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## Line-transect surveys

- Six surveys 1994-2022
- Ship-based and/or aerial
- All corrected for observer and porpoise availability bias
- Differences in survey area:
- 1994 not included in trend analysis
- 2005, 2012 post-stratified



## Bayesian trend analysis

- Incorporates all sources of uncertainty
- High CV $\rightarrow$ low influence, low CV $\rightarrow$ high influence
- 2005-2022 $=18$ years
- Trend: -2.68\% (95\% CI -4.13 to +1.26\%)/year
- $90.5 \%$ probability of a negative trend



## Mortality limit calculation

Population model based on:

- Bycatch vulnerability sex ratio
- Birth rate sex ratio
- Age distribution sexually mature females
- Max longevity
- Age-specific bycatch risk
- Age-specific survival ${ }^{N}$
$N=$ from North Sea pop



## Mortality limit calculation

1. Run the model for unmanaged bycatch for 60 years until today (1963-2022). Aim: Get starting points to calculate scenarios for today's depleted population.
2. Run the model managed bycatch during 100 years from today (2022-2121). Managed = no bycatch above mPBR mortality limit: $N_{\text {min }} * 1 / 2 R_{\text {max }} * F_{r}$ Test recovery factor $\left(F_{\mathrm{r}}\right)=0.1,0.2, \ldots, 1.0$.
Aim: Find which $F_{r}$ is needed to reach the conservation goal.
3. Calculate mPBR limit using the $F_{r}$ needed to reach the conservation goal.

## Mortality limit calculation

Step 1: Run model during unmanaged bycatch, i.e. up to today

- Rough starting point $\mathrm{K}=50,000$ animals
- Stochastic removals $0.1 \%$ to $5 \%$ of K
- Run model 10,000 times for 60 years
- Selected all end points $30 \%-70 \%$ of $K$ = starting points in step 2



## Mortality limit calculation

Step 2: Run the model during managed bycatch, calculating future scenarios, using:

- End points from step 1 as starting points
- Base-case scenario no bias + bias in 8 single parameters + bias in 2 parameters, for CV abundance $=0.2$ and $0.4 \Rightarrow 20$ combinations
- For $F_{r}$ from 0.1, 0.2 ... 1.0
- Run for 100 years
- Check which $F_{r}$ is needed to reach the conservation objective $80 \% \mathrm{~K}$ with $80 \%$ probability in 100 years


Base-case scenario: CV abundance $=0.2$, no other bias (all default values), $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{r}}=0.1$


B


Finding Fr for base-case scenario with $\mathrm{CV}=0.2$ : $\mathrm{Fr}=0.2$ is OK

| Robustness trial | Scenario | n | q | MNPL | $\mathrm{K}_{\text {trend }}$ | Frequency | $\mathrm{R}_{\text {max }}$ | CV | b.byc | b.abund | b. $\mathrm{R}_{\text {max }}$ | byc.CV | cata. | $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base case scenario | 0A | 302 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1 | 6 | 0.04 | 0.2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.2 |
|  | 0B | 298 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1 | 6 | 0.04 | 0.4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.3 |
| Bycatch underestimation | 1A | 302 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1 | 6 | 0.04 | 0.2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.1 |
|  | 1B | 298 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1 | 6 | 0.04 | 0.4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.1 |
| Abundance overestimation | 2A | 302 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1 | 6 | 0.04 | 0.2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.1 |
|  | 2B | 298 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1 | 6 | 0.04 | 0.4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.1 |
| Maximum <br> Productivity rate underestimation | 3A | 302 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1 | 6 | 0.04 | 0.2 | 1 | 1 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.4 |
|  | 3B | 298 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1 | 6 | 0.04 | 0.4 | 1 | 1 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.6 |
| Higher bycatch coefficient of variation | 5A | 302 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1 | 6 | 0.04 | 0.2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.2 | 0 | 0.2 |
|  | 5B | 298 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1 | 6 | 0.04 | 0.4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.2 | 0 | 0.2 |
| Lower survey frequency | 6A | 302 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1 | 10 | 0.04 | 0.2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.2 |
|  | 6B | 298 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1 | 10 | 0.04 | 0.4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.2 |
| Lower MNPL | 7A | 289 | 0.2 | 0.45 | 1 | 6 | 0.04 | 0.2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | NA |
|  | 7B | 311 | 0.2 | 0.45 | 1 | 6 | 0.04 | 0.4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.1 |
| Higher MNPL + bycatch underestimation | 8A | 298 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 1 | 6 | 0.04 | 0.2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.4 |
|  | 8B | 302 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 1 | 6 | 0.04 | 0.4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.4 |
| Catastrophic events happening | 9A | 302 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1 | 6 | 0.04 | 0.2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
|  | 9B | 298 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1 | 6 | 0.04 | 0.4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Carrying capacity degradation | 10A | 302 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 6 | 0.04 | 0.2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.4 |
|  | 10B | 298 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 6 | 0.04 | 0.4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.5 |

## Mortality limit results

- $\mathrm{N}_{\text {min }}=12,091$ animals, from SCANSIV (14,403; CV = 0.21)
$\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{r}}$ needed to reach conservation objective with $\mathrm{CV}=0.2$ :
- 3 scenarios: $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{r}}=0.4$
- 7 scenarios: $F_{r}=0.1$ or 0.2
- Bycatch underestimation scenario:
$F_{r}=0.1$
- Step 3: $\mathrm{mPBR}=\mathrm{N}_{\text {min }} * 1 / 2 \mathrm{R}_{\max } * \mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{r}}$


## Conclusions

- Population is in decline
- Mortality limit to reach conservation objective with bias in e.g. bycatch: 24 animals/year
- Current bycatch in DK and SE, excluding DE: ~900 animals/year
- Confirm Vulnerable status, conservation actions needed

