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#### Abstract

This document presents sampling levels obtained with Portuguese and Spanish Discard Sampling Programmes, both included in National Sampling Programmes, and some preliminary results for the lberian Southern Hake discards. These programs consist on onboard-observer sampling schemes, with co-operative vessels, quasirandom selected, in the ICES Division VIIIc and IXa. The methodology used to estimate hake discards for Portugal and Spain since 2003 was based on the one proposed in the $\tilde{W}$ Workshop on Discard Sampling Methodology and Raising Proceduresò (PGCCDBS, Denmark, 2003). Spain presents results for the years 1994, 1997, 1999, 2000, 2003 and 2004. In the Portuguese Program, 2004 is the first year with an analysis of discard data. The number of trips sampled by the Spanish program for 2004 was 53, distributed by three trawl fleets- BACA trawl, Pair trawl and WHVO trawl. Portuguese onboard-observers sampled 40 trips distributed by Crustacean and Fish trawl fleets. The estimated percentages of discarded hake in relation to total catch were of 19,9 (C.V. $=22.6 \%$ ) and 46,7 (C.V. $=72.1 \%$ ) for the Spanish and Portuguese fleets respectively. The confidence interval for the Portuguese discard estimate is very large which denotes the very low precision of the obtained value. A co-operation in the analysis of this kind of data, between the two countries, could be the next step, since a standardisation of the methods would be of great importance for a realistic comparison of results obtained from both programs.


## Introduction

The at-sea discarding of fish and its associated mortalities have been recognized and noted by fisheries scientists as inherent problem in the management of world fisheries (Alverson, 1995).
Various studies revealed that discard data show that discarding occurs at both high and variable rates, and therefore that stock assessments based only on landings would be significantly improved by knowledge of discarded numbers-at-age (Armstrong et al., 1995).

[^0]
## Sampling

The Spanish observers-on-board programme is based on a stratified random sampling, considering the Fishery Unit as stratum and the trip as sampling unit. Instead of effort, landings are used in the raising procedure due to the best quality of information.
Until 2003, the standard procedure used to calculate Spanish total discards was estimated on a haul basis as described by Trenkel (SGDBI, 2001). From 2003 onwards and following the recommendation of the rWorkshop on Discard Sampling Methodology and Raising Proceduresò(PGCCDBS, Denmark, 2003), general guidelines on appropriate sampling strategies and methodologies were described and the primary sampling unit was defined as the fishing trip instead of haul.

The Portuguese Discard Sampling Programme is based on a quasi-random sampling of co-operative commercial vessels (17 totals). Quasi-random sampling results from the fact that not always the vessels are available to take observers onboard for different reasons (p.e. new crew, too many days at sea, vessel/engine damages, etc.). The sampling levels for 2004 are presented in Table I.

The raising variable used to estimate total discards (D) was the total landings (L). A discard ratio ( $r=d / /$ ) was estimate for each sampled trip and calculated its mean. The obtained mean ratio was very different from the median, so all the ratios were logarithmized. The new mean and variance were estimated and, from them, is calculated a ratio estimate ( $r_{\text {est }}$ ) and its variance (Var $r_{\text {est }}$ ). The total discard is given by:

$$
\mathrm{D}=\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{est}}{ }^{\star} \mathrm{L}
$$

Lower and upper limits of this estimate were calculated as the respective variance (Var), coefficient of variation (CV), and discard percentage in relation to total catch from the Portuguese trawl fleet.

Length composition of discards and discarded numbers-at-age were also calculated for both Discard Sampling Programmes.

T申ble 1. Sampling levels per year obtained for the Spanish and Portuguese Discard Sampling Programs.
Spanish Discard Program

| BACA TRAWL | Trips | Sampling Hauls | Fishing hours | PAIR TRAWL | Trips | Sampling Hauls | Fishing hours | WHVO | Trips | Sampling Hauls | Fishing hours |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1993 | 3 | 8 | 53,9 | 1993 | 1 | 1 | 9,0 | 1993 |  |  |  |
| 1994 | 53 | 447 | 2096,0 | 1994 | 8 | 7 | 47,0 | 1994 | 7 | 14 | 60,2 |
| 1995 |  |  |  | 1995 |  |  |  | 1995 |  |  |  |
| 1996 |  |  |  | 1996 |  |  |  | 1996 |  |  |  |
| 1997 | 67 | 439 | 1883,0 | 1997 | 31 | 39 | 315,6 | 1997 | 1 | 2 | 7,5 |
| 1998 |  |  |  | 1998 |  |  |  | 1998 |  |  |  |
| 1999 | 44 | 250 | 944,0 | 1999 | 20 | 18 | 175,0 | 1999 |  |  |  |
| 2000 | 70 | 367 | 1327,0 | 2000 | 42 | 42 | 320,0 | 2000 | 14 | 35 | 118,5 |
| 2001 | 11 | 43 | 145,1 | 2001 | 7 | 7 | 59,7 | 2001 | 3 | 6 | 25,2 |
| 2002 |  |  |  | 2002 |  |  |  | 2002 |  |  |  |
| 2003 * | 23 | 100 | 384,4 | 2003 | 11 | 11 | 102,9 | 2003 | 18 | 56 | 175,4 |
| 2004 ** | 26 | 121 | 382,7 | 2004 | 10 | 11 | 94,6 | 2004 | 17 | 46 | 139,4 |

Portuguese Discard Program

| CRUST TRAWL | Trips | Sampling Hauls | Fishing hours | FISH TRAWL | Trips | Sampling Hauls | Fishing hours |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2004 | 16 | 101 | 613,5 | 2004 | 24 | 106 | 376,7 |

* Both gears used in 6 trips.
** Both gears used in 9 trips.


## Results

The estimated total discard from both Discard Sampling Programmes are presented in Table 2. It also shows the precision levels and the percentages of discard in weight and number in relation to the total catch of trawl fleets.

Table 2. Hake Discard (ton) of the Spanish trawlers in Divisions VIIIc and IXa and of the Portuguese trawlers in Division IXa, estimated with on board observers. Percentages in Weight and in number are in relation to Total Catch.

|  | Spain |  |  |  |  |  | Portugal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Discard | 1994 | 1997 | 1999 | 2000 | 2003 | 2004 | 2004 |
| Tn | 242,3 | 688,5 | 298,5 | 554,8 | 192,2 | 554,7 | 588,5 |
| CV | 39,5 | 38,4 | 25,4 | 20,6 | 126,9 | 22,6 | 63,9 |
| Lower Limit | - | - | - | - | - | - | 208,5 |
| Upper Limit | - | - | - | - | - | - | 968,5 |
| \% in Weight | 8,2 | 20,3 | 12,5 | 22,0 | 9,0 | 19,9 | 47,5 |
| \% in Number | 34,3 | 67,6 | 58,3 | 60,4 | 35,2 | 55,2 | - |
|  | Spain |  |  |  |  |  | Portugal |
| Total Discard | 1994 | 1997 | 1999 | 2000 | 2003 | 2004 | 2004 |
| Tn | 242,3 | 688,5 | 298,5 | 554,8 | 192,2 | 554,7 | 664,2 |
| CV | 39,5 | 38,4 | 25,4 | 20,6 | 126,9 | 22,6 | 72,1 |
| Lower Limit | - | - | - | - | - | - | 235,3 |
| Upper Limit | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1093,1 |
| \% in Weight | 8,2 | 20,3 | 12,5 | 22,0 | 9,0 | 19,9 | 47,5 |
| \% in Number | 34,3 | 67,6 | 58,3 | 60,4 | 35,2 | 55,2 | 84 |
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Figure 1 - Length composition of Hake Discard (number in thousands) of the Spanish and the Portuguese trawlers.

TABLE IV ñ Hake Discard numbers-at-age (number in thousands), mean weight (kg), mean length (cm).

| Spain |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1994 | Age | № | Mean weight | Mean length | Otholits sampled |
|  | 0 | 5842 | 0,013 | 11,5 | ALK Combined |
|  | 1 | 3253 | 0,033 | 16,5 | 97-99-00-03 |
|  | 2 | 70 | 0,069 | 21,4 |  |
|  | 3 | 0 | 0,145 | 27,5 |  |
| 1997 | Age | № | Mean weight | Mean length | Otholits sampled |
|  | 0 | 18163 | 0,016 | 12,9 | 134 |
|  | 1 | 7722 | 0,044 | 18,2 |  |
|  | 2 | 576 | 0,100 | 24,2 |  |
|  | 3 | 21 | 0,175 | 29,2 |  |
| 1999 | Age | № | Mean weight | Mean length | Otholits sampled |
|  | 0 | 6079 | 0,017 | 13,4 | 49 |
|  | 1 | 3577 | 0,039 | 17,5 |  |
|  | 2 | 448 | 0,102 | 24,4 |  |
|  | 3 | 45 | 0,179 | 29,4 |  |
| 2000 | Age | № | Mean weight | Mean length | Otholits sampled |
|  | 0 | 833 | 0,006 | 9,4 | 56 |
|  | 1 | 5691 | 0,030 | 15,8 |  |
|  | 2 | 4612 | 0,074 | 21,8 |  |
|  | 3 | 146 | 0,147 | 27,5 |  |
| 2003 | Age | № | Mean weight | Mean length | Otholits sampled |
|  | 0 | 694 | 0,018 | 13,5 | 153 |
|  | 1 | 2748 | 0,050 | 19,0 |  |
|  | 2 | 427 | 0,091 | 23,5 |  |
|  | 3 | 13 | 0,231 | 31,9 |  |
| 2004 | Age | № | Mean weight | Mean length | Otholits sampled |
|  | 0 | 5857 | 0,013 | 11,5 | 47 |
|  | 1 | 3171 | 0,032 | 16,5 |  |
|  | 2 | 137 | 0,062 | 20,7 |  |
|  | 3 |  |  |  |  |


| Portugal |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2004 | Age | o | Mean weight | Mean length |  |
|  | 3379 | 0,015 | Otholits read |  |  |
| $\mathbf{0}$ | 11287 | 0,048 | 18,2 |  | 427 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 616 | 0,116 | 25,4 |  |  |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 12 | 0,174 | 29,2 |  |  |

This table shows that in 2004 the most part of discarded fish were of age 0 (64\%) for the Spanish fleet and of age 1 ( $74 \%$ ) for the Portuguese fleet. Also the mean length and weight differ for the two fleets.

## Final Comments

Alverson et al. (1994) refer that non-pelagic trawlers usually discard as much as they land. Although it seems to happen in the Portuguese case, the fact is that the low precision obtained for the total discard estimate disables us to accept that same value as a realistic one.

The Spanish results since 1994 show that discard rates have high variability in time, what is referred in Alverson et al. (1994) and Kennelly (1995).

Differences between discard length distributions from the two programmes are scarce. The exception is for the bigger abundance of Portuguese smaller individuals. Thus, the differences observed, especially between the 0 and 1 ages, may be related with differences of the Age Length Keys from the two countries.

A co-operation in the analysis and use of this type of data, between the two countries, could be the next step. A standardisation of the methods and the sampling methodologies applied would be of great importance for a more realistic comparison of results obtained from both programs.
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[^0]:    The Spanish Discard Sampling Program in Divisions VIIIc and IXa started in 1994, however it did not cover the whole period until present. Its implementation was depended on several European and national investigation projects which had not an annual continuity. The lack of continuity in the time series make it probably not suitable for being used in the assessment, however the

