

MSE and dynamic state variable model with sigma function

Nekane Alzorriz

European Commission, Joint Research Centre (JRC), Sustainable
Resources Directorate, Water and Marine Resources Unit, Via Enrico
Fermi 2749, 21027 Ispra, Italy.

nekane.alzorriz@gmail.com

Jan Jaap Poos

Wageningen Marine Research, PO Box 68, 1970 AB IJmuiden, The
Netherlands.

janjaap.poos@wur.nl

May 2, 2018

Abstract

TBD We contrast three types of management plans to achieve maximum sustainable yields (MSY) from multiple stocks and compare their effectiveness based on a management strategy evaluation (MSE) that uses a dynamic state variable model including errors in decision-making in its operating model.

Keywords: management strategy evaluation; dynamics state variable model; errors in decision-making; landing obligation; maximum sustainable yield

1 Introduction

We have to implement alpha and beta, and make sure that age in VBLG is seasonal

Management strategy evaluation (MSE; [20, 21, 7]) seeks to study the implications of management strategies using simulation[18]. Such simulation should include all important processes of a fishery, which is inherently a socio-ecological system, with coupled dynamics of the fishing fleets, the exploited stocks, and their governance[18, 19]. Given the complexity of such a socio-ecological system the uncertainty about the dynamics and feedbacks are considerable. As a result, any forecasted success in achieving goals in a management strategy may thus be imperceptibly small compared to the stochasticity in results generated in the system, or worse, be counteracted by unintended consequences of the management strategy. The robustness of management strategies to the uncertainty in the processes that govern fisheries systems thus need to be accounted for [3, 14, 16, 18].

The adaptive response of fishers to their environment is one of the key uncertainties requiring attention in MSE [11]. Simulation tools for such adaptive responses are available in fisheries, borrowing methodology from the more general question of state-dependent foraging decisions in ecological systems [8, 13]. New tools for state-dependent behaviour of individual fishing vessels, translated into behaviour of the fleet and implemented using stochastic dynamic programming [2, 4, 9, 15, 12] have been developed. These models generally predict the effect in the short term (within a fishing trip, or a quota year) by optimizing a utility function and determine which choices best yields the best chance of increasing utility, while keeping track of the state of each individual. The effect of a choice on the utility depends on the economic environment, such as the home port of the vessel and the distance to fishing grounds, and the biological environment, such as the spatial distribution of the resources. Using such dynamic variable state models, effects of e.g. relocation costs of marine protected areas have been modelled [9].

Dynamic state variables have also been used to describe discarding behaviour [12, 5, 4]. These studies may shed light on the potential outcomes of the European fisheries management reform of 2013. That reform included using the use of the Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY) reference points as targets for exploiting commercially important fish stocks

and the gradual introduction of a landings obligation (LO) [10]. Indeed, using spatial and temporal distributions of catch rates within a single year, dynamic state variable models forecasted high costs in mixed fisheries in the short term as a result of the LO. These costs result from removing the option to adapt landings to quota by discarding parts of the catch [2]. This will result in fishing effort reallocation and early closures of fisheries once quota have been reached. However, the long term benefits to fisheries that could result from improved selectivity are ignored in those studies. Ignoring the potential for improved selectivity leaves out a key element in the perceived benefit of the LO. Because the LO should provide incentives for the use of more selective gears and for fisheries to move away from areas with high levels of unwanted catch [1, 2], the improved selectivity should lead to higher long term catches. Achieving single species MSY while landing all commercial catches in fisheries targeting multiple species (mixed fisheries) is challenging because achieving the objective for one species may mean missing the objective for another [22, 5]. Forecasting whether such management will be effective depends on understanding the response of individual effort allocation to the management.

To enable longer term prediction of the effects of changes in fisheries management, and thus complete the Management Strategy Evaluation, one needs to couple the fleet dynamic models that forecast the fleet response to management to biological dynamic models that forecast the fish population responses to the changing fleet response. We present an MSE that encompasses the individual harvester decision-making process and socioeconomic drivers on management effectiveness, i.e. if the fleet dynamic model results in a short term movement of vessels to allocate effort both spatially and temporally, we also expect longer term changes to occur in fish populations and the economy of the fishery [2]. Such combination needs to be responsive to all the drivers that influence and motivate the actual fleet and to respect existing constraints [23]. The drivers will include the (real or perceived) local abundance and catchability of the fished stocks and various resource costs, principally that of fuel. The constraints will include the obvious management-imposed constraints such as levels of total allowable catch, and economical constraints such as the contribution of the annual fines for exceeding catch quotas.

Using a MSE, the main objective of this work is not to reproduce the entire complexity of a real mixed fishery, but to define plausible hypothesis about population dynamics and then to implement the processes of interest, i.e., changes in population abundance, to finally measure the effect of the potential consequences associated with the fishers optimal choice location underlying assumption of the current state-dependent behaviour of individual fishing vessels. to understand the fleet dynamics in a spatially and temporally heterogeneous mixed quota-regulated fishery when reducing from unmanaged (unconstrained catch quota) to MSY managed and to compare it with a situation where discards are allowed in order to assess on the biological and economic consequences. If LO and catch quotas are not fully enforced, there will be an incentive to continue discarding. Therefore, this manuscript tends to understand the likely adaptive change in fishing patterns that will help us to understand if this leads to a better balance between quotas and catches.

2 Methods

The Management Strategy Evaluation framework was used to forecast the dynamics of a hypothetical mixed fishery on two species. The framework consists of an Operating Model (OM) and a Management Procedure (MP). In the fishery, there are three essential elements: (i) a collection of size structured fish stocks, whose dynamics are governed by annual reproduction, growth, migration, and mortality. (ii) A management body that evaluates the fishing pressure and aims to set annual quotas in accordance with fishing mortalities dictated by FMSY reference points. (iii) a fleet of individual fishers who aim to make the best use of their annual quota. Within this mixed fishery, individual vessels make adaptive choices on fishing location and discarding that depend on the distribution of the resources, and the quota that they are allocated. Each of these elements is discussed in more detail below. The essential elements of the framework are summarized in Figure 2.

The OM captured the key processes in the dynamics of the fish populations, the

fisheries and the management body, and can be thought of as a minimum realistic model [17]. The operating model thus includes individual harvester decision-making (including error) and the consequent biomass of fish stocks, including the essential elements for calculating the individual harvester economic performance. The management body used the MP to make its decision on how to respond to the state of the resource. This management procedure thus includes the data collection from the fishery, how these are interpreted, and the Harvest Control Rule that dictates the limits that are set to the fishery.




Figure 1: The conceptual framework and how it was mapped.

2.1 Population dynamics

In order to allow the fishery to make spatial and temporal choices, the model needed to be seasonally and spatially explicit. The dynamics of the fish stocks were modelled using an age-structured model that was spatially explicit, with seasonal time steps. In each seasonal time step, fish grow, migrate, and die. The number of fish of stock i of age a at year y , in season s , and area p was written as $N_i(a, y, s, p)$. The ages in the model range between age 0 and age A , the maximum age in the model. The seasons range between season 1 and season S , the last season within each year. Individuals were born at age 0,




Figure 2: The conceptual framework and how it was mapped.

at the start of each year y , in season 1. The number of new-born individuals $R_i(p)$ in the model was a function of the area p and independent of the size of the adult population. The population numbers at age 0 are thus

$$N_i(0, y, 1, p) = R_i(p). \quad (\text{Eq. 2.1.1})$$

Mortality in the model resulted only from catches in the fishery. Mortality from natural causes such as predation, diseases, and scenesens was assumed to be negligible in comparison. Although such absence of natural mortality impossible in reality, one could argue that the model thus mimiced long-lived species. The decrease in population numbers was thus the result of the catches ($C_i(a, y, s, p)$).

The mortality caused by the catches of the fishery reduce the population numbers. Because the model was seasonally structured, the population numbers for seasons 2 to S were dependent on the previous season,

$$N_i(a, y, s + 1, p) = N_i(a, y, s, p) - C_i(a, y, s, p). \quad (\text{Eq. 2.1.2})$$

the population numbers in season 1 depended on the numbers in season S of the previous year,

$$N_i(a + 1, y, 1, p) = N_i(a, y, S, p) - C_i(a, y, S, p). \quad (\text{Eq. 2.1.3})$$

Migration for each species was defined by an array $M_i(a, s, em, im)$ that defined immigration and emigration on a given stock relative to the stock sizes. The size of that array was defined by the number of age classes, seasons and number of areas. emigrants leave area em and move to area im . The emigrated part of the population is then subtracted from each of the areas, so that that population numbers per year and season remain unaffected by migration.

Individual body growth was modelled by a von Bertalanffy growth equation to convert numbers to lengths, and an allometric equation to convert length to weight. The stock weights are thus calculated from the population numbers as

$$W_i(a, y, s, p) = \alpha * (N_i(a, y, S, p) * L_{\infty_i} * (1 - \exp(-K*a)))^{\beta}, \quad (\text{Eq. 2.1.4})$$

and the same is done for the catch weights.

The realized catches are the sum of all individual catches resulting from the Dynamic State Variable Model. The Dynamic State Variable model inputs consist of the expected individual catch rates, which are a random variable. This, random variable is normally distributed, and its mean $\hat{c}_i(a, y, s, p)$ is a function of population size, age dependent catchability $q_i(a)$, and fishing effort $E(y, s, p)$ in any year, season, and area.

$$\hat{c}_i(a, y, s, p) = N_i(a, y, s, p) * q_i(a) * E(y, s, p). \quad (\text{Eq. 2.1.5})$$

2.2 The dynamic-state variable model

To simulate a fleet of individual fishing vessels, we used a Dynamic State Variable Model [2, 4, 8, 9, 13, 15]. The model was used to model location choice, extending the model structure in [4]. Each individual vessel had a set of choices, which include the choice to go fishing in a season, location choice within that season, and the choice to discard one or more species and size classes during a season. The model had annual fines for exceeding

landings quota as in [2]). In order to calculate state dependent choices during the year, we started by defining the annual fines for exceeding landings quotas at the end of the year:

$$\Phi(L_i, Q_i, F_i) = - \sum_i (\max(0, (L_i - Q_i)) * F_i), \quad (\text{Eq. 2.2.1})$$

where L_i was the cumulative annual landings for species i for an individual vessel. These cumulative landings defined the state of the individual. Q_i was the annual individual quota for landings for the different species. Individual quotas were not transferable. F_i was the fine per unit weight for exceeding individual landings quota.

The maximum expected utility between current season s and the end of the year was $V(L_i, Q_i, F_i, s)$, and the model started by setting $V(C_i, Q_i, F_i, S) = \Phi(C_i, Q_i, F_i)$. For preceding seasons, the expected utility depended on individual choices, and each time step individuals chose to visit fishing area p , or to stay in port. While fishing, any combination of the age classes caught of the quota species can be landed, or discarded. This discarding was defined by a matrix d . The size of that matrix was defined by the number of species under quota constraints and the number of age classes. Each element could take the value 0 (discard) or 1 (keep on board and land). The expected utility for each state and each time step s was calculated backward using stochastic dynamic programming [8]:

$$V(C_i, Q_i, F_i, s) = \max_{p,d}(R(p, d, s) - G(p) - C(p) + E_{p,d}[V(C'_i, Q_i, F_i, s+1)]), \quad (\text{Eq. 2.2.2})$$

where $R(p, d, s)$ was the expected immediate contribution of the gross revenue from the sales of fish in a season resulting from choices p , and d (gross revenues resulted from multiplying catches different age classes of species 1, species 2 and prices). Prices of fish were assumed to be dependent over fish age (subsection 2.2.1). $G(p)$ represented the incurred fuel costs per season from the choice of fishing area a , while $C(p)$ represented the variable operating costs (crew share, gear maintenance and landing costs, Table 1), which in turn depended on the change in cumulative landings and fish prices. The term $E_{p,d}[V(C'_i, Q_i, F_i, s+1)]$ denoted the expected future utility taken over all possible states

resulting from choices p , and d . The transition of these states were based on normal distributions of catch rates, using the means and variances for the species, as explained in the model conditioning section, following [15].

Rather than assuming that each individual always made the optimal choice, we assigned a probability to each choice proportional to its expected utility, following [9]. The expected utility for any choice was

$$U(C_i, Q_i, F_i, s) = R(p, d, s) - G(p) - C(p) + E_{p,d}[V(C'_i, Q_i, F_i, s + 1)]. \quad (\text{Eq. 2.2.3})$$

If U^* was the expected utility at the optimal choice for a given t , we set

$$\Delta_{p,d}(C_i, Q_i, F_i, s) = U^*(C_i, Q_i, F_i, s) - U(C_i, Q_i, F_i, s), \quad (\text{Eq. 2.2.4})$$

and then defined the probability of a choice for a given area and discarding as

$$P_{p,d}(C_i, Q_i, F_i, s) = \frac{e^{-\Delta_{p,d}(C_i, Q_i, F_i, s)/\sigma}}{\sum_p \sum_d e^{-\Delta_{p,d}(C_i, Q_i, F_i, s)/\sigma}}, \quad (\text{Eq. 2.2.5})$$

where σ was a tuning parameter that measures how important was to be near optimal. A high value of sigma resulted in uniform probabilities of choices, and that vessels were distributed uniformly among the different fishing areas. In contrast, if sigma was small then all vessels concentrated in the optimal location (but note that σ should be > 0). For computations, we used $\sigma = 40$ (noting that Δ ranged from 0 to $\sim 2 \times 10^3$, but was generally of the order of 1×10^2 in magnitude).

The dynamic state variable model was solved by iterating backwards in time, while finding the probability distribution choice in terms of location and discarding behaviour for all possible states, combining the net revenue obtained from the sale of fish and costs of a fishing trip and the effect of the annual fines when exceeding annual quota. Further details for this procedure can be found in [2, 6] and [9].

Once the backward calculations were finished, the forward part is a Monte Carlo simulation where the probabilities of choices were sampled randomly using the probabilities in Eq. 2.2.5. This was done for 700 individual vessels.

Table 1: Model and fishery conditioning.

model	
number of vessels	700
σ	40
number of areas	2
number of seasons	6
initial quota Q_{sp1} and Q_{sp2}	200
Fishery variable costs	
fuel costs (Euro day ⁻¹)	1240
gear maintenance (Euro day ⁻¹)	0
crew share	35%
landing costs (Euro t ⁻¹)	0
Fishery	
q	0.0005
effort (p,s)	1
CPUE	mean($pop * q * wts(yy - 2 : yy)$)
CPUE dev	0.08 * CPUE

2.2.1 Size dependent pricing

Prices of fish have been assumed to be fixed over time but influenced by the body weight of the individuals in the catch, as is commonly observed [24, 25]. Therefore, the resulting data of mean weights and average prices were used for further analysis. We fitted linear mixed models, using mean price and mean body weight as the response variable and covariate, respectively. Thus, following [24], the statistical models took the form:

$$pw_i \sim p_i \bar{w}_i + \beta_0 \times \frac{w_i - \bar{w}_i}{\bar{w}_i}, \quad (\text{Eq. 2.2.6})$$

where p is the mean price of species i , \bar{w}_i is the mean weight of the corresponding weight classes, and the fraction corresponded to the standarization of the mass relative to the mean observed individual catch mass over all ages classes. β_0 gave the price increase when individual mass was increased by \bar{w} . We used mean prices of 150 Euro kg⁻¹ for both species.

Table 2: Linear mass-prices estimated based on mean prices per mass age-classes. The price slopes β_0 were assumed to be similar to mean prices.

Market value (Euro kg ⁻¹)	age			
	1	2	3	4
species 1 and 2	778	1354	1780	2096

2.3 Case study parameterization

(six seasons) and spatially (two areas) explicit. The maximum age in the age-structured fish model was 4 years. The two stocks are named "stock 1" and "stock 2". and the areas are named "area a" and "area b". In the example used for our simulations, it was assumed that there were 100 new-borns per year for both stocks. The difference between the stocks is that all new-borns of stock 1 were born in "area a", while all new-borns of stock 2 were born in "area b".

In our example, the age dependent catchability $q_i(a)$ was assumed independent of age a .

A 20 % constant migration during any season was set between areas. The migration in population numbers ($M_i(a, s, im, em)$) was thus the proportion ($P(a, y, s, i, em, im)$) of the population available or vulnerable to fishing after migration occurs:

predict fish weight (W) at length (L). while assuming ($L\infty = 20$, $k = 0.093$), with the age-weight relationship ($W = L\infty * (1 - e^{-k*a})$); weight per fish was higher for the older fish.

was set to 3×10^3 Euro day⁻¹. These high fines combined with an assumed 100% detection of exceeding quotas resulted in model results in which fishers comply with quota regulations.

2.4 Endogenously determined quotas

The two management strategies we considered differ by the formulae used to determine exploitation rates (HCR). These manegemet strategies were chosen such that, if the management model was the correct model of reality, the corresponding equilibrium state of the system would meet the objective of the plan. For this purpose, each strategy was imple-

mented after a period where the fishery was unmanaged, by meaned with unconstrained quota for both species.

Table 3:

	MP (landings selectivity)	LO (full avoidance of discards)
Discarding	Allowed	Not allowed
Manager catch perception	$C = L + D$	$C = L$ ($D = 0$)
Selectivity (l_{ratio})	$\neq 1$	$= 1$
Yield per recruitment model	based in F_L	based in F_C

1. **MP Scenario: Landings selectivity**, under this scenario the fishery is under landings selectivity, only landings contribute to yield. Fishing mortality accounts for all catches, regardless wether these catches are landed or discarded.
2. **LO Scenario: Fulll avoidance of discards**, this scenario contemplates the LO with landings selectivity only and fulll avoidance of discards.

HCRs in the form of quotas were determined endogenously by simple and relatively linear reduction in catch if fishing mortality exceeded Fmsy. This required that fishing mortality for each stock must not exceed Fmsy, which was a limit reference point. An Optimum Yield (OY) was determined based on a MSY that must prevented overfishing, and that could be reduced from the MSY limit to take into account social, economic and precautionary considerations. Therefore, quota was determined by a set of harvest control rule parameters consisting of the exploitaion rate at MSY.

The resulted biomass harvested rate in a year y , depended in the manager catch perception (based in Table 1) and the standing biomass:

$$H_{a,y,s} = \frac{C_{i(numbers)}(a, y, s, p)}{C_{i(numbers)}(a, y, s, p) \times B_{i(numbers)}(a, y, s, p)}, \quad (\text{Eq. 2.4.1})$$

$$l_{ratio}(a, y, s) = \frac{L_{i(numbers)}(a, y, s, p)}{C_{i(numbers)}(a, y, s, p)}, \quad (\text{Eq. 2.4.2})$$

Through a yield per recruitment model, knowing growth, harvest rates and recruitment we can estimate how much to reduce the quota for achieving the MSY.

$$H_{MSY} = YIELDCURVE..., \quad (\text{Eq. 2.4.3})$$

$$Q_{MSY} = \frac{\sum([\frac{H_{MSY}}{H} \times H(a, s) \times l_{ratio}(a, s) \times B_{(numbers)}(a, s)] \times wts)}{\text{number of vessels}}, \quad (\text{Eq. 2.4.4})$$

$$Q(y + 1) = \max(\min(Q_{MSY}, Q(y) \times 1.15), Q(y) \times 0.85), \quad (\text{Eq. 2.4.5})$$

The management model encompassed the harvest control rules (HCR). The HCR referenced to biological reference points (F_{msy}) to produce management actions in the form of a harvest or effort level: changes in selectivity or spatial and temporal reallocations or restrictions of fishing effort. Costs and benefits, both economic and in terms of risks to both stock and livelihoods, could be computed and compared across different scenarios and management procedures (section 2.4).

3 Results

We simulated the effects of implementing a Management Plan (MP) and the Landing Obligation (LO) without any exceptions or flexibility. To be able to analyse the results of this complex actions of implementing the MP and the LO, the implementations should start simultaneously for all stocks and fleets. Under the MP, the Harvest Control Rule for the TACs is to advise F_{MSY} unless the biomass falls below a trigger biomass. If the biomass falls below this value, the advised TAC is based on the biomass trends. To check for trends, the latest biomass levels are compared to previous ones. If there is a decrease of a 20% or more, the TAC is reduced by 15%. If the comparison shows an increase of more than 20 % the TAC is increased by 15%.

3.1 Catch decisions and location choice

When discarding was allowed, but TACs changed by 15% based on previous year but trying approximate to F_{msy} , TACS showed a reduction and discards increased.

The implementation of LO caused an increase in TACs and revenues were higher than when discarding was allowed. Some fishing opportunities are always lost under the landing obligation; the final fishing mortalities are lower than the target fishing mortalities (at least for one species). However, this does not necessarily imply that the catches will be lower with landing obligation than without it. Catches will be reduced in the initial years of landing obligation implementation. However, at Spawning stock biomass increases with LO, the catches will increase too. Although the fishing opportunities are lost due to the choke effect, the biomass of some stocks might increase; after a few years, this extra abundance could be converted into more catches. This implies that are fleets that, in the mid-term, could benefit from the landing obligation.




Figure 3: Caches and harvest rates- Prices of the two species are equal (a truly mixed fishery)




Figure 4: Change in selectivity- Prices of the two species are equal (a truly mixed fishery)

4 Discussion

tbd prellezo 2016, In the mid-term and without any consideration made in terms of the ecosystem functioning as a whole, the results obtained from applying any kind of exemption or flexibility are, simply, negative. Fishing beyond FMSY (even in one year) implies that there will be a penalty in the future. This penalty will come in the form of lower biomasses, that has the mixed effect of increasing the cost of fishing the same level of catches and reducing the total catch due to the lower abundances and the subsequent lower TACs.

The largest yield (or catch) that can be taken from a species' stock over an indefinite period. Fundamental to the notion of sustainable harvest, the concept of MSY aims to maintain the population size at the point of maximum growth rate by harvesting the individuals that would normally be added to the population, allowing the population to continue to be productive indefinitely. Under the assumption of logistic growth, resource limitation does not constrain individuals reproductive rates when populations are small,




Figure 5: Effort- Prices of the two species are equal (a truly mixed fishery)




Figure 6: Revenues- Prices of the two species are equal (a truly mixed fishery)

but because there are few individuals, the overall yield is small. At intermediate population densities, also represented by half the carrying capacity, individuals are able to

breed to their maximum rate. At this point, called the maximum sustainable yield, there is a surplus of individuals that can be harvested because growth of the population is at its maximum point due to the large number of reproducing individuals. Above this point, density dependent factors increasingly limit breeding until the population reaches carrying capacity. At this point, there are no surplus individuals to be harvested and yield drops to zero. The maximum sustainable yield is usually higher than the optimum sustainable yield and maximum economic yield

There is an extensive literature on fisheries economic theory in which the Gordon-Schaefer equilibrium production model is central (Gordon 1954, Schaefer 1957, Clark 1983). This theory holds that there is an economic TRP, the Maximum Economic Yield (MEY), which occurs at the effort level yielding the greatest margin of revenue over cost from the resource. For a linear cost curve, this inevitably occurs to the left of MSY on the fishing effort axis. Since F_{mey} occurs at lower levels of effort than F_{msy} , the use of this economic Target Reference Point is less likely to result in biological overfishing than the use of F_{msy} .

As a TRP, F_{mey} is responsive to any changes in the economic environment which affect either the value of fish, or the cost of fishing. It may also be dependent on changes in fish abundance, if market price increases with declining abundance and is independent of the availability of similar resources elsewhere. Subsidies or external economic considerations such as fuel taxes will also affect the location of an economic Reference Point (e.g. Panayotou 1988).

The effect of supply on fish prices may, under certain circumstances, result in higher total profit, or profit per unit catch, when total catch is reduced. This characteristic may be a consideration in setting target fishing levels or catches but is least likely to be effective in situations where fish prices are set by global markets, e.g. the tuna fishery for the canning industry.

The value of a unit weight of the landed catch may vary with the size of individual fish, and in multispecies fisheries with species composition. Both fish size and species composition are functions of fishing mortality, and based on purely economic criteria,

may be used as target reference points. Even if the actual target F cannot be estimated, in theory, F could be adjusted in increments until the desirable target catch characteristics are achieved.

In considering TRPs based on economic criteria, it is important to be aware of the effect which the practice of discounting could have on reference points. In evaluating investment projects, including resource management, economists discount the future value of any commodity. Discount rates may be in the order of 10%. In the case of a fishery where the population growth rate does not exceed the discount rate, then a strict application of economic theory would suggest that in the absence of other considerations (such as an economic value placed on recreational use of resources) the whole stock should be harvested now, and the proceeds of their sale invested. Long-lived species with slow growth rates, such as whales, clearly fall into this category. The blatant contradiction between this common economic approach, and the concept of sustainability, constitutes an unresolved paradox (Hilborn and Walters 1992).

Acknowledgements

The content of this paper does not reflect the official opinion of the European Commission. Responsibility for the information and views expressed in this paper relies entirely with the authors.

References

- [1] N. Alzorriz, L. Arregi, B. Herrmann, M. Sistiaga, J. Casey, and J. J. Poos. Questioning the effectiveness of technical measures implemented by the Basque bottom otter trawl fleet: Implications under the EU landing obligation. *Fisheries Research*, 175:116–126, 2016.
- [2] N. Alzorriz, E. Jardim, and J. J. Poos. Likely status and changes in the main economic and fishery indicators under the landing obligation: A case study of the

- Basque trawl fishery. *Fisheries Research*, x:xxx–xxx, 2018.
- [3] B. S. Andersen, Y. Vermand, C. Ulrich, T. Hutton, and J. J. Poos. Challenges in integrating short-term behaviour in a mixed-fishery Management Strategies Evaluation frame: A case study of the North Sea flatfish fishery. *Fisheries Research*, 102(1-2):26–40, 2010.
 - [4] J. Batsleer, K. G. Hamon, H. M J van Overzee, A. D. Rijnsdorp, and J. J. Poos. High-grading and over-quota discarding in mixed fisheries. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*, 25(4):715–736, 2015.
 - [5] J. Batsleer, J. J. Poos, P. Marchal, Y. Vermand, and A. D. Rijnsdorp. Mixed fisheries management: Protecting the weakest link. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 479:177–190, apr 2013.
 - [6] J. Batsleer, A. D. Rijnsdorp, K. G. Hamon, H. M J van Overzee, and J. J. Poos. Mixed fisheries management: Is the ban on discarding likely to promote more selective and fuel efficient fishing in the Dutch flatfish fishery? *Fisheries Research*, 174:118–128, feb 2016.
 - [7] N. Bunnefeld, E. Hoshino, and E.J. Milner-Gulland. Management strategy evaluation: A powerful tool for conservation? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 26(9):441–447, 2011. cited By 109.
 - [8] C. W. Clark and M. Mangel. *Dynamic state variable models in ecology: Methods and applications*. Oxford University Press, New York, 2000.
 - [9] N. A. Dowling, C. Wilcox, M. Mangel, and S. Pascoe. Assessing opportunity and relocation costs of marine protected areas using a behavioural model of longline fleet dynamics. *Fish and Fisheries*, 13(2):139–157, jun 2011.
 - [10] EU. Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 on the Common Fisheries Policy, 2013.

- [11] E. A. Fulton, A. D. M. Smith, and D. C. Smith. Quantitative MSE of Alternative Management Strategies for Southeast Australian Fisheries. Technical Report June, CSIRO, 2007.
- [12] D. M. Gillis, E. K. Pikitch, and R. M. Peterman. Dynamic discarding decisions: Foraging theory for high-grading in a trawl fishery. *Behavioral Ecology*, 6(2):146–154, 1995.
- [13] A. I. Houston and J. M. McNamara. *Models of Adaptive Behaviour*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.
- [14] L. T. Kell, I. Mosqueira, P. Grosjean, J. M. Fromentin, D. Garcia, R. Hillary, E. Jardim, S. Mardle, M. A. Pastoors, J. J. Poos, F. Scott, and R. D. Scott. FLR : an open-source framework for the evaluation and development of management strategies. *ICES J Mar Sci*, 64(i):640–646, 2007.
- [15] J. J. Poos, J. A. Bogaards, F. J. Quirijns, D. M. Gillis, and A. D. Rijnsdorp. Individual quotas, fishing effort allocation, and over-quota discarding in mixed fisheries. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 67(2):323–333, oct 2010.
- [16] R. Prellezo, I. Carmona, and D. García. The bad, The good and the very good of the landing obligation implementation in the Bay of Biscay: A case study of Basque trawlers. *Fisheries Research*, 181:172–185, 2016.
- [17] A. E. Punt and D. S. Butterworth. The effects of future consumption by the cape fur seal on catches and catch rates of the cape hakes. 4. modelling the biological interaction between cape fur seals *arctocephalus pusillus pusillus* and the cape hakes *merluccius capensis* and *m. paradoxus*. *South African Journal of Marine Science*, 16(1):255–285, 1995.
- [18] A. E. Punt, D. S. Butterworth, C. L. de Moor, J. A. A. De Oliveira, and M. Haddon. Management strategy evaluation: Best practices. *Fish and Fisheries*, 17:303–334, 2016.

- [19] R. A. Rademeyer, É. E. Plagányi, and D. S. Butterworth. Tips and tricks in designing management procedures. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 64(4):618–625, 2007.
- [20] K. J. Sainsbury, A. E. Punt, and A. D. M. Smith. Design of operational management strategies for achieving fishery ecosystem objectives. *ICES Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil*, 57(3):731–741, jun 2000.
- [21] Stephen J. Smith. Analysis of data from bottom trawl surveys. *NAFO Scientific Council Studies*, 28(28):25–53, 1996.
- [22] C. Ulrich, Y. Vermard, P. J. Dolder, T. Brunel, E. Jardim, S. J. Holmes, A. Kempf, L. O. Mortensen, J. J. Poos, A. Rindorf, and Handling editor: Emory Anderson. Achieving maximum sustainable yield in mixed fisheries: a management approach for the north sea demersal fisheries. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 74(2):566–575, 2017.
- [23] W. N. Venables, N. Ellis, A. E. Punt, C. M. Dichmont, and R. A. Deng. A simulation strategy for fleet dynamics in Australia’s northern prawn fishery: Effort allocation at two scales. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 66(4):631–645, 2009.
- [24] F. Zimmermann, M. Heino, , and S. I. Steinsham. Does Size Matter? A Bioeconomic Perspective on Optimal Harvesting when Price is Size-dependent. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 68:1651–1659, 2011.
- [25] F. Zimmermann and M. Heino. Is size-dependent pricing prevalent in fisheries? The case of Norwegian demersal and pelagic fisheries. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 70:1389–1395, 2013.