Stock Assessment of Outside Lingcod

Assessment framework, straw dog model,
diagnostics and estimates

REVISION 1







Outside Lingcod Technical Working Group
Presentation 2
21st March 2024

Tom Carruthers
(tom@bluematterscience.com)

Resources / Links:

https://blue-matter.github.io/lingcod-outside-io

Contents

1. Assessment framework

- Stock Synthesis (v3.30.22, October 31 2023) (Methot & Wetzel 2013). Well established, and allows for sex-specific modelling and statistical catch at length if required. Some experience here with using it in BC for dogfish for example.
- r4ss (v1.49.1, 2023 – from GitHub) (Taylor et al. 2021)
- R (v4.3.2)



7.1. Straw dog model & data

Straw dog model: overview of input data

1. **Survey indices do not cover the early period that experience large catches (contrast).**
2. **Most contributory commercial fleet has no composition data since 2010.**
3. **Second most contributory commercial fleet has only one year of age composition data in 1984 of low sample size.**
4. Recreational fleet has no composition data (but we may have found some sparse data)
5. IPHC survey is longest but has only a single year of age composition data
6. Recent age composition data are lacking (2019 onwards)



Interpretation of bubble area:

Quantity of catch

Magnitude of index

Sample size

Straw-dog model: fleet and survey setup

Fleet	Data	Assumed female selectivity
Bottom trawl	Catch, age composition (length composition)	Double normal
Hook & line	Catch, age composition (length composition)	Double normal
Recreational	Catch, (age composition, length composition)	Mirrors hook and line

Survey	Data	Assumed female selectivity
Synoptic	Index, Age composition (length composition)	Double normal
HBLL	Index, Age composition (length composition)	Double normal
IPHC	Index, Age composition (length composition)	Double normal
Triennial	Index only	Mirrors Bottom trawl

Female double normal selectivity estimates only ascending / descending width + peak (3 parameters)
Male adjusts apical value(q) + ascending / descending width, peak is mirrored (4 parameters)

Straw-dog model parameters / data weighting

Input parameter	Fixed point value (unless otherwise stated)
Natural mortality rate, *M*	0.285 (f) 0.245(m)
von. Bert. maximum growth rate, *K*	0.15(f) 0.27(m)
von. Bert. asymptotic length, *Linf*	114.7(f) 82.8(m)
von. Bert. Age at length zero, t_0	-1.35 (f) -0.86 (m)
Length – weight, *alpha* (W = *alpha* x L ^ *beta*)	3.11 E-6 (f) 2.45 E-6(m)
Length – weight, *beta* (W = *alpha* x L ^ *beta*)	3.25 (f) 3.32(m)
Coefficient of variation of length at age	0.10 (f) 0.09 (m)
Inflection point of logistic maturity ogive (A50)	9.1 (f)
Slope of logistic maturity ogive	-0.75 (f) (as reported in SS input file)
Bev.-Holt steepness (mean unfished recruitment at 1/5 unfished spawning biomass), *h*	Estimated [0.5 – 1.0] from weakly informative beta prior
Fraction of recruits that are female	50%
Standard deviation in lognormal rec. deviations, σ_R	0.5
Effective annual sample size for age composition (among years within fleet)	20

Straw dog likelihood functions and priors

Data / prior	Likelihood function / prior
Annual catches	Lognormal (sd = 0.025)
Survey indices	Lognormal (‘empirically derived precision’)
Age compositions	Multinomial (mean annual ESS is 40 within fleet)
Steepness	Estimated [0.5 – 1.0] from weakly informative beta prior
Selectivity priors (various double normal)	Very weak beta prior to avoid nearing bounds and local minima

Steepness



Selectivity parameter (descending width)



A note on data weighting

Raw data:



Weighted data has same mean among areas within fleet (each row has a mean of 50 for example):



7.2. Base Case model diagnostics and estimates

Only evaluated for basic diagnostics

- Objective function gradient is lower than specified tolerance: 1E-5
- Model reliably converges on MLE parameter estimates from different initial parameter values.
- Model is sufficiently stable to profile on key model inputs such as natural mortality rate, steepness, recruitment variability. I.e., we can correctly interpret sensitivity analyses.
- Did not simulation self-test (if anything, a highly favourable test that, when I did the exercise, the majority of Stock Synthesis models appear to fail based on bias and precision in simulated / estimated management quantities).

Early Base Case model diagnostics: fit to survey indices

Generally good to very good fit to the three survey indices.

Some evidence of possible hyperdepletion (over responsiveness) in the IPHC survey. Maybe simply an issue with early data (1995 – 2000)

Age composition data inform selectivities that allow for lags in changes to the vulnerable biomass.



Base Case model diagnostics: fit to age composition data

Very good fit (on aggregate) to the most heavily sampled time series (Bottom trawl and synoptic)

Some issues of fit for data collected in smaller frequencies for one or two years (HBLL, HookLine, IPHC)





Base Case model diagnostics: fit to age composition data





Estimated ‘selectivities’



Mirrors HookLine

Mirrors BottomTrawl

Base Case model estimates: SSB, F, Recruitment

Median
50% CI
80% CI
20% / 40% SSB0
40% / 80% SSBMSY*





*SSBMSY / SSB0 ≈ 15%

Base Case model estimates: projection of current (approx.) F

Median
50% CI
80% CI
20% / 40% SSB0
40% / 80% SSBMSY



Base Case model estimates: SSB - Recruitment

Very little information regarding resilience (recruitment-driven biomass and no model estimates at low SSB)

Appearance of resilience may simply be a product of recruitment-driven SSB (the ‘mad scientist’ problem)



Straw dog model diagnostics 2: jitter analysis (numerical stability / definition in estimation problem)



Without Triennial



With Triennial





Straw dog model diagnostics 2: parameter profiling (CAA effective sample size)





Straw dog model diagnostics 2: parameter profiling (steepness)





Straw dog model diagnostics 2: parameter profiling (M)





Base Case model summary

Diagnostics

- Generally good to very good fit to survey data.
- Poor fit to some age composition data may be forgivable given low sample sizes.
- Scale better informed my inclusion of the (older) triennial survey.
- Some conflict in inference of scale among and within age-comps and surveys.
- Relatively certain pseudo management recommendations (OFL = FMSY x Vuln.Bio).

Estimates

- Recruitment driven pulses in vulnerable biomass / SSB (1985, 1998-2000, 2016).
- Strong recent age class (2016) leading to recent increases in VB and SSB (note that no comp data after 2019 so informed by only a handful of data points).
- Steepness is poorly informed and tends weakly to 1 – potentially problematic for reference points and numerical stability of the model. This is also a known issue for fisheries where variability in SSB is driven substantially by recruitment strength.
- Relative to both SSBMSY and SSB0 reference points, the model is underfished and projections of current fishing mortality suggest it is also subject to underfishing.

7.3. Where to go with Base Case model?

Do we continue with the sex-specific SS3 model with three fleets, three surveys, statistical catch at age?

If so:

- Investigate more restrictive selectivities for fleets / surveys.
- Evaluate impact of including length composition data – does it add any useful information or simply further conflict among data sources?
- Consider including age composition data for recreational fleet (some sparse data exist)
- Additional age-composition data available for synoptic survey?
- Sensitivity to historical catches (equilibrium catch option in SS3).

7.4. Reference points

- Both ‘unfished’ (equilibrium & dynamic) and MSY (equilibrium) reference points can be calculated and are available in SS outputs.
- As steepness values approach 1, conventional MSY reference points are sometimes dropped in favor of spawner per recruit formulations.
- High resilience (steepness) & rapid growth provide very low estimates of SSBMSY relative to equilibrium unfished SSB0 (~ 15%)

…

7.5. Straw dog model & stock structure

Historical patterns in estimated exploitation rate and recruitment are remarkably similar among North and South areas.



7.5. Straw dog model & stock structure

Historical patterns in estimated exploitation rate and recruitment are remarkably similar among North and South areas.



Thanks

The Lingcod Assessment Technical Team

Dana Haggarty

Quang Huynh

Leah Walker

Luke Rogers

App. Reporting and diagnostics

Conventional stocks assessment reporting and diagnostics relate to five general aspects:

- **Implementation**: whether the methods were applied correctly;
- **Reproducibility**: whether sufficient information is provided to be able to obtain the same results from the same data;
- **Objectivity**: whether there is a sound empirical basis for model structure and interpretation of data, so that results are not strongly determined by subjective judgement;
- **Performance**: how well the approaches capture the apparent system dynamics and match empirical observations;
- **Informing management:** support managers decision making.

App. Reporting and diagnostics

Conventional stocks assessment reporting and diagnostics relate to five general aspects:

- **Implementation**: code, use of established software, simulation testing;
- **Reproducibility**: model equations, code repository, description of all non-estimated parameters / assumptions and basis;
- **Objectivity**: sensitivity to alternative data interpretations and weighting, model assumptions and model parameters, parameter profiling;
- **Performance**: fit to data, patterns in residuals, retrospective analysis, hindcasting.
- **Informing management:** projections, decision tables, risk trade-off figures etc.

Sensitivity analyses

Parameters	Model assumptions	Data
Natural Mortality rate	Ricker stock-recruitment	Composition weighting
Steepness	Selectivity functions	IPHC weighting
Sigma R		Length data
		Recreational composition

Diagnostics

Numerical stability	Model misspecification	Uncertainty
Objective function gradients	Fit to data	MLE var-covariance
Jitter analysis	Residual patterns	MCMC mixing
Simulation self-testing	Retrospective analysis	Sensitivity analysis
Evaluation of MCMC chains	Hind casting	