



**Estimates of reporting rate from the Australian surface fishery based on previous tag seeding experiments and tag seeding activities in 2006/2007**

**William Hearn  
Tom Polacheck  
Clive Stanley  
Michael Rowlands**

**Prepared for the CCSBT 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Stock Assessment Group and the 12<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Extended Scientific Committee  
4-8 September, and 10-14 September 2007, Hobart, Australia**

## Table of Contents

Abstract.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Methods.....	2
Seeding operations.....	2
Estimation Model for Reporting Rates .....	3
Results.....	5
2006/2007 Tag Seeding .....	5
Tag shedding.....	6
Reporting Rates.....	6
Discussion.....	7
Literature Cited .....	10
Acknowledgements.....	11
Appendix 1: Estimation of Shedding in the Tag Seeding Experiments.....	16

## List of Tables

Table 1: Summary of the number of tag returns for double-tag-seeded fish from the tag seeding experiments by year.....	12
Table 2: Summary of tag returns by tow cage for the 2002/2003, 2003/2004, 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 tag seeding experiments, including single-tagged fish (except one cage where no tag shedding information was available). .....	13
Table 3: Estimates of reporting rates, their variances and standard errors for the Australian surface fishery for years 2002/2003 to 2005/2006. ....	15

## Abstract

A pilot tag-seeding project was conducted in 2002/2003 on purse seine caught fish when they were transferred from tow cages to grow out cages in the Australian southern bluefin tuna fishery, and overall, tags from 66.4% of the seeded fish were recovered. Further tag seeding was conducted during the 2003/2004, 2004/2005, 2005/2006 and 2006/2007 fishing seasons. The primary purpose of the tag seeding is to obtain estimates of tag reporting rates from this component of the global SBT fishery. This paper presents a report on the seeding conducted during the 2006/2007 surface fishing season. In addition, results from the analysis of the data obtained from the 2002/2003, 2003/2004, 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 tag-seeding experiments are reported and compared. In 2003/2004 tag seeding occurred in fish from 22 out of a total of 36 tow cages (an increase from 7 cages out of 37 in the previous year), and overall tags from 49.5% of the fish were recovered. In 2004/2005 tag seeding took place for 34 of the 36 tow cages (an increase on the previous year), and overall tags from 38.1% of the fish were recovered. In 2005/2006 tag seeding took place for 32 of the 36 tow cages (a slight decrease on the previous year), and overall tags from 20.4% of the fish were recovered. During 2006/2007 fish were tagged and seeded into farms from 29 of the 33 tow cages. Harvesting operations for 2006/2007 are still under way and as such the total number of returns is unknown at this point. For all years there have been no reports of any of the tag seeded fish dying prematurely or other negative impacts on fish from the tag seeding.

Analyses of the data (which incorporates the tag shedding estimates and variances) from the 2002/2003, 2003/2004, 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 fishing seasons yielded estimates of weighted mean reporting rates across cages of 0.640 (s.e. = 0.062), 0.503 (s.e. = 0.053), 0.396 (s.e. = 0.029), and 0.215 (se = 0.025), respectively. The estimates of reporting rates presented are low based on past expectations and rapidly declining over the years. The most critical statistical estimation issues that need further exploration includes, potential biases particularly the representativeness of the cages tagged, and the low level of the reporting rate. It is suggested that a reduction in direct and personal interactions between industry and the tagging program may be having a negative effect on the subsequent reporting rates. The very low estimate of the reporting rate for 2005/2006 raises the question of whether the tag seeding results are providing unbiased estimates of the reporting rate.

## Introduction

The CCSBT has embarked on a large scale juvenile tagging program as part of its collaborative Scientific Research Programme (SRP). The aim of the tagging component is to provide direct estimates of fishing and natural mortality rates (see Anon 2001). Estimates of tag reporting rates are essential for the SRP tagging program to meet its principle objective. In the design of the tagging program, it was anticipated that for most of the main fisheries components (i.e. the various longline fisheries), reporting rates would be estimated from observer data collected under the scientific observer component of the SRP. However, for the Australian purse seine surface fishery, which catches fish for tuna farming, observers can not provide useful data for estimating reporting rates since fish are not removed from the water at the time of capture. Thus, it is impossible to observe the number of fish with tags at the time of capture. As such, alternative approaches are required to estimate the reporting rate from this important component of the global SBT fishery. As part of its commitment to the SRP, Australia undertook a commitment to explore and develop an approach for estimating reporting rates from the SBT farm sector.

After consideration of alternative approach, tag seeding, or planting, was assessed to be the most (perhaps only) viable approach that would allow for direct estimation of reporting rates. In this approach, tags are inserted in a sample of fish within tuna farms. Since the number of seeded tags released into the farms is known exactly, reporting rates can be directly estimated from the number of tags subsequently returned taking into account any tag shedding. A pilot tag-seeding program was conducted in 2002/2003 to assess whether in fact tag seeding could be implemented to provide reliable reporting rates. The project was a pilot one in that it aimed to demonstrate (1) the viability of tagging fish in the farms without inducing mortality, (2) to determine if sufficient industry support could be gained to allow the tag seeding to go ahead in the future and (3) to provide data that would determine the level of tag seeding required to obtain reporting rate estimates with reasonable levels of precision. Based on the success of the pilot program (particularly the demonstrated ability to conduct the seeding without inducing mortality and to obtain estimates of reporting rates from the recapture of tag-seeded fish), tagging seeding has been carried on in each successive year to ensure that data are available for estimating tag reporting rates from the Australian surface fishery (Polacheck and Stanley 2004, 2005).

Polacheck and Stanley (2005) provided preliminary estimates of reporting rates for the surface fishery based on the data from the available tag-seeding data but identified a number of statistical estimation matters (particularly with respect to variance estimation and the estimation of shedding rates) needing further exploration. Polachek et al. (2006) developed improved and more robust methods for the estimation of reporting rates and their variances from the tag-seeding data, provided estimates of reporting rates and associated variances from the Australian surface fishery for the 2002/2003 through 2004/2005 fishing seasons using these methods and reported on tag seeding activities during the 2005/2006 season. The purpose of the present paper is to update this and also provide estimates of reporting rates and associated variances from the Australian surface fishery for the 2005/2006 fishing season using these methods and report on tag seeding activities during the 2006/2007 season.

## **Methods**

### *Seeding operations*

Stanley and Polacheck (2003) document the details of the approach taken for tag seeding. The approach developed was based on extensive discussions with industry and was designed to address three major concerns that were raised:

1. Potential for tag induced mortality and thus loss of fish and income;
2. Potential stress and reduction in growth within the farm from handling of fish for tagging;
3. Potential for the confidentiality and proprietary information on growth achieved by individual farmer to be compromised.

The protocol developed was to require that all tagging was to be undertaken by experienced taggers. In addition, to minimize stress and increased handling of fish, all fish that would be tagged would be taken from the 40 fish sampled for weight and length at the time fish are transferred from the towing cages to fish pens. This means that tag seeding would not require any additional fish to be taken from the water and physically handled. Moreover, tagging would thus entail a minimal of additional time that a fish sampled for weight and length would be out of the water. In order, to ensure that the confidentiality and proprietary nature of

any potential information on growth was maintained, it was agreed that no data on the length or weight of fish at the time of harvesting would be retained in the scientific tagging data base. Such data would not contribute to the interpretation of the results and thus their non-retention would not compromise the reason for conducting tag-seeding experiments.

Given the above, a target was set of tagging 10 fish from the 40 fish that are sampled for weight and length from as many tow cages as possible. In all cases, tagging was at the discretion of the company that owned the fish. (If a farmer desired to have more than 10 fish tagged, then up to 40 fish would be tagged.). All fish were to be double tagged so that tag shedding (which may be higher for fish tagged in cages) could be accounted for in the estimation of reporting rates. Standard conventional tags labelled with return to CSIRO were used in 2002/2003 pilot experiment, and thereafter CCSBT labelled tags.

Based on the success of the 2002/2003 experiment in terms of no reported negative concerns having been reported by industry relative to mortality and growth of seeded tagged fish, the same approach has been used in each successive season (i.e. 2003/2004, 2004/2005, 2005/2006 and 2006/2007). The only substantive difference between tagging from that in the 2002/2003 pilot experiment and subsequent tag seeding was that CCSBT labelled tags were used. This helps ensure that the intended “double blind” nature of the seeding experiments is realized (i.e. that seeded and un-seeded tags are indistinguishable) since almost all recent SBT tagging has been done with CCSBT labelled tags. In 2003/2004, some of the taggers performing the tagging in the seeding experiments were inexperienced because of unanticipated need for Protec Marine, the company that undertakes the 40 fish sampling, to engage extra staff. It became apparent when the results of the 2003/2004 seeding experiments were available, that high shedding rates were high for some taggers (see results below). Consequently, a preseason tag training workshop was conducted prior to the tag seeding of the 2004/2005, 2005/2006 and 2006/2007 season to train those that had not previously tagged and to refresh/standardized tagging techniques among all taggers. Only personnel that had been trained conducted tag seeding in these years in order to reduce shedding rates. The training workshops covered the rationale of tag seeding and instructed the taggers in tag insertion techniques.

### *Estimation Model for Reporting Rates*

We here repeat the model developed in Polacheck et al. (2006). The data available for estimating reporting rates are (1) the number of tags seeded into each tow cage, (2) the number of fish in each tow cage (including those for cages with no seeded tags), (3) the individual conducting the tag seeding, (4) the number of tag-seeded fish for which two tags were returned from a tow cage, (5) the number of tag-seeded fish for which only a single tag was return from a cage and (6) the number of tag-seeded fish for which no tags were returned. These data can be used to provide a straightforward estimate of the reporting rate from a tow cage:

$$\lambda_{h,j} = \frac{r_{h,j}}{(1 - \gamma_j)n_{h,j}} \quad (1)$$

$\lambda_{h,j}$  = the estimated reporting rate for the  $h^{\text{th}}$  tow cage with seeded fish tagged by the  $j^{\text{th}}$  tagger;

- $\gamma_j$  = the estimated tag shedding rate for the  $j^{\text{th}}$  tagger<sup>1</sup>;
- $n_{h,j}$  = the number of tags seeded into the  $h^{\text{th}}$  tow cage tagged by  $j^{\text{th}}$  tagger;
- $r_{h,j}$  = the number of recovered seeded tags from the  $h^{\text{th}}$  tow cage tagged by  $j^{\text{th}}$  tagger;

Note that the shedding rate ( $\gamma_j$ ) is defined as probability of a seeded tagged fish having shed both of its tags prior to being recaptured. As long as the shedding rate of seeded tags within a cage is independent of the reporting rate for a cage, the variance of  $\lambda_{h,j}$  equals

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\lambda}_{hj}) = \text{Var}\left(\frac{r_{h,j}}{n_{h,j}}\right) \hat{W}_j^2 + \left(\frac{r_{h,j}}{n_{h,j}}\right)^2 \text{Var}(\hat{W}_j) \quad (2)$$

where  $\hat{W}_j$  = the estimate of  $\frac{1}{1-\gamma_j}$ .

Assuming that the probability of returning a tag from a cage for a fish which has not shed both of its tags is independent (i.e. binomial process), the variance of  $r_h/n_h$  (the proportion of tags that were returned from seeded fish that had retained at least one tag) is:

$$\text{Var}\left(\frac{r_h}{n_h}\right) = \frac{r_h}{n_h} \left(1 - \frac{r_h}{n_h}\right) \frac{1}{n_h - 1} \quad (3)$$

Estimates of the variance of  $\hat{W}_j$  were obtained using the bootstrap procedure described in Appendix I. Note that equation 3 ignores the correction for the fact that the number of fish in each tow cage is finite as the correction factor is negligible in this situation<sup>2</sup>.

In terms of the shedding rates, it should be noted that the number of seeded double-tagged SBT released into a cage has almost always been ten. As such the numbers of returns from the double tagged tag-seeded fish are inadequate for obtaining a meaningful estimate of the shedding rate and its variances on an individual cage basis. Some pooling of recapture data among cages is necessary to obtain estimates of the tag shedding rates for the seeded tags<sup>3</sup>. In the analyses here we have assumed that differences in shedding rates are a tagger effect and cage independent<sup>4</sup>. We also allowed for shedding rates for a tagger to vary among year (e.g. as a result of the tag training that has been conducted). Where no significant differences were

<sup>1</sup> Note that all tagging of seeded fish within any cage was done by only one tagger.

<sup>2</sup> The finite correction factor equals one minus the sampling fraction. The sampling fraction in this case is on the order of .001 (i.e. 10 out of around 10,000 fish in a tow cage).

<sup>3</sup> Note that comparisons of shedding rates for seeded tags and wild tag releases indicate that the rates are different. In addition, taggers doing the seeding are different than those that have done the tagging in the wild and significant differences in shedding rates exist among different taggers. As such, it is not clear to what extent the differences in shedding rates are tagger effect or the result of releasing tagged fish directly into a farm cage (e.g. contact with the net may increase shedding in the initial period after tagging before tags become firmly embedded in muscle tissue). In any case, separate estimates of the shedding rates for seeded tags are required in order to avoid introducing biases into the reporting rates.

<sup>4</sup> No obvious company effects were apparent and it is not clear what would be plausible factors that would generate company specific differences in shedding rates.

found between taggers or years, data were pooled to form tagger groups in which the rates were similar for the taggers and years included within a group (See Appendix 1 for details).

The reporting rate estimates from equation 1 were combined to provide an overall annual average reporting rate ( $\hat{\lambda}_y$ ). In previous analyses (Polacheck and Stanley 2004, 2005), this was done by taking a simple average across all cages. While this provides unbiased estimates of the reporting rate, a more efficient estimate is to take a weighted mean of the reporting rates among cages taking into account the variability in the number of fish in each tow cage:

$$\hat{\lambda}_y = \sum_{h=1}^{N_{p,y}} \frac{g_{h,y}}{G_{p,y}} \hat{\lambda}_{h,y} \quad (4)$$

where  $N_{p,y}$  = the total number of cages with seeded tags in year  $y$ ,

$g_{h,y}$  = the number fish in the  $h^{\text{th}}$  tow cage in year  $y$  and

$G_{p,y} = \sum_{h=1}^{N_{p,y}} g_{h,y}$ , the total number of fish in the cages with seeded tags.

For comparison, we provide estimates of the simple and weighted mean reporting rate estimates. For the case of the simple mean, its variance is estimated as:

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\lambda}_y) = \frac{(1-f_y)}{N_{p,y}} \sum_{h=1}^{N_{p,y}} \frac{(\hat{\lambda}_{h,y} - \hat{\lambda}_y)^2}{N_{p,y} - 1} + \frac{f_y}{N_{p,y}^2} \sum_{h=1}^{N_{p,y}} \text{Var}(\hat{\lambda}_{h,y}) \quad (5)$$

where  $f_y$  = among-cage sampling fraction in year  $y$  (i.e. the proportion of cages with seeded tags -  $N_{p,y}/N_y$ ).

For the weighted mean, its variance is estimated as:

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\lambda}_y) = (1-f_y) N_{p,y} \sum_{h=1}^{N_{p,y}} \left( \frac{g_{h,y}}{G_{p,y}} \right)^2 \frac{(\hat{\lambda}_{h,y} - \hat{\lambda}_y)^2}{N_{p,y} - 1} + f_y \sum_{h=1}^{N_{p,y}} \left( \frac{g_{h,y}}{G_{p,y}} \right)^2 \text{Var}(\hat{\lambda}_{h,y}) \quad (6)$$

Note that  $f_y$  is defined slightly differently in equation 6. In this case, it is the fraction of farm fish that were in those cages that were seeded. The variance estimators (equations 5 and 6) used here represents an improvement over that used in the preliminary analyses of the tag-seeding data in Polacheck and Stanley (2004, 2005). The current estimator takes into account both the within and between cage variance in the reporting rate estimates and also the fact that in 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 a large proportion of the actual tow cages were seeded.

## Results

### 2006/2007 Tag Seeding

Information available at the time of this report indicates that fish were tagged and seeded into farms from 29 of the 33 cages in 2006/2007 or (88%). This was very similar to the 89% level achieved in 2005/2006 and a slight decrease from the 94% rate achieved in 2004/2005.

Overall, for the last three years seeding rates have been generally and markedly improved from the 61% level achieved in the first full year of seeding. The failure to achieve 100% coverage is due to two companies unwilling to permit tag seeding in their cages. As of July 1,

few seeded tags have been returned to CCSBT but most of the farm fish have yet to be harvested.

### *Tag shedding*

Table 1 provides a summary by tagger for each season of number of double-tagged seeded fish from which tags were returned, the number of these for which two tags were returned, and the fraction for which only a single tag was returned. As noted previously the fraction of fish for which only one tag was returned in 2003/2004 was quite high (0.429) indicating relatively high shedding rates in this year. Preliminary results presented in Polacheck and Stanley (2005) indicate that tag shedding rates in 2004/2005 had been reduced considerably over 2003/2004 as a result of training provided to taggers. Now that complete results are available for the 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 season they show that the shedding rates were maintained (Table 1). Thus, compared to the 0.429 fraction of single tags in 2003/2004, the fraction declined to 0.375 in 2004/2005, but increased to 0.413 in 2005/2006. However, the results in Appendix 1 suggest that this may be due to the difference in the proportion of tags seeded by different taggers and sampling variability. A notable result in 2005/2006 has been the substantial improvement in the performance of tagger 5 (previously the lowest performing tagger), with fractions of single tagged fish returned of 0.633, 0.583 and 0.400 in years 2003/2004, 2004/2005 and 2005/2006, respectively, which has markedly increased the precision of the estimate of the number of fish that have lost both tags during 2005/2006. This demonstrates that it is important to provide adequate training to all taggers, particularly the low performing ones.

Appendix 1 provides details of the method (from Polacheck et al. 2006) and analyses used to estimate the tag shedding rates from these tag-seeding experiments. The results of these analyses suggest that for the estimation of shedding rates, the data can be pooled into four year/tagger groups in which the shedding rates are not statistically different for those releases within a group, but are statistically different among groups. The estimates of the shedding rates (i.e. the probability of any tag being lost) ranged from ~0.08 to 0.44 among the four different groups (Table 1A4b<sup>5</sup>). For the tagger group with the highest shedding rate (Group IV, which are from tagger 5 for 2003/2004 and 2004/2005) about 20% of the seeded tagged fish would have been expected to have lost both their tags. For the other groups (including tagger 5 for 2005/2006) less than 9% of the seeded tagged fish would have been expected to have lost both their tags. In Polacheck et al. (2006) tagger group II was the highest shedding rate with about 13%, but this group included tagger 5 for 2003/2004 and 2004/2005. This discrepancy was due to the increase in data since 2006 which allows the data to be split into 4 groups by AIC, instead of 3 as in Polacheck et al. (2006).

The results in Appendix 1 also indicate that the shedding rates are estimated with adequate to high levels of precision. Thus, the estimates of the coefficient of variation for correction factor  $W_j$  (which accounts for the effects of tag shedding on the reporting rates) are less than 9% for Group IV and less than 2.5% for Groups I to III (Table A4c).

### *Reporting Rates*

Table 2 lists the number of tagged seeded fish that were released and the number that were recovered by tow cage for each year. Also given is the percentage returned from each cage, which is an estimate of the reporting rate for that cage uncorrected for tag shedding. Based on

<sup>5</sup> Note that the estimates in Table 1A4b are given in terms of the retention rate (i.e. the probably that a tag has been retained at the time of harvest) and the shedding rates are simply one minus these values.



these data, Table 3 provides weighted and unweighted (simple) estimates of the mean annual reporting rate which take into account the effects of tag shedding. The simple and weighted annual mean estimates are quite similar. The largest difference is for the 2004 where the simple mean estimate is 0.550 and the weighted mean is 0.503 (a difference of ~ 9 %). As would be expected, even in this case the difference between the weighted and simple mean estimates is not statistically different. Since the weighted mean reporting rate gives more weight to cages with large numbers of fish and these in turn would be expected to contain more wild tagged SBT, the weighted estimates would be the most appropriate to be incorporated into the mortality models that analyze data from wild tagged fish.

We re-estimated the reporting rates with shedding rates assumed zero and the percentage decreases in the reporting rates were 2.0% for 2002/2003, 10.4% for 2003/2004, 8.0% for 2004/2005, and 6.5% for 2005/2006. The lowest shedding rates associated with group I taggers were in 2002/2003, and the highest shedding rates associated with group IV taggers, were in 2003/2004 and 2004/2005, which demonstrate the importance of striving to keep shedding rates low. The changes would be much greater if a substantial fraction of the planted tags were only single-tagged.

## Discussion

As discussed in Polacheck et al. (2006), the estimated reporting rates presented here represent a substantial improvement over the preliminary estimates presented in Polacheck and Stanley (2004, 2005) as a number of statistical estimation matters that were identified as needing further exploration have been addressed. In particular, the current estimates provide (1) more robust and efficient error models for incorporating the effects of tag shedding, (2) allow for pooling of shedding rates when these were statistically similar either among taggers or across years and (3) account for the differential number of fish in different tow cages. In addition, the estimator for the shedding rate corrects an error in the estimator used in Polacheck and Stanley (2004, 2005), which resulted in an overestimate of the shedding rate and a corresponding underestimate of the reporting rates<sup>6</sup>. This effect was greatest for the 2003/2004 estimate and decreases the estimate of the overall reporting rate by ~0.10 (i.e. this is the primary source of the difference between the estimate of 0.63 given in Polacheck and Stanley (2005) for 2003/2004 with those in Table 3). For 2002/2003, the effect was negligible (i.e. a difference of ~0.005) due to the much lower shedding rates in that year.

It should also be noted that one seeded tag from the 2003/2004 seeding was returned from a recreational fisherman fishing outside the cages in Port Lincoln, and similarly 4 from the 2004/2005 seeding. These presumably represent escapees from the farms. While the expectation is that such escapes are rare, they could potentially slightly confound the interpretation of the seeding results – i.e. some (small) fraction of the non-reported seeded tags could represent escapees from the farm. In terms of the analyses of the overall tagging data, the question would be whether such escapees essentially die in the Port Lincoln area as a result of having been caught and placed in the farm (e.g. because of having developed a dependency on the farms for feeding or get caught by recreational fishermen) or whether they

---

<sup>6</sup> The estimator of the shedding rate in Polacheck and Stanley (2004, 2005) mistakenly used the conditional probability of that a fish had shed one tag given that it was recovered (i.e.  $1-Q$  of Appendix 1) as an estimate of the unconditional probability of shedding a tag.

return to the wild stock. In the former case, it would be appropriate to include escapee as part of the non-reported returns, in the latter they should be counted as non-captured tagged fish.

Ensuring that tag shedding is as minimal as possible is important for reducing uncertainty in the reporting rate estimates. This emphasizes the importance of tagger training and monitoring, and implementing a strict tagging protocol in order to reduce tag shedding to low levels. Note that the tagger (tagger 5 in 2003/2004 and 2004/2005) with the lowest retention rate (i.e. highest shedding rate) improved in 2005/2006 after training. Although tag shedding may be accounted for in single-tagged fish if a tagger has double-tagged sufficient number of fish, it is preferable that all seeded tagged fish are double-tagged to achieve both high levels of precision and to be able to test for consistency over time. One exception to this may be to conduct tagging with sufficient number of single and double tag fish to test for the possibility on non-independence of shedding in the farm cages and correct for this if it is found to be occurring.

There are small increases in the estimated reporting rates for 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 from those presented in Polacheck et al. (2006). Thus, the rate for 2003/2004 increased from 0.482 to 0.503 and the rate for 2005/2006 increased from 0.363 to 0.396. It should be noted that additional data are the primary cause of the increases, The other contributing cause has been due to the change in the grouping of taggers for the purpose of estimating shedding rates. In addition, the slight decrease, from 0.645 to 0.640, in the 2002/2003 reporting rate since Polacheck et al. (2006) has been entirely due to the change in the grouping of taggers.

Between 2002/2003 and 2005/2006, the estimated variances for the annual reporting rates have progressively declined (Table 2). This is primarily due to three reasons. Firstly the large increase in the sampling fraction to ~90% means that the among-cage component of the variance must become small (i.e. with 100% sampling it becomes zero). Secondly, the increase in the number of cages with seeded tags, from 6 to 32-34 yields a substantial decline in the estimate of the within-cage component (i.e. all else being equal the within cage component of the variance is inversely proportional to the number of cages seeded). These two factors are the main source of the decrease in the variance between 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 and off-set the increase in the shedding rate in that year. Thirdly, the shedding rates decreased markedly between 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 and high and uncertain shedding rates<sup>7</sup> can be a major contributor to the within cage component (i.e. equation 2). While there has been a marked decline in the variances, the coefficients of variation (CV) associated with the reporting rates have been rather steady (i.e. between 7.3% and 11.6% - Table 3). This mainly reflects the fact that the decline in the variances has occurred simultaneously with a decline in the reporting rate.

The estimates of the reporting rates have progressively declined during the three years of these experiments by an average of about 30% per year (i.e. from 0.640 in 2002/2003 to 0.503 in 2003/2004 to 0.396 in 2004/2005 and to 0.215 in 2005/2006 based on the weighted mean estimates). This is of concern, as it leads to increased uncertainty in any mortality rate estimates if other conditions remain constant. The decline between 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 was accompanied by a marked increase in the percentage of cages with seeded tags (i.e. 19% to 94%). It is unlikely that this increase in itself was responsible for a change of reporting rates. Nevertheless, there were two factors in the 2002/2003 experiment that potentially may have resulted in the estimate for that year being biased:

---

<sup>7</sup> Low shedding rates inherently will have low variances.

- (1) The seeded tags were CSIRO labeled tags while the wild fish tags in the cages had CCSBT labeled tags (with the possible exception of a few older fish). This could have resulted in a difference in the reporting rate between seeded tagged fish and wild tagged as the two types of tags were distinguishable. As the tag and labeling have been the same for seeded and wild tagged fish in subsequent years, this factor would not affect the latter reporting rate estimates.
- (2) There was initially substantial reluctance by industry to allow the seeding of tags into their cage and those cages that were actually seeded may not have constituted a representative sample. Those companies that did agree to cooperate the seeding may have been more cooperative/conscientious with respect to returning of tags. If this were the case, the estimate for 2002/2003 could be substantially biased upwards. In 2003/2004, 2004/2005, and 2005/2006 the high proportion of cages that were seeded would mean that the effect of any such correlation between actual reporting rates and those cages which were seeded would be much less. Nevertheless, if such a correlation did exist, the latter reporting rates would also be biased upward. Ideally, seeding should take place in 100% of the cages.

Low reporting rates will increase the uncertainty of any estimates derived from the tagging of wild caught animals. For example, the actual number of tags returns is the primary factor which determines the level of precision that will be achieved in a tagging experiment designed to estimate mortality rates (e.g. Brownie models). Having precise estimates of reporting rates and sufficient number of tag releases to ensure a reasonable number of returns can mitigate low reporting rate and reasonably precise mortality rate estimates are still achievable. However, when reporting rates estimates reach the low level that were obtained in 2005/2006, the magnitude of the correction factors to account for unreported tags becomes so large that the reliability of the fishing mortality rate estimates based on such low reporting rates becomes a concern as the result of potential unaccounted source of variance and potential biases in reporting rate estimates.

There is an obvious need to improve the reporting rate to maximize the benefits from the current and any future tagging. However, care needs to be taken when instituting any method to improve the reporting rates to ensure that it does not compromise/bias the overall tagging results. In particular, an approach that resulted in increased reporting rates but compromised the ability to precisely and accurately estimate the actual reporting rates could result in substantial increased uncertainty and should be avoided. Approaches that could be considered to increase reporting rates would include

- (1) having tag collectors routinely and frequently visit farm harvesting operations to make the returning of tags as easy as possible and being readily accessible for the collection of tags;
- (2) enabling tag collectors to provide on the spot rewards;
- (3) increasing the value of the reward provided;<sup>8</sup>
- (4) increasing the publicity and liaison activities (personal contacts) used for promoting awareness of the tagging program
- (5) using tags that can be automatically detected (e.g. PIT tags) or

---

<sup>8</sup> Cash rewards were increased from \$10 to \$15 at the start of the CCSBT tagging program

(6) the institution of a system using tag-collection observers who would monitor fish when they are harvested from the grow-out cages (ideally at the point at which they are removed from the water).

In terms of the last of these, unless coverage approached 100%, ensuring representative coverage of the harvest would be important. However, this may be difficult given that some fish are harvested for auction on the fresh market and others harvested for sale to freezer boats. The size of fish in these two categories is likely to be different as the relative proportion and timing of harvesting will vary among farm operators. In particular, harvesting for the fresh market occurs over an extended period with generally small numbers being harvested on any day and would present logistical difficulties assuming access could be arranged.

The low reporting rate estimate for 2005/2006 raises the question of whether in fact the tag seeding results are providing unbiased estimates of the reporting rate. In this context, a limited experiment monitoring for tag returns was conducted last year by the CCSBT Secretariat involving observing of fish for tags when they were being transferred to the freezer boats for processing (Secretariat, 2006). Only one seeded tag was recovered by the observer out of 67 tagged fish. As discussed in more detail in Polachek and Eveson 2007, the results from this experiment are confounded and difficult to interpret. The recovery of only one seeded tag during the monitoring appears not to be necessarily inconsistent with the tag seeding results given the issues and problems in interpreting the results from this experiment. Nevertheless, the low number does raise some concerns about shedding rates and lack of independence in shedding for double tagged fish released directly into farm cages. This issue needs to be addressed further and is explored further in Polachek and Eveson 2007.

## Literature Cited

- Anon. 2001. Report of the fifth meeting of the Scientific Committee. CCSBT. 19-24 March. Tokyo, Japan.
- Polachek, T. and C. Stanley. 2005. Tag seeding activities in 2004/2005 and preliminary estimates of reporting rate from the Australian surface fishery based on previous tag seeding experiments. CCSBT-ESC/0509/20.
- Polachek and Stanley 2004. Update on tag seeding activities and preliminary estimates of reporting rates from the Australian surface fishery based on tag seeding experiments. CCSBT-ESC/0409/15.
- Polachek, T., B. Hearn, C. Millar and C. Stanley. 1998. Updated estimates of mortality rates for juvenile SBT from multi-year tagging cohorts. CCSBT-SC/9808/20
- Polachek, T., W. Hearn, P. Eveson, and M. Rowlands. 2006. Estimates of reporting rate from the Australian surface fishery based on previous tag seeding experiments and tag seeding activities in 2005/2006. CCSBT-ESC/0609/14.
- Secretariat (CCSBT). 2006. SBT Tagging Program. CCSBT-ESC/0609/07.

Stanley, C. and T. Polacheck. 2003. Report from a pilot tag seeding programme for estimating tag reporting rates from the Australian surface fishery. CCSBT-ESC/0309/25.

## **Acknowledgements**

We wish to acknowledge the cooperation of those tuna farm operators that allowed tagging seeding to be undertaken within their cages. Without such cooperation, these tag-seeding experiments would not be possible. We also wish to thank Protec Marine for their assistance with the tag seeding and tag return operations. The Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF) provided funding support for this project.

Table 1: Summary of the number of tag returns for double-tag-seeded fish from the tag seeding experiments by year.

Year	Tagger	No. Tagged fish recovered	No. With two tags	Fraction with only one tag
2002/2003	1	36	31	0.14
	2	6	5	0.17
	3	16	13	0.19
2003/2004	3	22	11	0.50
	4	40	31	0.23
	5	30	11	0.63
	6	7	3	0.57
2004/2005	7	6	4	0.33
	3	33	18	0.45
	4	67	49	0.27
	5	24	10	0.58
2005/2006	6	4	3	0.25
	4	19	11	0.42
	5	25	15	0.40
	10	19	11	0.42

Table 2: Summary of tag returns by tow cage for the 2002/2003, 2003/2004, 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 tag seeding experiments, including single-tagged fish (except one cage where no tag shedding information was available).

Year	Cage	Tagger	No. Tagged	No. Returned	% Returned
2002/2003	1	1	20	20	100
	2	1	20	16	80
	3	2	10	6	60
	4	3	10	5	50
	5	3	11	7	64
	6	3	10	4	40
	7*	4	38	21	55
2003/2004	1	4	10	7	70
	2	5	10	5	50
	3	4	10	7	70
	4	6	10	1	10
	5	6	9	3	33
	6	5	10	0	0
	7	5	10	8	80
	8	3	10	8	80
	9	3	10	8	80
	10	3	10	6	60
	11	6	10	2	20
	12	5	10	3	30
	13	4	10	2	20
	14*	5	6	2	33
2004/2005	15	4	10	10	100
	16	4	10	9	90
	17	5	9	9	100
	18	7	10	6	60
	19	5	10	1	10
	20	5	10	0	0
	21	5	10	4	40
	22	4	10	5	50
	1	4	10	3	30
	2	4	10	2	20
	3	3	11	2	18
	4	4	10	1	10
	5	4	10	0	0
	6	5	10	7	70
	7	4	10	1	10
	8	4	10	0	0
9	3	10	6	60	
10	6	10	2	20	
11	5	10	2	20	
12	4	10	3	30	
13	5	10	1	10	
14	5	10	6	60	
15	4	10	3	40	
16	5	10	5	50	

Table 2 (continued)

Year	Cage	Tagger	No. Tagged	No. Returned	% Returned
2004/2005	17	5	10	4	40
	18	4	10	8	80
	19	4	10	4	30
	20	4	10	8	80
	21	4	10	4	40
	22	6	10	2	20
	23	4	10	5	50
	24	3	10	2	20
	25	4	10	3	30
	26	4	10	6	60
	27	4	10	1	10
	28	3	10	7	70
	29	3	10	3	30
	30	4	10	4	40
	31	4	10	3	30
	32	3	10	6	60
	2005/2006	33	3	10	8
34		4	10	8	80
1		4	10	6	60
2		4	10	3	30
3		4	10	3	30
4		4	10	7	70
5		5	12	1	8
6		5	10	2	20
7		5	10	3	30
8		5	8	0	0
9		5	10	2	20
10		5	10	4	40
11		5	10	1	10
12		5	10	1	10
13	5	10	0	0	
14	5	10	1	10	
15	5	10	10	100	
16*	5	19	4	21	
17	10	10	0	0	
18	10	10	1	10	
19	10	10	0	0	
20	10	10	0	0	
21	10	9	4	44	
22	10	10	0	0	
23	10	10	6	60	
24	10	10	4	40	
25	10	10	0	0	
26	10	10	0	0	



Table 2 (continued)

Year	Cage	Tagger	No. Tagged	No. Returned	% Returned
2005/2006	27	10	10	1	10
	28	10	10	2	20
	29	10	10	0	0
	30	10	10	0	0
	31	10	10	0	0
	32	10	10	1	10

\* The taggers in these cases mistakenly only single tagged the fish. In addition 10 fish were single tagged by another tagger whom tagged no other fish in these experiments. The data from this latter tagger have been excluded from the table and all analyses.

Table 3: Estimates of reporting rates, their variances and standard errors for the Australian surface fishery for years 2002/2003 to 2005/2006.

Year	$\hat{\lambda}$	Unweighted			Weighted			
		$\text{Var}(\hat{\lambda})$	$\text{SE}(\hat{\lambda})$	CV %	$\hat{\lambda}$	$\text{Var}(\hat{\lambda})$	$\text{SE}(\hat{\lambda})$	CV%
2002/2003	0.652	0.00498	0.071	10.9	0.640	0.00383	0.062	9.7
2003/2004	0.550	0.00268	0.052	9.5	0.503	0.00286	0.053	10.5
2004/2005	0.417	0.00082	0.028	6.7	0.396	0.00085	0.029	7.3
2005/2006	0.218	0.00059	0.024	11.0	0.215	0.00065	0.025	11.6

## Appendix 1: Estimation of Shedding in the Tag Seeding Experiments

William Hearn

We use the shedding model given in Polacheck et al. (2006, Appendix 1) that is repeated below. The data from the tag seeding experiments provide a data set of the number of tag seeded fish from in which the primary (A) tag only was returned, the companion (B) tag only was returned and both (A&B) are returned (These are referred to as  $r_A$ ,  $r_B$ , and  $r_{AB}$ , respectively, with  $r_T$  their sum). For each tagger the above numbers are summed over cages in each year and are listed in Table A1.

We now estimate the proportions of tags not shed (i.e.  $Q_A$  and  $Q_B$  for A and B tags), respectively, and  $Q$  for either tag under the assumption that  $Q_A = Q_B$ . Note that  $Q_A$ ,  $Q_B$  and  $Q$  are estimate of retention rate of a single tag and that the probability of shedding a single tag is 1 minus these quantities. Assuming independence in the shedding of the A and B tags, the probabilities that a fish has retained both tags, tag A only, tag B only, or no tags, are  $Q_A Q_B$ ,  $Q_A(1-Q_B)$ ,  $Q_B(1-Q_A)$ , and  $(1-Q_A)(1-Q_B)$ , respectively. However, a fish shedding two tags cannot normally be identified. However, the first three terms can be estimated from the observed data conditional on a fish having retained at least one tag are:

$$p_{AB} = \frac{Q_A Q_B}{Q_A + Q_B - Q_A Q_B} \quad \text{for fish with both A and B tag.}$$

$$p_A = \frac{Q_A(1-Q_B)}{Q_A + Q_B - Q_A Q_B} \quad \text{for fish with an A tag only}$$

$$p_B = \frac{Q_B(1-Q_A)}{Q_A + Q_B - Q_A Q_B} \quad \text{for fish with an B tag only.}$$

We use a maximum likelihood approach to estimate the retention rates. The likelihood for all  $r_T$  observed recaptures is proportional to

$$\Lambda = (p_A)^{r_A} (p_B)^{r_B} (p_{AB})^{r_{AB}}$$

and the negative log-likelihood is  $-LL = -\ln(\Lambda)$  (to within a constant). It is straightforward to show that the maximum likelihood estimates of the  $Q$  parameters are

$$Q_A = \frac{r_{AB}}{r_{AB} + r_B} \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$Q_B = \frac{r_{AB}}{r_{AB} + r_A} \quad (\text{A2})$$

and if  $Q = Q_A = Q_B$

$$Q = \frac{r_{AB}}{r_{AB} + 0.5(r_A + r_B)}. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Estimates of  $-LL$  are listed in Table A2 for each tagger with data spanning two or more fishing seasons, together with the

$$AIC = 2(-LL + df),$$

where  $df =$  the number of degrees of freedom (2 if  $Q_A \neq Q_B$ , and 1 if  $Q = Q_A = Q_B$ ).

We pooled tagger data over years in a way that minimizes the AIC (Table A2). For tagger 5, the AIC for the pooled 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 data is 121.645, which is smaller than the summed 2003/2004 AIC and the 2004/2005 AIC, namely 125.438. Therefore, it is valid to pool the data of tagger 5 over years 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 and this suggests that tagger 5 was consistent in his tagging technique between the two years. The same pertains to tagger 6. Furthermore, when an addition year is considered for tagger 5, the AIC for the pooled 2003/2004, 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 data is 172.484, which is larger than the sum of 2005/2006 AIC (49.868) and the AIC (121.645) of the pooled 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 data, namely 171.513 (Table A2). Therefore, the shedding rates of tagger 5 significantly changed (in fact reduced) in 2005/2006, likely due to training.

For tagger 4 the AIC for the pooled 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 data is 161.385, which is marginally larger than the summed 2003/2004 AIC and the 2004/2005 AIC, namely 161.358. Therefore, it would seem to be invalid to pool the tagger 4's data over years 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 (mainly due to shedding rate differences in A and B tags), in agreement with the somewhat stronger result of Polacheck et al. (2006) that were based on different data with 8 less returns than analysed here. However, when an addition year is considered for tagger 4, the AIC for the pooled 2003/2004, 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 data is 200.696, which is less than the sum of the AICs for the three years (202.312) (Table A2), and also for pooled data for other combinations of years. This means that the shedding rates associated with tagger 4 are consistent over the three years of tagging.

The situation is different again for tagger 3 who tagged over three years, i.e. 2002/2003 through 2004/2005. Note, the AIC estimate for 2004/2005 (Table A2) is higher than in Polacheck et al. (2006) due to a late return. In Table A2 for tagger 3, the summed 2002/2003 to 2004/2005 AICs is 140.854, which is larger than the AIC =138.529 for the pooled 2002/2003 to 2004/2005 data, which in turn is larger than sum of the AICs of the 2002/2003 data and the pooled 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 data, namely 137.990. Therefore, the data for 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 are pooled before analyses, but the 2002/2003 data are analysed separately, which is in agreement with the findings of Polacheck et al. (2006).

We now investigate pooling of return data over taggers. We list in Table A3 the estimates of  $Q_A$ ,  $Q_B$  and  $Q$  and the associated  $-LL$  and AIC values by tagger. In this list some tagger data are pooled over years as presented in Table A2. In all cases the model  $Q = Q_A = Q_B$  gave the best fit, i.e. lowest AIC. Note, in Polacheck et al. (2006) tagger 4 in 2004/2005 was made a separate group for which  $Q_A \neq Q_B$ . However, the inclusion of more recent data in the analyses has now shown that the shedding rates associated with tagger 4 are consistent over the three years of tagging for which  $Q = Q_A = Q_B$  (see two paragraphs above). The data are pooled into 4 groups in Table A4a, group I if  $Q > 0.85$  (see Table A3), group II if  $0.80 \leq Q < 0.85$ , group III if  $0.65 \leq Q < 0.80$ , group IV if  $Q < 0.65$ , which gives the least AIC. The numbers of returns in groups I-IV are listed in Table A4a.

The estimates of shedding parameters  $Q_A$ ,  $Q_B$  and  $Q$ , which are derived from the pooled data sets (Table A4a), are listed in Table A4b, together with the associated  $-LL$  and AIC values. In Table A4b the least AICs correspond to  $Q = Q_A = Q_B$  for all data groups.

### The shedding factor $W$

To take account of shedding in estimating the reporting rates we multiply the numbers of returns from each cage by a factor  $W_j$  where

$$\hat{W} = 1 + \frac{r_A r_B}{r_{AB} r_T}, \quad \text{if } Q_A \neq Q_B, \quad (\text{A4})$$

or

$$\hat{W} = 1 + \frac{(r_A + r_B)^2}{4r_{AB} r_T}, \quad \text{if } Q_A = Q_B = Q. \quad (\text{A5})$$

For data group,  $j$ , we need to estimate  $\text{Var}(\hat{W}_j)$ , conditional on the number of returned seeded tagged fish  $r_T$ , to allow an estimate of  $\text{Var}(\hat{\lambda}_{hj})$  from equation (2). We used a bootstrap estimation procedure to obtain a variance estimate for each tagging group. For each group and bootstrap run  $i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, 1000$ ), a number  $r_T$  ( $=r_A + r_B + r_{AB}$ ) of returns were randomly selected of which  $r_{iA}$  had  $A$  tags,  $r_{iB}$  had  $B$  tags and  $r_{iAB}$  has both  $A$  and  $B$  tags ( $r_{iA} + r_{iB} + r_{iAB} = r_T$ ). From which run  $W_{ji}$  is estimated from the appropriate equation above. The variance of  $W_j$  is then estimated as

$$\text{Var}(\hat{W}_j) = \frac{1}{999} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{1000} \hat{W}_{ji}^2 - \frac{1}{1000} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{1000} \hat{W}_{ji} \right)^2 \right), \quad (\text{A6})$$

The resulting estimates of  $W_j$  and their variances are listed on Table A4c for each tagger groups. The results suggest that the estimates of  $W_j$  are precise (i.e. coefficient of variations of less than 9%). The results also indicate that tag shedding is not a large factor in accounting for the relatively low reporting rates that have been estimated from these tag seeding experiments. For the tagger group (IV, i.e. tagger 5 for 2003/2004 and 2004/2005) with the highest shedding rate (i.e. a 44% probability that a tag will be shed), ~20% of the seeded tagged fish would have been expected to have lost both tags (i.e.  $1 - 1/(1.24)$ ). However, for other groups (which includes tagger 5 for 2005/2006) the expected fraction losing both tags is expected to be less than 9%.

It should be noted that for cage 7 in 2002/2003 all 38 fish that were seeded into it were only single tagged. The tagging in this case was done by tagger 4 and this was the only cage that he tagged in 2002/2003. In order to use the data from this cage in estimating the reporting rates we assumed tagger 4's proficiency in this case was the same as when he double-tagged cage fish in 2004/2005. Hence, the parameter estimates from group I were used to estimate  $W$  and  $\text{Var}(W)$  for this cage. However,  $W$  was estimated as  $W=1/Q$  to account for the fact that that single tagging occurred. Also in cage 14 in 2003/2004 all seeded tags were single releases and in this one case two taggers were doing the tagging. For one of these we have no data for double-tagged fish so we excluded his data and analysed the remaining data in the same way as data from cage 7 in 2002/2003. Again in cage 17 in 2005/2006 all seeded tags were single releases, which were analyzed in the same way.

Table A1: The number of seeded double-tagged fish by year and tagger for which only the primary tag was returned ( $r_A$ ), for which only the companion tag was returned ( $r_B$ ) and for which both tags were returned ( $r_{AB}$ ). (Note year refers to the last year in a season – i.e. 2004 indicates the 2003/2004 fishing season, 04-05 refers to the combined 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 seasons).

Tagger	Year	$r_A$	$r_B$	$r_{AB}$	Total
1	2003	3	2	31	36
2	2003	1	0	5	6
3	2003	1	2	13	16
	2004	3	8	11	22
	2005	7	8	18	33
	03-05	11	18	42	71
	04-05	10	16	29	55
4	2004	6	3	31	40
	2005	5	13	49	67
	2006	4	4	11	19
	04-06	15	20	91	126
5	2004	9	10	11	30
	2005	6	8	10	24
	2006	7	3	15	25
	04-06	22	21	36	79
	04-05	15	18	21	54
6	2004	1	3	3	7
	2005	0	1	3	4
	04-05	1	4	6	11
7	2004	1	1	4	6
10	2006	5	3	11	19

Table A2: Negative log-likelihood values and AIC statistic for models with year specific retention rate estimates by tagger compared to models in which retention rates are assumed equal in some years. Results are only shown for taggers that tagged in more than a single year. (Note year refers to the last year in a season – i.e. 2004 indicates the 2003/2004 fishing season and 04-05 refers to the combined 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 seasons).

Tagger	Year	-LL	df	AIC	$\Sigma$ -LL	df	$\Sigma$ AIC
3	2003	9.631	2	23.262			
	2004	21.695	2	47.389			
	2005	33.101	2	70.202	64.427	6	140.854
	2003	9.631	2	23.262			
	04-05	55.364	2	114.728	64.995	4	*137.990
	03-05	67.265	2	138.529	67.265	2	138.529
4	2004	27.055	2	58.110			
	2005	49.624	2	103.248			
	2006	18.477	2	40.954	95.156	6	202.312
	04-06	98.348	2	200.696	98.348	2	*200.696
5	2004	32.858	2	69.716			
	2005	25.861	2	55.722			
	2006	22.934	2	49.868	81.653	6	175.306
	2006	22.934	2	49.868			
	04-05	58.823	2	121.645	81.757	4	*171.514
	04-06	84.242	2	172.484	84.242	2	172.484
6	2004	7.030	2	18.059			
	2005	2.249	2	8.499	9.279	4	26.558
	04-05	10.081	2	24.162	10.081	2	*24.162

\* Model with the lowest AIC.

Table A3: Comparison of estimates of tag retention rates for primary and secondary tags with the estimates of the rates under the assumption that rates are same for both tags by tagger-year categories based on the results from Table A2. Also provided are the negative log-likelihood values and AIC statistics for the estimates under the two different assumptions. (Note year refers to the last year in a season – i.e. 2004 indicates the 2003/2004 fishing season and 04-05 refers to the combined 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 seasons).

Tagger	Years	$Q_A \neq Q_B$					$Q_A = Q_B$			
		$Q_A$	$Q_B$	-LL	df	AIC	Q	-LL	df	AIC
1	2003	0.9394	0.9118	17.871	2	39.742	*0.9254	17.972	1	*37.742
2	2003	1.000	0.8333	2.703	2	9.406	*0.9091	3.397	1	*8.793
3	2003	0.8667	0.9286	9.631	2	23.262	*0.8966	9.801	1	*21.601
3	04-05	0.6444	0.7436	55.364	2	114.728	*0.6905	56.063	1	*114.126
4	04-06	0.8198	0.8585	98.348	2	200.696	*0.8387	98.706	1	*199.412
5	04-05	0.5385	0.5833	58.823	2	121.646	*0.5600	58.959	1	*119.918
5	2006	0.8333	0.6818	22.934	2	49.868	*0.7500	23.757	1	*49.514
6	04-05	0.6000	0.8571	10.081	2	24.162	*0.7059	11.045	1	*24.090
7	2004	0.8000	0.8000	5.205	2	14.411	*0.8000	5.205	1	*12.411
10	2006	0.7857	0.6875	18.225	2	40.449	*0.7333	18.477	1	*38.954

\* estimates with the smaller AIC.

Table A4a. List of numbers for SBT seeded tag data groups for  $A$  tags only ( $r_A$ ),  $B$  tags only ( $r_B$ ) and  $A&B$  tags ( $r_{AB}$ ). (Note year refers to the last year in a season – i.e. 2004 indicates the 2003/2004 fishing season and 04-05 refers to the combined 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 seasons).

Group	Tagger	Year	$r_A$	$r_B$	$r_{AB}$	Total
I	1,2&3	2003	5	4	49	58
II	7&4	2004				
		04-06	16	21	95	132
III	5,10,3&6	2006				
		04-05	23	26	61	110
IV	5	04-05	15	18	21	54

Table A4b: Comparison of estimates of tag retention rates for primary and secondary tags with the estimates of the rates under the assumption that rates are same for both tags by tagger groups defined in Table A4a. Also provided are the negative log-likelihood values and AIC statistics for the estimates under the two different assumptions.

Group	$Q_A \neq Q_B$					$Q_A = Q_B$			
	$Q_A$	$Q_B$	-LL	df	AIC	Q	-LL	df	AIC
I	0.925	0.907	31.214	2	66.428	0.916	31.270	1	*64.540
II	0.819	0.856	103.615	2	211.230	0.837	103.954	1	*209.908
III	0.701	0.726	109.463	2	222.926	0.713	109.555	1	*221.110
IV	0.538	0.583	58.823	2	121.646	0.560	58.959	1	*119.918

\* Solution with the least AIC.

Table A4c. Estimates of the shedding factors ( $W$ ), their variances ( $\text{Var}(W)$ ), standard errors, ( $\text{SE}(W)$ ), and coefficient of variation (CV) by tagger groups for SBT seeded tags based on the model with the smallest AIC from Table A4b.

Group	$W$	$\text{Var}(W)$	$\text{SE}(W)$	CV%
I	1.0071	0.000030	0.0055	0.5
II	1.0273	0.000092	0.0096	0.9
III	1.0895	0.000733	0.0271	2.5
IV	1.2401	0.011345	0.1065	8.6