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## 2018 PBF stock assessment

* Meeting logistics

O March 5th to 12th at La Jolla, CA, USA.
O Participants: 26 scientists from
U.S.A., Japan, Korea, Mexico, Taiwan, IATTC, and SPC

* Update assessment

O Up-to-date data until June 2017.

- Basically the same demographic assumption (same model construction).
* Projection

O A projection for the current measures.
O Some projections under new HCR.
Report
○ ISC 2018 Annex 14 (SA/WP/06)


## Overview of 2018 assessment model

* A fully integrated model (Stock Synthesis-Version 3)

O Length-based, age-structured ( $0-20+$ ) model

- From 1952 to 2016
* Pan-Pacific Assessment

O No-spatially defined model (Area as Fleet approach)
Fishery definitions

- 19 Fisheries (Catch \& Size comp (if available))
- 3 CPUEs (TWN \& JPN Longlines, JPN Troll)
* Given biological traits (Growth, Maturity, Natural mortality)
* Estimate initial conditions, population scale, recruitments, and fishery selectivity


## Assumption of Population dynamics

* Age-specific Natural mortality

○ 1.6@age-0, 0.386@age-1, 0.25@age-2+

* Age-specific Maturity

○ 20\%@age-3, 50\%@age-4, 100\%@age-5+

* Growth, Length-Weight relationship

$$
=249.9 \times(1-\quad . \quad \times(\quad . \quad))
$$

* Stock Recruitment Relationship (S-RR)

O Beverton-holt Relationship ( $\mathrm{h}=0.999$, S.D. of $\log$ Rec. $=0.6$ )

* Selectivity of Fisheries

O Time varying selectivity

## What are updated ?

* Input data were updated.

O Catch (2015-2016)
○ CPUE (Whole time series, -2016)
$\checkmark$ TWN \& JPN Longlines, JPN Troll.

- The same standardization methods with previous assessment.
- Size composition
$\checkmark 6$ purse seines, 3 longlines, 3 set-nets, 2 trolls.
$\checkmark$ updated from 2014 (KOR PS, TWN LL, MEX PS)
or 2015 (the rest of the fleets).
* Basically the same demographic assumptions.

O Extend the last year of time varying selectivity.

## Catch by gear

## Catch by gear



## Catch per Unit of Effort based abundance index



## Size Composition data
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## Example of the updated composition data

Fleet 1 JPLL


Fleet 12 TWLL South
Fleet 14 MXCOMM


Updated

## Results

* Goodness of fit to

O CPUE based abundance indices

- Size composition
* Likelihood profile over population scale
* Retrospective diagnostics
* Assessment results

O SSB and Recruitment
O F at Age
O Kobe plot
O Impact plot

## Goodness of fit to CPUEs



S2: Jpn Longline (1952-1973)
S3: Jpn Longline (1974-1992)




S9: Twn Longline (2000-2016)


## Average fits to Size Compositions














## Likelihood profiles over fixed scaling parameter

* Each component marked the lowest likelihood around at maximum likelihood estimate (MLE) of $\log \left(R_{0}\right)$.

○ CPUE (9.5), Size comp. (9.5), Recruitment Penalty (9.6)
O Consistency regarding the population scale estimates.


## Retrospective Analysis

* No substantial pattern in recent 3-4 terminal years in the SSB estimates although those of 5 year and above might be slightly underestimated.
* Recruitment estimates are basically consistent.




## Assessment results

* Base case model derived consistent results with the previous assessment.
- SSB fluctuated over time; declined during 1996-2010, and increased since 2011.
- Recruitments in 2015 and 2016 are lower and higher than the historical average.




## Age specific fishing mortality

O Substantial decrease of $F$ is observed in ages 0-2 in 2015-2016.
O Note that stricter management measures in IATTC and WCPFC have been in place since 2015.


## Stock Trajectory

|  | Initial <br> rebuilding <br> target | Second <br> rebuilding <br> target | 1995 <br> (recent high) | $2002-2004$ <br> (reference <br> year) | (5 years ago) | (latest) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Biomass <br> $\left(\% \mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{F}=0}\right)$ | $\mathrm{SSB}_{\text {med } 1952-2014}$ <br> $=6.7 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $10.4 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ |
| fishing <br> intensity <br> $(\mathrm{SPR})$ | $6.7 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $5.1 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ |



2018/8/


WCPFC SC 14

Only recent 30 years


## Fishery impact plot

O Historically, the WPO coastal fisheries has had the greatest impact.
O Since about the mid-2000s, the WPO purse seine fleets targeting small PBF (age 0-1), have had the greatest impact.

O The impact of the EPO fishery was large before the mid-1980s, decreasing significantly thereafter.


## Projection

## Projection model overview

* Age-structured forward projection model (ssfuturePBF)

O Identical model structure with the stock assessment of PBF
O Given growth, maturity and Natural mortality which are identical with those used in the stock assessment

O Age-specific quarterly Fishing mortality of each fleet were assumed to be past particular year in the assessment (e.g. 2002-04).

O Catch upper limit could be set to depict a management measure.
O Two recruitment scenarios (low (1980-1989) and average (1952-2016))

* Projection time period
- From 2016 to 2034

O Initial condition (2016) was based on the stock assessment result.

* Uncertainty

O 300 bootstrap replicates followed by 20 recruitments resampling.

## Recruitment Scenario for Projection

- Specified by WCPFC HS-02.
- Low recruitment scenario until the initial rebuilding target being achieved and average recruitment thereafter.
- Recent 10-year recruitment is more optimistic than low recruitment scenario.



## Fishing mortality and Catch controls in projection

When the stock remains at low,
Catch does not meet its upper limit even fishery operates at given Fishing mortality (F).

Once the stock gets recovery, fishery could get better yield with same given $F$. In the projection, when the catch approaches to its limit, $F$ is adjusted or to be 0 (ban) to maintain catch limit.


## Projection with the current CMMs

O The projection of Status Quo (Scenario 0) resulted in an 98\% probability of achieving the initial rebuilding target.
O More optimistic result than the 2016 projection is mainly due to the relatively good recruitment of 2016 year class.


- Scenario 2016 (2016 assessment )
- Scenario 0 (low R)
——Scenario 1 (R_switch_at SSBmed)

Second rebuilding target (20\%SSB0)
Initial rebuilding target $\left(\right.$ SSB $\left._{\text {med 1952-2014 }}\right)$

## Retrospective Analysis for recruitment estimates

O Troll CPUE (Age-0 fishery) and size composition were main sources of information about recruitment strength.

O Recruitment estimates are basically consistent even when new size composition data is added.


## Sensitivity exercise for troll age-0 abundance index

__ A model with age-0 index
A model without age-0 index



## Kobe plot for the future periods ("La J olla Plot")



## Summary of the assessment

O ISC conducted an update assessment with the up-to-date data until 2016 fishing year (-June, 2017).

O The model represents the data sufficiently and results were consistent with the 2016 assessment.

O ISC concluded that the 2018 assessment results were the best available science information.

O The 2018 projection results are more optimistic, mainly due to the relatively good recruitment in the terminal year ( 2016 YC ).

O Based on the performance analyses of the recruitment estimates, 2016 recruitment was included in the projections.

Additional projections in response to the WCPFC Harvest Strategy 2017-02

## What's described in the WCPFC HS-2017-02?

WCPFC Harvest Strategy (HS-2017-02)

- Be prepared by the WCPFC NC \& IATTC joint WG.
- Provided two rebuilding targets, a HCR, and an assumption for future recruitment.
- Requested to conduct some projections based on the new HCR.


## Request for Projections under new HCR

If the projection indicates that the probability of achieving the initial rebuilding target is at 75\% or larger, ISC will be requested to provide relevant information on potential catch limit increases.

0 as long as the probability of reaching the initial rebuilding target is maintained at $70 \%$ or larger, and the probability of reaching the $2^{\text {nd }}$ rebuilding target by the agreed deadline remains at least $60 \%$.

## Recruitment assumptions for projection

O The Initial rebuilding period (until the stock meets SSB $_{\text {med1952-2014 }}$ ); Resampling from the relatively low recruitment period (1980-1989).

O The $2^{\text {nd }}$ rebuilding period (from next year of initial rebuilding period); Resampling from the entire assessment period.

## Scenarios with potential catch limit increase

Scenario 1: Approximation of the CMMs in force by the IATTC \& WCPFC. (Scenario 0): Same with the scenario 1, but low recruitment continues.
Scenario 2: Same catch limit with HS1, but no effort control (Constant Catch).
Scenario 3: 5\% increase of catch limit for all fleets from scenario 2.
Scenario 4: 10\% increase of catch limit for all fleets from scenario 2.
Scenario 5: 15\% increase of catch limit for all fleets from scenario 2.

| Scenario \# | WPO |  |  |  |  |  |  | EPO*3 |  | Catch limit Increase |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fishing mortality*1 | Catch limit |  |  |  |  | Catch limit |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Japan*2 |  | Korea |  | Taiwan | Commercial |  | Sports | WPO |  | EPO |  |
|  |  | Small | Large | Small | Large | Large | Small | Large |  | Small | Large | Small | Large |
| $0 * 4$ | F | 4,007 | 4,882 |  | 18 | 1,700 |  | 00 | - |  | \% |  |  |
| 1 | F | 4,007 | 4,882 |  | 18 | 1,700 |  | 0 | - |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | F x 2.0 | 4,007 | 4,882 |  | 18 | 1,700 |  | 00 | - |  | \% |  |  |
| 3 | F x 2.0 | 4,207 | 5,126 |  | 54 | 1,785 |  | 65 | - |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | F x 2.0 | 4,408 | 5,370 |  | 0 | 1,870 |  | 630 | - |  | \% |  |  |
| 5 | F x 2.0 | 4,608 | 5,614 |  | 26 | 1,955 |  | 95 | - |  | \% |  |  |

## Results of the projections

| Scenarios | Catch limit increase | Probability of achieving |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Initial rebuilding target | $2^{\text {nd }}$ rebuilding target |
| Scenario 0 | - | 98\% | 3\% |
| Scenario 1 | - | 99\% | 96\% |
| Scenario 2 | - | 96\% | 96\% |
| Scenario 3 | 5\% | 91\% | 93\% |
| Scenario 4 | 10\% | 83\% | 90\% |
| Scenario 5 | 15\% | 74\% | 85\% |



## Results of the projections for catch limit increase

O All of the scenarios provided were confirmed to achieve the rebuilding targets with the probability prescribed in the WCPFC Harvest Strategy.


## What did we do further?

- Investigating the possible effect if the increase of catch limit was differentiated between small and large fish.

| Scenario \# | WPO |  |  |  |  |  |  | Catch limit Increase |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Catch limit |  |  |  | Catch limit |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Japan Small Large | Korea |  | $\frac{\text { Taiwan }}{\text { Large }}$ | Commercial |  | Sports | WPO |  | EPO |  |
|  |  | Small | Large |  | Small | Large |  | Small | Large | Small | Large |
| 6 | 4,207 5,858 | 528 | 258 | 2,040 | 1,733 | 1,980 | - | 5\% | 20\% | 5\% | 20\% |
| 7 | 4,207 5,858 | 528 | 258 | 2,040 | 1,815 | 1,815 | - | 5\% | 20\% | 10\% | 10\% |
| 8 | 4,408 5,370 | 553 | 237 | 1,870 | 1,733 | 1,980 | - | 10\% | 10\% | 5\% | 20\% |
| 9 | 4,207 6,591 | 528 | 291 | 2,295 | 1,733 | 2,228 | - | 5\% | 35\% | 5\% | 35\% |
| 10 | 4,207 6,591 | 528 | 291 | 2,295 | 1,898 | 1,898 | - | 5\% | 35\% | 15\% | 15\% |
| 11 | 4,608 5,614 | 578 | 248 | 1,955 | 1,733 | 2,228 | - | 15\% | 15\% | 5\% | 35\% |
| 12 | 4,408 5,858 | 553 | 258 | 2,040 | 1,815 | 1,980 | - | 10\% | 20\% | 10\% | 20\% |
| 13 | 4,408 5,858 | 553 | 258 | 2,040 | 1,898 | 1,898 | - | 10\% | 20\% | 15\% | 15\% |
| 14 | 4,608 5,614 | 578 | 248 | 1,955 | 1,815 | 1,980 | - | 15\% | 15\% | 10\% | 20\% |
| 15 | 4,408 6,347 | 553 | 280 | 2,210 | 1,815 | 2,145 | - | 10\% | 30\% | 10\% | 30\% |
| 16 | 4,408 6,347 | 553 | 280 | 2,210 | 1,898 | 1,898 | - | 10\% | 30\% | 15\% | 15\% |
| 17 | 4,608 5,614 | 578 | 248 | 1,955 | 1,815 | 2,145 | - | 15\% | 15\% | 10\% | 30\% |

## Why did we do that?

- The most of catch in number were occupied by ages 0-1 fish.


Fishing year
$\square$ Age0 $\square$ Age1 $\square$ Age2 $\square$ Age3 $\square$ Age4 $\square$ Age5 $\square$ Age6 $\square$ Age7 $\square$ Age8 $\square$ Age9 $\square$ Age10+

## Difference of the Impact of fishery by catch at age

* Same weight of catch has different impact on the stock by age.

○ 1 ton of catch $\fallingdotseq 500$ of age $-0(2 \mathrm{~kg}$ of body weight) $\fallingdotseq 20$ of age $-3(49 \mathrm{~kg})$.
O Catching a high number of small fish can have a greater impact on future spawning stock biomass than catching the same weight of large fish.


| Age | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | 6 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Body weight | 2 | 11 | 27 | 49 | 75 | 102 | 130 | 156 |
| Fish/ton | 502 | 92 | 37 | 20 | 13 | 10 | 8 | 6 |

## Results of the different increment fraction scenarios

O All of the examined scenarios were confirmed to achieve the initial and second rebuilding targets given the recruitment assumption.

| Scenario \# | Catch limit Increase |  |  |  | Initial rebuilding target |  |  | Second rebuilding target |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { SSB } \\ (\mathbf{m t}) \\ \text { at } 2034 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | The year expected to achieve the target with $>\mathbf{6 0 \%}$ probability | Probability of achiving the target at 2024 | Probability of SSB is below the target at 2024 under the low recruitment | The year expected to achieve the target with $>60 \%$ probability | Probability of achiving the target at 2034 |  |
|  | Small | Large | Small | Large |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 5\% | 20\% | 5\% | 20\% | 2021 | 94\% | 6\% | 2028 | 95\% | 255,672 |
| 7 | 5\% | 20\% | 10\% | 10\% | 2021 | 94\% | 6\% | 2028 | 95\% | 248,911 |
| 8 | 10\% | 10\% | 5\% | 20\% | 2021 | 92\% | 9\% | 2029 | 94\% | 214,278 |
| 9 | 5\% | 35\% | 5\% | 35\% | 2021 | 93\% | 9\% | 2029 | 94\% | 246,153 |
| 10 | 5\% | 35\% | 15\% | 15\% | 2021 | 93\% | 9\% | 2029 | 94\% | 247,409 |
| 11 | 15\% | 15\% | 5\% | 35\% | 2021 | 84\% | 16\% | 2029 | 91\% | 233,055 |
| 12 | 10\% | 20\% | 10\% | 20\% | 2021 | 89\% | 11\% | 2029 | 93\% | 243,491 |
| 13 | 10\% | 20\% | 15\% | 15\% | 2021 | 89\% | 11\% | 2029 | 93\% | 243,223 |
| 14 | 15\% | 15\% | 10\% | 20\% | 2021 | 85\% | 16\% | 2029 | 91\% | 234,203 |
| 15 | 10\% | 30\% | 10\% | 30\% | 2021 | 87\% | 14\% | 2029 | 92\% | 237,742 |
| 16 | 10\% | 30\% | 15\% | 15\% | 2021 | 88\% | 13\% | 2029 | 92\% | 238,957 |
| 17 | 15\% | 15\% | 10\% | 30\% | 2021 | 84\% | 17\% | 2029 | 90\% | 232,769 |

## Results

O All of the examined scenarios were confirmed to achieve the initial and second rebuilding targets given the recruitment assumption.
O The results showed that the measures protecting small fish are more effective than those protecting large fish for rebuilding.

| Scenario \# | Catch limit Increase |  | Probability of achieving |  | Probability of SSB is below the initial target at 2024 under the low recruitment | Expected annual catch in 2024 (ton) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | WPO | EPO | initial <br> rebuilding target | second <br> rebuilding <br> target |  |  |
|  | Small Large | Small Large |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 15\% 15\% | 15\% | 74\% | 85\% | 24\% | 16,641 |
| 12 | 10\% 20\% | 10\% 20\% | 89\% | 93\% | 11\% | 16,841 |

## Summary for the projections under new HCR

O In accordance with WCPFC HS 02, ISC conducted additional projections with various combination of the increase of catch limit.

O All of the examined scenarios were confirmed to achieve the initial and second rebuilding targets given the recruitment assumption.
O The projection results also show that the measures protecting small fish are more effective than those protecting large fish to rebuild the stock.

## $1^{\text {st }}$ ISC Pacific Bluefin tuna MSE Workshop



30-31 May 2018
Yokohama, Japan

- 72 participants: fishery managers, stakeholders, NGOs, and scientists
○ Talks and discussions:
To learn about and understand the MSE process (Dinardo);
Requirements to implement an MSE (Nakatsuka);
Recent progress by ALBWG and other RFMOs (Holmes);
O First step for PBF MSE
O Results will be presented for NC-IATTC Joint Meeting in Sept .


## Thank you

