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Introduction

• Previous assessment conducted in 2003.
• Model period 1972-2004.
• Update with the inclusion of further two years data (catch, effort, LF). Additional tag data from northern area.
• GLM indices for equatorial PS fishery.
• Sensitivity analyses – incremental increase in PS fishing power.
• Current biomass and F relative to reference points, yield estimates.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CPUE

Standardised indices for all JP Offshore PL, PS fisheries, JP DW PL.

Equatorial PS GLM indices (NEW).

Sensitivity: PS equatorial fisheries (5% increase pa) – grey line.
Length data

Good coverage for most fisheries.

Converse temporal trends in fish size between PL (increasing) and equatorial PS (declining).
Tag data

Large tag data set.

Japanese and “OFP” releases.

Japanese releases in equatorial regions not included due to concern about different reporting rate.
Model structure – key assumptions

- PL catchability constant over time (all).
- Constant tag RR for all JP fisheries.
- Constant tag RR for all Equatorial PS fisheries.
- Selectivity equivalent for all PL fisheries.
- M-at-age estimated.
- Regional recruitment distribution fixed.
- Age specific quarterly movement.
- Broad prior on steepness of SRR.
Model diagnostics

- Very good fit to the catch data.
- No strong trends in the effort deviations.
- LF data – good fit to aggregated data, some temporal trends in residuals.
- Tagging data – very good fit to aggregated data, some discrepancies by fishery.
- Estimated tagging report rates comparable to assumed/measured level for most fisheries.
- Estimated growth rate very similar to GR derived from otolith increments (Tanabe et al. 2003).
- Natural mortality at age comparable to estimates derived from tag data (Hampton 2000).
Diagnostics – LF data
Increasingly underestimating the proportion of larger fish in the JP DW PL catch.
Diagnostics – tagging data
Catchability

Constant for JP PL fisheries.

Increasing for equatorial PS fisheries.
Movement

Quarterly movement coefficients scaled to recent age composition.

Main movement occurring south into region 4.
Recruitment

Most of recruitment within regions 5 and 6 and also 4.

Extremely high recent recruitment in 5 and 6.
Biomass

Most of biomass in regions 4 (?), 5, and 6.

High variation in region 6.

Recent sharp increase in region 5.
Outstanding issues

- Extremely high biomass in Region 4 relative to level of catch. Biomass level largely driven by tagging data – large releases and very few recoveries in late 1980s.
- Higher level of biomass in region 6 compared to region 5.
- Recent high recruitment.
Comparison

Much higher biomass in Region 4 and Region 6.

Lowered biomass level in Region 5.

Most likely driven by differences in tag reporting rate.

And the inclusion of additional years of data when high catches taken from Region 6.

Differences in northern regions relate to assumed constant $q$ in current assessment.
Fishery impacts

Fished and unfished total biomass.

Region 5 impact about 25%. WCPO 15%.

Similar levels of impact on the PS exploitable biomass.
Two alternative priors on steepness for SRR.
Reference points and yields

MSY yields 2.0 M mt or 2.7 M mt
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management quantity</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Base-case</th>
<th>High steepness</th>
<th>PS_power</th>
<th>PL56-fixq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{Y}_F$</td>
<td>t per quarter</td>
<td>227,000</td>
<td>231,000</td>
<td>229,000</td>
<td>207,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{Y}_{MSY}$ (or MSY)</td>
<td>t per quarter</td>
<td>499,000</td>
<td>664,000</td>
<td>482,000</td>
<td>326,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tilde{B}_0$</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>7,401,000</td>
<td>7,261,000</td>
<td>7,436,000</td>
<td>8,958,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tilde{B}_F$</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>5,989,000</td>
<td>6,060,000</td>
<td>5,589,000</td>
<td>6,628,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{B}_{MSY}$</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>2,907,000</td>
<td>2,576,000</td>
<td>2,636,000</td>
<td>3,694,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{S}\bar{B}_0$</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>6,025,000</td>
<td>5,912,000</td>
<td>6,130,000</td>
<td>7,486,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{S}\bar{B}_F$</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>4,669,000</td>
<td>4,720,000</td>
<td>4,337,000</td>
<td>5,317,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{S}\bar{B}_{MSY}$</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>1,865,000</td>
<td>1,381,000</td>
<td>1,618,000</td>
<td>2,726,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{current}$</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>8,744,000</td>
<td>8,720,000</td>
<td>7,772,000</td>
<td>10,764,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SB_{current}$</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>6,929,000</td>
<td>6,910,000</td>
<td>6,186,000</td>
<td>8,742,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{current,F=0}$</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>10,113,000</td>
<td>10,088,000</td>
<td>9,481,000</td>
<td>12,601,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{B}_{current}/\bar{B}_0$</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{B}_{current}/\tilde{B}_F$</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{current}/\bar{B}_{MSY}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{current}/B_{current,F=0}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SB_{current}/\bar{S}\bar{B}_0$</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SB_{current}/\bar{S}\bar{B}_F$</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SB_{current}/\bar{S}\bar{B}_{MSY}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{B}_F/\bar{B}_0$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{S}\bar{B}_F/\bar{S}\bar{B}_0$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{B}_{MSY}/\bar{B}_0$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{S}\bar{B}_{MSY}/\bar{S}\bar{B}_0$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{current}/\bar{F}_{MSY}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{B}<em>F/\bar{B}</em>{MSY}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{S}\bar{B}<em>F/\bar{S}\bar{B}</em>{MSY}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{Y}_F/MSY$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

• Overfishing not occurring \( \left( \frac{F_{\text{current}}}{F_{\text{MSY}}} = 0.1-0.3 \right) \) and not in an overfished state \( \left( \frac{B_{\text{current}}}{B_{\text{MSY}}} = 3.0 \right) \).

• Scenario of increased PS fishing power (5% pa) does not change conclusions regarding stock status.

• Increased yields available from the fishery, but MSY level highly uncertain. Current assessment may be “buffered” by uncertain estimates of biomass in some regions (4 and, to a lesser extent, 6).

• Improvement in current assessment would require large-scale tagging programme, principally in equatorial region.