Two further sets of results are presented here that are in addition to those presented in document 57.

## 1) Alternate CMP 4 runs which examine alternate TAC transfer options

(i) transfer 20\% from $A 8+$ to $A 3+4, A 5+6$ and $A 7$ in ratio 20:30:50 (i.e. more to $A 5+6$, less to A3+4).
(ii) transfer 20\% from $A 8+$ to $A 3+4, A 5+6$ and $A 7$ in ratio 10:50:40 (i.e. more to $A 5+6$, less to A3+A7)

|  | CMP 4 | CMP 4 alternative <br> (i) | CMP 4 alternative <br> (ii) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A34:A56:A7 <br> ratio | $\mathbf{3 0 : 2 0 : 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 : 3 0 : 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 : 5 0 : 4 0}$ |
| A1+2 | $1.39(0.67 ; 1.01)$ | $1.39(0.67 ; 1.02)$ | $1.38(0.68 ; 1.02)$ |
| A3+4 | $0.92(0.07 ; 0.53)$ | $1.03(0.22 ; 0.65)$ | $1.19(0.38 ; 0.77)$ |
| A5+6 | $1.69(1.30 ; 1.45)$ | $1.65(1.27 ; 1.41)$ | $1.54(1.20 ; 1.33)$ |
| A7 | $2.15(0.26 ; 1.11)$ | $2.11(0.26 ; 1.08)$ | $2.16(0.26 ; 1.12)$ |
| A8+ | $0.85(0.42 ; 0.65)$ | $0.82(0.45 ; 0.64$ | $0.78(0.39 ; 0.62)$ |
| T | $1.30(0.73 ; 0.96)$ | $1.30(0.73 ; 0.97)$ | $1.30(0.72 ; 0.97)$ |

2) Examine impact of assuming the "alternate: poaching split for future poaching levels.

Results are compared with CMP 3 results. In both cases the SAME OMs are used which have been fitted to data assuming the $80: 20$ poaching split. Thus the $35: 65$ poaching split applies to the FUTURE (2009+) only.

Super-area splits of poaching assumed

|  | $\mathbf{8 0 : 2 0}$ split <br> "baseline" | 35:65 split <br> "alternative" |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A1+2 | $1.1 \%$ | $0.15 \%$ |
| $A 3+4$ | $2.5 \%$ | $24.97 \%$ |
| $A 5+6$ | $2.5 \%$ | $30.13 \%$ |
| A7 | $14 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| A8 | $80 \%$ | $34.75 \%$ |

Table reporting B75m(2021/2006) median values (with $5^{\text {th }}$ and $25^{\text {th }}$ percentiles in parentheses).

|  | CMP 3 | CMP 3 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Poaching <br> split <br> between <br> A8:A1-7 | $80: 20$ | $35: 65$ |
| \# | 50 | 50 |
| simulations | 3000 | 3000 |
| $\alpha$ | $1.40(0.67 ; 1.02)$ | $1.19(0.62 ; 0.94)$ |
| A1+2 | $0.82(0.17 ; 0.46)$ | $0.73(0.04 ; 0.29)$ |
| A3+4 | $1.77(1.35 ; 1.51)$ | $1.89(1.20 ; 1.55)$ |
| A5+6 | $2.12(0.26 ; 1.07)$ | $1.45(0.21 ; 0.63)$ |
| A7 | $0.88(0.47 ; 0.68)$ | $0.99(0.58 ; 0.80)$ |
| A8+ | $0.29(0.74 ; 0.98)$ | $1.27(0.71 ; 0.94)$ |
| T | 1.29 |  |

The results shown in the table above clearly only implement the alternative poaching scenario partially. The full implementation requires all five super-area model assessments to be re-fitted to the data using the $35: 65$ historic poaching assumption, for both a past historic poaching level of 500 MT and 250 MT. These assessments are being run at the moment.
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