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## 1 Basic Identification Data

| Scientific name: | Common name: | ISCAAP Group: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mullus barbatus | Red mullet | 33 |
| $1^{\text {st }}$ Geographical sub-area: | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Geographical sub-area: | $3^{\text {rd }}$ Geographical sub-area: |
| GSA 18 |  |  |
| $4^{\text {th }}$ Geographical sub-area: | $5^{\text {th }}$ Geographical sub-area: | $6^{\text {th }}$ Geographical sub-area: |
| $1^{\text {st }}$ Country | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Country | $3^{\text {rd }}$ Country |
| Italy | Albania | Montenegro |
| $4^{\text {th }}$ Country | $5^{\text {th }}$ Country | $6^{\text {th }}$ Country |
| Stock assessment method: (direct, indirect, combined, none) |  |  |
| Combined (Trawl survey, XSA, a4aSCA, ALADYM) |  |  |
| Authors: |  |  |
| Bitetto I. ${ }^{1}$, Carbonara P. ${ }^{1}$, Casciaro L. ${ }^{1}$, Ceriola L. ${ }^{2}$, Đurović M. ${ }^{3}$, Facchini M. T. ${ }^{1}$, Hoxha A. ${ }^{4}$, Ikica Z. ${ }^{3}$, Joksimović A. ${ }^{3}$, Kolitari J. ${ }^{4}$, Kroqi G. ${ }^{4}$, Lembo G. ${ }^{1}$, Marković O. ${ }^{3}$, Milone N. ${ }^{2}$, Spedicato M. T. ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |
| Affiliation: |  |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ COISPA Tecnologia \& ricerca, Bari - Italy; ${ }^{2}$ AdriaMed, FAO, Rome - Italy; ${ }^{3}$ Institute of Marine Biology, University of Montenegro, Kotor - Montenegro; ${ }^{4}$ University of Tirana - Albania |  |  |

The ISSCAAP code is assigned according to the FAO 'International Standard Statistical Classification for Aquatic Animals and Plants' (ISSCAAP) which divides commercial species into 50 groups on the basis of their taxonomic, ecological and economic characteristics. This can be provided by the GFCM secretariat if needed. A list of groups can be found here:

## http://www.fao.org/fishery/collection/asfis/en

Direct methods (you can choose more than one):

- Acoustics survey
- Egg production survey
- Trawl survey
- SURBA
- Other (please specify)

Indirect method (you can choose more than one):

- ICA
- VPA
- LCA
- AMCI
- XSA
- Biomass models
- Length based models
- Other (please specify)

Combined method: you can choose both a direct and an indirect method and the name of the combined method (please specify)

## 2 Stock identification and biological information

### 2.1 Stock unit

The Southern Adriatic Sea is characterised by the presence of a deep central depression known as the "South Adriatic Pit" (or Bari Pit) where the seabed reaches a depth of 1,233 m.
The northern and southern portions of the Southern Adriatic Sea feature substantial differences; the first contains a wide continental shelf (the distance between the coastline and a depth of 200 m is around 45 nautical miles) and a very gradual slope; in the second, the isobathic contours are very close, with a depth of 200 m already found at around 8 miles from the Cape of Otranto. The continental shelf break is at a depth of around $160-200 \mathrm{~m}$ and is furrowed by the heads of canyons running perpendicular to the line of the shelf.
The Adriatic Sea, together with the Levant basin, is one of three areas in the Mediterranean where downwelling processes produced by surface cooling lead to the formation of so-called "dense waters", rich in oxygen, which supply the lower levels.


### 2.2 Growth and maturity

Incorporate different tables if there are different maturity ogives (e.g. catch and survey). Also incorporate figures with the ogives if appropriate. Modify the table caption to identify the origin of the data (catches, survey). Incorporate names of spawning and nursery areas and maps if available.

Table 2.2-1: Maximum size, size at first maturity and size at recruitment.

| Somatic magnitude measured |  |  | Units |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex LC, etc) | Fem | Mal | Combined | Reproduction <br> season |  |
| Maximum <br> size <br> observed | 33.5 | 30 |  | Recruitment <br> season |  |
| Size at first <br> maturity | 11.9 |  | Spawning area |  |  |
| Recruitment <br> size to the <br> fishery |  | 9 | Nursery area |  |  |

Table 2-2.2: $M$ vector and proportion of matures by size or age (Males)

| Size/Age | Natural mortality | Proportion of matures |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 1.03 | 0.16 |
| 1 | 0.71 | 0.92 |
| 2 | 0.65 | 1 |
| $3+$ | 0.62 | 1 |

Table 2-2.3: $M$ vector and proportion of matures by size or age (Females)

| Size/Age | Natural mortality | Proportion of matures |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 1.03 | 0.16 |
| 1 | 0.71 | 0.92 |
| 2 | 0.65 | 1 |
| $3+$ | 0.62 | 1 |

For the assessment a vector natural mortality estimated by PRODBIOM method (Abella et al., 1997) for sex combined. The vector of proportion of mature individuals by age has been derived slicing the maturity ogive by length with the von Bertalanffy coefficients for sex combined reported above. LFDA (FAO package) algorithm has been used for the age slicing.


Table 2-3: Growth and length weight model parameters


## 3 Fisheries information

### 3.1 Description of the fleet

The fleet data are referred to the whole GSA and are from the GFCM Task 1 Statistical Bulletin 2010. Catch data in the table 3.1.2 below reported are referred to the year 2014 (DCF data for Italy, and data from ADRIAMED pilot study and National Statistics for Albania and Montenegro). The operational units ITA18E0333-MUT, ITA18F0333- MUT, ALB 18 E 03 33- MUTand ALB 18 F 03 33- MUT include also demersal slope fishing (mixed demersal according to DCF classification).

The catch data from the whole GSA18 including the east side are below reported:
Table 3-1: Description of operational units exploiting the stock

|  | Country | GSA | Fleet Segment | Fishing Gear Class | Group of Target Species | Species |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Operational Unit 1* | ITA | 18 | $\begin{gathered} \text { D - Trawls (5- } \\ 12 \mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | 03 - Trawls | 33 - Demersal shelf species | MUT |
| Operational Unit 2 | ITA | 18 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E}-\text { Trawls (12- } \\ 24 \mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | 03 - Trawls | 33 - Demersal shelf species | MUT |
| Operational Unit 3 | ITA | 18 | F - Trawls (>24 <br> m) | 03 - Trawls | 33 - Demersal shelf species | MUT |
| Operational Unit 4 | ITA | 18 | B - Minor gear with engine (<6 m) | 07 - Gillnets and entangling nets | 33 - Demersal shelf species | MUT |
| Operational Unit 5 | ITA | 18 | C - Minor gear with engine (612 m ) | 07 - Gillnets and entangling nets | 33 - Demersal shelf species | MUT |
| Operational Unit 6 | MNE | 18 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E}-\text { Trawls (12- } \\ 24 \mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | 03 - Trawls | 33 - Demersal shelf species | MUT |
| Operational Unit 7 | MNE | 18 | B - Minor gear with engine (<6 m) | $\begin{aligned} & 07-\text { Gillnets } \\ & \text { and entangling } \\ & \text { nets } \end{aligned}$ | 33 - Demersal shelf species | MUT |
| Operational Unit 8 | MNE | 18 | C - Minor gear with engine (612 m) | $\begin{gathered} 07-\text { Gillnets } \\ \text { and entangling } \\ \text { nets } \end{gathered}$ | 33 - Demersal shelf species | MUT |
| Operational Unit 9 | ALB | 18 | $\begin{gathered} \text { D - Trawls (5- } \\ 12 \mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | 03 - Trawls | 33 - Demersal shelf species | MUT |


| Operational <br> Unit 10 | ALB | 18 | $\mathrm{E}-$ Trawls (12- <br> $24 \mathrm{~m})$ | 03 -Trawls | 33 - Demersal <br> shelf species |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Operational <br> Unit 11 | ALB | 18 | F-Trawls (>24 <br> $\mathrm{m})$ | 03 -Trawls | 33 - Demersal <br> shelf species |

Table 3.1-2: Catch, bycatch, discards and effort by operational unit in the reference year

| Operational Units* | Fleet <br> ( $n^{\circ}$ of <br> boats)* | Catch (T or <br> kg of the <br> species <br> assessed) | Other <br> species <br> caught <br> (names and <br> weight ) | Discards <br> (species <br> assessed) | Discards <br> (other <br> species <br> caught) | Effort <br> (units) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITA Operational <br> Units 1+2+3 | 400 | 1249.6 T |  | 119.6 |  |  |
| ITA Operational <br> Unit 4+5 | 355 | 22.6 T |  |  |  |  |
| MNE Operational <br> Units 6 | 20 | 41 T |  |  |  |  |
| MNE Operational <br> Units 7+8 | 90 | 4 T |  |  |  |  |
| ALB Operational <br> Units 9+10+11 | 199 | 147 T |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | 1684 T |  |  |  |  |


| Classification |  | Catch (t) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 ITA 18 B 0333 - ITA 18 C 0333 |  | $22.3{ }^{5}$ |
| 2007 ITA 18 D 0333 - ITA 18 E 0333 - ITA 18 F 0333 |  | 1741.5 |
| 2007 ALB 18 D 0333 - ALB 18 E 0333 - ALB 18 F 0333 |  | $171{ }^{1}$ |
| 2007 MNE 18 D 0333 - MNE 18 E 0333 - MNE 18 F 0333 |  | $38^{1}$ |
| 2007 MNE 18 B 0333 - MNE 18 C 0333 |  | $3.7^{1}$ |
|  | 2007 Total | 1976 |
| 2008 ITA 18 B 0333 - ITA 18 C 0333 |  | $22.3{ }^{1}$ |
| 2008 ITA 18 D 0333 - ITA 18 E 0333 - ITA 18 F 0333 |  | 947.9 |
| 2008 ALB 18 D 0333 - ALB 18 E 0333 - ALB 18 F 0333 |  | $149{ }^{2}$ |
| 2008 MNE 18 D 0333 - MNE 18 E 0333 - MNE 18 F 0333 |  | 38 |
| 2008 MNE 18 B 0333 - MNE 18 C 0333 |  | 3.74 |
|  | 2008 Total | 1161 |
| 2009 ITA 18 B 0333 - ITA 18 C 0333 |  | $22.3{ }^{1}$ |
| 2009 ITA 18 D 0333 - ITA 18 E 0333 - ITA 18 F 0333 |  | 969 |
| 2009 ALB 18 D 0333 - ALB 18 E 0333 - ALB 18 F 0333 |  | $154{ }^{2}$ |
| 2009 MNE 18 D 0333 - MNE 18 E 0333 - MNE 18 F 0333 |  | 36 |
| 2009 MNE 18 B 0333 - MNE 18 C 0333 |  | $3.6{ }^{4}$ |
|  | 2009 Total | 1186 |
| 2010 ITA 18 B 0333 - ITA 18 C 0333 |  | $22.3{ }^{1}$ |
| 2010 ITA 18 D 0333 - ITA 18 E 0333 - ITA 18 F 0333 |  | 635.7 |
| 2010 ALB 18 D 0333 - ALB 18 E 0333 - ALB 18 F 0333 |  | $90^{2}$ |
| 2010 MNE 18 D 0333 - MNE 18 E 0333 - MNE 18 F 0333 |  | 35 |
| 2010 MNE 18 B 0333 - MNE 18 C 0333 |  | $3.4{ }^{4}$ |
|  | 2010 Total | 786 |
| 2011 ITA 18 B 0333 - ITA 18 C 0333 |  | 37.5 |
| 2011 ITA 18 D 0333 - ITA 18 E 0333 - ITA 18 F 0333 |  | 508.1 |
| 2011 ALB 18 D 0333 - ALB 18 E 0333 - ALB 18 F 0333 |  | $110^{2}$ |
| 2011 MNE 18 D 0333 - MNE 18 E 0333 - MNE 18 F 0333 |  | 32 |
| 2011 MNE 18 B 0333 - MNE 18 C 0333 |  | $3.2{ }^{4}$ |
|  | 2011 Total | 691 |
| 2012 ITA 18 B 0333 - ITA 18 C 0333 |  | 7.1 |
| 2012 ITA 18 D 0333 - ITA 18 E 0333 - ITA 18 F 0333 |  | 2522.7 |
| 2012 ALB 18 D 0333 - ALB 18 E 0333 - ALB 18 F 0333 |  | $280^{2}$ |
| 2012 MNE 18 D 0333 - MNE 18 E 0333 - MNE 18 F 0333 |  | 35 |
| 2012 MNE 18 B 0333 - MNE 18 C 0333 |  | 3.54 |
|  | 2012 Total | 2848 |
| 2013 ITA 18 B 0333 - ITA 18 C 0333 |  | 47 |
| 2013 ITA 18 D 0333 - ITA 18 E 0333 - ITA 18 F 0333 |  | 1220.8 |
| 2013 ALB 18 D 0333 - ALB 18 E 0333 - ALB 18 F 0333 |  | $247^{2}$ |
| 2013 MNE 18 D 0333 - MNE 18 E 0333 - MNE 18 F 0333 |  | 32 |
| 2013 MNE 18 B 0333 - MNE 18 C 0333 |  | 3.1 |
|  | 2013 Total | 1550 |
| 2014 ITA 18 B 0333 - ITA 18 C 0333 |  | 22.6 |
| 2014 ITA 18 D 0333 - ITA 18 E 0333 - ITA 18 F 0333 |  | 1369.2 |
| 2014 ALB 18 D 0333 - ALB 18 E 0333 - ALB 18 F 0333 |  | $147{ }^{3}$ |
| 2014 MNE 18 D 0333 - MNE 18 E 0333 - MNE 18 F 0333 |  | 41 |
| 2014 MNE 18 B 0333 - MNE 18 C 0333 |  | 4.0 |
|  | 2014 Total | 1684 |

${ }^{1}$ Due to the lack of data, the 2007 catch for Albania and Montenegro was assumed to be identical to the catch of 2008
${ }^{2}$ Catches in Albania for period from 2008 to 2013 were obtained from within the SEDAF project (MAREA Specific Project No. 10)
${ }^{3}$ Preliminary data of Ministry of Environment, forests and Water Management of Albania for 2012.
${ }^{4}$ Due to the lack of data, the total production of fleet segments MNE 18 B 0333 and MNE 18 C 0333 for period 2008-2012 and 2014 was estimated based on the data from 2013
${ }^{5}$ From 2007 to 2010 catch for Italian gillnets and entangling nets was assumed to be equal to the average of catches in 2011-2014.


### 3.2 Historical trends

Available time series for
Red mullet landings in GSA 18 is relatively short (Table 3.2-1), consisting of only eight years (2007-2014), and even not complete for all countries in question.

Table 3.2-1. Landing data for GSA 18 by year and country

| Year | Italy-OTB | Italy-GEN | Montenegro- <br> OTB | Montenegro- <br> GEN | Albania | Total <br> Landings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 1679.6 | 22.3 | 38 | 3.7 | 171 | 1914 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 914.2 | 22.3 | 38 | 3.7 | 149 | 1127 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 954.3 | 22.3 | 36 | 3.6 | 154 | 1171 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 600.7 | 22.3 | 35 | 3.4 | 90 | 751 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 494.2 | 37.5 | 32 | 3.2 | 110 | 677 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 2088.6 | 7.1 | 35 | 3.5 | 280 | 2414 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 1202.8 | 47.0 | 32 | 3.1 | 247 | 1532 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 1249.6 | 22.6 | 41 | 4.0 | 147 | 1464 |

Table 3.2-2. Discard data available for GSA 18 by year and country

| Year | Italy-OTB |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 62 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 34 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 15 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 35 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 14 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 434 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 18 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 120 |

### 3.3 Management regulations

In Italy management regulations are based on technical measures, closed number of fishing licenses for the fleet and area limitation (distance from the coast and depth). In order to limit the over-capacity of fishing fleet, the Italian fishing licenses have been fixed since the late eighties and the fishing capacity has been gradually reduced. Other measures on which the management regulations are based regards technical measures (mesh size), minimum landing sizes (EC 1967/06) and seasonal fishing ban, that in southern Adriatic has been mandatory since the late eighties. Regarding long-lines the management regulations are based on technical measures related to the number of hooks and the minimum landing sizes (EC 1967/06), besides the regulated number of fishing licences. Regarding small scale fishery management regulations are based on technical measures related to the height and length of the gears as well as the mesh size opening, minimum landing sizes and number of fishing licenses for the fleet. In 2008 a management plan was adopted, that foresaw the reduction of fleet capacity associated with a reduction of the time at sea. Two biological conservation zone (ZTB) were permanently established in 2009 (Decree of Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry Policy of 22.01 .2009 ; GU n. 37 of 14.02 .2009 ) along the mainland, offshore Bari $\left(180 \mathrm{~km}^{2}\right.$, between about 100 and 180 m depth), and in the vicinity of Tremiti Islands ( $115 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ along the bathymetry of 100 m ) on the northern border of the GSA where a marine protected area (MPA) had been established in 1989. In the former only the professional small scale fishery using fixed nets and long-lines is allowed, from January 1st to June 30th, while in the latter the trawling fishery is allowed from November 1st to March 31 and the small scale fishery all year round. Recreational fishery using no more than 5 hooks is allowed in both the areas. Since June 2010 the rules implemented in the EU regulation (EC 1967/06) regarding the cod-end mesh size and the operative distance of fishing from the coasts are enforced.

In Montenegro, management regulations are based on technical regulations, such as mesh size (Official Gazette of Montenegro, $8 / 2011$ ), including the minimum landing sizes (Official Gazette of Montenegro, 8/2011), and a regulated number of fishing licenses and area limitation (no-fishing zone up to 3 NM from the coastline or 8 NM for trawlers of 24+ m LOA). Currently there are no MPAs or fishing bans in Montenegrin waters.

In Albania, a new law "On fishery" has now been approved, repealing the Law n . 7908. The new law is based on the main principles of the CFP, it reflects Reg. 1224/2009 CE ; Reg.1005/2008 CE; Reg. 2371/2002 CE; Reg. 1198/2006 CE; Reg. 1967/2006 CE; Reg. 104/2000; Reg. 1543/2000 as well as the GFCM recommendations. The legal regime governing access to marine resources is being regulated by a licensing system. Regarding conservation and management measures, minimum legal sizes and minimum mesh sizes
is those reflected in the CE Regulations. Albania has already an operational vessel register system. It is forbidden to trawl at less than 3 nautical miles ( nm ) from the coast or inside the 50 m isobath when this distance is reached at a smaller distance from the shore.

### 3.4 Reference points

Table 3.3-1: List of reference points and empirical reference values previously agreed (if any)

| Indicator | Limit <br> Reference <br> point/emp <br> irical <br> reference <br> value | Value | Target <br> Reference <br> point/empi <br> rical <br> reference <br> value | Value |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| B |  |  |  | Comments |  |
| SSB |  |  | Fo.1 | 0.42 |  |
| F |  |  |  |  |  |
| Y |  |  |  |  |  |
| CPUE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Index of <br> Biomass at <br> sea |  |  |  |  |  |

## 4 Fisheries independent information

### 4.1 MEDITS Trawl Survey

The sampling design is random stratified with number of haul by stratum proportional to stratum surface. Data were assigned to strata based upon the shooting position and average depth (between shooting and hauling depth). Hauls noted as valid were used only, including stations with no catches (zero catches are included).
The abundance and biomass indices by GSA were calculated through stratified means (Cochran, 1953; Saville, 1977). The variation of the stratified mean is then expressed as coefficient of variation respect to the mean.

## Direct methods: trawl based abundance indices

Table 4.1-1: Trawl survey basic information

| Survey | MEDITS | Trawler/RV | PEC |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sampling season | Summer |  |  |
| Sampling design | Stratified sampling design with the number of hauls proportionate to <br> the strata surface |  |  |
| Sampler (gear used) | GOC 73 |  |  |
| Cod -end mesh size <br> as opening in mm | 20 mm |  |  |
| Investigated depth <br> range (m) | $10-800 \mathrm{~m}$ |  |  |

Table 4.1-2: Trawl survey sampling area and number of hauls

| Stratum | Total surface ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Trawlable surface (km²) | Swept area (km²) | Number of hauls |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10-50 m | 3430 |  |  | 12 |
| 50-100 m | 6435 |  |  | 20 |
| 100-200 m | 9664 |  |  | 31 |
| 200-500 m | 4761 |  |  | 13 |
| 500-800 m | 4718 |  |  | 14 |
| Total (10-800 m) | 29008 |  |  | 90 |



Fig. 4.1-1. Map of MEDITS haul positions in the GSA 18
Table 4.1-3: Trawl survey abundance and biomass results (MEDITS 2014)

| Depth Stratum | Years | kg per $\mathbf{k m}^{2}$ | CV (\%) | N per $\mathbf{k m}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | CV (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10-50 m | 2014 | 170.0 | 37.3 | 39538 | 55.9 |
| 50-100 m | 2014 | 29.2 | 53.7 | 1149 | 60.1 |
| 100-200 m | 2014 | 23.2 | 27.5 | 596 | 26.8 |
| 200-500 m | 2014 | 1.4 | 74.8 | 25 | 79.2 |
| 500-800 m | 2014 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total (10-800 m) | 2014 | 34.6 | 24.7 | 5133 | 51 |

## Direct methods: trawl based length/age structure of population at sea

## Slicing method

The maturity scale used for the maturity stages of this species is MEDITS scale (Medits Handbook 2013, version 7).

The age slicing method used for this stock is the LFDA (FAO package) algorithm implemented by means of a routine in R .

Table 4.1-4: Trawl survey results by length or age class

| $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{km}^{2}$ (Total or <br> ex combined) by <br> Length or Age class | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ |  |
| $\mathbf{0}$ | 271.3 | 38.7 | 97.6 | 135.9 | 422.3 | 5562.9 | 2474.2 | 6827.5 |  |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 231.5 | 198.7 | 277.5 | 239.9 | 429.9 | 1034.5 | 1153.3 | 734.7 |  |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 27.4 | 71.4 | 43.7 | 32.3 | 31.4 | 60.2 | 75.9 | 54.2 |  |
| $\mathbf{3 +}$ | 0.7 | 7.6 | 8.6 | 5.7 | 3.4 | 3.9 | 5.4 | 1.6 |  |


| Total | 530.9 | 316.5 | 427.4 | 413.8 | 887.0 | 6661.6 | 3708.9 | 7618.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Sex ratio by <br> Length or Age <br> class | Year |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | $2007-$ <br> 2013 | $\ldots$. | $\ldots .$. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.5 |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |

The number are standardised to the square km but not raised to the overall area assuming the same catchability (=1).

## Direct methods: trawl based Recruitment analysis

Table 4.1-5: Trawl surveys; recruitment analysis summary

| Survey $\quad$ MEDITS | Trawler/RV | PEC |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Survey season | summer |  |
| Cod -end mesh size as opening in mm | 20 |  |
| Investigated depth range (m) | $10-800$ |  |
| Recruitment season and peak (months) |  |  |
| Age at fishing-grounds recruitment |  |  |
| Length at fishing-grounds recruitment |  |  |

Table 4.1-6: Trawl surveys; recruitment analysis results (<=9 cm)

| Years | Area in <br> $\mathbf{k m}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | N of <br> recruit per <br> $\mathbf{k m}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | CV |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 6}$ | 29008 | 65 | 102.1 |
| 1997 | 29008 | 1 | 67.2 |
| 1998 | 29008 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 1999 | 29008 | 718 | 34.8 |


| $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | 29008 | 0 | 0.0 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 29008 | 0.3 | 81.9 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 29008 | 2 | 66.1 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 29008 | 1 | 86.1 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 29008 | 3 | 102.8 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 29008 | 303 | 81.9 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 29008 | 0 | 0.0 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 29008 | 52 | 27.3 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 29008 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 29008 | 1 | 62.0 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 29008 | 1 | 73.7 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 29008 | 161 | 99.1 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 29008 | 3566 | 74.8 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 29008 | 1330 | 74.6 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 29008 | 4252 | 60.8 |



## Direct methods: trawl based Spawner analysis

Table 4.1-7: Trawl surveys; spawners analysis summary

| Survey MEDITS | Trawler/RV | PEC |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Survey season | summer |  |
| Investigated depth range (m) | $10-800$ |  |
| Spawning season and peak (months) |  |  |

Table 4.1-8: Trawl surveys; spawners analysis results (>= 12 cm )

| Years | Area in $\mathrm{km}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | N of spawners per km $^{2}$ | CV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1996 | 29008 | 60 | 30.8 |
| 1997 | 29008 | 68 | 32.1 |
| 1998 | 29008 | 82 | 23.7 |
| 1999 | 29008 | 106 | 22.4 |
| 2000 | 29008 | 98 | 19.4 |
| 2001 | 29008 | 123 | 25.1 |
| 2002 | 29008 | 113 | 45.1 |
| 2003 | 29008 | 87 | 24.9 |
| 2004 | 29008 | 75 | 24.3 |
| 2005 | 29008 | 157 | 27.6 |
| 2006 | 29008 | 108 | 22.8 |
| 2007 | 29008 | 191 | 20.6 |
| 2008 | 29008 | 205 | 16.1 |
| 2009 | 29008 | 233 | 26.7 |
| 2010 | 29008 | 202 | 28.5 |
| 2011 | 29008 | 336 | 51.5 |
| 2012 | 29008 | 771 | 25.5 |
| 2013 | 29008 | 888 | 20.6 |
| 2014 | 29008 | 557 | 31.7 |



### 4.1.1 Spatial distribution of the resources

Include maps with distribution of total abundance, spawners and recruits (if available)
In the GSA18 nursery areas of red mullet were localized using few years and the main place was offshore Gargano promontory, while a smaller nursery was localised in fron of Bari. Persistent spawning grounds were mainly identified in the eastern side, along the Albanian coasts at the latitude of Durrës (Fig. 4.1.1-1), on muddy bottom with coastal terrigenous muds biocoenosis (VTC). The main current is from south to north. Other nuclei were identified north of Vlora and along the coasts of Otranto on the west side.


Fig. 4.1.1-1. Position of persistent nursery (left) and spawning (right) areas of red mullet in the GSA18

### 4.1.2 Historical trends

Time series analysis (if available) and graph of the observed trends in abundance, abundance by age class, etc. for each of the directed methods used.


## 5 Ecological information

### 5.1 Protected species potentially affected by the fisheries

This analysis has not been carried out.

### 5.2 Environmental indexes

None environmental index used

## 6 Stock Assessment

In this section there will be one subsection for each different model used, and also different model assumptions runs should be documented when all are presented as alternative assessment options.

### 6.1 XSA

### 6.1.1 Model assumptions

The major assumption of the method is the flat selectivity for the oldest ages (selectivity as classical ogive). The method performs a tuning by survey index by age.
The method was applied using the age data obtained by the slicing of the length frequency distributions of the landing and, as tuning indices, MEDITS survey data.

### 6.1.2 Scripts

The rows related to the best run (shrinkage 2 ) are reported.

```
library(FLCore)
library(FLEDA)
library(FLXSA)
library(FLAssess)
library(FLash)
require(ggplotFL)
require(plyr)
require(FLBRP)
mul.stk <- readFLStock("MUL18.IND", no.discards=TRUE)
units(harvest(mul.stk))<-"f"
range(mul.stk) ["minfbar"] <- 0
range(mul.stk)["maxfbar"] <- 5
mul.stk <- setPlusGroup(mul.stk, 6)
mul.idx <- readFLIndices("MUL18TUN.DAT")
#settings of XSA
FLXSA.control.mul_2 <- FLXSA.control(x=NULL, tol=1e-09, maxit=30, min.nse=0.3,
fse=2, rage=0, qa\overline{ge=4, shk.n=TRUE, shk.f=TRUE, shk.yrs=2, shk.ages=2,}
window=100, tsrange=20, tspower=3, vpa=FALSE)
#plot of the final results
mul.xsa_2 <- FLXSA(mul.stk, mul.idx, FLXSA.control.mul_2)
mul.stk_2 <- mul.stk+mul.xsa_2
plot(mul}.stk_2,main="Shrinka\overline{ge 2")
#diagnostics and residuals
diagnostics(mul.xsa 2)
res2<-as.data.frame(index.res(mul.xsa_2))
res2[["sign"]] = ifelse(res05[["data"]] >= 0, "positive", "negative")
ggplot(data = res2) +geom_point(aes(x=year, y = age,size=abs(data),
colour=sign),shape=16)+ - scale_colour_manual(values = c("positive" = "red",
"negative" = "darkblue")) +scale_size_continuous(breaks= seq(-2, 2, by =
0.2))+ggtitle("Log catchability residuals at age by year Sh2")
#retrospective analysis
mul.stk.retro_2 <- retro(mul.stk, mul.idx, FLXSA.control.mul_2, 3)
plot(mul.stk.retro_2)
```


### 6.1.3 Input data and Parameters

Discards data of 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 were available for the western side and have been included in the assessment. The proportion of the discards of red mullet in the GSA 18 ranged from about $2 \%$ (2013) to about 21\% (2012). Discard data not available (in 2007 and 2008) have been estimated on the basis of the average discard ratio in 2009 and 2010.

|  | Catch-at-age (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age class | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
| 0 | 36582 | 12362 | 18687 | 18791 | 8430 | 122774 | 37065 | 67008 |
| 1 | 29394 | 20889 | 21834 | 15068 | 10157 | 41505 | 27325 | 25183 |
| 2 | 13060 | 8158 | 5132 | 2451 | 3585 | 11515 | 6223 | 3435 |
| $3+$ | 1825 | 708 | 1030 | 356 | 1265 | 1420 | 723 | 512 |

6.1.4 Tuning data

|  |  | Catch-at-age (N/km²) MEDITS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age class | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
| 0 | 271.32 | 38.74 | 97.65 | 135.91 | 422.27 | 5562.94 | 2474.24 | 6827.46 |
| 1 | 231.46 | 198.68 | 277.50 | 239.90 | 429.91 | 1034.52 | 1153.31 | 734.75 |
| 2 | 27.44 | 71.44 | 43.66 | 32.35 | 31.39 | 60.24 | 75.94 | 54.15 |
| 3 | 0.68 | 7.63 | 8.58 | 5.68 | 3.44 | 3.88 | 5.42 | 1.60 |

Additional settings for XSA are listed below:

- Catchability independent of size for ages $>0$
- Catchability independent of age for ages $>2$
- S.E. of the mean to which the estimates are shrunk $=2$
- Minimum standard error for population estimates derived from each fleet $=0.3$


### 6.1.5 Results

Fishing mortality (F) shows the minimum value of 0.23 ( $\overline{\mathrm{F}}$ or $F_{\text {bar }}$ ) in 2011, and a maximum of 0.74 in 2007. Average $F$ for the period of last three years (2012-2014) was 0.48.
The $\mathrm{F}_{0.1}$ value estimated on the basis of the XSA was 0.42 by FLBRP package (FLR library).
The summary of the best run, chosen for the advice is reported below in Fig. 6.1.5-1.

### 6.1.6 Robustness analysis

### 6.1.7 Retrospective analysis, comparison between model runs, sensitivity analysis, etc.

Sensitivity analysis with shrinkage values of $0.5,1.0,1.5$ and 2.0 was performed. A shrinkage of 2.0 (Fig. 6.1.6-1) was taken as the best choice on the basis of both the residuals and the retrospective analysis.


Fig. 6.1.6-1. Log catchability residuals at shrinkage 2.0


Fig. 6.1.6-2. Retrospective analysis results

The residuals do not shows any particular trend and the retrospective analysis seems to be consistent.

### 6.1.8 Assessment quality

Stability of the assessment, evaluation of quality of the data and reliability of model assumptions.

### 6.2 ALADYM

### 6.2.1 Model assumptions

A simulation was also carried out using ALADYM simulation model to evaluate the possible effects of the delay of the size at first capture for the examined stock. This delay can be represented by changes of technical parameters of the trawl gears as well as by the closure of area and /or fishing season. The model belongs to the family of pool-dynamic models, uses a monthly time scale and multi-fleet/gear approach.

This scenario was carried out under the assumption of stable but randomly varying recruitment in the medium terms. This was accomplished projecting forward the geometric mean of recruitment of the last three years. To take into account the uncertainty due to the process error a multiplicative log-normal error with mean 0 and standard deviation 0.3 was applied to the geometric mean of recruitment. Runs were accepted when observed and simulated catches showed lower residuals.

ALADYM model was parameterised using the same inputs as the assessment model: the total mortality by year, the natural mortality at length, the maturity parameters at length, the growth parameters and a selectivity function among the different options of ALADYM, to simulate the commercial catches (for European hake an ogive with deselection effects at larger size, to mimic the species avoidance to the gear and/or accessibility; for red mullet and deep water rose shrimp a usual ogive). For the present and past time the structure of the catches was used to verify the suitability of the selectivity functions of the model, thus taking into account the current selectivity. The change of selectivity was applied to the trawl fleet segments only and effects were estimated on SSB and catches, under the assumptions of $100 \%$ survival of individuals escaped from the codend. The change in selectivity in the forecasts was shaped using the size at first capture that would be determined by a 50 mm square mesh size, on the basis of literature.

### 6.2.2 Scripts

Version 10.1.3 has been used for the assessment. Inputs and parameters are specified in the following paragraphs.

### 6.2.3 Input data and Parameters

Input recruitment and change of the SSB and overall catches
The main fleet segments considered in the simulation were:

- ITA_DTS_0612
- ITA_DTS_1218
- ITA_DTS_1824_2440
- ITA_PGP_0006_0612
- ALB_DTS_1224
- MNE_DFN_0012
- MNE_DTS_0612
- MNE_DTS_1224

Among these only to DTS the management measure was applied.

For red mullet selectivity was modelled using an ogive; the set of selectivity parameters in the projection was:

- $\mathrm{L}_{50 \%}=141 \mathrm{~mm}$ total length
- Selection range 4 mm


### 6.2.4 Results

Comparison between observed and values simulated by ALADYM model for all the fleet segments are provided on Fig. 6.3.4-1.


Fig. 6.3.4-1. Simulated vs. observed landing for various fleet segments used in the assessment.

## 7 Stock predictions

Recruitment was considered stable, but varying randomly. This effect was simulated by forward projections of the geometric mean of the recruitment values of the previous three years. Uncertainty due to the process error was represented by a multiplicative log-normal error with a mean value of 0 and a standard deviation of 0.3.

The scenario focused on applying the 50 mm square mesh size to all trawl fleet segments.

### 7.1 Short term predictions

### 7.2 Medium term predictions



Fig. 7.2-1. Results of the ALADYM simulation

Results showed 200\% increase of the spawning stock biomass in 2021, and regarding catches and an increase of the overall catches of $40 \%$, after a slight decrease just after the application of the management measure.

### 7.3 Long term predictions

## 8 Draft scientific advice

## (Examples in blue)

| Based on | Indicator | Analytic al <br> reference <br> point (name <br> and value) | Current <br> value from <br> the analysis <br> (name and <br> value) | Empirical <br> reference <br> value (name <br> and value) | Trend <br> (time <br> period) | Stock <br> Status |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Fishing mortality | Fishing mortality | $\left(\mathrm{F}_{0.1},=0.42\right)$ | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {curr }}=0.48$ |  | N | $1 \mathrm{O}_{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fishing effort |  |  |  | D |  |
|  | Catch |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stock <br> abundance | Biomass |  |  | Percentiles <br> MEDITS biomass index ( $\mathrm{Kg} / \mathrm{km}^{\wedge} 2$ ): $33^{\text {rd }}: 10.5$ $66^{\text {th }}: 34.5$ <br> Current: 34.6 |  | $\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{L}}$ |
|  | SSB |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recruitment |  |  |  |  | D |  |
| Final Diagnosis |  | $\frac{F_{\text {curr }}}{F_{0.1}}=1.13$ |  |  |  |  |

The production of red mullet in GSA 18 is split in $1.4 \%$ caught by Italian fixed netters, $86.4 \%$ by Italian trawlers, about $2.6 \%$ by Montenegrin trawlers, about $0.3 \%$ by Montenegrin gillnets and trammel nets and about 9.3\% by Albanian trawlers.

### 8.1 Explanation of codes

## Trend categories

1) N - No trend
2) I-Increasing
3) D-Decreasing
4) C - Cyclic

## Stock Status

## Based on Fishing mortality related indicators

1) $\mathbf{N}$ - Not known or uncertain - Not much information is available to make a judgment;
2) $\mathbf{U}$ - undeveloped or new fishery - Believed to have a significant potential for expansion in total production;
3) $\mathbf{S}$ - Sustainable exploitation- fishing mortality or effort below an agreed fishing mortality or effort based Reference Point;
4) $\mathbf{I O}$-In Overfishing status- fishing mortality or effort above the value of the agreed fishing mortality or effort based Reference Point. An agreed range of overfishing levels is provided;

## Range of Overfishing levels based on fishery reference points

In order to assess the level of overfishing status when $\mathrm{F}_{0.1}$ from a Y/R model is used as LRP, the following operational approach is proposed:

- If $\mathrm{Fc}^{*} / \mathrm{F}_{0.1}$ is below or equal to 1.33 the stock is in $\left(\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{L}}\right)$ : Low overfishing
- If the $\mathrm{Fc} / \mathrm{F}_{0.1}$ is between 1.33 and 1.66 the stock is in $\left(\mathrm{O}_{1}\right)$ : Intermediate overfishing
- If the $\mathrm{Fc} / \mathrm{F}_{0.1}$ is equal or above to 1.66 the stock is in $\left(\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{H}}\right)$ : High overfishing
*Fc is current level of F

5) C- Collapsed- no or very few catches;

## Based on Stock related indicators

1) $\mathbf{N}$ - Not known or uncertain: Not much information is available to make a judgment
2) S - Sustainably exploited: Standing stock above an agreed biomass based Reference Point;
3) O-Overexploited: Standing stock below the value of the agreed biomass based Reference Point. An agreed range of overexploited status is provided;

Empirical Reference framework for the relative level of stock biomass index

- Relative low biomass: Values lower than or equal to $33^{\text {rd }}$ percentile of biomass index in the time series $\left(\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{L}}\right)$
- Relative intermediate biomass: Values falling within this limit and $66^{\text {th }}$ percentile ( $\mathrm{O}_{1}$ )
- Relative high biomass: Values higher than the $66^{\text {th }}$ percentile $\left(O_{H}\right)$

4) D - Depleted: Standing stock is at lowest historical levels, irrespective of the amount of fishing effort exerted;
5) R-Recovering: Biomass are increasing after having been depleted from a previous period;

## Agreed definitions as per SAC Glossary

Overfished (or overexploited) - A stock is considered to be overfished when its abundance is below an agreed biomass based reference target point, like B0.1 or BMSY. To apply this denomination, it should be assumed that the current state of the stock (in biomass) arises from the application of excessive fishing pressure in previous years. This classification is independent of the current level of fishing mortality.

Stock subjected to overfishing (or overexploitation) - A stock is subjected to overfishing if the fishing mortality applied to it exceeds the one it can sustainably stand, for a longer period. In other words, the current fishing mortality exceeds the fishing mortality that, if applied during a long period, under stable conditions, would lead the stock abundance to the reference point of the target abundance (either in terms of biomass or numbers)

