 | 9.598 |
|  | 3 |  |  | 2.006 | 15 | 154 | 191 | - | 360 | 360 | 2263 | 2263 | 2.623 |
|  | 4 |  |  | 3.059 | 2.553 | 19.826 | 329 | - | 22.708 | 22.708 | 1426 | 1426 | 24.134 |
|  | Total |  |  | 7.541 | 9.940 | 29.744 | 892 | 72 | 40.648 | 40.648 | 16.795 | 16795 | 57.443 |
| 2002 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 4.869 | 1.660 | 114 | - | 6.643 | 6.643 | 1896 | 1896 | 8.539 |
|  | 2 | 883 | 161 | 1.045 | 56 | 9 | 22 | - | 87 | 970 | 5563 | 5563 | 6.533 |
|  | 3 | 1.567 | 213 | 1.778 | 2.234 | 14.739 | 104 | - | 17.077 | 18.644 | 14147 | 14147 | 32.791 |
|  | 4 | 393 | 100 | 492 | 1.787 | 24.273 | 335 | - | 26.395 | 26.788 | 2033 | 2033 | 28.821 |
|  | Total | 2.843 | 475 | 3.316 | 8.946 | 40.681 | 575 | - | 50.202 | 53.045 | 23.639 | 23639 | 76.684 |
| 2003 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 615 | 581 | 22 | - | 1.218 | 1.218 | 1977 | 1977 | 3.195 |
|  | 2 | 246 | 160 | 406 | 76 | - | 22 | - | 98 | 344 | 2773 | 2773 | 3.117 |
|  | 3 | 2.984 | 1.005 | 3.989 | 172 | 1.613 | 89 | - | 1.874 | 4.858 | 5989 | 5989 | 10.847 |
|  | 4 | 188 | 547 | 735 | 0 | 6270 | 457 | - | 6.727 | 6.915 | 644 | 644 | 7.559 |
|  | Total | 3.418 | 1.713 | 5.131 | 863 | 8.464 | 590 | - | 9.917 | 13.335 | 11.383 | 11.383 | 24.718 |
| 2004 | 1 | 316 | - | 316 | 87 | 650 | - | - | 737 | 1.053 | 989 | 989 | 2.042 |
|  | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | - | 7 | 7 | 660 | 660 | 667 |
|  | 3 | 14 | - | 14 | 289 | 1.195 | 9 | - | 1.493 | 1.507 | 2484 | 2484 | 3.991 |
|  | , | 13 | - | 13 | 93 | 5.683 | 107 | - | 5.883 | 5.896 | 865 | 865 | 6.761 |
|  | Total | 343 | - | 343 | 469 | 7.528 | 123 | - | 8.120 | 8.463 | 4.998 | 4.998 | 13.461 |
| 2005 | 1 | - | - | - | 151 | - | - | - | r9 | 151 | 12 352 | 12 352 | 21 |
|  | 2 |  | - | - | 151 | - | - | - | 151 | 151 | 352 | 352 | 503 |
|  | 3 | - | - | - | 781 | - | - | - | 781 | 781 | 387 | 387 | 1. 168 |
|  | 4 | - | - | - | ${ }^{-1}$ | - | - | - | - | $\cdots$ | 211 | 211 | 211 |
|  | Total | - | - | - | 941 | - | - | - | 941 | 941 | 962 | 962 | 1.903 |
| 2006 |  | - | - |  | 75 | 83 |  |  |  | 158 | 2.205 | 2205 | 2.363 |
|  | 2 | - | - | - |  | - | 15 | - | 15 | 15 | 2.846 | 2846 | 2.861 |
|  | 3 | 114 | - | 114 | - | 649 | 20 | - | 669 | 783 | 5.749 | 5749 | 6.532 |
|  | 4 | 3 | - | 3 | - | 34.262 |  | - | 34.262 | 34.265 | 605 | 605 | 34.870 |
|  | Total | 117 | - | 117 | 75 | 34.994 | 35 | - | 35.104 | 35.221 |  | 11.405 | 46.626 |
| 2007 | 1 | - | - | - | 561 | 789 | - | - | 1.350 | 1.350 | 74 | 74 | 1.424 |
|  | 2 | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | 4 | 4 | 1.097 | 1097 | 1.101 |
|  | 3 | 1 | 2 |  | - |  | - | - | - |  | 2.429 | 2429 | 2.430 |
|  | 4 | - | - | , | - | 682 | - | - | 682 | 682 | 155 | 155 | 837 |
|  | Total | 1 | 2 | 3 | 565 | 1.471 | - | - | 2.036 | 2.037 |  | 3.755 | 5.792 |
| 2008 | 1 | 125 | - | 125 | 19 | 86 | 123 | - | 228 | 353 | 7 | 7 | 360 |
|  | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 30 | - | 30 | 30 | 1.803 | 1803 | 1.833 |
|  | 3 | - | - | - | - | 6.102 | - | - | 6.102 | 6.102 | 3.582 | 3582 | 9.684 |
|  | 4 | 125 | - | 125 | ${ }^{19}$ | 22.686 | 1.239 | - | ${ }^{23.925}$ | 23.925 | 336 | 336 | 24.261 |
|  | Total | 125 | - | 125 | 19 | 28.874 | 1.392 | - | 30.285 | 30.410 |  | 5.728 | 36.138 |
| 2009 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 22 | 515 | - | - | 537 | 538 | 2 | 2 | 540 |
|  | 2 | - | - | , | - |  | - | - | 5 | - | 4.026 | 4026 | 4.026 |
|  | 3 | 2 | - | 2 | - | 11.567 | - | - | 11.567 | 11.569 | 31.251 | 31251 | 42.820 |
|  | 4 | - | - |  | 2 | 5.399 | 4 | - | 5.403 | 5.403 | 1.736 | ${ }^{1736}$ | 7.139 |
|  | Total | 3 | - | 3 | 22 | 17.481 | 4 | - | 17.507 | 17.510 | 37.015 | 37.015 | 54.525 |
| 2010 |  | - | - | - | - | 194 | - | - | 194 | 194 | 104 | 104 | 298 |
|  | 2 | 157 | - | 157 | - | 478 | 59 | - | 537 | 694 | 17.906 | 17906 | 18.600 |
|  | 3 | 37 | - | 37 | - | 33.618 | 213 | - | 33.831 | 33.868 | 41.883 | 41883 | 75.751 |
|  | 4 | 8 | - | 8 | - | 30.276 | 38 | - | 30.314 | 30.322 | 984 | 984 | 31.306 |
|  | Total | 202 | - | 202 | - | 64.566 | 310 | - | 64.876 | 65.078 | 60.877 | 60.877 | 125.955 |
| 2011 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
|  | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 188 | 188 | 188 |
|  | 3 | - | - | - | - | 456 | 5 | - | 461 | 461 | 3.004 | 3.004 | 3.465 |
|  | 4 | - | - | - | - | 2.853 | - | - | 2.853 | 2.853 | 18 | 18 | 2.871 |
|  | Total | - | - | - | - | 3.309 | 5 | - | 3.314 | 3.314 | 3.210 | 3.210 | 6.524 |
| 2012 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 15 | - | - | 15 | 15 | 12 | 12 | 27 |
|  | 2 | - | - | , | - | , | - | - | - |  | 280 | 280 | 280 |
|  | 3 | 2 | - | 2 | - | 62 | 8 | - | 70 | 72 | 395 | 395 | 467 |
|  | 4 | 125 | - | 125 | - | 22.204 | - | - | 22.204 | 22.329 | 3.900 | 3.900 | 26.229 |
|  | Total | 127 | - | 127 | - | 22.281 | 8 | - | 22.289 | 22.416 | 4.587 | 4.587 | 27.003 |
| 2013 |  | - | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | 59 | 18 | 18 | 77 |
|  | 2 | 6 | - | 6 | - | 409 | - | - | 409 | 415 | 10.045 | 10.045 | 10.460 |
|  | 3 | 4.791 | - | 4.791 | 5 | 3.260 | 43 | - | 3.308 | 8.099 | 16.350 | 16.350 | 24.449 |
|  | 4 | 1.366 | - | 1.366 | - | 25.211 | - | - | 25.211 | 26.577 | 20.537 | 20.537 | 47.114 |
|  | Total | 6.163 | - | 6.163 | 5 | 28.939 | 43 | - | 28.987 | 35.150 | 46.950 | 46.950 | 82.100 |
| 2014 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1.318 | - | - | 1.318 | 1.318 | 6 | 6 | 1.324 |
|  | 2 | 62 | - | 62 | - | - | 2 | - | 2 | 64 | 3.146 | 3.146 | 3.210 |
|  |  | 492 | - | 492 | - | 5.606 | 20 | - | 5.626 | 6.118 | 7.252 | 7.252 | 13.370 |
|  | 4 |  | - |  | - | 18.006 | - | - | 18.006 | 18.006 | 8.260 | 8.260 | 26.266 |
|  | Total | 554 | - | 554 | - | 24.930 | 22 | - | 24.952 | 25.506 | 18.664 | 18.664 | 44.170 |
| 2015 | 1 | - | - | - | 21 | 305 | - | - | 326 | 326 | 268 | 268 | 594 |
|  | 2 | 2 | - | 21 | - | 549 | - | - | 549 | 551 | 6.812 | 6.812 | 7.363 |

Table 4
NORWAY POUT in IV and IIIaN (Skagerrak). Catch in numbers at age by quarter (millions). SOP is given in tonnes. Data for 1990 were estimated within the SXSA program used in the 1996 assessment.

| Age | Year Quarter | $\begin{array}{r} 1983 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 2 | 3 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 1984 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 2 | 3 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 1985 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 446 | 2671 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2231 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 678 |
| 1 |  | 4.207 | 1826 | 5825 | 4296 | 2.759 | 2252 | 5290 | 3492 | 2.264 | 857 | 1400 | 2991 |
| 2 |  | 1.297 | 1234 | 1574 | 379 | 1.375 | 1165 | 1683 | 734 | 1.364 | 145 | 793 | 174 |
| 3 |  | 15 | 10 | 17 | 7 | 143 | 269 | 8 | 0 | 192 | 13 | 19 | 0 |
| 4+ |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SOP |  | 58587 | 69964 | 216106 | 131207 | 56790 | 56532 | 152291 | 110942 | 57464 | 15509 | 62489 | 92017 |
| Age | Year | 1986 |  |  |  | 1987 |  |  |  | 1988 |  |  |  |
|  | Quarter | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5572 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 227 | 0 | 0 | 741 | 3146 |
| 1 |  | 396 | 260 | 1186 | 1791 | 2687 | 1075 | 1627 | 2151 | 249 | 95 | 183 | 632 |
| 2 |  | 1069 | 87 | 245 | 39 | 401 | 60 | 171 | 233 | 700 | 74 | 250 | 405 |
| 3 |  | 72 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4+ |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SOP |  | 37889 | 7657 | 45085 | 89993 | 33894 | 15435 | 38729 | 60847 | 22181 | 3559 | 21793 | 61762 |
| Age | Year | 1989 |  |  |  | 1990 |  |  |  | 1991 |  |  |  |
|  | Quarter | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 159 | 4854 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 993 | 0 | 0 | 734 | 3486 |
| 1 |  | 1736 | 678 | 1672 | 1741 | 1840 | 1780 | 971 | 1181 | 1501 | 636 | 1519 | 1048 |
| 2 |  | 48 | 133 | 266 | 93 | 584 | 572 | 185 | 116 | 1336 | 404 | 215 | 187 |
| 3 |  | 6 | 6 | 5 | 13 | 20 | 19 | 6 | 4 | 93 | 19 | 22 | 18 |
| $4+$ |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SOP |  | 15379 | 13234 | 55066 | 82880 | 28287 | 39713 | 26156 | 45242 | 42776 | 20786 | 62518 | 64380 |
| Age | Year | 1992 |  |  |  | 1993 |  |  |  | 1994 |  |  |  |
|  | Quarter | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 879 | 954 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 1175 | 0 | 0 | 647 | 4238 |
| 1 |  | 3556 | 1522 | 3457 | 2784 | 1942 | 813 | 1147 | 1050 | 1975 | 372 | 1029 | 1148 |
| 2 |  | 1086 | 293 | 389 | 267 | 699 | 473 | 912 | 445 | 591 | 285 | 421 | 134 |
| 3 |  | 118 | 20 | 1 | 2 | 15 | 58 | 19 | 2 | 56 | 29 | 71 | 0 |
| $4+$ |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SOP |  | 64224 | 27973 | 114122 | 96177 | 36206 | 29291 | 62290 | 53470 | 34575 | 15373 | 53799 | 79838 |
| Age | Year | 1995 |  |  |  | 1996 |  |  |  | 1997 |  |  |  |
|  | Quarter | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 700 | 1692 | 0 | 0 | 724 | 2517 | 0 | 0 | 109 | 343 |
| 1 |  | 3992 | 1905 | 2545 | 3348 | 535 | 560 | 1043 | 650 | 672 | 99 | 3090 | 1922 |
| 2 |  | 240 | 256 | 47 | 59 | 772 | 201 | 1002 | 333 | 325 | 131 | 372 | 207 |
| 3 |  | 6 | 32 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 38 | 37 | 0 | 79 | 119 | 105 | 35 |
| 4+ |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SOP |  | 36942 | 28019 | 69763 | 97048 | 21888 | 13366 | 74631 | 46194 | 15320 | 8708 | 78809 | 54100 |
| Age | Year | 1998 |  |  |  | 1999 |  |  |  | 2000 |  |  |  |
|  | Quarter | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 94 | 339 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 1127 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 302 |
| 1 |  | 261 | 210 | 411 | 531 | 202 | 318 | 1298 | 576 | 653 | 280 | 1368 | 4616 |
| 2 |  | 690 | 310 | 332 | 215 | 128 | 220 | 338 | 160 | 185 | 207 | 266 | 245 |
| 3 |  | 47 | 18 | 2 | 13 | 73 | 93 | 35 | 23 | 3 | 48 | 20 | 6 |
| 4+ |  | 8 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SOP |  | 19562 | 12026 | 20866 | 22830 | 7833 | 12535 | 41445 | 30497 | 10207 | 11589 | 44173 | 119001 |
| Age | Year | 2001 |  |  |  | 2002 |  |  |  | 2003 |  |  |  |
|  | Quarter | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 32 | 368 | 0 | 0 | 340 | 290 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 |
| 1 |  | 220 | 133 | 122 | 267 | 485 | 351 | 621 | 473 | 59 | 64 | 191 | 54 |
| 2 |  | 845 | 246 | 27 | 439 | 148 | 24 | 284 | 347 | 76 | 49 | 121 | 161 |
| 3 |  | 35 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 17 | 5 | 24 | 26 | 22 | 25 | 16 | 32 |
| 4+ |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| SOP |  | 21400 | 11778 | 4630 | 26565 | 8553 | 6686 | 32922 | 28947 | 3190 | 3106 | 10842 | 7549 |
| Age | Year | 2004 |  |  |  | 2005 |  |  |  | 2006 |  |  |  |
|  | Quarter | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 14 | 57 | * | * | * | * |  |  | 10 | 368 |
| 1 |  | 13 | 4 | 51 | 100 | * | * | * | * | 30 | 56 | 130 | 1086 |
| 2 |  | 55 | 16 | 51 | 78 | * | * | * | * | 52 | 45 | 65 | 50 |
| 3 |  | 9 | 6 | 7 | 2 | * | * | * | * | 9 | 24 | 7 | 1 |
| $4+$ |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | * | * | * | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SOP |  | 2040 | 667 | 4018 | 6762 | 8 | 8 | 13 | 13 | 2205 | 2848 | 6551 | 34949 |
| Age | Year | 2007 |  |  |  | 2008 |  |  |  | 2009 |  |  |  |
|  | Quarter | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1179 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 12 |
| 1 |  | 20 | 41 | 32 | 10 | 5 | 54 | 166 | 438 | 50 | 36 | 621 | 169 |
| 2 |  | 43 | 26 | 16 | 6 | 10 | 41 | 115 | 31 | 1 | 47 | 613 | 27 |
| 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 1 |
| 4+ |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SOP |  | 1428 | 1100 | 2430 | 838 | 361 | 1840 | 8532 | 24111 | 538 | 2105 | 36661 | 6509 |
| Age | Year | 2010 |  |  |  | 2011 |  |  |  | 2012 |  |  |  |
|  | Quarter | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 135 |
| 1 |  | 6 | 799 | 1118 | 716 | 0 | 1 | 44 | 23 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 404 |
| 2 |  | 1 | 905 | 738 | 331 | 0 | 5 | 69 | 61 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 185 |
| 3 |  | 0 | 17 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 10 |
| $4+$ |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SOP |  | 198 | 40322 | 57487 | 33071 | 0 | 222 | 3749 | 2872 | 29 | 281 | 469 | 26168 |
| Age | Year | 2013 |  |  |  | 2014 |  |  |  | 2015 |  |  |  |
|  | Quarter | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |  |  |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 8 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 141 | 884 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 1 |  | 5 | 631 | 805 | 1287 | 10 | 33 | 197 | 522 | 48 | 442 |  |  |
| 2 |  | 0 | 39 | 131 | 199 | 51 | 60 | 167 | 115 | 7 | 16 |  |  |
| 3 |  | 0 | 4 | 18 | 27 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 5 |  |  |
| 4+ |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| SOP |  | 79 | 10460 | 24444 | 47126 | 1324 | 3212 | 13384 | 26244 | 594 | 7363 |  |  |



Figure 1. Landings from the small meshed Danish industrial fishery for of Norway pout by year and ICES rectangles for the period 1987-2015. The "Norway pout box" is shown on the maps.


Figure 1. (Continued).


Figure 1.
(Continued)


Figure 1. (Continued).


Figure 2. Relative proportions of total landings (catches) south of 55 degrees N and 57 degrees N in the Danish Norway pout fishery, as well as the proportion of unallocated landings.


Figure 3. Landings of Norway pout by year and ICES rectangles for the period 1995-2003. Landings include Danish and Norwegian landing for the whole period. The area of the circles represents landings by rectangle. All rectangle landings are scaled to the largest rectangle landings shown at the 1995 map. The "Norway pout box" and the boundary between the EU and the Norwegian EEZ are shown on the map. (From Anon. 2005 and ICES 2007).


Figure 4. Distribution of landings from the small meshed Danish industrial fishery for Norway pout by year, quarter, ICES rectangles, and metier for selected years in the period 19872015. The "Norway pout box" is shown on the maps.


Figure $4 . \quad$ (Continued).


Figure $4 . \quad$ (Continued).


Figure $4 . \quad$ (Continued).


Figure $4 . \quad$ (Continued).


Figure 4. (Continued). Average landings by metier in the period 2004-2015 by area (IV = North Sea; IIIa = Skagerrak-Kattegat) for the Danish small meshed fishery targeting Norway pout.


Figure 5. Average Danish and Norwegian landings of Norway pout by quarter of the year and ICES rectangles for the period 1994-2003. The area of the circles represents landings by rectangle. All rectangle landings are scaled to the largest rectangle landings shown at the quarter 1 map. (From Anon. 2005 and ICES 2007).


Figure 6. Quarterly distribution of Danish landings by year. (Based on data from the ICES WGNSSK September 2015 Norway pout assessment).


Figure 7. Quarterly distribution of combined Danish and Norwegian landings by year. (Based on data from the ICES WGNSSK September 2015 Norway pout assessment).


Figure 8. Fishing power and catch efficiency comparison between vessel groups. Catch rates (ton/fishing day) for the small meshed Danish industrial fishery for of Norway pout by year, ICES rectangles, metier, and engine horse power class for selected years in the period 1987-2015. The "Norway pout box" is shown on the maps.


Figure 8. (Continued).


Figure 8. (Continued).


Figure 8. (Continued).


Figure 8. (Continued).


Figure 8. (Continued).

## A.3. Sampling of the Danish Targeted Norway pout Fishery

## Sampling scheme, procedures and background

The EU Data Collection Regulation (DCR), i.e. the EU Regulation (EU1639/2001), was implemented in 2002. On national basis the existing data collection programmes were accordingly further developed to be more uniform programmes across EU which affected the market sampling procedures for the EU fisheries. According to the DCR, minimum levels of data collection by species were set where a minimum number of market samples per tonnes of landing were required. The national market sampling programmes have been adjusted accordingly. In general, there was set a level of minimum 1 sample per 1000 tonnes landed for Norway pout in the North Sea and Skagerrak-Kattegat. Furthermore, each country was obliged to sample foreign vessels landing in their country.

The DRC was revised in 2008 where a new Data Collection Framework (DCF) under the Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008 (EU 2008a) came into force from 2009 and has been the legal basis until 2017. The implementation decision to the DCF is given in the Commission Decision EC No. 2008/949/EC (EU 2008b). The EC No. 2008/949/EC regulation gives all the details on how the national data collection programs should be set up. The sampling of the Danish fishery data is conducted according to the standards set in this regulation and described in the Danish National Programme for Collection of Fisheries Data (2011-2013) and the Annual Report on the Danish National Data Collection Program (2015 last version). This sampling programme of the Danish fishery has been in force and conducted in the period from 2008/2009 to 2016, however, there will be introduced a new implementation regulation of the EC No 199/2008 regulation from 2017 onwards. The description of this current sampling according to the DCF Programmes and the annual reports are available from the EU Commission web-site https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/ and summarised below. Discard sampling of Danish human consumption fishery including the small meshed shrimp fishery where small by-catches of Norway pout is taken is described in Storr-Poulsen et al. (2012).

The Norway pout assessment includes landings (catch) data from the period 1983 onwards. Besides the logbook information reported from the fishery there has been harbour samplings of the Danish commercial small meshed fishery during the whole period since 1983. The trawl fisheries targeting small demersal fish (OTB_DEF_1631_0_0 up to 2011 and OTB_DEF_16_31_2_35 form 2012 onwards), i.e. the bottom trawl fishery targeting small demersal fish in the North Sea which is a Norway pout fishery, is in the sampling process a metier which in IV +VIIId is not merged with other metiers. The metier is sampled concurrently in harbours/at markets by purchasing unsorted samples (https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/). The fishery is for Norway pout and no discard occur in the fishery as all catches are landed unsorted and used for fish meal and oil production. Therefore, catches are sampled in the harbours. This minimizes the costs for sampling. It is not physical possible for the vessels participating in this fishery to discard the catches when it has been taken on board.

Sampling scheme 1 is applied (https://datacollection.irc.ec.europa.eu/) - see below. In relation to the harbour sampling of landings for reduction purposes the industrial fishery is divided into four types of fisheries; the sandeel fishery, the sprat fishery, the Norway pout fishery and the blue whiting fishery. According to sampling scheme 1 there is collected information of landing by all species caught and length measurements are made for all species. From the industrial landings representative samples are taken from the landings, and the fish in the samples are length measured, weighted, aged and maturity determined. The sampling is stratified by quarter and subdivision. Typically, there is taken at least one sample for every 1000 ton of landings.

Sampling of landings and data acquisition: According to the legislation information on fish and shellfish sold in Danish harbours has to be reported to the Danish AgriFish Agency. The registration and information duty applies to the following persons and parties:

- Storage warehouses, cold storage warehouses, or other establishments receiving fish and shellfish with purpose for sale, storage, sorting, or other liking treatments before the fish is sold to first hand buyers.
- Persons or parties that as a part of their trade buy fish directly from the fishermen for sale purposes on the home-market, export including transistation, for conservation purposes or processing for later sale.
- Persons or parties receiving fish directly from the fishermen in cases where the sale has taken place before the landing of the fish.
- Fishermen selling the catch directly to the consumer, lands it directly in a foreign country, export it including transit or process the fish from own landing.

Therefore, all information on sold fish and shellfish are registered and all these information are stored in the Sales Notes database which is a computerized database and includes among others the following information:

- Vessel number.
- Landing place and buyer.
- Species and size-class.
- Quality and purpose (e.g. human consumption).
- Weight in kilo and value in national currency (exchanged to DKK)

The information in the Sales Notes database is at present registered according to the provisions of Council Regulation (EC) No 1224/2009 and No 404/2011 (previously according to Regulation EC No 2847/93 and No $104 / 2000$ ). Conversion factors for raising from gutted weight to live weight is estimated. It should be noted that all landings are recorded and there is no derogation for vessels less than 10 meters. This means, a $100 \%$ coverage for all landings including all other countries flagged vessels landing in Denmark.

The Danish fishery can be divided into two categories: A fishery with landings only for human consumption purposes and the so-called "Industrial fishery", where all the landings are made for reduction purposes (fish meal and oil).

Collecting data on landings designated reduction purposes: For landings made for reduction purposes only the target-species is registered. Therefore, the Sales Notes database does not contain reliable information on bycatches taken by industrial fishing fleet. In order to be able to estimate species composition of the industrial landings additional information has to be collected. The method and data used in estimation of landings by species is described in the following.

The objective of the Danish sampling scheme for industrial landings is to collect data needed for estimation of the species composition of landings by statistical rectangle and month and for the collection of biological parameters such as length, weight and age by species landed.

A number of random sub-samples are taken from the landings by the fisheries control authorities. The samples are sorted and weighted by species. The information registered includes e.g.:

- The vessel number.
- Landing harbour and landing date.
- Total landing in kilos.
- Total weight in grams per sample.
- Weight in grams per species.

In addition to the above-mentioned samples, fisheries control authorities collects a number of samples, which are delivered to DTU Aqua. These samples are sorted by species and each species is length measured, weighed and selected species are aged.

The species composition of the landings is derived by metier (the Norway pout fishery, the sprat fishery and the sandeel fishery) as follows: The total landings for reduction purposes by month and area are calculated using the sales note database. The landings are then allocated to statistical rectangle using the relative geographical
distribution from the logbook database of landings identified as have been taken for reduction purposes. The output is the total industrial landings by statistical rectangle and month.

The relative species composition by statistical rectangle and month is estimated using the information in the species composition and biological databases. An average composition by rectangle is estimated as the mean of all samples from the rectangle. If more than one sample is taken from the same landing, a mean composition of the landing is calculated and treated as one sample.

After calculation of average composition by rectangle a new average composition is calculated taking into account the species composition in all neighbouring rectangles. Taking the mean species composition of the rectangle and all 8 surrounding rectangles does this.

The total landings by species, statistical rectangle and month are calculated using the estimated species composition and total landings by rectangle and month.

The estimation procedure is illustrated by the flow diagram below.


Total landing by ICES statistical rectangle and month


Total landings by species, ICES statistical rectangle and month

The information on landings is merged with other fishery dependent data and stored in the DFAD database

## Certainty in the sampling schemes over time

The uncertainty in the Danish Norway pout landings with respect to catch composition varies over time in the assessment period as a result of different sampling principles as well as introduction of various regulations to reduce by-catch in the fishery (see also Section 3 below).

The sampling of the Danish Norway pout fishery (as described above) has not changed in the period 2002 to 2016.

From 1988 onwards, the 9 -square system was introduced as the basic principle for estimating the catch composition in the small meshed fishery for reduction purposes in the North Sea and Skagerrak-Kattegat. This system introduced a model for selecting, using and weighing samples from the 9 surrounding squares if there were no observations/samples for a given square for given quarter. This system reduced uncertainty in the estimation of the catch composition of the landings.

From 1996 onwards, there was introduced a new randomized system for selecting vessels and fishing trips for sampling and fishing control in the harbours. This is the so-called "pling-system" where a random number generator determined which vessels and trips there should be sampled and controlled. Also this system reduced uncertainty in the estimation of the catch compositions of the landings and improved the efficiency of the fishing control. Before 1996 the sampling of the fishing trips and vessels conducting Norway pout fishery was not randomized and not as covering as the randomized and more extensively covering harbour sampling from 1996 onwards.

From 1996 onwards, the by-catch quotas for herring in the small meshed fishery for reduction purposes in respectively the North Sea and IIIa (Skagerrak-Kattegat) was introduced in the yearly EU TAC-Quota Regulations based on the yearly Agreed Records between EU and Norway (see Section 3 below). This was introduced as a by-catch ceiling which from 1996 onwards resulted in setting an actual yearly by-catch quota of herring. These by-catch quotas were introduced in 1996 because of very high fishing pressure on the North Sea herring stock in this period.

In July 1996, the herring by-catch rules were tightened up in the EU Member States. Denmark implemented a $10 \%$ by-catch limit. In 1999, the (EC) No 1434/98 specifying conditions under which herring may be landed for industrial purposes other than direct human consumption was implemented. Though, Denmark maintained the $10 \%$ limit. This national limit was year later adjusted to the EU rules. The EU rules specified $20 \%$ herring bycatch in the North Sea (ICES Div. IV) and 10\% bycatch in Skagerrak-Kattegat (ICES Div. IIIa). When by-catch ceilings was changed to by-catch quotas in 2013, the by-catch rules were repealed and instead the target species rules according to the technical measures /(EC) No 950/98 was used to limit the by-catches.

In 2015, the landing obligation in EU industrial fisheries was implemented (see below and Section 3) and the (EC) No 1434/98 was repealed (see below).

From 1998 onwards, target species and by-catch regulations were introduced in the Danish Norway pout fishery through the establishment of the agreed EU Council and EU-Norway Bilateral Regulation of Fisheries by-catch regulations in the Norway pout fishery (e.g. EU Regulation No 850/98 (EU 1998) - see also section 3 below). Here certain target species minimum percentages were introduced according to the mesh size and mesh type regulations included as well. The by-catch regulations for small meshed fishery ( $16-31 \mathrm{~mm}$ in mesh size) in the North Sea stipulated here is that catch retained on board must consist of i) at least $90 \%$ of any mixture of two or more target species, or ii) at least $60 \%$ of any one of the target species, and no more than $5 \%$ of any mixture of cod, haddock, saithe, and no more than $15 \%$ of any mixture of certain other by-catch species. These maximum percentages of by-catch species has been in force until 2015 with introduction of the landing obligation regulations (see below and Section 3).

According to the Appendix (Bilag) 6 Note (Meddelelse) from October 2012 from the Danish Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries, according to the general rules set in the Ministry Regulation (Bekendtgoerelse) No. 1222 of 16 December 2011 § 2, it is from $15^{\text {th }}$ October 2012 obligatory for all Danish vessels participating in the targeted Norway pout fishery in the North Sea and Skagerrak-Kattegat to use a 35 mm grid in the small meshed trawl gears used in the fishery (typically with cod-end mesh sizes $16-31 \mathrm{~mm}$ ). The grid needs to be in accordance with the following technical specifications: Solid grid in steel, plastic, glass fibre or nylon with minimum 35 mm bar width, and the grid has to be mounted in a net section in front of the cod-end where it covers the full cross area of the section and with an opening which allows escapement of fish which cannot pass the grid.

In the Commission Delegated Regulation EU No 1395/2014 of 20 October 2014 establishing a discard plan for certain small pelagic fisheries and fisheries for reduction purposes in the North Sea (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OI.L .2014.370.01.0035.01.ENG). According to this Landing Obligation Regulation implemented from 1st January 2015 the percentage catch composition regulations in the Norway pout fishery were omitted. In the small meshed fishery for reduction purposes targeting industrial or small pelagic species it is not allowed to release or discard catches. All catches - disregarding catch composition - shall be taken on board and be landed. Previous regulations for these fisheries concerning maximum catch composition are accordingly no longer in force
(http://naturerhverv.dk/fileadmin/user upload/NaturErhverv/Filer/Fiskeri/Erhvervsfiskeri/Discardforbud/Vejle dning til landingsforpligtelsen - industri og pelagisk - Nordsoeen Skagerrak og Kattegat V1.pdf ). However, according to the Danish national management of the Discard Plan under the EU (Danish) TAC-Quota Regulation for 2016 (European Union Newsletter 28 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Jan. 2016 (DA) L22/87) then there can with reference to the landing obligation be included only up to $5 \%$ of whiting when maximum $9 \%$ of the Norway pout quota consists of by-catch of the species covered by Article 15, point 8, in the EU regulation EU/1380/2013.
All these by-catch regulations and gear technical measures and their enforcements have all improved the certainty of the catch composition in the Danish small meshed fishery for reduction purposes conducted in the North Sea and in Skagerrak-Kattegat.

With respect to Norwegian samplings, then the Danish and Norwegian commercial landings sampling procedures of the commercial landings, which vary significantly between the countries, were described in detail in the report of the WGNSSK meeting in September 2004 (ICES WGNSSK (2005) ICES C.M. 2005/ACFM:07). From here it appears that sampling and reporting from Norwegian vessels fishing Norway pout and blue whiting has been slightly changed in 2009 and onwards. Previously, all catch reported as Norway pout included by-catch of other species which was used as input in the assessment. These data was also the basis for the Norwegian official catch statistics reported to among other ICES. The procedure up until 2009 was that if a catch (landing) from a fishing trip consisted of more than $50 \%$ of Norway pout in weight then the full catch consisting of all species was reported as Norway pout for this landing, i.e. by-catch was included in the reported Norway pout catch. In 2009 and onwards, each catch (landing) per trip is evaluated (sorted) according to species, and the actual catch per species for each landing is reported. This increases the precision of the actual catch numbers of Norway pout from Norway. Norway pout caught both in the Norway pout fishery as well as in the blue whiting fishery are from 2009 included in the assessment, and by-catch of other species are excluded. There has not been made an analysis and thorough evaluation of the effect of this change in Norwegian sampling procedure with respect to relative change in the reported catch at age and weight at age. However, the Norwegian assessment experts evaluate that this have only minor effect on the catch at age in number and the weight at age used in the assessment as the by-catch and the actual catch has balanced each other out previously. With respect to effort data, only effort is reported for Norwegian trips with landings consisting of more than $50 \%$ Norway pout in weight for 2009 and onwards. Consequently, the procedure in estimating and reporting (average) effort data from Norway (see below) has remained unchanged according to previous years standard procedure for estimating effort data.

## A.4. BY-CATCHES IN THE NORWAY POUT FISHERY AND GEAR SELECTIVITY

## Fisheries impacts on the ecosystem

During the 1960s a significant small-mesh fishery developed for Norway pout and blue whiting in the northern North Sea. This fishery was characterized by relatively large bycatches, especially of haddock and whiting.

By-catch of herring, saithe, cod, haddock, whiting, and monkfish at various levels in the small meshed fishery in the North Sea and Skagerrak directed towards Norway pout has been documented (e.g. Degel et al., 2006, ICES CM 2007/ACFM:35, (WD 22 and section 16.5.2.2)). Especially by-catch of juvenile haddock and cod as well as larger saithe has been in focus. Recent by-catch levels in the Danish and Norwegian small meshed fisheries are given in Table 1 under Section A.1. Bycatches of these species have been low in the recent decade, and in general, the by-catch levels of these gadoids have decreased in the Norway pout fishery over the years to a present very low level of by-catch of other species (5-10\%). In Figure 9 below the by-catch and relative species distribution is shown as proportion of Norway pout, haddock and whiting in the in the Danish and Norwegian small-meshed fisheries for reduction purposes targeting Norway pout in the North Sea for the period 1974 to 2005 as estimated in 2007 (data from ICES 2007). Furthermore, Table 5 below gives by-catch levels in 2002-2005 by species in Danish and Norwegian small meshed industrial trawl fishery in the North Sea and Skagerrak areas targeting Norway pout. For Norway, the landings used for consume purposes in the small meshed fishery can only be allocated to industrial fishery for the last two years in this period.

The Danish fishery has historically used two types of trawls which gives significantly different catch rates and of Norway pout and herring. Some fishermen conduct a rather clean Norway pout fishery where they use more wide trawl gears with lower gap (trawl opening height) where they catch more Norway pout and only very few herring. Other fishermen conduct a more mixed fishery targeting Norway pout and herring where they use more pelagic trawl types with larger gap and less wideness which are more efficient towards herring.

With the aim of protecting other species (cod, haddock, saithe, whiting, and herring as well as mackerel, monkfish, squids, flatfish, gurnards, Nephrops) a row of management measures are in force for the small meshed fishery in the North Sea such as the area closures, by-catch regulations (by-catch quotas of herring and maximum by-catch percentages for gadoids and herring), minimum mesh size, selective grids/panels in the small meshed gears, and minimum landing size as described under regulations below in section 3. Technical measures to protect the above mentioned bycatch species have been maintained or improved in the directed Norway pout fishery.


Figure 9. Proportion of Norway pout, haddock and whiting in the in the Danish and Norwegian smallmeshed fisheries in the North Sea for the period 1974-2005. (From EU 2007 based on data from ICES in 2007).

Table 5. Landings (tons) per species in the Danish small meshed Norway pout fishery in the North Sea by year and quarter. Landings are divided into the part used for reduction purposes and the part used for human consumption purposes. The latter landings are included in catch in numbers of human consumption landings.

| Year Species | Purpose | Quarter 1 | Quarter 2 | Quarter 3 | Quarter 4 | Blank | Total | \% of total catch |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2005 Norway pout | Reduction |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 2004 | Reduction | 504 |  | 1474 | 5877 |  | 7855 | 87.5 |
| 2003 | Reduction |  | 45 | 1556 | 6322 |  | 7923 | 87.8 |
| 2002 | Reduction | 2,546 |  | 5,603 | 25,567 | 9,508 | 43224 | 78.6 |
| 2005 Blue whiting | Reduction |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 2004 | Reduction | 66 |  |  |  |  | 66 | 0.73 |
| 2003 | Reduction |  | 19 | 23 | 8 |  | 50 | 0.55 |
| 2002 | Reduction | 1966 |  | 589 | 950 | 1171 | 4676 | 8.50 |
| 2005 Herring |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 2004 |  | 11 |  | 422 | 304 |  | 737 | 8.21 |
| 2003 |  |  | 1 | 113 | 222 |  | 336 | 3.73 |
| 2002 |  |  |  | 217 | 2337 | 639 | 3193 | 5.81 |
| 2005 Cod | Reduction |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Hum. Con. |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 2004 | Reduction |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1.3 | 0.01 |
|  | Hum. Con. | 0.3 |  | 0.2 | 0.3 |  | 0.8 | 0.01 |
| 2003 | Reduction |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 | 0.03 |
|  | Hum. Con. |  |  | 0.5 | 0.8 |  | 1.3 | 0.01 |
| 2002 | Reduction |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 | 0.01 |
|  | Hum. Con. | 2 |  | 15.4 | 22.7 |  | 40.1 | 0.07 |
| 2005 Haddock | Reduction |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Hum. Con. |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 2004 | Reduction | 5 |  | 49 | 3 |  | 57 | 0.63 |
|  | Hum. Con. | 0.2 |  | 0.2 | 0.5 |  | 0.9 | 0.01 |
| 2003 | Reduction |  |  |  | 16 |  | 16 | 0.18 |
|  | Hum. Con. |  |  | 0.1 | 1.8 |  | 1.9 | 0.02 |
| 2002 | Reduction |  |  | 408 | 1137 |  | 1545 | 2.81 |
|  | Hum. Con. | 0.7 |  | 4.3 | 9.8 |  | 14.8 | 0.03 |
| 2005 Whiting | Reduction |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Hum. Con. |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 2004 | Reduction | 32 |  | 59 | 141 |  | 232 | 2.58 |
|  | Hum. Con. | 0.4 |  | 0.3 | 0.2 |  | 0.9 | 0.01 |
| 2003 | Reduction |  |  | 51 | 214 |  | 265 | 2.94 |
|  | Hum. Con. |  |  | 0.3 | 2 |  | 2.3 | 0.03 |
| 2002 | Reduction |  |  | 239 | 1436 |  | 1675 | 3.05 |
|  | Hum. Con. |  |  | 5.4 | 5.5 |  | 10.9 | 0.02 |
| 2005 Saithe | Reduction |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Hum. Con. |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 2004 | Reduction |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Hum. Con. | 0.7 |  | 5.8 | 4.2 |  | 10.7 | 0.12 |
| 2003 | Reduction |  | 0.4 | 4 | 22.8 |  | 27.2 | 0.30 |
|  | Hum. Con. |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 2002 | Reduction |  |  | 45 | 201 |  | 246 | 0.45 |
|  | Hum. Con. | 30 |  | 84.3 | 66.3 |  | 180.6 | 0.33 |
| 2005 Other human | Hum. Con. |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 2004 Cons. Species | Hum. Con. | 0.9 |  | 2.7 | 2.5 |  | 6.1 | 0.07 |
| 2003 | Hum. Con. |  | 0.6 | 2.2 | 6.2 |  | 9 | 0.10 |
| 2002 | Hum. Con. |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 2005 All species | All |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 2004 | All | 626 |  | 2023 | 6331 |  | 8980 | 100 |
| 2003 | All |  | 66 | 2025 | 6929 |  | 9020 | 100 |
| 2002 | All | 4511 |  | 6815 | 31887 | 11767 | 54980 | 100 |

## Gear Selective Devices to Reduce By-Catch

Review of scientific documentation show that gear selective devices can be used in the Norway pout fishery, significantly reducing by-catches of juvenile gadoids, larger gadoids, and other non-target species (Eigaard and Holst, 2004; Nielsen and Madsen, 2006, ICES CM 2007/ACFM:35, WD 23 and section 16.5.2.2; Eigaard and Nielsen, ICES CM2009/M:22; Eigaard, Hermann and Nielsen, 2012). Sorting grids are at present used in the Norwegian and Danish fishery (partly implemented as management measures for the larger vessels), but modification of the selective devices and their implementation in management is ongoing.

From 2010 grids have been used in the Norwegian fishery. From 15 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ October 2012 it has been obligatory for all Danish vessels participating in the targeted Norway pout fishery in the North Sea and Skagerrak-Kattegat to use a 35 mm grid in the small meshed trawl gears used in the fishery (typically with cod-end mesh sizes 16-31 mm ). The introduction of the sorting grid in the Danish fishery (see below) has lead to a reduction in catch rates of $5-10 \%$. The grid reduced the bycatch of gadoids by around $50 \%$ in biomass, but it remains difficult to avoid small gadoids (Eigaard et al. 2012); it also resulted in a reduction of herring bycatch. For the Norwegian fishery, area closures have had an effect on reducing by-catches in the combined Norway pout and blue whiting fishery. Introduction of selective grids in the Norwegian trawls used for this fishery has furthermore had an effect on bycatches, but some vessels do not always use this grid in the fishery (not mandatory in a part of the fishery).

Existing technical measures such as the closed Norway pout box, minimum mesh size in the fishery, and bycatch regulations to protect other species have been maintained.

## Studies on selectivity in the Norway pout fishery

Early Scottish and Danish attempts to divide haddock, whiting and herring from Norway pout by using separator panels, square mesh windows, and grids were all relatively unsuccessful. More recent Faeroese experiments with grid devices have been more successful. A $74 \%$ reduction of haddock was estimated (Zachariassen and Hjalti, 1997) and $80 \%$ overall reduction of the by-catch (Anon., 1998).

Investigations of gear specific selective devices and gear modifications to reduce un-wanted by-catch in the small meshed Norway pout fishery in the North Sea and Skagerrak have been made during sea trials in year 2000 and reported through an EU Financed Project (EU, 2002), and the results from here have been followed up upon in a scientific paper from DIFRES and CONSTAT, DK (Eigaard and Holst, 2004). Previous investigations of size selective gear devices in the Norway pout trawl fishery in the North Sea was performed by IMR Norway during sea trials in 1997-1999 also published in a scientific paper (Kvalsvik et al., 2006), as well as in a number of other earlier studies on the issue. Main results of previous investigations have been reviewed and summarized in Working Document No. 23 to the WGNSSK (2006) by Nielsen and Madsen (2006).

Danish-Norwegian fishing trials and pilot investigations were performed in autumn 2005 in order to explore by-catch- levels in the small meshed industrial trawl fishery in the North Sea targeting Norway pout. The results are given in Working Document No. 22 to the WGNSSK (2006) by Degel, Nedreaas and Nielsen (2006). The results were noisy and showed variable by-catch levels for different species. The investigations indicated spatiotemporal differences in catch levels by species in the commercial small meshed fishery for Norway pout as well as an effect of targeting and use of fishing method on the by-catches. However, these patterns are only based on results from pilot investigations. Existing logbook data and knowledge about spatio-temporal patterns in catch rates of target species and by-catch species in the fishery are at present not adequate and with high enough spatial and temporal resolution to implement management measures with respect to regulations on spatiotemporal allocation of fishing effort to reduce by-catches. With regard to diurnal differences in the catch rates of Norway pout and by-catches of other species, the few pilot investigation results indicated significant lower bycatch of Blue whiting during night hauls.

Eigaard and Holst (2004) and EU (2002) found that when testing a trawl gears with a sorting grid with a 24 mm bar distance in combination with a 108 mm (nominal) square mesh window through experimental, commercial fishery the results showed improved selectivity of the commercial trawl with catch weight reductions of haddock and whiting of 37 and $57 \%$, but also a $7 \%$ loss of Norway pout. The study showed that application of
these reduction percentages to the historical level of industrial by-catch in the North Sea lowered on average the yearly haddock by-catch from 4.3 to $2.7 \%$ of the equivalent spawning stock biomass. For whiting the theoretical reduction was from 4.8 to $2.1 \%$. The purpose of the sorting grid was to remedy the by-catch of juvenile gadoids in the industrial fishery for Norway pout, while the purpose of square mesh window was to retain larger marketable consume fish species otherwise sorted out by the grid. By-catches in this study was mainly evaluated for haddock, whiting and cod, i.e. not for all above mentioned by-catch species of concern in the Norway pout fishery. However, the experiments have shown that the by-catch of important human consumption species in the industrial fishery for Norway pout can be reduced substantially by inserting a grid system in front of the cod-end. The study also demonstrated that it is possible to retain a major part of the larger marketable fish species like whiting and haddock and at the same time maintain substantial reductions of juvenile fish of the same species. The study finally gave clear indications that further improvement of the selectivity is possible. This can be obtained by adjusting the bar distance in the grid and the mesh size in the selective window, but further research would be necessary in order to establish the optimal selective design.

The results reported in Kvalsvik et al. (2006) include results for more species of concern in the Norway pout fishery. They carried out experimental fishing with commercial vessels first testing a prototype of a grid system with different mountings of guiding panel in front of the grid and with different spacing ( 25,22 and 19 mm ) between bars, and then, secondly, testing if the mesh size in the grid section and the thickness of the bars influenced the selectivity of the grid system. Two different mesh sizes and three different thicknesses of bars were tested. Based on the first experiments, only a bar space of 22 mm were used in the later experiments. These showed respectively that a total of $94.6 \%$ (weight) of the by-catch species was sorted out with a $32.8 \%$ loss of the industrial target species, where the loss of Norway pout was around $10 \%$, and respectively that $62.4 \%$ of the bycatch species were sorted out and the loss of target species was $22 \%$, where the loss of Norway pout was around $6 \%$. When testing selectivity parameters for haddock, the main by-catch species, the parameters indicated a sharp size selection in the grid system.
In conclusion, the older experiments indicate that there is no potential in using separator devices and square mesh panels. Recent and comprehensive experiments with grid devices indicate a loss of Norway pout at around $10 \%$ or less when using a grid with a $22-24 \mathrm{~mm}$ bar distance. It is also indicated that there is a considerable loss of other industrial species being blue whiting, Argentine and horse mackerel. A substantial by-catch reduction of saithe, whiting, cod, ling, hake, mackerel, herring, haddock and tusk have been observed. The reduction in haddock by-catch is, however, lowered by the presence of smaller individuals. The Danish experiment indicates that it is possible to retain larger valuable consume fish species by using a square mesh panel in combination with the grid. Selectivity parameters have been estimated for haddock, whiting and Norway pout. These can be used for simulation scenarios including estimates of the effect of changing the bar distance in the grid. Selectivity parameters for more by-catch species would be relevant. However, the grid devices have shown to work for main by-catch species. A general problem encountered by implementing sorting grids in industrial fisheries is the very large catches handled. Durability and strength of the grid devices used under fully commercial conditions are consequently very important and needs further attention. Furthermore, handling of heavy grid devices can be problematic from some vessels. Grid devices are, nevertheless, used in most shrimp fisheries, where catches often are large.

Sorting grids in combination with square mesh panels have been shown to reduce bycatches of whiting and haddock by $57 \%$ and $37 \%$, respectively (Eigaard and Holst, 2004; Nielsen and Madsen 2006 (ICES CM 2006/ACFM:35); Eigaard and Nielsen, 2009).

The most recent study on by-catch reduction by use of selective devices in the Danish Norway pout fishery is published in Eigaard, Hermann and Nielsen 2012. Here a lightweight sorting grid was developed to reduce bycatch in the Danish small-meshed trawl fishery ( 22 mm full mesh in the cod end) for Norway pout in the North Sea. Experimental fishing with the grid demonstrated the possibility to capture Norway pout with only a minimum of unintended bycatch. Fishing with two different grid orientations, backwards and forwardsleaning, in distinct day and night hauls, resulted in an estimated release of between 88.4 and $100 \%$ of the total number of haddock (Melanogrammus aeglefinus) and whiting (Merlangius merlangus) entering the trawl.

However, bycatch reductions were not significantly different between day and night or between grid orientations, indicating that the grid rejection of haddock and whiting is not influenced by fish behaviour. The loss of the target species, Norway pout, was low(between $5.6 \%$ and $13.7 \%$ ) in comparison with the bycatch excluded, and clearly length dependent. Consequently, loss of target species would vary with the size structure of the population fished. Although results were not statistically significant, length-based analyses indicated that the grid rejection likelihood for particularly smaller Norway pout ( $<16 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) was higher when fishing with the forwards-leaning grid during the night; this might be explained by behavioural and visual aspects of the fishgrid encounter process for Norway pout.

## A.5. DISCARD OF NORWAY POUT IN FISHERIES FOR CONSUME PURPOSES

Discard levels of Norway pout in international fisheries are low as shown in Table 6 and Figure 10. It should be noted that Norway is not conducting discard sampling because of their discard ban, so the discard of Norway pout in Norwegian fisheries are not known. This is the case for both Norwegian fisheries for consume purposes and small meshed fisheries for reduction purposes. With respect to the latter there are in general no discarding in the small meshed fisheries for reduction purposes in Denmark and Norway.

Norway pout is only caught in small meshed fisheries for reduction purposes conducted by Denmark and Norway with typically $16-31 \mathrm{~mm}$ mesh size in the trawl cod end (i.e. the DEF_16-31_0_0 or DEF_16-31_2_35 or DEF_16-31_X_X metiers) or in crustacean (shrimp and Nephrops) fisheries in the northern North Sea or in Skagerrak conducted by several countries. Table 6 gives an overview of discard of Norway pout by year, metier and country during the period 2002-2015 based on imported data from InterCatch August 2016. The discard data covers fisheries for human consumption purposes, which mainly are crustacean fisheries, as there is no discard of Norway pout in small meshed fisheries (metiers) for reduction purposes conducted by Denmark and Norway. Other countries do not have small meshed fisheries for Norway pout or do not sample them. Because of the discard ban there is no discard tabulated for the Norwegian fisheries. Figure 10 gives an overview of absolute (tons) and relative (\%) proportion between discard of Norway pout in fisheries for human consumption purposes and the total landings of Norway pout in the small meshed fisheries for reduction purposes (with no discard in the latter) divided by year in the period 2002-2014. The total landings data originates from the ICES evaluated total landings of Norway pout by year as presented in the September 2015 Norway pout assessment in the ICES WGNSSK Report 2015.

Table 6. Discard of Norway pout by year, metier and country for the period 2002-2015 based on imported data from InterCatch August 2016. The discard data covers fisheries for human consumption purposes as there is no discard of Norway pout in small meshed fisheries (metiers) for reduction purposes. Because of a discard ban there is no discard in Norwegian fisheries.

| Row Labels | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FPO_CRU_0_0_0_all |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Sweden |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| GNS_DEF_>=220_0_0_all |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| GNS_DEF_100-119_0_0_all |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| GNS_DEF_120-219_0_0_all |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| GNS_DEF_120-219_0_0_all_FDF |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| GTR_DEF_all_0_0_all |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| UK (England) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| MIS_MIS_O_O_O_HC | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Denmark | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Sweden |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| MIS_MIS_0_0_0_IBC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sweden |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| OTB_CRU_32-69_0_0_all | 472 | 26 |  | 62 |  |  | 153 | 625 | 943 | 301 | 136 | 109 | 106 | 183 |
| Denmark | 472 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  | 246 | 206 | 36 | 60 | 81 | 55 | 64 |
| Sweden |  |  |  | 62 |  |  | 153 | 379 | 738 | 265 | 76 | 28 | 51 | 119 |
| OTB_CRU_32-69_2_22_all |  |  |  | 3 |  |  | 26 | 165 | 105 | 2 | 6 | 26 | 12 | 48 |
| Sweden |  |  |  | 3 |  |  | 26 | 165 | 105 | 2 | 6 | 26 | 12 | 48 |
| OTB_CRU_70-89_2_35_all | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sweden |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| OTB_CRU_70-99_0_0_all | 4 | 0 | 9 | 28 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 2027 | 996 | 1807 | 339 | 55 | 79 | 119 |
| Denmark | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| UK (England) | 3 | 0 | 8 | 17 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 11 | 11 |
| UK(Scotland) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2019 | 995 | 1805 | 333 | 53 | 68 | 108 |
| OTB_CRU_70-99_0_0_all_FDF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Denmark |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| OTB_CRU_90-119_0_0_all | 9 | 4 | 20 | 17 | 29 | 5 | 13 | 25 | 62 | 32 | 11 | 15 | 1 | 5 |
| Denmark | 9 | 2 | 20 | 15 | 29 | 5 | 8 | 21 | 62 | 30 | 11 | 12 | 1 | 3 |
| Sweden |  | 1 | 0 | 2 |  |  | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| OTB_CRU_90-119_0_0_all_FDF |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| OTB_DEF_>=120_0_0_all | 29 | 21 | 90 | 23 | 15 | 3 | 24 | 160 | 103 | 188 | 20 | 341 | 168 | 75 |
| Denmark | 28 | 20 | 90 | 23 | 15 | 3 | 22 | 6 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| UK (England) | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| UK(Scotland) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 154 | 80 | 182 | 18 | 336 | 167 | 73 |
| OTB_DEF_>=120_0_0_all_FDF |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 1 |
| Denmark |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 1 |
| UK(Scotland) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| OTB_DEF_70-99_0_0_all |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| UK (England) |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| SDN_DEF_>=120_0_0_all | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Denmark | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| SDN_DEF_>=120_0_0_all_FDF |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SSC_DEF_>=120_0_0_all | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SSC_DEF_>=120_0_0_all_FDF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Denmark |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| TBB_CRU_16-31_0_0_all |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UK (England) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| TBB_DEF_>=120_0_0_all | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Denmark | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TBB_DEF_90-99_0_0_all | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Denmark | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grand Total | 516 | 57 | 123 | 133 | 53 | 18 | 221 | 3006 | 2216 | 2336 | 522 | 552 | 376 | 431 |



Figure 10. Absolute (tons) and relative (\%) proportion between discard of Norway pout in fisheries for human consumption purposes and the total landings of Norway pout in the small meshed fisheries for reduction purposes (with no discard in the latter) divided by year in the period 2002-2014 The total landings data originates from the ICES evaluated total landings of Norway pout by year as presented in the September 2015 Norway pout assessment in the ICES WGNSSK Report 2015.

## A.6. Commercial fishery efficiency by year, quarter, metier and vessel category

Denmark, Sweden, Germany, Faroe Islands and UK (England-Wales, Scotland, N. Ireland) provide catch and effort data to the ICES InterCatch Database in standardized format for the stock and fishery, and Norway, France, Netherlands, and Belgium has from 2016 reported their catch and effort in InterCatch as well in standardized format by metier.

In Figures 11-21 the Danish commercial fishery efficiency in form of catch rates (catch per unit of effort, CPUE) in tonnes per fishing days for the Danish commercial Norway pout fishery are shown. This also include normalized catch rates to long term averages as an indicator of changes in catch efficiency over time from 19872015 of the different metiers as well as differences in catch efficiency between vessel categories (engine horse power classes) and between different seasons (quarters) of year.

The analysed CPUE data cover all Danish metiers fishing Norway pout, and all fishing trips where the catch composition in the landings (catches) have consisted of $70 \%$ or more of Norway pout. In Figure 11 the catches from the total Danish Norway pout fishery during the period 1987-2015 is shown by ICES statistical rectangle. It appears from here that the main Danish Norway pout fishery during this period has been conducted in the rectangles 45E9, 46E9, 47E9, 45F0, 46F0, 47F0, 45F1, 46F1, and 47F1 which among other includes the Fladen Ground area. In Figures 12-21 the catch efficiency of the Danish fishery from those squares are included (shown).


Figure 11. Distribution of the total Danish Norway pout catches during the period 1987-2015 by ICES statistical rectangle.

Commercial fishery catch per unit of effort by year, quarter, metier and vessel category:


Figure 12. Norway pout in IV and IIIa. Catch per unit of effort (CPUE) by metier in tonnes per fishing day per year for the Danish fishing fleet. The CPUE covers trips where more than $70 \%$ of the landings were Norway pout, and it covers all metiers fishing Norway pout.


Figure 13. Norway pout in IV and IIIa. Catch per unit of effort (CPUE) by metier normalized to long term average per year for the Danish fishing fleet. The CPUE covers trips where more than $70 \%$ of the landings were Norway pout, and it covers all metiers fishing Norway pout.


Figure 14. Norway pout in IV and IIIa. Catch per unit of effort (CPUE) by engine horse power (hp) class in tonnes per fishing day per year for the Danish fishing fleet. The CPUE covers trips where more than $70 \%$ of the landings were Norway pout, and it covers the metier OTB_DEF_16-31_0_0 only (main metier fishing Norway pout up to 2011).


Figure 15. Norway pout in IV and III. Catch per unit of effort (CPUE) by engine horse power (hp) class in tonnes per fishing day per year for the Danish fishing fleet. The CPUE covers trips where more than $70 \%$ of the landings were Norway pout, and it covers the metier OTB_DEF_16-31_2_35 only (main metier fishing Norway pout from 2012 onwards).


Figure 16. Norway pout in IV and IIIa. Catch per unit of effort (CPUE) by horse power (hp) group normalized to long term average per year for the Danish fishing fleet. The CPUE covers trips where more than $70 \%$ of the landings were Norway pout, and it covers the OTB_DEF_16-31_0_0 metier (main metier 1987-2011).


Figure 17. Norway pout in IV and IIIa. Catch per unit of effort (CPUE) by horse powr (hp) group normalized to long term average per year for the Danish fishing fleet. The CPUE covers trips where more than $70 \%$ of the landings were Norway pout, and it covers the OTB_DEF_16-31_2_35 metier (main metier 2012 onwards).


Figure 18. Norway pout in IV and IIIa. Catch per unit of effort (CPUE) by quarter of year (1-4) in tonnes per fishing day per year for the Danish fishing fleet. The CPUE covers trips where more than $70 \%$ of the landings were Norway pout, and it covers the metier OTB_DEF_16-31_0_0 only (main metier fishing Norway pout up to 2011).


Figure 19. Norway pout in IV and IIIa. Catch per unit of effort (CPUE) by quarter of year in tonnes per fishing day per year for the Danish fishing fleet. The CPUE covers trips where more than $70 \%$ of the landings were Norway pout, and it covers the metier OTB_DEF_16-31_2_35 only (main metier fishing Norway pout from 2012 onwards).


Figure 20. Norway pout in IV and IIIa. Catch per unit of effort (CPUE) by quarter of year normalized to long term average per year for the Danish fishing fleet. The CPUE covers trips where more than $70 \%$ of the landings were Norway pout, and it covers the OTB_DEF_16-31_0_0 metier (main metier 1987-2011).


Figure 21. Norway pout in IV and IIIa. Catch per unit of effort (CPUE) by quarter of year normalized to long term average per year for the Danish fishing fleet. The CPUE covers trips where more than $70 \%$ of the landings were Norway pout, and it covers the OTB_DEF_16-31_2_35 metier (main metier 2012 onwards).

## A. 7 COMMERCIAL CATCH AND EFFORT FISHERY DATA USED IN THE ASSESSMENT UP TO 2016

The SXSA seasonal assessment used up to August 2016 the combined catch and effort data from the commercial Danish and Norwegian small meshed trawler fleets fishing mainly in the northern North Sea in selected fishing areas of the total fishing area. Inclusion and exclusion of this commercial tuning fleet in the assessment was tested with the SXSA model during exploratory assessment runs at the May 2016 and August 2016 benchmark assessment (ICES WKPOUT 2016) as well as with exploratory runs with the seasonal SAM, SESAM, model during the August 2016 benchmark assessment (ICES WKPOUT 2016).

Combined CPUE indices by age and quarter for the Danish and Norwegian commercial fishery tuning fleet (including data up to 2006) is calculated from effort data obtained from the method of effort standardization of the commercial fishery tuning fleet described below and vessel category specific catches by area. CPUE is estimated on a quarterly basis for the Danish and Norwegian commercial fleets.

The resulting combined, commercial fishery CPUE data by age and quarter is presented in the input data to the yearly performed assessment. The commercial fleet data (up to 2006) are used in tuning of the assessment based on the combined and standardized Danish and Norwegian effort data and on the catch data for the commercial fishery

Commercial fishery tuning fleets:
In addition to the analyses of the commercial fishery assessment tuning fleet (including data up to 2006) as described above (effort standardization) the quarterly CPUE indices of the commercial fishery tuning fleet were analysed during the 2004 benchmark assessment:

1. The indices for the 0-group in $3^{\text {rd }}$ quarter of the year have been excluded from the commercial fishery tuning fleet. The main argumentation for doing that is that this age group indicate clear patterns in trends in catchability over the assessment period as shown in the single fleet/quarter assessment runs in section 12.3 (Figure 12.3.7), ICES WGNSSK (2005). Secondly, there is no correlation between the commercial fishery $3^{\text {rd }}$ quarter 0 -group index and the commercial fishery $4^{\text {th }}$ quarter 0 -group index, and no correlation between the $3^{\text {rd }}$ quarter commercial fishery 0 -group index in a given year with the 1 -group index of the $3^{\text {rd }}$ quarter commercial fishery the following year.
2. The $2^{\text {nd }}$ quarter indices for all age groups have been excluded from the commercial fishery tuning fleet. This is mainly because of indications of strong trends in catchability over time in the assessment period for this part of the tuning fleet for all age groups as indicated by single fleet tuning runs in the section 12.3 (Figure 12.3.7), ICES WGNSSK (2005). Also, the within quarter and between quarter correlation indices are in general relatively poor. The cohorte analyses of the $2^{\text {nd }}$ quarter commercial fishery indices indicate as well relative changes over time.

For an overview of the time series included and used by year and age in the assessment see Table 7 below.
Commercial fishery tuning fleet up until 2006
Background descriptions of the commercial fishery tuning series used (including data up to 2006) from the commercial fishery are given in the 2004 working group report (ICES WGNSSK (2005) ICES CM 2005/ACFM: 07) and the 1996 working group report (ICES CM 1997/Assess:6). The Danish catch and effort data covers the main Danish fishing grounds in the Northern North Sea including the Fladen Ground (North-Area-2) - see Figure 11 above.

Standardized effort data for both the Norwegian and Danish commercial fishery vessels are included in the assessment commercial fishery tuning fleet up until 2006.

Method of effort standardization of the commercial fishery tuning fleet
Results and parameter estimates by period from the yearly regression analysis on CPUE versus GRT for the different Danish vessel size categories are used in the effort standardization of both the Norwegian and Danish commercial fishery vessels included in the assessment tuning fleet with data up until 2006.

Background descriptions of the commercial fishery tuning series used (including data up to 2006) and methods of effort standardization of the commercial fishery between different vessel size categories and national commercial fleets are given in the 2004 working group report (ICES WGNSSK (2005) ICES CM 2005/ACFM: 07) and the 1996 working group report (ICES CM 1997/Assess:6). Previous to the 2001 assessment the effort has been standardized by vessel category (to a standard 175 GRT vessel) only using the catch rate proportions between vessel size categories within the actual year. In 2002, a new regression standardization method was introduced (see methodological description below), and the assessment was run both with and without the new standardization method (regression). The differences in results of output SSB, TSB and F between the two assessment runs were small.

With respect to further exploration of the effect of using effort standardization and using a combined Danish and Norwegian commercial fishery tuning fleet in the Norway pout assessment (including data up to 2006) different analyses have been made in relation to this in the benchmark assessment in 2004. This was done to investigate alternative standardization methods and alternative division of the commercial fishery assessment tuning fleet used in the assessment. The results of these analyses were presented to and discussed by the working group in 2004 and presented in the 2004 working group report in section 12 (ICES CM 2005/ACFM:07). Since 2002, the assessments have used output of the regression analyses using time series from 1987(1994)-most recent assessment year, where the regressions have been applied to the Danish and Norwegian commercial fishery. Effort standardization of both the Danish and the Norwegian part of the commercial fishery tuning series is performed by applying standardization factors to reported catch and effort data for the different vessel size categories. The standardization factors are obtained from regression of CPUE indices by vessel size category over years of the Danish commercial fishery tuning fleet. The number of small vessels in the Danish Norway pout fishing fleet has decreased significantly and the relative number of large vessels has increased in the more recent years. Furthermore, there were found no trends in CPUE between vessel categories over time. For these reasons the CPUE indices used in the regression has been obtained from pooled catch and effort data over the years 1994-present assessment year by vessel category in order to obtain and include estimates for all vessel categories also for the latest years where no observations exists for the smallest vessels groups.
The conclusion of the discussion in the working group of these analysis results was that further analysis and exploration of data is necessary before suggesting an alternative standardization method and alternative division of commercial fishery tuning fleets (potentially) to be used in the assessment. This should be done in a coming benchmark assessment of the stock. Among other it should be further investigated whether it is possible to split the Danish and Norwegian commercial tuning fleet, and also effects of excluding the commercial tuning fleets from the assessment should be further exploited. See also comments to future benchmarking further below.

Parameter estimates from regressions of $\ln (C P U E)$ versus $\ln$ (average GRT) by period together with estimates of standardized CPUE to the group of Danish 175 GRT industrial fishery trawlers is shown for the period 19942006 in this quality control handbook below.

The regression model used in effort standardisation is the following:
Regression models: $\mathrm{CPUE}=\mathrm{b}^{*} \mathrm{GRT}^{a}=>\ln (\mathrm{CPUE})=\ln (\mathrm{b})+\mathrm{a}^{*} \ln ((\mathrm{GRT}-50))$
Parameter estimates from regressions of $\ln (C P U E)$ versus $\ln$ (average GRT) by period together with estimates of standardized CPUE to the group of Danish 175 GRT industrial fishery trawlers is used to standardize effort in the commercial fishery tuning fleet used in the Norway pout assessment. Parameter estimates for the period 1994-2006 is the following:

| Year | Slope | Intercept | R-Square | CPUE(175 tonnes) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1994-2006$ | 0.18 | 14.05 | 0.77 | 32.76 |

## Norwegian effort data

In 1997, Norwegian effort data were revised as described in sections 13.1.3.1 and 1.3.2 of the 1997 working group report (ICES CM 1998/Assess:7). Furthermore, in the 2000 assessment Norwegian average GRT and Effort data for 1998-99 were corrected because data from ICES area IIa were included for these years in the 1998-99 assessments. Observed average GRT and effort for the Norwegian commercial fleets are given in the input data to the yearly performed assessment. This information has been put together in the report of the ICES WGNSSK meeting in 2004 (ICES WGNSSK (2005), ICES CM 2005/ACFM:07). No Norwegian effort data exist for the commercial fishery tuning fleet in 2005, the first part of 2006, and in 2007 due to closure of the fishery. Norwegian effort data for the directed Norway pout fishery in 2008 has not been prepared because the fishery has been on low level, and data for 2010-2013 has not been prepared because of introduction of selective grids in the Norwegian fishery since 2010. See also comments on benchmarking further below.

## Danish effort data

In each yearly assessment the input data as CPUE data by vessel size category and year for the Danish commercial fishery in area IVa is given. This is based on fishing trips where total catch included at least $70 \%$ Norway pout and blue whiting per trip, and where Norway pout was reported as main species in catch in the logbook per fishing day and fishing trip. There has been a relative reduction in the number and effort of small vessels and an increase for the larger vessels in the fleet in the latest years. Furthermore, it appears clearly that there is big difference in CPUE (as an indicator of fishing power) between different vessel size categories (BRT). Accordingly, standardization of effort is necessary when using a combined commercial fishery tuning fleet in the assessment including several vessel categories. Minor revisions (up-dating) of the Danish effort and catch data used in the effort standardization and as input to the tuning fleets have been made for the 2001 assessment. No Danish effort data exist for the commercial fishery tuning fleet in 2005, the first part of 2006, and in 2007 as well as the first part of 2011 and 2012 due to closure of the fishery.

## Exploration of methods for effort standardization

With respect to further exploration of the effect of using effort standardization and using a combined Danish and Norwegian commercial fishery tuning fleet in the Norway pout assessment (including data up until 2006) different analyses have been made in relation to the benchmark assessment in 2004. This was done to investigate alternative standardization methods and alternative division of the commercial fishery assessment tuning fleet used in the assessment. The results of these analyses were presented to the working group and were discussed here in 2004 (ICES CM 2005/ACFM:07).

Analysis of variance (GLM-analyses) of catch, effort and log transformed CPUE data on trip basis for the Danish commercial fishery for Norway pout during the period 1986 to 2004 showed statistical significant differences in catch rates between different GT-groups, years, quarters of years (seasons), and fishing areas, as well as statistical significant first order interaction effects between all of these variables. The detailed patterns in this variation are not clear and straight forward to conclude on.
It has so far not been possible to obtain disaggregated effort and catch data by area and vessel size (GT-group) from the Norwegian Norway pout fishery to perform similar analyses for the Norwegian fishery.
Also, it is not possible to regenerate the historical time series (before 1996) of catch numbers at age in the commercial fishery tuning fleet by nation which is only available for the combined Danish and Norwegian commercial tuning fleet. The reason for this is partly that there is no documentation of historical allocation of biological samples (mean weight at age data) to catch data (catch in weight) in the tuning fleet in order to calculate catch number at age for the period previous to 1996 for both nations, and partly because it seems impossible to obtain historical biological data for Norway pout (previous to 1996) from Norway. Alternative division of the commercial fishery tuning fleet would, thus, need new allocation of biological data to catch data for both the Danish and Norwegian fleet, and result in a significantly shorter Norwegian commercial fishery tuning fleet time series, and a historically revised Danish commercial fishery tuning fleet with new allocation of biological data to catch data. Revision of the tuning fleet would, furthermore, need analyses of possible
variation in biological mean weight at age data to be applied to different fleets, as well as of the background for and effect of this possible variation.

## Standardized effort data

The resulting combined and standardized Danish and Norwegian effort for the commercial fishery used in the assessment is presented in the input data to the yearly performed assessment, as well as the combined CPUE indices by age and quarter for the commercial fishery tuning fleet (Table 6 below).
The seasonal variation in effort data is one reason for performing a seasonal VPA.
Revision of assessment tuning fleets (survey CPUE data and commercial fishery CPUE data) in the 2004 benchmark assessment (commercial fishery tuning fleet):

Revision of the Norway pout assessment tuning fleets was performed during the 2004 benchmark assessment. The background for this, the results, and the conclusions from the analyses in relation to this are described here in the stock quality handbook as well as in the benchmark assessment in the working group report from 2004. Revision of the Norway pout assessment tuning fleets during benchmark assessment have been based partly on cohorte analyses and analyses of correlations within and between the different tuning fleet indices by age group, as well as on the results from a row of exploratory assessment runs described under section 12.3 of the 2004 benchmark assessment (ICES WGNSSK (2005)) which analyses the performance of the different tuning fleets in the assessment. The exploratory assessment runs also give indications of possible catchability patterns and trends in the fishery over time within the assessment period. The analyses of the tuning fleet indices are presented in the benchmark assessment 2004 (ICES WGNSSK (2005)) Figures 12.2.3-12.2.8 and Tables 12.2.912.2.12.

The current benchmark assessment should evaluate usefulness of using the commercial fishery tuning time series in the assessment from Danish and Norwegian commercial fishery. This should take into consideration influence on cpue and targeting in the Norway pout fishery based on the several fishing closures (several real time management closures) in recent years, introduction of selective devices in recent years being different for Norwegian and Danish fishery, different targeting in Danish and Norwegian Norway pout fisheries (Norway pout, blue whiting), as well as yearly changes in fleet efficiency given changes in vessel sizes targeting Norway pout over time.
Table 7. Overview over the resulting tuning data time series and fleets included and used in the assessment during different time periods (by year and age) in the assessment (From ICES WGNSSK 2015 Report covering the September 2015 Norway pout assessment).

Table 5.3.1 Norway pout IV \& IllaN (Skagerrak). Tuning fleets and indices used in the final 2004 benchmark assessment as well as in the 2005-2015 assessments compared to the 2003 assessment.


## 2. Distribution of the Norway pout stock in relation to the fishery

## B.1. DISTRIBUTION OF THE STOCK IN RELATION TO THE FISHERY BASED ON SURVEY DATA AND SURVEY TUNING TIME SERIES USED IN THE ASSESSMENT

## Survey tuning time series used in the Norway pout assessment

Trawl survey index time series of abundance of Norway pout by age and quarter are for the assessment period available from the ICES International Bottom Trawl Survey (IBTS Q1 and Q3) and the English Ground-fish Survey (EGFS Q3 being a part of IBTS Q3) and the Scottish Ground-fish Survey (SGFS Q3 being a part of IBTS Q3). An overview of the survey tuning time series included used by year and age in the assessment during different assessment periods is shown in Table 1 below.

The survey trawl survey indices for Norway pout are in form of standard abundance and density indices estimated as the catch per unit of effort (CPUE in number of fish per hour) by age for the international bottom trawl surveys coordinated by ICES and conducted according to ICES standard survey and sampling design (www.ices.dk).

Table 1. Norway pout IV \& IIIaN (Skagerrak). Tuning fleets and indices used in the final 2004 benchmark assessment, in the 2005-2015 assessments, as well as in the 2016 assessment, compared to the 2003 assessment. Changes marked with grey.


1) The IBTS Q1 tuning fleet has remained unchanged compared to previous years assessments and benchmark assessments.

It should be noted that in the 2014 IBTS Q1 survey, less hauls were conducted in the northern part of the North Sea than usual. This did not result in change in the log residual stock numbers, the log inverse catchabilities, and the weighting factors for computing survivors in the assessment for this survey.
2) The SGFS Q3 for age group 0 and 1 for the period 1998 and onwards has been used as tuning fleet in the assessment. The short time series is due to the change in survey design for SGFS.
The SGFS data from 1998 onwards should be used with caution due to new survey design (new vessel from 1998 and new gear and extended survey area from 1999). The 0-group indices from this survey have accordingly not been used in the assessment tuning fleet for this survey previous to the 2004 benchmark assessment. The index for the 0 -group from SGFS changed with an order of magnitude in the years after the change in survey design compared to previous years (Table 12.2.8, ICES WGNSSK (2005)).

From 2009 and onwards the SGFS changed its survey area slightly with a few more hauls in the northern North Sea and a few less hauls in the German Bight. This is not evaluated to influence the indices significantly as the indices are based on weighted sub-area averages.

In 3rd quarter 2015 and 2016 test trials were conducted in the international third quarter IBTS with 15 min duration hauls compared to 30 min duration hauls. The new 15 min test hauls have been included in the index calculation for 3rd quarter 2015 and 2016, and will potentially affect the Norway pout indices for the SGFS, the EGFS and the combined IBTS Q3 index. It has been necessary to include the 15 min hauls in the SGFS 2015 and 2016 as extensive areas (of the total SGFS survey area) are only covered with this type of hauls. Analyses of this are on-going and nothing conclusive is available at present concerning potential significant impacts of this on the indices. Preliminary analyses indicate no significant differences in catch rates of Norway pout between the 15 min hauls and the 30 min hauls in the SGFS, however, the variability is very high and there are only very few observations available.

For the September assessments up to and including 2015 the quarter 30 -group and 1-group survey indices for SGFS is back-shifted to the final season of the assessment in the terminal year, i.e. to quarter 2 of the assessment year in order to include the most recent 0-group estimate in the assessment. From 2016 with use of the SESAM model including quarter 3 information in the terminal assessment year this back shifting is not necessary.
3) The EGFS Q3 for age group 0 and 1 for the period 1992 and onwards has been used as tuning fleet in the assessment. The shorter time series is due to the change in survey design for EGFS. Furthermore, there is a good argument for excluding the age 2-3 of the EGFS as the within survey correlation between the age groups 1-2 and 2-3 is very poor while the within correlation between age groups 0-1 is good.

The EGFS data from previous to 1992 should be used with caution as the survey design shifted in 1992. This change in survey design has until 2004 been accounted for by simply multiplying all indices with a factor 3.5 for all age groups in the years previous to 1992 in order to standardize it to the later indices. The EGFS survey indices for Norway pout has been revised in the 2004 assessment compared to the previous years assessment for the 1996, 2001, 2002, and 2003 indices. In previous years assessments (before 2004) the full EGFS survey time series for all age groups have been included as an assessment tuning fleet.

In September 2015, the EGFS survey indices were revised as to incorporate the relevant primes within the Norway pout area following the IBTS Manual (2015), i.e. in the selection of the prime stations to be included in the Norway pout index calculation. The revision is described in detail in an ICES working document to ICES WGNSSK 2015 (Silva, 2015). This has changed the EGFS indices for Norway pout for all years and ages since 1992. Especially, the indices for the 0-group have changed significantly without any obvious trends over time. However, the perception of the dynamics in the stocks (e.g. strong year classes as 0 -group and also as older ages in the cohorts) seems not to have changed in relative terms. Consequently, there is consistency in this to the previous EGFS indices and in relation to the other survey indices also for Norway pout. The log inverse catchabilities in the September 2015 SXSA assessment have increased slightly for the EGFS in 2015 compared to
previous years assessments, while the weighting factors for computing survivors in the September 2015 SXSA assessment were quite similar to those from previous years SXSA assessments. Also, this seems not to have affected the log residual stock numbers.

In 3rd quarter 2015 and 2016 test trials were conducted in the international third quarter IBTS with 15 min duration hauls compared to 30 min duration hauls. The new 15 min test hauls have been included in the index calculation for 3rd quarter 2015 and 2016, and will potentially affect the Norway pout indices for the SGFS, the EGFS and the combined IBTS Q3 index. Only one 15 min test haul was included in the EGFS 2015. Analyses of this are on-going and nothing conclusive is available at present concerning potential significant impacts of this on the indices.

For the September assessments up to and including 2015 the quarter 3 0-group and 1-group survey indices for EGFS is back-shifted to the final season of the assessment in the terminal year, i.e. to quarter 2 of the assessment year in order to include the most recent 0-group estimate in the assessment. From 2016 with use of the SESAM model including quarter 3 information in the terminal assessment year this back shifting is not necessary.
4) Time series for the combined IBTS Q3 survey are only available from 1991 and onwards. The IBTS Q3 for the period 1991- onwards has been included in the assessment. This survey has a broader coverage of the Norway pout distribution area compared to the EGFS and SGFS isolated. The 3rd quarter IBTS and the EFGS and SGFS are not independent of each other as the two latter is a part of the first. Accordingly, the below changes have been made for the survey tuning index series in the 2004 benchmark assessment.

As the combined IBTS Q3 survey index is not available for the most recent year (terminal assessment year) to be used in the September seasonal assessment it has been chosen to exclude the 0 - and 1-group indices from the IBTS Q3 in order to allow inclusion of the 0- and 1-group indices from the SGFS and EGFS which are available for the most recent year in the September assessment. (Not relevant in relation to spring assessments conducted up to 2015). Accordingly, the IBTS Q3 tuning fleet for age 2 and age 3 has been included in the assessment as a new tuning fleet. As the SXSA assessment model used up to and including 2015 demands at least two age groups in order to run which is one reason for including both age 0 and age 1 under the EGFS and SGFS tuning fleets and not including age 1 in the IBTS Q3 tuning fleet.

In 3rd quarter 2015 and 2016 test trials were conducted in the international third quarter IBTS with 15 min duration hauls compared to 30 min duration hauls. The new 15 min test hauls have been included in the index calculation for 3rd quarter 2015 and 2016, and will potentially affect the Norway pout indices for the SGFS, the EGFS and the combined IBTS Q3 index. Analyses of this are on-going and nothing conclusive is available at present concerning potential significant impacts of this on the indices.

Revision of assessment tuning fleets (survey CPUE data and commercial fishery CPUE data) in the 2004 benchmark assessment:

Revision of the Norway pout assessment tuning fleets was performed during the 2004 benchmark assessment. The background for this, the results, and the conclusions from the analyses in relation to this are described in the Stock Annex (stock quality handbook) as well as in the benchmark assessment in the working group report from 2004.

Revision of the Norway pout assessment tuning fleets during benchmark assessment have been based partly on cohort analyses and analyses of correlations within and between the different tuning fleet indices by age group, as well as on the results from a row of exploratory assessment runs described under section 12.3 of the 2004 benchmark assessment (ICES WGNSSK (2005)) which analyses the performance of the different tuning fleets in the assessment. The exploratory assessment runs also give indications of possible catchability patterns and trends in the fishery over time within the assessment period. The analyses of the tuning fleet indices are presented in the benchmark assessment 2004 (ICES WGNSSK (2005) Figures 12.2.3-12.2.8 and Tables 12.2.912.2.12).

## Stock distribution according to IBTS survey data

The distribution of the Norway pout stock in the North Sea and Skagerrak-Kattegat is shown as catch per unit of effort (CPUE in number of fish per haul) by age and for all age groups combined in the ICES International Bottom Trawl Surveys (ICES IBTS) in $1^{\text {st }}$ and $3^{\text {rd }}$ quarter of the year for a 30 year period from 1985 to 2016. The data originates from downloads/extracts from the ICES DATRAS database in August 2016.

The distribution of the Norway pout stock as observed in the Quarter 1 North Sea IBTS surveys by year, (quarter), and ICES rectangle for the period 1985-2016 for age groups 1-6 Norway pout aggregated is shown in Figure 22. The distribution of stock density patterns are shown on the maps as survey catch per unit of effort (CPUE), i.e. catch rates in number of individuals per trawl hour (no of fish caught). The data used for the calculations are CPUE per age group per survey trawl haul as extracted and downloaded from the ICES DATRAS database. The mean CPUE as number per trawl hour per age group (or summed over age groups) by survey (i.e. by year and quarter) is calculated for each ICES rectangle as the mean number per hour of all hauls performed in each rectangle. The mean CPUE per rectangle are either calculated as averages per year or as averages over several years. The same is shown in Figure 23 but for the $3^{\text {rd }}$ quarter in the Quarter 3 IBTS survey for the period 1991-2015 and also including the age group 0 which is observed representatively in the third quarter IBTS survey as well. In general, the main abundance consists of 1- and 2-group fish in the surveys because of high natural mortality and gear selectivity (see also Nielsen 2016 - Working Document to WKPOUT 2016) which are also the main age groups caught in the commercial fishery. There is only very limited fishery on 0 -group (very small catches).

In the previous sections of the present paper the distribution of the commercial Norway pout fishery has not been shown on age disaggregated basis, but aggregated over ages. When compared to the survey based distribution patterns of the stock, also aggregated over ages, then it appears that the fishery in general is mainly concentrated in the northern North Sea where also the highest densities and abundances of Norway pout occur for all years and quarters during the investigated 30 year period. The distribution by age group of Norway pout is given in Nielsen (2016 - Working Document to WKPOUT) where it is investigated whether the stock has changed its distribution over time for different life stages and seasonal patterns herein.

The IBTS mean CPUE (numbers per hour) by quarter as an average for the full period 1991-2004 is shown in Figure 24 where the boundary between the EU and the Norwegian EEZ are included on the map as well.

Finally, the positions fished at the International Bottom Trawl Survey (IBTS) first quarter and the mean CPUE (numbers) of Norway pout by rectangle for the full period 1981-1999 is shown in Figure 25. The standard area used to calculate abundance indices and the 200 m depth contour is also shown.


Figure 22. Catch per unit of effort (No/h) of Norway pout by year, (quarter), age, and ICES rectangles for the IBTS Quarter 1 survey in the period 1985-2016. The "Norway pout box" is shown on the maps.


Figure 22. (Continued).


Figure 22. (Continued).


Figure 22. (Continued).


Figure 22. (Continued).


Figure 23. Catch per unit of effort (No/h) of Norway pout by year, (quarter), age, and ICES rectangles for the IBTS Quarter 3 survey in the period 1991-2015. The "Norway pout box" is shown on the maps.
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Figure 24. IBTS mean CPUE (numbers per hour) by quarter during the period 1991-2004. The area of the circles is proportional to CPUE. The IBTS surveys do only cover areas within the 200 m depth zone. The "Norway pout box" and the boundary between the EU and the Norwegian EEZ are shown on the map. The maps are scaled individually. (From EU 2007).


Figure 25. Positions fished at the International Bottom Trawl Survey (IBTS) first quarter and mean CPUE (numbers) of Norway pout by rectangle, 1981-1999. The standard area used to calculate abundance indices and the 200 m depth contour is also shown [from Sparholt et al., 2002b].

## 3. Relevant fishery regulations for the Norway pout fishery

## C. 1 Overview of some recent management measures and regulations relevant for the Norway pout fishery and stock:

The Norway pout fishery is regulated by Total Allowable Catch (TAC), i.e. catch quotas, effort ceilings, as well as a row of technical measures and by-catch regulations. In order to protect other species (cod, haddock, saithe, whiting, and herring as well as mackerel, monkfish, squids, flatfish, gurnards, Nephrops) there is a row of technical management measures in force for the small meshed fishery in the North Sea such as area closures, minimum mesh size, selective grids/panels in the small meshed gears, as well as by-catch regulations (by-catch quotas of herring and maximum by-catch percentages for gadoids and herring) and minimum landing size regulations. An overview of relevant regulations for the Norway pout fishery and stock is given below.

## TAC and catch quota regulations:

According to the yearly EU TAC-Quota Regulations based on the yearly Agreed Records between EU and Norway (e.g. TAC and Quota Regulations (2341/2002, 2287/2003, 27/2005) there is set an annual TAC for Norway pout. An overview of the management advice forming basis for the setting of the TAC is shown in Table 8 and the actual quotas are shown in Table 9.

Table 8. The management advice that forms basis for setting of the TAC for Norway pout in Subarea IV and Division IIIa, i.e. the basis of the assessment.

| ICES stock data category | 1 (ICES, 2015b). |
| :--- | :--- |
| Assessment type | Age-based analytical (seasonal XSA, SXSA). |
| Input data | Commercial catches (quarterly catches; ages and mean weight-at-age from catch sam- <br> pling of mainly Danish and Norwegian fishery), four survey indices (IBTS Q1\&3, <br> EngGFS-IBTS-Q3, ScoGFS-IBTS-Q3), three commercial indices (CFQ1,Q3,Q4, until <br> 2006). Annual maturity data from commercial catch sampling, natural mortality from <br> survey indices (IBTS Q1\&3). |
| Discards and bycatch | Discards and bycatch of Norway pout considered negligible; not included in the as- <br> sessment. |
| Indicators | None. |
| Other information | None. |
| Working group | Working Group on the Assessment of Demersal Stocks in the North Sea and Skager- <br> rak (WGNSSK). |

Table 9. Norway pout in Subarea IV and Division IIIa. History of ICES advice, the agreed TAC (quotas), official catches, and ICES estimates of catch. All weights are in thousand tonnes.

| Year | ICES advice | Pred. catch <br> corresp. to <br> advice | TAC Norway | TAC <br> EU* | Offi- <br> cial <br> catch | ICES <br> catch |
| :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1987 | No advice | - | No TAC | 200 | 215 | 147 |
| 1988 | No advice | - | No TAC | 200 | 187 | 102 |
| 1989 | No advice | - | No TAC | 200 | 276 | 167 |
| 1990 | No advice | - | No TAC | 200 | 212 | 140 |
| 1991 | No advice | - | No TAC | 200 | 223 | 155 |
| 1992 | No advice | - | No TAC | 200 | 335 | 255 |


| 1993 | No advice | - | No TAC | 220 | 241 | 176 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1994 | No advice | - | No TAC | 220 | 214 | 176 |
| 1995 | Can sustain current F | - | No TAC | 180 | 289 | 181 |
| 1996 | Can sustain current F; take bycatches into consid. | - | No TAC | 220 | 197 | 122 |
| 1997 | Can sustain current F; take bycatches into consid. | - | No TAC | 220 | 155 | 133 |
| 1998 | Can sustain current F; take bycatches into consid. | - | No TAC | 220 | 72 | 62 |
| 1999 | Can sustain current F; take bycatches into consid. | - | No TAC | 220 | 93 | 85 |
| 2000 | Can sustain current F; take bycatches into consid. | - | No TAC | 220 | 182 | 175 |
| 2001 | Can sustain current F; take bycatches into consid. | - | No TAC | 211.2 | 63 | 57 |
| 2002 | Can sustain current F; take bycatches into consid. | - | No TAC | 198 | 93 | 74 |
| 2003 | Can sustain current F; take bycatches into consid. | - | No TAC | 198 | 24 | 21 |
| 2004 | The stock is in risk of decreasing below Blim | - | No TAC | 198 | 16 | 14 |
| 2005 | Fishery should be closed |  | Only bycatch | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 2006 | Fishery closed until 4th August where a TAC of 95000 t was set. |  | No TAC | 95 | 54 | 47 |
| 2007 | Fishery closed because SSB < Bpa in 2008. | 0 | Only bycatch | 5 | 6 | 6 |
| 2008 | $\mathrm{F}=0.35$ or 50000 t for first half of 2008 | $\begin{array}{r} <50 \text { in } 1 \text { st } 6 \\ \text { months } \end{array}$ |  | 41 |  |  |
| In-year ** | Maintain SSB > $\mathrm{Bpa}_{\text {pa }}$ | < 148 | 80 | 114.6 | 39 | 36 |
| 2009 | Reduce F to increase SSB $>\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{pa}}$ | $<35$ |  | 28.3 |  |  |
| In-year ** | Maintain SSB > B ${ }_{\text {pa }}$ | $<157$ | 128 | 116.3 | 55 | 56 |
| 2010 | Maintain SSB > B ${ }_{\text {pa }}$ | <307 | 86 | 76 |  |  |
| In-year ** | Maintain SSB > MSY Bescapement | < 434 |  | 163 | 137 | 126 |
| 2011 | No directed fisheries | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| In-year ** | Maintain SSB > MSY Bescapement | $<6$ | 3 | 4.5 | 7 | 7 |
| 2012 | No fisheries | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |
| In-year ** | No fisheries | 0 |  |  | 30 | 27 |
| In-year *** | Maintain SSB > MSY Bescapement | <101 | 25 | 70.7 |  |  |
| 2013 | Maintain SSB > MSY Bescapement | $\begin{array}{r} <458, C_{12}=0 \\ <393, C_{12} \\ =101 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 157 | 165.7 | 82 | 82 |
| In-year ** | Maintain SSB > MSY Bescapement | < 457 |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | Maintain SSB > MSY Bescapement | $<216$ | 108 | 128.3 |  | 44 |
| In-year ** | Maintain SSB > MSY Bescapement | <108 | 123 |  |  |  |
| 2015 | Precautionary considerations ( $\mathrm{F}=0.6$ ) | <326 | 163 | 150 |  |  |
| 2016 | MSY approach (escapement biomass with $\mathrm{F}_{\text {cap }}$ ) | <390 |  |  |  |  |

* Divisions IIII(EU) and IIIa, and Subarea IV(EU).
** For Norway pout preliminary advice was given in autumn, while the in-year advice was given in June on the basis of the first surveys and catches in the TAC year.
*** Update of in-year advice in October 2012.

For the Danish demersal fishery there is on national basis introduced individual transferable catch quotas in form of a vessel quota shares which is also practiced in the Danish Norway pout fishery from 2007 onwards.

## Effort Regulation and Effort Ceilings

Effort limits in terms of Days-at-Sea: Since 2003, the EU Community has limited the number of days that a fishing vessel can be out of port and fishing in the North Sea and adjacent areas. This is implemented through annexes to the TAC and Quota Regulations (e.g. 2341/2002, 2287/2003, 27/2005). Days at sea may be transferred between vessels with an adjustment for differences in engine power between the vessels. Additional days have been allocated to some member states in respect of decommissioning taking place since 2001.In Table 10 the effort ceilings for the small meshed Norway pout and sandeel fishery in the North Sea is shown for the years 2003 to 2005.

Table 10. The baseline days-at-sea allocations per month (i.e. before additions to take account of decommissioning) were as follows:

| Gear type | Otter trawl, <br> 100mm (90mm in <br> IIIa) or over | Beam trawls, <br> 80mm or over | Static <br> demersal <br> nets | Demersal <br> longlines | Otter trawls <br> 70-99mm (70-89mm <br> in Skagerrak) | Trawl fishery <br> 16-31mm |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Typical <br> target <br> species | Cod, haddock, <br> whiting | Plaice and <br> sole | Cod, turbot | Cod | Nephrops | Norway pout, <br> sandeel |
| 2003 | 9 | 15 | 16 | 19 | 25 | 23 |
| 2004 | 10 | 14 | 14 | 17 | 22 | 20 |
| 2005 | $10^{*}$ | 13 | 13 | 16 | 21 | 19 |

$\left(^{*}\right)$ - including one additional day allowable where administrative sanctions are in place.

As a result of the cod plan ( $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{EC}$ ) No 1342/2008) provisions, in particular with regard to Article 13, as well as in relation to the effort regime in context of Annex IIA to Council Regulation (EC) No 57/2011 there has been maintained effort regulation up until (and including) 2016 for regulated gears in the North Sea including the also TR3 gears which small meshed trawls with cod end mesh sizes of $16-31 \mathrm{~mm}$ belongs to. The effort ceilings are set in the yearly EU TAC and Quota Regulations according to the cod management plan for the TR3 fleet including the small meshed fisheries for reduction purposes targeting Norway pout.

## Licenses

For Norwegian vessels there is practiced a licensing scheme for vessels fishing with small mesh trawls. This has been a part of a capacity reduction scheme for vessels fishing with small mesh trawl. Accordingly, a small mesh trawl license is required to use a smaller mesh size than 16 mm in the directed fishery for sandeel in the season 15 April - 23 June. The same licence is required in order to participate in the mixed industrial fishery for blue whiting and Norway pout. The number of vessels holding such a license has been reduced substantially the latter years as a result of the capacity reduction scheme put in place in 2002. The potential number of participating vessel was about 75 vessels in 2001. By May 2005 the number of potential participants has been reduced to about 50. In 200438 vessels participated in the sandeel fishery. The number of participating vessels in 2005 was 22 as of 24 May 2005.

## By-catch regulations:

From 1996 onwards, the by-catch quotas for herring in the small meshed fishery for reduction purposes in respectively the North Sea and IIIa (Skagerrak-Kattegat) was introduced in the yearly EU TAC-Quota Regulations based on the yearly Agreed Records between EU and Norway. This was introduced as a by-catch ceiling which from 1996 onwards resulted in setting an actual yearly by-catch quota of herring. These by-catch
quotas were introduced in 1996 because of very high fishing pressure on the North Sea herring stock in this period. The development in the by-catch quotas of herring in the North Sea are shown in Table 11.
Table 11. By-catch quotas of herring in 1000 tons for the small meshed fishery for reduction purposes.

| Year <br> Before 1996 | By-catch ceiling <br> 0 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1996 | 44 |
| 1997 | 24 |
| 1998 | 22 |
| 1999 | 30 |
| 2000 | 36 |
| 2001 | 36 |
| 2002 | 36 |
| 2003 | 52 |
| 2004 | 38 |
| 2005 | 50 |
| 2006 | 43 |
| 2007 | 32 |
| 2008 | 19 |
| 2009 | 16 |
| 2010 | 14 |
| 2011 | 16 |
| 2012 | 18 |
| 2013 | 14 |
| 2014 | 13 |
| 2015 | 16 |
| 2016 | 13 |

In July 1996, the herring by-catch rules were tightened up in the EU Member States. Denmark implemented a $10 \%$ by-catch limit. In 1999, the (EC) No 1434/98 specifying conditions under which herring may be landed for industrial purposes other than direct human consumption was implemented. Though, Denmark maintained the $10 \%$ limit. This national limit was year later adjusted to the EU rules. The EU rules specified $20 \%$ herring bycatch in the North Sea (ICES Div. IV) and 10\% bycatch in Skagerrak-Kattegat (ICES Div. IIIa). When by-catch ceilings was changed to by-catch quotas in 2013, the by-catch rules were repealed and instead the target species rules according to the technical measures /(EC) No 950/98 was used to limit the by-catches.

In 2015, the landing obligation in EU industrial fisheries was implemented (see below) and the (EC) No 1434/98 was repealed (see below).

From 1998 onwards, target species and by-catch regulations were introduced in the Danish Norway pout fishery through the establishment of the agreed EU Council and EU-Norway Bilateral Regulation of Fisheries by-catch regulations in the Norway pout fishery (e.g. EU Regulation No 850/98 (EU 1998)). Here certain target species minimum percentages were introduced according to the mesh size and mesh type regulations included as well. The by-catch regulations for small meshed fishery ( $16-31 \mathrm{~mm}$ in mesh size) in the North Sea stipulated here is that catch retained on board must consist of i) at least $90 \%$ of any mixture of two or more target species, or ii) at least $60 \%$ of any one of the target species, and no more than $5 \%$ of any mixture of cod, haddock, saithe, and no more than $15 \%$ of any mixture of certain other by-catch species. These maximum percentages of by-catch species has been in force until 2015 with introduction of the landing obligation regulations (see below).
According to the Appendix (Bilag) 6 Note (Meddelelse) from October 2012 from the Danish Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries, according to the general rules set in the Ministry Regulation (Bekendtgoerelse) No. 1222 of 16 December 2011 § 2, it is from $15^{\text {th }}$ October 2012 obligatory for all Danish vessels participating in the targeted Norway pout fishery in the North Sea and Skagerrak-Kattegat to use a 35 mm grid in the small meshed trawl gears used in the fishery (typically with cod-end mesh sizes $16-31 \mathrm{~mm}$ ). The grid needs to be in accordance with the following technical specifications: Solid grid in steel, plastic, glass fibre or nylon with minimum 35 mm bar width, and the grid has to be mounted in a net section in front of the cod-end where it
covers the full cross area of the section and with an opening which allows escapement of fish which cannot pass the grid.

In the Commission Delegated Regulation EU No 1395/2014 of 20 October 2014 establishing a discard plan for certain small pelagic fisheries and fisheries for reduction purposes in the North Sea (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L .2014.370.01.0035.01.ENG). According to this Landing Obligation Regulation implemented from $1^{\text {st }}$ January 2015 the percentage catch composition regulations in the Norway pout fishery were omitted. In the small meshed fishery for reduction purposes targeting industrial or small pelagic species it is not allowed to release or discard catches. All catches - disregarding catch composition - shall be taken on board and be landed. Previous regulations for these fisheries concerning maximum catch composition are accordingly no longer in force (http://naturerhverv.dk/fileadmin/user upload/NaturErhverv/Filer/Fiskeri/Erhvervsfiskeri/Discardforbud/Vejle dning til landingsforpligtelsen - industri og pelagisk - Nordsoeen Skagerrak og Kattegat V1.pdf ) However, according to the Danish national management of the Discard Plan under the EU (Danish) TAC-Quota Regulation for 2016 (European Union Newsletter 28th Jan. 2016 (DA) L22/87) then there can with reference to the landing obligation be included only up to $5 \%$ of whiting when maximum $9 \%$ of the Norway pout quota consists of by-catch of the species covered by Article 15, point 8, in the EU regulation EU/1380/2013.

The Norwegian technical regulations are generally designed to avoid catches of non-targeted species and/or fish below the minimum size. The discard ban on commercially important species is considered a cornerstone of this policy. Norwegian technical regulations are summarised in "Regulations relating to sea-water fisheries" of 22 December 2004. This stipulates the discard ban, the percentage composition of the catch that may be legally caught according to area and type of fishing gear being used, the characteristics of fishing gear that may be used in the fishery on certain species or in different areas, the minimum catching sizes and specific measures to limit catches of fish under the minimum catching size, regulations of mesh design, mesh sizes, selectivity devices etc.

When fishing demersal species for human consumption in the North Sea with trawl or Danish seine, it is prohibited to use gear where the mesh size of any part of the gear is less than 120 mm . In the Norwegian saithe fishery in the EU zone 110 mm may be used in accordance to the EU regulation in the EU zone. In the Norwegian North Sea gill net fisheries for cod, haddock, saithe, plaice, ling, pollack and hake it is prohibited to use gill nets where the full mesh size is less than 148 mm . In the Norwegian fishery for anglerfish the minimum mesh size is 360 mm and in the halibut fishery the minimum mesh size is 470 mm .

Norway pout may only be fished as bycatch in the mixed industrial fishery in all areas under Norwegian fisheries jurisdiction

## Technical measures

## Mesh size regulations in the North Sea and adjacent areas

Use of towed nets of any size mesh is permitted, however according to the mesh size in use there is an obligation to retain only particular species of fish. These tables are a simplified synopsis of measures in Council Regulation 850/98 and Commission Regulation 2056/2001 (EU 1998).

|  | Conditions for use of towed gear (North Sea and West Scotland) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mesh size | Main target species in <br> North Sea | Synopsis of required catch percentages |
| b.) 16 to 31 mm | Norway pout, sprat | Minimum $60 \%$ of one species of Norway pout, sardine, sandeel, anchovy, eels, <br> smelt and some non-human consumption species (with no more than $5 \%$ of <br> cod, haddock or saithe, and some upper limits on the percentages of other <br> species such as mackerel, squids, flatfish, gurnards, Nephrops), or at least $90 \%$ <br> of any two or more of those species. |

According to the Appendix (Bilag) 6 Note (Meddelelse) from October 2012 from the Danish Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries, according to the general rules set in the Ministry Regulation (Bekendtgoerelse) No. 1222 of 16 December 2011 § 2, it is from $15^{\text {th }}$ October 2012 obligatory for all Danish vessels participating in the targeted Norway pout fishery in the North Sea and Skagerrak-Kattegat to use a 35 mm grid in the small meshed trawl gears used in the fishery (typically with cod-end mesh sizes $16-31 \mathrm{~mm}$ ). The grid needs to be in accordance with the following technical specifications: Solid grid in steel, plastic, glass fibre or nylon with minimum 35 mm bar width, and the grid has to be mounted in a net section in front of the cod-end where it covers the full cross area of the section and with an opening which allows escapement of fish which cannot pass the grid.

The difficulty here has been to develop a robust selective grid with smaller grid bar widths to be used in the Danish trawls in order to reduce by-catch of especially other smaller gadoids (in the areas where the Danish fishery operate) compared to the Norwegian trawls where the main aim is to reduce the by-catch of especially larger saithe in the areas where the Norwegian fishery operate.

Norway has since 2010 implemented a regulation with demand of use of selection grids with larger bar widths $(40 \mathrm{~mm})$ in trawls used for fishing Norway pout and blue whiting in order to reduce by-catches of other species, especially saithe.

## Areas closed to some fishing activities

During the 1960s a significant small meshed fishery developed for Norway pout in the northern North Sea. This fishery was characterized by relatively large by-catches, especially of haddock and whiting. In order to reduce by-catches of juvenile roundfish, the "Norway pout box" was introduced where fisheries with small meshed trawls were banned. The UK Government set up the closure in 1977, prohibiting the fishery of the small mesh size bottom trawl in the area, in order to protect the juveniles of haddock, whiting and other roundfish and to increase the recruitment. The UK Government ratified the statutory instru-ment setting up an area closure of the Norway pout fishery in Feb 1977. In 1986 the closure was included in EC legislation (Regulation 3094/86, Article 27) and further consolidated in Council Regulation (EC) 850/98.

Accordingly, the "Norway pout box" has been closed for industrial fishery for Norway pout since 1977 onwards (EC Regulation No 3094/86). The box includes roughly the area north of $56^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ and west of $1^{\circ} \mathrm{W}$ (see Figure 26). Within the Norway pout box as defined in Article 27 of Regulation (EC) 850/98 (see Appendix 2.2) it is prohibited throughout the year to retain more than $5 \%$ of the catch as Norway pout if they are caught within a large area in the northwestern North Sea (Figure 7.1). The purpose has been protection of juvenile gadoids (mainly cod, haddock, and whiting) caught in mixtures with Norway pout. An overview of the background and the goals with the Norway pout box regulation is given in Table 12.


Figure 26. Closure of an area for Norway pout to protect other roundfish (Article 27 of CR 850/89).

In the EU SGMOS meeting in 2007 (EU 2007) it was concluded that it is not possible to fully quantify the effect of the closure of the fishery inside the Norway pout box both with respect to catch rates of target and by-catch species as well as effects on the stocks (EU, 1985; 1987a; 1987b; ICES, 1979). There has not been performed fully covering evaluation of the effect of closed areas in relation to interacting effects of technological development in the fishery including changed selectivity and fishing behaviour over time in relation to by-catch rates. These effects can not readily be distinguished. Existing documentation does not allow for a full quantification of the effects of the closure of the small meshed fishery inside the Norway pout box. Before the closure, the Danish and Faeroes fisheries mainly took place in the northwestern North Sea and the Norwegian fishery in the Norwegian Trench (ICES 1977; EU 2007). Based on IBTS samples for the period 1991-2004 (Figure 6.2 in EU 2007), $30.0 \%$ and $27.5 \%$ of Norway pout numbers were estimated to be inside the Norway pout box for the first and third quarter, respectively. It should be noted that the IBTS survey does not cover depths >200 m along the Norwegian Trench, and that no fishery inside the Norway pout box may contribute to overestimation of the abundance relative to area outside).

Table 12. Background, goals and objectives of the Norway pout box.

| Area | Characteristics, Location and Seasonality | Purpose | Defined in Regulation (EC): |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Norway pout box | Prohibited to retain more than $5 \%$ of the catch as Norway pout if they are caught within an area boounded by $56^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ and the UK coast, $58^{\circ} \mathrm{N} 2^{\circ} \mathrm{E}$, <br> $58^{\circ} \mathrm{N} 0^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \mathrm{W}$, <br> $59^{\circ} 15^{\prime} \mathrm{N} 0^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \mathrm{W}$, <br> $59^{\circ} 15^{\prime} \mathrm{N} 1^{\circ} \mathrm{E}$, <br> $60^{\circ} \mathrm{N} 1^{\circ} \mathrm{E}$, <br> $60^{\circ} \mathrm{N} 0^{\circ}$, <br> $60^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \mathrm{N} 0^{\circ}$, <br> $60^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \mathrm{N}$ and the coast of the Shetland Islands, $60^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ and the coast of the Shetland Islands, $60^{\circ} \mathrm{N} 3^{\circ} \mathrm{W}$, <br> $58^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \mathrm{N} 3^{\circ} \mathrm{W}$ <br> $58^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \mathrm{N}$ and the coast of the mainland UK. | Protection of juvenile gadoids (cod, haddock) caught in mixtures with Norway pout) | Article 26 of Regulation 850/98 |

Table 12. (Continued).

| Norway pout box | Goals | Specific objectives | Indices of success | Success criteria |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Establishment of the Norway pout box (1977 by the UK Government, 1986 by the EC Regulation 3094/86) <br> To protect certain roundfish species (EC 3094/86) | Article 27 of Regulation (EC) 850/98 <br> To reduce the fishing mortality on juvenile gadoids such as, haddock, cod and whiting. | To increase the recruitment of these species to human consumption fishery. <br> None explicit. <br> Disaggregated catch rates from IBTS surveys of Norway pout and juveniles of cod, whiting and haddock inside and around the Norway pout box (for preliminary distribution patterns) | Catch rates of the same species <br> from commercial fishery around the box based on further disaggregated catch data and from trial fishery with commercial vessels both inside and outside the box <br> None explicit. | Reduced fishing mortality of juvenile haddock, cod and whiting. <br> None explicit <br> Evaluation of disaggregated CPUE indices from IBTS surveys and commercial fishery inside and outside the Norway pout box, respectively, for Norway pout, cod, whiting and haddock. Provide new data for this. |

The effects of the Norway pout box are not yet thoroughly evaluated (EU 2007). Earlier attempts have proven it impossible to differentiate the effects of the box from the effects of e.g. technological advances and selectivity of gear (Anon. 1987). On the basis of analyses of catch and bycatch data in the Danish Norway pout fishery inside and outside the Box 1975-1986, it was concluded that bycatch of each age group of whiting, haddock and herring depends on location, quarter, year class strength and year within the study period (Anon. 1987). According to this study, bycatch of whiting and haddock dominated in the Norway Pout fishery, and bycatch was shown to be correlated with introduced technical measures, including the Norway pout box and the introduction of the Common Fisheries Policy in 1983. However, changes in bycatch were shown to be linked to differences in yearly and seasonal distribution of Norway pout. Thus, it was from this study not possible to separate area and seasonal effects in relation to quantifying the effect on bycatch by the Norway pout box. In addition, technological development in the industrial fisheries in this decade was not evaluated.

Additional legislation by Norway of closed areas for Norway pout fishery in the Norwegian economic zone covers the Patch Bank (closed since 2002) and the Egersund Bank (closed since 2005) where Norway pout may only be fished as bycatch in the mixed industrial fishery in all areas under Norwegian fisheries jurisdiction. Two areas in the Norwegian economic zone have been closed for fishing on Norway pout, sandeel and blue whiting (Figure 27). The approach has been to close areas where the probability of bycatches of juveniles and not-targeted species, such as cod, saithe, haddock, are considered unacceptably high. This measure could therefore also be mentioned as a measure to protect juveniles of other species than Norway pout and sandeel. As of 1 January 2002 the Patch Bank was permanently closed. Before the closure of the Patch Bank an annual average of approximately 2.000 tonnes of Norway pout were fished in this area by Norwegian vessels. As from 1 May 2005 a seasonal closure of the Egersund Bank in the period 1 December to 31 May was determined.


Figure 27. Area closures for Norway pout fishery in the Norwegian economic zone in the North Sea: The Patch Bank (closed since 2002) and Egersund Bank (closed since 2005).

## Minimum landing sizes

These sizes are defined in Annex XII to Regulation 850/1998, though some changes are in effect for 2005 by means of the TAC and quota regulation (Regulation 27/2005). Here sizes for some of the main commercial species only are stated.

| Species | Minimum Landing Size in 2005, as North <br> Sea/IIIa | Regulation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Norway pout | None | $850 / 1998$ |

## 4. Quota up-take in the Norway pout fishery

The TAC was not taken in 2008-2010 and 2012-2014, while the small TAC in 2011 was taken. This was likely due to high fishing (fuel) costs in all years as well as bycatch regulations in 2009-2010 and 2013 (mainly in relation to whiting bycatch). There was only less than $30 \%$ quota uptake of the ICES adviced TAC for 2012. This low uptake may be explained by the late opening of the fishery at the end of quarter 3 in 2012. In 2013 and 2014, the quota uptake was also below $30 \%$. Individual quotas for the Danish fishery may also play a role in the uptake.

The quota uptake for Norway pout has generally been low with an average yearly uptake of $34 \%$ in Denmark. Except for the years 2010 and 2011, where the quota uptake was more than $80 \%$, then the quota uptake has been below $35 \%$. There have been extensive yearly fluctuations in the TACs set for Norway pout with resulting very variable quotas. The relative low quota uptake by Denmark can mainly be explained by the fishermen in years with concurrent high sprat occurrences and quotas in the North Sea has preferred to fish sprat compared to Norway pout because the costs per landed ton of sprat is significantly lower than the costs per ton of landed Norway pout. (Danish Ministry of Environment and Food 2016).

The quota uptake by year and species in the Danish small meshed fisheries for reduction purposes is shown in Figure 28 where sperling = Norway pout, tobis = sandeel, and brisling = sprat.


Figure 28. Quota uptake (\%) of species by year targeted in the Danish small meshed fisheries for reduction purposes. Sperling = Norway pout, tobis = sandeel, and brisling = sprat. (Danish Ministry of Environment and Food 2016).

In Figure 29 there is made a comparison in the quota uptake between Denmark and Norway by year of Norway pout.


Figure 29. Comparison of the quota uptake (\%) of Norway pout (sperling) by year between Denmark and Norway. (Danish Ministry of Environment and Food 2016).

## 5. Mean weight at ages used in the catch and in the commercial tuning fleet and in the stock

## Mean weight at age in catch

The mean weight at age in the catch is based on observations, i.e. samplings from commercial fishery (see sampling section A. 3 above), since 1984 onwards (Fig. 30). Mean weight at age in the catch is estimated as a weighted average of Danish and Norwegian data. Mean weight at age in the catch is shown in the yearly assessment reports including the historical levels, trends and seasonal variation in this. Mean landings weight at age from Danish and Norwegian fishery from 2005-2008 as well as for 2011 are uncertain because of the few observations. Missing values have been filled in using a combination of sources, values from 2004, from adjacent quarters and areas, and from other countries within the same year, for the period 2005-2008, and in first half year 2010, and for 2011 there has also been used information from other quarters. Also, mean weight at age information from Norway has in 2011 involved survey estimates. The assumptions of no changes in weight at age in catch in these years do not affect assessment output significantly because the catches in the same period were low. Mean weight at age data is available from both Danish and Norwegian fishery in 2009, second half 2010, second half 2011, second half 2012, and all of 2013, 2014 as well as in 2015 and 2016.

The mean weight at age used in the commercial tuning fleet by quarter for the period 1983-2006 in the assessments from 2006-2015 (where the commercial tuning fleet has been used in the assessment) is shown in the yearly assessment reports and in Figure 31. It appears that mean weight at age in the commercial tuning for fleet 1 for age group 2 in 4th quarter of the year is very low.

As the abundance (number of individuals) in the tuning indices as well as the number of fish in the catches by age group (catch numbers) are calculated by raising the weights of the samples with the total catch weights, the catch in numbers and the numbers of individuals in the indices are influenced directly by the mean weight at age estimates used. Accordingly, if the mean weight at age is too low then this will positively bias the abundance estimates used as input in the assessments (numbers at age in catch and CPUE in the indices).

Figure 30. NORWAY POUT IV and IIIaN (Skagerrak). Weighted mean weights at age in catch of the Danish and Norwegian commercial fishery for Norway pout by quarter of year during the period 19832015. (From the ICES WGNSSK Sep. 2015 Norway pout Assessment).


Figure 31. NORWAY POUT IV and IIIaN (Skagerrak). Trends in CPUE (normalized to unit mean) by quarterly commercial tuning fleet and survey tuning fleet used in the Norway pout SXSA assessment for each age group and all age groups together. (From the ICES WGNSSK Sep. 2015 Norway pout Assessment).


## Mean weight at age in the stock

The Inter-benchmark assessment in spring 2012 (IBPNorwayPout, ICES 2012c) introduce revised estimates of mean weight at age in the stock used in the Norway pout assessment. The background and rationale behind the revision of mean weight at age in the stock is described in the IBPNorwayPout report (ICES, 2012c) and primary literature (e.g. Lambert et al., 2009).

The same mean weight at age in the stock is used for all years, and mean weight at age in catch is partly used as estimator of weight in the stock. This has resulted in slightly changed levels of constant mean weight at ages in the stock which have been calculated partly from long term averages of mean weight at age in the catch. No major revision of mean weight at age in the stock has been performed compared to the values used in previous assessments. The estimation of mean weights at age in the catches and the used mean weights in the stock in the assessment is described above.

The revised Mean Weight at Age (MWA) in the stock used in the benchmark assessment were for the 1-, 2- and 3- groups taken as the long term averages from the commercial data. Data for MWA by quarter for age 0 were kept constant as used in the Baseline. MWA was recorded from commercial fishery catch data, but not from the IBTS, from which only length data are available. The revised MWA in the stock was applied in assessment scenario runs as obtained from long term averages measured from the commercial fishery catch. The changes in MWA were minor compared to the Baseline and did not have much impact on the assessment results.
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# Norwegian industrial fishery for Norway pout in the North Sea 
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## Summary

The Norwegian industrial trawl fishery in the North Sea is a mixed fishery carried out using demersal trawls with small meshed codend (minimum 16 mm meshes), where the main fishing areas in the Norwegian exclusive economic zone (NEEZ) are along the western part of the Norwegian Trench. In EU-waters, the fishery is carried out on the Fladen Ground and east of Shetland. Norway pout and blue whiting are the main target species, but the landings of Norway pout is typically larger than the blue whiting landings. To reduce the amount of bycatches the fishery has been regulated with area and seasonal restrictions and by-catch limitations. From 2010, selection grids have been used to reduce the by-catch of larger gadoids, however, some vessels ( 7 vessels) have been allowed to trawl without using selection grid as they are equipped to deliver larger fish for human consumption. From 2016, all vessel staffed and equipped to deliver large fish are allowed to fish without selection grid. The number of vessels with industrial trawling license has dropped over the years, from about 99 in 2002 to 29 in 2016. At the same time, the average vessel size and engine power have increased markedly.

## Description of the fishery

According to the Norwegian regulations the Norwegian industrial trawling for Norway pout can be carried out in Skagerrak and south of $64^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ in the North Sea. However, target trawling for Norway pout is not allowed north of $62^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ as the Norwegian regulations prohibit trawling with small meshed trawls for species as cod, haddock, whiting and saithe north of this latitude.

The Norway pout fishery is carried out by licensed industrial trawlers, which target blue whiting and Norway pout, often at the same trip. The license system is complex, and the different vessels have different species quotas and some vessels take out the large fish such as saithe, cod, monkfish, hake and others from the catch and deliver for human consumption. The fishing strategies differ between vessels, as some vessels take most of their blue whiting quota west of Ireland, whereas others save their quota to be able to carry out a mixed blue whiting - Norway pout fishery in the North Sea. Some vessels have also a license to target Atlantic argentine (Argentina silus) north of $62^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$. From the landing statistics it seems like some vessels also target horse mackerel, herring, blue whiting and herring in the same trip that can last as long as up to 9 days.

The landings of Norway pout are very low from January to May as the trawlers are occupied with other fisheries. After the end of the sandeel fishery in May/June, some of the industry trawlers start the Norway pout fishery.

Geographical distribution of effort by quarter is presented in Figure 1, where data are extracted from the Norwegian Directorate of Fisheries logsheet database. The maps show all hauls carried out in the period 2011-2015 for the Norwegian industrial trawlers where Norway pout or blue whiting is defined as target species and where more than 1 ton in the catch has be registered as Norway pout. From 2011, it has been mandatory for industrial trawlers (and other larger fishing vessels) to submit electronic logsheets. For the previous years, no logsheet data are electronically available for the industrial trawlers. The main trawling activity is along the western part of Norwegian Trench south of $60^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$, on Fladen ground and in the area east of Shetland (Figure 1).


Figure 1 Geographical distribution of trawl hauls where Norway pout is the target species. Information is collected from the Norwegian logsheet database. Red dots represent vessels using selection grid, and black circles are vessels that are allowed to trawl without selection grid.
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## Regulations

Many of the regulations for the Norwegian industrial trawling in the North Sea (targeting Norway pout and blue whiting) are in place to reduce the large by-catch problems. Studies show that the catch from a single fishing trip can consist of almost 40 species (Anon 2013).

## Selection grid

From 1 May 2010 all trawlers targeting Norway pout in NEEZ had to use selection grid with a grid distance of 40 mm . However, a small number of vessels ( 7 vessels) were allowed to catch Norway pout without using selection grid as they had equipment and historical tradition of take out and deliver larger fish for human consumption. From 2016, all vessels staffed and equipped to deliver large fish are allowed to fish without selection grid. A considerable number of vessels have rebuilt their onboard production line to be able to sort out large fish, and per $15^{\text {th }}$ of July 201612 vessels can fish without selection grid. Note that some vessels will test twin-trawls in 2016 to improve the catch-rates. From 2016, according to TACagreement between Norway and EU, all Norwegian industrial trawlers fishing Norway pout in EU waters (ICES area IV) have to use a selection grid with a minimum grid distance of 35 mm .

## Seasonal regulations

The industrial fishery in NEEZ in the North Sea is open from $1^{\text {st }}$ of April to $31^{\text {st }}$ of October, but some important fishing grounds have additional seasonal closures (see below) when the abundance of herring and gadoid juveniles can be high in these areas.

## Closed areas

The Egersund bank is closed for all small mesched trawl fishery 01.10 - 31.05. Implemented 1 January 2003. Until 2006 the closed season was 01.12-31.05.

Geographical position:

1. $58^{\circ} 37^{\prime} \mathrm{N} 03^{\circ} 44^{\prime} \varnothing$
2. $57^{\circ} 49^{\prime} \mathrm{N} 05^{\circ} 48^{\prime} \varnothing$
3. $57^{\circ} 33^{\prime} \mathrm{N} 05^{\circ} 02^{\prime} \varnothing$
4. $58^{\circ} 29^{\prime} \mathrm{N} 03^{\circ} 02^{\prime} \varnothing$

The Patch bank was closed for industrial trawling from 1 January 2002
Geographical position:

## By-catch limitations

The maximum bycatch of cod, haddock and saithe in industrial trawling in the North Sea is maximum $20 \%$ in weight by haul and by landing. The bycatch of herring is maximum $10 \%$, Any bycatch of herring is taken from the vessel quota. The bycatch of greater argentine is maximum $10 \%$. Maximum bycatch of monkfish is $0.5 \%$, and landing of monkfish by trip should not exceed 500 kg . Only vessels with quota of blue whiting are allowed to conduct small meshed industrial trawling.

## Official landing statistics and control of species composition

For all landings, the skipper and the representative of the landing site sign the sales note where the landing is reported by species. The sales notes form the basis of all official landing statistics. When the landing is controlled by the Directorate of Fisheries, the speciescomposition (in weight) is recorded, and the skipper and the landing-site representative get access to this measured species-composition to use in the signed sales note. If the landings are not controlled, the species composition from the electronic logbook is given at the sales notes. According to plan, about $20 \%$ of all industrial fishing landings in numbers are supposed to be controlled. However, the proportion of controlled samples has decreased in the recent years, and in some quarters no controls have been carried out at all. The low number of controls, in combination with large variation in fishing strategies make it difficult to estimate the actual catch composition taken by the Norwegian industrial trawlers in the North Sea. In addition to controls at the landing site, the Norwegian Coast guard have inspection of hauls at sea, however, these inspection is often done in areas known to problematic with regards to bycatch of herring and juveniles of gadoids.

Table 1. Problems with the Norwegian landing statistics of Norway pout

| Description | References |
| :--- | :--- |
| The species diversity in the landings notes is generally much lower <br> than observed in controls and studies. | Appendix 1 (In Norwegian). <br> Kvalsvik et al. 2006 |
| The sub-sampling of the landings is difficult, and studies show that <br> large individuals are under-represented in the samples as the sub- <br> sample device at the landing site does not sort out large fish. | "Prøvetaking av industrirastoff og <br> seddelskriving ved landing Forslag til <br> forbedringer - Forslag til forbedringer" <br> (Anno 2013) |
| Too low number of controls, and too few sub-samples when the <br> landings are small or medium. | "Prøvetaking av industriråstoff og <br> seddelskriving ved landing Forslag til <br> forbedringer - Forslag til forbedringer" <br> (Anno 2013) |
| Some of the landings are delivered in Denmark with no control of <br> the catch composition |  |

Due to the problems mentioned above, the official landings of Norway pout, blue whiting and by-catches species taken by the industrial trawlers in the North Sea cannot not be considered reliable. Furthermore, the low number of controls and problems with the sub-sampling it is difficult to estimate a trustworthy modified landing of Norway pout. The controls, and studies at sea and personal communication with people working with the controls give the impression that the official landing of Norway pout is an overestimate in years with high quotas of Norway pout.

## Effort analyses

Table 2 shows that the number of Norwegian vessel with industry trawling license has been reduced from almost 100 in 2001 to 29 in 2016. At the same time, the number of active Norway pout trawlers has been reduced from 37 to 17, and the average horse power of the active Norway pout trawlers has increased from 1205 to 3214. These numbers reflects the marked restructuring of the fleet, which makes it difficult to standardize effort for the last 15 years.

Table 2. Historical changes in number of vessels and engine powers (of those that are fishing)

| Year | No. Vessels <br> licence | with <br> No. <br> (Annual landing $>50 \mathrm{t}$ ) | Mean HP |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2001 | 97 | 37 | 1205 |
| 2002 | 99 | 39 | 1276 |
| 2003 | 74 | 22 | 1390 |
| 2004 | 70 | 16 | 1417 |
| 2005 | 68 | 2 | 1620 |
| 2006 | 57 | 24 | 2006 |
| 2007 | 58 | 16 | 1720 |
| 2008 | 45 | 10 | 1940 |
| 2009 | 43 | 15 | 2442 |
| 2010 | 41 | 29 | 2852 |
| 2011 | 39 | 6 | 2075 |
| 2012 | 36 | 13 | 2240 |
| 2013 | 35 | 27 | 2754 |
| 2014 | 36 | 17 | 2488 |
| 2015 | 30 | 17 | 3214 |
| 2016 | 29 |  |  |

Furthermore, it is difficult to normalize effort as the vessels may target different species during the same trip. Logsheet data shows that the ratio of Norway pout in a haul is seldom $100 \%$ (Figure 2), and a vessel may operate in different bottom depths targeting different species. As the Norwegian industrial fishery (exclusive the sandeel fishery) in the North Sea is a mixed species fishery, the catch rates of Norway pout is in addition to abundance of Norway pout affected by fishing strategies to utilize quotas of other species such as blue whiting, saithe, horse mackerel etc.


Figure 2. Boxplot of proportion of Norway pout by haul taken by the industry trawlers where the target species is blue whiting or Norway pout and the catch of Norway pout is $>1000 \mathrm{~kg}$ by haul.
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## Innledning

Fiskeridirektoratet (FDir) startet et prosjekt i 2014 på kartlegging av artssammensetning og lengdefordeling om bord på fartøy som tråler etter industrifisk som landes til mel- og oljeproduksjon. Prosjektledere har vært Robert Misund og Geir Blom. Fra juli i år har det blitt gjennomført tokt om bord på tre ulike fartøy som har dispensasjon fra ristpåbudet. Denne dispensasjonsordningen innebærer at fisk som er egnet til konsum skal sorteres ut og sløyes, og resten går på tank. Fiskearter som normalt benyttes til konsum er: sei, torsk, lyr, lange, lysing, breiflabb, gråsteinbit, smørflyndre og kveite. Konsumfisken har ofte en lengde som er større enn de respektive minstemålene.

Formålet med prosjektet var å analysere artssammensetning og lengdefordeling på fisk som går på tank i industrifisket med småmasket trål etter øyepål og kolmule. Unders $\varnothing$ kelsene har blitt utført om bord på én tur med tre ulike fartøy som har dispensasjon fra ristpåbudet i perioden juli til september 2014.

## Materiale og metoder

Robert Misund organiserte toktene om bord på de tre fartøyene. Geir Blom utarbeidet prosedyren for prøvetaking av artssammensetning og opparbeiding av lengdeprøver som ble benyttet. Personellet på de tre toktene var: Robert Misund og Leif Åge Larsen -
Overvåkningstjenesten (OVT)(Tokt 1), Geir Blom og Edd A. Ingebrigtsen - OVT (Tokt 2) og Lise Langård og Arnt-Magnus Gamst - OVT (Tokt 3).

Industrifisken ble tatt med småmasket trål om bord på de tre fartøyene. Det ble gjennomføret to trålhal per døgn der hvert hal varte mellom 5 og 7 timer. Det ble ikke trålt om natten.

På to av fartøyene ble fisken pumpet om bord, og på ett fartøy ble fisken sekket om bord. Konsumfisk ble frasortert etter hvert som fisken ble pumpet eller sekket om bord. Resten av fisken gikk på transportbånd til lagringstankene. Prøvetakingen av fisk som gikk på tank bestod i å fylle korg for korg med fisk fra fiskestrømmen på båndet. Det ble tatt ut 3 delprøver fra hvert trålhal, der hver delprøve bestod av 1 eller 2 korger (ca. 30 kg per korg) med materiale, avhengig av størrelsen på halet (2 korger per delprøve hvis halet var større enn 30 tonn). Det ble tatt ut en delprøve fra begynnelsen (delprøve 1), midten (delprøve 2) og slutten (delprøve 3) fra hvert hal.

Fisken i hver delprøve ble sortert til art, og evertebrater til art eller familie, orden eller klasse. Hver kategori ble veid separat til nærmeste 1 g eller 10 g på en Marel vekt. Lengden av fiskearter (målarter) som øyepål, kolmule, sølvtorsk, strømsild osv. ble målt til nærmeste $0,5 \mathrm{~cm}$ nedad på et målebrett. Andre fiskearter ble målt til nærmeste hele cm nedad. Det ble lengdemålt mellom 14 til 100 individ av tallrike arter fra hver korg. Hvert individ av en art ble lengdemålt hvis det var < 25 individ av en fiskeart i en korg.

I tillegg ble det benyttet sporingsdata og data fra den elektroniske fangstdagboken (ERS) i den videre analysen av dataene fra toktene.

Tabell 1 gir en oversikt over når toktene ble gjennomført, område(r) der fangsten ble tatt, antall trålhal, totalt prøveuttak, estimert kvantum på tank og antall arter registrert i fangsten på toktene.

Tabell 1. Oversikt over områdene trålhalene ble utført, perioder for undersøkelsene, antall trålhal unders $\varnothing \mathrm{kt}$, estimert kvantum på tank og antall arter registrert på hvert av de tre toktene som har blitt gjennomført i 2014 med pelagiske trålfartøy som har dispensasjon fra ristpåbudet. * = Trålposen revnet på det ene halet, og det ble derfor ikke tatt prøver fra dette halet.

| Tokt | Områder | Periode | Antall trålhal undersøkt | Kvantum prøve (kg) | Estimert kvantum på tank (tonn) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tokt 1 | Egersundbanken | 17.-21. juli | 9 (10)* | 1149 | 293 | 12 |
| Tokt 2 | Rotteholet og Egersundbanken | 14.-17. august | 8 | 830 | 107 | 37 |
| Tokt 3 | Egersundbanken | 6.-10. september | 10 | 837 | 151 | 18 |

Rådataene ble lagt inn i Excel-ark av Geir Blom og Modulf Overvik, og førstnevnte har også analysert dataene som er samlet inn og skrevet rapporten.

For hver delprøve ble vektene av hver kategori summert sammen til total vekt per delprøve. Prosentandelen av hver kategori i en delprøve ble så beregnet. Dette gav 3 ulike prosentandeler ( P ) per kategori ( $\mathrm{K}_{1, n}$ ) per hal:
$\mathrm{K}_{1} \mathrm{~Pa}, \mathrm{~K}_{1} \mathrm{~Pb}$ og $\mathrm{K}_{1} \mathrm{Pc}, \ldots, \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{Pa}, \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{Pb}, \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{Pc}$ der $n$ er antall kategorier (arter), der $\mathrm{Pa}=\%$ i delprøve 1, $\mathrm{Pb}=\%$ i delprøve 2 og $\mathrm{Pc}=\%$ i delprøve 3.

Gjennomsnittlig artssammensetning (vekt og \%) på tank for hvert av toktene ble kalkulert etter følgende prosedyre:

Først ble de 3 ulike (prosent)andelene per kategori per hal multiplisert med sum vekt ( $V_{\text {sum }}$ ) per hal fra ERS. Dette gav 3 ulike vektestimater ( $\mathrm{Va}, \mathrm{Vb}$ og Vc ) av hver kategori ( $\mathrm{K}_{1}, \mathrm{n}$ ) per hal slik at:

1) $V_{\text {sum }}=\mathrm{VaK}_{1}+\mathrm{VaK}_{2}+\ldots . . . . \mathrm{VaK}_{n}$,
2) $\mathrm{V}_{\text {Sum }}=\mathrm{VbK}_{1}+\mathrm{VbK}_{2}+\ldots \ldots . . \mathrm{VbK}_{\mathrm{n}}, \mathrm{og}$
3) $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{Sum}}=\mathrm{VcK}_{1}+\mathrm{VcK}_{2}+\ldots \ldots . . \mathrm{VcK}_{\mathrm{n}}$,
der $\mathrm{V} a=$ vekt basert på delprøve $1, \mathrm{Vb}=$ vekt basert på delprøve 2 , og $\mathrm{Vc}=$ vekt basert på delprøve 3.

Ved å gjøre disse beregningene for hvert hal, og så summere over hal, ble:

$$
\mathrm{H}=\mathrm{n} \quad \mathrm{H}=\mathrm{n} \quad \mathrm{H}=\mathrm{n} \quad \mathrm{H}=\mathrm{n}
$$

4) $\sum\left(\mathrm{V}_{\text {sum }}\right)=\left[\sum\left(\mathrm{VaK}_{1}\right)+\sum\left(\mathrm{VaK}_{2}\right)+\ldots \ldots . . \sum\left(\mathrm{VaK}_{\mathrm{n}}\right)\right]$,
$H=1 \quad H=1 \quad H=1 \quad H=1$
$\mathrm{H}=\mathrm{n} \quad \mathrm{H}=\mathrm{n} \quad \mathrm{H}=\mathrm{n} \quad \mathrm{H}=\mathrm{n}$
5) $\sum\left(\mathrm{V}_{\text {sum }}\right)=\left[\sum\left(\mathrm{VbK}_{1}\right)+\sum\left(\mathrm{VbK}_{2}\right)+\ldots \ldots . . \sum\left(\mathrm{VbK}_{\mathrm{n}}\right)\right]$, og
$H=1 \quad H=1 \quad H=1 \quad H=1$
$\mathrm{H}=\mathrm{n} \quad \mathrm{H}=\mathrm{n} \quad \mathrm{H}=\mathrm{n} \quad \mathrm{H}=\mathrm{n}$
6) $\sum\left(\mathrm{V}_{\text {sum }}\right)=\left[\sum\left(\mathrm{VcK}_{1}\right)+\sum\left(\mathrm{VcK}_{2}\right)+\ldots \ldots . . \sum\left(\mathrm{VcK}_{n}\right)\right]$,
$\begin{array}{llll}H=1 & H=1 & H=1 & H=1\end{array}$
der $\mathrm{H}=$ trålhal fra 1 til n.

Deretter ble vektandelen (\%) av hver kategori ( $\mathrm{K}_{1, \mathrm{n}}$ ) ift. til $\sum\left(\mathrm{V}_{\text {sum }}\right)$ gitt i 4), 5) og 6) kalkulert.
Dermed kunne endelig gjennomsnittlig artssammensetning (vekt og \%) på tank for hvert av toktene kalkuleres som:

Gjennomsnittlig vekt per kategori $\left(\right.$ SnittVK $\left._{1, n}\right)=\left[\Sigma\left(\mathrm{VaK}_{1}\right)+\sum\left(\mathrm{VbK}_{1}\right)+\sum\left(\mathrm{VcK}_{1}\right)\right] / 3$, $\sum\left[(\right.$ VaKn $\left.)+\sum(V b K n)+\sum(V c K n)\right] / 3, o g$
gjennomsnittlig prosentandel per kategori $\left[\right.$ Snitt\% $\left.\left(\mathrm{VK}_{1, n}\right)\right]=\left[\% \sum\left(\mathrm{VaK}_{1}\right)+\% \sum\left(\mathrm{VbK}_{1}\right)+\right.$ $\left.\% \sum\left(\mathrm{VcK}_{1}\right)\right] / 3$ $\qquad$ $\left[\% \Sigma(\operatorname{VaKn})+\% \Sigma(V b K n)+\% \sum(V c K n)\right] / 3$.

Gjennomsnittlig artssammensetning (vekt og \%) med standardfeil (SE) ble kalkulert vha. programmet STATISTICA.

Lengdefordelingene av ulike arter er presentert i histogrammer med informasjon om gjennomsnittlig lengde per art med tilhørende standardavvik, minimums- og maksimumslengder og antall individ lengdemålt. Dette ble også gjort vha. programmet STATISTICA.

## Resultater

## Artsammensetning på tank

A.

B.


Figur 1. A. Gjennomsnittlig prosentandel med 1*standardfeil (SE) og 2*SE av arter registrert i fangsten som gikk på tank på Tokt 1. Toktet ble gjennomført på Egersundbanken ( 9 av 10 hal ble unders $\varnothing \mathrm{kt}$ ) i perioden 17.-21. juli 2014. B. Sammenligning av gjennomsnittlig prosentandel av arter i fangsten som gikk på tank estimert ut fra FDirs målinger av artsammensetning og prosentandel av arter tatt fra ERS på Tokt 1.

Øyepål var den desidert viktigste arten i fangsten på Tokt 1, og det ble kalkulert gjennomsnittlige prosentandeler av øyepål og nordsjøsild på henholdsvis 82,7\% og 8,9\% i fangsten som gikk på tank (Figur 1A). Summen av sei, torsk og hyse som gikk på tank var $1,4 \%$. Prosentandelen av øyepål var 9,6\% høyere i ERS (92,3\%) enn den gjennomsnittlige prosentandelen ( $82,7 \%$ ) av $ø$ yepål i FDirs målinger på Tokt 1 (Figur 1B). For nordsjøsild var prosentandelen 5,1\% i ERS mot 8,9\% i FDirs målinger.

Det ble registrert 12 arter i målingene av artssammensetning på tank (se Tabell 2), og det er antatt 11 arter gitt i ERS på tank. FDirs estimat av øyepål på tank var mer enn 28000 kg lavere enn det i ERS mens estimatet for nordsjøsild var mer enn 11000 kg høyere enn det i ERS. Disse forskjellene er betydelige sett i lys av at skipper på Tokt 1 hadde tilgang til FDirs måleresultat av artssammensetningen på tank. For arter som hvitting og gapeflyndre var FDirs estimater mer enn 4000 kg høyere enn de i ERS (tall for gapeflyndre manglet i ERS).

Tabell 2. Oppsummering av fangst på tank på Tokt 1 med artsfordeling $i$ kvanta og prosent oppgitt i ERS og estimert gjennomsnitt i FDirs målinger basert på data fra 9 hal. Forskjellen i vekt per art på tank mellom FDirs estimat og ERS er gitt i den siste kolonnen i tabellen. Positive forskjeller indikerer et FDirs estimat er høyere enn de i ERS, og negative forskjeller indikerer at FDirs estimat er lavere enn de i ERS. * = Kvanta av konsumarter som antas å ha gått på tank.

| Arter | ERS (kg) | ERS (\%) | Estimert på $\boldsymbol{t a n k}(\mathrm{kg})$ | Estimert på tank (\%) | Forskjell (kg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Øyepål | 270000 | 92,29 | 241893 | 82,68 | -28107 |
| Nordsjøsild | 15000 | 5,13 | 26100 | 8,92 | 11100 |
| Kolmule | 5000 | 1,71 | 8183 | 2,80 | 3183 |
| Sei* | 1750 | 0,60 | 1136 | 0,39 | -614 |
| Torsk* | 380 | 0,13 | 1297 | 0,44 | 917 |
| Hvitting | 230 | 0,08 | 4952 | 1,69 | 4722 |
| Hyse | 120 | 0,04 | 1627 | 0,56 | 1507 |
| Lange* | 40 | 0,01 | 0 | 0,00 | -40 |
| Lyr* | 40 | 0,01 | 0 | 0,00 | -40 |
| Smørflyndre* | 3 | <0,01 | 0 | 0,00 | -3 |
| Rødspette* | 3 | <0,01 | 0 | 0,00 | -3 |
| Lysing | 0 | 0,00 | 2367 | 0,81 | 2367 |
| Gapeflyndre | 0 | 0,00 | 4429 | 1,51 | 4429 |
| Lomre | 0 | 0,00 | 74 | 0,03 | 74 |
| Strømsild | 0 | 0,00 | 240 | 0,08 | 240 |
| Makrell | 0 | 0,00 | 269 | 0,09 | 269 |
| Alle | 292566 | 100,00 | 292566 | 100,00 | 0 |

FDirs målinger av artssammensetning viste at kolmule og øyepål var de viktigste artene i fangsten på Tokt 2, og det ble kalkulert gjennomsnittlige prosentandeler av kolmule og øyepål på henholdsvis 44,9\% og 34,0\% (Figur 2A). Summen av sei, torsk og hyse på tank utgjorde $0,6 \%$, og nordsjøsild på tank utgjorde $<0,1 \%$.
A.

B.


Figur 2. A. Gjennomsnittlig prosentandel med 1*standardfeil (SE) og 2*SE av arter registrert i fangsten som gikk på tank på Tokt 2. Toktet ble gjennomført i områdene Rotteholet (6 hal) og på Egersundbanken (2 hal) i perioden 14.-17. august 2014. B. Sammenligning av gjennomsnittlig prosentandel av arter i fangsten som gikk på tank estimert ut fra FDirs målinger av artsammensetning og prosentandel av arter tatt fra ERS på Tokt 2.

Det var generelt god overensstemmelse mellom prosentandeler av ulike arter i ERS og FDirs gjennomsnittlige estimat (Figur 2B). Imidlertid var prosentandelen av sølvtorsk 2,3\% høyere i

ERS sammenlignet med FDirs estimat, og for sølvtorsk var prosentandelen 1,8\% lavere i ERS sammenlignet med FDirs estimat.

Det ble registrert hele 37 arter i FDirs målinger av artssammensetning på tank (se Tabell 3), og i ERS er det oppgitt bare 12 arter som har gått på tank.

FDirs estimat av øyepål på tank var mer enn 2400 kg lavere enn det i ERS mens estimatet for øyepål var nesten 2000 kg høyere enn det i ERS. Skipper på Tokt 2 benyttet seg aktivt av FDirs måleresultat av artssammensetning på tank før han gav opplysningene i ERS, men konsentrerte seg om de viktigste artene i fangstene. Imidlertid kritiserte skipper FDirs fremgangsmåte i prøvetakingen av artssammensetning, og i et brev som er sendt FDir hevdes det at med FDirs tallgrunnlag ville estimatet for lange bli hele 800 kg på tank bare i det første halet. FDirs estimat er på 753 kg lange på tank for hele turen (8 hal).

Tabell 3. Oppsummering av fangst på tank på Tokt 2 med artsfordeling i kvanta og prosent oppgitt i ERS og estimert gjennomsnitt i FDirs målinger basert på data fra 8 hal. Forskjellen i vekt per art på tank mellom FDirs estimat og ERS er gitt i den siste kolonnen i tabellen. Positive forskjeller indikerer et FDirs estimat er høyere enn de i ERS, og negative forskjeller indikerer at FDirs estimat er lavere enn de i ERS. * kvanta av konsumarter som antas å ha gått på tank.

| Arter | ERS (kg) | ERS (\%) | Estimert på tank (kg) | Estimert på tank (\%) | Forskjell (kg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kolmule | 48700 | 45,39 | 48225 | 44,94 | -475 |
| $\emptyset$ yepål | 38900 | 36,25 | 36452 | 33,97 | -2 448 |
| Strømsild | 6800 | 6,34 | 4966 | 4,63 | -1 834 |
| Sølvtorsk | 6740 | 6,28 | 8716 | 8,12 | 1976 |
| Svarthå | 2120 | 1,98 | 1105 | 1,03 | -1 015 |
| Lysing* | 1850 | 1,72 | 2286 | 2,13 | 436 |
| Vassild | 0 | 0,00 | 1518 | 1,41 | 1518 |
| Gapeflyndre | 780 | 0,73 | 1284 | 1,20 | 504 |
| Lange* | 530 | 0,49 | 753 | 0,70 | 223 |
| Smørflyndre* | 400 | 0,37 | 377 | 0,35 | -23 |
| Hvitting | 200 | 0,19 | 244 | 0,23 | 44 |
| Sei* | 170 | 0,16 | 259 | 0,24 | 89 |
| Torsk* | 110 | 0,10 | 272 | 0,25 | 162 |
| Nordsjøsild | 0 | 0,00 | 60 | 0,06 | 60 |
| Hyse | 0 | 0,00 | 94 | 0,09 | 94 |
| Lomre | 0 | 0,00 | 124 | 0,12 | 124 |
| Skjellbrosme | 0 | 0,00 | 243 | 0,23 | 243 |
| Sjøpølse | 0 | 0,00 | 93 | 0,09 | 93 |
| Sjøkreps | 0 | 0,00 | 80 | 0,07 | 80 |
| Havmus | 0 | 0,00 | 33 | 0,03 | 33 |
| Asymmetrisk kråkebolle | 0 | 0,00 | 16 | 0,01 | 16 |
| Tverrhalet langebarn | 0 | 0,00 | 2 | <0,01 | 2 |
| Hågjel | 0 | 0,00 | 36 | 0,03 | 36 |
| Isgalt | 0 | 0,00 | 10 | 0,01 | 10 |
| Blekksprut | 0 | 0,00 | 4 | <0,01 | 4 |
| Piggskate | 0 | 0,00 | 17 | 0,02 | 17 |
| Reke | 0 | 0,00 | 5 | <0,01 | 5 |
| Snegl | 0 | 0,00 | 5 | <0,01 | 5 |
| Sjøanemone | 0 | 0,00 | 2 | <0,01 | 2 |
| Firetrådet tangbrosme | 0 | 0,00 | 0,3 | <0,01 | 0,3 |
| Trollhummer | 0 | 0,00 | 0,2 | <0,01 | 0,2 |
| Børstemakk | 0 | 0,00 | 0,1 | <0,01 | 0,1 |
| Sypike | 0 | 0,00 | 9 | 0,01 | 9 |
| Panserulke | 0 | 0,00 | 2 | <0,01 | 2 |
| Eremittkreps | 0 | 0,00 | 8 | 0,01 | 8 |
| Langhalet langebarn | 0 | 0,00 | 1 | <0,01 | 1 |
| Laksesild | 0 | 0,00 | 0,5 | <0,01 | 0,5 |
| Alle | 107300 | 100,00 | 107300 | 100,00 | 0 |
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Figur 3. A. Gjennomsnittlig prosentandel med 1*standardfeil (SE) og 2*SE av arter registrert i fangsten som gikk på tank på Tokt 3. Toktet ble gjennomført på Egersundbanken (10 hal ble undersøkt) i perioden 6.-10. september 2014. B. Sammenligning av gjennomsnittlig prosentandel av arter i fangsten som gikk på tank estimert ut fra FDirs målinger av artsammensetning og prosentandel av arter tatt fra ERS på Tokt 3.

Øyepål og kolmule var de klart viktigste artene i fangsten på Tokt 3, og det ble kalkulert gjennomsnittlige prosentandeler av øyepål og kolmule på henholdsvis 67,5\% og 27,1\% i fangsten som gikk på tank (Figur 3A). Summen av sei, torsk og hyse som gikk på tank var $0,9 \%$. Prosentandelen av nordsjøsild på tank var svært lav ( $0,03 \%$ ).

Det var svært god overensstemmelse i prosentandeler av ulike arter på tank mellom FDirs estimat og de gitt i ERS (Figur 3B).

Det ble registrert 18 arter i FDirs målinger av artssammensetning på tank (se Tabell 4), og det samme antall arter ble gitt i ERS.

Skipper på Tokt 3 benyttet seg svært aktivt av FDirs måleresultat av artssammensetning på tank før han gav opplysningene i ERS, og han passet på at alle artene registrert av FDir var mediERS.

Tabell 4. Oppsummering av fangst på tank på Tokt 3 med artssammensetning $i$ kvanta og prosent oppgitt i ERS og estimert gjennomsnitt i FDirs målinger basert på data fra 10 hal. Forskjellen i vekt per art på tank mellom FDirs estimat og ERS er gitt i den siste kolonnen i tabellen. Positive forskjeller indikerer et FDirs estimat er høyere enn de i ERS, og negative forskjeller indikerer at FDirs estimat er lavere enn de i ERS. * = Kvanta av konsumarter som antas å ha gått på tank.

| Arter | ERS (kg) | ERS (\%) | Estimert på tank (kg) | Estimert på tank (\%) | Forskjell (kg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Øyepål | 101541 | 67,21 | 102039 | 67,54 | 498 |
| Kolmule | 41706 | 27,60 | 40919 | 27,08 | -787 |
| Sandflyndre | 1807 | 1,20 | 1992 | 1,32 | 185 |
| Strømsild | 1745 | 1,16 | 1778 | 1,18 | 33 |
| Lysing* | 1002 | 0,66 | 1065 | 0,71 | 63 |
| Hvitting | 965 | 0,64 | 1009 | 0,67 | 44 |
| Sei* | 742 | 0,49 | 650 | 0,43 | -93 |
| Gapeflyndre | 470 | 0,31 | 272 | 0,18 | -198 |
| Sølvtorsk | 435 | 0,29 | 425 | 0,28 | -10 |
| Torsk* | 363 | 0,24 | 758 | 0,50 | 395 |
| Skjellbrosme | 82 | 0,05 | 21 | 0,01 | -61 |
| Smørflyndre* | 70 | 0,05 | 12 | 0,01 | -58 |
| Lange* | 46 | 0,03 | 45 | 0,03 | -1 |
| Nordsjøsild | 42 | 0,03 | 43 | 0,03 | 1 |
| Hyse | 36 | 0,02 | 6 | <0,01 | -30 |
| Svarthå | 27 | 0,02 | 37 | 0,02 | 10 |
| Hågjel | 2 | <0,01 | 9 | 0,01 | 7 |
| Ulke upes. | 1 | <0,01 | 2 | <0,01 | 1 |
| Alle | 151082 | 100,00 | 151082 | 100,00 | 0 |

På Tokt 2 og 3 ble det også registrert betydelige mengder av sjøkreps i noen av trålhalene. Sjøkrepsen ble sortert ut samtidig med utsorteringen av konsumfisk, og ble oppbevart i rekekorger. Den ble kokt og spist av mannskapet om bord etter hvert som den ble fanget.

Sjøkrepsen ble ikke oppgitt i ERS, men det kan dreid seg om 150-200 kg totalt på hvert av de to toktene.

## Lengdefordeling av fiskearter



Figur 4. Lengdefordeling av målartene kolmule og øyepål per tokt (Tokt 1-3). Gjennomsnittlig lengde (cm) med tilhørende standardavvik og minimums- og maksimumslengder for hver av artene per tokt er oppgitt.

Det ble lengdemålt 1995 stk. kolmule og 6015 stk. øyepål til sammen på de tre toktene. Den gjennomsnittlige lengden av kolmule var mellom $24,0 \mathrm{~cm}$ og $25,4 \mathrm{~cm}$ på de tre toktene med minimums- og maksimumslengder på henholdsvis $9,5 \mathrm{~cm}$ og $39,0 \mathrm{~cm}$ (Figur 4). For øyepål lå gjennomsnittslengden mellom $16,1 \mathrm{~cm}$ og $17,2 \mathrm{~cm}$ med minimums- og maksimumslengder på henholdsvis $4,0 \mathrm{~cm}$ og $22,0 \mathrm{~cm}$.

Det ble registrert lengdemålt 15 stk. sei totalt i FDirs prøver på de tre toktene, og den gjennomsnittlige lengden av sei som gikk på tank var mellom $40,8 \mathrm{~cm}$ og $44,3 \mathrm{~cm}$ (Figur 5). Minimumslengden varierte fra 29 cm til 42 cm mellom toktene, og maksimumslengden lå mellom 47 cm og 65 cm . Hovedtyngden av sei i prøvene var større enn minstemålet på 40 cm .

Det ble funnet i alt 96 stk. torsk i prøvene tatt i løpet av de tre toktene.
Gjennomsnittslengden av torsk som gikk på tank lå mellom $17,3 \mathrm{~cm}$ og $24,1 \mathrm{~cm}$ (Figur 6). Minimums- og maksimumslengden lå henholdsvis fra $7,0 \mathrm{~cm}$ til $11,0 \mathrm{~cm}$ og fra $34,0 \mathrm{~cm}$ til
$39,0 \mathrm{~cm}$ mellom toktene. All torsk som ble registrert i FDirs prøver var altså mindre enn minstemålet på $40,0 \mathrm{~cm}$.


Figur 5. Lengdefordeling av sei per tokt (Tokt 1-3). Gjennomsnittlig lengde (cm) med tilhørende standardavvik og minimums- og maksimumslengder per tokt er oppgitt. Pilene i figuren angir minstemålet på $40,0 \mathrm{~cm}$.


Figur 6. Lengdefordeling av torsk per tokt (Tokt 1-3). Gjennomsnittlig lengde (cm) med tilhørende standardavvik og minimums- og maksimumslengder per tokt er oppgitt. Pilen i figuren angir minstemålet på $40,0 \mathrm{~cm}$.


Figur 7. Lengdefordeling av hyse per tokt (Tokt 1-3). Gjennomsnittlig lengde (cm) med tilhørende standardavvik og minimums- og maksimumslengder per tokt er oppgitt. Pilen i figuren angir minstemålet på $31,0 \mathrm{~cm}$.

Det ble registrert til sammen 59 stk. hyse i prøvene tatt iløpet av de tre toktene.
Gjennomsnittslengden av hyse som gikk på tank var $28,8 \mathrm{~cm}$ på Tokt $1 \mathrm{og} 11,9 \mathrm{~cm}$ på Tokt 2
(Figur 7). Minimums- og maksimumslengden på Tokt 1 var henholdsvis $23,0 \mathrm{~cm}$ og $37,0 \mathrm{~cm}$, og på Tokt 2 var minimums- og maksimumslengden henholdsvis 9,0 cm og 25,0 cm. På Tokt 3 ble det funnet 1 stk. hyse i lengdeintervallet 10-15 cm. På Tokt 1 ble det altså registrert noen individ av hyse i prøvene som var større enn minstemålet på $31,0 \mathrm{~cm}$ mens all hyse i prøvene på Tokt 2 og 3 var mindre enn minstemålet.


Figur 8. Lengdefordeling av nordsjøsild per tokt (Tokt 1-3). Gjennomsnittlig lengde (cm) med tilhørende standardavvik og minimums- og maksimumslengder per tokt er oppgitt. Pilen i figuren angir minstemålet på $20,0 \mathrm{~cm}$.

Det ble lengdemålt til sammen 756 stk. nordsjøsild fra prøvene tatt i løpet av de tre toktene, men det var kun på Tokt 1 ( 752 individ ble lengdemålt) at denne arten var tallrik i FDirs prøver. Hovedtyngden av nordsjøsild som ble registrert på Tokt 1 var altså yngel, og den gjennomsnittlige lengden var 19,0 cm (Figur 8). Lengden varierte mellom 15,0 cm og 32,0 cm på dette toktet. På Tokt 2 og Tokt 3 ble det bare funnet 4 stk. nordsjøsild totalt i prøvene med en lengde fra $22,0 \mathrm{~cm}$ til $29,0 \mathrm{~cm}$.

## Konklusjoner

FDir registrerte omtrent tre ganger så mange arter i fangsten som gikk på tank enn de som ble oppgitt i ERS på Tokt 2. På Tokt 1 og 3 var det bra samsvar mellom antall arter i FDirs prøver og de som er gitt i ERS.

På Tokt 1 var det stor forskjell mellom FDirs estimerte gjennomsnittskvantum på tank av øyepål og nordsjøsild sammenlignet med kvantaene gitt i ERS, til tross for at skipper hadde tilgang til resultatene av målingene. FDirs estimat av øyepål på tank var mer enn 28000 kg lavere enn det i ERS mens estimatet for nordsjøsild var mer enn 11000 kg høyere enn det i ERS.

Mengden av sei, torsk og hyse som gikk på tank var $\leq 1,4 \%$ av totalfangsten på alle toktene. Mengden av nordsjøsild på tank ble estimert til 8,9\% av totalfangsten på Tokt 1. På de andre toktene utgjorde nordsjøsild $<0,1 \%$ av totalfangsten på tank.

Den gjennomsnittlige lengden av kolmule var mellom $24,0 \mathrm{~cm}$ og $25,4 \mathrm{~cm}$ på de tre toktene med minimums- og maksimumslengder på henholdsvis $9,5 \mathrm{~cm}$ og $39,0 \mathrm{~cm}$. For øyepål lå gjennomsnittslengden mellom $16,1 \mathrm{~cm}$ og $17,2 \mathrm{~cm}$ med minimums- og maksimumslengder på henholdsvis $4,0 \mathrm{~cm}$ og $22,0 \mathrm{~cm}$.

Hovedtyngden av sei i FDirs prøver var større enn minstemålet på 40 cm . All torsk i prøvene var mindre enn minstemålet på 40 cm , og hyse i prøvene var mindre enn minstemålet på 31 cm på Tokt 2 og 3 og var rundt minstemålet på Tokt 1. Det ble lengdemålt i alt 752 stk . nordsjøsild på Tokt 1, og hovedtyngden av denne silden var mindre enn minstemålet på 20 cm (gjennomsnittlig lengde: $19,0 \mathrm{~cm}$ ). Lengden av silden varierte mellom $15,0 \mathrm{og} 32,0 \mathrm{~cm}$ på dette toktet.

Basert på resultatene av FDirs målinger av artssammensetning er det åpenbart at skipper, ut i fra $\emptyset$ yemål, ikke er i stand til å angi alle artene i fangsten. Det betyr at arter som opptrer i små kvanta i fangsten ikke blir gitt i ERS, og dette har betydning for biodiversitetsaspektet og økosystembetraktninger. Det er også åpenbart at skipper ikke er i stand til å angi en korrekt artssammensetning i fangsten for hvert hal ut i fra øyemål. Ved landing av industrifangst uten kontroll er det artssammensetningen i ERS som er basis for føring av artssammensetningen på sluttseddel. Det medfører at FDirs fangststatistikk også blir feil. Hvis man skal oppnå en mest mulig korrekt fangststatistikk for industrifisket, må man enten ha pålagt prøvetaking om bord på fartøyene eller ved landing. Hvis ikke, er det nødvendig å videreføre ordningen med bifangstavsetning i industrifisket.

Da det ble registrert relativt store mengder med yngel av nordsjøsild i fangstene tatt på Egersundbanken på Tokt 1, bør det vurderes om dette området bør stenges midlertidig for fiske med småmasket trål ved stort innslag av sildeyngel i fangstene.

# Check of age readings of Norway pout in the North Sea between Denmark and Norway 

By Julie Olivia Davies, J. Rasmus Nielsen and Lotte Worsøe Clausen,<br>Technical University of Denmark, National Institute of Aquatic Resources, DTU Aqua.

## 1. Introduction, background, and purpose

This working document presents a preliminary age reading check conducted in 2016 of otoliths from Norway pout in the North Sea made between Danish and Norwegian age readers at DTU Aqua (DK) and IMR (N). In order to provide some information on the quality of the Norway pout age readings a preliminary check was initiated in order to investigate whether there are any age reading issues between the countries reading otoliths of Norway pout caught in the commercial Norway pout fishery in the North Sea and Skagerrak-Kattegat areas (nop34 ICES Area IV and IIIa stock). Age readings from the Danish and Norwegian commercial fishery are directly used in the Norway pout stock assessment to estimate catch, mean weight, maturity and mortality at age. Also, the age readings from the IBTS survey in first and third quarter of the year are used in several stock assessment tuning fleets to obtain catch per unit of effort (CPUE) indices by age in several assessment tuning time series. The age determination of otoliths from the IBTS surveys involves additional institutes.

The results from the age reading check are directly relevant for the ICES benchmark assessment for the Norway pout stock conducted in August 2016, ICES WKPOUT. However, as a full scale exchange is already planned under the remits of ICES WGBIOP and results should be available by September 2017 these preliminary results are only to indicate that there are discrepancies in the age estimations provided by the participating laboratories.
The working document is subdivided into 3 main sections with introduction, initial otolith check material, indicative results and time plan for the current full scale otolith exchange program.

1. Introduction with background and purpose
2. Initial otolith check material and indicative results
3. Future full scale otolith exchange program

## 2. Initial otolith check material and indicative results

During 2015-2016, a small scale otolith exchange check for Norway pout in the North Sea was arranged between Denmark and Norway (DTU Aqua Denmark and IMR Norway). Denmark and Norway are the only nations having targeted Norway pout commercial fishery with small meshed trawls for reduction purposes in the North Sea and Skagerrak. The Danish Norway pout commercial fishery is at present mainly conducted in the Northern North Sea at Fladen Ground, and the Norwegian commercial Norway pout
fishery is mainly conducted in the Norwegian zone (EEZ) in the North Sea. Only a limited fishery is conducted in Skagerrak.

Accordingly, there were 127 otoliths selected from the Danish commercial fishery and 100 otoliths from the Norwegian commercial fishery to be checked. The selected otoliths covered the fishery in the respective main fishing areas in the autumn 2014 (and additionally a few otoliths from spring 2015). Furthermore, the otoliths covered the full individual fish length range of Norway pout observed in the North Sea fishery and surveys during that period, i.e. covered a very broad length and age range in both samples.

The otoliths were first read by the sampling institute. They were then sent to the sister institute with only indication of fish number, length and date of capture for a cross age reading check at the other institute. Consequently, the age reading of the other party was not known to the age reader when reading the otoliths from the other institute. After the cross check age reading period ended in spring 2016, the otoliths and age readings were compiled for initial analyses.

Below are the results of these initial analyses presented.

Sample Overview

|  | Area | Quarter | Year | Length range | No. of fish |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Denmark | $4 \mathrm{~A} / 45 \mathrm{FO}$ | 4 | 2014 | $9-18 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 40 |
|  | $4 \mathrm{~A} / 45 \mathrm{FO}$ | 4 | 2014 | $9-18.5 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 44 |
|  | $4 \mathrm{~A} / 49 \mathrm{FO}$ | 4 | 2014 | $8.5-17.5 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 43 |
| Norway | $4 \mathrm{~A} / 42-05$ | 3 | 2015 | $15-20 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 14 |
|  | $4 \mathrm{~A} / 42-23$ | 4 | 2014 | $13.5-18 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 50 |
|  | $4 \mathrm{~A} / 42-23$ | 4 | 2014 | $9-15.5 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 36 |

## Results

a) Danish samples

The readers agreed on $77 \%$ of the samples, with $100 \%$ agreement at age 0 and a decrease in agreement with an increase in age. The table below shows the reader comparison matrix; both countries agree that there are 46 fish which are age 0,46 fish which are aged 1 and 6 fish which are age 2 . Where there is disagreement, there is a tendency for Norway to estimate the ages of the fish to be one year older in comparison to Denmark. This is indicated by the red boxes where Norway has estimated one fish to be 1 year old in comparison to an age of 0 estimated by the Danish reader. In addition, Norway has estimated 28 fish to be age 2 where Denmark has estimated age 1.

|  | Age DK |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age N | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 0 | 46 |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 46 |  |
| 2 |  | 28 | 6 |

b) Norwegian samples

The readers agreed on $65 \%$ of the samples, with $100 \%$ agreement at age 0 and a decrease in agreement with an increase in age. A similar pattern in seen where Norway will estimate the fish to be older in comparison to Denmark, see the table below. Both countries agree that there are 19 fish which are 0 years old, 40 aged 1 and 6 aged 2 . The values in red indicated where Norway has
estimated 22 fish to be aged 2 when Denmark has estimated them to be 1, 5 fish have been assigned an age of 3 and 8 an age of 4 when Denmark ages these fish to be just 2 years old.

The lower level of agreement in the Norwegian sample set coincides with a broader length distribution with fish $18-20 \mathrm{~cm}$ included in the exchange set.

|  | Age DK |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age N | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 0 | 19 |  |  |
| 1 |  | 40 |  |
| 2 |  | 22 | 6 |
| 3 |  |  | 5 |
| 4 |  |  | 8 |

It appears that especially for the larger fish there are discrepancies in the otolith readings and ageing of the Norway pout. As the exchange was carried out without the inclusion of otolith images for the readers to record their otolith interpretations on it is difficult to identify where the discrepancies in the age determinations are. However, as Norway pout grow very quickly in the first year the centre of the otoliths are highly opaque which may cause problems when identifying the first winter ring. In addition, the subsequent growth zones are much narrower in comparison and it is likely that the interpretation of these narrow growth zones at the edge may also contribute to the differences in the ages estimated by the two countries, especially in respect to the older fish.

The results from the pre-calibration exercise between Denmark and Norway clearly show discrepancies between the readers involved; the overall agreement of $72 \%$ is below $80 \%$ and thus there is a need to carry out a full scale otolith exchange where images are provided for the readers to annotate.

## 3. Future full scale otolith exchange program

Based on the above results it seems necessary - and it is recommended - that the planned full scale otolith exchange program is carried out as soon as possible for the Norway pout stock in the North Sea and Skagerrak-Kattegat.

A full scale exchange and calibration workshop is currently underway, according to WGBIOP standards and will include all relevant laboratories supplying age-data to ICES on the Norway pout.

The recommended plan for such a full scale otolith exchange program is the following:

- Photographing the material for exchange: Jul-Sep 2016;
- Exchange of otoliths and cross reading: Sep-Dec 2016;
- Analysis of exchange otolith readings and results by the exchange coordinator and selected colleagues: Jan-Mar 2017;
- Results and potential correction of data in relation to assessment (catch at age, tuning and survey fleets, etc.): Apr-Jul 2017;
- Implementation in the Norway pout assessment or potential InterBenchmark Assessment: Aug-Sep 2017.


# Estimation of abundance of Norway pout from shrimp surveys using the new open source software StoX 

Espen Johnsen and Guldborg Søvik

## Introduction

Annual shrimp swept-area surveys have been conducted by the Institute of Marine Research since 1984 in Skagerrak and the Norwegian Deep in the eastern side of the Norwegian trench in the North Sea. The main objective of the survey is to monitor abundance and distribution of the northern shrimp (Pandalus borealis) stock. In addition to northern shrimp, the catch of fish, Norway lobster and sea cucumber have been sorted to species where the total weight and abundance, the individual length and/or weight have been recorded for each species. The depth ( $100-550 \mathrm{~m}$ ) and geographical distribution of the trawl positions of the shrimp survey does not overlap with the positions covered by the International Bottom Trawl Surveys organized by ICES, however, Norway pout is a very common species in the catches for both the IBTS surveys and the Norwegian trawl survey despite the nonoverlapping survey areas, and the purpose of the work is to analyze the shrimp survey data with the purpose of establishing an additional fishery-independent survey time series that may be used as a future input in the stock assessment of Norway pout in the Skagerrak and North Sea.

## Method

In 2006, the survey period was moved from May/June to January/February in order to provide better biomass estimates of 1-group shrimp (recruitment) and berried females (SSB). In 2013, the list of the sampling stations was revised, and from 2014104 stations with fixed positions is in the fixed station list.

The trawling is carried out with a Campelen research trawl with a Rockhopper ground gear made of rubber discs (see Engås and Godø 1989). The 20 mesh size in the fishing bag with a 6 mm inner net in the cod end. Waco 1500 kg trawl doors is used. To stabilize the doors distance, a 10 meter long strapping rope (Engås and Ona, 1993) mounted 200 meter in front of the trawling doors was implemented as standard in 2009. The distance between the doors is typically 46-48 meter. To measure the performance of the trawling, depth sensors, trawl eye and door distance sensors are used as standard. Bottom temperature and salinity were measured by CTD at each trawl station.

Standard towing time is 30 minutes with a towing speed of 3 knots over ground. In areas with expected high rates of fish the towing time may be reduced to 15 minutes to avoid large catches.

In this analyses, only survey data for the period 2010-2016 was available, however, the full time series will be available by the end of 2016 which enables a full time series analyses.

## Survey area and strata

Figure 1 shows the area survey area, strata boarders and fixed station positions. In our sweptarea calculations, the strata have been modified by merging some of the previous strata, and
new strata boarders are depicted in Figure 2. The new strata is the same as used for the updated survey time series estimated for Northern shrimp.

## Estimating catch rates of Norway pout

No age reading of Norway pout is available for shrimp survey, and all swept-area estimates are given as number by cm groups. The software StoX (http://www.imr.no/forskning/prosjekter/stox/nb-no) for the swept-area estimates. Density of Norway pout by trawl station (i) by cm length group (l) is calculated as:

$$
\rho_{l, i}=\frac{x_{l, i}}{a_{i}}
$$

where the number of individuals (x) by length group is divided by the area swept (a). Area swept is calculated as towing distance multiplied trawling width ( 11.7 m ), which is the same as used for the Northern shrimp estimates. The mean density by length group by stratum is estimated as:

$$
\bar{\rho}_{l}=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{l, i}
$$

Where n is number of station in a stratum. The stratified mean number for the entire survey area is estimated as:

$$
N_{l}=A \sum_{k=1}^{n k} \bar{\rho}_{l} W
$$

Where nk is number of strata and W is the proportion of the total survey area (A) in stratum $k$.

## Validation of results

The conversion from abundance by length groups to abundance by age is feasible using an age length key. In this work, a constant age length key to estimate Numbers of age 1 for all 7 years was used (Table 1). It is possible for future work to utilize the age readings from the IBTS Q1 survey, and for future surveys we may start to read otoliths for Norway pout.

## Results and discussion

Norway pout was caught in about $99 \%$ of all trawl stations, where the highest catch rates where shallower than 350 meter (Figure 3). Figure 4 shows the estimated number of Norway pout by length group by survey for 2010 to 2016. Although, the survey effort has not been constant between all years as bad weather and time constraints has made it impossible to cover all stations, the estimates seem to reflect the stock size. To test the reliability of the
survey, the estimated abundance of age 1 individuals (Figure 5) was compared with the with the IBTS Q1 abundance index for age 1 (Figure 5).

The Pearson's product-moment correlation between $\log ($ abundance of IBTS Q1 age 1) and $\log$ (abundance age 1 from shrimp survey) was high 0.87 ( $p=0.02$ ). As we didn't have 2016 data available for IBTS Q1 2016, only data for 2010 to 2015 was used in this analysis. This high correlation indicates that the population of Norway pout in the shrimp survey area has a similar recruitment dynamic as in the shallower parts of the North Sea. More advanced age length key is needed to test the internal consistency and the external consistency of older Norway pout.

## Summary

The objective of this work was to carry out a preliminary analyses of the Norway pout data recorded during the shrimp survey to examine the usefulness of the Shrimp survey in the Norway pout stock assessment. Despite the shortcomings in the analyses caused by the lack of age reading and short time series, the results clearly indicates that the survey estimates are in line with the IBTS survey time series. Therefore, the full survey time series (from 1984) should be estimated when data are available, and more advanced methods to estimate age based from the length distributions before the survey time series should be tested as an input to the Norway pout stock assessment.
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## Tables

Table 1. Age length key used to estimate number of individuals of age 1 from the length distribution.

| Length (cm) | Age 1 | Age <br> $2+$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 1 | 0 |
| 7 | 1 | 0 |
| 8 | 1 | 0 |
| 9 | 1 | 0 |
| 10 | 1 | 0 |
| 11 | 0.9 | 0.1 |
| 12 | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| 13 | 0.05 | 0.95 |
| 14 (and larger) | 0 | 1 |

Figures


Fig. 1. Norwegian shrimp survey in Skagerrak and the Norwegian Deep (ICES Divs. IIIa and IVa east): the revised strata system (introduced in 2007 and adjusted in 2008) with the 111 fixed trawl stations. Trawl stations marked in red were introduced in 2008. (Taken from NAFO, ICES (2015) NAFO/ICES Pandalus Assessment Group Meeting, 9-16 September 2015. NAFO SCS Doc. 15/13. ICES CM 2015/ACOM:14, 85 s.)
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Figure 2. Survey area, strata and distribution of stations for the Norwegian shrimp survey. Blue squares shows stations with Norway pout in the catch, open squares depict stations with zero catch of Norway pout.


Figure 3. Depth vs. CPUE (n/towing distance) of Norway pout in the shrimp survey


Figure 4. Estimated number of individuals by length of Norway pout by survey.


Figure 5. Estimated number of age 1 (black colums) by year derived by using the constant age length key presented in Table 1. Lower right figure; relative abundance indices of age 1 of Norway pout from the shrimp survey (black line) and IBTS Q1 (blue line).

# SESAM - Seasonal State-space Assessment Model Applied to Norway Pout in the North Sea. 

Anders Nielsen and Casper W. Berg

September 6, 2016

## 1 Introduction

Age based assessment models such as the SAM model (Nielsen and Berg, 2014) are typically formulated with time steps of one year. This is convenient because seasonal patterns can be ignored, but also because commercial catch data historically have been aggregated over years, which precludes analyzing them in finer time steps. However, when seasonal data are available the key stock assessment outputs (estimates of stock abundance, fishing mortality, and recruitment) can also be estimated on a seasonal basis, which enables quantification of the effects of seasonal management procedures that may optimize yield (Ferro et al., 2008) or reduce bycatch of certain species that are particularly vulnerable in certain periods of the year.
This document describes a seasonal extension of the SAM model (Nielsen and Berg, 2014) called SESAM. The model preserves the nice properties of the SAM model, namely that the fishing mortality is specified via an unobserved stochastic process that allows for gradual changes in both fishing pressure and selectivity, and catches are treated as observations with noise. This description is specific to the application of SESAM to Norway Pout in the North Sea.

## 2 Model

The yearly time step state-space assessment model (SAM) is defined in Nielsen and Berg (2014). The detailed formulas will not be repeated here, but in brief the model consist of two parts. 1) The logarithms of the age-specific stock sizes $\log N$ and the logarithms of the age-specific fishing mortality rates $\log F$ are considered to be a multidimensional unobserved stochastic process. 2) Conditional on the unobserved process the distributions of the observations of catches and survey indices are described. This two step approach allows for a flexible model with few model parameters, and allows assessments to be conducted with statistical rigor. Extending the SAM framework to use more flexible time steps is described here. For notational convenience we assume that each year is subdivided into a fixed number of equidistant intervals $(s=1 \ldots S)$. Although $S$ can be any positive integer, in the following we will assume four seasons i.e. $S=4$ and refer to the $s$ subscript as quarter. We enumerate each observation from 1 to $N$ (total number of observations) and map them to their corresponding time interval which we denote $t_{1}, t_{2}, \ldots, t_{N}$.

Fishing mortality In the standard yearly SAM the fishing mortality process is modelled as a multivariate random walk process, such that the vector $\log F_{y}$ is described by:

$$
\log F_{y}=\log F_{y-1}+\epsilon_{y}
$$

where the vector $\epsilon_{y}$ is assumed to follow a multivariate normal distribution with mean vector 0 and covariance matrix $\Sigma_{F}$.
In a seasonal model a seasonal pattern in the fishing mortality must be expected. A simple way to achieve this is to setup a separate process for each season in the model, such that e.g. first quarter fishing mortality in a given year only depends on first quarter fishing mortality in the previous year. This can be setup as a $S$-lagged process, such that:

$$
\log F_{t_{i}}=\log F_{t_{i-S}}+\epsilon_{i}
$$

here the vector $\epsilon_{i}$ is assumed to follow a multivariate normal distribution with mean vector 0 and covariance matrix $\Sigma_{F}$, which has the same $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ structure as in Nielsen and Berg (2014).
Future extensions of SESAM could include more general process formulations where the fishing mortality in a given season is allowed to depend on several previous lags, and where the covariance matrix is allowed to be differ between seasons.
A vague prior is imposed on $\log F \sim N\left(0,20^{2}\right)$. This is merely to stabilize the likelihood optimization, and it was verified that this prior has practically no effect on the final estimates.

Stock size process The stock size process in the standard yearly SAM is defined to follow the yearly stock equation on logarithmic scale, such that $\log N_{a+1, y+1} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\log N_{a, y}-\left(F_{a, y}+M_{a, y}\right), \sigma_{a}^{2}\right)$.
The extension to SESAM is to update the stock equation to seasonal time steps, and to scale the variance accordingly. The updated $\log N$ increment distribution becomes:
$\log N_{a, t_{i}} \sim\left\{\begin{array}{l}\mathcal{N}\left(\log N_{a, t_{i-1}}-\left(F_{a, t_{i-1}}+M_{a, t_{i-1}}\right) \Delta t_{i}, \sigma_{a}^{2} \Delta t_{i}\right), \quad \text { if } t_{i} \text { and } t_{i+1} \text { are in same year } \\ \mathcal{N}\left(\log N_{a-1, t_{i-1}}-\left(F_{a-1, t_{i-1}}+M_{a-1, t_{i-1}}\right) \Delta t_{i}, \sigma_{a}^{2} \Delta t_{i}\right), \quad \text { otherwise }\end{array}\right.$
Notice that the fish becomes one year older at January first.

Recruitment process The standard yearly SAM has different options for modelling the stock recruitment process, but the simplest option is a plain random walk on logarithmic initial stock sizes.
In SESAM recruitment could take place in one or more quarters - in the most general case in every quarter. For Norway Pout the zero year olds are never observed in the first two quarters, we therefore need only consider recruitment in the two last quarters of the year. To further simplify, we assume that all recruitment happens only in the third quarter, which permits a simple random walk assumption on the recruitment process in the third quarter only (lag of one year). While the latter assumption is unlikely to affect estimates of SSB and $\bar{F}$ given that these are mainly immature fish outside the selection range of the commercial gear, the estimated distribution of 0 -year olds between quarter 3 and 4 and their corresponding fishing mortalities will be affected by this assumption.

Observations Standard catch- and survey-equations are used to predict the observations with a lognormal error term.

SESAM is implemented such that at the time steps can be set up to match the time steps of the observations exactly. E.g. it can potentially be set up to match a three week survey exactly. The fact that the internal time steps of the process matches the observations exactly makes it simpler to predict the observations without having to use interpolations. The only potential difficulty is when observations span more than one time step, but in such cases the prediction is simply adding predictions from each time step. E.g. if the model uses quarterly time steps (to match other data sources), but only yearly catch-at-age is observed, then the yearly catch at age is predicted as the sum of all four quarters.

For Norway Pout quarterly time steps are used and surveys are predicted deterministically from the start of the containing quarter to the center of the surveys observation interval.

Zero observations The assumption of having lognormal distributed observations does not permit observations equal to zero. In the standard SAM the number of age groups can typically be adjusted such that no more than a couple of percent of the data are zeroes. This means that zero observations may be treated as missing without introducing substantial bias. When catches are aggregated over quarters rather than years the probability of observing no catches increases, i.e. the proportion of zero observations gets larger, and treating them as missing will cause substantial positive bias. Our solution to this problem is to define for each fleet (commercial and survey) a minimum detection limit, such that the likelihood of a zero observation is equal to the probability of obtaining an observation below the detection limit. The same solution was used by Cadigan (2015), where the detection limit was set to half of the minimum positive value for the fleet in question. We apply the same detection limit, although the sensitivity of the results to this choice should be evaluated.

|  | x |
| :--- | ---: |
| 1 | 0.01 |
| 2 | 0.15 |
| 3 | 5.00 |
| 4 | 117.50 |
| 5 | 113.00 |
| 6 | 1.00 |

Table 1: $\overline{\text { Detection limits by fleet }}$

The appeal of this method is that the probability of observing a zero depends on the expected value as well as on the variance of that expectation. In other words, lower expected abundance implies that the probability of zero increases, while increasing the variance of that expectation would lead to lower zero probability. This is in contrast to for instance delta-lognormal models where zero probabilities may be estimated independent of the mean and variance of positive observations.

Residuals One-step ahead (OSA) residuals for diagnostics are calculated as described in Berg and Nielsen (2016). These residuals are defined as follows. Let $Y_{1} \ldots Y_{N}$ be the combined vector of scalar observations sorted by time, fleet, and age, then the residual $r_{i}$ associated with the $i$ th
observation is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{i}=\frac{Y_{i}-\hat{Y}_{i \mid i-1}}{\operatorname{sd}\left(Y_{i \mid i-1}\right)} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\hat{Y}_{i \mid i-1}=E\left(Y_{i} \mid Y_{i-1}, \ldots, Y_{1}\right)$ is the OSA prediction of the observation $Y_{i}$ given $\left\{Y_{1}, \ldots, Y_{i-1}\right\}$, and $\operatorname{sd}\left(Y_{i \mid i-1}\right)$ is the standard deviation of this prediction. When the observation $Y_{i}$ is a zero observation, $Y_{i}$ is replaced with a randomized quantile residual, that is $\Phi^{-1}\left(U_{i}\right)$ where $U_{i}$ is uniform distributed on $\left[0, P\left(Y_{i}<\right.\right.$ detection limit $\left.)\right]$.

Forecasting Forecasting is done as follows.

1. Assume values for $M$, weight-at-age in the catches and in the stock, and maturity-at-age for the projection period.
2. Draw $K$ samples from the joint posterior distribution of the states $(\log N$ and $\log F)$ in the last year with data, and the recruitment in all years.
3. Assume that $\log F_{t}=\log F_{t-S}+\log \psi_{t}$, for all future values of $t$ where $\psi_{t}$ is some chosen vector of multipliers of the $F$-process. If $\psi_{t}=1$ for all $t$ this corresponds to assuming the same level and quarterly pattern in $F$ for all future time-steps as in the last data year.
4. Create $K$ forecasting trajectories starting from the samples of joint posterior distribution of the states. The is done by sampling $K$ recruitments directly from the random walk recruitment process estimated by the model, or from the vector of historic recruitments obtained in step 2 , and then projecting the states forward in time using the stock equation with randomly sampled process errors from their estimated distribution.
5. Find $\psi_{t}$ such that the fifth (or any other) percentile of the catches (total mass) in the projections equal some desired level (optional).

Forecasting weight-at-age in the catches There is substantial variation in weight-at-age in the commercial catches from year to year, which means that usual methods of using running averages will be quite sensitive to the bandwidth of the running average. This is important, since TAC estimates calculated in step 5 above depend directly on the catch weight-at-age.
The following models is used:

$$
E\left(\sqrt{C W_{a, q, t}}\right)=\mu_{a, q}+s(\text { cohort }, a)+U_{t}
$$

where $\mu_{a, q}$ is a mean for each combination of quarter and age, $s()$ is tensor product smoothing spline, and $U_{t}$ are normal distributed random effects. There square root transform is used to achieve variance homogeneity in the residuals.


Figure 1: Mean weight in the catches by age and quarter over time

## 3 Results

The following runs are tried:

1. Base run. Commercial CPUE series omitted. Detection limit set to 0.5 times the smallest positive observation by fleet. Note, that parameter coupling is without row 2 (commercial CPUE fleet). Excluding the years 2005-2008 from the $\log F$ random walk variance estimation (in practice achieved by inflating the standard dev. by a factor of 100 for the involved increments).
2. As the base run but with commercial CPUE series included. Parameter coupling as in appendix.
3. As the base run but detection limit set to 0.99 times the smallest positive observation by fleet.
4. As the base run but detection limit set to 2 times the smallest positive observation by fleet.
5. As the base run but excluding data from 1983 and 1984
6. As the base run but with 0.5 times the natural mortality.
7. As the base run but excluding data from 1983.
8. As the base run but excluding data from 1983, 1984, and 1985.
9. As the base but using all years in the $\log F$ RW variance estimation.

### 3.1 Run 1 (base run)



Figure 2: SSB: Blue is SESAM, green is XSA (May 2014).


Figure 3: $\bar{F}_{1-2}$ : Blue is SESAM by quarter, cyan is SESAM yearly average, green is XSA yearly average.


Figure 4: Recruitment: Black is SESAM, green is XSA.


Figure 5: Stock-Recruitment from SESAM. SSB is calculated in Q1, whereas recruitment is in Q3.


Figure 6: SESAM one-step ahead residuals by fleet. Circles are used for positive observations while ' + ' denotes randomized residuals from zero observations. Blue is positive, red is negative.


Figure 7: Observed versus predicted.


Figure 8: Total catch weight observed versus predicted by quarter.


Figure 9: Total catch weight observed versus predicted by year.


Figure 10: Total catch weight in the IBTSQ1 survey observed versus predicted by year.


Figure 11: Retrospective diagnostic run.

|  | time | SSB | lo | hi |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1983 | 344.11 | 223.70 | 464.51 |
| 2 | 1984 | 322.11 | 218.26 | 425.96 |
| 3 | 1985 | 207.14 | 135.02 | 279.26 |
| 4 | 1986 | 116.24 | 70.83 | 161.64 |
| 5 | 1987 | 136.95 | 88.94 | 184.95 |
| 6 | 1988 | 171.21 | 93.27 | 249.16 |
| 7 | 1989 | 115.86 | 72.68 | 159.05 |
| 8 | 1990 | 199.25 | 127.51 | 270.99 |
| 9 | 1991 | 254.00 | 160.67 | 347.32 |
| 10 | 1992 | 358.31 | 228.71 | 487.92 |
| 11 | 1993 | 414.32 | 251.83 | 576.82 |
| 12 | 1994 | 266.26 | 146.54 | 385.99 |
| 13 | 1995 | 335.10 | 194.93 | 475.27 |
| 14 | 1996 | 601.62 | 328.84 | 874.39 |
| 15 | 1997 | 460.20 | 252.41 | 668.00 |
| 16 | 1998 | 535.74 | 285.18 | 786.31 |
| 17 | 1999 | 290.21 | 155.25 | 425.17 |
| 18 | 2000 | 355.88 | 202.35 | 509.41 |
| 19 | 2001 | 484.14 | 252.64 | 715.65 |
| 20 | 2002 | 252.38 | 130.24 | 374.52 |
| 21 | 2003 | 180.93 | 92.17 | 269.69 |
| 22 | 2004 | 141.64 | 69.60 | 213.68 |
| 23 | 2005 | 90.13 | 45.19 | 135.07 |
| 24 | 2006 | 111.62 | 65.04 | 158.21 |
| 25 | 2007 | 196.74 | 100.61 | 292.86 |
| 26 | 2008 | 217.67 | 121.24 | 314.10 |
| 27 | 2009 | 316.15 | 178.47 | 453.83 |
| 28 | 2010 | 504.44 | 279.95 | 728.93 |
| 29 | 2011 | 537.27 | 286.28 | 788.26 |
| 30 | 2012 | 218.03 | 118.06 | 317.99 |
| 31 | 2013 | 221.96 | 128.05 | 315.88 |
| 32 | 2014 | 446.88 | 227.83 | 665.92 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |

Table 2: SSB in Q1. 'lo' and 'hi' is the 5 and 95 percentiles respectively

|  | time | SSB | recruitment |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1983.00 | 344.11 | 82123.02 |
| 2 | 1984.00 | 322.11 | 43893.23 |
| 3 | 1985.00 | 207.14 | 28436.83 |
| 4 | 1986.00 | 116.24 | 62344.17 |
| 5 | 1987.00 | 136.95 | 14025.64 |
| 6 | 1988.00 | 171.21 | 49275.35 |
| 7 | 1989.00 | 115.86 | 53982.47 |
| 8 | 1990.00 | 199.25 | 73101.64 |
| 9 | 1991.00 | 254.00 | 103235.93 |
| 10 | 1992.00 | 358.31 | 54074.28 |
| 11 | 1993.00 | 414.32 | 48880.39 |
| 12 | 1994.00 | 266.26 | 140825.54 |
| 13 | 1995.00 | 335.10 | 59414.23 |
| 14 | 1996.00 | 601.62 | 118543.36 |
| 15 | 1997.00 | 460.20 | 30767.34 |
| 16 | 1998.00 | 535.74 | 55181.80 |
| 17 | 1999.00 | 290.21 | 110283.79 |
| 18 | 2000.00 | 355.88 | 28101.83 |
| 19 | 2001.00 | 484.14 | 31550.92 |
| 20 | 2002.00 | 252.38 | 23921.37 |
| 21 | 2003.00 | 180.93 | 11588.23 |
| 22 | 2004.00 | 141.64 | 11528.77 |
| 23 | 2005.00 | 90.13 | 40163.83 |
| 24 | 2006.00 | 111.62 | 28079.75 |
| 25 | 2007.00 | 196.74 | 44117.49 |
| 26 | 2008.00 | 217.67 | 80740.48 |
| 27 | 2009.00 | 316.15 | 99636.26 |
| 28 | 2010.00 | 504.44 | 11036.81 |
| 29 | 2011.00 | 537.27 | 20817.80 |
| 30 | 2012.00 | 218.03 | 98083.09 |
| 31 | 2013.00 | 221.96 | 38491.38 |
|  |  | 5 | 10 |

Table 3: Estimated SSB in Q1 and recruitment in Q3

|  | time | fbar | fbar5 | ssb | ssb5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2014.25 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 320.77 | 197.04 |
| 2 | 2014.50 | 0.15 | 0.06 | 354.36 | 217.00 |
| 3 | 2014.75 | 0.62 | 0.26 | 231.08 | 136.84 |
| 4 | 2015.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 286.84 | 168.47 |
| 5 | 2015.25 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 224.93 | 131.67 |
| 6 | 2015.50 | 0.15 | 0.06 | 233.54 | 132.00 |
| 7 | 2015.75 | 0.62 | 0.26 | 153.27 | 84.56 |
| 8 | 2016.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 236.82 | 112.36 |

Table 4: Forecast given status quo F. 'fbar5' and 'ssb5' are the 5 th percentiles

|  | time | fbar | fbar5.0 | ssb | ssb5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2014.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 321.19 | 197.32 |
| 2 | 2014.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 360.10 | 222.37 |
| 3 | 2014.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 247.26 | 152.48 |
| 4 | 2015.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 337.98 | 216.54 |
| 5 | 2015.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 262.98 | 167.40 |
| 6 | 2015.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 277.09 | 170.34 |
| 7 | 2015.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 188.47 | 115.40 |
| 8 | 2016.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 316.41 | 156.37 |

Table 5: Forecast given zero F. 'fbar5' and 'ssb5' are the 5th percentiles

## Parameter estimates

|  | Estimate | Std. Error |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| logSdLogFsta | -0.42148852 | $1.901621 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logSdLogN | -3.64022923 | $2.138309 \mathrm{e}+01$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogObs~}$ | 0.89954656 | $6.226468 \mathrm{e}-02$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.36959586 | $9.229369 \mathrm{e}-02$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.63475329 | $8.925200 \mathrm{e}-02$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogObs~}$ | -0.50644743 | $1.221702 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogObs}$ | -0.77487756 | $1.477536 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogObs}$ | -0.42203995 | $1.164322 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -2.37885584 | $2.007455 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.81673519 | $2.342258 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.82920090 | $3.419413 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -2.57733713 | $2.443985 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.78751162 | $2.512312 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -2.50255656 | $2.494839 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.95196151 | $2.561078 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.91138013 | $2.985827 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -2.76633691 | $3.634329 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| trans_rho | 5.30094463 | $4.697853 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogR}$ | -0.07995401 | $1.481646 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| rho | 0.99995026 | $4.673001 \mathrm{e}-05$ |

### 3.2 Run 2

In run 2 the commercial CPUE fleet has been included. $\log F$ RW variance inflated for years with closed fishery.


Figure 12: Run 2 SSB: Blue is SESAM, green is XSA (May 2014), red is the base run.


Figure 13: Run $2 \bar{F}_{1-2}$ : Blue is SESAM by quarter, cyan is SESAM yearly average, green is XSA yearly average.


Figure 14: Run 2 Recruitment: Black is SESAM, green is XSA.


Figure 15: Run 2 Stock-Recruitment from SESAM (top). SSB is calculated in Q1, whereas recruitment is in Q3. Bottom figure is base run.


Figure 16: Run 2 SESAM one-step ahead residuals by fleet. Circles are used for positive observations while ' + ' denotes randomized residuals from zero observations. Blue is positive, red is negative.

|  | time | SSB | lo | hi |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1983 | 350.40 | 226.99 | 473.80 |
| 2 | 1984 | 372.28 | 250.43 | 494.12 |
| 3 | 1985 | 242.34 | 155.97 | 328.71 |
| 4 | 1986 | 127.37 | 77.32 | 177.43 |
| 5 | 1987 | 135.96 | 89.50 | 182.42 |
| 6 | 1988 | 160.50 | 91.30 | 229.71 |
| 7 | 1989 | 109.66 | 70.04 | 149.29 |
| 8 | 1990 | 185.91 | 122.03 | 249.79 |
| 9 | 1991 | 215.88 | 142.63 | 289.12 |
| 10 | 1992 | 306.67 | 204.29 | 409.06 |
| 11 | 1993 | 363.62 | 231.23 | 496.00 |
| 12 | 1994 | 211.39 | 130.02 | 292.75 |
| 13 | 1995 | 247.54 | 157.96 | 337.11 |
| 14 | 1996 | 433.52 | 257.88 | 609.16 |
| 15 | 1997 | 302.63 | 180.57 | 424.70 |
| 16 | 1998 | 365.82 | 208.67 | 522.97 |
| 17 | 1999 | 193.70 | 111.56 | 275.84 |
| 18 | 2000 | 239.60 | 147.22 | 331.99 |
| 19 | 2001 | 331.77 | 185.91 | 477.64 |
| 20 | 2002 | 166.37 | 92.74 | 239.99 |
| 21 | 2003 | 120.02 | 67.38 | 172.67 |
| 22 | 2004 | 77.54 | 41.77 | 113.30 |
| 23 | 2005 | 52.22 | 28.50 | 75.95 |
| 24 | 2006 | 79.41 | 49.33 | 109.48 |
| 25 | 2007 | 138.56 | 74.08 | 203.04 |
| 26 | 2008 | 156.57 | 90.58 | 222.57 |
| 27 | 2009 | 225.70 | 132.70 | 318.70 |
| 28 | 2010 | 375.79 | 215.85 | 535.74 |
| 29 | 2011 | 384.24 | 207.60 | 560.88 |
| 30 | 2012 | 148.83 | 78.11 | 219.55 |
| 31 | 2013 | 163.22 | 98.83 | 227.60 |
| 32 | 2014 | 335.05 | 171.04 | 499.06 |
| 1 | 10 |  |  | 5 |

Table 6: SSB in Q1. 'lo' and 'hi' is the 5 and 95 percentiles respectively

|  | time | SSB | recruitment |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1983.00 | 350.40 | 91184.18 |
| 2 | 1984.00 | 372.28 | 48068.76 |
| 3 | 1985.00 | 242.34 | 30393.65 |
| 4 | 1986.00 | 127.37 | 54215.11 |
| 5 | 1987.00 | 135.96 | 13047.64 |
| 6 | 1988.00 | 160.50 | 47090.82 |
| 7 | 1989.00 | 109.66 | 49341.05 |
| 8 | 1990.00 | 185.91 | 58910.29 |
| 9 | 1991.00 | 215.88 | 95576.96 |
| 10 | 1992.00 | 306.67 | 49395.83 |
| 11 | 1993.00 | 363.62 | 43794.25 |
| 12 | 1994.00 | 211.39 | 106346.54 |
| 13 | 1995.00 | 247.54 | 45535.96 |
| 14 | 1996.00 | 433.52 | 71539.94 |
| 15 | 1997.00 | 302.63 | 21332.39 |
| 16 | 1998.00 | 365.82 | 36054.68 |
| 17 | 1999.00 | 193.70 | 67690.03 |
| 18 | 2000.00 | 239.60 | 21038.49 |
| 19 | 2001.00 | 331.77 | 23212.01 |
| 20 | 2002.00 | 166.37 | 18549.47 |
| 21 | 2003.00 | 120.02 | 7634.38 |
| 22 | 2004.00 | 77.54 | 8655.31 |
| 23 | 2005.00 | 52.22 | 31026.83 |
| 24 | 2006.00 | 79.41 | 20208.43 |
| 25 | 2007.00 | 138.56 | 34184.27 |
| 26 | 2008.00 | 156.57 | 51324.32 |
| 27 | 2009.00 | 225.70 | 70186.91 |
| 28 | 2010.00 | 375.79 | 8202.78 |
| 29 | 2011.00 | 384.24 | 15646.75 |
| 30 | 2012.00 | 148.83 | 71858.47 |
| 31 | 2013.00 | 163.22 | 30751.77 |
|  |  |  | 9 |

Table 7: Estimated SSB in Q1 and recruitment in Q3

|  | time | fbar | fbar5 | ssb | ssb5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2014.25 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 242.60 | 139.15 |
| 2 | 2014.50 | 0.19 | 0.09 | 268.55 | 146.48 |
| 3 | 2014.75 | 0.80 | 0.35 | 173.46 | 87.94 |
| 4 | 2015.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 218.36 | 111.07 |
| 5 | 2015.25 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 173.35 | 85.78 |
| 6 | 2015.50 | 0.19 | 0.09 | 183.49 | 85.75 |
| 7 | 2015.75 | 0.80 | 0.35 | 120.63 | 53.59 |
| 8 | 2016.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 181.28 | 75.09 |

Table 8: Forecast given status quo F. 'fbar5' and 'ssb5' are the 5 th percentiles

[!htb]
Figure 17: Run 2 Observed versus predicted.


Figure 18: Total catch weight observed versus predicted by quarter.


Figure 19: Total catch weight observed versus predicted by year.

|  | time | fbar | fbar5.0 | ssb | ssb5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2014.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 242.92 | 139.35 |
| 2 | 2014.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 274.00 | 151.03 |
| 3 | 2014.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 190.00 | 99.25 |
| 4 | 2015.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 269.22 | 149.75 |
| 5 | 2015.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 213.10 | 113.95 |
| 6 | 2015.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 230.18 | 115.29 |
| 7 | 2015.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 158.14 | 76.67 |
| 8 | 2016.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 264.69 | 114.52 |

Table 9: Forecast given zero F. 'fbar5' and 'ssb5' are the 5th percentiles

## Parameter estimates

|  | Estimate | Std. Error |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| logSdLogFsta | -0.51231046 | $2.391020 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logSdLogN | -1.58271380 | $5.802301 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logSdLogObs | 0.90068124 | $6.280415 \mathrm{e}-02$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.36990021 | $1.027052 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logSLLogObs | 1.39562351 | $8.308373 \mathrm{e}-02$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.01025582 | $7.012222 \mathrm{e}-02$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.58756218 | $9.389995 \mathrm{e}-02$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.55331645 | $1.259494 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.76221636 | $1.556728 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.43611115 | $1.222855 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logQ | -9.20505003 | $6.619155 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logQ | -2.58270006 | $1.897436 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logQ | -1.81167309 | $2.509339 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logQ | -3.54017411 | $6.341643 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logQ | -2.14778553 | $1.797332 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logQ | -1.57267557 | $2.095101 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logQ | -1.48450223 | $3.421031 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logQ | -2.26392186 | $2.126941 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logQ | -1.46697077 | $2.169489 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logQ | -2.17426240 | $2.199151 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logQ | -1.60196128 | $2.241499 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logQ | -1.53405769 | $2.703287 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logQ | -2.30072593 | $3.753525 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| trans_rho | 5.11185124 | $4.543706 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logSdLogR | -0.12334838 | $1.659673 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| rho | 0.99992740 | $6.596919 \mathrm{e}-05$ |

### 3.3 Run 3

In run 3 the detection limit has been set to 0.99 times the smallest observation greater than zero by fleet.


Figure 20: Run 3 SSB: Blue is SESAM, green is XSA (May 2014), red is the base run.


Figure 21: Run $3 \bar{F}_{1-2}$ : Blue is SESAM by quarter, cyan is SESAM yearly average, green is XSA yearly average, red is the base run.


Figure 22: Run 3 Recruitment: Black is SESAM, green is XSA, red is the base run.


Figure 23: Run 3 Stock-Recruitment from SESAM (top). SSB is calculated in Q1, whereas recruitment is in Q3. Bottom figure is base run.


Figure 24: Run 3 SESAM one-step ahead residuals by fleet. Circles are used for positive observations while ' + ' denotes randomized residuals from zero observations. Blue is positive, red is negative.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1983 | 344.60 | 226.95 | 462.26 |
| 2 | 1984 | 321.50 | 219.10 | 423.91 |
| 3 | 1985 | 206.23 | 135.55 | 276.91 |
| 4 | 1986 | 115.14 | 70.96 | 159.32 |
| 5 | 1987 | 136.24 | 89.15 | 183.32 |
| 6 | 1988 | 170.13 | 93.49 | 246.76 |
| 7 | 1989 | 115.91 | 73.50 | 158.32 |
| 8 | 1990 | 199.63 | 128.66 | 270.61 |
| 9 | 1991 | 253.26 | 162.28 | 344.24 |
| 10 | 1992 | 355.84 | 228.75 | 482.93 |
| 11 | 1993 | 412.48 | 253.55 | 571.42 |
| 12 | 1994 | 264.73 | 147.18 | 382.29 |
| 13 | 1995 | 333.76 | 195.63 | 471.88 |
| 14 | 1996 | 601.95 | 331.83 | 872.07 |
| 15 | 1997 | 460.20 | 255.55 | 664.84 |
| 16 | 1998 | 534.14 | 287.17 | 781.11 |
| 17 | 1999 | 289.45 | 156.41 | 422.49 |
| 18 | 2000 | 354.23 | 202.95 | 505.51 |
| 19 | 2001 | 481.26 | 256.72 | 705.80 |
| 20 | 2002 | 251.79 | 131.89 | 371.68 |
| 21 | 2003 | 180.72 | 93.01 | 268.43 |
| 22 | 2004 | 141.84 | 72.26 | 211.43 |
| 23 | 2005 | 89.83 | 46.40 | 133.26 |
| 24 | 2006 | 110.93 | 65.15 | 156.71 |
| 25 | 2007 | 195.38 | 100.81 | 289.96 |
| 26 | 2008 | 216.94 | 121.82 | 312.06 |
| 27 | 2009 | 314.46 | 179.46 | 449.46 |
| 28 | 2010 | 501.84 | 281.11 | 722.57 |
| 29 | 2011 | 535.60 | 287.76 | 783.43 |
| 30 | 2012 | 217.86 | 119.30 | 316.41 |
| 31 | 2013 | 221.03 | 128.49 | 313.58 |
| 32 | 2014 | 443.54 | 227.63 | 659.44 |
| 1 | 10 | 1 |  | 5 |

Table 10: SSB in Q1. 'lo' and 'hi' is the 5 and 95 percentiles respectively

|  | time | SSB | recruitment |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1983.00 | 344.60 | 81848.02 |
| 2 | 1984.00 | 321.50 | 43554.70 |
| 3 | 1985.00 | 206.23 | 28277.63 |
| 4 | 1986.00 | 115.14 | 62269.37 |
| 5 | 1987.00 | 136.24 | 14072.29 |
| 6 | 1988.00 | 170.13 | 49596.43 |
| 7 | 1989.00 | 115.91 | 53955.75 |
| 8 | 1990.00 | 199.63 | 72759.58 |
| 9 | 1991.00 | 253.26 | 103122.05 |
| 10 | 1992.00 | 355.84 | 53997.57 |
| 11 | 1993.00 | 412.48 | 48640.16 |
| 12 | 1994.00 | 264.73 | 141183.70 |
| 13 | 1995.00 | 333.76 | 59461.80 |
| 14 | 1996.00 | 601.95 | 118560.57 |
| 15 | 1997.00 | 460.20 | 30768.31 |
| 16 | 1998.00 | 534.14 | 55039.21 |
| 17 | 1999.00 | 289.45 | 110045.44 |
| 18 | 2000.00 | 354.23 | 28091.56 |
| 19 | 2001.00 | 481.26 | 31598.33 |
| 20 | 2002.00 | 251.79 | 23908.13 |
| 21 | 2003.00 | 180.72 | 11484.36 |
| 22 | 2004.00 | 141.84 | 11453.13 |
| 23 | 2005.00 | 89.83 | 39864.04 |
| 24 | 2006.00 | 110.93 | 28084.87 |
| 25 | 2007.00 | 195.38 | 43788.01 |
| 26 | 2008.00 | 216.94 | 80530.41 |
| 27 | 2009.00 | 314.46 | 99534.67 |
| 28 | 2010.00 | 501.84 | 11048.35 |
| 29 | 2011.00 | 535.60 | 20742.33 |
| 30 | 2012.00 | 217.86 | 97577.68 |
| 31 | 2013.00 | 221.03 | 38345.32 |
|  |  | 5 | 1.21 |

Table 11: Estimated SSB in Q1 and recruitment in Q3

|  | time | fbar | fbar5 | ssb | ssb5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2014.25 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 317.19 | 194.97 |
| 2 | 2014.50 | 0.15 | 0.07 | 349.73 | 214.78 |
| 3 | 2014.75 | 0.62 | 0.27 | 228.09 | 136.44 |
| 4 | 2015.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 283.33 | 168.03 |
| 5 | 2015.25 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 221.60 | 131.16 |
| 6 | 2015.50 | 0.15 | 0.07 | 231.01 | 132.03 |
| 7 | 2015.75 | 0.62 | 0.27 | 151.54 | 83.94 |
| 8 | 2016.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 235.15 | 112.40 |

Table 12: Forecast given status quo F. 'fbar5' and 'ssb5' are the 5 th percentiles


Figure 25: Run 3 Observed versus predicted.


Figure 26: Total catch weight observed versus predicted by quarter.


Figure 27: Total catch weight observed versus predicted by year.

|  | time | fbar | fbar5.0 | ssb | ssb5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2014.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 317.47 | 195.22 |
| 2 | 2014.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 355.45 | 219.91 |
| 3 | 2014.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 244.33 | 151.55 |
| 4 | 2015.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 335.26 | 216.60 |
| 5 | 2015.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 261.38 | 167.48 |
| 6 | 2015.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 275.90 | 170.59 |
| 7 | 2015.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 187.84 | 114.35 |
| 8 | 2016.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 315.18 | 154.51 |

Table 13: Forecast given zero F. 'fbar5' and 'ssb5' are the 5th percentiles

## Parameter estimates

|  | Estimate | Std. Error |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| logSdLogFsta | -0.40624157 | $1.796872 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logSdLogN | -4.00000000 | $1.956329 \mathrm{e}+01$ |
| logSdLogObs | 0.83091188 | $6.221925 \mathrm{e}-02$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.37694370 | 9.014096e-02 |
| logSdLogObs | -0.63408005 | 8.696643e-02 |
| logSdLogObs | -0.50634609 | $1.155941 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.77300383 | $1.423206 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.41923205 | $1.159904 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -2.37617512 | $1.985583 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -1.81340178 | $2.314981 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -1.82329535 | 3.383826e-01 |
| $\log Q$ | -2.57486680 | $2.421594 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -1.78473301 | $2.489217 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -2.49939687 | $2.472203 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -1.94878754 | $2.537791 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log \mathrm{Q}$ | -1.90717641 | $2.958024 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -2.75852047 | $3.609283 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| trans_rho | 5.32732309 | $4.457078 e^{-01}$ |
| logSdLogR | -0.08026687 | $1.436576 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| rho | 0.99995282 | $4.205675 \mathrm{e}-05$ |

### 3.4 Run 4

In run 4 the detection limit has been set to 2 times the smallest observation greater than zero by fleet.


Figure 28: Run 4 SSB: Blue is SESAM, green is XSA (May 2014), red is the base run.


Figure 29: Run $4 \bar{F}_{1-2}$ : Blue is SESAM by quarter, cyan is SESAM yearly average, green is XSA yearly average, red is the base run.


Figure 30: Run 4 Recruitment: Black is SESAM, green is XSA, red is the base run.


Figure 31: Run 4 Stock-Recruitment from SESAM (top). SSB is calculated in Q1, whereas recruitment is in Q3. Bottom figure is base run.


Figure 32: Run 4 SESAM one-step ahead residuals by fleet. Circles are used for positive observations while ' + ' denotes randomized residuals from zero observations. Blue is positive, red is negative.

|  | time | SSB | lo | hi |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1983 | 346.32 | 229.51 | 463.14 |
| 2 | 1984 | 321.96 | 220.55 | 423.37 |
| 3 | 1985 | 205.07 | 135.47 | 274.67 |
| 4 | 1986 | 112.85 | 69.84 | 155.85 |
| 5 | 1987 | 133.69 | 87.53 | 179.85 |
| 6 | 1988 | 166.44 | 90.58 | 242.29 |
| 7 | 1989 | 116.80 | 74.41 | 159.20 |
| 8 | 1990 | 204.21 | 131.93 | 276.49 |
| 9 | 1991 | 256.24 | 164.93 | 347.55 |
| 10 | 1992 | 356.52 | 230.30 | 482.74 |
| 11 | 1993 | 412.40 | 255.56 | 569.24 |
| 12 | 1994 | 263.33 | 147.60 | 379.06 |
| 13 | 1995 | 330.71 | 195.11 | 466.31 |
| 14 | 1996 | 597.07 | 331.90 | 862.24 |
| 15 | 1997 | 455.91 | 255.01 | 656.82 |
| 16 | 1998 | 527.75 | 285.56 | 769.95 |
| 17 | 1999 | 285.50 | 155.42 | 415.58 |
| 18 | 2000 | 349.11 | 201.24 | 496.99 |
| 19 | 2001 | 473.56 | 254.36 | 692.76 |
| 20 | 2002 | 248.39 | 131.16 | 365.61 |
| 21 | 2003 | 178.80 | 92.55 | 265.06 |
| 22 | 2004 | 141.25 | 72.65 | 209.85 |
| 23 | 2005 | 88.83 | 46.23 | 131.43 |
| 24 | 2006 | 109.26 | 64.40 | 154.12 |
| 25 | 2007 | 193.31 | 100.39 | 286.24 |
| 26 | 2008 | 215.02 | 121.47 | 308.58 |
| 27 | 2009 | 310.49 | 178.19 | 442.79 |
| 28 | 2010 | 496.93 | 279.78 | 714.08 |
| 29 | 2011 | 534.26 | 288.36 | 780.17 |
| 30 | 2012 | 221.39 | 122.08 | 320.69 |
| 31 | 2013 | 221.86 | 129.51 | 314.22 |
| 32 | 2014 | 440.79 | 227.03 | 654.55 |
| 1. |  | 2 |  |  |

Table 14: SSB in Q1. 'lo' and 'hi' is the 5 and 95 percentiles respectively

|  | time | SSB | recruitment |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1983.00 | 346.32 | 81495.78 |
| 2 | 1984.00 | 321.96 | 43066.39 |
| 3 | 1985.00 | 205.07 | 27730.58 |
| 4 | 1986.00 | 112.85 | 62251.03 |
| 5 | 1987.00 | 133.69 | 14250.51 |
| 6 | 1988.00 | 166.44 | 50963.98 |
| 7 | 1989.00 | 116.80 | 54212.13 |
| 8 | 1990.00 | 204.21 | 72599.37 |
| 9 | 1991.00 | 256.24 | 103064.15 |
| 10 | 1992.00 | 356.52 | 53958.81 |
| 11 | 1993.00 | 412.40 | 48355.08 |
| 12 | 1994.00 | 263.33 | 140309.88 |
| 13 | 1995.00 | 330.71 | 59167.78 |
| 14 | 1996.00 | 597.07 | 117611.18 |
| 15 | 1997.00 | 455.91 | 30394.37 |
| 16 | 1998.00 | 527.75 | 54447.13 |
| 17 | 1999.00 | 285.50 | 108754.62 |
| 18 | 2000.00 | 349.11 | 27811.47 |
| 19 | 2001.00 | 473.56 | 31468.24 |
| 20 | 2002.00 | 248.39 | 23922.28 |
| 21 | 2003.00 | 178.80 | 11300.67 |
| 22 | 2004.00 | 141.25 | 11211.74 |
| 23 | 2005.00 | 88.83 | 39500.27 |
| 24 | 2006.00 | 109.26 | 27913.18 |
| 25 | 2007.00 | 193.31 | 43164.77 |
| 26 | 2008.00 | 215.02 | 79748.84 |
| 27 | 2009.00 | 310.49 | 99483.78 |
| 28 | 2010.00 | 496.93 | 11843.53 |
| 29 | 2011.00 | 534.26 | 20809.44 |
| 30 | 2012.00 | 221.39 | 97072.00 |
| 31 | 2013.00 | 221.86 | 38095.74 |
|  |  | 5 | Q |

Table 15: Estimated SSB in Q1 and recruitment in Q3

|  | time | fbar | fbar5 | ssb | ssb5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2014.25 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 314.87 | 194.48 |
| 2 | 2014.50 | 0.16 | 0.07 | 346.98 | 212.74 |
| 3 | 2014.75 | 0.63 | 0.28 | 225.80 | 134.14 |
| 4 | 2015.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 280.50 | 164.45 |
| 5 | 2015.25 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 220.28 | 129.18 |
| 6 | 2015.50 | 0.16 | 0.07 | 227.99 | 129.24 |
| 7 | 2015.75 | 0.63 | 0.28 | 149.68 | 83.05 |
| 8 | 2016.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 231.97 | 110.28 |

Table 16: Forecast given status quo F. 'fbar5' and 'ssb5' are the 5th percentiles


Figure 33: Run 4 Observed versus predicted.


Figure 34: Total catch weight observed versus predicted by quarter.


Figure 35: Total catch weight observed versus predicted by year.

|  | time | fbar | fbar5.0 | ssb | ssb5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2014.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 315.26 | 194.78 |
| 2 | 2014.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 353.00 | 218.20 |
| 3 | 2014.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 242.75 | 149.69 |
| 4 | 2015.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 333.59 | 212.66 |
| 5 | 2015.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 259.06 | 165.03 |
| 6 | 2015.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 273.21 | 167.66 |
| 7 | 2015.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 185.68 | 112.57 |
| 8 | 2016.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 313.94 | 154.24 |

Table 17: Forecast given zero F. 'fbar5' and 'ssb5' are the 5th percentiles

## Parameter estimates

|  | Estimate | Std. Error |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| logSdLogFsta | -0.37770275 | $1.681664 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogN}$ | -4.00000000 | $1.658156 \mathrm{e}+01$ |
| logSdLogObs | 0.76063278 | $6.278404 \mathrm{e}-02$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.38786445 | $8.778245 \mathrm{e}-02$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.62631197 | 8.757709e-02 |
| logSdLogObs | -0.50816782 | $1.213752 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.78069255 | $1.492233 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.44677772 | $1.188929 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -2.37289475 | $1.971866 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -1.80894355 | $2.297644 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -1.81836753 | 3.364211e-01 |
| $\log Q$ | -2.56082972 | $2.407735 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -1.78466188 | $2.473499 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -2.49594937 | $2.451722 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -1.93409557 | $2.528644 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -1.90154842 | $2.921039 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -2.73142915 | $3.579847 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| trans_rho | 5.37241235 | $4.278246 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogR}$ | -0.08646003 | $1.437117 e-01$ |
| rho | 0.99995689 | 3.688833e-05 |

### 3.5 Run 5

In run 5 the two first years of data (1983 and 1984) have been omitted.


Figure 36: run 5 SSB: Blue is SESAM, green is XSA (May 2014), red is the base run.


Figure 37: run $5 \bar{F}_{1-2}$ : Blue is SESAM by quarter, cyan is SESAM yearly average, green is XSA yearly average, red is the base run.


Figure 38: run 5 Recruitment: Black is SESAM, green is XSA, red is the base run.


Figure 39: run 5 Stock-Recruitment from SESAM (top). SSB is calculated in Q1, whereas recruitment is in Q3. Bottom figure is base run.


Figure 40: run 5 SESAM one-step ahead residuals by fleet. Circles are used for positive observations while ' + ' denotes randomized residuals from zero observations. Blue is positive, red is negative.

|  | time | SSB | lo | hi |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1985 | 182.98 | 114.79 | 251.18 |
| 2 | 1986 | 100.65 | 63.11 | 138.19 |
| 3 | 1987 | 118.43 | 79.52 | 157.34 |
| 4 | 1988 | 142.49 | 80.58 | 204.40 |
| 5 | 1989 | 97.97 | 64.30 | 131.64 |
| 6 | 1990 | 170.55 | 112.78 | 228.32 |
| 7 | 1991 | 214.41 | 140.42 | 288.40 |
| 8 | 1992 | 303.78 | 200.24 | 407.32 |
| 9 | 1993 | 346.94 | 220.65 | 473.24 |
| 10 | 1994 | 211.75 | 121.61 | 301.88 |
| 11 | 1995 | 271.34 | 165.50 | 377.18 |
| 12 | 1996 | 483.82 | 275.13 | 692.50 |
| 13 | 1997 | 365.09 | 208.02 | 522.17 |
| 14 | 1998 | 428.64 | 235.89 | 621.40 |
| 15 | 1999 | 226.91 | 124.76 | 329.07 |
| 16 | 2000 | 283.96 | 166.83 | 401.09 |
| 17 | 2001 | 382.67 | 208.89 | 556.45 |
| 18 | 2002 | 194.62 | 102.81 | 286.42 |
| 19 | 2003 | 137.69 | 70.21 | 205.16 |
| 20 | 2004 | 108.22 | 53.62 | 162.82 |
| 21 | 2005 | 68.87 | 34.30 | 103.43 |
| 22 | 2006 | 89.16 | 53.00 | 125.31 |
| 23 | 2007 | 152.69 | 77.15 | 228.24 |
| 24 | 2008 | 171.25 | 96.38 | 246.11 |
| 25 | 2009 | 250.16 | 143.88 | 356.45 |
| 26 | 2010 | 397.19 | 224.10 | 570.28 |
| 27 | 2011 | 422.23 | 226.62 | 617.84 |
| 28 | 2012 | 171.19 | 93.37 | 249.02 |
| 29 | 2013 | 177.00 | 103.84 | 250.16 |
| 30 | 2014 | 349.72 | 177.42 | 522.02 |

Table 18: SSB in Q1. 'lo' and 'hi' is the 5 and 95 percentiles respectively

|  | time | SSB | recruitment |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1985.00 | 182.98 | 25847.09 |
| 2 | 1986.00 | 100.65 | 57336.91 |
| 3 | 1987.00 | 118.43 | 12514.27 |
| 4 | 1988.00 | 142.49 | 44448.52 |
| 5 | 1989.00 | 97.97 | 48078.90 |
| 6 | 1990.00 | 170.55 | 65375.07 |
| 7 | 1991.00 | 214.41 | 91612.04 |
| 8 | 1992.00 | 303.78 | 47572.04 |
| 9 | 1993.00 | 346.94 | 42158.93 |
| 10 | 1994.00 | 211.75 | 118852.49 |
| 11 | 1995.00 | 271.34 | 49487.13 |
| 12 | 1996.00 | 483.82 | 100109.01 |
| 13 | 1997.00 | 365.09 | 25360.56 |
| 14 | 1998.00 | 428.64 | 45918.93 |
| 15 | 1999.00 | 226.91 | 91881.25 |
| 16 | 2000.00 | 283.96 | 23014.17 |
| 17 | 2001.00 | 382.67 | 25704.23 |
| 18 | 2002.00 | 194.62 | 19350.92 |
| 19 | 2003.00 | 137.69 | 9277.10 |
| 20 | 2004.00 | 108.22 | 9265.02 |
| 21 | 2005.00 | 68.87 | 32607.05 |
| 22 | 2006.00 | 89.16 | 22317.29 |
| 23 | 2007.00 | 152.69 | 35212.32 |
| 24 | 2008.00 | 171.25 | 64495.92 |
| 25 | 2009.00 | 250.16 | 80103.32 |
| 26 | 2010.00 | 397.19 | 8882.67 |
| 27 | 2011.00 | 422.23 | 16892.38 |
| 28 | 2012.00 | 171.19 | 79504.88 |
| 29 | 2013.00 | 177.00 | 31345.86 |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 19: Estimated SSB in Q1 and recruitment in Q3

|  | time | fbar | fbar5 | ssb | ssb5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2014.25 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 250.98 | 153.83 |
| 2 | 2014.50 | 0.20 | 0.08 | 277.54 | 168.83 |
| 3 | 2014.75 | 0.81 | 0.34 | 178.31 | 104.57 |
| 4 | 2015.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 221.18 | 122.81 |
| 5 | 2015.25 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 173.06 | 96.58 |
| 6 | 2015.50 | 0.20 | 0.08 | 180.68 | 96.85 |
| 7 | 2015.75 | 0.81 | 0.34 | 118.08 | 60.93 |
| 8 | 2016.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 180.88 | 79.95 |

Table 20: Forecast given status quo F. 'fbar5' and 'ssb5' are the 5th percentiles


Figure 41: run 5 Observed versus predicted.


Figure 42: Total catch weight observed versus predicted by quarter.


Figure 43: Total catch weight observed versus predicted by year.

|  | time | fbar | fbar5.0 | ssb | ssb5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2014.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 251.34 | 154.23 |
| 2 | 2014.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 283.33 | 174.29 |
| 3 | 2014.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 194.64 | 119.59 |
| 4 | 2015.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 272.29 | 174.71 |
| 5 | 2015.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 212.06 | 134.41 |
| 6 | 2015.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 225.15 | 137.07 |
| 7 | 2015.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 153.40 | 92.31 |
| 8 | 2016.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 265.77 | 126.69 |

Table 21: Forecast given zero F. 'fbar5' and 'ssb5' are the 5th percentiles

## Parameter estimates

|  | Estimate | Std. Error |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| logSdLogFsta | -0.38949954 | $1.960667 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logSdLogN | -4.00000000 | $1.947580 \mathrm{e}+01$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogObs~}$ | 0.88030054 | $6.468808 \mathrm{e}-02$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.34714677 | $9.614269 \mathrm{e}-02$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.63896238 | $9.052506 \mathrm{e}-02$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogObs~}$ | -0.50951304 | $1.156813 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogObs}$ | -0.76981370 | $1.424953 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogObs}$ | -0.42526961 | $1.171982 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -2.19257565 | $1.974076 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.57560688 | $2.308227 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.51044903 | $3.470558 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -2.38242528 | $2.330651 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.58357438 | $2.404675 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -2.29470925 | $2.394244 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.73522740 | $2.469501 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.65492649 | $2.937650 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -2.44393562 | $3.733885 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| trans_rho | 5.26282154 | $4.368801 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogR}$ | -0.05257591 | $1.482907 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| rho | 0.99994632 | $4.689972 \mathrm{e}-05$ |

### 3.6 Run 6

In run 6 the natural mortality has been multiplied with 0.5 relative to the base run.


Figure 44: run 6 SSB: Blue is SESAM, green is XSA (May 2014), red is the base run.


Figure 45: run $6 \bar{F}_{1-2}$ : Blue is SESAM by quarter, cyan is SESAM yearly average, green is XSA yearly average, red is the base run.


Figure 46: run 6 Recruitment: Black is SESAM, green is XSA, red is the base run.


Figure 47: run 6 Stock-Recruitment from SESAM (top). SSB is calculated in Q1, whereas recruitment is in Q3. Bottom figure is base run.


Figure 48: run 6 SESAM one-step ahead residuals by fleet. Circles are used for positive observations while ' + ' denotes randomized residuals from zero observations. Blue is positive, red is negative.

|  | time | SSB | lo | hi |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1983 | 268.32 | 158.56 | 378.08 |
| 2 | 1984 | 274.66 | 157.41 | 391.91 |
| 3 | 1985 | 200.73 | 98.99 | 302.48 |
| 4 | 1986 | 131.85 | 52.72 | 210.97 |
| 5 | 1987 | 136.88 | 60.73 | 213.04 |
| 6 | 1988 | 181.56 | 72.48 | 290.64 |
| 7 | 1989 | 141.95 | 57.01 | 226.90 |
| 8 | 1990 | 200.85 | 95.90 | 305.81 |
| 9 | 1991 | 260.50 | 124.14 | 396.87 |
| 10 | 1992 | 353.09 | 172.96 | 533.21 |
| 11 | 1993 | 455.18 | 203.73 | 706.62 |
| 12 | 1994 | 354.34 | 128.70 | 579.99 |
| 13 | 1995 | 361.76 | 141.46 | 582.06 |
| 14 | 1996 | 638.79 | 255.11 | 1022.48 |
| 15 | 1997 | 589.08 | 219.84 | 958.32 |
| 16 | 1998 | 646.37 | 253.66 | 1039.08 |
| 17 | 1999 | 463.41 | 167.88 | 758.93 |
| 18 | 2000 | 429.68 | 174.39 | 684.98 |
| 19 | 2001 | 550.23 | 207.39 | 893.08 |
| 20 | 2002 | 404.15 | 140.29 | 668.00 |
| 21 | 2003 | 294.30 | 105.73 | 482.87 |
| 22 | 2004 | 230.32 | 79.33 | 381.31 |
| 23 | 2005 | 162.15 | 56.05 | 268.26 |
| 24 | 2006 | 148.77 | 65.16 | 232.37 |
| 25 | 2007 | 227.16 | 93.59 | 360.74 |
| 26 | 2008 | 276.42 | 122.12 | 430.72 |
| 27 | 2009 | 368.79 | 169.64 | 567.95 |
| 28 | 2010 | 570.29 | 257.12 | 883.45 |
| 29 | 2011 | 689.04 | 296.70 | 1081.39 |
| 30 | 2012 | 444.68 | 190.07 | 699.28 |
| 31 | 2013 | 321.28 | 147.18 | 495.38 |
| 32 | 2014 | 510.75 | 216.44 | 805.06 |
| 21 | 10 |  | 1 | 5 | 959.1

Table 22: SSB in Q1. 'lo' and 'hi' is the 5 and 95 percentiles respectively

|  | time | SSB | recruitment |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1983.00 | 268.32 | 38605.11 |
| 2 | 1984.00 | 274.66 | 19906.33 |
| 3 | 1985.00 | 200.73 | 13431.26 |
| 4 | 1986.00 | 131.85 | 26264.40 |
| 5 | 1987.00 | 136.88 | 5917.07 |
| 6 | 1988.00 | 181.56 | 21968.10 |
| 7 | 1989.00 | 141.95 | 24487.70 |
| 8 | 1990.00 | 200.85 | 30140.94 |
| 9 | 1991.00 | 260.50 | 46620.49 |
| 10 | 1992.00 | 353.09 | 23132.17 |
| 11 | 1993.00 | 455.18 | 21019.60 |
| 12 | 1994.00 | 354.34 | 59998.71 |
| 13 | 1995.00 | 361.76 | 24918.45 |
| 14 | 1996.00 | 638.79 | 45509.30 |
| 15 | 1997.00 | 589.08 | 12487.97 |
| 16 | 1998.00 | 646.37 | 21900.00 |
| 17 | 1999.00 | 463.41 | 42600.08 |
| 18 | 2000.00 | 429.68 | 11382.99 |
| 19 | 2001.00 | 550.23 | 13399.90 |
| 20 | 2002.00 | 404.15 | 10141.66 |
| 21 | 2003.00 | 294.30 | 4721.59 |
| 22 | 2004.00 | 230.32 | 4679.45 |
| 23 | 2005.00 | 162.15 | 16840.82 |
| 24 | 2006.00 | 148.77 | 11568.05 |
| 25 | 2007.00 | 227.16 | 18482.40 |
| 26 | 2008.00 | 276.42 | 32643.71 |
| 27 | 2009.00 | 368.79 | 38494.45 |
| 28 | 2010.00 | 570.29 | 4228.26 |
| 29 | 2011.00 | 689.04 | 8215.14 |
| 30 | 2012.00 | 444.68 | 39689.42 |
| 31 | 2013.00 | 321.28 | 16330.02 |
|  |  | 9 | Q |

Table 23: Estimated SSB in Q1 and recruitment in Q3

|  | time | fbar | fbar5 | ssb | ssb5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2014.25 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 452.65 | 253.03 |
| 2 | 2014.50 | 0.12 | 0.05 | 557.08 | 309.11 |
| 3 | 2014.75 | 0.43 | 0.18 | 441.78 | 239.71 |
| 4 | 2015.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 470.43 | 258.33 |
| 5 | 2015.25 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 449.75 | 247.85 |
| 6 | 2015.50 | 0.12 | 0.05 | 499.30 | 275.37 |
| 7 | 2015.75 | 0.43 | 0.18 | 392.33 | 215.05 |
| 8 | 2016.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 414.77 | 217.24 |

Table 24: Forecast given status quo F. 'fbar5' and 'ssb5' are the 5th percentiles


Figure 49: run 6 Observed versus predicted.


Figure 50: Total catch weight observed versus predicted by quarter.


Figure 51: Total catch weight observed versus predicted by year.

|  | time | fbar | fbar5.0 | ssb | ssb5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2014.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 452.96 | 253.28 |
| 2 | 2014.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 563.66 | 314.67 |
| 3 | 2014.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 459.48 | 256.61 |
| 4 | 2015.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 510.90 | 297.18 |
| 5 | 2015.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 486.77 | 284.25 |
| 6 | 2015.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 548.38 | 321.42 |
| 7 | 2015.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 439.33 | 258.25 |
| 8 | 2016.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 499.11 | 278.33 |

Table 25: Forecast given zero F. 'fbar5' and 'ssb5' are the 5th percentiles

## Parameter estimates

|  | Estimate | Std. Error |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| logSdLogFsta | -0.46587262 | $2.125070 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logSdLogN | -2.66568964 | $3.810024 \mathrm{e}+00$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogObs~}$ | 0.90314410 | $6.256002 \mathrm{e}-02$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.35712756 | $9.727371 \mathrm{e}-02$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.56775246 | $8.595565 \mathrm{e}-02$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogObs~}$ | -0.52193522 | $1.239748 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogObs}$ | -0.75578032 | $1.520942 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogObs}$ | -0.37881597 | $1.127986 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.84231298 | $2.470393 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.80598468 | $3.095974 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -3.17418109 | $4.084801 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.76662697 | $2.897969 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.52394877 | $3.060091 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.70774540 | $3.003562 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.71221619 | $3.137894 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -2.39037398 | $3.736764 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -4.59800864 | $4.176932 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| trans_rho | 5.35778963 | $5.371490 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogR}$ | -0.08011774 | $1.540767 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| rho | 0.99995561 | $4.768904 \mathrm{e}-05$ |

## 3.7 run 7

Without 1983.


Figure 52: run 7 SSB: Blue is SESAM, green is XSA (May 2014), red is the base run.


Figure 53: run $7 \bar{F}_{1-2}$ : Blue is SESAM by quarter, cyan is SESAM yearly average, green is XSA yearly average, red is the base run.


Figure 54: run 7 Recruitment: Black is SESAM, green is XSA, red is the base run.


Figure 55: run 7 Stock-Recruitment from SESAM (top). SSB is calculated in Q1, whereas recruitment is in Q3. Bottom figure is base run.


Figure 56: run 7 SESAM one-step ahead residuals by fleet. Circles are used for positive observations while ' + ' denotes randomized residuals from zero observations. Blue is positive, red is negative.

|  | time | SSB | lo | hi |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1984 | 348.99 | 225.12 | 472.86 |
| 2 | 1985 | 188.43 | 124.08 | 252.79 |
| 3 | 1986 | 101.00 | 65.23 | 136.78 |
| 4 | 1987 | 122.58 | 83.48 | 161.69 |
| 5 | 1988 | 147.92 | 85.18 | 210.65 |
| 6 | 1989 | 100.93 | 67.04 | 134.83 |
| 7 | 1990 | 175.04 | 117.02 | 233.05 |
| 8 | 1991 | 220.66 | 146.57 | 294.75 |
| 9 | 1992 | 312.69 | 208.81 | 416.56 |
| 10 | 1993 | 357.86 | 230.50 | 485.23 |
| 11 | 1994 | 220.00 | 129.36 | 310.64 |
| 12 | 1995 | 281.01 | 174.72 | 387.31 |
| 13 | 1996 | 502.61 | 291.84 | 713.38 |
| 14 | 1997 | 380.42 | 222.31 | 538.52 |
| 15 | 1998 | 445.70 | 251.49 | 639.92 |
| 16 | 1999 | 237.29 | 134.40 | 340.17 |
| 17 | 2000 | 295.68 | 177.94 | 413.42 |
| 18 | 2001 | 398.72 | 223.65 | 573.79 |
| 19 | 2002 | 203.67 | 111.34 | 296.00 |
| 20 | 2003 | 144.20 | 76.52 | 211.89 |
| 21 | 2004 | 113.01 | 58.57 | 167.44 |
| 22 | 2005 | 72.10 | 37.61 | 106.59 |
| 23 | 2006 | 92.57 | 56.44 | 128.71 |
| 24 | 2007 | 159.44 | 84.05 | 234.83 |
| 25 | 2008 | 178.48 | 103.70 | 253.26 |
| 26 | 2009 | 260.57 | 154.29 | 366.85 |
| 27 | 2010 | 414.05 | 240.62 | 587.48 |
| 28 | 2011 | 438.43 | 243.40 | 633.45 |
| 29 | 2012 | 178.03 | 100.50 | 255.57 |
| 30 | 2013 | 183.98 | 110.85 | 257.12 |
| 31 | 2014 | 364.88 | 191.91 | 537.85 |
| 21 | 10 |  |  | 5 |

Table 26: SSB in Q1. 'lo' and 'hi' is the 5 and 95 percentiles respectively

|  | time | SSB | recruitment |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1984.00 | 348.99 | 41143.87 |
| 2 | 1985.00 | 188.43 | 26675.17 |
| 3 | 1986.00 | 101.00 | 58289.74 |
| 4 | 1987.00 | 122.58 | 12746.72 |
| 5 | 1988.00 | 147.92 | 45207.31 |
| 6 | 1989.00 | 100.93 | 48950.73 |
| 7 | 1990.00 | 175.04 | 66574.99 |
| 8 | 1991.00 | 220.66 | 93517.86 |
| 9 | 1992.00 | 312.69 | 48558.49 |
| 10 | 1993.00 | 357.86 | 43150.84 |
| 11 | 1994.00 | 220.00 | 122324.84 |
| 12 | 1995.00 | 281.01 | 51114.44 |
| 13 | 1996.00 | 502.61 | 103013.88 |
| 14 | 1997.00 | 380.42 | 26311.36 |
| 15 | 1998.00 | 445.70 | 47477.40 |
| 16 | 1999.00 | 237.29 | 94835.93 |
| 17 | 2000.00 | 295.68 | 23818.06 |
| 18 | 2001.00 | 398.72 | 26614.42 |
| 19 | 2002.00 | 203.67 | 19946.38 |
| 20 | 2003.00 | 144.20 | 9648.61 |
| 21 | 2004.00 | 113.01 | 9615.67 |
| 22 | 2005.00 | 72.10 | 33689.87 |
| 23 | 2006.00 | 92.57 | 23229.04 |
| 24 | 2007.00 | 159.44 | 36597.79 |
| 25 | 2008.00 | 178.48 | 67193.79 |
| 26 | 2009.00 | 260.57 | 82785.04 |
| 27 | 2010.00 | 414.05 | 9245.32 |
| 28 | 2011.00 | 438.43 | 17516.59 |
| 29 | 2012.00 | 178.03 | 82407.64 |
| 30 | 2013.00 | 183.98 | 32187.21 |
| E |  |  | 2 |

Table 27: Estimated SSB in Q1 and recruitment in Q3

|  | time | fbar | fbar5 | ssb | ssb5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2014.25 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 262.16 | 162.70 |
| 2 | 2014.50 | 0.18 | 0.08 | 289.27 | 179.02 |
| 3 | 2014.75 | 0.77 | 0.33 | 186.07 | 111.63 |
| 4 | 2015.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 230.80 | 133.14 |
| 5 | 2015.25 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 181.33 | 104.77 |
| 6 | 2015.50 | 0.18 | 0.08 | 187.21 | 104.94 |
| 7 | 2015.75 | 0.77 | 0.33 | 122.64 | 66.85 |
| 8 | 2016.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 188.28 | 86.74 |

Table 28: Forecast given status quo F. 'fbar5' and 'ssb5' are the 5th percentiles


Figure 57: run 7 Observed versus predicted.

|  | time | fbar | fbar5.0 | ssb | ssb5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2014.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 262.50 | 163.22 |
| 2 | 2014.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 294.75 | 183.86 |
| 3 | 2014.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 202.80 | 126.81 |
| 4 | 2015.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 281.96 | 181.75 |
| 5 | 2015.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 219.54 | 140.35 |
| 6 | 2015.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 232.24 | 143.45 |
| 7 | 2015.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 157.82 | 96.68 |
| 8 | 2016.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 270.80 | 134.39 |

Table 29: Forecast given zero F. 'fbar5' and 'ssb5' are the 5th percentiles

## Parameter estimates

|  | Estimate | Std. Error |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| logSdLogFsta | -0.39782473 | $1.893602 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logSdLogN | -4.00000000 | $1.765474 \mathrm{e}+01$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogObs~}$ | 0.91023112 | $6.380487 \mathrm{e}-02$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.36272725 | $9.398721 \mathrm{e}-02$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.64757696 | $8.894566 \mathrm{e}-02$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogObs~}$ | -0.50732275 | $1.153137 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogObs}$ | -0.77109653 | $1.420923 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogObs}$ | -0.42460106 | $1.168632 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -2.21461403 | $1.874743 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.62806292 | $2.188063 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.56519572 | $3.301265 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -2.41511573 | $2.269417 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.61874961 | $2.337151 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -2.32935646 | $2.320872 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.77249792 | $2.389745 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -1.70043776 | $2.826649 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logQ}$ | -2.49724374 | $3.564953 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| trans_rho | 5.35059020 | $4.907860 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogR}$ | -0.06780765 | $1.459797 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| rho | 0.99995496 | $4.420475 \mathrm{e}-05$ |

## 3.8 run 8

Without 1983, 1984, and 1985.


Figure 58: run 8 SSB: Blue is SESAM, green is XSA (May 2014), red is the base run.


Figure 59: run $8 \bar{F}_{1-2}$ : Blue is SESAM by quarter, cyan is SESAM yearly average, green is XSA yearly average, red is the base run.


Figure 60: run 8 Recruitment: Black is SESAM, green is XSA, red is the base run.


Figure 61: run 8 Stock-Recruitment from SESAM (top). SSB is calculated in Q1, whereas recruitment is in Q3. Bottom figure is base run.


Figure 62: run 8 SESAM one-step ahead residuals by fleet. Circles are used for positive observations while ' + ' denotes randomized residuals from zero observations. Blue is positive, red is negative.

|  | time | SSB | lo | hi |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1986 | 103.31 | 59.75 | 146.88 |
| 2 | 1987 | 139.35 | 84.35 | 194.35 |
| 3 | 1988 | 174.00 | 82.22 | 265.78 |
| 4 | 1989 | 114.44 | 64.90 | 163.97 |
| 5 | 1990 | 193.31 | 114.26 | 272.36 |
| 6 | 1991 | 244.06 | 142.67 | 345.45 |
| 7 | 1992 | 345.72 | 202.96 | 488.47 |
| 8 | 1993 | 397.63 | 221.74 | 573.52 |
| 9 | 1994 | 253.28 | 119.97 | 386.58 |
| 10 | 1995 | 323.10 | 164.94 | 481.27 |
| 11 | 1996 | 579.38 | 277.20 | 881.56 |
| 12 | 1997 | 443.58 | 210.83 | 676.33 |
| 13 | 1998 | 520.64 | 239.15 | 802.14 |
| 14 | 1999 | 279.07 | 126.48 | 431.66 |
| 15 | 2000 | 343.17 | 168.96 | 517.37 |
| 16 | 2001 | 467.89 | 211.50 | 724.27 |
| 17 | 2002 | 241.93 | 104.33 | 379.52 |
| 18 | 2003 | 171.22 | 71.66 | 270.79 |
| 19 | 2004 | 134.87 | 56.07 | 213.67 |
| 20 | 2005 | 85.67 | 36.14 | 135.20 |
| 21 | 2006 | 107.15 | 54.39 | 159.90 |
| 22 | 2007 | 189.28 | 80.41 | 298.16 |
| 23 | 2008 | 208.83 | 99.42 | 318.24 |
| 24 | 2009 | 303.02 | 147.91 | 458.13 |
| 25 | 2010 | 482.36 | 230.25 | 734.47 |
| 26 | 2011 | 519.38 | 234.34 | 804.41 |
| 27 | 2012 | 210.83 | 97.08 | 324.57 |
| 28 | 2013 | 212.16 | 106.47 | 317.86 |
| 29 | 2014 | 421.10 | 181.60 | 660.59 |

Table 30: SSB in Q1. 'lo' and 'hi' is the 5 and 95 percentiles respectively

|  | time | SSB | recruitment |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1986.00 | 103.31 | 63771.28 |
| 2 | 1987.00 | 139.35 | 13594.59 |
| 3 | 1988.00 | 174.00 | 48489.33 |
| 4 | 1989.00 | 114.44 | 52301.77 |
| 5 | 1990.00 | 193.31 | 71789.38 |
| 6 | 1991.00 | 244.06 | 100597.10 |
| 7 | 1992.00 | 345.72 | 52599.78 |
| 8 | 1993.00 | 397.63 | 47906.02 |
| 9 | 1994.00 | 253.28 | 137097.51 |
| 10 | 1995.00 | 323.10 | 57191.68 |
| 11 | 1996.00 | 579.38 | 117032.77 |
| 12 | 1997.00 | 443.58 | 29386.84 |
| 13 | 1998.00 | 520.64 | 53565.30 |
| 14 | 1999.00 | 279.07 | 107909.93 |
| 15 | 2000.00 | 343.17 | 26997.89 |
| 16 | 2001.00 | 467.89 | 30111.89 |
| 17 | 2002.00 | 241.93 | 23056.74 |
| 18 | 2003.00 | 171.22 | 11070.77 |
| 19 | 2004.00 | 134.87 | 11001.79 |
| 20 | 2005.00 | 85.67 | 39062.80 |
| 21 | 2006.00 | 107.15 | 26902.02 |
| 22 | 2007.00 | 189.28 | 42378.34 |
| 23 | 2008.00 | 208.83 | 77196.11 |
| 24 | 2009.00 | 303.02 | 97045.53 |
| 25 | 2010.00 | 482.36 | 10641.04 |
| 26 | 2011.00 | 519.38 | 20027.86 |
| 27 | 2012.00 | 210.83 | 93291.59 |
| 28 | 2013.00 | 212.16 | 36522.57 |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 31: Estimated SSB in Q1 and recruitment in Q3

|  | time | fbar | fbar5 | ssb | ssb5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2014.25 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 301.12 | 170.63 |
| 2 | 2014.50 | 0.16 | 0.06 | 332.32 | 187.11 |
| 3 | 2014.75 | 0.66 | 0.26 | 215.82 | 116.62 |
| 4 | 2015.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 270.08 | 145.72 |
| 5 | 2015.25 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 212.05 | 114.75 |
| 6 | 2015.50 | 0.16 | 0.06 | 221.62 | 116.62 |
| 7 | 2015.75 | 0.66 | 0.26 | 145.64 | 74.09 |
| 8 | 2016.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 225.34 | 99.75 |

Table 32: Forecast given status quo F. 'fbar5' and 'ssb5' are the 5th percentiles


Figure 63: run 8 Observed versus predicted.

|  | time | fbar | fbar5.0 | ssb | ssb5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2014.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 301.54 | 170.89 |
| 2 | 2014.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 338.29 | 192.62 |
| 3 | 2014.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 232.50 | 132.25 |
| 4 | 2015.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 321.78 | 195.60 |
| 5 | 2015.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 251.77 | 151.78 |
| 6 | 2015.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 266.73 | 156.94 |
| 7 | 2015.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 182.18 | 105.78 |
| 8 | 2016.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 309.26 | 148.02 |

Table 33: Forecast given zero F. 'fbar5' and 'ssb5' are the 5th percentiles

## Parameter estimates

|  | Estimate | Std. Error |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| logSdLogFsta | -0.3735957 | $2.057461 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogN}$ | -4.0000000 | $1.052187 e+01$ |
| logSdLogObs | 0.8640896 | $6.560511 \mathrm{e}-02$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.3378024 | $1.015640 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.6515812 | 9.121463e-02 |
| logSdLogObs | -0.5073017 | $1.145527 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.7750838 | $1.416808 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| logSdLogObs | -0.4220508 | $1.161581 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -2.3402637 | $2.467687 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -1.7737635 | $2.888264 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -1.7743100 | $4.065936 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -2.5422904 | $2.805104 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -1.7489679 | $2.898946 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -2.4643668 | $2.893105 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -1.9110519 | $2.982583 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -1.8650993 | $3.498653 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\log Q$ | -2.7213021 | $4.284419 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| trans_rho | 5.2143044 | $4.101827 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogR}$ | -0.0443999 | $1.495780 \mathrm{e}-01$ |
| rho | 0.9999409 | $4.852041 \mathrm{e}-05$ |

## 3.9 run 9

$\log F$ random walk variance NOT inflated for increments that involve years where the fishery was closed (end point in the period Q1 2005 to 2007 Q4).


Figure 64: run 9 SSB: Blue is SESAM, green is XSA (May 2014), red is the base run.


Figure 65: run $9 \bar{F}_{1-2}$ : Blue is SESAM by quarter, cyan is SESAM yearly average, green is XSA yearly average, red is the base run.


Figure 66: run 9 Recruitment: Black is SESAM, green is XSA, red is the base run.


Figure 67: run 9 Stock-Recruitment from SESAM (top). SSB is calculated in Q1, whereas recruitment is in Q3. Bottom figure is base run.


Figure 68: run 9 SESAM one-step ahead residuals by fleet. Circles are used for positive observations while ' + ' denotes randomized residuals from zero observations. Blue is positive, red is negative.
$\left.\begin{array}{rrrrr}\hline & \text { time } & \text { SSB } & \text { lo } & \text { hi } \\ \hline 1 & 1983 & 406.47 & 253.20 & 559.74 \\ 2 & 1984 & 402.36 & 255.67 & 549.04 \\ 3 & 1985 & 256.50 & 151.95 & 361.06 \\ 4 & 1986 & 147.22 & 69.96 & 224.48 \\ 5 & 1987 & 183.65 & 97.72 & 269.59 \\ 6 & 1988 & 234.21 & 95.26 & 373.16 \\ 7 & 1989 & 164.13 & 82.49 & 245.77 \\ 8 & 1990 & 244.43 & 130.48 & 358.38 \\ 9 & 1991 & 314.96 & 164.82 & 465.11 \\ 10 & 1992 & 453.76 & 242.72 & 664.80 \\ 11 & 1993 & 536.63 & 264.13 & 809.12 \\ 12 & 1994 & 346.04 & 146.43 & 545.65 \\ 13 & 1995 & 439.58 & 203.96 & 675.21 \\ 14 & 1996 & 827.00 & 363.10 & 1290.91 \\ 15 & 1997 & 643.55 & 287.80 & 999.30 \\ 16 & 1998 & 733.30 & 318.82 & 1147.78 \\ 17 & 1999 & 410.34 & 180.94 & 639.73 \\ 18 & 2000 & 475.50 & 224.93 & 726.08 \\ 19 & 2001 & 675.49 & 287.90 & 1063.08 \\ 20 & 2002 & 356.86 & 153.01 & 560.70 \\ 21 & 2003 & 244.95 & 98.43 & 391.47 \\ 22 & 2004 & 202.87 & 83.18 & 322.57 \\ 23 & 2005 & 125.47 & 51.85 & 199.09 \\ 24 & 2006 & 152.09 & 72.74 & 231.43 \\ 25 & 2007 & 295.73 & 130.96 & 460.49 \\ 26 & 2008 & 307.20 & 143.26 & 471.13 \\ 27 & 2009 & 415.72 & 197.13 & 634.32 \\ 28 & 2010 & 672.46 & 312.44 & 1032.49 \\ 29 & 2011 & 744.87 & 318.40 & 1171.34 \\ 30 & 2012 & 324.09 & 141.59 & 506.58 \\ 31 & 2013 & 293.45 & 140.35 & 446.54 \\ 32 & 2014 & 540.93 & 218.54 & 863.32 \\ \hline 1 & 10 & & 1 & 5\end{array}\right)$

Table 34: SSB in Q1. 'lo' and 'hi' is the 5 and 95 percentiles respectively

|  | time | SSB | recruitment |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1983.00 | 406.47 | 95812.31 |
| 2 | 1984.00 | 402.36 | 52622.97 |
| 3 | 1985.00 | 256.50 | 34586.21 |
| 4 | 1986.00 | 147.22 | 74053.26 |
| 5 | 1987.00 | 183.65 | 17555.23 |
| 6 | 1988.00 | 234.21 | 60126.45 |
| 7 | 1989.00 | 164.13 | 65153.40 |
| 8 | 1990.00 | 244.43 | 82376.82 |
| 9 | 1991.00 | 314.96 | 127751.51 |
| 10 | 1992.00 | 453.76 | 68354.53 |
| 11 | 1993.00 | 536.63 | 63997.50 |
| 12 | 1994.00 | 346.04 | 182320.51 |
| 13 | 1995.00 | 439.58 | 81429.79 |
| 14 | 1996.00 | 827.00 | 144140.94 |
| 15 | 1997.00 | 643.55 | 39878.44 |
| 16 | 1998.00 | 733.30 | 68446.17 |
| 17 | 1999.00 | 410.34 | 136558.40 |
| 18 | 2000.00 | 475.50 | 37437.55 |
| 19 | 2001.00 | 675.49 | 41426.71 |
| 20 | 2002.00 | 356.86 | 37045.24 |
| 21 | 2003.00 | 244.95 | 16281.26 |
| 22 | 2004.00 | 202.87 | 14940.67 |
| 23 | 2005.00 | 125.47 | 57281.62 |
| 24 | 2006.00 | 152.09 | 37999.37 |
| 25 | 2007.00 | 295.73 | 59671.27 |
| 26 | 2008.00 | 307.20 | 98158.54 |
| 27 | 2009.00 | 415.72 | 133395.86 |
| 28 | 2010.00 | 672.46 | 17500.44 |
| 29 | 2011.00 | 744.87 | 28906.59 |
| 30 | 2012.00 | 324.09 | 118590.65 |
| 31 | 2013.00 | 293.45 | 44624.34 |
|  |  | 9 | $Q 1$ |

Table 35: Estimated SSB in Q1 and recruitment in Q3

|  | time | fbar | fbar5 | ssb | ssb5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2014.25 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 388.98 | 211.01 |
| 2 | 2014.50 | 0.19 | 0.08 | 425.27 | 225.91 |
| 3 | 2014.75 | 0.59 | 0.23 | 274.21 | 137.12 |
| 4 | 2015.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 341.75 | 175.01 |
| 5 | 2015.25 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 271.33 | 138.28 |
| 6 | 2015.50 | 0.19 | 0.08 | 282.98 | 140.90 |
| 7 | 2015.75 | 0.59 | 0.23 | 186.49 | 89.29 |
| 8 | 2016.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 298.48 | 134.02 |

Table 36: Forecast given status quo F. 'fbar5' and 'ssb5' are the 5th percentiles


Figure 69: run 8 Observed versus predicted.

|  | time | fbar | fbar5.0 | ssb | ssb5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2014.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 389.83 | 211.72 |
| 2 | 2014.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 434.05 | 233.69 |
| 3 | 2014.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 298.79 | 157.32 |
| 4 | 2015.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 406.63 | 232.33 |
| 5 | 2015.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 320.32 | 179.56 |
| 6 | 2015.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 339.47 | 185.18 |
| 7 | 2015.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 233.92 | 124.07 |
| 8 | 2016.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 403.73 | 191.75 |

Table 37: Forecast given zero F. 'fbar5' and 'ssb5' are the 5th percentiles

## Parameter estimates

|  | Estimat | Std. Error |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| logSdLogFsta | 0.5225184 | 0.08094524 |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogN}$ | -2.0487090 | 0.96866392 |
| logSdLogObs | 0.8598290 | 0.07435483 |
| logSdLogObs | -0.5045405 | 0.09543755 |
| logSdLogObs | -0.6569763 | 0.09347905 |
| logSdLogObs | -0.5142971 | 0.12031938 |
| logSdLogObs | -0.8105399 | 0.15220142 |
| logSdLogObs | -0.4539778 | 0.12080368 |
| $\log Q$ | -2.6282446 | 0.25059190 |
| $\log Q$ | -2.1102179 | 0.29149656 |
| $\log Q$ | -2.2412425 | 0.40971581 |
| $\log Q$ | -2.8541428 | 0.29536758 |
| $\log Q$ | -2.0728556 | 0.30397908 |
| $\log Q$ | -2.7874268 | 0.30059608 |
| $\log Q$ | -2. 2501052 | 0.30792043 |
| $\log Q$ | -2.2468620 | 0.35559650 |
| $\log Q$ | -3.1728541 | 0.41659265 |
| trans_rho | 2.4627419 | 0.40159986 |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogR}$ | -0.1191183 | 0.15603907 |
| rho | 0.9855862 | 0.01149372 |
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## 4 Appendix

### 4.1 Parameter names

| Name | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\operatorname{logSdLogFsta}$ | $\log$ of process CV for $\log F$ <br> $\log$ of process CV for $\log N$ (survival <br> process) <br> log observation CV. Estimates and their <br> ordering correspond to the 'keyVarObs' <br> coupling. <br> $\log$ catchability (surveys only). Esti- <br> mates and their ordering correspond to |
| trans_rho | the 'keyLogQ' coupling. <br> correlation between increments in the <br> $\log F$ for neighbouring age groups (on <br> transformed scale) <br> log of process CV for log recruitment <br> function. <br> same as 'trans_rho' except on the nor- <br> mal scale (i.e. between -1 and 1). |
| rogSdLogR | rho |

### 4.2 Coupling of parameters

Rows denote fleets (if multiple), columns are ages.

| \$keyVarObs |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | [,1] | [,2] | [,3] | [,4] |
| [1,] | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| [2,] | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| [3,] | NA | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| [4, ] | 5 | 5 | NA | NA |
| [5, ] | 6 | 6 | NA | NA |
| [6, ] | NA | NA | 7 | 7 |

\$keyVarLogN
[1] 0000
\$keyLogFsta
[1] 0123
\$keyVarLogF
[1] 0000
\$keyLogQ
[,1] [,2] [,3] [,4]
[1,] NA NA NA NA
$[2] \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad$,
$[3] \quad \mathrm{NA} \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad$,
$[4] \quad 7 \quad 8 \quad \mathrm{NA} \quad$,
$[5] \quad 9 \quad$,$10 \quad NA \quad$ NA
$[6] \quad \mathrm{NA} \quad \mathrm{NA} 11 \quad$,

| Name | Description |
| :---: | :---: |
| keyVarObs | observation variance coupling |
| keyVarLogN | survival process variance |
| keyVarLogF | F-process variance coupling |
| keyLogQ | catchability coupling |

### 4.3 Simulation study

The results from the simulation study are shown in figure 70. The true simulated state trajectories $(\log (\mathrm{N})$ and $\log (\mathrm{F}))$ are generally within the confidence bounds of the estimated trajectories as expected. The confidence intervals for the estimated fixed effect parameters also appear to have the right coverage, so the conclusion must be that the simulation code correctly correponds to the estimation code and the model is identifiable from the data.


Figure 70: Results from simulation study. Excerpt of true and estimated log-transformed stock numbers, $\log (\mathrm{N})$, by age over time (quarterly timesteps, only first 50 are shown), log-transformed fishing mortalities by age, $\log (\mathrm{F})$, (ages 7 and 8 have been grouped together), and parameters (right panel, true values shown as red dots). On all figures $95 \%$ marginal confidence intervals are shown, and on the figures with $\log (\mathrm{N})$ and $\log (\mathrm{F})$ true values are shown as numbers, and estimated values are shown as thick lines with thin dashed lines indicating CIs.

