



CCSBT-ESC/0409/41

Record of discussion leading to a change in decision on data to be used in the 2004 Assessment

(Prepared by the Secretariat)

Abstract

A data exchange working group at MPWS3 agreed that the 2004 stock assessment should use the same historic data as was used in the 2001 stock assessment. However, intercessional discussion revealed that there were problems with this decision because some historic data used in the operating model differed from that used in the 2001 assessment. As a consequence, it was agreed to change the decision on what historic data was to be used in both the 2004 stock assessment and operating model update. It was decided that a different dataset should be used for the Japanese fishery, which is based on “L5M” data up to 1994 and CCSBT data from 1995. It was also decided that there was little value in conducting the previously agreed mechanical update of the operating model. Instead, it was agreed to run the operating model with the new data to 2000 for comparison with existing operating model results, and then to run the operating model with the full new data up to 2003

Background

On 6 April 2004, the Secretariat distributed a data CD that contained the latest historical datasets (particularly catch effort and catch at size data) that had been provided to the Secretariat. Some of these datasets (particularly for Japan and New Zealand) differed from historical data that had been provided by members in the past and details of the reasons for the changes were not available.

At the Third Meeting of the Management Procedure Workshop (MPWS3), a data exchange working group agreed on which historical datasets should be used for the 2004 stock assessment. This agreement was documented as Attachment 7 of the MPWS3 report. In brief, it was agreed that the 2004 assessment would used the same historic dataset (up to 2000) as was used in the 2001 assessment. It was further agreed that members would document the level and types of changes in their historic datasets and describe the reason for the changes. Subject to a successful review at SAG5, the revised historic data would become the “official” data for assessments in future years.

The data exchange group at MPWS3 did not explicitly consider data to be used for the update of the operating model (OM) because it had already been agreed that this was to be a mechanical update without changing the historic time series of data used in the OM.

On 1 June 2004, the Secretariat sought clarification from members on whether the year 2000 data for the OM should be updated as was being done for the assessment data¹. In this

¹ Year 2000 was the last data year in the 2001 assessment and it is standard practise to update the last year of data used.

clarification, the Secretariat also reminded members that the pre-2000 historical data used in the OM differed from that used by the 2001 assessment and that as a consequence, the 2004 assessment and updated OM would be using some different historical data. This reminder led to extensive intercessional discussion that resulted in changing the decision on what historic data would be used for both the 2004 stock assessment and the update of the OM.

Intercessional Discussion

A period of intense intercessional discussion was held from 2 – 25 June 2004 in order to agree on what historic data to use. Most of the discussion included selected people from each member, the SAG/SC chairs, the MP Coordinator and consultant, and the Secretariat. However, due to the urgent need to resolve the issue, the last 5 days of discussion was largely conducted between Australia, Japan and the Secretariat, with copies to the MP coordinator, consultant (and SAG/SC chairs when appropriate). Other members were advised of this and were offered copies of correspondence and the opportunity to make comments.

Important principles in the discussions were that:

- There should not be any differences between the data sets used in the 2004 stock assessment and the OM update.
- It is necessary to have confidence that the data is correct

Discussions focussed on the Japanese catch effort and catch at size data because these data are particularly important data for the assessment and these data had changed. For the Japanese data, it was revealed that:

- The data used in the 2001 assessment came from NRIFS's "L5M"² data set. However, continual revisions are made to the L5M data (with major updating up to 5 years after exploitation) that are not reflected in the data used in the 2001 assessment. This results in discrepancies (from 1989 onwards) between the current version of the "L5M" data and the data used in the 2001 assessment.
- The data originally provided for the operating model in 2002 came from updated L5M data, but errors in area assignment were detected in this data.
- The historic data provided for the CCSBT database was prepared with a data preparation technique (which includes RTMP data) that Japan considers more reliable for CCSBT purposes than the L5M data. However, this technique did not include a logbook coverage adjustment which means that the data provided for the CCSBT database for years prior to 1995 (when there was no RTMP data) would be underestimated.

As a consequence of the above, it was agreed that the updated L5M data should be provided and used for years up to and including 1994³, and that the data from the CCSBT database should be used from 1995.

It was also noted that further explanation and clarification of the data was still required, but that this information could be provided at the September 2004 SAG meeting.

With a revised historical dataset being agreed, it was also agreed that there was little value in conducting the previously agreed mechanical update of the OM. Instead, it was agreed to run the OM with the new data to 2000 for comparison with existing OM results, and then to run the operating model with the full new data up to 2003.

² This data set has been the basis for data provision from Japan for all regional fisheries organisations. However, for data from 1995 and onwards, a different (better) data set is now generated for the CCSBT.

³ Japan provided the required L5M catch effort and related size data to the Secretariat on 5 July 2004.

Resolution

On 25 June 2004, the Executive Secretary sent the following e-mail to the data exchange mailing lists to outline the final proposals and to finalise the discussion. No one voiced any concerns over these proposals, so this is the final decision on the data to be used for the 2004 stock assessment and the OM update.

“Dear all

There has been a lot of discussion between member scientists over the last few days regarding the data to use in the coming assessment and update of the operating model. The outcome of these discussions is that there is general agreement that with the exception of Japanese data prior to 1995, the data to be used for all fisheries on catch effort and size is the data that was distributed on the CCSBT data CD in April 2004 plus all updates to that data provided in this year's data exchange. For the Japanese data prior to 1995, Japan will circulate the catch effort and size data to be used in the next day or two. This outcome means that our “best” versions of the fishery data will be used in both the assessment and operating model and that the assessment and operating model will use the same data.

The MPWS3 workshop agreed that a mechanical update of the operating model would be conducted, only updating the data from 2000. However, due to the outcome of these discussions (which means that revised historical data would be used), there is little value in conducting a mechanical update. As defined at MPWS3. Instead the proposal is to first run the operating model with the new dataset up to 2000 and to compare results with the existing OM results to assess the effect of the changed historic data. The n the operating model should be run with the full new dataset up to 2003.

Due to the complexity of these discussions and the need for an urgent resolution, not everyone was involved in the discussions and they now represent agreement by Australia and Japan. If the other members have some difficulty with this agreement please let me know immediately.

The importance of documentation has been re-confirmed as agreed in April, 2004. All parties should provide documentation describing data preparation procedures, with a specific emphasis on changes from the historical records, to the SAG/SC in September this year for discussion.

Regards
Brian”