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The data to which the South African anchovy and sardine assessments are tuned are not raw data. Some of the data have already been subjected to a number of analyses and refinements. These associated calculations are often done "behind the scenes" and their details are seldom recorded. This lack of record can result in a discontinuity in the method used to calculate data for subsequent assessments, particularly if assumptions made in the calculations are not documented and/or a new person becomes responsible for developing the data to be used for input to the assessment. This document serves to record the generation from the raw data of the data used in the anchovy and sardine assessments carried out in 2010 and 2011. All files referred to below are available from the first author.

## Anchovy Commercial Data

Monthly Raised Length Frequencies (RLFs)
Monthly raised length frequencies were constructed for the anchovy landings using the method in Appendix A. Although it is possible to split the RLFs by area from 1987, as the assessment will be run for a single stock in a single area, RLFs for a single area only are considered.

In 7 months no length frequencies were available although there were landings. In these cases the length frequencies of former months were used to estimate a raised length frequency as follows:
$R L F_{y, \text { mis } \sin g, l}=R L F_{y, \text { previous }, l} \times$ Tonnage $_{y, \text { mis } \sin g} /$ Tonnage $_{y, \text { previous }}$
The "former" month used in this estimation is listed in the below table.

| Year | Month for which <br> length frequency was <br> missing | Tonnage <br> landed in <br> missing month | Area in which <br> landings <br> occurred | Month from which <br> length frequency was <br> used | Tonnage <br> landed in this <br> used month |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1984 | October | 22878 t | Western | July 1984 | 18193 t |
| 1984 | November | 7281 t | Western | July 1984 | 18193 t |

The RLFs by month from 1984 to 1986 and also by area from 1987 to 2010 are stored in Anchovy RLFs with Cut-Off Lengths.xls.

[^0]
## Splitting Juvenile and Adult Catch

Cunningham and Butterworth 2007 proposed the use of the following cut-off lengths for each month to calculate the number of juveniles and adults:

| Month | Cut-off length |
| :--- | :---: |
| January | 7 cm |
| February | 8 cm |
| March | 9 cm |
| April | 9.5 cm |
| May | 10 cm |
| June | 10.5 cm |
| July | 10.5 cm |
| August | 10.5 cm |
| September | 10.5 cm |
| October | 10.5 cm |
| November | 5 cm |
| December | 6 cm |

However, the cut-off length used to calculate the number of recruits from the recruit survey differs on an annual basis, ranging between 9.5 and 11.5 cm . In only 8 years do the above cut-off lengths for recruits in the commercial catch match that used to calculate the number of recruits surveyed. These cut-off lengths have been based on the length frequency as measured during the survey. To avoid a mismatch between the cut-off length used to calculate the recruits caught prior to the survey (used in the model to predict the number of recruits at the time of the survey) and that used to calculate the recruits observed during the survey, the above table of cut-off lengths was adjusted for certain years as follows:

| Month | Survey | Fixed cut- | Survey | New Commercial cut-off lengths |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | April | May | June | July-Oct |
| 1985 | May | 10 cm | 10.5 cm | 9.5 cm | 10.5 cm | 10.5 cm | 10.5 cm |
| 1986 | June | 10.5 cm | 10.5 cm | 9.5 cm | 10 cm | 10.5 cm | 10.5 cm |
| 1987 | July | 10.5 cm | 11 cm | 9.5 cm | 10 cm | 10.5 cm | 11 cm |
| 1988 | June | 10 cm | 11.5 cm | 9.5 cm | 10.5 cm | 11.5 cm | 11.5 cm |
| 1989 | June | 10 cm | 10.5 cm | 9.5 cm | 10 cm | 10.5 cm | 10.5 cm |
| 1990 | June | 10 cm | 10.5 cm | 9.5 cm | 10 cm | 10.5 cm | 10.5 cm |
| 1991 | May | 10 cm | 10.5 cm | 9.5 cm | 10.5 cm | 10.5 cm | 10.5 cm |
| 1992 | May | 10 cm | 10.5 cm | 9.5 cm | 10.5 cm | 10.5 cm | 10.5 cm |
| 1993 | May | 10 cm | 10.5 cm | 9.5 cm | 10.5 cm | 10.5 cm | 10.5 cm |
| 1994 | May | 10 cm | 9.5 cm | 9.5 cm | 9.5 cm | 10 cm | 10.5 cm |
| 1995 | June | 10 cm | 10.5 cm | 9.5 cm | 10 cm | 10.5 cm | 10.5 cm |
| 1996 | July | 10 cm | 10.5 cm | 9.5 cm | 10 cm | 10.5 cm | 10.5 cm |
| 1997 | May | 10 cm | 10 cm | 9.5 cm | 10 cm | 10.5 cm | 10.5 cm |
| 1998 | May | 10 cm | 10.5 cm | 9.5 cm | 10.5 cm | 10.5 cm | 10.5 cm |
| 1999 | May | 10 cm | 10 cm | 9.5 cm | 10 cm | 10.5 cm | 10.5 cm |
| 2000 | May | 10 cm | 9.5 cm | 9.5 cm | 9.5 cm | 10 cm | 10.5 cm |
| 2001 | May | 10 cm | 9 cm | 9 cm | 9 cm | 10 cm | 10.5 cm |
| 2002 | May | 10 cm | 11 cm | 10 cm | 11 cm | 11 cm | 11 cm |
| 2003 | May | 10 cm | 10 cm | 9.5 cm | 10 cm | 10.5 cm | 10.5 cm |
| 2004 | May | 10 cm | 11 cm | 10 cm | 11 cm | 11 cm | 11 cm |
| 2005 | May | 10 cm | 9.5 cm | 9.5 cm | 9.5 cm | 10 cm | 10.5 cm |
| 2006 | May | 10 cm | 9.5 cm | 9.5 cm | 9.5 cm | 10 cm | 10.5 cm |


| 2007 | May | 10 cm | 9.5 cm | 9.5 cm | $\mathbf{9 . 5} \mathbf{c m}$ | $\mathbf{1 0} \mathbf{c m}$ | 10.5 cm |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | May | 10 cm | 9.5 cm | 9.5 cm | $\mathbf{9 . 5} \mathbf{c m}$ | $\mathbf{1 0} \mathbf{c m}$ | 10.5 cm |
| 2009 | May | 10 cm | 10.5 cm | 9.5 cm | $\mathbf{1 0 . 5} \mathbf{c m}$ | 10.5 cm | 10.5 cm |
| 2010 | May | 10 cm | 11 cm | $\mathbf{1 0} \mathbf{c m}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 c m}$ | $\mathbf{1 1} \mathbf{c m}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 c m}$ |

Monthly anchovy catch numbers are available for 1981 to 1983 (De Oliveria pers. comm.) but no RLFs are available for these months. These data are not used in the assessment.

The resulting monthly catch numbers of juveniles and adults, summed over all areas, are stored in Anchovy Commercial Catch.xls. The annual juvenile and adult anchovy catches for year $y$ are calculated as the sum over all months from November $y$-1 to October $y$. The annual juvenile and adult anchovy catch data are given in Table 1 and stored in Anchovy Commercial Catch.xls.

## Catch Weight

The data available for these calculations include the number of fish in length class $l$ in month $m$ in area $a$, $N_{l, m, a}$, (used above) and the observed tonnage in month $m$ in area $a, O b s T_{m, a}$ from 1984 to 2010. These data are recorded in Anchovy RLFs with Cut-Off Lengths.xls. The length-weight relationship used is (Lynne Shannon pers. comm. using 1990-1996 data):
mass $=0.00750 \times L_{c}^{3.110}$, where mass is in kilograms and length in centimetres.

Expected mass by length class, area and month is calculated as: $E M_{l, m, a}=0.0075 \times l_{\text {mid }}^{3.110} \times N_{l, m, a}$ where $l_{\text {mid }}$ is the mid-point of the length class considered.

Adjusted mass by length class, area and month is calculated as: $A M_{l, m, a}=\frac{E M_{l, m, a}}{\sum_{l} E M_{l, m, a}} \times O b s T_{m, a}$
Average monthly adjusted mass by length class, area and month is calculated as:
$\overline{A M}_{l, m, a}=\frac{A M_{l, m, a}}{N_{l, m, a}}=\frac{\frac{E M_{l, m, a}}{\sum_{l} E M_{l, m, a}} \times O b s T_{m, a}}{N_{l, m, a}}$
Average juvenile mass by month for the total area is calculated as: $M_{m}^{j u v}=\frac{\sum_{a} \sum_{l<c u t o f f} \overline{A M}_{l, m, a} \times N_{l, m, a}}{\sum_{a} \sum_{l<c u t o f f} N_{l, m, a}}$
Average adult mass by month for the total area is calculated as: $M_{m}^{a d}=\frac{\sum_{a} \sum_{l \geq \text { cutoff }} \overline{A M}_{l, m, a} \times N_{l, m, a}}{\sum_{a} \sum_{l \geq \text { cutoff }} N_{l, m, a}}$
A check is performed on the calculations such that:

$$
M_{m}^{j u v} \times \sum_{a} \sum_{l<c u t o f f} N_{l, m, a}+M_{m}^{a d} \times \sum_{a} \sum_{l \geq \text { cutoff }} N_{l, m, a}=\sum_{a} O b s T_{m, a} .
$$

The above calculations and average juvenile and adult anchovy catch mass by month are stored in Anchovy RLFs with Cut-Off Lengths.xls.

The annual average juvenile and anchovy catch mass are calculated using a weighted average: $\frac{\sum_{m} M_{m}^{j u v} \times N_{m}^{j u v}}{\sum_{m} N_{m}^{j u v}}$ and $\frac{\sum_{m} M_{m}^{a d} \times N_{m}^{a d}}{\sum_{m} N_{m}^{a d}}$, where $N_{m}^{j u v}$ and $N_{m}^{a d}$ are the monthly juvenile and adult catch-atage reported in Table 1. These sums are taken over the months November $y$ - 1 to October $y$, except for 1984 when the sum is from January to October 1984. The annual values are given in Table 1 and stored in Anchovy Commercial Catch.xls.

Between 1981 and 1983 there were no data to calculate catch weights-at-age as above.

## Juvenile catch prior to the survey

RLFs were also calculated from the first of the month in which the annual recruit survey took place to the day before the commencement of the survey using the method in Appendix A. Inspector data (which include samples for species split) are required to do this (see Appendix A), but were not available in 1985 and 1986. Daily skippers' estimates of tonnage landed were, however, available for these years. Although the total tonnage landed in May 1985 and June 1986 was estimated by the skippers to be different to that arising from the source data, it was assumed that the proportion of catch taken before the survey compared to the whole month was the same between the skippers' estimates and the source data. Thus RLFs for 1-19 May 1985 and 1-9 June 1986 were calculated as follows: $N_{l, \text { partmonth }, a}=N_{l, \text { fullmonth }, a} \times S$ Sipper $T_{\text {partmonth }} / \operatorname{Skipper} T_{\text {fullmonth }}$, using the data in the below table.

|  | Days for which catch <br> is required | Catch for the <br> month (tons) | Skipper estimated catch <br> for the month (tons) | Skipper estimated catch <br> prior to the survey (tons) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| May 1985 | $1-19^{\text {th }}$ | 74245 | 77174 | 48396 |
| June 1986 | $1-9^{\text {th }}$ | 64662 | 68189 | 10338 |

The cut-off length method described on page 2 was applied to calculate the number of juveniles landed in the month prior to the commencement of the survey. The associated average juvenile catch weight was also calculated using the method detailed on pages 2-3. The total juvenile catch prior to the survey was then summed over all months from November y-1 to the day prior to the commencement of the survey. The average juvenile mass in this catch was calculated as a weighted average, taking the number of juveniles caught in each month into account. These data are given in Table 2 and are available together with the necessary calculations in Anchovy RLFs with Cut-Off Lengths.xls and Survey Data.xls.

## Sardine Commercial Data

Monthly raised length frequencies were constructed for the sardine landings using the method in Appendix A. These have been split by area (east and west of Cape Agulhas).

ALKs for sardine commercial catch for some months each year from 1984 to 1999 were derived by Michael Kerstan (De Oliveria 2003). Due to inconsistencies between the ALKs from Michael Kerstan and Deon Durholtz, these ALKs have not been used in the assessments. Monthly ALKs for sardine commercial catch from 2004, 2006, 2007 and 2008 were derived by Cynthia Mtengwane. Once any differences for reader error have been considered, these ALKs will be used in the sardine assessment.

Proportions-at-length in the commercial catch, computed directly from the RLFs were used may also be used to fit a length based model in due course. These RLFs are available by month between 1984 and 1986 and by area (east and west of Cape Agulhas) and month between 1987 and 2010 and are stored in Sardine RLFs by area.xls. The tonnages landed each month were provided with the RLFs from 1987 onwards. For 1984 to 1986 the monthly tonnages landed were obtained from RLF data provided for the assessment in 2004.

For the single stock assessment, the catch tonnage and RLFs by month are assumed to be equal to the combined catch tonnage east and west of Cape Agulhas ${ }^{1}$.

The annual commercial catch tonnages are given in Table 3.

## Juvenile catch prior to the survey

As catch is modelled quarterly, the observed sardine juvenile catch prior to the survey is required only from 1 May to the day before the survey commenced. This was calculated from the RLFs of landings between 1 May and the day before the commencement of the survey. The cut-off lengths used to calculate the recruit survey biomass, based on a modal progression analysis (Coetzee and Merkle 2007) are also applied to the calculation of the recruit catch between 1 May and the day before the survey commenced. As for anchovy, inspector data were not available in 1985 and 1986. Daily skippers' estimates of tonnage landed were, however, available for these years. Although the total tonnage landed in May 1985 and June 1986 was estimated by the skippers to be different to that arising from the source data, it was assumed that the proportion of catch taken before the survey compared to the whole month was the same between the skippers' estimates and the source data. Thus RLFs for 1-19 May 1985 and 19 June 1986 were calculated as follows:
$N_{l, \text { partmonth }, a}=N_{l, \text { fullmonth }, a} \times$ Skipper $_{\text {partmonth }} /$ SkipperT $T_{\text {fullmonth }}$, using the data in the below table.

[^1]|  | Days for which catch <br> is required | Catch for the <br> month (tons) | Skipper estimated catch <br> for the month (tons) | Skipper estimated catch <br> prior to the survey (tons) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| May 1985 | $1-19^{\text {th }}$ | 3274 | 479 | 205 |
| June 1986 | $1-9^{\text {th }}$ | 4042 | 970 | 609 |

These data are stored in Sardine RLFs by area.xls and given in Table 2.

## November Survey Data

The time series of total biomass estimates from the acoustic surveys in November each year has previously been updated to "uncapped" biomass estimates, using a new target strength expression and, in the case of sardine, taking attenuation into account (Coetzee et al. 2008, de Moor et al. 2008). For assessment purposes we assume this corresponds to the biomass of all fish aged 1 and above. The time series of biomass and associated CVs is given in Table 4 for sardine and anchovy. In addition daily egg production method (DEPM) estimates of adult anchovy biomass between 1984 and 1991 are available and given in Table 4 (De Oliveira 2003). For assessment purposes we assume this corresponds to spawning biomass.

These survey data are stored in SurveyData.xls, with finer details on the calibration of uncapped biomass from capped biomass in SardineNovCalibration_FINAL.xls and AnchovyNovCalibration_FINAL.xls.

Although anchovy ALKs for the November surveys from 1992 to 1995 were derived by Prosch (De Oliveria 2003), these unpublished data are no longer available. A combined 1992-1995 Prosch ALK is, however, available and was used for all years from 1984 to 2010 to estimate the anchovy weight-at-age and proportion of 1-year-olds in the November survey. These data are listed in Table 5 and the combined ALK is stored in Anchovy92-95AvgALK.xls. It is odd that in some years the weight-at-age 4 is less than the weight-at-age 3 and also sometimes weight-at-age 3 in year $y<$ weight-at-age 2 in year $y-1$ and weight-at-age 4 in year $y$ < weight-at-age 3 in year $y-1$. No explanation for this is available. To test the robustness of the model to the estimates of proportion of 1-year-olds derived using the combined ALK in the November survey, estimates of the proportion (by number) of 1-year-old were also derived assuming a $10 \mathrm{~cm}, 10.5 \mathrm{~cm}$ and 11 cm cut-off length. These data are also listed in Table 5.

Sardine ALKs for the November surveys derived by Deon Durholtz are available by area (east and west of Cape Agulhas) only for 1993, 1994, 1996, 2001-2004 and 2006-2009. ALKs for the November surveys from 1984-1999 derived by Michael Kerstan are also available (De Oliveria 2003), but inconsistencies between the two sets of ALKs restricted the use of ALKs from both readers. These ALKs were used to calculate the proportion-at-age and weight-at-age in the November survey (Table 6). There were cases where no sardine of a particular length class were aged, while fish of that length class were observed in the survey. Many of these were for the smaller or larger length classes which were then assigned to age 0 or $5+$. 'Middle' length classes were assigned to ages similar to those of the length classes directly above and below. Due to the small sample sizes of the 5+ age group in 1996 and 2001,
the weight-at-age $5+$ was calculated to be smaller than that of age 4 . In these two years, therefore, the weight-at-age $5+$ was set equal to that of age 4 . The weight-at-age for years during which sardine abundance was at a peak (2001-2004) is on average lower than that for the remaining years (1993, 1994, 1996 and 2006-2009). To account for this apparent change in weight-at-age during the period of peak abundance, the average weight from 2001 to 2004 is used in 2000 when the sardine abundance was at a peak and the average weight from 1993, 1994, 1996 and 2006 is used in the remaining years. The ALKs and the method used to calculate the proportion-at-age and weight-at-age are stored in Nov survey prop at age.xls, Nov survey prop at age_west of Cape Agulhas.xls and Nov survey prop at age_east of Cape Agulhas.xls.

## Recruit Survey Data

The time series of recruitment estimates from the acoustic surveys in May/June each year has previously been updated to "uncapped" estimates of biomass, using a new target strength expression and, in the case of sardine, taking attenuation into account (Coetzee et al. 2008, de Moor et al. 2008). The time series of biomass and associated CVs is given in Table 8 for sardine and anchovy. The average recruit numbers at the time of the survey were calculated dividing the annual biomass by the average recruit weight. This biomass and average recruit weight were calculated in a separate database, using the uncapped density per interval from the new time series as input. The two biomass series are not identical due to the different methods of weighting used (the capping regression and calibration is unaffected by the different methods). A brief description of the two methods is given in Appendix B. Although not ideal, given the time frame available, the difference between the biomass from the two methods could not be narrowed. This is a matter that needs to be addressed at some stage. In the assessments, the recruit numbers are used together with the CVs on recruit biomass.

These survey data are stored in SurveyData.xls, with finer details on the calibration of uncapped biomass from capped biomass in SardineMayCalibration_FINAL.xls and AnchovyMayCalibration_FINAL.xls.
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Table 1. Annual juvenile and adult anchovy catch (in billions) and mean catch weight (in grams).
Annual data for year y consists of data from November y-1 to October y, as described in the text above.

|  | Annual anchovy catch number |  | Annual anchovy catch weight |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | 0 year olds | 1 year olds | 0 year olds | 1 year olds |
| 1984 | 29.987537 | 9.416485 | 5.654 | 10.210 |
| 1985 | 33.371373 | 7.860243 | 5.744 | 11.225 |
| 1986 | 50.114319 | 6.250229 | 4.535 | 11.569 |
| 1987 | 30.206807 | 31.995000 | 6.895 | 12.255 |
| 1988 | 52.937734 | 17.038205 | 6.225 | 14.099 |
| 1989 | 19.137241 | 14.209377 | 6.392 | 12.324 |
| 1990 | 32.073406 | 1.128842 | 4.304 | 11.971 |
| 1991 | 25.051411 | 1.226593 | 5.550 | 9.794 |
| 1992 | 59.888922 | 7.809713 | 4.235 | 12.220 |
| 1993 | 32.142345 | 9.063604 | 4.157 | 11.274 |
| 1994 | 20.916611 | 5.796501 | 4.349 | 11.221 |
| 1995 | 39.863617 | 1.677212 | 4.036 | 9.491 |
| 1996 | 6.245386 | 1.364796 | 4.738 | 9.445 |
| 1997 | 11.868556 | 0.072043 | 5.008 | 13.424 |
| 1998 | 21.938896 | 0.704636 | 4.553 | 11.324 |
| 1999 | 34.803815 | 0.454625 | 4.991 | 11.293 |
| 2000 | 44.709797 | 3.412580 | 5.120 | 11.304 |
| 2001 | 54.329708 | 4.228331 | 4.557 | 8.949 |
| 2002 | 44.238443 | 1.839153 | 4.427 | 10.839 |
| 2003 | 62.448521 | 1.144999 | 3.880 | 11.795 |
| 2004 | 39.672506 | 1.150048 | 4.618 | 7.945 |
| 2005 | 31.523186 | 10.084982 | 5.670 | 10.261 |
| 2006 | 29.611774 | 1.384965 | 4.765222 | 4.870 |

Table 2. The date of the commencement of the annual recruit survey; juvenile anchovy catch (in billions) and mean catch weight of individual fish (in grams) from 1 November $\mathrm{y}-1$ to the day before the annual recruit survey in year $y$; and juvenile sardine catch (in numbers) from 1 May to the day before the annual recruit survey.

| Year | Date of commence -ment of survey | Time of the recruit survey after 1 May | Cut-offlength(cm) foranchovyjuvenilecatch inthe monthof thesurvey | Juvenile anchovy catch between 1 Nov and the start of the survey | Mean juvenile anchovy catch weight prior to the survey | Cut-off length (cm) for sardine juvenile catch | Juvenile sardine catch between 1 May and the start of the survey |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | West of Cape Agulhas | East of Cape Agulhas |
| 1985 | 20-May | 0.613 | <10.5 | 12.285776 | 4.781 | <15.5 | 0.1641 | 0.0000 |
| 1986 | 10-Jun | 1.300 | <10.5 | 21.077845 | 4.623 | <15.5 | 0.3399 | 0.0000 |
| 1987 | 20-Jul | 2.613 | <11.0 | 14.324998 | 7.849 | <15.0 | 0.1859 | 0.0000 |
| 1988 | 27-Jun ${ }^{2}$ | 1.867 | <11.5 | 13.416153 | 4.447 | <16.0 | 0.3184 | 0.0000 |
| 1989 | 08 -Jun ${ }^{3}$ | 1.233 | <10.5 | 12.459006 | 5.840 | <16.0 | 0.3680 | 0.0000 |
| 1990 | 22-Jun | 1.700 | <10.5 | 31.037845 | 4.329 | <16.0 | 0.7266 | 0.0000 |
| 1991 | 07-May | 0.194 | <10.5 | 12.483650 | 5.220 | <16.0 | 0.0078 | 0.0000 |
| 1992 | 13-May | 0.387 | <10.5 | 12.200420 | 3.947 | <16.0 | 0.0288 | 0.0000 |
| 1993 | 21-May | 0.645 | <10.5 | 1.471250 | 5.551 | <16.0 | 0.0473 | 0.0001 |
| 1994 | 05-May | 0.129 | <10.5 | 4.316175 | 4.700 | <16.0 | 0.0687 | 0.0000 |
| 1995 | 10-Jun | 1.300 | <10.5 | 12.433369 | 5.665 | <16.0 | 0.5838 | 0.0000 |
| 1996 | 05-Jun | 1.133 | <10.5 | 4.080647 | 4.528 | <15.0 | 0.3511 | 0.0000 |
| 1997 | 17-May | 0.516 | <10.0 | 0.163541 | 6.241 | <14.0 | 0.0358 | 0.0000 |
| 1998 | 20-May | 0.613 | <10.5 | 5.995158 | 6.264 | <14.0 | 0.4242 | 0.0000 |
| 1999 | 10-May | 0.290 | <10.0 | 1.771712 | 5.056 | $<17.0$ | 0.0252 | 0.0001 |
| 2000 | 15-May | 0.452 | $<9.5$ | 7.989902 | 5.990 | $<17.0$ | 0.0849 | 0.0001 |
| 2001 | 05-May | 0.129 | $<9.0$ | 4.908445 | 5.347 | <12.0 | 0.0003 | 0.0000 |
| 2002 | 05-May | 0.129 | <11.0 | 2.581755 | 7.000 | <16.0 | 0.0346 | 0.0000 |
| 2003 | 14-May | 0.419 | <10.0 | 3.023380 | 4.990 | <16.0 | 0.0864 | 0.0007 |
| 2004 | 08-May | 0.226 | <11.0 | 3.923131 | 5.762 | <14.0 | 0.0360 | 0.0000 |
| 2005 | 13-May | 0.387 | <9.5 | 3.821107 | 6.550 | <13.5 | 0.1007 | 0.0000 |
| 2006 | 19-May | 0.581 | <9.5 | 0.882745 | 5.220 | <15.0 | 0.0368 | 0.0001 |
| 2007 | 18 May | 0.548 | <9.5 | 5.824435 | 5.626 | <12.5 | 0.0507 | 0.0000 |
| 2008 | 21 May | 0.645 | <9.5 | 3.697926 | 6.664 | <10.5 | 0.1082 | 0.0000 |
| 2009 | 15 May | 0.452 | <10.5 | 7.398002 | 3.440 | $<12.5$ | 0.0317 | 0.0000 |
| 2010 | 27 May | 0.8387 | <11.0 | 6.725074 | 5.057 | <13.5 | 0.2794 | 0.0017 |

[^2]Table 3a. The monthly sardine commercial catch tonnage (in thousands of tons), west of Cape Agulhas.

| Year | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1984 | 1.980 | 6.802 | 4.975 | 6.520 | 5.114 | 1.361 | 0.010 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.261 | 0.131 |
| 1985 | 3.641 | 5.715 | 6.198 | 4.255 | 3.274 | 5.640 | 1.964 | 0.011 | 0.014 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 1986 | 1.310 | 7.319 | 8.638 | 3.539 | 2.714 | 4.042 | 2.855 | 0.162 | 0.060 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 1987 | 3.693 | 6.509 | 7.293 | 7.053 | 2.179 | 2.860 | 2.045 | 1.625 | 0.272 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 1988 | 1.856 | 5.603 | 2.854 | 5.950 | 5.120 | 6.550 | 3.144 | 2.047 | 0.507 | 0.896 | 1.147 |
| 1989 | 1.508 | 4.692 | 8.433 | 6.122 | 5.627 | 4.554 | 2.336 | 0.774 | 0.178 | 0.037 | 0.176 |
| 1990 | 3.036 | 6.206 | 8.154 | 7.581 | 11.411 | 8.622 | 3.600 | 5.149 | 1.715 | 0.695 | 0.344 |
| 1991 | 2.536 | 6.202 | 5.490 | 8.937 | 7.969 | 7.726 | 5.728 | 3.999 | 1.586 | 1.098 | 0.124 |
| 1992 | 0.923 | 5.648 | 6.059 | 4.787 | 3.636 | 9.620 | 5.158 | 8.114 | 6.328 | 1.096 | 0.292 |
| 1993 | 4.707 | 8.047 | 7.011 | 5.739 | 7.828 | 5.496 | 1.647 | 2.542 | 1.467 | 1.329 | 1.306 |
| 1994 | 1.977 | 8.236 | 13.058 | 9.239 | 20.825 | 8.162 | 6.735 | 10.757 | 4.694 | 5.206 | 1.224 |
| 1995 | 2.747 | 6.089 | 12.158 | 6.990 | 15.730 | 10.736 | 10.924 | 21.078 | 8.760 | 14.804 | 5.884 |
| 1996 | 3.906 | 10.954 | 10.167 | 8.369 | 12.134 | 9.697 | 5.657 | 7.590 | 8.834 | 10.344 | 11.219 |
| 1997 | 1.284 | 8.451 | 10.835 | 12.311 | 14.213 | 7.037 | 15.402 | 12.612 | 21.079 | 8.517 | 3.164 |
| 1998 | 2.412 | 9.536 | 14.409 | 8.006 | 12.165 | 17.662 | 14.183 | 18.899 | 12.001 | 14.604 | 4.447 |
| 1999 | 2.220 | 0.225 | 5.513 | 5.814 | 14.274 | 10.678 | 14.195 | 15.531 | 16.339 | 6.717 | 22.870 |
| 2000 | 0.000 | 2.458 | 9.199 | 12.610 | 14.846 | 18.058 | 11.736 | 12.731 | 10.366 | 19.419 | 15.934 |
| 2001 | 2.281 | 10.931 | 17.451 | 14.309 | 14.972 | 13.831 | 6.970 | 11.929 | 5.618 | 27.219 | 25.785 |
| 2002 | 0.146 | 12.502 | 14.810 | 27.069 | 12.565 | 10.029 | 9.465 | 18.993 | 25.524 | 25.341 | 47.653 |
| 2003 | 3.895 | 25.308 | 29.307 | 23.079 | 16.886 | 16.429 | 7.335 | 1.956 | 3.957 | 23.431 | 59.365 |
| 2004 | 8.485 | 40.662 | 31.709 | 18.455 | 34.071 | 18.932 | 15.969 | 5.986 | 26.365 | 22.716 | 60.675 |
| 2005 | 0.211 | 19.927 | 30.285 | 20.879 | 6.860 | 0.840 | 1.886 | 0.693 | 0.587 | 5.007 | 10.766 |
| 2006 | 1.123 | 0.907 | 19.342 | 6.271 | 1.304 | 3.364 | 2.978 | 1.284 | 13.726 | 19.074 | 15.634 |
| 2007 | 3.474 | 7.525 | 5.981 | 6.504 | 9.218 | 2.029 | 3.804 | 5.168 | 6.738 | 4.090 | 2.850 |
| 2008 | 0.000 | 0.809 | 8.143 | 7.962 | 2.917 | 4.420 | 1.468 | 1.685 | 0.137 | 7.146 | 9.285 |
| 2009 | 0.049 | 9.119 | 18.076 | 12.986 | 7.946 | 5.363 | 3.546 | 2.474 | 0.122 | 0.325 | 0.171 |
| 2010 | 0.893 | 7.571 | 15.677 | 11.244 | 11.782 | 11.691 | 10.940 | 4.682 | 2.219 | 0.083 | 0.000 |

Table 3b. The monthly sardine commercial catch tonnage (in thousands of tons), east of Cape Agulhas.
There was no catch east of Cape Agulhas prior to 1989.

| Year | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1989 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.167 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.004 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.047 |
| 1990 | 0.011 | 0.031 | 0.153 | 0.061 | 0.046 | 0.031 | 0.059 | 0.014 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.057 |
| 1991 | 0.010 | 0.224 | 0.114 | 0.158 | 0.272 | 0.074 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.230 | 0.134 |
| 1992 | 0.000 | 0.039 | 0.155 | 0.544 | 0.387 | 0.338 | 0.201 | 0.013 | 0.056 | 0.126 | 0.352 |
| 1993 | 0.097 | 0.234 | 0.378 | 0.276 | 0.227 | 0.196 | 0.005 | 0.152 | 0.161 | 0.119 | 0.142 |
| 1994 | 0.011 | 0.633 | 0.270 | 0.315 | 0.561 | 0.607 | 0.534 | 0.481 | 0.144 | 0.395 | 0.072 |
| 1995 | 0.365 | 0.716 | 0.605 | 0.062 | 0.481 | 0.159 | 0.309 | 0.135 | 0.257 | 0.837 | 0.594 |
| 1996 | 0.064 | 0.533 | 0.427 | 0.400 | 1.073 | 0.731 | 0.625 | 0.539 | 0.672 | 0.398 | 1.136 |
| 1997 | 0.093 | 0.290 | 0.741 | 0.362 | 0.640 | 0.369 | 1.061 | 0.134 | 0.105 | 0.298 | 0.000 |
| 1998 | 0.012 | 0.000 | 0.536 | 0.612 | 0.972 | 1.156 | 0.554 | 0.069 | 0.168 | 0.016 | 0.100 |
| 1999 | 0.708 | 0.061 | 0.413 | 0.692 | 0.817 | 0.943 | 0.255 | 0.408 | 0.457 | 0.709 | 1.006 |
| 2000 | 0.000 | 0.271 | 0.541 | 0.754 | 1.444 | 1.133 | 0.138 | 0.688 | 0.357 | 0.172 | 0.505 |
| 2001 | 0.135 | 0.304 | 0.537 | 0.497 | 0.657 | 0.992 | 1.253 | 1.798 | 2.178 | 1.481 | 1.152 |
| 2002 | 0.000 | 0.885 | 0.671 | 0.678 | 2.493 | 2.880 | 4.275 | 4.873 | 3.314 | 3.051 | 2.712 |
| 2003 | 0.586 | 2.005 | 2.172 | 2.669 | 6.255 | 7.391 | 9.603 | 6.849 | 9.180 | 6.531 | 6.066 |
| 2004 | 0.534 | 1.660 | 2.543 | 4.306 | 7.630 | 10.285 | 10.250 | 13.757 | 8.218 | 5.704 | 4.287 |
| 2005 | 0.468 | 4.889 | 5.332 | 9.093 | 15.173 | 24.374 | 25.240 | 18.241 | 18.181 | 8.579 | 15.560 |
| 2006 | 0.947 | 6.454 | 10.630 | 12.502 | 28.180 | 25.894 | 17.695 | 8.775 | 3.450 | 3.823 | 3.469 |
| 2007 | 0.441 | 6.518 | 10.762 | 12.977 | 16.243 | 15.116 | 7.227 | 4.603 | 3.252 | 0.160 | 2.033 |
| 2008 | 0.344 | 2.088 | 3.189 | 13.837 | 8.529 | 3.685 | 7.192 | 2.254 | 0.236 | 1.055 | 1.055 |
| 2009 | 0.671 | 2.725 | 4.318 | 6.829 | 7.009 | 4.400 | 3.334 | 0.374 | 0.932 | 1.267 | 0.876 |
| 2010 | 0.814 | 2.443 | 3.156 | 2.836 | 3.461 | 3.256 | 3.017 | 3.250 | 2.626 | 0.277 | 0.000 |

Table 4. Sardine and anchovy 1+ biomass (in tons) as far as Port Alfred and associated CV from the November acoustic survey and anchovy spawner (1+) biomass and associated CV determined by the DEPM.

|  | Acoustic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEPM |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area | Hondeklip Bay to Port Alfred |  |  |  | Hondeklip Bay to Cape Agulhas |  | Cape Agulhas to Port Alfred |  | Full Area |  |
| Year | Anchovy 1+ Biomass (t) | CV | Sardine 1+ Biomass (t) | CV | Sardine 1+ Biomass (t) | CV | Sardine 1+ <br> Biomass (t) | CV | Anchovy 1+ Biomass (t) | CV |
| 1984 | 1553813 | 0.282 | 48378 | 1.118 | 48009 | 1.127 | 369 | 0.644 | 1100000 | 0.45 |
| 1985 | 1366294 | 0.211 | 45013 | 0.509 | 25457 | 0.680 | 19556 | 0.767 | 616000 | 0.4 |
| 1986 | 2568625 | 0.172 | 299797 | 0.848 | 238230 | 1.054 | 61566 | 0.672 | 2001000 | 0.35 |
| 1987 | 2108771 | 0.157 | 111285 | 0.630 | 94165 | 0.734 | 17120 | 0.693 | 1606000 | 0.3 |
| 1988 | 1607060 | 0.222 | 134362 | 0.957 | 128043 | 1.005 | 6319 | 0.525 | 1679000 | 0.35 |
| 1989 | 751529 | 0.167 | 256655 | 0.274 | 198328 | 0.334 | 58327 | 0.397 | 421000 | 0.35 |
| 1990 | 651711 | 0.183 | 289876 | 0.352 | 248855 | 0.382 | 41020 | 0.905 | 723000 | 0.58 |
| 1991 | 2327834 | 0.159 | 597858 | 0.395 | 517180 | 0.444 | 80678 | 0.675 | 2913000 | 0.35 |
| 1992 | 2088025 | 0.161 | 494157 | 0.658 | 247756 | 0.560 | 246401 | 1.191 | 3600000 | 0.31 |
| 1993 | 916359 | 0.209 | 560019 | 0.427 | 480822 | 0.488 | 79198 | 0.603 | 770000 | 0.34 |
| 1994 | 617276 | 0.159 | 518354 | 0.370 | 389730 | 0.432 | 128624 | 0.709 |  |  |
| 1995 | 601271 | 0.217 | 843944 | 0.713 | 363542 | 0.302 | 480402 | 1.229 |  |  |
| 1996 | 162048 | 0.410 | 529456 | 0.471 | 257763 | 0.352 | 271693 | 0.849 |  |  |
| 1997 | 1482633 | 0.267 | 1224632 | 0.329 | 964835 | 0.322 | 259797 | 0.982 |  |  |
| 1998 | 1229132 | 0.217 | 1607328 | 0.251 | 1082547 | 0.341 | 524781 | 0.305 |  |  |
| 1999 | 2052156 | 0.156 | 1635410 | 0.212 | 708029 | 0.324 | 927381 | 0.280 |  |  |
| 2000 | 4653779 | 0.125 | 2292380 | 0.500 | 726230 | 0.633 | 1566150 | 0.670 |  |  |
| 2001 | 6720287 | 0.107 | 2309600 | 0.142 | 669617 | 0.313 | 1639983 | 0.154 |  |  |
| 2002 | 3867649 | 0.154 | 4206250 | 0.227 | 1184713 | 0.247 | 3021538 | 0.300 |  |  |
| 2003 | 3563232 | 0.236 | 3564171 | 0.197 | 1343118 | 0.300 | 2221053 | 0.258 |  |  |
| 2004 | 2044615 | 0.131 | 2615715 | 0.334 | 292522 | 0.437 | 2323193 | 0.372 |  |  |
| 2005 | 3077001 | 0.144 | 1048991 | 0.300 | 75604 | 0.524 | 973386 | 0.321 |  |  |
| 2006 | 2106273 | 0.136 | 712553 | 0.346 | 177885 | 0.414 | 534667 | 0.441 |  |  |
| 2007 | 2507501 | 0.157 | 256727 | 0.345 | 57666 | 0.503 | 199061 | 0.421 |  |  |
| 2008 | 3705893 | 0.120 | 384080 | 0.422 | 211871 | 0.528 | 172209 | 0.682 |  |  |
| 2009 | 3792547 | 0.136 | 502254 | 0.271 | 262853 | 0.285 | 239400 | 0.474 |  |  |
| 2010 | 2077414 | 0.144 | 508392 | 0.235 | 309465 | 0.328 | 198927 | 0.314 |  |  |

Table 5. Anchovy proportion-at-age 1 (by number) and weight-at-age (in grams) in the November survey.

|  | Proportion-at-Age 1 |  |  |  |  | Weight-at-Age |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Year | Combined <br> ALK | 10cm <br> cut-off | $\mathbf{1 0 . 5 c m}$ <br> cut-off | 11cm <br> cut-off | Age 1 | Age 2 | Age 3 | Age 4 |  |
| 1984 | 0.422 | 0.051 | 0.124 | 0.369 | 12.794 | 15.149 | 16.618 | 17.205 |  |
| 1985 | 0.474 | 0.103 | 0.256 | 0.484 | 11.422 | 14.773 | 17.022 | 17.561 |  |
| 1986 | 0.670 | 0.390 | 0.587 | 0.713 | 10.016 | 14.129 | 16.267 | 17.334 |  |
| 1987 | 0.719 | 0.450 | 0.646 | 0.775 | 9.984 | 14.049 | 16.422 | 17.770 |  |
| 1988 | 0.637 | 0.219 | 0.522 | 0.738 | 10.253 | 13.088 | 15.342 | 16.822 |  |
| 1989 | 0.354 | 0.043 | 0.061 | 0.187 | 12.348 | 14.375 | 15.403 | 15.617 |  |
| 1990 | 0.747 | 0.498 | 0.663 | 0.817 | 8.788 | 13.524 | 16.179 | 17.703 |  |
| 1991 | 0.730 | 0.443 | 0.636 | 0.791 | 8.373 | 12.069 | 14.041 | 15.285 |  |
| 1992 | 0.624 | 0.297 | 0.445 | 0.646 | 8.924 | 12.616 | 13.995 | 14.977 |  |
| 1993 | 0.546 | 0.189 | 0.334 | 0.553 | 9.620 | 12.647 | 14.180 | 14.898 |  |
| 1994 | 0.402 | 0.116 | 0.223 | 0.327 | 11.090 | 14.616 | 15.896 | 16.067 |  |
| 1995 | 0.740 | 0.574 | 0.678 | 0.761 | 7.011 | 11.268 | 13.563 | 14.162 |  |
| 1996 | 0.488 | 0.333 | 0.358 | 0.395 | 9.708 | 16.396 | 17.840 | 17.724 |  |
| 1997 | 0.471 | 0.209 | 0.325 | 0.422 | 10.416 | 15.509 | 18.019 | 17.610 |  |
| 1998 | 0.505 | 0.284 | 0.401 | 0.487 | 9.483 | 17.137 | 19.980 | 19.402 |  |
| 1999 | 0.628 | 0.386 | 0.517 | 0.645 | 9.612 | 15.167 | 18.538 | 19.389 |  |
| 2000 | 0.760 | 0.529 | 0.682 | 0.807 | 8.238 | 12.265 | 14.507 | 16.251 |  |
| 2001 | 0.857 | 0.738 | 0.825 | 0.899 | 6.866 | 11.599 | 14.141 | 15.518 |  |
| 2002 | 0.754 | 0.504 | 0.668 | 0.808 | 8.087 | 12.135 | 13.701 | 15.102 |  |
| 2003 | 0.724 | 0.428 | 0.622 | 0.807 | 8.465 | 11.981 | 14.311 | 16.914 |  |
| 2004 | 0.587 | 0.201 | 0.412 | 0.626 | 10.220 | 13.519 | 15.299 | 16.364 |  |
| 2005 | 0.473 | 0.259 | 0.347 | 0.409 | 10.459 | 16.275 | 18.299 | 18.089 |  |
| 2006 | 0.434 | 0.208 | 0.310 | 0.395 | 10.168 | 16.469 | 18.750 | 19.274 |  |
| 2007 | 0.667 | 0.530 | 0.592 | 0.649 | 7.780 | 15.724 | 18.708 | 19.137 |  |
| 2008 | 0.826 | 0.721 | 0.788 | 0.848 | 7.016 | 13.893 | 17.195 | 18.693 |  |
| 2009 | 0.716 | 0.464 | 0.630 | 0.768 | 8.970 | 13.448 | 16.043 | 17.009 |  |
| 2010 | 0.648 | 0.294 | 0.508 | 0.701 | 9.306 | 13.050 | 15.066 | 16.297 |  |
| Average |  |  |  |  | 9.460 | 13.958 | 16.123 | 16.969 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 102 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 6a. Sardine proportion-at-age (by number) and weight-at-age (in grams) in the November survey for the full area (one stock).

|  | Proportion-at-Age |  |  |  |  | Weight-at-Age |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Age 1 | Age 2 | Age 3 | Age 4 | Age 5 | Age 1 | Age 2 | Age 3 | Age 4 | Age 5 |
| 1993 | 0.528 | 0.230 | 0.161 | 0.050 | 0.031 | 37.254 | 69.736 | 74.850 | 100.685 | 118.476 |
| 1994 | 0.229 | 0.188 | 0.249 | 0.162 | 0.172 | 46.851 | 69.253 | 81.051 | 87.699 | 92.706 |
| 1996 | 0.222 | 0.362 | 0.154 | 0.074 | 0.188 | 55.382 | 83.662 | 109.836 | 117.766 | 117.766 |
| 2001 | 0.820 | 0.053 | 0.077 | 0.033 | 0.018 | 25.504 | 64.847 | 77.444 | 94.547 | 94.547 |
| 2002 | 0.338 | 0.246 | 0.210 | 0.125 | 0.080 | 27.985 | 62.753 | 74.848 | 84.715 | 93.621 |
| 2003 | 0.550 | 0.191 | 0.096 | 0.101 | 0.063 | 39.279 | 65.435 | 77.581 | 79.712 | 84.280 |
| 2004 | 0.321 | 0.209 | 0.247 | 0.129 | 0.095 | 41.239 | 84.260 | 94.863 | 104.228 | 112.998 |
| 2006 | 0.740 | 0.067 | 0.055 | 0.071 | 0.066 | 45.395 | 73.641 | 87.892 | 95.543 | 101.883 |
| 2007 | 0.724 | 0.173 | 0.049 | 0.026 | 0.029 | 54.193 | 81.465 | 90.886 | 81.836 | 103.084 |
| 2008 | 0.923 | 0.072 | 0.004 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 33.161 | 46.649 | 77.251 | 96.556 | 96.556 |
| 2009 | 0.792 | 0.093 | 0.066 | 0.037 | 0.013 | 30.370 | 72.936 | 83.931 | 88.459 | 96.738 |
| Average <br> $(93-96,06-$ <br> $09)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average <br> $(01-04)$ |  |  |  |  |  | 43.229 | 71.049 | 86.528 | 95.506 | 103.887 |

Table 6b. Sardine proportion-at-age (by number) and weight-at-age (in grams) in the November survey west of Cape Agulhas.

|  | Proportion-at-Age |  |  |  |  | Weight-at-Age |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Age 1 | Age 2 | Age 3 | Age 4 | Age 5 | Age 1 | Age 2 | Age 3 | Age 4 | Age 5 |
| 1993 | 0.420 | 0.344 | 0.181 | 0.033 | 0.022 | 35.598 | 73.875 | 72.822 | 111.681 | 123.518 |
| 1994 | 0.237 | 0.176 | 0.265 | 0.152 | 0.169 | 43.045 | 67.099 | 78.456 | 81.929 | 90.912 |
| 1996 | 0.083 | 0.537 | 0.180 | 0.157 | 0.044 | 38.343 | 59.669 | 71.670 | 85.982 | 107.678 |
| 2001 | 0.900 | 0.034 | 0.033 | 0.006 | 0.026 | 21.613 | 48.773 | 65.380 | 74.071 | 94.024 |
| 2002 | 0.518 | 0.308 | 0.103 | 0.049 | 0.022 | 29.369 | 49.304 | 61.408 | 77.496 | 87.503 |
| 2003 | 0.847 | 0.105 | 0.035 | 0.010 | 0.004 | 38.328 | 49.880 | 56.871 | 74.041 | 90.222 |
| 2004 | 0.556 | 0.243 | 0.168 | 0.027 | 0.005 | 38.203 | 60.167 | 71.041 | 82.656 | 88.337 |
| 2006 | 0.867 | 0.096 | 0.035 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 51.982 | 67.749 | 76.259 | 95.993 | 95.993 |
| 2007 | 0.943 | 0.030 | 0.021 | 0.003 | 0.003 | 53.944 | 70.165 | 75.573 | 94.747 | 94.747 |
| 2008 | 0.948 | 0.045 | 0.006 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 30.611 | 48.048 | 78.667 | 104.531 | 104.531 |
| 2009 | 0.834 | 0.081 | 0.050 | 0.026 | 0.009 | 24.981 | 71.710 | 82.748 | 83.888 | 88.870 |
| Average <br> $(93-96,06-$ <br> $09)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average <br> $(01-04)$ |  |  |  |  |  | 39.786 | 65.474 | 76.599 | 94.107 | 100.893 |

Table 6c. Sardine proportion-at-age (by number) and weight-at-age (in grams) in the November survey east of Cape Agulhas.

|  | Proportion-at-Age |  |  |  |  | Weight-at-Age |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Age 1 | Age 2 | Age 3 | Age 4 | Age 5 | Age 1 | Age 2 | Age 3 | Age 4 | Age 5 |
| 1993 | 0.765 | 0.117 | 0.072 | 0.031 | 0.015 | 34.686 | 54.131 | 72.322 | 95.091 | 116.462 |
| 1994 | 0.169 | 0.152 | 0.224 | 0.229 | 0.226 | 60.375 | 73.601 | 89.307 | 98.173 | 102.231 |
| 1996 | 0.354 | 0.204 | 0.059 | 0.024 | 0.360 | 91.345 | 132.838 | 176.034 | 199.687 | 199.687 |
| 2001 | 0.790 | 0.054 | 0.098 | 0.034 | 0.024 | 26.467 | 74.822 | 81.455 | 94.221 | 97.196 |
| 2002 | 0.209 | 0.228 | 0.290 | 0.166 | 0.107 | 24.715 | 74.217 | 78.636 | 87.525 | 97.878 |
| 2003 | 0.242 | 0.165 | 0.493 | 0.060 | 0.040 | 36.579 | 67.501 | 80.121 | 95.428 | 99.656 |
| 2004 | 0.257 | 0.202 | 0.241 | 0.168 | 0.133 | 40.654 | 89.857 | 95.803 | 106.708 | 113.418 |
| 2006 | 0.674 | 0.085 | 0.059 | 0.095 | 0.086 | 40.564 | 67.217 | 91.829 | 97.424 | 104.363 |
| 2007 | 0.617 | 0.268 | 0.045 | 0.037 | 0.034 | 48.252 | 75.540 | 94.839 | 80.168 | 102.644 |
| 2008 | 0.393 | 0.212 | 0.279 | 0.117 | 0.000 | 31.025 | 38.312 | 40.430 | 53.502 | 53.502 |
| 2009 | 0.734 | 0.099 | 0.092 | 0.057 | 0.018 | 40.959 | 75.213 | 85.323 | 92.753 | 104.315 |
| Average <br> $(93-96,06-$ <br> $09)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average <br> $(01-04)$ |  |  |  |  |  | 49.601 | 73.836 | 92.869 | 102.400 | 111.886 |

Table 8. Sardine and anchovy recruitment (in thousand tons and in billions) from Hondeklip Bay to Cape Infanta and associated CV from the recruitment acoustic survey. The mean recruit weight is also given (in grams). The sardine recruitment and associated CV from Cape Infanta to Cape St Francis is also given for some years.

|  | Anchovy |  |  |  |  | Sardine |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | West of Cape Infanta |  |  |  |  | Cape Infanta to Cape St Francis |  |  |  |  |
| Year | Biomass <br> (Method <br> 1 of App <br> B) | Biomass <br> (Method <br> 2 of App <br> B) | CV* | Mean <br> Weight | $\begin{gathered} \text { Numbe } \\ \text { rs }^{*} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Biomas } \\ \text { s } \\ \text { (Metho } \\ \text { d } 1 \text { of } \\ \text { App B) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Biomas } \\ \text { s } \\ \text { (Metho } \\ \text { d } 2 \text { of } \\ \text { App B) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | CV* | Mean Weight | $\underset{\mathbf{r s}^{*}}{\substack{\text { Numbe }}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Biomas } \\ \text { s } \\ \text { (Metho } \\ \text { d } 1 \text { of } \\ \text { App B) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Biomas <br> s (Metho d 2 of App B) ${ }^{\#}$ | CV* | Mean Weight | $\begin{gathered} \text { Numbe } \\ \text { rss }^{*} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 1985 | 348.612 | 368.623 | 0.263 | 4.177 | 83.458 | 37.568 | 38.265 | 0.596 | 10.426 | 3.603 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1986 | 617.468 | 621.089 | 0.183 | 4.433 | 139.299 | 47.241 | 50.073 | 0.594 | 12.739 | 3.708 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1987 | 676.727 | 721.578 | 0.163 | 5.438 | 124.442 | 97.559 | 98.643 | 0.598 | 12.101 | 8.062 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1988 | 561.409 | 563.107 | 0.163 | 4.352 | 129.010 | 4.416 | 5.223 | 0.402 | 10.138 | 0.436 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1989 | 161.526 | 173.349 | 0.201 | 4.875 | 33.136 | 50.525 | 66.081 | 0.616 | 22.413 | 2.254 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1990 | 169.597 | 170.083 | 0.225 | 3.315 | 51.153 | 27.483 | 31.208 | 0.907 | 11.010 | 2.496 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1991 | 519.847 | 528.177 | 0.149 | 4.577 | 113.580 | 22.765 | 26.665 | 0.276 | 11.957 | 1.904 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1992 | 428.099 | 458.455 | 0.166 | 4.568 | 93.712 | 68.140 | 74.822 | 0.325 | 12.190 | 5.590 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1993 | 448.329 | 481.108 | 0.259 | 3.896 | 115.072 | 111.184 | 114.956 | 0.358 | 7.204 | 15.434 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1994 | 107.915 | 145.336 | 0.180 | 3.531 | 30.565 | 58.378 | 72.462 | 0.311 | 21.629 | 2.699 | 0.020 | 30.263 | 0.562 | 28.011 | 6.517 |
| 1995 | 391.598 | 392.016 | 0.178 | 3.547 | 110.400 | 199.591 | 205.149 | 0.345 | 7.664 | 26.042 | 0.005 | 4.606 | 0.417 | 19.156 | 0.235 |
| 1996 | 72.170 | 74.842 | 0.222 | 2.802 | 25.757 | 65.632 | 73.612 | 0.370 | 18.595 | 3.530 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1997 | 404.473 | 404.620 | 0.185 | 4.474 | 90.401 | 380.090 | 396.718 | 0.420 | 9.415 | 40.372 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1998 | 451.510 | 453.210 | 0.149 | 3.310 | 136.520 | 124.952 | 134.907 | 0.354 | 11.660 | 10.716 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999 | 813.098 | 826.090 | 0.158 | 4.081 | 199.228 | 220.589 | 235.720 | 0.378 | 21.255 | 10.378 | 58.613 | 75.966 | 0.585 | 45.419 | 1.290 |
| 2000 | 2477.589 | 2553.502 | 0.170 | 3.966 | 624.675 | 265.489 | 299.473 | 0.359 | 13.273 | 20.002 | 168.591 | 175.175 | 0.503 | 31.870 | 5.290 |
| 2001 | 2027.740 | 1998.427 | 0.134 | 3.233 | 627.200 | 553.538 | 573.427 | 0.285 | 9.216 | 60.065 | 0.005 | 0.008 | 0.695 | 9.932 | 0.000 |
| 2002 | 1541.803 | 1560.101 | 0.115 | 2.963 | 520.413 | 610.344 | 616.331 | 0.183 | 12.417 | 49.153 | 41.495 | 83.139 | 0.960 | 31.103 | 1.334 |
| 2003 | 1391.468 | 1434.900 | 0.190 | 3.234 | 430.308 | 508.911 | 600.667 | 0.217 | 13.963 | 36.448 | 19.948 | 34.522 | 0.512 | 43.572 | 0.458 |
| 2004 | 1060.548 | 1071.419 | 0.223 | 4.445 | 238.569 | 25.871 | 40.419 | 0.324 | 6.326 | 4.089 | 4.187 | 75.454 | 0.794 | 7.191 | 0.582 |

[^3]Table 8 (continued)

|  | Anchovy |  |  |  |  | Sardine |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | West of Cape Infanta |  |  |  |  | Cape Infanta to Cape St Francis |  |  |  |  |
| Year | Biomass <br> (Method <br> 1 of App <br> B) | Biomass (Method 2 of App B) | CV* | Mean Weight | $\underset{\text { rss }^{*}}{\text { Numbe }}$ | Biomas <br> S (Metho d 1 of App B) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Biomas } \\ \text { s } \\ \text { (Metho } \\ \text { d } 2 \text { of } \\ \text { App B) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | CV* | Mean Weight | $\underset{\text { rs }^{*}}{\text { Numbe }}$ | Biomas <br> S (Metho d 1 of App B) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Biomas } \\ \text { s } \\ (\text { Metho } \\ \text { d } 2 \text { of } \\ \text { App B })^{*} \end{gathered}$ | CV* | Mean Weight | $\underset{\text { rss }^{*}}{\text { Numbe }}$ |
| 2005 | 535.958 | 299.833 | 0.269 | 3.029 | 176.917 | 16.736 | 11.236 | 0.303 | 5.823 | 2.874 | 20.658 | 86.705 | 0.593 | 19.357 | 1.067 |
| 2006 | 259.194 | 275.797 | 0.182 | 2.207 | 117.465 | 49.926 | 50.394 | 0.379 | 5.220 | 9.564 | 62.564 | 71.332 | 0.579 | 17.721 | 3.530 |
| 2007 | 1499.082 | 1534.523 | 0.183 | 2.959 | 506.703 | 29.689 | 34.575 | 0.342 | 10.110 | 2.937 | 17.985 | 34.505 | 0.757 | 13.506 | 1.332 |
| 2008 | 1432.841 | 1491.847 | 0.202 | 2.544 | 563.156 | 20.555 | 24.461 | 0.325 | 5.336 | 3.852 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 1307.613 | 1317.059 | 0.188 | 3.598 | 363.387 | 57.739 | 63.468 | 0.679 | 6.271 | 9.210 | 64.360 | 64.193 | 1.007 | 17.762 | 3.623 |
| 2010 | 1667.695 | 1687.118 | 0.265 | 4.351 | 383.328 | 477.437 | 499.986 | 0.458 | 13.423 | 35.569 | 6.407 | 9.042 | 0.906 | 20.077 | 0.319 |

[^4]
## Appendix A: Pelagic sample allocation

The sample allocation method is the process whereby a length frequency is allocated to every commercial landing, enabling the transformation of the catch to its raised length frequency (RLF). The commercial catch data and field station length frequency data are entered and stored on a Sybase database on the MCM network and the calculations are performed in Access.

## Species

For the assessments which serve as the operating models to test Operational Management Procedures it is necessary to calculate RLFs for anchovy (Engraulis encrasicolus) and sardine (Sardinops sagax) though RLFs for round herring (Etrumeus whiteheadii) and horse mackerel (Trachurus trachurus capensis) are also generated for every run.

## Data sources

- Commercial catch: The skipper completes a skipper form for every trip and records the estimated catch and the geographic position of individual throws. The scale monitor contract was awarded to Nosipho Consultants in 2002. They sample every landing for its species composition and tonnage landed. Prior to 2002 this was the task of the fisheries inspector and hence the catch sheet is referred to as the inspector's form. Skipper data are available on Sybase from 1984 onwards but inspector data were obtained only from 1987. MCM field station personnel collect data sheets and enter the information on Sybase.
- Field station samples: MCM field station personnel collect random samples at the major pelagic fishing harbors for species composition and length frequency (Capricorn fishing was contracted from 2002 until 2005 to man St. Helena Bay and Gansbaai). Samples of industrial fish such as anchovy and round herring are obtained from the top of the hold before the vessel discharges. For this reason industrial samples are obtained mainly from the last throw of the trip. Offloading further damages the already partially-decomposed fish and one cannot sample from the conveyer belt because it would be impossible to weigh those fish. Directed sardine catch, on the other hand, is kept in a very good condition onboard on ice and good quality samples are easily obtained from the conveyor belt, whilst the vessel is discharging. Unfortunately it is seldom possible to establish which throw is being sampled. Field station data are available on Sybase from 1984 onwards. Ports sampled over the period include Lamberts Bay, Laaiplek, St. Helena Bay, Saldanha, Cape Town, Hout Bay, Kalk Bay, Hermanus, Gansbaai, Mossel Bay and Port Elizabeth.
- Observer samples: The observer program started in 1999 but onboard biological sampling was started only in 2001. Observer sampling results reflect an improvement on the field station data
because samples are obtained from a known throw, all throws are sampled and the fish is always in a good condition. Unfortunately the length frequency samples have to be taken ashore for weighing and this gives rise to room for error. The data are stored in an Access database called CAPFISH.


## Data extraction from Sybase

- Catch data are extracted from Sybase as text (flat) files; throw.csv contains the skippers' data and catch.csv contains the inspectors' data.
- Field station data are extracted in the same manner; spcomp.cs $v$ contains the species composition data and lfreq.csv contains the length frequency data.


## Data handling and evaluation

## MCM data

- Unfortunately there is no manual proof reading of all the data, except in cases where the number of throws is excessive (more than 10) and the trip duration is of an unrealistic duration (more than 3 days). Data evaluation is limited to electronic checking for noticeable mistakes.
- A duplicate dataset of catch.csv which is regularly updated by email is kept at Saldanha in an Access table. This means that the data are entered twice, but into separate databases and this allows for the comparison of the two data sets on a regular basis for differences and errors. It might appear unnecessary to keep two data sets, but this is the sole reason that the pelagic catch data remain representative of what was recorded by the scale monitors.
- The expected sample weights associated with the length frequency data in lfreq.csv are computed and samples that deviate more than $30 \%$ are flagged and checked against the raw data. If a flag results from a punch error then the data are corrected, but in the case of a sampling error the record is deleted from the data base.
- Suspect positions, for example areas outside the normal catch areas are checked against the raw data and, if necessary, corrected.


## Observer data

- Limited manual proof reading of data
- Only observer trips that match the commercial data for vessel name and date are used. Mismatched dates do occur, making it very difficult to establish whether a specific vessel carried an observer on a specific date. Therefore samples from such observer trips are ignored to prevent the inclusion of poor data. Only trips that do link can be used, because the scale monitor's species composition is used to determine the target species of the length frequency sample.
- The structure of the observer length frequency table is altered to make it compatible with the Sybase dataset.
- Only observer length frequencies whose predicted sample weights fall within the set range are used. Data with possible measurement errors or wrong species names are excluded.


## Access programs

1) Capfish.mdb (observer data)
2) RLFdata.mdb (where the RLFs are generated)

## General program outline

- Catches are allocated to pool-area/week strata:

1. Week: the throw date with the largest catch is used.
2. Pool area: the existing 21 areas (see Figure A.2) are used, but in 1999 area 21 was subdivided into areas 23 and 24, to accommodate the eastward fishing expansion. The throws within each landing are examined, and the throw with the greatest mass is used as the representative throw.
3. Assign a target species to every catch. The species with the largest mass is defined as the dominant species in the landing.

- The length frequency samples are grouped by species and target species for the pool-area/week strata and summed.
- A new catch table with additional space for the allocated length frequencies is created.
- The length frequency table is searched and a frequency based on the species, target species, week and pool area criteria are assigned to the catch table.
- In the event of catches not being represented by an appropriate sample, the pool-area/week will be expanded to include surrounding areas and weeks. Stratum expansion continues alternately by week and pool until an appropriate frequency is located.
- If no appropriate sample is found then the average sample for the month is applied. Where no sample for the month exits in the case of anchovy, the raised length frequency is estimated using the raised length frequency of a former month as detailed in the text. Where no sample for the month exists in the case of sardine, the previous month is used. Catches of each species and the length frequencies are summed by month over larger user specified areas.
- The RLFs are exported as Excel files in numbers per length group.

The user specified areas that are used are:

1. Areas 1-6: North of Cape Columbine
2. Areas 7-12: Cape Columbine to Cape Point
3. Areas 13-20: Cape Point to Cape Infanta
4. Area 23: Cape Infanta to Plettenberg Bay
5. Area 24: East of Plettenberg Bay

In 2007 three new areas were introduced because of planned changes to the OMP:

1. West: West of 20 degrees east (West of Cape Agulhas)
2. South: East of 20 degrees east and west of 24 degrees 50 minutes east (between Cape Agulhas and Cape St. Francis)
3. East: East of 24 degrees 50 minutes east (East of Cape St. Francis)

Although the RLFs are summarized according to different areas, the allocation process is still based on the original pool areas, with the exception of those cases where pool areas were split by the new borders.

## Program changes

In January 2007 four changes were made to the process above:

- The observer length frequencies were included.
- To prevent juvenile sardine frequencies from being allocated to adult sardine catches, the species was separated into directed and by catch for allocation purposes. This is applicable only when sardine is landed as a by catch with anchovy. Sardine by catch with anchovy is mainly juvenile fish whereas by catch with round herring it is mostly adult fish.
- Noticeable error in the RLF results when the field station catch composition data are used to identify the target species of the length frequency sample, and these composition data differ from those of the scale monitor. Because the field station data are not proofread, and given the inclusion of the observer length frequencies (they also need a target species to be identified), it was decided to standardize on the scale monitors species composition as the only source.
- Missing skipper data (catch area) are catered for. This occurs when the skipper fails to hand in a trip sheet. Currently this is not a major problem but it did happen in the 1980s and 1990s. Where the catch.csv file does not have a related record in the throw.csv file, the program will search for the most likely catch position, based on the catch type of the other vessels for the same date.

The first change leads to enhanced coverage, especially in the case of industrial fish, i.e. anchovy that are poorly sampled by the field stations. The last three changes were implemented to prevent errors caused by bad data or poor sampling coverage. This can typically be seen in a RLF plot as an improbable peak at a certain length group.

In March 2007 an additional change was implemented. Towards the end of the year sporadic landings can be overlooked, because it is not cost effective to continue extensive sampling. These landings are
generally small but it is still necessary to allocate a size to the fish. In the past the annual RLF average was used, but it was felt that it is better to allocate the length frequency from the adjacent month. The length frequencies are first stratified by area and species type, but where no match is found the requirements for matching area and target species are removed alternatively until a match is found.

Even though throws in multiple pool areas during a single trip do occur, only the catch area for the biggest throw is selected. This is done in order to keep continuity with the old sample allocation method. A change that could be considered would be to allocate a sample to every throw as opposed to every trip. The scale monitor samples at regular intervals and discrete throws are not sampled. However, if one assumes the species composition of the throws are uniform, then the catch per throw can be calculated, by proportionally applying the species composition to individual throws. Observer sampling is ideally suited for this approach, because every throw is sampled, but greater sampling coverage and matched skipper throws are required.

## Sampling coverage required

Optimum sample size and sampling coverage can be determined only by using a suitable statistical study, and one can therefore only speculate on the sample size required. Logistic constraints have necessitated a random stratified sampling method, and the grouping of catches and samples on a week/pool-area basis has been adopted since electronic data processing began. Both the sampling and the raised length frequency approaches are arguably the most suitable considering the fishing strategy and the available data. The percentage coverage per stratum is readily quantified, and the first level pool-area/week coverage could possibly be used as an index of sampling coverage. 100 percent coverage is not attainable because of financial and logistic constraints, and it is more than likely unnecessary. From Figure A. 1 it appears that 80 percent coverage is attainable when the field station and observer samples are combined.

Many factors influence the relationship between the number of samples taken and the coverage obtained, but in general more samples will lead to better coverage. This partially explains the declining trend of the field station data in Figure A.1. Directed sardine samples are easily obtained but industrial fish have to be collected from the hold of the vessel, a difficult and unpleasant task. The numbers of buckets to be taken at the field stations are prescribed, but when a decision has to be taken on the fish type by the field station worker, then the ice fish is favoured more often than not. Directed sardine from all areas (except Port Elizabeth) are processed at the canneries in the St. Helena Bay area and because the field station is manned regularly, good coverage was attained. Erratic sampling at Saldanha Bay, Hout Bay and Gansbaai also contributed to the decrease of industrial fish coverage. With the inclusion of observer samples however, the target percentage is reached for anchovy and juvenile sardine by catch. If 80 percent is a realistic benchmark, then one can then conclude that the sampling effort (regarding TAC
species) for the time period 2001 to 2006 was adequate. It has to be stressed that this was achieved only with the inclusion of samples from the observer program.


Figure A.1. Coverage obtained on a first level pool-area/week for the field stations (FS), the observers (OBS) and a combination of the two (FS\&OBS).


Figure A.2. The pool areas that are used for sample allocation and the three larger areas that are used for the OMP revision.

## Appendix B: Methods Used to Calculate Recruit Biomass

Two different methods are used to calculate recruit biomass. The first has been used since the start of the time series and is used to calculate recruit numbers, while the second was devised as a method to estimate CVs of recruit-only biomass. The biomasses differ between the methods due to the differences in the way the densities are weighted.

## Method 1

This method, designed by Ian Hampton and Beatriz Roel, has been used since the start of the time series and calculates recruit biomass, number of recruits (less than a certain cut-off length) and a recruit mean weight:

1) The acoustic biomass per stratum (of adults and recruits) is calculated using the Jolly and Hampton method (i.e., each interval is weighted by interval length and a mean density per transect is calculated. Each transect is again weighted by its length to get a mean density per stratum).
2) Each acoustic interval has been linked to a particular grid reference (trawl sample) which was used to scale the acoustic energy to density. The trawl sample has a length frequency (LF) and associated length frequency mass (LFMASS). This LF and LFMASS include both adults and recruits as it is impossible at this stage (at sea) to know what the cut-off length for a recruit is. The LFMASS is the total weight of the LF sample (the combined weight of all fish of a particular species measured for the LF distribution).
3) For each interval, the acoustic density is multiplied by the interval length. This weighted interval density is then summed over all intervals for each grid reference, per stratum and per species to give an acoustic weighting to each grid reference, $W_{G R}$ (grid,stratum,species).
4) The weighted grid reference is then summed over all grid references for each stratum and species to give a weighted grid reference per stratum for each species, $W_{G R}$ (stratum,species).
5) For each length class of each grid reference, calculate a Trawl WF (trawl weighting factor) $=\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{GR}}$ (grid,stratum,species)/LFMASS. This converts the acoustic weighting (in terms of mass) into a factor in terms of numbers.
6) The length frequency (LF) is then weighted by this Trawl WF and summed for each length class to give a weighting to each length class (Lgroup) for each stratum for each species sum(number* ${ }^{*}$ trawl WF), WLF(Lgroup,stratum,species).
7) $W L F$ (Lgroup,stratum,species) is then scaled to the biomass of the stratum: BLF(Lgroup,stratum,species $)=[W L F($ Lgroup,stratum,species $)] *[B I O M A S S($ stratum,species $)] /[\Sigma$ $W_{G R}($ stratum,species $\left.)\right]$.
8) BLF is then summed across all strata for each species to give a final length frequency per species for the survey (this is done separately up to Cape Infanta and for the whole survey).
9) For each species an age/length matrix is then generated using a cut-off length for recruits.
10) The proportion in each length class is multiplied by BLF to get the total number of 0-year olds (recruits) and the total number of 1-year olds (adults). This is again done separately as far as Cape Infanta and for the whole survey. The number of fish in each length class is then multiplied by a length weight regression to get an estimated weight (in grams) for each length class, where $w=0.00924 \times$ Lgroup $^{3.046}$ for anchovy and $w=0.0096 \times$ Lgroup $^{3.075}$ for sardine.
11) The numbers and weights are then summed across all length classes for each species to give total number of 0-year-olds, $N_{\text {tot }, 0}$, and 1-year-olds, $N_{\text {tot }, 1}$, and total weight of 0-year-olds, $W_{\text {tot }, 0}$, and 1-year-olds, $W_{\text {tot }, l}$.
12) The mean weight of 0 -year-olds and 1 -year-olds is then calculated by $M W_{a}=\left(W_{\text {tot, } a} / 1000000\right) / N_{\text {tot }, a}$. The calculated biomass is then $B_{\text {calc }}=M W_{0} * N_{\text {tot }, 0}+M W_{1} * N_{\text {tot }, l}$ and should be close to the acoustic biomass, $B_{\text {acoustic. }} \quad B_{\text {calc }}$ and $B_{\text {acoustic }}$ are not always identical because in some years the fish are heavier/lighter than that predicted by the length weight regression. The mean weight of recruits and 1 -year-olds is weighted by the ratio of the calculated to actual acoustic biomass to get a corrected mean weight: $C M W_{a}=M W_{a} * B_{\text {acoustic }} / B_{\text {calc }}$.

## Method 2

This method was devised to map recruit only density rather than the density of combined adults and recruits. In summary the density in each interval is multiplied by the proportion of recruits in that interval to get a recruit only density. The proportion of recruits in each interval is obtained by calculating the proportion of acoustic energy backscattered by recruits only, based on the length frequency that each interval has been assigned and a cut-off length:

1) For each trawl (grid) the acoustic back scattering for each length class is calculated for each species and multiplied by the number of fish in that length class (basically applying the species specific target strength relationship to the length class $\left(L_{t}\right)$ ):

$$
B S=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
10^{0.1 \times-21.12} \times L_{t}^{-12.15 / 10} \times N & \text { if } S p=1 \\
10^{0.1 \times-13.21} \times L_{t}^{-14.9 / 10} \times N & \text { if } S p=2 \text { or } 5 \\
10^{0.1 \times-7.75} \times L_{t}^{-15.44 / 10} \times N & \text { if } S p=3 \text { or } 4
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $S p 1=$ anchovy, $S p 2=$ sardine, $S p 3=$ horse mackerel, $S p 4=$ mackerel and $S p 5=$ round herring.
2) The backscattering $(B S)$ is summed for each species for each trawl to give a total backscatter for each grid, $B S_{\text {tot }}$.
3) The backscattering due to recruits, $B S_{\text {rec }}$, is then calculating by summing $B S$ for only the length classes less than the cut-off length for each species for each trawl. The cut-off length is obtained from the modal progression analysis after using Method 1 above to weight the length frequency of the entire survey.
4) The proportion of recruits in each trawl is then calculated by $B S_{\text {red }} d B S_{\text {tot }}$.
5) This proportion is then multiplied by the original interval density (of recruits and adults) to obtain the recruit only density (for all years).
6) This recruit only density is used in the regressions of capped to uncapped data in order to estimate (using the Jolly and Hampton weighting procedure) the uncapped recruit only biomass prior to 1997 together with a CV.


[^0]:    \# MARAM (Marine Resource Assessment and Management Group), Department of Mathematics and Applied Mathematics, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch, 7701, South Africa.
    ${ }^{+}$Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries - Branch Fisheries, Private Bag X2, Rogge Bay, 8012, South Africa.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ The LFs assigned to some trawls slightly east of Cape Agulhas would likely have been from Gaansbaai landings in a single area scenario, but due to the split in catches at Cape Agulhas, a LF from Mossel Bay area would instead be used. The difference between such single area and two-area RLFs is assumed to be minor.

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ The first station was on $27^{\text {th }}$ June 1988, although the first acoustic interval was only logged after midnight, i.e. on $28^{\text {th }}$ June 1988.
    ${ }^{3}$ The first station was on $8^{\text {th }}$ June 1989 , although the first acoustic interval was only logged after midnight, i.e. on $9^{\text {th }}$ June 1989.

[^3]:    * Data to which the assessments are tuned.
    \# Blank cells correspond to years for which the survey did not reach Cape St. Francis.

[^4]:    * Data to which the assessments are tuned.
    \# Blank cells correspond to years for which the survey did not reach Cape St. Francis.

