## Beaked redfish (Sebastes mentella) in subareas 1 and 2 (Northeast Arctic)

## ICES advice on fishing opportunities

ICES advises that when the precautionary approach is applied, catches in 2021 should be no more than 66158 tonnes, and catches in 2022 should be no more than 67210 tonnes.

Note: This advice sheet is abbreviated due to the Covid-19 disruption. The previous advice issued for 2019-2020 is attached as Annex 1.

## Stock development over time



Figure $1 \quad$ Beaked redfish in subareas 1 and 2. Summary of the stock assessment. The assumed recruitment value is unshaded. Shaded areas (F, SSB) and error bars (R) indicate 95\% confidence intervals.

## Stock and exploitation status

Table 1 Beaked redfish in subareas 1 and 2. State of the stock and the fishery relative to reference points.

|  | Fishing pressure |  |  |  |  | Stock size |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2017 | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | 2018 | 2019 |  | 2020 |
| Maximum sustainable yield | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {MSY }}$ |  | ? | ? | Undefined | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{MSY} \\ & \mathrm{~B}_{\text {trigger }} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | Above trigger |
| Precautionary approach |  | (v) | (v) | $(v)$ | Below possible reference points | $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{pa}} \mathrm{B}_{\text {lim }}$ | - | ( |  | Full reproductive capacity |
| Management plan | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {MGT }}$ | - | - | - | Not applicable | $\mathrm{B}_{\text {MGT }}$ | - | - |  | Not applicable |

## Catch scenarios

Table 2 Beaked redfish in subareas 1 and 2. Assumptions made for the interim year and in the forecast.

| Variable | Value | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $F_{\text {ages 19+ }}$ (2020) | 0.045 | F2019 |
| SSB (2021) | 948178 tonnes | Short-term forecast |
| Rage 2 (2021) | 409925 thousands | Regression between survey indices and recruitment time-series |
| Catch (2020) | 48305 tonnes | Short-term forecast |

Table 3a Beaked redfish in subareas 1 and 2. Annual catch scenarios for 2021. All weights are in tonnes.

| Basis | Total catch (2021) | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{F}_{\text {total }} \\ (2021) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SSB } \\ (2022) \end{gathered}$ | \% SSB change * | \% TAC change ** | \% Advice change *** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ICES advice basis |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICES <br> Precautionary Approach | 66158 | 0.060 | 964737 | 1.7 | 18.4 | 18.4 |
| Other scenarios |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{F}=0$ | 0 | 0 | 1018666 | 7.4 | -100.00 | -100.00 |
| $\mathrm{F}_{2021}=\mathrm{F}_{2020}$ | 49703 | 0.045 | 978137 | 3.2 | -11.0 | -11.0 |
| $\mathrm{F}_{2021}=1.1 \times \mathrm{F}_{2020}$ | 54566 | 0.049 | 974176 | 2.7 | -2.3 | -2.3 |
| $\mathrm{F}_{2021}=1.2 \times \mathrm{F}_{2020}$ | 59409 | 0.054 | 970232 | 2.3 | 6.4 | 6.4 |
| $\mathrm{F}_{2021}=0.9 \times \mathrm{F}_{2020}$ | 44821 | 0.040 | 982114 | 3.6 | -19.8 | -19.8 |
| $\mathrm{F}_{2021}=0.8 \times \mathrm{F}_{2020}$ | 39920 | 0.036 | 986108 | 4.0 | -28.5 | -28.5 |
| $\mathrm{F}=0.08$ | 87441 | 0.080 | 947421 | -0.1 | 56.5 | 56.5 |
| $\mathrm{F}=0.084$ | 91652 | 0.084 | 943996 | -0.4 | 64.1 | 64.1 |
| $\mathrm{F}=0.10$ | 108350 | 0.100 | 930423 | -1.9 | 94.0 | 94.0 |
| Suggested 50000 t cap for all evaluated HCRs | 50000 | 0.045 | 977895 | 3.1 | -10.5 | -10.5 |

* SSB 2022 relative to SSB 2021 (948178 tonnes).
** Catch in 2021 relative to TAC set by Norway and Russia in 2020 (55860 tonnes).
*** Advice value for 2021 relative to the advice value for 2020.
Table 3b Beaked redfish in subareas 1 and 2. Annual catch scenarios for 2022 with $\mathrm{F}_{2021}=0.06$. All weights are in tonnes.

| Basis | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total catch } \\ \text { (2022) } \end{gathered}$ | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {total }}(2022)$ | SSB (2023) | \% SSB change * | \% TAC change ** | \% Advice change *** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ICES advice basis |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| F = 0.06 | 67210 | 0.060 | 985269 | 3.9 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Other scenarios |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{F}=0.08$ | 87316 | 0.080 | 950710 | 0.3 | 32.0 | 32.0 |
| $\mathrm{F}=0.084$ | 91209 | 0.084 | 943950 | -0.4 | 37.9 | 37.9 |
| $\mathrm{F}=0.10$ | 106354 | 0.100 | 917408 | -3.2 | 60.8 | 60.8 |
| Suggested 50000 t cap for all evaluated HCRs | 50000 | 0.044 | 1014319 | 7.0 | -24.4 | -24.4 |

* SSB 2023 relative to SSB 2021 (948178 tonnes).
** Catch in 2022 relative to TAC in 2021 under the $F=0.06$ scenario ( 66158 tonnes).
*** Advice value for 2022 relative to the advice value for 2021.


## Quality of the assessment



Figure 2 Beaked redfish in subareas 1 and 2. Historical assessment results. Prior to 2018, $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{bar}}$ was calculated over the ages 1218. Recruitment was revised upwards by the inclusion of an updated Barents Sea ecosystem survey index. Forecast recruitment is based on regression between survey indices and recruitment time-series for the intermediate year, and the average of the last ten cohorts for the subsequent forecast years.

## History of the advice, catch, and management

Table 4 Beaked redfish in subareas 1 and 2. ICES advice, agreed TACs, and catches. All weights are in tonnes.

| Year | ICES advice | Predicted catch corresponding to advice | Agreed TAC | ICES catches |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1987 | Precautionary TAC | 70000* | 85000 | 35000 |
| 1988 | $\mathrm{F}=\mathrm{F}_{0.1}$; TAC | 11000 | - | 41000 |
| 1989 | Status quo F; TAC | 12000 | - | 47000 |
| 1990 | Status quo F; TAC | 18000 | - | 63000 |
| 1991 | $F$ at $F_{\text {med }}$; TAC | 12000 | - | 68000 |
| 1992 | If required, precautionary TAC | 22000 | - | 32000 |
| 1993 | If required, precautionary TAC | 18000 | 18000 | 12814 |
| 1994 | If required, precautionary TAC | - | - | 12721 |
| 1995 | Lowest possible F | - | - | 10284 |
| 1996 | Catch at lowest possible level | - | - | 8075 |
| 1997 | Catch at lowest possible level | - | - | 8598 |
| 1998 | No directed fishery, reduce bycatch | - | - | 14045 |
| 1999 | No directed fishery, reduce bycatch | - | - | 11209 |
| 2000 | No directed fishery, bycatch at lowest possible level | - | - | 10075 |
| 2001 | No directed fishery, bycatch at lowest possible level | - | - | 18418 |
| 2002 | No directed fishery, bycatch at lowest possible level | - | - | 6993 |
| 2003 | No directed fishery, bycatch at lowest possible level | - | - | 2520 |
| 2004 | No directed trawl fishery and low bycatch limits | - | - | 5493** |
| 2005 | No directed trawl fishery and low bycatch limits | - | - | 8465** |
| 2006 | No directed trawl fishery and low bycatch limits | - | - | 33261** |
| 2007 | No directed trawl fishery and low bycatch limits | - | $1550{ }^{\wedge}$ | 20219** |
| 2008 | Protection of juveniles, no directed trawl fishery and low bycatch limits | - | 14500^ | 13095** |
| 2009 | Protection of juveniles, no directed trawl fishery and low bycatch limits | - | 10500^ | 10246** |
| 2010 | Protection of juveniles, no directed trawl fishery and low bycatch limits | - | 8600^ | 11924** |
| 2011 | Protection of juveniles, no directed trawl fishery and low bycatch limits | - | 7900^ | 12962** |


| Year | ICES advice | Predicted catch corresponding to advice | Agreed TAC | ICES catches |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 | Protection of juveniles, no directed fishery and low bycatch limits | - | 7500^ | 11059** |
| 2013 | $\mathrm{F}_{0.1}$ | < 47000 | 19500^ | 9474** |
| 2014 | Status quo catch | < 24000 | $36800 \wedge \wedge$ | 18780** |
| 2015 | Precautionary approach | < 30000 | $3000{ }^{\#}$ | 25836 |
| 2016 | Precautionary approach | < 30000 | 30000\# | 35429 |
| 2017 | Precautionary approach | < 30000 | 30000\# | 31201 |
| 2018 | Precautionary approach | < 32658 | 32658\# | 38739 |
| 2019 | Precautionary approach | < 53757 | 53757\# | 45955 |
| 2020 | Precautionary approach | < 55860 | 55860\# |  |
| 2021 | Precautionary approach | <66158 |  |  |
| 2022 | Precautionary approach | <67210 |  |  |

* Includes both Sebastes mentella and S. norvegicus.
** Includes the pelagic catches in the Norwegian Sea outside the EEZ.
$\wedge$ TAC set by the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC) for an Olympic fishery in international waters.
$\wedge \wedge$ Sum of TAC set by NEAFC in international waters and by Norway in the Norwegian Economic Zone.
\# TAC set by jointly by Norway and Russia.
Table 5 Beaked redfish in subareas 1 and 2. Catches inside and outside the NEAFC Regulatory Area (RA) as estimated by ICES.

| Year | Inside the NEAFC RA <br> (tonnes) | Outside the NEAFC RA <br> (tonnes) | Total catches <br> (tonnes) | Proportion inside the <br> NEAFC RA (\%) |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2017 | 6463 | 24738 | 31201 | $21 \%$ |
| 2018 | 7826 | 30913 | 38739 | $20 \%$ |
| 2019 | 6060 | 39895 | 45955 | $13.2 \%$ |

## Summary of the assessment

Table 6 Beaked redfish in subareas 1 and 2. Assessment summary. Weights are in tonnes.

| Year | Recruitment |  |  | Spawning-stock biomass |  |  | Catches | Fishing mortality |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Recruitment age 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { High } \\ & 95 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Low } \\ & 95 \% \end{aligned}$ | SSB | $\begin{aligned} & \text { High } \\ & 95 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Low } \\ & 95 \% \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{F} \\ \text { ages } \end{gathered}$ | High 95\% | Low <br> 95\% |
|  | thousands |  |  | tonnes |  |  |  | 19+ |  |  |
| 1992 | 417153 | 528945 | 328989 | 254448 | 344979 | 187675 | 15590 | 0.044 | 0.059 | 0.032 |
| 1993 | 278015 | 349985 | 220845 | 316887 | 414833 | 242066 | 12814 | 0.031 | 0.041 | 0.023 |
| 1994 | 194668 | 245034 | 154654 | 398183 | 510259 | 310724 | 12721 | 0.027 | 0.036 | 0.021 |
| 1995 | 183773 | 230453 | 146549 | 457415 | 578782 | 361498 | 10284 | 0.021 | 0.027 | 0.0160 |
| 1996 | 146256 | 183484 | 116582 | 379363 | 488111 | 294843 | 8075 | 0.0140 | 0.0190 | 0.0110 |
| 1997 | 102907 | 129084 | 82039 | 465175 | 583976 | 370542 | 8598 | 0.0140 | 0.0180 | 0.0110 |
| 1998 | 52516 | 66249 | 41629 | 525004 | 652130 | 422659 | 14045 | 0.0190 | 0.024 | 0.0150 |
| 1999 | 45519 | 57363 | 36120 | 590128 | 723931 | 481055 | 11209 | 0.0150 | 0.0190 | 0.0120 |
| 2000 | 34891 | 43911 | 27723 | 683117 | 829643 | 562469 | 10075 | 0.0120 | 0.0140 | 0.0100 |
| 2001 | 36120 | 46197 | 28241 | 634228 | 773026 | 520352 | 18418 | 0.021 | 0.026 | 0.0170 |
| 2002 | 40387 | 51288 | 31803 | 714557 | 863309 | 591435 | 6993 | 0.0070 | 0.0090 | 0.0060 |
| 2003 | 42998 | 54849 | 33708 | 786173 | 944415 | 654446 | 2520 | 0.0030 | 0.0030 | 0.0020 |
| 2004 | 54143 | 68859 | 42573 | 790256 | 946824 | 659578 | 5493 | 0.0060 | 0.0070 | 0.0050 |
| 2005 | 133043 | 169540 | 104403 | 844035 | 1008034 | 706717 | 8465 | 0.0080 | 0.0100 | 0.0070 |
| 2006 | 244520 | 310999 | 192251 | 831383 | 993879 | 695455 | 33261 | 0.039 | 0.051 | 0.030 |
| 2007 | 368760 | 475656 | 285887 | 965725 | 1152187 | 809439 | 20219 | 0.023 | 0.031 | 0.0170 |
| 2008 | 360302 | 467973 | 277404 | 904291 | 1083339 | 754835 | 13095 | 0.0180 | 0.024 | 0.0140 |
| 2009 | 368411 | 486229 | 279142 | 939826 | 1124533 | 785457 | 10246 | 0.0120 | 0.0170 | 0.0090 |
| 2010 | 455484 | 613278 | 338290 | 894833 | 1072690 | 746466 | 11924 | 0.0130 | 0.0180 | 0.0100 |
| 2011 | 603049 | 830030 | 438138 | 882102 | 1057228 | 735984 | 12962 | 0.0150 | 0.020 | 0.0110 |
| 2012 | 436063 | 616081 | 308646 | 876057 | 1049094 | 731560 | 11056 | 0.0130 | 0.0180 | 0.0100 |
| 2013 | 253115 | 374344 | 171145 | 829231 | 995217 | 690928 | 9474 | 0.0120 | 0.0170 | 0.0090 |
| 2014 | 222022 | 340304 | 144852 | 777639 | 935618 | 646334 | 18780 | 0.024 | 0.032 | 0.0180 |


| Year | Recruitment |  |  | Spawning-stock biomass |  |  | Catches | Fishing mortality |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Recruitment age 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { High } \\ & 95 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Low } \\ & 95 \% \end{aligned}$ | SSB | $\begin{aligned} & \text { High } \\ & 95 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Low } \\ & \text { 95\% } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{F} \\ \text { ages } \end{gathered}$ | High 95\% | Low 95\% |
|  | thousands |  |  | tonnes |  |  |  | 19+ |  |  |
| 2015 | 346890 | 599459 | 200736 | 802654 | 961976 | 669719 | 25856 | 0.034 | 0.044 | 0.027 |
| 2016 | 443804 | 859959 | 229037 | 832279 | 994631 | 696427 | 35646 | 0.045 | 0.057 | 0.035 |
| 2017 | 511637 | 1062561 | 246360 | 835969 | 999671 | 699074 | 30934 | 0.038 | 0.049 | 0.030 |
| 2018 | 445345 | 1050183 | 188855 | 856590 | 1023395 | 716973 | 38739 | 0.042 | 0.055 | 0.033 |
| 2019 | 423351 | 1187156 | 150971 | 885553 | 1057688 | 741433 | 45955 | 0.045 | 0.059 | 0.034 |
| 2020 | 264746* |  |  | 917578 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* Assumed value (regression between survey indices and recruitment time-series).
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## Beaked redfish (Sebastes mentella) in subareas 1 and 2 (Northeast Arctic)

ICES advice on fishing opportunities
ICES advises that when the precautionary approach is applied, catches in 2019 should be no more th $5375 \%$ es, and catches in 2020 should be no more than 55860 tonnes.

Stock development over time
Spawning-stock biomass (SSB) increased steadily from 1992 to 2007, followed by stab wLo ion below that peak. Whilst the year classes 1996-2003 were weak, there is evidence for strong year classe 2005 -2010. Recent recruitments are slightly above the long-term average. Fishing mortality has been low but has increased sir :e 7 J .


Figure 1
Beaked redfish in subareas unshaded.
d 2. Summary of the stock assessment. Assumed recruitment value for 2018 is

Stock and exploitation status

ICES assesses that fishing ressu on the stock is below possible precautionary levels; and spawning stock size is above MSY Btrigger and above $R_{\text {pa }}$ a $+B_{\text {lir }}$

Table $1 \quad$ Beake redfisio in subareas 1 and 2. State of the stock and fishery relative to reference points.


## Catch scenarios

Table 2 Beaked redfish in subareas 1 and 2. Assumptions made for the interim year and in the forecast.

| Variable | Value | Notes |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $F_{\text {ages 19+ }}(2018)$ | 0.039 | $F_{2017}$ |  |
| SSB (2019) | 841973 tonnes | Short term forecast |  |
| $R_{\text {age 2 }}$ (2018) | 266341 thousands | Regression between survey indices and recruitment | ne serie |
| Catch (2018) | 33386 tonnes | Short-term forecast |  |

Table 3a Beaked redfish in subareas 1 and 2. Annual catch scenarios for 2019. All weights are tonne

| Basis | Total catch (2019) | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {total }}(2019)$ | SSB (2020) | \% SSB change * | \% TAC ange * | \% Advice change *** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ICES advice basis |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICES <br> Precautionary <br> Approach: F=0.06 | 53757 | 0.060 | 860231 |  | 64.6 | 64.6 |
| Other scenarios |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{F}=0$ | 0 | 0 | 905559 |  | -100 | -100 |
| $\mathrm{F}_{2019}=\mathrm{F}_{2018}$ | 35264 | 0.039 | 875810 | $\checkmark \quad 4.0$ | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| $\mathrm{F}_{2019}=1.1 \times \mathrm{F}_{2018}$ | 38724 | 0.043 | 872894 | 3.7 | 18.6 | 18.6 |
| $\mathrm{F}_{2019}=1.2 \times \mathrm{F}_{2018}$ | 42173 | 0.047 | 869988 | 3.3 | 29.1 | 29.1 |
| $\mathrm{F}_{2019}=0.9 \times \mathrm{F}_{2018}$ | 31792 | 0.035 | 878737 | 4.4 | -2.7 | -2.7 |
| $\mathrm{F}_{2019}=0.8 \times \mathrm{F}_{2018}$ | 28308 | 0.031 | 88167 | 4.7 | -13.3 | -13.3 |
| $\mathrm{F}=0.06$ | 53757 | 0.060 | 8602 | 2.2 | 64.6 | 64.6 |
| $\mathrm{F}=0.08$ | 71056 | 0.080 | 84. 672 | 0.4 | 117.6 | 117.6 |
| $\mathrm{F}=0.084$ | 74479 | 0.084 | 4279 | 0.1 | 128.1 | 128.1 |
| $\mathrm{F}=0.10$ | 88053 | 0.100 | 1381 | -1.3 | 169.6 | 169.6 |
| Suggested 50kt cap for all evaluated HCRs | 50000 | 0.056 | 86._395 | 2.5 | 53.1 | 53.1 |

* SSB 2020 relative to SSB 2019.
** Catch in 2019 relative to TAC set by Norway and R1 sia in .18 (32 658 t).
*** Advice value for 2019 relative to advice value for 118.

Table 3b Beaked redfish in subareas 1 ana Annual catch scenarios for 2020 with $F_{2019}=0.06$. All weights are in tonnes.

| Scenarios | Total catch (2020) | $\mathrm{F} \text { tal }\left(20_{<}\right)$ | SSB (2021) | \% SSB change * | \% TAC change ** | \% Advice change <br> *** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{F}=0.06$ | 55860 | . 060 | 876101 | 1.8 | 3.9 | 3.9 |
| $\mathrm{F}=0.08$ | 73832 | 080 | 861062 | 0.1 | 37.3 | 37.3 |
| $F=0.084$ | 77 | 0.084 | 858088 | -0.2 | 44.0 | 44.0 |
| $\mathrm{F}=0.10$ | 91 | 0.100 | 846299 | -1.6 | 70.2 | 70.2 |
| Suggested 50kt cap for all evaluated HCRs | $5000$ | 0.054 | 881007 | 2.4 | -7.0 | -7.0 |

* SSB 2021 relative to SऽB $\angle{ }^{\circ} 0$.
** Catch in 2020 relative o TÁun 2019 under the $F=0.06$ scenario.
*** Advice value fs 2020 lative to advice value for 2019.

This year's a sice i. $65 \%$ higher than last year and this is mainly due to higher fishing mortality, which was shown to be precautionar in the recent MSE evaluations (ICES, 2018b).


## Basis of the advice

Table $4 \quad$ Beaked redfish in subareas 1 and 2. The basis of the advice.

| Advice basis | ICES precautionary approach |
| :--- | :--- |
| Management plan | There is no agreed management plan for this stock. Long-term management plan ptiol <br> evaluated by ICES (ICES, 2018b). The evaluated HCRs will be considered by the <br> fisheries commission in October 2018. |

## Quality of the assessment

The stock was benchmarked in 2018. The choice of a scaling coefficient for the Norwegian- ssian eu system survey is a source of potential bias of up to $50 \%$, but the advice is robust to this uncertainty.

Data from the pelagic survey in the Norwegian Sea was reviewed in the recent benchmark ass ssm ht and is now included in the assessment model. However, the survey series still does not appropriately cover the gec "phical distribution of the adult population, and further inclusion of the slope survey should be prioritized.

Age determination is lacking for some surveys and catches in recent years. To smou hour purious variations in SSB, caused by biologically unfounded year-to-year variations in the weight-at-age of the $19+$ grour a fixed weight-at-age function (i.e. common across years) was adopted for the assessment model during the $A_{1}$ tic Fisheries Working Group (AFWG) meeting. Fish over age 19 (used as plus group) constitute the majority of the fi rable 'iomass, and age data are not currently available for this component. Expanding the age range in the assessme $t$ in $t$ e future will improve the quality of the assessment.


Figure 2 Beaked redfish in subarea and Historical assessment results. Prior to 2018, $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{bar}}$ was calculated over ages 12-18. Since the 2018 assessment, trin fst year of each recruitment line is the assumed value used in the forecast.

## Issues relevant for the advic

Long-term management p'op have been proposed by Norway and Russia and evaluated by ICES (ICES, 2018b). In the absence of an agreed tanage nnt plan, ICES advice is based on the MSY approach. In the absence of a defined Fmsy the advice is based on $F=06$. thic st the highest fishing mortality of those tested during the MSE evaluations (ICES, 2018b) that was found to be rec tionary. A value of $\mathrm{F}=0.08$ was also tested and found not to be precautionary.

There is no in rnation greement on the sharing of TAC among countries and between national and international waters.


## Reference points

Table 5 Beaked redfish in subareas 1 and 2. Reference points, values, and their technical basis.

| Framework | Reference point | Value | Technical basis | ource |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MSY approach | MSY $\mathrm{B}_{\text {trigger }}$ | 315000 t | $\mathrm{B}_{\text {pa }}$ | S (20) b$)$ |
|  | $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ | Not defined |  |  |
| Precautionary approach | $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{lim}}$ | 227000 t | $\sim \mathrm{B}_{\text {loss }}(\mathrm{SSB}$ in 1992) | CES (2018b) |
|  | $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{pa}}$ | 315000 t | $\sim \mathrm{B}_{\lim } \times \mathrm{e}^{(1.645 \times 0.2)}$ | ICES (2018b) |
|  | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {lim }}$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{pa}}$ |  |  |  |
| Management plan | SSB ${ }_{\text {mgt }}$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{mgt}}$ |  |  |  |

Table 5 Beaked redfish in subareas 1 and 2. Basis of the assessment and advice.

| ICES stock data category | 1 (ICES, 2016) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Assessment type | Statistical catch-at-age model |
| Input data | Commercial catches: international landings (tonne, age ${ }^{\text {crequencies and weight-at-age from catch }}$ sampling of the pelagic and demersal fisheries and fro the si vey; survey indices: <br> numbers-at-age from BS-NoRu-Q1-Btr, Eco-NoRu <br> Q4-Btr; <br> proportion-at-age from deep pelagic ecosystem sur <br> annual maturity data from BS-NoRu-Q1- $-E c c$, Ru- 3 -Btr, and commercial catch sampling; natural mortalities were fixed at 0.05 . |
| Discards and bycatch | Discarding and bycatch are assumed neg sible. |
| Indicators | Survey-based biomass estimate in we No egiar sea (Red-Nor-Q3) |
| Other information | Last benchmark was in January 2018 WKREDFISH; ICES, 2018a). Proposed management plans were evaluated in 2018 (WKREBMSE; ICES 2018 |
| Working group | Arctic Fisheries Working Group ${ }^{\text {cIWG/ }}$ |

## Information from stakeholders

There is no additional available information

## History of the advice, catch, and manal emer.

Table 6 Beaked redfish in subareas 1 a. 2. ICES advice, agreed TACs, and catches. All weights are in tonnes.

| Year | ICES ady: | Predicted catch corresponding to advice | Agreed TAC | ICES catches |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1987 | Precautionary TAC | 70000* | 85000 | 35000 |
| 1988 | F=F0.1; TAC | 11000 | - | 41000 |
| 1989 | Status quo F; TA | 12000 | - | 47000 |
| 1990 | Status quo $\mathrm{F}^{\text {TAC }}$ | 18000 | - | 63000 |
| 1991 | $F$ at $\mathrm{F}_{\text {med }} ; 7 \mathrm{C}$ | 12000 | - | 68000 |
| 1992 | If required, $p$ ?cautionary TAC | 22000 | - | 32000 |
| 1993 | If ruireu, qutionary TAC | 18000 | 18000 | 12814 |
| 1994 | If -qua d, precautionary TAC | - | - | 12721 |
| 1995 | $L$ vest po vible $F$ | - | - | 10284 |
| 1996 | Catu owest possible level | - | - | 8075 |
| 19.7 | - at lowest possible level | - | - | 8598 |
| 1998 | No directed fishery, reduce bycatch | - | - | 14045 |
| 1999 | No directed fishery, reduce bycatch | - | - | 11209 |
| 2000 | No directed fishery, bycatch at lowest possible level | - | - | 10075 |


| Year | ICES advice | Predicted catch corresponding to advice | Agreed TAC | ICES catches |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2001 | No directed fishery, bycatch at lowest possible level | - | - | 18418 |
| 2002 | No directed fishery, bycatch at lowest possible level | - | - | 6993 |
| 2003 | No directed fishery, bycatch at lowest possible level | - | - | - 2520 |
| 2004 | No directed trawl fishery and low bycatch limits | - |  | 5493** |
| 2005 | No directed trawl fishery and low bycatch limits | - |  | 8465** |
| 2006 | No directed trawl fishery and low bycatch limits | - |  | 33261** |
| 2007 | No directed trawl fishery and low bycatch limits | - | ~1550, | 20219** |
| 2008 | Protection of juveniles, no directed trawl fishery and low bycatch limits | - | $14500^{\wedge}$ | 13095** |
| 2009 | Protection of juveniles, no directed trawl fishery and low bycatch limits |  | 10500^ | 10246** |
| 2010 | Protection of juveniles, no directed trawl fishery and low bycatch limits |  | 8600^ | 11924** |
| 2011 | Protection of juveniles, no directed trawl fishery and low bycatch limits |  | 7900^ | 12962** |
| 2012 | Protection of juveniles, no directed fishery and low bycatch limits |  | 7500^ | 11059** |
| 2013 | F0.1 | $\triangle \quad<4700$ | $1950{ }^{\wedge}$ | 9474** |
| 2014 | Status quo catch | -4000 | $36800{ }^{\wedge}$ | 18780** |
| 2015 | Precautionary approach | ¢ 30000 | $3000{ }^{\text {\# }}$ | 25836 |
| 2016 | Precautionary approach | $\square<30000$ | $3000{ }^{\text {\# }}$ | 35429 |
| 2017 | Precautionary approach | $-<30000$ | 30000\# | 31201 |
| 2018 | Precautionary approach | < 32658 | 32658\# |  |
| 2019 | Precautionary approach | <53757 |  |  |
| 2020 | Precautionary approach | <55860 |  |  |

* Includes both Sebastes mentella and S. norvoniaus.
** Includes the pelagic catches in the Norwe sian St outside the EEZ.
$\wedge$ TAC set by the North East Atlantic Fisheric Comm sion (NEAFC) for an Olympic fishery in international waters.
$\wedge \wedge$ Sum of TAC set by NEAFC in international wa s and by Norway in the Norwegian Economic Zone.
\# TAC set by jointly by Norway and Russia.


## History of the catch and landir

Table 7 Beaked res ish in s bareas 1 and 2. Catch distribution by fleet in 2017 as estimated by ICES.



* Provisional figures. ** Includes UK (E\&W) since ${ }^{29} 00$.


[^0]
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[^0]:    * Assumed value (regression between survey indices and ecr. +ment time series)

