PAUA (PAU 7) – Marlborough

(Haliotis iris)
Paua



1. FISHERY SUMMARY

PAU 7 was introduced into the Quota Management System in 1986–87 with a TACC of 250 t. As a result of appeals to the Quota Appeal Authority the TACC increased to 267.48 t by 1989. On 1st October 2001 a TAC of 273.73 t was set with a TACC of 240.73 t, customary and recreational allowances of 15 t each and an allowance of 3 t for other mortality. On 1 October 2002 the TAC was reduced to 220.24 t and the TACC was set at 187.24 t. No changes were made to the customary, recreational or other mortality allowances (Table 1).

Table 1: Total allowable catches (TAC, t) allowances for customary fishing, recreational fishing, and other sources of mortality (t) and Total Allowable Commercial Catches (TACC, t) declared for PAU 7 since introduction into the QMS.

Year	TAC	Customary	Recreational	Other mortality	TACC
1986–89	-	-	-	-	250.00
1989–2001					267.48
2001–02	273.73	15	15	3	240.73
2002–present	220.24	15	15	3	187.24

1.1 Commercial fisheries

The fishing year runs from 1 October to 30 September. In 2001–02 concerns about the status of the PAU 7 fishery led to a decision by the commercial sector to voluntarily shelve 20% of the TACC for that fishing year. From the 2003–04 to the 2006–07 fishing years the industry proposed to shelve 15% of the TACC. The proposal met with varying success, with less than 15% of the ACE being shelved in three of the four years.

On 1 October 2001 it became mandatory to report catch and effort on PCELRs using fine-scale reporting areas that had been developed by the New Zealand Paua Management Company for their voluntary logbook programme (Figure 1). Reported landings and TACCs for PAU 7 are shown in Table 2 and Figure 2.



Figure 1: Map of fine scale statistical reporting areas for PAU 7.

Table 2: Reported Landings and TACC in PAU 7 from 1983–84 to the present. The last column shows the TACC after shelving has been accounted for.

Year	Landings (kg)	TACC (t)	After shelving	Year	Landings (kg)	TACC (t)	After shelving
1973–74	147 440	-	-	1994–95	247 108	266.17	266.17
1974–75	197 910	-	-	1995–96	268 742	267.48	267.48
1975–76	141 880	-	-	1996–97	267 594	267.48	267.48
1976–77	242 730	-	-	1997–98	266 655	267.48	267.48
1977–78	201 170	-	-	1998–99	265 050	267.48	267.48
1978–79	304 570	-	-	1999–00	264 642	267.48	267.48
1979–80	223 430	-	-	2000–01	215 920	267.48	*213.98
1980–81	490 000	-	-	2001–02	187 152	240.73	240.73
1981–82	370 000	-	-	2002–03	187 222	187.24	187.24
1982–83	400 000	-	-	2003–04	159 551	187.24	*159.15
1983–84	330 000	-	-	2004–05	166 940	187.24	*159.15
1984–85	230 000	-	-	2005–06	183 363	187.24	*159.15
1985–86	236 090	-	-	2006–07	176 052	187.24	*159.15
1986–87	242 180	250	250	2007–08	186 845	187.24	187.24
1987–88	255 944	250	250	2008–09	186 846	187.24	187.24
1988–89	246 029	250	250	2009–10	187 022	187.24	187.24
1989–90	267 052	263.53	263.53	2010–11	187 240	187.24	187.24
1990–91	273 253	266.24	266.24	2011–12	186 980	187.24	187.24
1991–92	268 309	266.17	266.17	2012-13	149 755	187.24	187.24
1992–93	264 802	266.17	266.17	2013-14	145 523	187.24	187.24
1993–94	255 472	266.17	266.17				

* Voluntary shelving

1.2 Recreational fisheries

For the purpose of the stock assessment, the Shellfish Working Group (SFWG) agreed to assume that recreational catch was 5 t in 1974 and that it increased linearly to 15 t in 2000, and then remained at 15 t. For further information on recreational fisheries refer to the introductory PAU Working Group Report.



Figure 2: Reported commercial landings and TACC for PAU 7 from 1986–87 to present.

1.3 Customary fisheries

For the purpose of the stock assessment the SFWG agreed to assume that customary catch was 4 t in 1974, increasing linearly to 10 t between 1974 and 2000, and then remaining at 10 t. For further information on customary fisheries refer to the introductory PAU Working Group Report.

1.4 Illegal catch

For the purpose of the stock assessment the SFWG agreed to assume that illegal catch was 1 t in 1974 and that it increased linearly to 15 t between 1974 and 2000, remaining at 15 t from 2000 through to 2005, and then decreasing linearly to 7.5 t in 2008. For projections the Working Group agreed to assume that illegal catch would remain at 7.5 t. For further information on illegal catch refer to the introductory PAU Working Group Report.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

The Working Group agreed that handling mortality would not be factored into the model. For further information on other sources of mortality refer to the introductory PAU Working Group Report.

2. BIOLOGY

For further information on paua biology refer to the introductory PAU Working Group Report. A summary of biological parameters used in the PAU 7 stock assessment is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Estimates of biological parameters (*H. iris*).

		Estimate	Source
1. Natural mortality (*M*)			
All		0.02–0.25	Sainsbury (1982)
PAU 7	0.14 (0.13–0.15)	Median (5%–95% C.L.)	estimated by the assessment model
2. Weight = a (length)^b (weight in g, shell length in mm)			
	a = 2.59E–08	b = 3.322	Schiel & Breen (1991)
3. Size at maturity (shell length)			
50% mature	90.7(89.9–91.5) mm	Median (5%–95% C.L.)	estimated by the assessment model
length at 95% mature - 50% mature	11.6(9.6–13.4) mm	Median (5%–95% C.L.)	estimated by the assessment model
4. Exponential growth parameters (both sexes combined)			
g_{75}	25.8(23.0–28.7) mm	Median (5%–95% C.L.)	estimated by the assessment model: growth increment of animal with initial length of 75 mm.
g_{120}	5.5 (5.1–5.8) mm	Median (5%–95% C.L.)	estimated by the model: growth increment

of animal with initial length of 120 mm.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

For further information on stocks and areas refer to the introductory PAU Working Group Report.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

The stock assessment is implemented as a length-based Bayesian estimation model, with point estimates of parameters based on the mode of the joint posterior distribution, and uncertainty of model estimates investigated using the marginal posterior distributions generated from Markov chain-Monte Carlo simulations. The 2011 assessment was restricted to Statistical Areas 017 and 038 which includes most (over 90%) of the recent catch**.**

4.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance indices

Parameters estimated in the assessment model and their assumed Bayesian priors are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4: A summary of estimated model parameters, lower bound, upper bound, type of prior, (*U*, uniform; *N*, normal; *LN* = lognormal), mean and CV of the prior.

Parameter	Prior	μ	C.V.	Bounds	
				Lower	Upper
ln(*R0*)	*U*	–	–	5	50
M (Natural mortality)	*LN*	0.1	0.35	0.01	0.5
g_1*(Mean growth at 75 mm)*	*U*	–	–	1	50
g2(Mean growth at 75 mm)	*U*	–	–	0.01	50
φ *(cv of mean growth)*	*U*	–	–	0.001	1
$Ln(q^I)$ (catchability cofficient of CPUE)	*U*	–	–	-30	0
$Ln(q^J)$ (*catchability cofficient of PCPUE)*	*U*	–	–	-30	0
$Ln(q^k)$ (catchability cofficient of RDSI)	*U*	–	–	-30	0
L_{50} (Length at 50% maturity)	*U*	–	–	70	145
L_{95-50}(Length beteen 50% and 95% maturity)	*U*	–	–	1	50
T_{50}(Length at 50% selectivty for the divery survey)	*U*	–	–	70	125
T_{95-50}(Length between 50% and 95% selectivty for the divery survey)	*U*	–	–	0.001	50
D_{50}(Length at 50% selectivty for the divery survey)	*U*	–	–	70	145
D_{95-50}(Length between 50% and 95% selectivty for the divery survey)	*U*	–	–	0.01	50
ϵ (Recruiment deviations)	*N*	0	0.4	-2.3	2.3
h (CPUE shape parameter)	*U*	–	–	0.01	2

The observational data were:

1. A standardised CPUE series covering 1983–2001 based on FSU/CELR data.
2. A standardised CPUE series covering 2002–2011 based on PCELR data.
3. A standardised research diver survey index (RDSI).
4. A research diver survey proportions-at-lengths series (RDLF).
5. A commercial catch sampling length frequency series (CSLF).
6. Tag-recapture length increment data.
7. Maturity at length data.

4.1.1 Relative abundance estimates from standardised CPUE analyses

The 2011 stock assessement used two sets of standardised CPUE indices: one based on FSU/CELR data covering 1983–2001, and another based on PCELR data covering 2002–2011. For both series, standardised catch per unit effort (CPUE) analyses were carried out using Generalised Linear Models (GLMs). A stepwise procedure was used to select predictor variables, and they were entered into the model in the order that gave the maximum decrease in the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC). Predictor variables were accepted into the model only if they explained at least 1% of the deviance.

The standardised index of FSU/CELR series from the 2005 assessment is re-presented here, as the SFWG agreed that it was not necessary to update this series. The unit of catch used was the total estimated daily catch for a vessel. As the diver-hours field on the CELR forms contains a high number of errors, the unit of effort used was the total number of diver days (total number of divers on a vessel for a day). Records were restricted to those from vessels that fished the top 75% of catch in any given year, and from areas 017 and 038. The standardised index is shown in the left panel of Figure 3.

PCELR data were extracted in October 2011 for the time frame 1 October 2001 to 30 September 2011.The Shellfish Working Group suggested that the Fisher Identification Number (FIN) be used in the standardisation instead of vessel. The reason for this is that the FIN is associated with a permit holder who may employ a suite of grouped vessels, which implies that there could be linkage in the catch rates among vessels operated under a single FIN. It was decided to use criteria which specified a minimum number of records (PCELRs and CELRs) per year for a minimum number of years for selecting FIN permit holders for the model. The selected criteria were at least 40 records per year for a minimum of four years. This reduced the number of FIN permit holders from 72 to 20, but retained 76% of the original catch over 2002–2011.

To ensure that there were sufficient data to estimate fine scale statistical area and diver effects in the standardisation, only those fine scale statistical areas and divers with at least 10 diver days were retained. This dropped the number of fine scale statistical areas from 54 to 45, and the number of divers from 379 to 82 (51% of divers have just one dive-day).

The standardisation was done on the natural log of catch per diver day. Variables offered to the model were diver, diving condition, fishing duration FIN (Fisher identification number), fishing year, month and statistical area; no interactions were included in the model and fishing year was forced to be in the model as an explanatory variable. The standardised index is shown in the right panel of Figure 3.



Figure 3: The standardised CPUE indices with 95% confidence intervals for the early CELR/FSU series (left) and the recent PCELR series (right).

4.1.2 Relative abundance estimates from research diver surveys

The relative abundance of paua in PAU 7 was also estimated from a number of independent research diver surveys (RDSI) undertaken in various years between 1992 and 2005. Concerns about the reliability of these data to estimate relative abundance instigated reviews in 2009 (Cordue 2009) and 2010 (Haist 2010). The reviews assessed i) the reliability of the research diver survey index as a proxy for abundance and ii) whether the RDSI, when used in the paua stock assessment models, results in model outputs that adequately reflect the status of the stocks. Both reviews suggested that outputs from paua stock assessments using the RDSI should be treated with caution. For a summary of the conclusions from the reviews refer to the introductory PAU Working Group Report. Relative abundance estimates from research diver surveys are shown in Figure 4.



Figure 4: The standardised RDSI from the negative-binomial GLM models fitted to paired diver counts for surveys in Statistical Areas 017 and 038 within PAU 7.

4.2 Stock assessment methods

The 2012 PAU 7 stock assessment (Fu 2012, Fu et al 2012) used the length-based model first implemented in 1999 for PAU 5B (Breen et al 2000 and revised for subsequent assessments in PAU 7 (Andrew et al 2000, Breen & Kim 2003, Breen & Kim 2005 and Fu 2012). The model is described in Breen et al (2003).

The model structure assumes a single sex population residing in a single homgeneous area, with length classes from 70 mm to 170 mm, in groups of 2 mm. Growth is length-based, without reference to age, mediated through a growth transition matrix that describes the probability of each length class changing at each time step. Paua enter the partition following recruitment and are removed by natural mortality and fishing mortality. The assessment addresses only Areas 017 and 038 within PAU 7. These areas have supported most (more than 90%) of the catch until recently, and all of the available data originate from these two areas, but the relationship between this subset of PAU 7 and the remainder of PAU 7 is uncertain.

The model simulates the population dynamics from 1965 to 2011. Catches were available for 1974–2011, and were assumed to increase linearly between 1965 and 1973 from 0 to the 1974 catch level. Catches included commercial, recreational, customary, and illegal catch, and all catches occurred within the same time step.

Recruitment was assumed to take place at the beginning of the annual cycle, and length at recruitment was defined by a uniform distribution with a range between 70 and 80 mm. The stock-recruitment relationship is unknown for paua. A relationship may exist on small scales, but not be apparent when large-scale data are modelled (Breen et al 2003). No explicit stock-recruitment relationship was modelled in previous assessments; however, the SFWG agreed to use a Beverton-Holt stock-recruitment relationship with steepness (h) of 0.75 for this assessment.

Maturity is not required in the population partition. The model estimated proportions mature with the inclusion of length-at-maturity data. Growth and natural mortalities were also estimated within the model.

The models used two selectivities: the commercial fishing selectivity and research diver survey selectivity, both assumed to follow a logistic curve and to reach an asymptote.

The assessment was conducted in several steps. First, the model was fitted to the data with arbitrary weights on the various data sets. The weights were then iteratively adjusted to produce balanced residuals among the datasets where the standardised deviation of the normalised residuals was close to one for each dataset. The fit obtained is the mode of the joint posterior distribution of parameters (MPD). Next, from the resulting fit, Markov chain-Monte Carlo (MCMC) simulations were made to obtain a large set of samples from the joint posterior distribution. From this set of samples, forward projections were made with a set of agreed indicators obtained. Sensitivity trials were explored by comparing MPD fits made with alternative model assumptions.

A base case model (1.0) was chosen by the SFWG for the assessment: the tag-recapture data from all areas (except for D'Urville) were included, growth parameters were estimated within the model using an exponential growth curve, the weighting of the proportion-at-length data was determined using the TA1.8 method (Francis 2011), and maturity data from Northern faces were excluded. The base case model also assumed a steepness of 0.75 for the stock-recruitment relationship and estimated the CPUE shape parameter. The base case and sensitivities are summarised in Table 5.

The assessment reported:

- B_0 (the equilibrium spawning stock biomass assuming that recruitment is equal to the average recruitment from the period for which recruitment deviation were estimated).
- The mid-season spawning and recruited biomass for 2011 ($B_{current}$ and $B^r_{current}$), and for the projected period (B_{proj} and B^r_{proj}), and from a reference period, 1985–87. The latter was a period that had been previously chosen because the biomass was relatively stable. The means of values from the three years were called B_{ref} and B^r_{ref} for spawning and legal biomass respectively. Legal biomass is the biomass of paua above the legal size limit (currently 125 mm).
- % B_0 — Ratio of current and projected spawning biomass to B_0.
- % B_{ref} — Ratio of current and projected spawning biomass to B_{ref}.
- Pr(>B_{ref}) — Probabilities that current and projected spawning biomass greater than B_{ref}.
- Pr(>$B_{current}$) — Probabilities that projected spawning biomass greater than $B_{current}$.
- Pr(<20% B_0) — Probabilities that projected spawning biomass is less than 20% B_0.
- Pr(<10% B_0) — Probabilities that projected spawning biomass is less than 10% B_0.
- %B^r_0 — Ratio of current and projected legal biomass to B^r_0.
- %B^r_{ref} — Ratio of current and projected legal biomass to B^r_{ref}.
- Pr(>B^r_{ref}) — Probabilities that current and projected legal biomass greater than B^r_{ref}.
- Pr(>$B^r_{current}$) — Probabilities that projected legal biomass greater than $B^r_{current}$.

Recruitments for projections were obtained by randomly re-sampling model estimates from 1996 to 2006. Projections were run at four different levels of catch: the current TACC, and reductions of 10%, 15% and 20%.

4.2.1 Stock assessment results

Current estimates from the base case suggested that spawning stock population in 2011 ($B_{current}$) was about 22% (19–26%) of the unfished level (B_0), and vulnerable biomass ($B^r_{current}$) was about 10% (8–12%) of the initial state (B^r_0) (Figure 5, Table 6). Model projections made for three years, assuming current catch levels and using recruitments re-sampled from the recent model estimates, suggested that the spawning stock biomass will slightly increase to about 23.4% (17–32%) B_0 over the next three years (Table 7). Projections made with alternative catch levels showed that the spawning stock biomass will increase to about 24.4%, 25.0%, and 25.5% B_0 respectively, if the current TACC was to be reduced by 10%, 15% and 20% respectively (Table 7).

Table 5: Summary descriptions for base case and sensitivity model runs.

Model runs	Descriptions
0.0 (Initial model)	Iterative reweighting, assumed *h* of 0.75 and U^{max} of 0.8, estimated *h*
1.0 (Base case)	TA1.8 weighting method, assumed *h* of 0.75 and U^{max} of 0.8, estimated *h*
1.1	1.0, but fixed CPUE shape parameter (*??*) at 1
1.2	1.0, but assuming steepness (*h*) of 1
1.3	1.0, but assuming steepness (*h*) of 0.5
1.4	1.0, but assuming maximum exploitation rate (U^{max}) of 0.9
1.5	1.0, but assuming maximum exploitation rate (U^{max}) of 0.65
2.0	1.0, fixed growth parameters at low values
3.0	1.0, fixed growth parameters at high values

The base case model appeared to have represented most observational data well, and there is no obvious indication of lack of fit. The CPUE shape parameter was estimated to be less than 1, suggesting possible hyper-stability in the relationship between CPUE and abundance. However, model results changed very little when a linear relationship between CPUE and abundance was assumed.

Model sensitivity runs which assumed different values for the stock-recruitment steepness (*h*) parameter appeared to compensate for the differences in the stock-recruitment relationship with changes in R_0, recruitment deviations, and natural mortality. Estimates of current stock status were similar between these model runs, although there were some differences in the size of the estimated B_0.

Table 6: Summary of the marginal posterior distributions from the MCMC chain from the base case (1.0). The columns show the 5th and 95th percentiles, and the medians. Biomass is in tonnes.

	5%	Median	95%	MPD estimate
B_0	3905	4242	4541	4156
B_{ref}	1299	1426	1561	1359
$B_{current}$	790	933	1115	877
$B_{current}/B_0$	0.19	0.22	0.26	0.21
$B_{current}/B_{ref}$	0.56	0.66	0.78	0.65
B_0^r	3063	3417	3719	3368
B_{ref}^r	669	816	971	777
$B_{current}^r$	261	334	428	313
$B_{current}^r/B_0^r$	0.08	0.10	0.12	0.09
$B_{current}^r/B_{ref}^r$	0.32	0.41	0.54	0.40
$U_{current}$	0.33	0.41	0.49	0.43

The base case assumed a maximum exploitation rate (U_{max}) of 0.8 and there were two years (2001 and 2003) in which the exploitation rate was estimated to be at this bound. When U_{max} was assumed to be 0.65, the estimated exploitation rates for 2001 and 2003 were also at the bound; when U_{max} was assumed to be 0.9, the estimated exploitation rate for 2003 was at the bound. However, biomass estimates were similar among all these runs.

The base case assessment estimated growth parameters within the model using the tag-recapture data. The fits to the tag-recapture data appear adequate, but are likely to have been influenced by the proportion-at-length data as well. Sensitivity runs, which assumed alternative growth parameters (fixed at values representing either a fast or slow growth rate), led to significant changes to the estimates of abundance, but had poor fits to the proportion-at-length data.



Figure 5: Posterior distributions of spawning stock biomass as a percentage of virgin level from MCMC 1.0. The box shows the median of the posterior distribution (horizontal bar), the 25th and 75th percentiles (box), with the whiskers representing the full range of the distribution. The target is the median reference biomass (33.6% B_0).

The base case estimated growth parameters within the model incorporating the tag-recapture data. The fits to the tag-recapture data appear adequate, but are likely to have been influenced by the proportion-at-length data. Sensitivity runs assuming alternative growth parameters (fixed at values representing either a fast or slow growth rate) led to significant changes to the estimates of abundance, but had poor fits to the proportion-at-length data.

4.5 Yield estimates and projections

No estimate of *MCY* has been made for PAU 7.

No estimate of *CAY* has been made for PAU 7.

4.6 Other factors

The stock assessment model assumed homogeneity in recruitment, that natural mortality does not vary by size or year, and that growth has the same mean and variance throughout the entire area. However, it is known that paua fisheries are spatially variable and that apparent growth and maturity in paua populations can vary over very short distances. Variation in growth is addressed to some extent by having a stochastic growth transition matrix based on tagging data collected from a range of different locations. Similarly, the length frequency data are integrated across samples from many places. The effect of this integraion across local areas is likely to make model results optimistic. For instance, if some local stocks are fished very hard and others not fished, local recruitment failure can result due to the limited dispersal range of this species. Recruitment failure is a common observation in overseas abalone fisheries. Fishing may also cause spatial contraction of populations (e.g., Shepherd & Partington 1995), and some populations appear to become relatively unproductive after initial fishing (Gorfine & Dixon 2000). If this happens, the assessment will overestimate productivity in the population as a whole. It is also possible that good recruitments estimated by the model might have been the result of serial depletion.

Table 7: Projections to 2014 of the key indicators (from the base case MCMC) with future commercial catch set to 100%, 90%, 85%, and 80% of the TACC. Key indicators are spawning stock biomass (*B*) and recruited biomass (*rB*) and include % of virgin biomass and % biomass from a reference period (B_{ref}) and the probability of being above current biomass or below default limits.

	2011	2014			
Projection		Current TACC	90% TACC	85% TACC	80% TACC
$\%B_0$	22.1 (18.0–27.2)	23.4 (16.5–31.5)	24.4 (17.5–32.6)	25.0(18.0–33.1)	25.5 (18.5–33.6)
$\%B_{ref}$	65.5 (53.7–80.5)	69.3 (49.4–942)	72.4 (52.5–97.4)	74.0(54.1–99.0)	75.6 (55.7–100.6)
$Pr(> B_{ref})$	0.000	0.008	0.015	0.021	0.029
$Pr(>B_{current})$		0.671	0.796	0.854	0.897
$Pr(<20\%B_0)$	0.173	0.176	0.112	0.086	0.063
$Pr(<10\%B_0)$	0.000	0.000	0.000	0	0
$\%rB_0$	9.8 (0.073–0.130)	10.5 (6.2–15.9)	11.7 (7.4–17.1)	12.3(8.0–17.7)	12.9 (8.6–18.4)
$\%rB_{ref}$	41.2 (30.0–56.6)	43.9 (26.3–67.6)	49.0 (30.9–73.2)	51.6(33.3–76.1)	54.2 (35.6–79.0)
$Pr(> rB_{ref})$	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$Pr(>rB_{current})$		0.679	0.926	0.975	0.995

CPUE provides information in the model on changes in relative abundance. However, CPUE is generally considered to be a poor index of stock abundance for paua, due to divers' ability to maintain catch rates by moving from area to area despite a decreasing biomass (hyperstability). Breen et al (2003) argued that standardised CPUE might monitor changes of abundance in a fully exploited fishery, and that declines in the CPUE most likely reflected a decline in the population. PAU 7 is generally considered to be a fully developed fishery: the exploitation rate in Statistical Areas 017 and 038 is known to have been high and there are unlikely to be many unfished areas within the area.

Commercial catch length frequencies provide information on changes in population structure under fishing pressure. However, if serial depletion has occurred and fishers have moved from area to area, samples from the commercial catch may not correctly represent the population of the entire stock. For PAU 7, there has been a long time-series of commercial catch sampling and the spatial coverage of the available samples is generally considered to be adequate throughout the years.

The utility of research diver survey indices to provide relative abundance information has been an ongoing concern in the SFWG. Cordue (2009) identified issues associated with diver surveys based on the timed swim approach and questioned their adequacy as indices of relative abundance. Haist (2010) suggested that the existing RDSI data were likely to be more useful at a stratum level. The general consensus is that the index-abundance relationship from the research diver survey is likely to be nonlinear, and cannot easily be quantified in a stock assessment.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

Stock Structure Assumptions

The 2012 assessment was conducted for Statistical Areas 017 and 038 only, but these include most (more than 90%) of the recent catch.

- **PAU 7-** *Haliotis iris*

Stock Status	
Year of Most Recent Assessment	2012
Assessment Runs Presented	Base case MCMC

Reference Points	Interim Target: B_{ref} (average spawning biomass from 1985–1987) = 33.6% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0
Status in relation to Target	Spawning stock biomass was estimated to be 66% B_{ref} and is Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be at or above the interim target
Status in relation to Limits	Spawning stock biomass was estimated to be 22% B_0, and is About as Likely as Not (40–60%) to be below the soft limit and Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the hard limit

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



Posterior distributions of spawning stock biomass as a percentage of virgin level from MCMC 1.0. The box shows the median of the posterior distribution (horizontal bar), the 25th and 75th percentiles (box), with the whiskers representing the full range of the distribution. The target is the median reference biomass (33.6% B_0).

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	Three year projections indicate that spawning and recruited biomass are likely to increase but are Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be at or above the target by this time.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing decline below Limits	Soft Limit: About as Likely as Not (40–60%) Hard Limit: Unlikely (< 40%)

Assessment Methodology & Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Full quantitative stock assessment	
Assessment Method	Length based Bayesian model	
Assessment Dates	Latest: 2012	Next: 2015
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- CPUE	1 – High Quality
	- Research diver survey indices	2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: it is suggested that the RDSI do not provide a reliable index of abundance
	- Commercial catch length frequency	1 – High Quality
	- Research diver length frequency	1 – High Quality

	- Tag-recapture data - Maturity at length data	1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	-	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	- Data weighting (LF only) and steepness	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Spatial heterogeneity not incorporated - Potential hyperstability in CPUE - Potential for localised recruitment failure	

Qualifying Comments
No account has been taken of the voluntary closure of areas affected by "greening". Stock projections also do not account for reduced production due to potential closed areas in the future, which are likely to slow or reverse projected increases in stock size.

Fishery Interactions
-

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Andrew, N L; Breen, P A; Kendrick, T H; Naylor, J R (2000) Stock assessment of PAU 7 for 1998–99. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/48*. 22 p.

Andrew, N L; Naylor, J R; Gerring, P (1999) A modified timed–swim method for paua stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment. Report 2000/4*. 23 p.

Breen, P.A., Andrew, N.L., & Kendrick, T.H. 2000: Stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5B and PAU 5D using a new length-based model. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/33*.37 p.

Breen, P A; Kim, S W (2003) The 2003 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 7. *New Zealand Fishery Assessment Report. 2003/41*. 119 p.

Breen, P A; Kim, S W; Andrew, N L (2003) A length-based Bayesian stock assessment model for abalone. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 54(5): 619–634.

Breen, P A; Kim, S W (2005) The stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report. 2005/47*. 114 p.

Cordue, P L (2009) Analysis of PAU 5A diver survey data and PCELR catch and effort data. SeaFic and PAUMac 5 report. 45 p.

Chen, Y; Breen, P A; Andrew, N L (2000) Impacts of outliers and mis-specification of priors on Bayesian fish stock assessment. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*. 57: 2293–2305.

Francis, R I C C (2011) Data weighting in statistical fisheries stock assessment models. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 68: 15.

Fu, D (2012) The 2011 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2012/27*. 57 p.

Fu, D; McKenzie, A; Naylor, R (2012) Summary of input data for the PAU 7 stock assessment for the 2010–11. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2012/26*.

Gerring, P; Andrew, N L; Naylor, J R (2003) Incidental fishing mortality of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in the PAU 7 commercial fishery. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report. 2003/56*. 13 p.

Gorfine, H K; Dixon, C D (2000) A behavioural rather than resource-focused approach may be needed to ensure sustainability of quota managed abalone fisheries. *Journal of Shellfish Research* 19: 515–516.

Haist, V (2010) Paua research diver surveys: review of data collected and simulation study of survey method. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report. 2010/38*. 54p.

McKenzie, A (2004) Alternative CPUE standardization for PAU 7. NIWA Client Report WLG2004-74. 18 p.

McKenzie, A (2010) CPUE standarisation for PAU 7 in 2010. NIWA Client Report, WLG2010-29. 12 p.

McKenzie, A; Smith, A N H (2009) Data inputs for the PAU 7 stock assessment in 2008. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report. 2009/33*. 34 p.

McKenzie, A; Smith, A N H (2009) The 2008 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report. 2009/34*. 86 p.

McShane, P E; Naylor, J R (1995) Small-scale spatial variation in growth, size at maturity, and yield- and egg-per-recruit relations in the New Zealand abalone *Haliotis iris*. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 29: 603–612.

Pirker, J G (1992) Growth, shell–ring deposition and mortality of paua (*Haliotis iris* Martyn) in the Kaikoura region. MSc thesis, University of Canterbury. 165 p.

Punt, A E (2003) The performance of a size-structured stock assessment method in the face of spatial heterogeneity in growth. *Fisheries Research* 65: 391–409.

Sainsbury, K J (1982) Population dynamics and fishery management of the paua, *Haliotis iris*. 1. Population structure, growth, reproduction and mortality. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 16: 147–161.

Schiel, D R (1989) Paua fishery assessment 1989. New Zealand Fishery Assessment Research Document 1989/9: 20 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)

Schiel, D R (1992) The paua (abalone) fishery of New Zealand. *In:* Shepherd, S A; Tegner, M J; Guzman del Proo, S (Eds.), *Abalone of the World: Biology, fisheries, and culture*. Blackwell Scientific, Oxford.

Schiel,D R; Breen, P A (1991) Population structure, ageing and fishing mortality of the New Zealand abalone *Haliotis iris*. *Fishery Bulletin* 89: 681–691.

Shepherd, S A; Partington, D (1995) Studies on Southern Australian abalone (genus *Haliotis*). XVI. Recruitment, habitat and stock relations. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 46: 669–680.

Will, M C; Gemmell, N J (2008) Genetic Population Structure of Black Foot paua. New Zealand Fisheries Research Report. GEN2007A: 37 p. (Unpublished document held by Ministry for Primary Industries, Wellington.)