

Workshop objectives

- 1. Evaluate methodologies for counting daily and annual increments
- 2. Compare daily and annual increment counts from pairs of otoliths from both species
- 3. Compare growth rates from length-at-age data based on otolith increment counts with those from tagging data
- 4. Evaluate the growth models being used in stock assessments for bigeye and yellowfin tunas in the EPO and WCPO
- 5. Develop a work plan to resolve any scientific and technical issues



1) Evaluate methodologies for counting daily and annual increments

- A planned preliminary technical meeting to compare methodologies had to be postponed due to the US Federal Government shutdown.
- Some aspects were evaluated based on the presentations.
- This work will be continued as soon as possible.



2) Compare daily and annual increment counts from pairs of otoliths from both species

- Comparisons of EPO bigeye otoliths found differences between daily and annual increment counts for larger individuals.
- Further work on both species will be done at the postponed technical meeting.



3) Compare growth rates from length-at-age data based on otolith increment counts with those from tagging data

- There is no evidence of inconsistency, but the comparisons are based on limited data.
- EPO tagging data suggest that there is two-stage growth, but daily otolith data do not.
- The WCPO tagging data included larger fish than the annual otolith data, and therefore estimate a higher L∞.
- Separation of EPO tag releases at 95°W and 140°W (also different release periods) showed different growth rates



4) Evaluate the growth models being used in stock assessments for bigeye and yellowfin tunas in the EPO and WCPO

- The growth models ignore spatial variation.
- There are some inconsistencies in the length-composition data used in the assessment models and the growth models.
- Stock assessment results and management recommendations are sensitive to L∞.
- Differences in the L∞ used in the EPO and WCPO assessments of bigeye are representative of size composition in these stocks, as EPO fish grow to larger sizes.
- There is still uncertainty in the estimates of L∞, and more data need to be collected.

5) Recommendations and workplan

- Hold a technical workshop to compare methodologies, and exchange additional otoliths from the EPO and WCPO, both as soon as possible.
- Include the following elements in the work plan:
 - Improve and document the protocols for daily and annual ageing.
 - Conduct spatial analyses based on otolith weight, using all available otoliths
 - Extend the validation of daily and annual otolith counts across the Pacific by incorporating some oxytetracycline (OTC) marking in tagging programs.
 - Extend the spatial/temporal/size distribution of EPO daily otolith data.
 - Develop Pacific-wide assessments that can accommodate spatial variation in growth rates and reflect stock structure and movement hypotheses.





Questions

