## Example only! Based mainly on 2009 advice / draft MSY approach, do not quote

### 8.4.2

Advice June 2009
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { ECOREGION } & \text { Widely distributed and migratory stocks } \\ \text { STOCK } & \text { Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI, and VII, and Divisions VIIIa,b,d) (Northern stock) }\end{array}$

## Advice for 2010

ICES advises on the basis of the transition scheme towards the ICES MSY framework ${ }^{1}$ that landings for 2010 should be no less than 48000 t .
Additionally, management measures for hake should aim to reduce catches of species the mixed fisheries catching this stock ${ }^{2}$. These measures could include selective gears, gear restrictions, area closures, etc.
Stock status





Figure 9.4.2.2 Summary of stock assessment (weights in '000 tonnes). Recruitment 2007-2009 replaced by geometric mean (1990-06).
SSB is estimated to have increased to just above $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{pa}}$ in 2009. ICES considers that the stock has been around this level (the recovery plan target) for the last 2 years. F has been around $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{pa}}$ since 2001, but has not been near $\mathrm{F}_{\text {MSY }}$ since 1986.

## Management objectives

A recovery plan has been agreed by the EU in 2004 (EC Reg. No. 811/2004) which results in a TAC of 54500 t in 2010. The aim of the plan is to increase the SSB to above 140000 t with a fishing mortality ( $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{mgt}}$ ) than 0.25 , constrained by a year-to-year change in TAC of $15 \%$ when SSB is above 100000 t . The recovery plan has not been evaluated by ICES.

[^0]
## Biology

Hake is a bottom dwelling fish that is part of the top range of the food chain in the ecosystem. There is no biological basis for the current ICES stock definition of northern and southern hake. [relevance?]

## Environmental influence on the stock

There is no scientific understanding of the influence of the environment on this stock.

## The fisheries

Hake is caught in mixed fisheries together with megrim and anglerfish. Discards of juvenile hake can be substantial in some areas and fleets.

```
Catch by fleet Total catch (year) # kt where # kt landings (% gear-type(s), % other gear-types), # kt discards, #
    kt industrial by-catch, # kt unaccounted removals
```


## Effects of the fisheries on the ecosystem

Catch of juvenile hake reduce the stock abundance in the long run and reduce the long-term yield. Reducing mortality of small fish can be achieved by measures that reduce unwanted bycatch through shifting the selection pattern towards larger fish. This would reduce discards of other species as well and will increase the mean weight in the catch.

## Quality considerations

Age reading for this stock may overestimate the age categories. Additionally, recruitment is assessed with only one survey. Both uncertainties influence the assessment predictions. Discards data are not taken into account due to deficiencies in the area coverage.


Figure 9.4.1.3 Comparison between current and previous assessments (predicted intermediate years are included ${ }^{3}$ ).
The assessment is consistent with last year.

## Scientific basis

| Assessment type | age-based assessment (XSA) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Input data | 4 survey indices (list of abbreviations....) |
|  | 4 commercial cpue indices (......) |
| Discards and by-catch | Not included in the assessment |
| Other information | The last benchmark of the assessment method dates from 200? |

## Sources

ICES, 2006. Report of the Working Group on the Assessment of Southern Shelf Stocks of Hake, Monk and Megrim, 9-18 May 2006, Bilbao, Spain, ICES CM 2006/ACFM:29.
ICES, 2009. Report of the Working Group on the Assessment of Southern Shelf Stocks of Hake, Monk, and Megrim, 5-11 May 2009, ICES CM 2009/ACOM:08.

[^1]
### 8.4.2

Supporting Information June 2009

## ECOREGION Widely distributed and migratory stocks <br> STOCK Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI, and VII, and Divisions VIIIa,b,d (Northern stock)

## Reference points

|  | Type | Value | Technical basis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MSY <br> approach |  |  |  |
|  | MSY $_{\text {trigger }}$ | 140000 t | $\mathrm{B}_{\text {pa }}$ as defined in 1998 |
|  | $\mathrm{~F}_{\text {MSY }}$ | 0.18 | $\mathrm{~F}_{\text {max }}$ in 2009 |
|  | $\mathrm{~B}_{\text {pa }}$ | 100000 t | $\mathrm{B}_{\text {lim }}=\mathrm{B}_{\text {loss }}$ the lowest observed biomass in the 2003 assessment |
|  | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {lim }}$ | 140000 t | $\mathrm{B}_{\text {pa }} \sim \mathrm{B}_{\text {lim }} * 1.4$ |
|  | $\mathrm{~F}_{\text {pa }}$ | 0.35 | $\mathrm{~F}_{\text {lim }}=\mathrm{F}_{\text {loss }}$ |

(unchanged since: 2009)
Yield and spawning biomass per Recruit F-reference points (2009):

|  | Fish Mort <br> Ages 2-6 | Yield/R | SSB/R |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average last 3 years | 0.25 | 0.31 | 0.91 |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{\max }$ | 0.18 | 0.32 | 1.21 |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{0.1}$ | 0.10 | 0.29 | 1.88 |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{\text {med }}$ | 0.34 | 0.29 | 0.64 |

## Catch options

Basis: $\mathrm{F}(2009)=$ mean $\mathrm{F}(06-08)=0.25 ; \mathrm{R}(07-10)=\mathrm{GM} 1990-2006=184$ millions; $\operatorname{SSB}(2010)=161.6$; landings $(2009)=50.1$

| Rationale | Landings (2010) | Basis | $\begin{gathered} F \\ (2010) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SSB } \\ (2011) \end{gathered}$ | \%SSB change ${ }^{1}$ | \%TAC change $^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MSY framework | 42 | $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ | 0.18 | 186 | 15\% | -19\% |
| MSY transition | 48 | Avg $\mathrm{F}_{\text {this }} / \mathrm{F}_{\text {that }}{ }^{5}$ | 0.21 | 178 | 10\% | - 2\% |
| Precautionary approach | 55 | $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{pa}}$ | 0.25 | 172 | 6\% | 6\% |
| EU recovery plan | 55 | F (recovery plan) | 0.25 | 172 | 6\% | 6\% |
| Status quo | 0 | $\mathrm{F}=0$ | 0.00 | 233 | 44\% | -100\% |
|  | 6 | $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{sa}} * 0.1$ | 0.03 | 226 | 40\% | -88\% |
|  | 16 | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {sa }} * 0.25$ | 0.06 | 216 | 33\% | -70\% |
|  | 30 | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {so }} * 0.5$ | 0.13 | 200 | 23\% | -42\% |
|  | 43 | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {sa }} * 0.75$ | 0.19 | 185 | 14\% | -16\% |
|  | 51 | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {so }} * 0.9$ | 0.23 | 177 | 9\% | -2\% |
|  | 55 | $\mathrm{F}_{50}$ | 0.25 | 171 | 6\% | 7\% |
|  | 60 | $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{s} 0} * 1.1$ | 0.28 | 166 | 3\% | 16\% |

All weights in ' 000 tonnes.
${ }^{1)}$ SSB 2011 relative to SSB 2010.
${ }^{2)}$ Predicted landings 2010 relative to TAC 2009 (51.5 thousand tonnes).

## MSY approach

Following the ICES MSY framework implies fishing mortality to be reduced to 0.18 (equal to $\mathrm{F}_{\text {MSY }}$ ), resulting in landings of 42000 t in 2010. This is expected to lead to an SSB of 186000 t in 2011

[^2]Following the transition scheme towards the ICES MSY framework implies fishing mortality to be reduced to 0.21 (Avg $\mathrm{F}_{\text {this }} / \mathrm{F}_{\text {that }}$ ), resulting in landings of 48000 t in 2010. This is expected to lead to an SSB of 178000 t in 2011

## PA approach

The fishing mortality in 2010 should be no more than Fpa corresponding to landings of less than 54500 t in 2010. This is expected to keep SSB above Bpa in 2011.

## Management plan(s) / policy paper

Following the agreed EU recovery plan implies a TAC of 54500 t in 2010 which is expected to lead to a TAC increase of 6\%.

## Additional considerations

Discards of juvenile hake can be substantial in some areas and fleets. The spawning biomass and the long-term yield can be substantially improved by reducing mortality of small fish. This could be achieved by measures that reduce unwanted bycatch through shifting the selection pattern towards larger fish.

The northern hake SSB is for 2009 estimated to be above the recovery plan target ( 140000 t ). Article 3 of the recovery plan prescribes that a management plan should be implemented when the target is reached in two consecutive years. ICES considers that SSB has been approximately 140000 t in the last two years.

Stable fishing mortalities since 2001 at about Fpa (0.25) and the 2006 year class that is above average have contributed to the recent increase in SSB.

## Data

The fishing industry and scientists have, at national level, discussed information that can be used in the assessments. However, national industries have not provided any additional quantitative information for use in the assessment.

## Comparison with previous assessment and catch options

The estimate for SSB in 2008 has been revised up/downward by X\% and F in 2007 has been revised up/downward by Y\% compared to last year's assessment. Last year's advice was based on the precautionary principle (Fpa). This year's advice is based on the ICES MSY framework ( $\mathrm{F}_{\text {MSY }}$ )

## Uncertainties in assessment and catch options

Age from otolith readings may be overestimated. Further studies, extensive tag-recapture studies, complementary ageing and growth methodologies, and even alternative non-age-based assessment methods are required to draw any firm conclusions on these matters. Analyses indicate that stock trends are robust to uncertainties in growth (ICES, 2006). However, if growth of hake is underestimated, reference points would need to be revisited.

Discards are not included in the assessments. The available data are patchy and noisy and discard rates of several fleets are still simply not known. Even, when data are available, it has not yet been possible to incorporate them in a consistent way.

The historical performance of the assessments shows consistent overestimation of SSB and underestimation of fishing mortality for the last few years in the assessment. SSB for 2008 has been revised downwards by $3 \%$ and F for 2007 upwards by $4 \%$.

There are large uncertainties associated with the most recent recruitment estimates; these are only estimated by a single survey. In the absence of reliable 2007 and 2008 recruitment estimates, geometric mean recruitment has been used.

There is no biological basis for the current stock definition of northern and southern hake.

## Assessment and management area

Maps of ICES' stock assessment (advice) area and map of management area, to be produced.



Figure 9.4.1.2. Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI, and VII, and Divisions VIIIa,b,d) (Northern stock). Stock-recruitment plot, yield per recruit analysis

Table 9.4.1.1 Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI, and VII, and Divisions VIIIa,b,d) (Northern stock). Single stock exploitation boundaries (advice), management, catch, and landings.

| Year | ICES <br> Advice / Single-stock exploitation <br> boundaries (from 2004 onwards) | Predicted catch <br> corresp to advice | Agreed <br> TAC $^{1}$ | ICES <br> landings | Disc. <br> slip. | ICES |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ***

[^3]Tables 9.4.1.2 Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI, and VII, and Divisions VIIIa,b,d) (Northern stock). Estimated landings, discards, and catches ('000 tonnes) by ICES area.

| Year | Landings (1) |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Discards (2) } \\ \hline \text { VIIIa,b } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Catches (3) } \\ \hline \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | IVa+VI | VII | VIIIa,b | Unallocated | Total |  |  |
| 1961 | - | - | - | 95.6 | 95.6 | - | 95.6 |
| 1962 | - | - | - | 86.3 | 86.3 | - | 86.3 |
| 1963 | - | - | - | 86.2 | 86.2 | - | 86.2 |
| 1964 | - | - | - | 76.8 | 76.8 | - | 76.8 |
| 1965 | - | - | - | 64.7 | 64.7 | - | 64.7 |
| 1966 | - | - | - | 60.9 | 60.9 | - | 60.9 |
| 1967 | - | - | - | 62.1 | 62.1 | - | 62.1 |
| 1968 | - | - | - | 62.0 | 62.0 | - | 62.0 |
| 1969 | - | - | - | 54.9 | 54.9 | - | 54.9 |
| 1970 | - | - | - | 64.9 | 64.9 | - | 64.9 |
| 1971 | 8.5 | 19.4 | 23.4 | 0 | 51.3 | - | 51.3 |
| 1972 | 9.4 | 14.9 | 41.2 | 0 | 65.5 | - | 65.5 |
| 1973 | 9.5 | 31.2 | 37.6 | 0 | 78.3 | - | 78.3 |
| 1974 | 9.7 | 28.9 | 34.5 | 0 | 73.1 | - | 73.1 |
| 1975 | 11.0 | 29.2 | 32.5 | 0 | 72.7 | - | 72.7 |
| 1976 | 12.9 | 26.7 | 28.5 | 0 | 68.1 | - | 68.1 |
| 1977 | 8.5 | 21.0 | 24.7 | 0 | 54.2 | - | 54.2 |
| 1978 | 8.0 | 20.3 | 24.5 | -2.2 | 50.6 | 2.4 | 52.9 |
| 1979 | 8.7 | 17.6 | 27.2 | -2.4 | 51.1 | 2.7 | 53.8 |
| 1980 | 9.7 | 22.0 | 28.4 | -2.8 | 57.3 | 3.2 | 60.5 |
| 1981 | 8.8 | 25.6 | 22.3 | -2.8 | 53.9 | 2.3 | 56.3 |
| 1982 | 5.9 | 25.2 | 26.2 | -2.3 | 55.0 | 3.1 | 58.1 |
| 1983 | 6.2 | 26.3 | 27.1 | -2.1 | 57.5 | 2.6 | 60.1 |
| 1984 | 9.5 | 33.0 | 22.9 | -2.1 | 63.3 | 1.9 | 65.1 |
| 1985 | 9.2 | 27.5 | 21.0 | -1.6 | 56.1 | 3.8 | 59.9 |
| 1986 | 7.3 | 27.4 | 23.9 | -1.5 | 57.1 | 3.0 | 60.1 |
| 1987 | 7.8 | 32.9 | 24.7 | -2.0 | 63.4 | 2.0 | 65.3 |
| 1988 | 8.8 | 30.9 | 26.6 | -1.5 | 64.8 | 2.0 | 66.8 |
| 1989 | 7.4 | 26.9 | 32.0 | 0.2 | 66.5 | 2.3 | 68.8 |
| 1990 | 6.7 | 23.0 | 34.4 | -4.2 | 59.9 | 1.5 | 61.4 |
| 1991 | 8.3 | 21.5 | 31.6 | -3.9 | 57.6 | 1.7 | 59.3 |
| 1992 | 8.6 | 22.5 | 23.5 | 2.1 | 56.6 | 1.7 | 58.3 |
| 1993 | 8.5 | 20.5 | 19.8 | 3.3 | 52.1 | 1.5 | 53.6 |
| 1994 | 5.4 | 21.1 | 24.7 | 0 | 51.3 | 1.9 | 53.1 |
| 1995 | 5.3 | 24.1 | 28.1 | 0 | 57.6 | 1.2 | 58.9 |
| 1996 | 4.4 | 24.7 | 18.0 | 0 | 47.2 | 1.5 | 48.8 |
| 1997 | 3.3 | 18.9 | 20.3 | 0 | 42.6 | 1.8 | 44.4 |
| 1998 | 3.2 | 18.7 | 13.1 | 0 | 35.0 | 0.8 | 35.8 |
| 1999 | 4.3 | 24.0 | 11.6 | 0 | 39.8 | 0.8 | 40.6 |
| 2000 | 4.0 | 26.0 | 12.0 | 0 | 42.0 | 0.6 | 42.6 |
| 2001 | 4.4 | 23.1 | 9.2 | 0 | 36.7 | 0.5 | 37.2 |
| 2002 | 2.9 | 21.2 | 15.9 | 0 | 40.1 | 0.3 | 40.4 |
| 2003* | 3.3 | 25.4 | 14.4 | 0 | 43.2 | - | 43.2 |
| 2004* | 4.4 | 27.5 | 14.5 | 0 | 46.4 | - | 46.4 |
| 2005* | 5.5 | 26.6 | 14.5 | 0 | 46.6 | - | 46.6 |
| 2006* | 6.1 | 24.7 | 10.6 | 0 | 41.5 | - | 41.5 |
| 2007* | 7.0 | 27.5 | 10.6 | 0 | 45.1 | - | 45.1 |
| 2008* | 10.7 | 22.8 | 14.3 | 0 | 47.8 | - | 47.8 |

(1) Spanish data for 1961-1972 not revised, data for Sub-area VIII for 1973-1978 include data for

Divisions VIIIa,b only. Data for 1979-1981 are revised based on French surveillance data.
Includes Divisions IIIa, IVb,c from 1976.
There are some unallocated landings ( moreover for the period 1961-1970).
(2) Discards have been estimated from 1978 and only for Divisions VIIIa,b.
(3) From 1978 total catches used for the Working Group.
(*) Year for which no discards estimates is available

Table 9.4.1.3 Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI, and VII, and Divisions VIIIa,b,d) (Northern stock). Summary of stock assessment.

| Year | Recruitment <br> Age 0 millions | SSB tonnes | Landings tonnes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mean F } \\ \text { Ages 2-6 } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1978 | 311 | 206100 | 49500 | 0.212 |
| 1979 | 283 | 243900 | 50600 | 0.193 |
| 1980 | 359 | 228800 | 56500 | 0.208 |
| 1981 | 276 | 246900 | 53900 | 0.205 |
| 1982 | 223 | 248700 | 55000 | 0.225 |
| 1983 | 228 | 238200 | 57500 | 0.223 |
| 1984 | 200 | 253800 | 63300 | 0.226 |
| 1985 | 214 | 349600 | 56100 | 0.143 |
| 1986 | 199 | 320900 | 57100 | 0.174 |
| 1987 | 207 | 265900 | 63400 | 0.230 |
| 1988 | 213 | 206600 | 64800 | 0.286 |
| 1989 | 195 | 185500 | 66500 | 0.327 |
| 1990 | 252 | 148700 | 64300 | 0.353 |
| 1991 | 204 | 120400 | 52400 | 0.292 |
| 1992 | 240 | 104100 | 56600 | 0.380 |
| 1993 | 212 | 102100 | 52100 | 0.293 |
| 1994 | 179 | 95500 | 51300 | 0.382 |
| 1995 | 199 | 98900 | 57600 | 0.432 |
| 1996 | 201 | 95600 | 47200 | 0.355 |
| 1997 | 158 | 98300 | 42600 | 0.307 |
| 1998 | 147 | 94000 | 35000 | 0.286 |
| 1999 | 158 | 91800 | 39800 | 0.322 |
| 2000 | 150 | 94600 | 42000 | 0.328 |
| 2001 | 138 | 103600 | 36700 | 0.245 |
| 2002 | 149 | 107700 | 40100 | 0.263 |
| 2003 | 181 | 110000 | 43200 | 0.278 |
| 2004 | 195 | 121600 | 46400 | 0.272 |
| 2005 | 192 | 120500 | 46500 | 0.275 |
| 2006 | 228 | 129800 | 41500 | 0.233 |
| 2007 | 184* | 126700 | 45100 | 0.263 |
| 2008 | 184* | 136600 | 47800 | 0.243 |
| 2009 | 184* | 145900 |  |  |
| Average | 208 | 163791 | 51045 | 0.273 |

*2007, 2008 and 2009 recruitment estimates replaced by geometric mean (1990-06)


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Reference to ICES MSY framework and transition
    ${ }^{2}$ See advice for anglerfish in the same area: x.x.y

[^1]:    ${ }^{3} \mathrm{R}$ intermediate year will be excluded in future

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ MSY reference points are made up, not to be quoted as the final ones, since the decision rule is not final yet.
    ${ }^{5}$ The MSY transition scheme is not yet settled, this figure is a guestimate for the sake of this example.

[^3]:    Weights in ' 000 t .
    ${ }^{1}$ Sum of area TACs corresponding to northern stock plus Division IIa (EC zone only).
    ${ }^{2}$ Landings.
    *Single-stock boundary and the exploitation of this stock should be conducted in the context of mixed fisheries.
    **In 2003 onwards, no estimations of discards were available.
    ***ICES catch not used in the assessment. Assessment based on landings only.

