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## 1. INTRODUCTION

In 1977 a first preliminary assessment of the shallow water prawn stocks at Sofala Bank was made (Ulltang \& al., 1980).

Using additional data from 1977-1982, the first assessment was updated in 1980 (Ulltang, 1980) and in 1983 (Ulltang \& al., 1983).

The present report includes the detailed description of data and explanations of the methods used in the last assessment. Data from 1983, which were not available during the last assessment, are also included in the present report.

## 2. THE FISHERY

Reported or estimated total catches for the years 1974-1983 are given in Table 1 and Figure 1 A.

Table 1. Total catches (tonnes) of shallow water shrimp at Sofala Bank 1974-1983. Values in brackets indicate estimated catches.

| Year | Mozambique | Foreign <br> fleets | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1974 | $(6000-7000)$ | $(4000-5000)$ | $(10000-12000)$ |
| 1975 | $(6000-7000)$ | $(4000-5000)$ | $(10000-12000)$ |
| 1976 | $(6000-7000)$ | $(5000)$ | $(11000-12000)$ |
| 1977 | $(5000)$ | 4541 | $(9500)$ |
| 1978 | 4732 | 4868 | 9600 |
| 1979 | 4182 | 4596 | 8778 |
| 1980 | 6925 | 1082 | 8007 |
| 1981 | 8581 | 796 | 9377 |
| 1982 | 6117 | 1791 | 7908 |
| 1983 | 6134 | 1967 | 8101 |

During the period 1980-1983 two important changes occurred in the fleets of the joint-venture enterprises. Firstly, the Efripel fleet almost doubled, and this increased the effective total fishing effort by about $33 \%$ compared to the 1979 level. Secondly, in 1980 a joint-venture company with spain was founded, and most of the Spanish fleet working under licence was incorporated in the national fleet. As licenced vessels


Fig. 1. A) Total catches for the period 1974-1983;
B) Annual mean catch per hour for Efripel fleet (type Vega); C) Total fishing effort in Efripel trawling hours units during 1977-1983.
they had earlier not been allowed to work inside the 12 miles limit, while as a joint venture a high number of vessels were allowed to work very near the shore.
3. CATCH AND EFFORT DATA

As for the years 1974-1979, logbook data giving detailed information on catch and effort were available from the trawlers of the enterprise Efripel for the period 1980-1983.

Table 1.1 (Annex 1) includes data on total catch of the Efripel trawlers, the catch of the various species and hours of trawling for the period 1980-1983.

Number of trawl hauls taken in the various squares in 1980, 19811982 and 1983 are shown on Figures 1.1. to 1.4 (Annex 1). As in the previous years, the main fishing areas are Pebane and the area between Quelimane and the delta of the Zambezi River. However, comparing with the years 1974-1979, during the period 1980-1983 a more important part of the fishing effort was carried out all over the coast, between $16^{\circ} 40^{\prime} \mathrm{S}$ and $19^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \mathrm{S}$ 。 Most probably this is related with the decrease in the catch rates observed during the last period of years.

Annual mean catch per hour for the whole period 1974-1983 for the Efripel trawlers (type Vega) is shown in Fig. $1 B$ and in the following table.

| Year | 74 | 75 | 76 | 77 | 78 | 79 | 80 | 81 | 82 | 83 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{Kg} / \mathrm{h}$ | 63 | 52 | 90 | 93 | 86 | 64 | 58 | 64 | 51 | 39 |

Catch per hour of trawling was at a high level during the years 1976-1978 but has since declined and reached its lowest value in 1983. The fluctuation in total catch per hour is mainly caused by fluctuations in the catches of the species $P$. indicus (Fig. 2). As pointed out by Ulltang (1980) catch rates and total catches seem to be very dependent on variation in recruitment of this species.


Fig. 2. Comparison between mean annual catch per hour of trawling of Total shrimp and $P$. indicus.

By dividing total catches by catch per hour of the Efripel trawlers, total fishing effort (in Efripel trawling hours units) can be estimated. The result is given below and in Fig. 1 C. The years 1974-1976 have not been included because of the large uncertainties in figures for total catches for these years.

| Year | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Fishing effort | 102 | 112 | 137 | 138 | 147 | 155 | 205 |
| $(1000$ hours trawling $)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

4. BIOMASS ESTIMATES

Mean annual biomasses for 1980-1983 were estimated by the "Swept area" method using catch per hour of the Efripel trawlers (type Vega).

Table 1.2 (Annex 1 ) includes data of total catch, catch of the various species and hours of trawling splitted by area and depth strata. The strata boundaries are shown in Fig. 1.5 (Annex 1).

Biomass was estimated for each strata (Annex 1, Table 1.3).

It is possible that biomass may be over-estimated by using the "Swept area" method, since it is known that the fishing fleet often is concentrated in rather small areasp and the catch rates in these areas may not be representative for the large stratum area。 Stratified random trawl surveys by R/V "Dr。 Fridtjof Nansen" conducted in October-November 1980 and September 1982 resulted in $44 \%$ and $14 \%$ lower estimates than those obtained by using Efripel catch rates from the same strata during the same periods. However, the trawl used by the research vessel may have a lower efficiency in catching shrimp than the commercial shrimp trawl, and in the "swept area" calculations $100 \%$ catching efficiency was assumed.

The estimates derived from the Efripel data were therefore used as the best available estimates of mean annual biomass, correcting for the part of the biomass outside the strata covered by the Efripel trawlers. The correction was made using data from trawl surveys carried out in Sofala Bank in 1980, 1982 and 1983 (Table 1.4, Annex 1).

The following table shows the results obtained.

Table 2. Mean annual biomass (tonnes) based on Efripel catch per hour corrected for biomass outside the fishing area.

| Year | Mean annual biomass <br> of the fishing areas <br> B, C and D | Time of <br> the survey | Correcting <br> factor | Corrected <br> biomass |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1980 | 3449 | Oct-Nov | 0.66 | 5226 |
| 1981 | 3637 | - | $0.67 *$ | 5428 |
| 1982 | 2803 | Sep | 0.68 | 4122 |
| 1983 | 2312 | May - Jun | 0.67 | 3451 |

[^0]It should, however, be stressed that there are two factors which could lead to substancial errors in the estimates. $A$ lower efficiency in catching shrimp present in the area covered by the trawl than the $100 \%$ assumed, would result in underestimating the abundance. Non-random fishing searching for the best concentrations would have the opposite effect. Both factors are probably present.
5. ESTIMATION OF MORTALITY

Total mortality (Z), fishing mortality (F) and natural mor= tality (M) for $P$. indicus were estimated using two different approaches:

1) The use of catch per effort data (Ulltang, 1980)
2) Cohort analysis (Jones and Zalinge, 1981)
5.1. The use of C.p.u.e. data

Total mortality (Z) was estimated from the variation with time of number caught per hour of trawling.

The method is based on the assumption that changes in number caught per hour reflect changes in abundance and not changes in availability.

For a period of no recruitment, the mean monthly mortality during the period may be estimated as the slope of the regression line of $\ln$ (catch/hour) against time.

Fig. 3 indicates that almost no recruitment occurred during the following periods: 1980 - June to September, 1981 - June to October, 1982 - June to August and 1983 - June to August.

The regression lines of $\ln$ (catch/hour) against month during these periods (Fig. 4), starting with the last month of recruitment, gave estimates of $Z$ as shown in Table 3 .

Table 3. Mean monthly total mortality of $P$. indicus.

| Year | Z (monthly) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1980 | 0.37 |
| 1981 | 0.29 |
| 1982 | 0.37 |
| 1983 | 0.37 |



Fig. 3. P. indicus. Number caught of the various length groups per hour trawling plotted against month for the period 1980-1983.

Table 4 gives the mean monthly fishing mortality for the years 1980-1983, estimated by dividing annual catch by mean annual biomass.

Table 4. Mean monthly fishing mortalities computed from total annual catches and mean annual biomasses.

| Year | Total annual <br> catch (tonnes) | Mean annual <br> biomass (tonnes) | $F_{\text {monthly }}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1980 | 8 | 007 | 5226 |
| 1981 | 9 | 377 | 5428 |
| 1982 | 7908 | 4 | 122 |
| 1983 | 8 | 3 | 451 |

Natural mortality (M) was then calculated by subtracting fishing mortality from total mortality.


Fig. 4. P. indicus. Regression of the logarithm of total number caught per hour of trawling plotted against month.

The results obtained by the c.p.u.e. method for the years 1977-1983 are summarized below. The values for 1977-1979 are taken from Ulltang (1980)。

Table 5. Estimates of monthly $Z, F$ and $M$ for $P$. indicus during 1980-1983.

| Year | $Z \underline{\text { (P. indicus) }}$ | $F$ | $M(\underline{\text { P. indicus) }}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1977 | 0.27 (Apr-Aug) | 0.09 | 0.18 |
| 1978 | 0.39 (Jun-Sep) | 0.10 | 0.29 |
| 1979 | 0.51 (Apr-Jul) | 0.12 | 0.39 |
| 1980 | 0.37 (May-Sep) | 0.13 | 0.24 |
| 1981 | 0.29 (May-0ct) | 0.14 | 0.15 |
| 1982 | 0.37 (May-Aug) | 0.16 | 0.21 |
| 1983 | 0.37 (May-Aug) | 0.20 | 0.17 |

The results suggest that $M$ is lower than assumed in earlier reports. The mean $M$ as estimated above for the years 1977-1983 is 0.23 , while a value of 0.3 was assumed earlier. As a result of the increasing fishing effort, monthly $F$ has increased from a level of about 0.1 in 1977-78 to about 0.2 in 1983.

A check on the results above was made by carrying out a cohort analysis.

### 5.2. Length cohort analysis

The method of Jones and van Zalinge (1981) was applied to an annual frequency distribution of length, assuming that recruitment occurs annually, each year-class making its first appearance in the fishery about September-October and becoming reduced to negligible numbers one year after. Therefore length data from September ' 81 to August ' 82 is believed to relate to the catches of a cohort through the course of its entire life。

The method was applied using growth parameters from Madagascar, and an input value of $F / Z_{1}=0.5$ based on the results in the previous section. Tables 1.6 and 1.7 (Annex 1) give the worksheets for applying the method.

Some few individuals have been caught with length greater than the value used for $L_{\infty}$. These numbers were not used in the calculations. The resulting errors in the estimates will be negligible and will only affect the largest size groups.

Estimates of $F$ and $Z$ were obtained for females of carapace length ranging from 29-39 mm. For the smallest individuals the mortality estimates tend to be quite small since these are incompletely recruited to the fishing gear. Estimates obtained for sizes bigger than 39 mm were not considered because the estimates obtained for larger individuals are more dependent on the input value of $F / Z$ and therefore less reliable than the ones obtained for smaller individuals.

Resulting mean monthly $F$ during the period september 1981August 1982 was estimated as 0.16 , assuming $M=0.18$, or 0.13 , assuming $M=0.23$. $M=0.18$ is the mean for $1981-82$ as estimated in Table 5.

Assuming $M=0.18$ the estimated $F$-value by the cohort analysis is very similar to those resulting from the c.p.u.e. method for 1981-1982.

Yield per recruit curves for $P$. indicus were estimated for the two alternative values of $M(0.18$ and 0.23$)$. The curves are shown in Fig. 5.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

Ulltang (1980) recommended that fishing effort should not increase to more than $33 \%$ over the 1979 level, this corresponding to an increase in fishing mortality to 0.16. A further increase should not be allowed before data on effects on the stocks of fishing at that level become available.

The present analysis indicates that fishing mortality reached the level of 0.16 in 1982 and increased further to 0.2 in 1983. With the new estimates of natural mortality, this level of $F$


Fig. 5. P. indicus. Yield per recruit ( $\mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{R}$ ) plotted against fishing mortality (F) for natural mortality $(\mathrm{M})=0.18$ and 0.23 .
corresponds to a level of fishing effort near the optimum level from yield per recruit considerations. $F_{0.1}$ has now been estimated to about $0.2(M=0.18)$ or $0.3(M=0.23)$.

The main factor causing the annual fluctuations in catch per unit of effort seems to be fluctuations in recruitment of $P_{\text {. }}$ indicus. It has not yet been possible to demonstrate any relationship between spawning stock and resulting recruitment for this species. A longer time series would be needed for demonstrating a relationship if it existed. But even assuming that there are no strong relationship between spawning stock and resulting recruitment, the gains in yield which could be expected from a further increase in fishing mortality would be very moderate, especially when compared to the corresponding decrease in catch per hour trawling. For example, assuming $\mathrm{M}=0.18$, an increase in fishing mortality from 0.16 to 0.20 increases yield by about $7 \%$, while mean annual biomass and thereby catch per hour trawling decreases by 14\%. If recruitment is decreasing with decreasing spawning stock size, the gain in yield is lower than $7 \%$ or even negative, while biomass and catch per hour trawling decrease by more than $14 \%$.

Taking into account both the uncertainties which exist in the yield per recruit studies (i.e. uncertainties in the value of growth parameters and natural mortality) and the low recruitment of $P$. indicus the last five years, it is adviced not to allow a further increase in fishing mortality. Instead, one should try to keep $F$ at a level not higher than that estimated for 1982.

There are in principle two different ways of controlling fishing mortality. It can either be controlled by directly limiting fishing effort (for example by limiting the number of vessels participating in the fishery) or by setting catch quotas.

Concerning the first approach, one problem is how to control the effective fishing effort by for example taking fully into account the effectiveness of the vessels when a new one is substituting an old one.

The main difficulty with the second approach is that the catch corresponding to a certain $F$-level is dependent on recruitment.

This could to some extent be overcome if catch quotas for a year were not finally decided before some indications of recruitment were available。

In Fig. 6 is shown the relationship between catch per hour during January-March and the whole year for the EFRIPEL trawlers, indicating that the abundance during the first three months is a good indicator of the abundance for the year as a whole.


Fig. 6. EFRIPEL trawlers. Mean catch per hour (kg) during the whole year plotted against mean catch per hour during January-March.

An index of recruitment was calculated for each year during the period 1977-1983 by dividing total yield by the yield per recruit for $P$. indicus corresponding to the fishing mortality estimated for the year in question. These indices were plotted against mean catch per hour trawling for the EFRIPEL trawlers during January-March each year. The results are shown in Fig. 7 ( $M=0.18$ ) and Fig。 8 ( $M=0.23$ ). There is a strong correlation, again indicating that the abundance of shrimp during the first


Fig. 7. Index of recruitment (R) plotted against mean catch per hour ( $c / h$ ) during January-March. $M=0.18$.
three month of the year is a good indicator of the total recruitment that year.

The estimated regression lines in Figs. 7-8 can be used to estimate total annual catch corresponding to a certain $F$-level when mean catch per hour during January-March is known. For each mean catch per hour a corresponding index of recruitment can be calculated. By multiplying this index with yield per recruit of $P$. indicus for the $F$ level decided, the total catch can be predicted. In Table 6 are shown as an example resulting catches for some selected $F$-values for five different levels of mean catch per hour during January-March (covering the range which has been observed 1977-1983).


Fig. 8. Index of recruitment (R) plotted against mean catch per hour ( $c / h$ ) during January-March. $M=0.23$.

Because of the large fluctuations in recruitment, it is advisable not to set the final catch quota before some indications of recruitment are available, and the procedure suggested above for calculating total catches would make it possible to take the final decision in April after for example having set a preliminary quota (at a rather low level) earlier.

It is not possible to estimate natural mortality with any high precision, but the two values used should indicate the likely range. It is advisable for the moment to base management considerations on $M=0.18$. This value is appreciably lower than

Table 6. Predicted annual catches (tonnes) corresponding to various values of mean catch per hour (kg) of the EFRIPEL trawlers (type VEGA) during January-March and selected values of monthly fishing mortality (F).

| Mean catch per hour | F |  |  | $\mathrm{M}=0.18$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.12 | 0.14 | 0.16 | 0.20 |
| 40 | 6275 | 6713 | 7072 | 7616 |
| 60 | 7541 | 8067 | 8499 | 9151 |
| 80 | 8809 | 9424 | 9928 | 10690 |
| 100 | 10077 | 10781 | 11358 | 12230 |
| 120 | 11346 | 12138 | 12787 | 13769 |
|  | F |  |  | $\mathrm{M}=0.23$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean catch per hour | 0.12 | 0.14 | 0.16 | 0.20 |
| 40 | 5999 | 6495 | 6916 | 7586 |
| 60 | 7399 | 8010 | 8530 | 9356 |
| 80 | 8797 | 9525 | 10143 | 11125 |
| 100 | 10197 | 11039 | 11755 | 12894 |
| 120 | 11594 | 12553 | 13368 | 14662 |

the value assumed earlier, and has the effect of decreasing estimated gains in yield by increasing fishing effort. Therefore, the estimated limits which the yield will vary between at $\mathrm{F}=0.16$ is somewhat lower than those given by Ulltang (1980).

As pointed out in earlier reports, the fact that yield per recruit curves were not available for other species than $P$. indicus introduces an extra uncertainty into the assessment. However, because of the large contribution to the catches from this species, it was found justifiable to apply the conclusions based on $Y / R$ for this species to the whole population of shallow water prawns at Sofala Bank.
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A N NEX 1

Table 1.1 Catch and effort data for the EFRIPEL trawlers (type VEGA), 1980-1983.

| Year <br> Month | $\begin{gathered} \text { P. } \\ \text { indicus } \end{gathered}$ | M. monoceros |  |  | P. latisulcatus | Total catch |  | Hours of trawling | Catch/ hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | P. japonicus | P. <br> monodon |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1980 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jan | 29716 | 26986 | 598 | 4276 |  |  | 61576 | 1022.43 | 60.23 |
| Feb | 97028 | 26446 | 148 | 23222 |  |  | 146844 | 2029.74 | 72.34 |
| Mar | 50462 | 62840 | 6682 | 6744 | 96 |  | 126824 | 2586.95 | 49.02 |
| Apr | 124814 | 56046 | 2946 | 5240 | 66 |  | 189112 | 2611.14 | 72.43 |
| May | 112416 | 89516 | 2382 | 4778 | 356 |  | 209448 | 2539.60 | 82.47 |
| Jun | 98140 | 75746 | 3110 | 2450 | 20 |  | 179466 | 2608.23 | 68.82 |
| Jul | 67404 | 94818 | 8730 | 10346 | 120 |  | 181418 | 2888.73 | 62.80 |
| Aug | 87686 | 88900 | 11038 | 4646 | 104 |  | 192374 | 4189.62 | 45.90 |
| Sep | 57136 | 84716 | 5400 | 4800 | 8 |  | 152060 | 3549.28 | 42.85 |
| Oct | 66290 | 97974 | 2868 | 11618 |  |  | 178750 | 3395.76 | 52.61 |
| Nov | 65460 | 107764 | 1646 | 14630 | 100 |  | 189600 | 3627.52 | 52.27 |
| Dec | 95198 | 88614 | 446 | 18008 |  |  | 202266 | 3582.20 | 56.46 |
| Total | 951750 | 900366 | 45994 | 110758 | 870 | 2 | 009738 | 34631.20 | 58.03 |



| 1982 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Jan | 96 | 454 | 90 | 606 | 1 | 170 | 7 | 908 | 4 | 196 | 142 | 3 | 354.95 | 58.48 |
| Feb | 97 | 164 | 78 | 712 | 4 | 728 | 5 | 702 | - | 186 | 306 | 2 | 851.59 | 65.33 |
| Mar | 112 | 968 | 131 | 216 | 7 | 368 | 5 | 782 | 404 | 257 | 738 | 3 | 188.71 | 80.82 |
| Apr | 149 | 856 | 141 | 812 | 6 | 596 | 4 | 064 | 326 | 302 | 654 | 3 | 913.26 | 77.35 |
| May | 139 | 972 | 85 | 234 | 2 | 662 | 3 | 408 | 80 | 231 | 356 | 3 | 869.60 | 59.80 |
| Jun | 93 | 498 | 91 | 996 | 3 | 728 | 18 | 604 | 274 | 208 | 100 | 3 | 851.99 | 54.03 |
| Jul | 73 | 308 | 98 | 662 | 7 | 042 | 10 | 694 | 214 | 189 | 920 | 3 | 975.86 | 47.75 |
| Aug | 67 | 580 | 91 | 262 | 7 | 998 | 10 | 646 | 274 | 177 | 760 | 4 | 539.46 | 39.14 |
| Sep | 50 | 522 | 66 | 128 | 10 | 366 | 7 | 618 | 850 | 135 | 484 | 4 | 413.01 | 30.69 |
| Oct | 50 | 462 | 37 | 722 |  | 894 | 5 | 978 | 48 | 95 | 104 | 3 | 709.61 | 25.65 |
| Nov | 28 | 616 | 80 | 800 |  | 800 | 2 | 588 | - | 112 | 804 | 2 | 995.33 | 37.66 |
| Dec | 72 | 844 | 67 | 926 |  | 816 | 6 | 994 | 40 | 148 | 620 | 3 | 254.07 | 45.68 |
| Total | 1033 | 244 | 1 | 062076 | 54 | 168 | 89 | 986 | 2 | 514 | 2 | 241 | 988 | 43 |

Table 1.1 (contd)

| Year <br> Month | $\begin{gathered} \text { P. } \\ \text { indicus } \end{gathered}$ | M. monoceros | Catch (kg) |  | P. latisulcatus | Total catch |  | Hours of trawling | Catch/ <br> hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | japonicus | P. monodon |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1983 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jan | 68470 | 51440 | 3322 | 18614 | 20 |  | 141866 | 2609.58 | 54.35 |
| Feb | 90400 | 64302 | 4598 | 7422 | 246 |  | 166968 | 3584.72 | 46.58 |
| Mar | 113604 | 68068 | 2254 | 24014 | 352 |  | 208292 | 4661.65 | 44.69 |
| Apr | 113718 | 78096 | 7474 | 6972 | 254 |  | 206514 | 4768.90 | 43.30 |
| May | 128102 | 78432 | 1608 | 15678 | 124 |  | 223944 | 4549.06 | 49.23 |
| Jun | 64762 | 44080 | 1574 | 16086 | 726 |  | 127228 | 3137.35 | 40.55 |
| Jul | 17420 | 16684 | 2440 | 2710 | 212 |  | 39466 | 1099.63 | 35.91 |
| Aug | 39270 | 37458 | 10366 | 4796 | 926 |  | 92816 | 3337.82 | 27.82 |
| Sep | 56336 | 22582 | 1756 | 7100 | 146 |  | 87920 | 2768.66 | 31.75 |
| Oct | 46264 | 32302 | 13096 | 7948 | 1432 |  | 101042 | 3581.69 | 28.20 |
| Nov | 78088 | 50742 | 302 | 20510 | 26 |  | 149668 | 4379.64 | 34.18 |
| Dec | 73524 | 59756 | 1456 | 8230 | 44 |  | 143010 | 4331.16 | 33.03 |
| Total | 889958 | 603942 | 50246 | 140080 | 4508 | 1 | 688734 | 42809.86 | 39.45 |

Table 1.2 Catch and effort data of the EFRIPEL trawlers (type VEGA) for strata $B, C$, D and E, 1980-1983.

| Area | Depth <br> (m) | $\begin{gathered} \text { P. } \\ \text { indicus } \end{gathered}$ | M. monoceros | jch | $\begin{gathered} \text { (kg } \\ \text { P. } \\ \text { onic } \end{gathered}$ |  | P. <br> nodon | P. latisulcatus | Total | catch |  | urs of awling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1980 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| B | 5-15 | 38290 | 8894 |  | 66 | 4 | 404 |  | 51 |  |  | 607.58 |
| B | 15-25 | 12558 | 5112 |  | 248 |  | 358 |  | 19 | 276 |  | 260.21 |
|  | 5-15 | 113526 | 24856 |  | 504 |  |  |  | 187 | 994 | 2 | 947.14 |
|  | 15-25 | 122452 | 100936 | 4 | 216 | 16 | 224 | 62 | 243 | 890 | 4 | 665.42 |
| C | 25-35 | 111454 | 159294 | 18 | 408 | 12 | 936 | 262 | 302 | 354 | 5 | 599.19 |
|  | 35-45 | 49590 | 100356 | 9 | 592 | 8 | 636 | 290 | 168 | 464 | 2 | 972.40 |
|  | 45-55 | 8102 | 26762 |  | 980 | 3 | 134 |  | 38 | 978 |  | 568.60 |
|  | 5-15 | 6480 | 3506 |  | 248 | 1 | 218 |  | 11 | 452 |  | 232.98 |
| D | 15-25 | 274424 | 262478 | 6 | 334 | 8 |  | 20 | 551 | 736 | 9 | 789.14 |
| D | 25-35 | 101328 | 125148 | 4 | 060 | 2 |  | 232 | 233 | 616 | 4 | 004.35 |
|  | 35-45 | 8004 | 20300 |  | 328 |  | 322 |  | 28 | 954 |  | 413.73 |
| F | 15-25 | 94810 | 56128 | 1 | 174 | 1 | 612 |  | 153 | 724 | 2 | 312.78 |
| $\pm$ | 25-35 | 10010 | 4822 |  | 16 |  | 72 |  | 14 | 920 |  | 210.50 |

1981

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| B | $5-15$ | 32 | 008 | 16 | 212 |  | 194 | 2 | 830 |  | 51 | 244 |
|  | $15-25$ | 18 | 784 | 19 | 082 |  | 114 | 1 | 988 |  | 39 | 968 |

1982


Table 1.2 (contd)

| Area | Depth (m) | $\begin{gathered} \text { P. } \\ \text { indicus } \end{gathered}$ | M. monoceros | $\begin{gathered} \text { Catch }(\mathrm{kg}) \\ \text { P. } \\ \text { japonicus } \end{gathered}$ | P. monodon | P. latisulcatus | Total catch | Hours of trawling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1983 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| B | 5-15 | 59380 | 26142 | 64 | 10584 | 46 | 96216 | 1885.91 |
|  | 15-25 | 8632 | 4180 | 32 | 1474 | 24 | 14342 | 396.05 |
| C | 5-15 | 163372 | 35416 | 1390 | 73782 | 134 | 274094 | 6581.83 |
|  | 15-25 | 194024 | 136504 | 6934 | 21398 | 564 | 359424 | 10031.25 |
|  | 25-35 | 111896 | 123828 | 28066 | 10258 | 1108 | 275156 | 7122.35 |
|  | 35-45 | 12092 | 33788 | 8174 | 2366 | 1912 | 58332 | 1509.15 |
|  | 45-55 | 84 | 474 | 114 | 22 | 26 | 720 | 29.49 |
| D | 5-15 | 34566 | 17814 | 286 | 6420 | 54 | 59140 | 1507.62 |
|  | 15-25 | 239272 | 148920 | 2760 | 10660 | 286 | 401898 | 10185.48 |
|  | 25-35 | 52724 | 68622 | 2344 | 2786 | 354 | 126830 | 2980.43 |
|  | 35-45 | 362 | 1526 |  | 58 |  | 1946 | 45.05 |
| E | 5-15 | 182 | 274 |  | 50 |  | 506 | 15.41 |
|  | 15-25 | 13038 | 6346 | 82 | 222 |  | 19688 | 505.35 |
|  | 25-35 | 334 | 108 |  |  |  | 442 | 11.99 |
| F | 15-25 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.50 |

Table 1.3 Biomass estimates based on EFRIPEL catch per hour of trawling. (Strata B, C and D). Swept area during one hour of trawling $=3 \times 1.852 \times 0.017 \times 2 \mathrm{~km}$.

| Strata | Depth | Area | $\left(\mathrm{km}{ }^{2}\right)$ | kg/h | $\begin{array}{r} 1980 \\ \text { Biomass } \end{array}$ | (tonnes) | kg/h | $\begin{array}{r} 1981 \\ \text { Biomass } \end{array}$ | (tonnes) | kg/h | $\begin{array}{r} 1982 \\ \text { Biomass } \end{array}$ | (tonnes) | kg/h | $\begin{array}{r} 1983 \\ \text { Biomass } \end{array}$ | (tonnes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | 5-15 |  | 223 | 85.02 | 100 | 482 | 67.60 | 80 | 464 | 44.37 | 52 | 242 | 51.02 | 60 | 247 |
|  | 15-25 |  | 974 | 74.08 | 382 |  | 74.45 | 384 |  | 36.79 | 190 |  | 36.21 | 187 |  |
| C | 5-15 |  | 063 | 63.79 | 359 | 1050 | 65.05 | 366 | 1236 | 44.96 | 253 | 883 | 41.64 | 234 | 713 |
|  | 15-25 |  | 235 | 52.27 | 342 |  | 67.98 | 444 |  | 40.76 | 266 |  | 35.83 | 234 |  |
|  | 25-35 |  | 707 | 54.00 | 202 |  | 69.97 | 262 |  | 54.35 | 203 |  | 38.63 | 145 |  |
|  | 35-45 |  | 490 | 56.68 | 147 |  | 63.15 | 164 |  | 62.06 | 161 |  | 38.65 | 100 |  |
| D | 5-15 | 1 | 070 | 49.15 | 278 | 1917 | 61.69 | 349 | 1937 | 50.03 | 283 | 1678 | 39.23 | 222 | 1352 |
|  | 15-25 | 1 | 537 | 56.36 | 459 |  | 55.82 | 454 |  | 49.69 | 404 |  | 39.46 | 321 |  |
|  | 25-35 | 2 | 336 | 58.34 | 721 |  | 58.93 | 729 |  | 52.27 | 646 |  | 42.55 | 526 |  |
|  | 35-45 | 1 | 238 | 69.98 | 459 |  | 61.81 | 405 |  | 52.63 | 345 |  | 43.20 | 283 |  |
| Total |  | 10 | 873 |  | 3449 |  |  | 3637 |  |  | 2803 |  |  | 2312 |  |

Table 1.4 Biomass estimates from trawl surveys at Sofala Bank.

| Strata | : Biomass (tonnes) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 46 | 2 | 17 |  |
| 2 |  | 104 | 33 | 34 |
| 3 |  | 729 | 197 | 243 |
| 4 |  | 583 | 142 | 1169 |
| Sub total | 2046 | 1416 | 372 | 1446 |
| 5 |  | 0 (a) | 117 | 514 |
| 6 |  | 228 | - | 200 |
| Sub total | 933 | 651 (a) | - | 714 |
| Total | 3025 | 2069 (a) | - | 2160 |

(a) The total biomass estimate was corrected comparing the results of "Dr Fridtjof Nansen" survey with the results obtained in another vessel - "S. Rybak" - surveying the same area at the same time. This was made because Stratum 5 seemed to need a further stratification.

Table 1.5 P. indicus. Number caught per hour of trawling by length group, 1980-1983.

| Month | $<11.5$ | 11.5-12.5 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total } \\ 12.5-13.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { length (cm) } \\ 13.5-14.5 \end{gathered}$ | 14.5-15.5 | $\geqslant 15.5$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1980 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jan | 123 | 600 | 350 | 318 | 170 | 78 | 1639 |
| Feb | 116 | 778 | 732 | 549 | 357 | 86 | 2618 |
| Mar | 21 | 165 | 216 | 290 | 178 | 66 | 936 |
| Apr | 65 | 277 | 227 | 489 | 453 | 412 | 1923 |
| May | 99 | 441 | 355 | 463 | 327 | 328 | 2013 |
| Jun | 22 | 161 | 225 | 356 | 277 | 390 | 1431 |
| Jul | 1 | 17 | 57 | 149 | 144 | 343 | 7.11 |
| Aug | 2 | 12 | 33 | 99 | 136 | 325 | 607 |
| Sep | 2 | 16 | 36 | 82 | 115 | 233 | 484 |
| Oct | 13 | 106 | 119 | 157 | 184 | 178 | 757 |
| Nov | 51 | 170 | 147 | 166 | 145 | 133 | 812 |
| Dec | 301 | 324 | 179 | 189 | 175 | 207 | 1375 |
| 1981 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jan | 287 | 408 | 345 | 395 | 278 | 188 | 1901 |
| Feb | 217 | 333 | 271 | 352 | 260 | 156 | 1589 |
| Mar | 127 | 248 | 253 | 379 | 391 | 459 | 1857 |
| Apr | 88 | 157 | 229 | 443 | 513 | 581 | 2011 |
| May | 51 | 128 | 160 | 470 | 487 | 605 | 1901 |
| Jun | 19 | 79 | 125 | 317 | 382 | 580 | 1502 |
| Jul | 4 | 24 | 52 | 176 | 210 | 463 | 929 |
| Aug |  | 19 | 54 | 213 | 249 | 469 | 1004 |
| Sep | 4 | 35 | 54 | 120 | 166 | 294 | 673 |
| Oct | 6 | 28 | 39 | 75 | 97 | 161 | 406 |
| Nov | 23 | 53 | 54 | 106 | 130 | 167 | 533 |
| Dec | 69 | 74 | 51 | 89 | 99 | 150 | 532 |
| 1982 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jan | 290 | 289 | 178 | 221 | 224 | 232 | 1434 |
| Feb | 390 | 429 | 236 | 261 | 256 | 235 | 1807 |
| Mar | 64 | 110 | 128 | 301 | 387 | 389 | 1379 |
| Apr | 262 | 283 | 196 | 305 | 365 | 338 | 1749 |
| May | 77 | 161 | 174 | 281 | 332 | 403 | 1428 |
| Jun | 14 | 50 | 80 | 172 | 229 | 314 | 859 |
| Jul | 5 | 19 | 40 | 92 | 160 | 283 | 599 |
| Aug | 8 | 11 | 27 | 67 | 117 | 240 | 470 |
| Sep | 8 | 27 | 41 | 74 | 110 | 145 | 405 |
| Oct | 9 | 52 | 72 | 94 | 140 | 147 | 514 |
| Nov | 28 | 68 | 59 | 70 | 71 | 100 | 396 |
| Dec | 331 | 316 | 206 | 160 | 157 | 122 | 1292 |
| 1983 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jan | 124 | 251 | 284 | 251 | 243 | 147 | 1300 |
| Feb | 181 | 268 | 229 | 227 | 210 | 134 | 1299 |
| Mar | 138 | 348 | 316 | 262 | 181 | 83 | 1328 |
| Apr | 42 | 136 | 194 | 279 | 240 | 166 | 1057 |
| May | 57 | 123 | 136 | 241 | 283 | 301 | 1141 |
| Jun | 14 | 47 | 71 | 160 | 225 | 247 | 764 |
| Jul | 2 | 11 | 19 | 65 | 107 | 278 | 482 |
| Aug | 2 | 14 | 21 | 66 | 95 | 182 | 380 |
| Sep | 9 | 81 | 95 | 130 | 177 | 246 | 738 |
| Oct | 3 | 45 | 72 | 86 | 126 | 145 | 477 |
| Nov | 122 | 139 | 137 | 147 | 130 | 151 | 826 |
| Dec | 195 | 248 | 125 | 136 | 100 | 112 | 916 |

Table 1.6 Cohort analysis for females; Cohort September'81 - August'82; $\mathrm{L}_{\infty}=48.2$, $\mathrm{K}=0.21$, $\mathrm{M}=0.18$

| Carapace length <br> (L) | $\frac{48.2-\mathrm{L} 1}{48.2-\mathrm{L} 2}$ | A X | $X=A .$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. caught } \\ \times 10^{6} \end{gathered}$ | Cohor <br> x 10 | F/Z | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {monthly }}$ | $\mathrm{z}_{\text {monthly }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 51 |  |  |  | 0.03 a) |  |  |  |  |
| 49 |  |  |  | 0.15 a) |  |  |  |  |
| 47 |  |  |  | 0.29 | 0.58 | (0.5) |  |  |
| 45 | 2.667 | 1.523 | (1.231) b) | 0.61 | 1.63 | 0.58 | 0.25 | 0.43 |
| 43 | 1.625 | 1.231 |  | 1.34 | 4.12 | 0.54 | 0.21 | 0.39 |
| 41 | 1.385 | 1.150 |  | 2.03 | 7.78 | 0.55 | 0.22 | 0.40 |
| 39 | 1.278 | 1.111 |  | 2.27 | 12.12 | 0.52 | 0.20 | 0.38 |
| 37 | 1.217 | 1.088 |  | 2.10 | 16.63 | 0.477 | $0.16]$ | 0.34 |
| 35 | 1.179 | 1.073 |  | 2.38 | 21.70 | 0.47 | 0.16 | 0.34 |
| 33 | 1.152 | 1.062 |  | 2.56 | 27.19 | 0.47 | 0.16 | 0.34 |
| 31 | 1.132 | 1.054 |  | 2.89 | 33.25 | 0.48 ] | 0.17 | 0.35 |
| 29 | 1.116 | 1.048 |  | 2.09 | 38.71 | 0.38 | 0.11 | 0.29 |
| 27 | 1.104 | 1.043 |  | 1.55 | 43.73 | 0.31 | 0.08 | 0.26 |
| 25 | 1.094 | 1.039 |  | 1.17 | 48.42 | 0.25 | 0.06 | 0.24 |
| 23 | 1.086 | 1.036 |  | 0.61 | 52.60 | 0.15 | 0.03 | 0.21 |
| 21 | 1.079 | 1.033 |  | 0.34 | 56.48 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.20 |
| 19 | 1.074 | 1.031 |  | 0.04 | 60.08 | 0.01 | 0.002 | 0.18 |

a) Values not used ( $L>L_{\infty}$ )
b) Value used in preference to 1.523

Table 1.7 Cohort analysis for females; Cohort September'81 - August'82; $\mathrm{L}_{\infty}=48.2$, $\mathrm{K}=0.21$, $\mathrm{M}=0.23$

| Carapace length (L) | $\frac{48.2-\mathrm{L} 1}{48.2-\mathrm{L} 2}$ | $=A \quad X=A$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. caught } \\ \times 10^{6} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort no. } \\ & \times 10^{6} \end{aligned}$ | $F / Z$ | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {monthly }}$ | $\mathrm{Z}_{\text {monthly }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 51 |  |  | 0.03 a) |  |  |  |  |
| 49 |  |  | 0.15 a) |  |  |  |  |
| 47 |  |  | 0.29 | 0.58 | (0.5) |  |  |
| 45 | 2.667 | 1.711 (1.305) b) | 0.61 | 1.78 | 0.51 | 0.24 | 0.47 |
| 43 | 1.625 | 1.305 | 1.34 | 4.78 | 0.45 | 0.19 | 0.42 |
| 41 | 1.385 | 1.195 | 2.03 | 9.25 | 0.45 | 0.19 | 0.42 |
| 39 | 1.278 | 1.144 | 2.27 | 14.70 | 0.42 | 0.17 | 0.40 |
| 37 | 1.217 | 1.114 | 2.10 | 20.58 | 0.367 | 0.13 ] | 0.367 |
| 35 | 1.179 | 1.094 | 2.38 | 27.23 | 0.36 | 0.13 | 0.36 |
| 33 | 1.152 | 1.081 | 2.56 | 34.59 | 0.35 | 0.12 | 0.35 |
| 31 | 1.132 | 1.070 | 2.89 | 42.69 | 0.36 | 0.13 | 0.36 |
| 29 | 1.116 | 1.062 | 2.09 | 50.37 | 0.27 | 0.09 | 0.32 |
| 27 | 1.104 | 1.056 | 1.55 | 57.81 | 0.21 | 0.06 | 0.29 |
| 25 | 1.094 | 1.050 | 1.17 | 64.96 | 0.16 | 0.04 | 0.27 |
| 23 | 1.086 | 1.046 | 0.61 | 71.71 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.25 |
| 21 | 1.079 | 1.043 | 0.34 | 78.36 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.24 |
| 19 | 1.074 | 1.040 | 0.04 | 84.80 | 0.006 | 0.001 | 0.23 |

a) Values not used (L> $L_{\infty}$ )
b) Value used in preference to 1.711

Figure l.l






Figure 1.5 Strata boundaries of the commercial fishing (dotted line) and of the fishing surveys (full-line).


[^0]:    * No survey was made in 1981. Correcting factor computed as the mean of 1980 and 1982 factors.

