

Unnecessarily Complicated Research Title

John Smith

California, United States

Abstract

Keywords: Science, Publication, Complicated

1. Introduction

- Risk and uncertainty
- One rule for all?
- Impact of life histories
- Comparison of constant catch v changing catch based on trends in an empirical index.
- catch only - need good catch data if you havent got this how can you set catch limits

Sustainability and risks to non target exploited marine fish stock populations requires both estimates of current stock status, the effects of fishing pressure (catchability and fishing effort) and the effects of management measures on target populations, however these data are often lacking. Subsequently there is increasing concern and a growing need for the development of innovative approaches so that management of all marine stocks not just those of high commercial value can be included into the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP [1]) framework. Under the CFP management objectives are to recover stocks and to maintain stocks within safe biological limits to levels that can produce Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY), including by-catch species by 2015 (Implementation Plan adopted at the World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg in 2002) and no later than 2020. These conservation objectives are currently being achieved by introducing

biological target (can fluctuate around targets) and limit (i.e must not be exceeded) reference points e.g. population size (stock biomass) and/or yields (catches) and/or long-term yields and fishing mortality against which the preservation of stocks within such limits are assessed. These targets or limit reference points are often referred to as harvesting strategies which include an operational component called a harvest control rule (HCR) that are based on indicators (e.g. monitoring data or models) of stock status and to prevent overfishing.

The International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) categorises stocks in to classes *data-rich*, (categories 1 and 2) i.e those that have a quantitative assessment based on conventional methods that require large amounts of data that include a long historical time series of catches and sound biological information [2]; or *data-limited* [3](categories 3 and 4) (often called data poor) those without assessment, forecasts and have limited funding for research. For data-rich stocks ICES uses two types of reference points for providing fisheries advice;

1. Precautionary Approach (PA) reference points (those relating to stock status and exploitation relative to precautionary objectives) and
2. MSY reference points (those relating to achieving MSY)

In contrast for data limited stocks MSY *proxy* reference points are used to estimate stock status and exploitation. Often many of the methods used to estimate MSY proxy reference points require length based inputs as they are cheap, easy to collect [4] and are related to life history parameters such as fish size, mortality and fecundity as well as fishery selectivity. For example many methods are being developed to estimate MSY, but currently only 4 are approved by ICES, these include, Surplus Production model in Continuous Time (catch based) (SPiCT; [5], Mean Length Z (MLZ; [6]), Length Based Spawner Per Recruit (LBSPR; [7]) and Length Based Indicators (LBI; e.g. [8]). The aforementioned data limited procedures have differing data requirements, intended uses and obviously have their own strengths and weaknesses.

To test the performance of candidate management procedures often requires evaluation of alternative hypothesis about the dynamics of the system e.g. population dynamics (life history dynamics such as growth parameters which are an indication of fishery exploitation levels and management) and the behaviour of the fishery (e.g range contraction and density dependence) etc.. Due to the nature of conflicting objectives, stakeholder interests and the uncertainty in the dynamics of the resource and/ or the plausibility of alter-

native hypotheses can lead to poor decision making and can be problematic when defining management policy.

An intense area of work being researched over the last 2 decades is Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE), which focuses on the broader aspects of fishing (the Ecosystem) whereby different management options are tested against a range of objectives (see [9]). The approach is not to come up with a definitive answer, but to lay-bare the trade offs associated with each management objective, along with identifying and incorporating uncertainties in the evaluation and communicating the results effectively to client groups and decision-makers. MSE is not intended to be complex but to provide a robust framework that account for conflicting poorly defined objectives and uncertainties that have been absent in conventional management [9].

To assess case specific harvest strategies (via simulation) within the MSE, we will implement a management procedure based on a empirical HCR that adjusts yield depending on stock status for a given set of tunable parameters for each of the harvest strategies and to test their robustness to uncertainty. This approach could also help identify similar conditions across species where particular advice rules are likely to work well, and where they perform poorly for a given a set of parameters.

Often empirical harvest control rules require extensive exhaustive parameter searches to tune or optimise 'hyper-parameters' (external parameters to a model) that aren't directly learnt from estimators. This requires a technique known as a grid search that extensively searches for all combinations of all parameters. In contrast, and some what less time consuming alternative and efficient parameter search strategies can be considered for a given range of parameter space and a known distribution. As such a random sample can be obtained and used to perform the different experiments for parameter optimisation. This approach differs from the simplest constant catch HCR strategy whereby catches are kept constant and low to ensure no lasting damage is done in periods of low stock productivity or whereby the stock is highly variable year on year, therefore the empirical approach can help optimise catch by setting a precautionary Total Allowable Catch (TAC).

Here we describe methods to assess the performance of each HCR via a set of utilities: safety ($B/B_{MSY} > 1$), yield ($yield/MSY$), kobe proportion (proportion of years that stay in the green zone of kobe plot ($B/B_{MSY} > 1$), and Yield Annual Variation (yield changes by 10% year on year).

2. Material and Methods

2.1. Materials

Life history parameters for growth, natural mortality and maturity were used to develop an age-based Operating Model. To do this the parameters were first used to parameterise functional forms for mass (W), proportion mature (Q), natural mortality (M) and fishing mortality (F) at age. These were then used to calculate the spawner (S/R) and yield-per-recruit (Y/R) which were then combined with a stock recruitment relationship [10] to calculate the equilibrium stock size as a function of fishing mortality (F).

This analysis allows a variety of reference points such as those based on Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY), i.e. B_{MSY} the spawning stock biomass (S) and F_{MSY} the fishing mortality that produces MSY at equilibrium to be estimated. Other reference points are $F_{0.1}$ the fishing mortality on the yield per recruit curve where the slope is 10% of that at the origin, a conservative proxy for F_{MSY} ; and F_{Crash} which is the fishing mortality that will drive the stock to extinction since it is equivalent to a R/S greater than the slope at the origin of the stock recruitment relationship, i.e. recruitment can not replace removals for a fishing mortality equal to F_{Crash} .

The equilibrium relationships can then be turned into a forward dynamic model and projected forward.

A variety of functional forms can be assumed for all of the various process, i.e. growth, mortality, maturity, the selection pattern of the fisheries and the stock recruitment relationship. Commonly processes such as growth and maturity-at-age are well known while those for natural mortality and the stock recruitment relationship are poorly known [11]. In the later case assumptions have to be made and to evaluate the sensitivity of any analysis to those assumptions a variety of scenarios are considered. Below a base case is defined that can then be modified to create a variety of scenarios.

2.2. Methods

FLife and MSE

2.2.1. Operating Model

Age based.

127 2.2.2. *Management Procedure*

128 The management procedure was based on an empirical MP, where an
129 increase in an index of abundance resulted in an increase in the TAC, while
130 a decrease in the index results in an decrease in the TAC.

131 2.2.3. *Random Search*

132 When running an MSE commonly a set of MP scenarios are run to tune
133 the MP, this requires running the MSE for each OM scenario for a range of
134 fixed values in the HCR and then choosing the rule that best meets manage-
135 ment objectives. If there are a lot of parameters to tune then a grid search
136 may become unfeasible. An alternative is random search [12] as randomly
137 chosen trials are more efficient for parameter optimisation than trials based
138 on a grid.

139 3. Results

140 Estimates of the simulated life history parameters obtained from Fishbase
141 (<http://www.fishbase.org>) are presented in Fig.1. These show that for fast
142 growing species which are small in size l_{∞} (asymptotic length parameter)
143 species such as sprat, the growth parameter k is high. The sprats age-at-
144 50%-maturity a_{50} are low, in contrast to a slower growing larger longer lived
145 species l_{∞} such as rays or pollack.

146 Observations in Fig.2 shows that the assumed maturity in the OM is
147 related to selectivity and that the faster growing species are more susceptible
148 to fishing, although the slower growing larger (by mass and length) species
149 (e.g. pollack has a higher natural mortality rate at lower ages) with the
150 most significant rate increases associated with turbot. A levelling off in the
151 mortality rate is evident for ray just prior to age 4.5. In contrast, there have
152 been less steep declines in natural mortality estimates for brill, but most
153 notably for sprat.

154 Fig.3 displays the equilibrium relationships of the operating model. Com-
155 parisons of reference points estimates can be made across species. The m/k
156 plot shows interesting trends with lower values for sprat where the growth
157 rate k is considerably higher than the natural mortality rate with little un-
158 certainty around the estimate. In contrast to a slower growing species such as
159 pollack where natural mortality is higher, as is the uncertainty around the es-
160 timate. The relationships when compared the proxy for fishing pressure f/m

161 show that the estimate is considerably higher in sprat than pollack, how-
162 ever the intrinsic population growth rate r shows that sprats reproductive
163 capacity is higher and thus its surplus production.

164 **[EXAMPLES TO BE UPDATED]**

- 165 • Figure 3 shows the life history parameters
- 166 • Figure 2 shows the vectors
- 167 • Figure 4 shows the time series relative to reference points
- 168 • Figure ?? shows the performance statistics; points are
 - 169 1.
 - 170 2.
 - 171 3.
 - 172 4.
 - 173 5. Figure 5 shows the utility functions for the seven study stocks
 - 174 points area
- 175 1.
- 176 2.
- 177 3.
- 178 4.

179 **4. Discussion**

- 180 • Bullet point one
- 181 • Bullet point two

182 **5. Conclusions**

- 183 • Bullet point one
- 184 • Bullet point two

6. References

References

- [1] E. Commission, Regulation (eu) no 1380/2013 of the european parliament and of the council of 11 december 2013 on the common fisheries policy, amending council regulations (ec) no 1954/2003 and (ec) no 1224/2009, and repealing council regulations (ec) no 2371/2002 and (ec) no 639/2004, and council decision 2004/585/ec (2013).
- [2] N. Bentley, Data and time poverty in fisheries estimation: potential approaches and solutions, *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* 72 (2015) 186–193.
- [3] C. Costello, D. Ovando, R. Hilborn, S. D. Gaines, O. Deschenes, S. E. Lester, Status and solutions for the world’s unassessed fisheries, *Science* (2012) 1224768.
- [4] T. J. Quinn, R. B. Deriso, Quantitative fish dynamics, Oxford University Press, 1999.
- [5] M. W. Pedersen, C. W. Berg, A stochastic surplus production model in continuous time, *Fish and Fisheries* 18 (2017) 226–243.
- [6] T. Gedamke, J. M. Hoenig, Estimating mortality from mean length data in nonequilibrium situations, with application to the assessment of goosfish, *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 135 (2006) 476–487.
- [7] A. Hordyk, K. Ono, K. Sainsbury, N. Loneragan, J. Prince, Some explorations of the life history ratios to describe length composition, spawning-per-recruit, and the spawning potential ratio, *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 72 (2014) 204–216.
- [8] W. N. Probst, M. Kloppmann, G. Kraus, Indicator-based status assessment of commercial fish species in the north sea according to the eu marine strategy framework directive (msfd), *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 70 (2013) 694–706.
- [9] L. Kell, I. Mosqueira, P. Grosjean, J. Fromentin, D. Garcia, R. Hillary, E. Jardim, S. Mardle, M. Pastoors, J. Poos, et al., FLR: an open-source framework for the evaluation and development of management strategies, *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* 64 (2007) 640.




Figure 1:

- 217 [10] M. Sissenwine, J. Shepherd, An alternative perspective on recruitment
 218 overfishing and biological reference points, *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 44
 219 (1987) 913–918.
- 220 [11] C. G. Michielsens, M. K. McAllister, A bayesian hierarchical analysis of
 221 stock recruit data: quantifying structural and parameter uncertainties,
 222 *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 61 (2004) 1032–1047.
- 223 [12] J. Bergstra, Y. Bengio, Random search for hyper-parameter optimiza-
 224 tion, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 13 (2012) 281–305.

225 7. Figures




Figure 2:




Figure 3:




Figure 4:




Figure 5: