

PROCESS: Approval of ICES advice for Celtic Sea stocks (WCCS, 25 June 2015, 2pm CPH time)

Draft advice made available in parts to ACOM members: 17/6 and 18/6

Participants

Country/ other	Participants	Comments sent to ACOM Forum	Advice approval before WebEx
Chair			
ACOM Chair			
Belgium			
Canada			
Denmark			
Estonia			
Finland			
France			
Germany			
Iceland			
Ireland			
Latvia			
Lithuania			
Netherlands			
Norway			
Poland			
Portugal			
Russia			
Spain			
Sweden			
UK			
USA			
EG Chairs			
ICES secretariat			

Comment and/or Issue raised (ACOM member)	Proposal /Explanation / Decision (marked in GREEN)
General comments	
anb-78ab Black-bellied anglerfish (<i>Lophius budegassa</i>) in Divisions VIIb–k and VIIIa,b,d (West and Southwest of Ireland, Bay of Biscay)	
anp-78ab White anglerfish (<i>Lophius piscatorius</i>) in Divisions VIIb–k and VIIIa,b,d (Southern Celtic Seas, Bay of Biscay)	
Carmen Stock status table Top 2 rows text should be “Undefined” instead of “Unknown”	Agree, to be done (& same for anb-78ab) DONE
Carmen Quality of the assessment, end of 1st paragraph “Other information such as commercial Ipue (Spanish Porcupine Groundfish Survey [SPPGFS]) support the overall increase in stock biomass since the early 2000s.” ⇒ Replace by: “Other information, such as commercial Ipue and the Spanish Porcupine Groundfish Survey [SPPGFS], support the overall increase in stock biomass since the early 2000s.”	Agree, to be done (and check the survey acronym) DONE
Carmen Table 5.3.61.6 (2014 catch by fleet) Replace “Commercial landings” and “Commercial discards” by “Landings” and “Discards”	Agree, to be done DONE
Bss-47 Seabass (<i>Dicentrarchus labrax</i>) in Divisions IVb and c, VIIa, and VIId–h (Central and South North Sea, Irish Sea, English Channel, Bristol Channel, Celtic Sea)	

Max

Label of front page figures

SS provides also estimated of uncertainty around F, they should be provided as we do for SAM model estimates.

Carmen

We're checking with stock experts if there is a specific reason why they did not provide them.

My guess is that, on the one hand, these do not come out so immediately out of SS in this assessment which considers multiple fleets (??); and, on the other hand, as F includes both commercial and recreational F, but Frecreational is treated as a fixed known value in the stock assessment, the uncertainty bounds we can get for F out of stock assessment model are not realistic.
==> but we're checking with stock experts

Max: suggest to use the data from the SS3 report file. If not possible to do this year it should be addressed next year.

Conclusion: try to have the values this year, otherwise for next year!!!

Max

Catch options table, footnote to MSY approach

"Because MSY $B_{trigger}$ has not been identified for this stock, the ICES MSY approach has been applied without consideration of SSB in relation to MSY $B_{trigger}$."

This is a case where the lack of a $B_{trigger}$ results in a non-precautionary advice compared to stock where we have $B_{trigger}$. In other words, the less we know the less precautionary we are. The stock is declining rapidly, both SSB and R, F is almost 4 times FMSY and the stock is basically at B_{lim} , but we still use FMSY as basis of the advice. If we had a $B_{trigger}$, we would reduce the advice of a ratio equal to 1.4, as usually $B_{trigger} = B_{pa} = B_{lim}/1.4$. I suggest that we use $B_{trigger} = B_{lim}/1.4$ and reduce the advice of 40%. In alternative, we could give a 0 advice, as the stock even with an FMSY advice

Carmen

This was discussed at length at the ADG. In the end, the ADG decided to go for advice based on F_{msy} because: (1) it already represents a very large cut with respect to all values estimated for F in more than a decade; (2) the stock has always been exploited above F_{msy} ; (3) the stock will be part of the F_{msy} ranges workshop in October where F_{msy} may end up being recalculated and B_{pa} will be established.

Given the above, the ADG did not think it was appropriate for it to set a preliminary B_{pa} value, that may change in the autumn. I also note that

will still have a large probability of being below Blim (evident from uncertainty estimates from the SS model).

Fmsy may also change in the autumn when Fmsy ranges are considered.

However, I think the alternative suggested by Max should be considered by ACOM for a WebEx decision.

I understand that Max's proposal would correspond to:

$F(2016) = Fmsy * SSB(2016) / (Blim * 1.4) = 0.09$, as a "temporary proxy" for the MSY approach

[I also agree with Max that the uncertainty in SSB in the final assessment year (2015) seems > 20% and, hence, I think we might expect that Bpa will likely be > Blim*1.4]

⇒ For ACOM's consideration and decision

Maurice: agree with Max point but understand the ADG decision. Would go for Max suggestion

Jesper: agree with Max suggestion, if it possible to calculate

Colm: The WGCSE calculated a Bpa based on the assessment and this value from the WGCSE could be used. The Bpa (7970 tonnes = 1.5*Blim) is based on the uncertainty of the assessment.

Joanne: Support the decision of using Bpa. If a Bpa was calculated and presented at the ADG, then this value should be used.

CONCLUSION: Use the option $F(2016) = Fmsy * SSB(2016) / (Btrigger = Bpa)$
A new catch forecast will need to be prepared.

How to present the value in the advice? Will this

new value be: a) Btrigger; b) preliminary Btrigger;
c) other option

Eskild: use option a)

Maurice: use option a)

Jesper: the value was not review and would prefer
to go for option b)

Carmen: include "subject to review". The intention
is to show that ICES will devote more work on this
topic

Eskild: having "subject to review" is unclear

Max: use option a)

Colm: use option a)

Conclusion: use option a)

Is ICES also defining Bpa or only MSY Btrigger?

Carmen: define both, i.e. Bpa and then MSY
Btrigger

Carl: define Bpa and adopt MSY Btrigger as MSY
Btrigger

Colm: WGCSE was defined a Bpa

Max: define Bpa and adopt MSY Btrigger as MSY
Btrigger

Maurice: define Bpa and adopt MSY Btrigger as
MSY Btrigger

Conclusion: the two values (Btrigger and Bpa) will
be on the reference points table. A new catch
option will be included (using
 $F(2016)=F_{msy} * SSB(2016) / (Btrigger = Bpa)$) and
this will be the advice.

<p>Max</p> <p>Quality of the assessment</p> <p>The retrospective has been done for one single year instead than for 3 or 5 years. There is no reason why the retrospective is not run for at least 5 years as the time series is long enough. This should be added here</p>	<p>Carmen</p> <p>These are historical plots from the assessment, not retrospective plots. This stock has been in Category 1 only since 2014, that's the reason why only 2 lines are shown in the graph.</p>
<p>Bss-wosi</p> <p>Seabass (<i>Dicentrarchus labrax</i>) in Divisions VIa, VIIb, and VIIj (West of Scotland, West of Ireland and eastern part of Southwest of Ireland)</p>	
<p>cod-7e-k</p> <p>Cod (<i>Gadus morhua</i>) in Divisions VIIe–k (Eastern English Channel and Southern Celtic Seas)</p>	
<p>Carmen</p> <p>Issues relevant for the advice</p> <p>“The advice is based on a new estimate of F_{MSY} which has been estimated using the new procedures (ICES, 2014).”</p> <p>⇒ I suggest replacing by:</p> <p>“The advice is based on a new value of F_{MSY} which has been estimated using the agreed ICES guidelines (insert reference to both WKMSYRE2 and WKMSYREF3 reports).”</p>	<p>Carl: Refer to the MSY ranges advice release in march 2015. Better to refer to a advice.</p> <p>Conclusion: refer to the MSY ranges advice (March 2015).</p> <p>DONE</p>
<p>cod-rock</p> <p>Cod (<i>Gadus morhua</i>) in Division VIb (Rockall)</p>	
<p>cod-scow</p> <p>Cod (<i>Gadus morhua</i>) in Division VIa (West of Scotland)</p>	
<p>Canada</p> <p>ICES stock advice</p> <p>Minor point but ‘when the MSY and precautionary approaches’ should this</p>	<p>Carmen</p> <p>The MSY approach is embedded in the precautionary approach</p>

be both or just MSY? I know that the stock is below Blim but is not the PA embedded into the ICES MSY approach?

We have used this wording “MSY and precautionary approaches” sometimes in the past for stocks such as this one, where we feel that the SSB is too low to be able to apply the usual advice rule under the MSY approach.

It is also a way of emphasizing that this is the advice we would also give under the precautionary approach (i.e. MSY implies precautionary but not necessarily the other way around, but in this case we consider the advice is the same under both approaches).

ADGCS applied this formulation to cod-scow, whiting-scow, her-6a7b, sole-iris

⇒ I assume no changes are required (but we may reach a different decision for whiting-scow when we discuss this stock in the WebEx)

Eskild: Suggest to only say “MSY approach”. That is in line with the Introduction. Referring to both approach seems that we are being more precautionary in this case

Joanne: agree with Eskild comment

Conclusion: The basis for the advice should be the MSY approach. The catch option table will not have a PA row and the equivalent of the MSY AR will be included in “Other options”, see the cod-scow example. The text needs to be checked to reflect this decision.

	<p>This will apply to cod-scow, sol-iris and her-6a7bc</p> <p>DONE for cod-scow</p>
<p>Carmen</p> <p>Reference points table, management plan line (same presentation as agreed for cod-kat):</p> <p>Instead of a single SSB_{MGT}, it should show: $SSB_{MS-lower} = 14\ 000\ t$ and $SSB_{MS-upper} = 22\ 000\ t$ (in line with the contents of the plan EC 1342/2008)</p>	<p>Agree, to be done</p> <p>$SSB_{MP-lower} = 14\ 000\ t$ and $SSB_{MP-upper} = 22\ 000\ t$ (in line with the contents of the plan EC 1342/2008)</p> <p>DONE</p>
<p>Carmen</p> <p>Stock status table:</p> <p>Text on SSB_{MGT} line should be: “Below $SSB_{MS-lower}$”</p>	<p>Agree, to be done</p> <p>Below $SSB_{MP-lower}$</p> <p>DONE</p>
<p>Carmen</p> <p>Table 5.3.7.3 (catch options table):</p> <p>I think the Management plan catch option requires the following footnote: “Given the 0 TAC in 2015, the 20% constraint on inter-year TAC changes (Article 7.5 of the management plan) has not been applied in the calculation of this catch option.”</p>	<p>Agree, to be done</p> <p>DONE</p>
<p>ACOM leadership</p> <p>The following feedback was received from the European Commission in January 2015: “ICES should provide advice in relation to adjustments in both TAC and effort for each of the cod stocks under the long term plan (amended Council Regulation (EC) No 1342/2008).”</p> <p>The ACOM leadership considers that an appropriate sentence should be included this year, to address this feedback from the European Commission.</p> <p>For Kattegat cod and North Sea cod, sentences addressing this request have been included in the “Issues relevant for the advice” section.</p>	<p>Agree, to be done</p> <p>DONE</p>

Suggestion: insert the following sentences as the second paragraph in the “Issues relevant for the advice” section:

“The EU cod management plan (EC 1342/2008) is based on setting TACs complemented with an effort regime. Following Article 12 of the plan, the maximum allowable effort for the relevant effort groups would be adjusted by the same percentage as the fishing mortality. The adjustment in F according to the EU cod management plan catch option (calculated without taking into account the 20% constraint in inter-year TAC changes because of the 0 TAC in 2015) from 2015 to 2016 is a 25% reduction.”

I would suggest also having the following paragraph after the one above (to make it clear that the MP is not the basis of our advice and, at the same time, to explain why we’re saying that the MSY and precautionary approach correspond to zero catch):

“The basis of ICES advice for this stock is the MSY ~~and precautionary~~ approaches. Because of the low SSB and recruitment, it is not possible to identify any non-zero catch that would be compatible with the MSY ~~or the precautionary~~ approach.”

Carmen

Quality of the assessment:

Minor typo: “Despite these uncertainties it is clear for the assessment and additional information...” ==> Replace “for” by “from”

⇒ Agree, to be done
DONE

Canada

Information from stakeholders:

There is something wrong with this sentence ‘The Scottish Industry-Science partnership survey was initiated in 2013 throughout 2014’ is it ‘The Scottish Industry-Science partnership survey was initiated in 2013 and conducted throughout 2014’?

Carmen

My recollection from what stakeholders explained at the ADG is that the sentence should be:
“The Scottish Industry–Science partnership survey was carried out from late 2013 until late 2014 to provide information on a quarterly basis on the distribution and abundance of cod and other

demersal species in Division VIa.”
 ⇒ same change to be implemented for whiting-scow
 Colm: The survey is on going and continue in 2015.

Conclusion:
 The Scottish Industry-Science partnership survey was initiated in 2013 and conducted throughout 2014. **Agree, to be done**

DONE for cod-scow
DONE for whg-scow

had-7b-k
 Haddock (*Melanogrammus aeglefinus*) in Divisions VIIb–k (Southern Celtic Seas and English Channel)

had-iris
 Haddock (*Melanogrammus aeglefinus*) in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)

had-rock
 Haddock (*Melanogrammus aeglefinus*) in Division VIb (Rockall)

her-irls
 Herring (*Clupea harengus*) in Division VIIa South of 52° 30' N and VIIg,h,j,k (Irish Sea, Celtic Sea and Southwest of Ireland)

Carmen
 When referring to the proposed management plan, we should indicate who proposed it. ==> **Suggestions: DONE (but used “agreed” not “proposed”**

Rationale	Catch (2016)	Basis	F (2016)	SSB (2016) *	% SSB change **	% TAC change ***
MSY approach	23 164	F _{MSY}	0.26	92102	-16%	+48%

Zero catch	0	Zero catch	0	111364	-5%	-100%
Other options	20 764	F _{target} F _{mgmt} in management plan proposed by Pelagic AC	0.23	99539	-15%	+33%
	20 348	Long-term management plan proposed by Pelagic AC (30% TAC increase ^)	0.22	99787	-15%	+30%
	15 652	TAC 2015	0.17	102250	-12%	0%
	16 633	F ₂₀₁₅	0.18	101976	-13%	+6%

Advice basis	MSY approach
Management plan	ICES evaluated the long-term management plan for Celtic Sea herring proposed by the Pelagic AC in 2011 as precautionary (ICES, 2012; 2015a). ICES was requested to provide advice based on the MSY approach and to include the management plan as a catch option.

Framework	Reference point	Value	Technical basis	Source
Proposed Management plan proposed by Pelagic AC (2011)	SSB _{MGT}	61 000	Long term management plan	ICES (2012)
	F _{MGT}	0.23	Long term management plan	ICES (2012)

Carl: comparing to last year the term “agreed” was used: suggest to change “agreed by the pelagic AC
Maurice: agrees with carl’s proposal

Conclusion: used “MP agreed by the Pelagic AC”. Agreed, to be done. DONE

her-67bc Herring (<i>Clupea harengus</i>) in Divisions VIa and VIIb,c (West of Scotland, West of Ireland)	
Canada ICES stock advice Same comment about the MSY and precautionary approach as west of Scotland cod.	⇒ Do as agreed for cod-scow Conclusion: same as cod-scow with only reference to MSY approach and same set up for the catch option. DONE

Carmen
Catch options table
Assuming ACOM agrees to present the 0 catch advice as corresponding to the MSY and precautionary approaches, then I think it would be clearer to present the catch options in a similar way as done for cod-scow and sole-iris:

Rationale	Catch (2016)	Basis	F (2016)	SSB (2016) *	% SSB change **	% TAC change ***
-----------	--------------	-------	----------	--------------	-----------------	------------------

MSY and Precautionary approach	0	Zero catch	0	166670	-14%	-100%
Other options	12762	$F_{MSY} \times SSB_{2015} / MSY B_{trigger}$	0.08	159452	-18%	-44%
	17797	F_{2015}	0.11	156570	-19%	-22%
	22690	TAC_{2015}	0.14	153750	-21%	0%
	26049	F_{MSY}	0.16	151803	-22%	15%
	17018	$TAC_{2015} - 25\%$	0.10	157017	-19%	-25%
	8509	$F = 0.05$	0.05	161870	-17%	-62%

her-nirs

Herring (*Clupea harengus*) in Division VIIa North of 52° 30'N (Irish Sea)

Canada

Quality of the assessment, 2nd paragraph:

Is this statement accurate? 'No catch information was included in the assessment for 2014 due to inaccurate age information.' There is an estimate of F in 2014. I think it was the commercial catch at age that was not used but the catch was?

So perhaps 'No commercial catch at age information was included in the assessment for 2014 due to inaccurate age information'.

Carmen

The statement was accurate, no catch information (age composition or tonnage) for 2014 was included in the assessment; however, survey indices were still included for 2014. The assessment uses SAM, which is able to deal with the missing year of catch data and still estimate F for 2014.

⇒ We can either keep the original sentence or change to Joanne's suggestion. Both seem fine to me.

Joanne: keep the original sentence

Conclusion: Keep the original sentence. No changes needed. **DONE**

meg-4a6a

Megrim (*Lepidorhombus spp.*) in Divisions IVa and VIa (Northern North Sea, West of Scotland)

Larry

Stock development over time

"Fishing mortality has been below F_{MSY} for almost the full time-series and the

Agree to the change, but would suggest:

<p>biomass is well above $MSY B_{trigger}$” ⇒ I suggest replacing this text by: “Fishing mortality has been below F_{MSY} for most of the time-series and has even further declined since the late 1990’s. Biomass has consistently been above $MSY B_{trigger}$ and has steadily increased since 2005.”</p>	<p>“Fishing mortality has been below F_{MSY} for most of the time-series and has even further declined an overall declining trend since the late 1990’s. Biomass has consistently been above $MSY B_{trigger}$ and has steadily increased since 2005.”</p> <p>Conclusion: agreed to be done DONE</p>
<p>Mixed fisheries document</p>	
<p>ple-7b-c Plaice (<i>Pleuronectes platessa</i>) in Divisions VIIb,c (West of Ireland)</p>	
<p>ple-7h-k Plaice (<i>Pleuronectes platessa</i>) in Divisions VIIh–k (Celtic Sea South, Southwest of Ireland)</p>	
<p>Canada It seems odd that the advice is an increase over the last advice yet the qualitative assessment is that F is above possible reference points. If the stock size is stable (as the qualitative assessment says it is) then this will result in an increase in F that is already thought to be too high. I realize that this is the result of the application of the category three ‘rule’ but still it seems to have some inconsistency.</p>	<p>Carmen At the ACOM meeting in Dec 2014 it was decided that, for stocks for which the PA buffer had been applied before, the PA buffer would not be applied this year again, unless we saw additional reasons for concern that required extra action this year.</p> <p>The advised increase for this stock is based on the SSB trend, which is slightly increasing in the last 5 years (“2 versus 3” approach gives a ratio=1.12).</p> <p>The PA buffer (0.8 factor), which is the mechanism for decreasing F in Category 3 stocks, was applied to the stock in 2013; since the starting point for this year’s advice calculation is the advice provided in the year when the PA buffer was applied (instead of the last 3 year average landings), it still has the PA buffer “built in”.</p> <p>Note that if we had instead applied the “2 vs 3”</p>

approach based on the last 3-year average landings and a PA buffer we would obtain: $182 \times 1.2 \times 0.8 = 163$, which is higher than our advice.

I hope this helps to make the approach a bit clearer.

⇒ I assume no changes are needed, but let me know if you think otherwise

Joanne: the F is too high and stock size is stable and an increase in the advice is weird. But it is okay to keep as it is. It is an application of the rule.

Carl: why we are not reiterate the last year advice. Looking back to last year advice where ICES gave the same advice as previously. The perception of the stock this year is similar to last year and there is no reason to change the advice. The method 3.2. might be catching noise.

Maurice: agree with Carl's suggestion of keeping the last year advice. This stock is a good candidate for biennial advice. Multiannual advice is the right thing to do for this stock, the question is when a new update.

Colm: Last year's advice was a roll over from 2013. Giving the same advice this year will mean to keep the same advice since 2013. The WGCSE apply the rule of method 3.2. Having this as the same advice from last year may raise inconsistency.

Carmen: two option:

- a) Keep the advice as drafted by the ADG, but valid for two years
- b) The perception of the stock has not changed and the same advice as last year

	<p>is provided and valid for one year.</p> <p>Carl: should be b).</p> <p>Conclusion: Agree with b. To be done!!!!</p> <p>DONE</p>
ple-celt	
Plaice (<i>Pleuronectes platessa</i>) in Divisions VIIIf,g (Bristol Channel, Celtic Sea)	
<p>Carmen</p> <p>Catch options section, 2nd sentence</p> <p>“The perception of the stock has not changed; therefore, the advice given in the two most recent years is still applicable this year and is described in the table below.”</p> <p>==> Replace by:</p> <p>“The perception of the stock has not changed; therefore, the advice given last year is still applicable this year.”</p>	<p>Agree, to be done</p> <p>DONE</p>
<p>Carmen</p> <p>Quality of the assessment, last sentence</p> <p>“The Aarts and Poos (2009) model, previously used as basis of the advice, continues to have difficulty in interpreting the data. The model results were inconsistent with the survey data, which are considered to be the most reliable indicator of stock biomass. Therefore, the previously age based analytical model was not used to provide advice for 2016.”</p> <p>⇒ Replace by (to avoid giving the impression that we had a Category 1 assessment before):</p> <p>“The Aarts and Poos (2009) model, previously used as basis of the advice (as a trends-based assessment), continues to have difficulty in interpreting the data. The model results were inconsistent with the survey data, which are considered to be the most reliable indicator of stock biomass. Therefore, the previous age based analytical model was not used to provide advice for 2016.”</p>	<p>Agree, to be done</p> <p>DONE</p>
<p>Alain</p> <p>Table 5.3.38.5</p> <p>TAC(2015) is 461, not 641 t</p>	<p>Agree, to be done</p> <p>DONE</p>
ple-iris	

Plaice (<i>Pleuronectes platessa</i>) in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)	
pol-celt Pollack (<i>Pollachius pollachius</i>) in Subareas VI-VII (Celtic Seas and the English Channel)	
Carmen ICES stock advice The sentence in red is missing (according to the template) and should be added: “ICES advises that when the precautionary approach is applied, commercial catches should be no more than 4200 tonnes in each of the years 2016 and 2017. All commercial catches are assumed to be landed. ICES cannot quantify the recreational catches.”	Agree, to be done DONE
Max Figures in Summary of the assessment section This figures describe the Stock development over time and thus should be moved up just after the Stock advice section. The Catch Option section mention the DCAC but does not show the figures until the end of the document, which is also confusing. I suggest therefore to move the DCAC figures up and use them to describe the status of the stock.	Carmen I think the intention of the ADG was not to use these figures to describe stock status, but more as “supporting information” or as part of the mechanism for calculating the catch advice. This was the same the previous time the DCAC method was run for the stock (in 2012); these figures were at the back, not at the front of the advice sheet. I think bringing them to the front of the sheet might give them a status that was not really intended. On the other hand, reading through the advice sheet, I get the impression (like Max) that the advice sheet might be easier to read if the figures were at the front. ⇒ For ACOM decision If we’d bring these 2 figures to the front, the “Stock development over time” text should be rewritten, eg. “The available information is insufficient to evaluate the exploitation and the trends of pollack in the

Celtic Sea ecoregion. Official commercial landings were stable in the last two decades. **Most landings are from Subarea VII and are considered to be above a range that approximates MSY.**"

Jesper: agree with Max to include the figure in the first page.

Colm: the landing line go outside the DCAC box. At the ADG they we move to move to the back to downgrade the importance of this results.

Carl: agree with Colm. The results are not giving a direct impact on the advice.

Joanne: agree not keep the plots are the end. In the text we should refer to the figures, but to bring to the front.

Max: the confusion is because the method is mentioned in the catch option. The sentence (second) to explain why the PA buffer is not applied is unclear. The rules of this method should be explained in the text.

Conclusion: Keep the figures where they are originally, and refer to the figures in the text. Max will help with a sentence (second in the catch option) to help to explain.

Sentence provided offline after the webex:

The Depletion-Corrected Average Catch (DCAC, which is interpreted as an approximation to MSY) method was applied to provide catch advice for this stock in 2012. The ICES implementation of this method advises a reduction of catch to the DCAC when the stock catch is above the DCAC and, for

	<p>this reason, an additional precautionary buffer is not needed. The perception of the stock has not changed; therefore, the advice given in the three most recent years is still applicable this year.</p> <p>DONE</p>
<p>Carmen Catch options section, 2nd and 3rd sentences I suggest a slight rewording for clarity: For the Depletion-Corrected Average Catch (DCAC, which is interpreted as an approximation to MSY) method, used to provide advice for this stock, ICES considers that a precautionary buffer is not needed because the ICES implementation of the method already incorporates a fast reduction of catch when it is above the DCAC (ICES, 2012). The perception of the stock has not changed; therefore, the advice given in the three most recent years is still applicable this year.</p>	<p>Agree, to be done</p> <p>RELATED WITH THE ITEM ABOVE— Carmen: this has been taken care of, no need for further action</p>
<p>sol-7b-c Sole (<i>Solea solea</i>) in Divisions VIIb,c (West of Ireland)</p>	
<p>sol-7h-k Sole (<i>Solea solea</i>) in Divisions VIIh–k (Celtic Sea South, Southwest of Ireland)</p>	
<p>Stock status table Canada The stock status table has the F below possible reference points but has red crosses. Alain F qualitative evaluation: tick marks should be green.</p>	<p>The red crosses should be changed to green tick marks (inverted ones, as it is a Qualitative Evaluation)</p> <p>DONE</p>
<p>Canada Table 5.3.15.2 In the table with the catch option calculation are the values for Index A and Index B correct?</p>	<p>Their order has been reversed: value 0.99 should be on the top row and 1.08 on the second row. Thank you for noticing! ⇒ To be changed DONE</p>
<p>Max Catch options, justification for not applying PA buffer</p>	<p>Carmen 1. The stock status qualitative evaluation symbols</p>

“The stock assessment suggests that mortality rates are lower and stable in recent years and the catch age structure confirms a low overall mortality rate (Figure 5.3.51.2). Therefore, the precautionary buffer was not applied to the catch advice this year.”

1. This is inconsistent with Stock and exploitation status where F is estimated to be above the reference point. So either the F is considered low and the PA buffer is not applied (but then the symbol needs to be changed) or we apply the PA buffer.

2. It is also important to state if and when the PA buffer was applied before. It is not clear from the text.

for F should be set green; the red crosses were there by mistake.

The text provided under the “Catch options” section (broad age structure in the catch) was the main information used by the ADG to infer that F must be low and no PA buffer was needed.

2. The PA buffer was applied in 2012, based on a different approach to advice (catch curves method). In 2013 the stock changed to Category 3 based on a separable VPA assessment and since 2014 it has been in Category 3 based on an XSA trends-based assessment covering only Div VIIjk. The PA buffer has not been applied after 2012 based on a similar justification every year, i.e. that F is considered to be below possible reference points.

I don't think the advice this year needs to explain that the PA buffer was applied in 2012, because this was not used by the ADG to decide whether the PA buffer was needed this year (there have been many changes in the approach and many updates in the advice for this stock after 2012, so the 2012 PA buffer was not really taken into account by the ADG). The ADG reasoning was only based on the fact that F is considered to be below possible reference points.

Conclusion: No changes are needed.
NO ACTION

sol-celt

Sole (*Solea solea*) in Divisions VIIf,g (Bristol Channel, Celtic Sea)

<p>Alain Table 5.3.50.6, “Discards and bycatch row” Instead of “Not included, considered negligible”, it should say “Not included in the assessment, but used to provide catch advice.”</p>	<p>Agree, to be done DONE</p>
<p>sol-iris Sole (<i>Solea solea</i>) in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)</p>	
<p>Canada Same comment about the MSY and precautionary approach as west of Scotland cod.</p>	<p>⇒ Do as agreed for cod-scow Conclusion: use MSY approach ONLY and check the catch option table as cod-scow. And the MSY and PA approach on the zero advice. Check all the tex. DONE</p>
<p>spr-celt Sprat (<i>Sprattus sprattus</i>) in Subarea VI and Divisions VIIa–c and f–k (West of Scotland, Southern Celtic Seas)</p>	
<p>spr-echw Sprat (<i>Sprattus sprattus</i>) in Divisions VII d,e (English Channel)</p>	
<p>whg-7b,c,e-k Whiting (<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>) in Divisions VII b,c,e–k (Southern Celtic seas and Eastern English Channel)</p>	
<p>Stock development over time “Fishing mortality (F) has a declining trend since 2007 and is estimated to be at F_{MSY} in 2014.”</p> <p>Canada This does not capture the recent increase. Consider changing to ‘Fishing mortality (F) increased since 2012 and is estimated to be at F_{MSY} in 2014.’</p> <p>Alain Replace by: Fishing mortality (F) has declined from 2007 to 2012 and has been below F_{MSY} since 2011 and at F_{msy} in 2014.</p>	<p>Carmen Proposal, accounting for both texts as well as the ADG’s: “Fishing mortality (F) declined from 2007 to 2012; F was below F_{MSY} during 2011-2013 and is at F_{MSY} in 2014.”</p> <p>Conclusion: Agree with the new text DONE</p>

whg-iris Whiting (<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>) in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)	
whg-rock Whiting (<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>) in Division VIb (Rockall)	
whg-scow Whiting (<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>) in Division VIa (West of Scotland)	
<p>Max</p> <p>ICES stock advice</p> <p>This advice is very weird. First, there is no MSY value so I wonder how we can follow the MSY approach (there is an MSY Btrigger but it is not used in the advice).</p> <p>SSB (2016) is over Blim but then is estimated to go below Blim in 2017 with 0 catches, which is strange. I suspect it is the results of a very low assumption for age 1 fish, which is the average of 2005 to 2014 XSA values, although R has been much larger from 2010 onwards and this stock is mainly constituted by few age classes. Thus, I think the SSB in the forecast is kept artificially low by this assumption and that the 0 advice is not correct.</p>	<p>Carmen</p> <p>I understand the concern. It was also discussed at the ADG.</p> <p>Concerning SSB and Recruitment: maturity is assumed to be knife-edge at age 2 and M very high. Hence, very fast stock dynamics. One might argue that Rec was assumed to be too low in 2016 but, on the other hand, Rec in 2015 is also rather uncertain and strongly influences SSB in 2016. At this stage, there is no information about Rec(2016), so erring on the cautious side may not be unreasonable, given the very low SSB in the last 2 decades.</p> <p>A main difficulty is that the only reference points we have are Blim and Bpa. An attempt at deriving Fmsy took place this year but I understood that errors or inconsistencies had been encountered, so we still don't have Fmsy (the stock will be in the Fmsy ranges workshop this autumn). So even if a higher Rec(2016) had been assumed, we would still have had no obvious mechanism for providing a catch advice for 2016 (unless some minor amount of catch in 2016 allowed SSB(2017) to be at Bpa, but I expect that would be unlikely).</p> <p>In the end the ADG took the view that it was</p>

appropriate to provide a zero catch advice for 1 more year, because the stock has been below Blim for many years, and even though it is forecast to be just above Blim in 2016, it is also forecast to be below Blim in 2017 even with no catch in 2016. However, it is highly necessary to have Fmsy in place for next year.

⇒ For ACOM decision

I think the options could be:

- A. stay with the ADG's proposed advice
- B. re-do the short-term forecast with a higher Rec(2016) and see whether any amount of catch in 2016 leads to $SSB(2017) > Bpa$ (i.e. precautionary approach); I think it would be unlikely
- C. find some ad-hoc way of providing a non-zero catch advice for 2016, e.g. provide advice according to $F(2016)=F(2012-2014)=0.04$ or simply as the average catch of the last 3 years [on the basis that the stock has been able to increase under those levels of F or catch and Rec(2015) appears to be relatively good]

David: the SSB is far away to Bpa and the zero advice seems appropriate (option A)

Joanne: would prefer to keep option A

Max: still think that the wrong R assumption was used.

Maurice: option A

Conclusion: no change to the forecast. Option A
No action needed

<p>Canada Same comment about the MSY and precautionary approach as west of Scotland cod.</p>	<p>Carmen In this case, since the stock is now close to Blim, and also taking into account Max's comments, it may be more appropriate to describe this advice as "precautionary approach"</p> <p>David: agree</p> <p>Conclusion: the advice basis should be the PA approach DONE</p>

Closed the meeting at 15:50 (CPH time); 36 hour moratorium; Advice will be sent out 30 June.