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• Agreement to finalise an OMP-14 based on Interim OMP-13v3 with guidelines for some spatial disaggregation of directed sardine catch

• Part 1: Alternative predictors of past splits in directed sardine catch

• Part 2: A way-forward for how to develop a rule to advise on a catch split under OMP-14
Part 1: Predicting Past Catch/Survey Splits

- A) Model the proportion of catch west of Cape Agulhas
- B) Model the proportion of survey biomass west of Cape Agulhas

Only considered data in past 10 years
Part 1: Predicting Past Catch/Survey Splits

Models:
- **Survey**: the proportion of survey biomass west of CA in $y-1$
- **Avg 2 Surveys**: the average of the proportion of survey biomass west of CA in $y-1$ and $y-2$
- **Avg 3 Surveys**: the average of the proportion of survey biomass west of CA in $y-1$, $y-2$ and $y-3$
- **Weight 3 Surveys**: the weighted average of the proportion of survey biomass west of CA in $y-1$, $y-2$, $y-3$, with greater weight given to more recent years
- **Est Weight 3 Surveys**: the weighted average of the proportion of survey biomass west of CA in $y-1$, $y-2$, $y-3$ with weights estimated
- **Weight 5 Surveys**: the weighted average of the proportion of survey biomass west of CA in $y-1$, $y-2$, $y-3$, $y-4$, $y-5$, with greater weight given to more recent years
- **Avg 2 Surveys & Catch**: the average of the proportion of survey biomass and catch west of CA in $y-1$, $y-2$, with greater weight given to survey data
Predicting Past Catch Splits

Fitting to 2008-2013 Data only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>( q )</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg 2 Surveys</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg 3 Surveys</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight 3 Surveys</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est Weight 3 Surveys</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight 5 Surveys</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg 2 Surveys &amp; Catch</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Predicting Past Survey Splits

Fitting to 2008-2013 Data only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>( q )</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg 2 Surveys</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg 3 Surveys</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight 3 Surveys</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est Weight 3 Surveys</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight 5 Surveys</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg 2 Surveys &amp; Catch</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variance much higher. Bias lower.
Part 1: Predicting Past Catch/Survey Splits

• Summary:
• Can predict past catch split more accurately than past survey split
• A non-negligible additive bias is required to fit the data
• Note additive bias implies model can only be used for a short period of time (e.g. if current upward trend in survey proportion continues, the models could soon produce unrealistic results)
Part 1: Predicting Past Catch/Survey Splits

• Summary:

• Catch predictions represent what would happen in the absence of any directive regarding spatial management.

- What flexibility about recommended OMP-14 proportions might be appropriate, given the level of precision with which the proportion can be estimated?
Part 2:
Recommendation for OMP-14 Catch Splits

• Step 1: SPSWG needs to agree on an ideal median annual proportional split

• Four examples:
  • Survey y-1: Catch should reflect the distribution of sardine during Nov y-1 survey
  • Avg last 2 Surveys: Catch should reflect average distribution of sardine during recent 2 surveys. May smooth out any large, but temporary changes in proportions
  • Avg last 2 Surveys & Catch: Best predictor model. Inclusion of historic catch as a means to allow some socio-economic preference
  • Avg last and next Survey: Catch should reflect the distribution of sardine during the catch period (taken as an average of that at the beginning and end of period)
Part 2: Recommendation for OMP-14 Catch Splits

Variability from observed data only

Variability from observed data AND predictive model
"Recommendations" consistently lower than observations -> a shift in fishing pressure would be required
Part 2: Recommendation for OMP-14 Catch Splits

• Step 1: SPSWG needs to agree on an ideal median annual proportional split
• Step 2: What is an acceptable error about such a recommendation?
• Step 3: Can industry realistically achieve the ideal split + error or should some further tolerance (bias) be allowed during the short term (OMP-14)
Part 2: Recommendation for OMP-14 Catch Splits

• OMP-14 recommendation = $p(\text{ideal}) \pm \text{error} + \text{bias}$

• Should recommendation apply to TAC or catch?
Exploring options for spatially disaggregated directed sardine catch under OMP-14
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- Agreement to finalise an OMP-14 based on Interim OMP-13v3 (single area directed sardine TAC) with guidelines for some spatial disaggregation of directed sardine catch.
Recommendation for OMP-14 Catch Splits

• Step 1: SPSWG needs to agree on an ideal median annual proportional split
• Step 2: What is an acceptable error about such a recommendation?
• Step 3: Can industry realistically achieve the ideal split + error or should some further tolerance (bias) be allowed during the short term (OMP-14)

OMP-14 recommendation = p(ideal) ± error + bias
Recommendation for OMP-14 Catch Splits

• Step 1: SPSWG needs to agree on an ideal median annual proportional split

Generally management objectives would be to split the catch by area in the same proportion as the split of the resource abundance by area
Recommendation for OMP-14 Catch Splits

- **Four examples:**
  - **Survey y-1:** Catch should reflect the distribution of sardine during Nov y-1 survey.
  - **Avg last 2 Surveys:** Catch should reflect average distribution of sardine during recent 2 surveys. May smooth out any large, but temporary changes in proportions.
  - **Avg last 2 Surveys & Catch:** Best predictor model. Inclusion of historic catch as a means to allow some socio-economic preference.
  - **Avg last and next Survey:** Catch should reflect the distribution of sardine during the catch period (taken as an average of that at the beginning and end of period).
Recommendation for OMP-14 Catch Splits

• Four examples:
  • **Survey y-1**: Catch should reflect the distribution of sardine during Nov y-1 survey
  • **Avg last 2 Surveys**: Catch should reflect average distribution of sardine during recent 2 surveys. May smooth out any large, but temporary changes in proportions
  • **Avg last 2 Surveys & Catch**: Best predictor model. Inclusion of historic catch as a means to allow some socio-economic preference
  • **Avg last and next Survey**: Catch should reflect the distribution of sardine during the catch period (taken as an average of that at the beginning and end of period)
Predicting Past Survey Splits

Need a predictor of proportion of sardine west of Cape Agulhas during next survey

- **Survey**: the proportion of survey biomass west of CA in y-1
- **Avg 2 Surveys**: the average of the proportion of survey biomass west of CA in y-1 and y-2
- **Avg 3 Surveys**: the average of the proportion of survey biomass west of CA in y-1, y-2 and y-3
- **Weight 3 Surveys**: the weighted average of the proportion of survey biomass west of CA in y-1, y-2, y-3, with greater weight given to more recent years
- **Est Weight 3 Surveys**: the weighted average of the proportion of survey biomass west of CA in y-1, y-2, y-3 with weights estimated
- **Weight 5 Surveys**: the weighted average of the proportion of survey biomass west of CA in y-1, y-2, y-3, y-4, y-5, with greater weight given to more recent years
- **Avg 2 Surveys & Catch**: the average of the proportion of survey biomass and catch west of CA in y-1, y-2, with greater weight given to survey data
Predicting Past Survey Splits

Need a predictor of proportion of sardine west of Cape Agulhas during next survey

- **Survey**: the proportion of survey biomass west of CA in y-1
- **Avg 2 Surveys**: the average of the proportion of survey biomass west of CA in y-1 and y-2
- **Avg 3 Surveys**: the average of the proportion of survey biomass west of CA in y-1, y-2 and y-3
- **Weight 3 Surveys**: the weighted average of the proportion of survey biomass west of CA in y-1, y-2, y-3, with greater weight given to more recent years
- **Est Weight 3 Surveys**: the weighted average of the proportion of survey biomass west of CA in y-1, y-2, y-3 with weights estimated
- **Weight 5 Surveys**: the weighted average of the proportion of survey biomass west of CA in y-1, y-2, y-3, y-4, y-5, with greater weight given to more recent years
- **Avg 2 Surveys & Catch**: the average of the proportion of survey biomass and catch west of CA in y-1, y-2, with greater weight given to survey data
Predicting Past Survey Splits

- **Observed**: Red line indicates the observed proportion west of Cape Agulhas.
- **Avg 2 Surveys**: Dotted line represents the average of two surveys.
- **Weight 5 Surveys**: Dashed line shows the weighted average of five surveys.
Recommendation for OMP-14 Catch Splits

Variability from observed data only

“Recommendations” consistently lower than observations -> a shift in fishing pressure would be required

Variability from observed data AND predictive model

Predictive model used: Avg 2 Surveys, Variance would be a little smaller if weight 5 surveys used
Recommendation for OMP-14 Catch Splits

• Step 1: SPSWG needs to agree on an ideal median annual proportional split

• OMP-14 recommendation = p(ideal) ± error + bias
  • e.g. p(ideal) = 0.5[p(Nov_{y-2})+p(Nov_{y-1})]
  • e.g. p(ideal) = 0.5[p(Nov_{y-1})+p(predicted Nov_{y})]
Recommendation for OMP-14 Catch Splits

- **Step 1:** SPSWG needs to agree on an ideal median annual proportional split
- **Step 2:** What is an acceptable error about such a recommendation?
- OMP-14 recommendation = p(ideal) ± error + bias
  - e.g. error = ±1 SE
    - (±0.09 average for Avg last 2 surveys)
    - (±0.15 average for Avg last and next survey)
Recommendation for OMP-14 Catch Splits

• Step 1: SPSWG needs to agree on an ideal median annual proportional split
• Step 2: What is an acceptable error about such a recommendation?
• Step 3: Can industry realistically achieve the ideal split + error or should some further tolerance (bias) be allowed during the short term (OMP-14)
Recommendation for OMP-14 Catch Splits

White bars show \( p(\text{ideal}) \pm 1\text{SE} \)

e.g. bias = 0?
Recommendation for OMP-14 Catch Splits

• Apply recommendation to TAC or catch?
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