OREOS (OEO)

(*Pseudocyttus maculatus*, *Allocyttus niger*, *Neocyttus rhomboidalis* and *Allocyttus verucosus*)





1. INTRODUCTION

The oreo (OEO) complex consists of four species: smooth oreo (*Pseudocyttus maculatus*; SSO), black oreo (*Allocyttus niger*; BOE), spiky oreo (*Neocyttus rhomboidalis*; SOR) and warty oreo (*Allocyttus verucosus*; WOE). The species most commonly caught are smooth oreo and black oreo.

The main black oreo and smooth oreo fisheries have been assessed separately and individual reports produced for each as follows:

1. OEO 3A black oreo and smooth oreo
2. OEO 4 black oreo and smooth oreo
3. OEO 1 and OEO 6 black oreo and smooth oreo

2. BIOLOGY

2.1 Black oreo

Black oreo have been found within a 600 m to 1300 m depth range. The geographical distribution south of about 45° S is not well known. It is a southern species and is abundant on the south Chatham Rise, along the east coast of the South Island, the north and east slope of Pukaki Rise, the Bounty Platform, the Snares slope, Puysegur Bank and the northern end of the Macquarie Ridge. They most likely occur all around the slope of the Campbell Plateau.

Spawning occurs from late October to at least December and is widespread on the south Chatham Rise. Mean length at maturity for females, estimated from Chatham Rise trawl surveys (1986–87, 1990, 1991–93) using macroscopic gonad staging, is 34 cm TL.

They appear to have a pelagic juvenile phase, but little is known about this phase because only about 12 fish less than 21 cm TL have ever been caught. The pelagic phase may last for 4–5 years with lengths of up to 21–26 cm TL.

Unvalidated age estimates were obtained for Chatham Rise and Puysegur-Snares samples in 1995 and 1997 respectively using counts of the zones (assumed to be annual) observed in thin sections of otoliths.

These estimates indicate that black oreo is slow growing and long lived. The maximum estimated age was 153 years (45.5 cm TL fish). Australian workers used the same methods, i.e., sections of otoliths, and reported similar results A von Bertalanffy growth curve was fitted to the Puysegur samples only (Table 1). Estimated age at maturity for females was 27 years.

A first estimate of natural mortality (*M*), 0.044 (yr^{-1}), was made in 1997 using the Puysegur growth data only. This estimate is uncertain because it appeared that the otolith samples were taken from a well fished part of the Puysegur area.

Black oreo appear to settle over a wide range of depths on the south Chatham Rise, but appear to prefer to live in the depth interval 600–800 m that is often dominated by individuals with a modal size of 28 cm TL.

2.2 Smooth oreo

Smooth oreo occur from 650 m to about 1500 m depth. The geographical distribution south of about 45° S is not well known. It is a southern species and is abundant on the south Chatham Rise, along the east coast of the South Island, the north and east slope of Pukaki Rise, the Bounty Platform, the Snares slope, Puysegur Bank and the northern end of the Macquarie Ridge. They most likely occur all around the slope of the Campbell Plateau.

Spawning occurs from late October to at least December and is widespread on the south Chatham Rise in small aggregations. Mean length at maturity for females, estimated from Chatham Rise trawl surveys (1986–87, 1990, 1991–93) using macroscopic gonad staging, is 40 cm TL.

They appear to have a pelagic juvenile phase, but little is known about this phase because only about six fish less than 16 cm TL have ever been caught. The pelagic phase may last for 5–6 years with lengths of up to 16–19 cm TL.

Unvalidated age estimates were obtained for Chatham Rise and Puysegur-Snares fish in 1995 and 1997 respectively using counts of the zones (assumed to be annual) observed in thin sections of otoliths. These estimates indicate that smooth oreo is slow growing and long lived. The maximum estimated age was 86 years (51.3 cm TL fish). Australian workers used the same methods, i.e., sections of otoliths, and reported similar results. A von Bertalanffy growth curve was fitted to the age estimates from Chatham Rise and Puysegur-Snares fish combined and the parameters estimated for the growth curve are in Table 1. Estimated age at maturity for females was 31 years.

An estimate of natural mortality, 0.063 (yr^{-1}), was made in 1997 (Doonan et al 1997). The estimate was from a moderately exploited population of fish from the Puysegur region.

There are concentrations of recently settled smooth oreo south and south west of Chatham Island, although small individuals (16–19 cm TL) occur widely over the south Chatham Rise at depths of 650–800 m.

Table 1: Biological parameters for black oreo and smooth oreo stock assessments. Values not estimated are indicated by (-). Some parameters may be estimated in specific stock assessments. [Continued on next page.]

Fishstock			Estimate
1. Natural Mortality - *M* (yr^{-1})			
	Females	Males	Unsexed
Black oreo (McMillan et al 1997)	0.044 (0.028-0.075)	0.044 (0.028-0.075)	0.044
Smooth oreo (Doonan et al 1997)	0.063 (0.042-0.099)	0.063 (0.042-0.099	
2. Age at recruitment - A_r (yr)			
Black oreo	-	-	-
Smooth oreo	21	21	

Table 1 [Continued].

Fishstock									**Estimate**
3. Age at maturity A_M (yr)									
Black oreo			27			-			-
Smooth oreo			31			-			
4. von Bertalanffy parameters									
			Females			Males			Unsexed
	$L_{\infty(cm, TL)}$	$k(yr^{1})$	t_0 (yr)	$L_{\infty(cm, TL)}$	$k(yr^{1})$	t_0 (yr)	$L_{\infty(cm, TL)}$	$k(yr^{1})$	t_0 (yr)
Black oreo	39.9	0.043	-17.6	37.2	0.056	-16.4	38.2	0.05	-17.0
Smooth oreo	50.8	0.047	-2.9	43.6	0.067	-1.6			
5. Length-weight parameters (Weight = a(length)^b (Weight in g, length in cm fork length))									
			Females			Males			Unsexed
	a		b	a		b	a		b
Black oreo	0.008		3.28	0.016		3.06	0.0078		3.27
Smooth oreo	0.029		2.90	0.032		2.87			
6. Length at recruitment (cm, TL)									
			Females			Males			Unsexed
Black oreo			-			-			-
Smooth oreo			34			-			
7. Length at maturity (cm, TL)									
Black oreo			34			-			-
Smooth oreo			40			-			-
8. Recruitment variability (σ_R)									
Black oreo			0.65			0.65			0.65
Smooth oreo			0.65			0.65			
9. Recruitment steepness									
Black oreo			0.75			0.75			0.75
Smooth oreo			0.75			0.75			

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

3.1 Black oreo

Stock structure of Australian and New Zealand samples was examined using genetic (allozyme and mitochondrial DNA) and morphological counts (fin rays, etc.). It was concluded that the New Zealand samples constituted a stock distinct from the Australian sample based on "small but significant difference in mtDNA haplotype frequencies (with no detected allozyme differences), supported by differences in pyloric caeca and lateral line counts". The genetic methods used may not be suitable tools for stock discrimination around New Zealand.

A New Zealand pilot study examined stock relationships using samples from four management areas (OEO 1, OEO 3A, OEO 4 and OEO 6) of the New Zealand EEZ. Techniques used included genetic (nuclear and mitochondrial DNA), lateral line scale counts, settlement zone counts, parasites, otolith microchemistry, and otolith shape. Lateral line scale and pyloric caeca counts were different between samples from OEO 6 and the other three areas. The relative abundance of three parasites differed significantly between all areas. Otolith shape from OEO 3A samples was different to that from OEO 1 and OEO 4, but OEO 1, OEO 4 and OEO 6 otolith samples were not morphologically different. Genetic, otolith microchemistry, and settlement zone analyses showed no regional differences.

3.2 Smooth oreo

Stock structure of Australian and New Zealand samples was examined using genetic (allozyme and mitochondrial DNA) and morphological counts (fin rays, etc.). No differences between New Zealand and Australian samples were found using the above techniques. A broad scale stock is suggested by these results but this seems unlikely given the large distances between New Zealand and Australia. The genetic methods used may not be suitable tools for stock discrimination around New Zealand.

A New Zealand pilot study examined stock relationships using samples from four management areas (OEO 1, OEO 3A, OEO 4 and OEO 6) of the New Zealand EEZ. Techniques used included genetic (nuclear and mitochondrial DNA), lateral line scale counts, settlement zone counts, parasites, otolith microchemistry, and otolith shape. Otolith shape from OEO 1 and OEO 6 was different to that from OEO 3A and OEO 4 samples. Weak evidence from parasite data, one gene locus and otolith microchemistry suggested that northern OEO 3A samples were different from other areas. Lateral line scale and otolith settlement zone counts showed no differences between areas.

These data suggest that the stock boundaries given in previous assessment documents should be retained until more definitive evidence for stock relationships is obtained, i.e., retain the areas OEO 1, OEO 3A, OEO 4, and OEO 6 (see the figure on the first page of the Oreos assessment report above).

The four species of oreos (black oreo, smooth oreo, spiky oreo, and warty oreo) are managed with separate catch limits for black and smooth in some areas. Each species could be managed separately. They have different depth and geographical distributions, different stock sizes, rates of growth, and productivity.

4. FISHERY SUMMARY

4.1 Commercial fisheries

Commercial fisheries occur for black oreo (BOE) and smooth oreo (SSO). Oreos are managed as a species group, which also includes spiky oreo (SOR). The Chatham Rise (OEO 3A and OEO 4) is the main fishing area, but other fisheries occur off Southland on the east coast of the South Island (OEO 1/OEO 3A), and on the Pukaki Rise, Macquarie Ridge, and Bounty Plateau (OEO 6). In the past oreo catch has been taken as bycatch of the more valuable orange roughy fisheries but target fisheries are now much more common in most areas for smooth or black oreo.

Total reported landings of oreos and TACs are shown in Table 2, while Figure 1 depicts the historical landings and TACC values for the main OEO stocks. OEO 3A and OEO 4 were introduced into the QMS in 1982–83, while OEO 1 and OEO 6 were introduced later in 1986–87. Total oreo catch from OEO 4 exceeded the TAC from 1991–92 to 1994–95 and was close to the TAC from 1995–96 to 2000–01 (Table 2). Catch remained high in OEO 4 while the orange roughy fishery has declined. The OEO 4 TACC was reduced from 7 000 to 5 460 t in 2001–02 but was restored to 7 000 t in 2003–04. In 2015–16, following an assessment of SSO 4, the OEO 4 TACC was reduced to 3 000 t and the catch of smooth oreo was approximately 2 000 t.

The oreo catch from OEO 3A was less than the TAC from 1992–93 to 1995–96, substantially so in 1994–95 and 1995–96. The OEO 3A TAC was reduced from 10 106 to 6 600 t in 1996–97. A voluntary agreement between the fishing industry and the Minister of Fisheries to limit catch of smooth oreo from OEO 3A to 1400 t of the total oreo TAC of 6 600 t was implemented in 1998–99. Subsequently the total OEO 3A TAC was reduced to 5 900 t in 1999–00, 4 400 in 2000–01, 4 095 in 2001–02 and 3 100 t in 2002–03. Catch from the Sub-Antarctic area (OEO 6) increased substantially in 1994–95 and exceeded the TAC in 1995–96. The OEO 6 TAC was increased from 3 000 to 6 000 t in 1996–97. There was also a voluntary agreement not to fish for oreos in the Puysegur area which started in 1998–99. OEO 1 was fished under the adaptive management programme up to the end of 1997–98. The OEO 1 TAC reverted back to pre-adaptive management levels from 1998–99.Catches have declined since then, and from 1 October 2007 the TACC was reduced to 2500 t, and other sources of mortality were allocated 168 t.

Reported estimated catches by species from tow by tow data recorded in catch and effort logbooks (Deepwater, TCEPR, and CELR) and the ratio of estimated to landed catch reported are given in Table 3.

Table 2: Total reported landings (t) for all oreo species combined by Fishstock from 1978–79 to present and TACs (t) from 1982–83 to present.

Fishing	OEO 1		OEO 3A		OEO 4		OEO 6		Totals	
year	Landings	TAC	Landings	TAC	Landings	TAC	Landings	TAC	Landings	TAC
1978–79*	2 808	-	1 366	-	8 041	-	17	-	12 231	-
1979–80*	143	-	10 958	-	680	-	18	-	11 791	-
1981–82*	21	-	12 750	-	9 296	-	4 380	-	25 851	-
1982–83*	162	-	8 576	10 000	3 927	6 750	765	-	26 514	-
1983–83#	39	-	4 409	#	3 209	#	354	-	13 680	17 000
1983–84†	3 241	-	9 190	10 000	6 104	6 750	3 568	-	8 015	#
1984–85†	1480	-	8 284	10 000	6 390	6 750	2 044	-	22 111	17 000
1985–86†	5 390	-	5 331	10 000	5 883	6 750	126	-	18 204	17 000
1986–87†	532	4 000	7 222	10 000	6 830	6 750	0	3 000	16 820	17 000
1987–88†	1 193	4 000	9 049	10 000	8 674	7 000	197	3 000	15 093	24 000
1988–89†	432	4 233	10 191	10 000	8 447	7 000	7	3 000	19 159	24 000
1989–90†	2 069	5 033	9 286	10 106	7 348	7 000	0	3 000	19 077	24 233
1990–91†	4 563	5 033	9 827	10 106	6 936	7 000	288	3 000	18 703	25 139
1991–92†	4 156	5 033	10 072	10 106	7 457	7 000	33	3 000	21 614	25 139
1992–93†	5 739	6 044	9 290	10 106	7 976	7 000	815	3 000	21 718	25 139
1993–94†	4 910	6 044	9 106	10 106	8 319	7 000	983	3 000	23 820	26 160
1994–95†	1 483	6 044	6 600	10 106	7 680	7 000	2 528	3 000	23 318	26 160
1995–96†	4 783	6 044	7 786	10 106	6 806	7 000	4 435	3 000	18 291	26 160
1996–97†	5 181	6 044	6 991	6 600	6 962	7 000	5 645	6 000	23 810	26 160
1997–98†	2 681	6 044	6 336	6 600	7 010	7 000	5 222	6 000	24 779	25 644
1998–99†	4 102	5 033	5 763	6 600	6 931	7 000	5 287	6 000	21 249	25 644
1999–00†	3 711	5 033	5 859	5 900	7 034	7 000	5 914	6 000	22 083	24 633
2000–01†	4 852	5 033	4 577	4 400	7 358	7 000	5 932	6 000	22 518	23 933
2001–02†	4 197	5 033	3 923	4 095	4 864	5 460	5 737	6 000	22 719	22 433
2002–03†	3 034	5 033	3 070	3 100	5 402	5 460	6 115	6 000	18 721	20 588
2003–04†	1 703	5 033	2 856	3 100	6 735	7 000	5 811	6 000	17 621	19 593
2004–05†	1 025	5 033	3 061	3 100	7 390	7 000	5 744	6 000	17 105	21 133
2005–06†	850	5 033	3 333	3 100	6 829	7 000	6 463	6 000	17 220	21 133
2006–07†	903	5 033	3 073	3 100	7 211	7 000	5 926	6 000	17 475	21 133
2007–08†	947	2 500	3 092	3 100	7 038	7 000	5 902	6 000	17 113	21 133
2008–09†	582	2 500	2 848	3 100	6 907	7 000	5 540	6 000	16 979	18 600
2009–10†	464	2 500	3 550	3 350	7 047	7 000	5 730	6 000	15 877	18 600
2010–11†	381	2 500	3 370	3 350	7 061	7 000	3 610	6 000	16 791	18 850
2011–12†	581	2 500	3 324	3 350	6 858	7 000	2 325	6 000	14 422	18 860
2012–13	652	2 500	3 245	3 350	6 944	7 000	136	6 000	13 088	18 860
2013–14	386	2 500	3 473	3 350	7 024	7 000	367	6 000	11 251	18 860
2014–15	277	2 500	3 352	3 350	7 274	7 000	156	6 000	11 059	18 860
2015–16	523	2 500	3 334	3 350	2 898	3 000	1 357	6 000	8 111	14 860
2016–17	603	2 500	3 206	3 350	3 011	3 000	1 200	6 000	8 020	14 860
2017–18	601	2 500	3 177	3 350	2 867	3 000	2 138	6 000	8 783	14 860

Source: FSU from 1978–79 to 1987–88; QMS/MFish/MPI from 1988–89 to 2013–14. *, 1 April to 31 March. #, 1 April to 30 September. Interim TACs applied. †, 1 October to 30 September. Data prior to 1983 were adjusted up due to a conversion factor change

Table 3: Reported estimated catch (t) by species (smooth oreo (SSO), black oreo (BOE) by Fishstock from 1978–79 to 2007–08 and the ratio (percentage) of the total estimated SSO plus BOE, to the total reported landings (from Table 2. -, less than 1. No catch split available for 2008–09.

	SSO				BOE				Total	Estimated landings
Year	OEO 1	OEO 3A	OEO 4	OEO 6	OEO 1	OEO 3A	OEO 4	OEO 6	estimated	(%)
1978–79*	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	9	-
1979–80*	16	5 075	114	0	118	5 588	566	18	11 495	98
1980–81*	1	1 522	849	2	66	8 758	5 224	215	16 637	64
1981–82*	21	1 283	3 352	2	0	11 419	5 641	4 378	26 096	98
1982–83*	28	2 138	2 796	60	6	6 438	1 088	705	13 259	97
1983–83#	9	713	1 861	0	1	3 693	1 340	354	7 971	100
1983–84†	1 246	3 594	4 871	1 315	1 751	5 524	1 214	2 254	21 769	99
1984–85†	828	4 311	4 729	472	544	3 897	1 651	1 572	18 004	99
1985–86†	4 257	3 135	4 921	72	1 060	2 184	961	54	16 644	99
1986–87†	326	3 186	5 670	0	163	4 026	1 160	0	14 531	96
1987–88†	1 050	5 897	7 771	197	114	3 140	903	0	19 072	100
1988–89†	261	5 864	6 427	-	86	2 719	1 087	0	16 444	86
1989–90†	1 141	5 355	5 320	-	872	2 344	439	-	15 471	83
1990–91†	1 437	4 422	5 262	81	2 314	4 177	793	222	18 708	87
1991–92†	1 008	6 096	4 797	2	2 384	3 176	1 702	15	19 180	88
1992–93†	1 716	3 461	3 814	529	3 768	3 957	1 326	69	18 640	78
1993–94†	2 000	4 767	4 805	808	2 615	4 016	1 553	35	20 599	88
1994–95†	835	3 589	5 272	1 811	385	2 052	545	230	14 719	81
1995–96†	2 517	3 591	5 236	2 562	1 296	3 361	364	1 166	20 093	84
1996–97†	2 203	3 063	5 390	2 492	2 578	3 549	530	1 950	21 755	88
1997–98†	1 510	4 790	5 868	2 531	1 027	1 623	811	1 982	20 142	95
1998–99†	2 958	2367	5 613	3 462	820	3 147	844	1 231	20 442	93

Table 3 [Continued]:

Year	SSO OEO 1	OEO 3A	OEO 4	OEO 6	BOE OEO 1	OEO 3A	OEO 4	OEO 6	Total estimated	Estimated landings (%)
1999–00†	2 533	1 733	5 985	4 306	970	3 943	628	1 043	21 142	94
2001–02†	2 973	1 769	3 806	4 470	697	2 378	515	983	17 591	94
2002–03†	2 521	1 395	4 105	3 941	481	1 636	868	1 640	16 587	94
2003–04†	1 046	1 244	5 082	3 767	458	1 590	973	1 496	15 656	92
2004–05†	665	1 447	5 848	3 840	234	1 594	851	1 580	16 059	93
2005–06†	529	1 354	5 145	3 289	265	1 770	763	2 616	15 731	90
2006–07†	530	1 220	5 863	2 214	263	1 651	795	3 071	15 607	91
2007–08†	407	1 482	6 150	2 182	429	1 521	592	3 022	15 785	93

Source: FSU from 1978–79 to 1987–88 and MFish from 1988–89 to 2006–07 * 1 April to 31 March. #, 1 April to 30 September. †, 1 October to 30 September.

Descriptive analyses of the main New Zealand oreo fisheries were updated with data from 2006–07 in 2008. Standardised CPUE analyses of black and smooth oreo have been updated as follows:

- smooth oreo in OEO 3A in 2009;
- black oreo in OEO 4 in 2009;
- black oreo in OEO 6 (Pukaki) in 2009;
- smooth oreo OEO 6 (Bounty) in 2008;
- black oreo in OEO 3A in 2008;
- smooth oreo in OEO 4 in 2007;
- smooth oreo in Southland (OEO 1 and OEO 3A)in 2007;
- smooth oreo OEO 6 (Pukaki) in 2006.





Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the four main OEO stocks. From top: OEO 1 (Central East - Wairarapa, Auckland, Central Egmont, Challenger, Southland, South East Catlin Coast), OEO 3A (South East Cook Strait/Kaikoura/Strathallan). [Continued on next page].





Figure 1 [Continued]: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the four main OEO stocks. From top: OEO 4 (South East Chatham Rise), and OEO 6 (Sub-Antarctic).

4.2 Recreational fisheries
There are no known recreational fisheries for black oreo and smooth oreo.

4.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries
There is no known customary non-commercial fishing for black oreo and smooth oreo.

4.4 Illegal catch
Estimates of illegal catch are not available.

4.5 Other sources of mortality
Dumping of unwanted or small fish and accidental loss of fish (lost codends, ripped codends, etc.) were features of oreo fisheries in the early years. These sources of mortality were probably substantial in those early years but are now thought to be relatively small. No estimate of mortality from these sources has been made because of the lack of hard data and because mortality now appears to be small. Estimates of discards of oreos were made for 1994–95 and 1995–96 from MFish observer data. This involved calculating the ratio of discarded oreo catch to retained oreo catch and then multiplying the annual total oreo catch from the New Zealand EEZ by this ratio. Estimates were 207 and 270 t for 1994–95 and 1995–96 respectively.

5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECOSYSTEM CONSIDERATIONS

This section was updated for the 2018 Fishery Assessment Plenary. An issue-by-issue analysis is available in the Aquatic Environment & Biodiversity Annual Review 2017 (MPI 2017, https://www.mpi.govt.nz/dmsdocument/27471-aquatic-environment-and-biodiversity-annual-review-aebar-2017-a-summary-of-environmental-interactions-between-the-seafood-sector-and-the-aquatic-environment).

5.1 Role in the ecosystem

Smooth and black oreo dominate trawl survey relative abundance estimates of demersal fish species at 650–1200 m on the south and southwest slope of the Chatham Rise (e.g., Hart & McMillan 1998). They are probably also dominant at those depths on the southeast slope of the South Island and other southern New Zealand slope areas including Bounty Plateau, and Pukaki Rise. They are replaced at depths of about 700–1200 m on the east and northern slope of Chatham Rise by orange roughy. The south Chatham Rise oreo fisheries are relatively long-standing, dating from Soviet fishing in the 1970s but the effects of extracting approximately 6 000 t per year of smooth oreo from the south Chatham Rise (OEO 4) ecosystem between 1983–84 and 2012–13 are unknown.

5.1.1 Trophic interactions

Smooth oreo feed mainly on salps (80%), molluscs (9%, of which 8% are squids but also including octopods), and teleosts (5%) (percentage frequency of occurrence in stomachs with food, Stevens et al 2011). Black oreo feed on teleosts (48%), crustaceans (36%), salps (24%), and cephalopods (mainly squid, 6%) (Stevens et al 2011). Diet varies with fish size but salps remained the main prey for smooth oreo in the largest fish with small numbers of Scyphozoa, fish and squids. Salps were the main prey for smaller black oreo but amphipods and natant decapod crustaceans were important for intermediate sized fish (Clark et al 1989). Smooth oreo and black oreo occur with orange roughy at times. Orange roughy diet was mainly crustaceans (58%), teleosts (41%), and molluscs (10%, particularly squids) (frequency of occurrence, Stevens et al 2011) suggesting little overlap with the salp-dominated diet of smooth oreo. Where they co-occur, orange roughy and black oreo may compete for teleost and crustacean prey.

Predators of oreos probably change with fish size. Larger smooth oreo, black oreo and orange roughy were observed with healed soft flesh wounds, typically in the dorso-posterior region. Wound shape and size suggest they may be caused by one of the deepwater dogfishes (Dunn et al 2010).

5.1.2 Ecosystem indicators

Tuck et al (2009) used data from the Sub-Antarctic and Chatham Rise middle-depth trawl surveys to derive indicators of fish diversity, size, and trophic level. However, fishing for oreos occurs mostly deeper than the depth range of these surveys and is only a small component of fishing in the areas considered by Tuck et al (2009).

5.2 Non-target fish and invertebrate catch

Anderson et al (2017) summarised the bycatch of oreo trawl fisheries from 2001–02 to 2014–15. Since 2001–02, oreo species (five species, mainly smooth oreo and black oreo) accounted for about 95% of the total estimated catch from all observed trawls targeting oreos. In total, over 500 species or species groups were identified by observers in the target fishery. Total annual fish bycatch in the oreo fishery ranged from 580–1575 t between 2001–02 and 2009–10 and declined to lower levels (350–535 t) in subsequent years. Orange roughy (1.9%) was the main bycatch species, with no other species or group of species accounting for more than 0.6% of the total catch. Other recorded bycatch species included deepwater dogfish (1%; mostly Baxter's dogfish *Etmopterus granulosus*), rattails (0.6%), hoki (0.4%), and slickheads (0.15%), all of which were usually discarded. Estimated annual bycatch of non-QMS species was roughly equal to that of QMS species. From 2001–02 to 2014–15, the overall discard fraction value was 0.01 kg (range of 0.01–0.05 kg) and tended to be lower in recent years.

Non-QMS invertebrate bycatch made up a very small fraction of the overall catch (0.3%) and included corals (0.1%), warty squid (0.06%), and echinoderms (0.02%) (Anderson et al 2017). Other observed species or species groups each accounted for less than 0.01% of the observed catch. Tracey et al (2011) analysed the distribution of nine groups of protected corals based on bycatch records from observed trawl effort from 2007–08 to 2009–10, primarily from 800–1000 m depth. For the oreo target fishery, the highest catches were reported from the north and south slopes of the Chatham Rise, east of the Pukaki Rise, and on the Macquarie Ridge.

5.3 Incidental capture of Protected Species (seabirds, mammals, and protected fish)

For protected species, capture estimates presented here include all animals recovered to the deck of fishing vessels (alive, injured or dead), but do not include any cryptic mortality (e.g., a seabird struck by a warp but not brought on board the vessel, Middleton & Abraham 2007, Brothers et al 2010). Ramm (2011, 2012a, 2012b) summarised observer data for combined bottom trawl fisheries for orange roughy, oreos, cardinalfish and listed annual captures of seabirds, and mammals from 2008–09 to 2010–11.

5.3.1 Marine mammal interactions

Trawlers targeting orange roughy, oreo, and black cardinalfish occasionally catch New Zealand fur seal (which were classified as “Not Threatened” under the NZ Threat Classification System in 2010, Baker et al 2016). Between 2002–03 and 2007–08, there were 14 observed captures of NZ fur seal in orange roughy, oreo, and black cardinalfish trawl fisheries. There has been one observed capture in the period between 2008–09 and 2016–17, during which time the average level of annual observer coverage was 26.7% (Table 4). Corresponding mean annual estimated captures in this period ranged 0–3 (mean 1.25) based on statistical capture models (Thompson et al 2013; Abraham et al 2016). All observed fur seal captures occurred in the Sub-Antarctic region.

Table 4: Number of tows by fishing year and observed and model-estimated total NZ fur seal captures in orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish trawl fisheries, 2002–03 to 2016–17. No. Obs, number of observed tows; % obs, percentage of tows observed; Rate, number of captures per 100 observed tows, % inc, percentage of total effort included in the statistical model. Estimates are based on methods described in Abraham et al (2016), available via https://data.dragonfly.co.nz/psc . Estimates for 2002–03 to 2016–17 are based on data version 2018v1.

				Observed		Estimated	
	Tows	No.obs	%ob	Captures	Rate	Capture	95%c.i.
2002–03	8 872	1 384	15.6	0	0.0	4	0-13
2003–04	8 006	1 262	15.8	2	0.2	10	3-26
2004–05	8 428	1 619	19.2	4	0.2	15	6-32
2005–06	8 287	1 358	16.4	2	0.1	11	4-25
2006–07	7 361	2 324	31.6	2	0.1	3	2-7
2007–08	6 730	2 811	41.8	5	0.2	8	5-14
2008–09	6 132	2 372	38.7	0	0.0	2	0-8
2009–10	6 013	2 134	35.5	0	0.0	3	0-9
2010–11	4 177	1 205	28.8	0	0.0	4	0-11
2011–12	3 653	922	25.2	0	0.0	1	0-5
2012–13	3 098	346	11.2	0	0.0	0	0-3
2013–14	3 607	434	12.0	0	0.0	1	0-4
2014–15	3 809	978	25.7	1	0.1	2	1-4
2015–16	4 086	1 421	34.8	0	0.0	1	0-3
2016–17	3 964	1 226	30.9	0	0.0		

5.3.2 Seabird interactions

Annual observed seabird capture rates ranged from 0 to 0.9 per 100 tows in orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish trawl fisheries between 2002–03 and 2014–15 (Baird 2001, 2004 a, b, 2005, Baird & Smith 2004, Abraham & Thompson 2009, Abraham et al 2009, Abraham & Thompson 2011, Abraham et al 2016, Abraham & Richard 2017, 2018). Capture rates have fluctuated without obvious trend at this low level. In the 2015-16 fishing year, there were 4 observed captures of birds, and 2 in 2016-17, in orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish trawl fisheries at a rate of 0.3 to 0.2 birds (respectively) per 100 observed tows (Table 5). The average capture rate in deepwater trawl fisheries (including orange roughy, oreo and cardinalfish) for the period from 2002–03 to 2015–16 is about 0.29 birds per 100 tows, a very low rate relative to other New Zealand trawl fisheries, e.g. for scampi (4.43 birds per 100 tows) and squid (13.79 birds per 100 tows) over the same years.

Table 5: Number of tows by fishing year and observed seabird captures in orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish trawl fisheries, 2002–03 to 2016–17. No. obs, number of observed tows; % obs, percentage of tows observed; Rate, number of captures per 100 observed tows. Estimates are based on methods described in Abraham et al (2016) and Abraham & Richard (2017, 2018) and available via https://data.dragonfly.co.nz/psc. Estimates for 2002–03 to 2016–17 are based on data version 2018v1.

	Fishing effort			Observed captures		Estimated captures	
	Tows	No. obs	% obs	Captures	Rate	Mean	95% c.i.
2002–03	8 870	1 383	15.6	0	0.00	27	14-45
2003–04	8 006	1 262	15.8	3	0.24	27	15-42
2004–05	8 431	1 619	19.2	7	0.43	46	28-72
2005–06	8 290	1 358	16.4	8	0.59	33	21-50
2006–07	7 363	2 325	31.6	1	0.04	16	7-27
2007–08	6 729	2 810	41.8	7	0.25	19	11-29
2008–09	6 133	2 373	38.7	7	0.29	20	12-30
2009–10	6 006	2 130	35.5	19	0.89	35	26-46
2010–11	4 180	1 206	28.9	1	0.08	12	5-22
2011–12	3 655	923	25.3	2	0.22	10	5-18
2012–13	3 096	345	11.1	2	0.58	13	6-23
2013–14	3 608	435	12.1	2	0.46	14	6-24
2014–15	3 815	977	25.6	0	0.00	12	5-22
2015–16	4 091	1 421	34.7	4	0.28	13	6-20
2016–17	3 961	1 226	31.0	2	0.16	11	5-18

Table 6: Number of observed seabird captures in orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish fisheries, 2002–03 to 2016–17, by species and area. The risk category is an estimate of aggregate potential fatalities across trawl and longline fisheries relative to the Population Sustainability Thresholds, PST (from Richard et al 2017, where full details of the risk assessment approach can be found). These data are available via https://data.dragonfly.co.nz/psc, based on data version 2017v1.

Species	Risk Category	Chatham Rise	ECSI	Fiordland	Sub-Antarctic	Stewart Snares Shelf	WCSI	Total
Salvin's albatross	High	13	4	0	3	0	0	20
Southern Buller's albatross	High	3	0	1	0	0	0	4
Chatham Island albatross	High	7	0	0	1	0	0	8
New Zealand white-capped albatross	High	3	0	0	0	0	1	4
Gibson's albatross	High	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Antipodean albatross	Medium	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Northern royal albatross	Low	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Southern royal albatross	Negligible	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total albatrosses	**-**	**30**	**4**	**1**	**4**	**0**	**1**	**40**
Northern giant petrel	Medium	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
White-chinned petrel	Negligible	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Grey petrel	Negligible	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Sooty shearwater	Negligible	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Common diving petrel	Negligible	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
White-faced storm petrels	Negligible	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Cape petrel	-	8	1	0	0	0	0	9
Short-tailed shearwater	-	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Petrels, prions and shearwaters	-	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Total other birds	**-**	**17**	**5**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**25**
Grand Total		**94**	**18**	**2**	**12**	**2**	**2**	**130**

Salvin’s albatross was the most frequently captured albatross (50% of observed albatross captures) but seven different species have been observed captured since 2002–03. Cape petrels were the most frequently captured other taxon (41%, Table 6). Seabird captures in the orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish fisheries have been observed mostly around the Chatham Rise and off the east coast South Island. These numbers should be regarded as only a general guide on the distribution of captures because the observer coverage is not uniform across areas and may not be representative.

The deepwater trawl fisheries (including the cardinal fish target fishery) contributes to the total risk posed by New Zealand commercial fishing to seabirds (see Table 7). The two species to which the fishery poses the most risk are Chatham Island albatross and Salvin's albatross, with this suite of fisheries posing 0.6 and 0.022 of Population Sustainability Threshold (PST) (Table 7). Chatham albatross and Salvin's albatross were assessed at high risk (Abraham et al 2016).

Table 7: Risk ratio of seabirds predicted by the level two risk assessment for the oreo and all fisheries included in the level two risk assessment, 2006–07 to 2016–17, showing seabird species with a risk ratio of at least 0.001 of PST (from Richard et al 2017, where full details of the risk assessment approach can be found). The risk ratio is an estimate of aggregate potential fatalities across trawl and longline fisheries relative to the PST. The DOC threat classifications are shown (Robertson et al 2017 at http://www.doc.govt.nz/documents/science-and-technical/nztcs19entire.pdf).

		Risk ratio			
Species name	PST (mean)	OEO, ORH, CDL target trawl	TOTAL	Risk category	DOC Threat Classification
Chatham Island albatross	425.2	0.060	0.362	High	At Risk: Naturally Uncommon
Salvin's albatross	3 599.5	0.022	0.780	High	Threatened: Nationally Critical
Northern giant petrel	335.4	0.005	0.138	Medium	At Risk: Naturally Uncommon
Northern Buller's albatross	1 627.4	0.002	0.253	Medium	At Risk: Naturally Uncommon
Black petrel	437.1	0.002	1.153	Very high	Threatened: Nationally Vulnerable
Antipodean albatross	364.3	0.002	0.203	Medium	Threatened: Nationally Critical
Gibson's albatross	496.1	0.002	0.337	High	Threatened: Nationally Critical
Northern royal albatross	715.1	0.001	0.043	Low	At Risk: Naturally Uncommon

Mitigation methods such as streamer (tori) lines, Brady bird bafflers, warp deflectors, and offal management are used in the orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish trawl fisheries. Warp mitigation was voluntarily introduced from about 2004 and made mandatory in April 2006 (Department of Internal Affairs 2006). The 2006 notice mandated that all trawlers over 28 m in length use a seabird scaring device while trawling (being "paired streamer lines", "bird baffler" or "warp deflector" as defined in the Notice).

5.4 Benthic interactions

The spatial extent of seabed contact by trawl fishing gear in New Zealand's EEZ and Territorial Sea has been estimated and mapped in numerous studies for trawl fisheries targeting deepwater species (Baird et al 2011, Black et al 2013, Black and Tilney 2015, Black and Tilney 2017, and Baird and Wood 2018) and species in waters shallower than 250 m (Baird et al 2015). The most recent assessment of the deepwater trawl footprint was for the period 2007–08 to 2016–17 (Baird & Mules 2019).

Orange roughy, oreos, and cardinalfish are taken using bottom trawls and accounted for about 14% of all tows reported on TCEPR forms to have fished on or close to the bottom between 1989–90 and 2004–05 (Baird et al 2011). Tows are located in Benthic-optimised Marine Environment Classification (BOMEC, Leathwick et al 2012) classes J, K (mid-slope), M (mid-lower slope), N, and O (lower slope and deeper waters) (Baird & Wood 2012), and 94% were between 700 and 1 200 m depth (Baird et al 2011). Deepsea corals in the New Zealand region are abundant and diverse and, because of their fragility, are at risk from anthropogenic activities such as bottom trawling (Clark & O'Driscoll 2003, Clark & Rowden 2009, Williams et al 2010). All deepwater hard corals are protected under Schedule 7A of the Wildlife Act 1953. Baird et al (2013) mapped the likely coral distributions using predictive models and concluded that the fisheries that pose the most risk to protected corals are these deepwater trawl fisheries.

During 1989–90 to 2015–16, about 59 130 bottom trawls targeting oreo species were reported on TCEPRs (Baird & Wood 2018): between 1600–2500 tows were reported a year during 1989–90 to 1994–95; 2000–3300 tows between 1995–96 and 2009–10; and annual tows decreased from almost 2000 tows in 2010–11 to under 800 tows in 2015–16. The total footprint generated from these tows was estimated at about 15 960 km^2. This footprint represented coverage of 0.4% of the seafloor of the combined EEZ and the Territorial Sea areas; 1.1% of the 'fishable area', that is, the seafloor area open to trawling, in depths of less than 1600 m. For the 2016–17 fishing year, 685 oreo bottom tows had an estimated footprint of 255 km^2 which represented coverage of < 0.1% of the EEZ and Territorial Sea and > 0.1% of the fishable area (Baird & Mules 2019).

The overall trawl footprint for oreo (1989–90 to 2015–16) covered 4% of the seafloor in 800–1000 m, 3% of 1000–1200 m seafloor, and 0.8% of the 1200–1600 m seafloor (Baird & Wood 2018). In 2016–17, the oreo footprint contacted 0.1%, < 0.1%, and < 0.1% of those depth ranges, respectively (Baird & Mules 2019). The BOMEC areas with the highest proportion of area covered by the oreo footprint were classes J (comprising mainly the Challenger Plateau and northern and southern slopes of the Chatham Rise) and M (shallower waters of the Southern Plateau). In 2016–17, the oreo footprint covered about 0.04% of the 311 360 km^2 of class J and 0.04% of the 233 825 km^2 of class M (Baird & Mules 2019).

Trawling for orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish, like trawling for other species, is likely to have effects on benthic community structure and function (e.g., Rice 2006) and there may be consequences for benthic productivity (e.g., Jennings et al 2001, Hermsen et al 2003, Hiddink et al 2006, Reiss et al 2009). These consequences are not considered in detail here but are discussed in the 2017 Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Annual Review (MPI, 2017).

The New Zealand EEZ contains Benthic Protection Areas (BPAs) and seamount closures that are closed to bottom trawl fishing for the protection of benthic biodiversity. These combined areas include 28% of underwater topographic features (including seamounts), 52% of all seamounts over 1000 m elevation and 88% of identified hydrothermal vents.

5.5 Other considerations

5.5.1 Spawning disruption

Fishing during spawning may disrupt spawning activity or success. Morgan et al (1999) concluded that Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) “exposed to a chronic stressor are able to spawn successfully, but there appears to be a negative impact of this stress on their reproductive output, particularly through the production of abnormal larvae”. Morgan et al (1997) also reported that “Following passage of the trawl, a 300-m-wide "hole" in the [cod spawning] aggregation spanned the trawl track. Disturbance was detected for 77 min after passage of the trawl.” There is no research on the disruption of spawning smooth oreo and black oreo by fishing in New Zealand, but spawning of both species appears to be over a protracted period (October to February) and over a wide area (O’Driscoll et al 2003). Fishing continues during the spawning period, possibly because localised spawning schools of smooth oreo, in particular, may provide good catch rates.

5.5.2 Genetic effects

Fishing, environmental changes, including those caused by climate change or pollution, could alter the genetic composition or diversity of a species. There are no known studies of the genetic diversity of smooth or black oreo from New Zealand. Genetic studies for stock discrimination are reported under “stocks and areas”.

5.5.3 Habitat of particular significance to fisheries management

Habitat of particular significance for fisheries management does not have a policy definition currently although work is currently underway to generate one. O’Driscoll et al (2003) identified the south Chatham Rise as important for smooth oreo spawning, and the north, east and south slope as important for juveniles. The south Chatham Rise is also important for black oreo spawning and juveniles. Deepsea corals such as the reef-forming scleractinian corals and gorgonian sea fan corals are thought to provide prey and refuge for deep-sea fish (Fosså et al 2002, Stone 2006, Mortensen et al 2008). Large aggregations of deepwater species like orange roughy, oreos, and cardinalfish occur above seamounts with high densities of such “reef-like” taxa, but it is not known if there are any direct linkages between the fish and corals. Bottom trawling for orange roughy, oreos, and cardinalifish has the potential to affect features of the habitat that could qualify as habitat of particular significance to fisheries management.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Abraham, E R; Berkenbusch, K; Richard, Y; Thompson, F (2016) Summary of the capture of seabirds, mammals, and turtles in New Zealand commercial fisheries, 2002–03 to 2012–13. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No.169*. 205 p.

Abraham, E R; Richard, Y (2017) Summary of the capture of seabirds in New Zealand commercial fisheries, 2002–03 to 2013–14. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 184*. 88 p.

Abraham, E R; Richard, Y (2018) Estimated capture of seabirds in New Zealand trawl and longline fisheries, 2002–03 to 2014–15. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 197*. 97 p.

Abraham, E R; Thompson, F N (2009) Capture of protected species in New Zealand trawl and longline fisheries, 1998–99 to 2006–07. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 32*. 197 p.

Abraham, E R; Thompson, F N (2011) Summary of the capture of seabirds, marine mammals, and turtles in New Zealand commercial fisheries, 1998–99 to 2008–09. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 80*.

Abraham, E R; Thompson, F N; Berkenbusch, K (2013) Estimated capture of seabirds in New Zealand trawl and longline fisheries, 2002–03 to 2010–11. Final Research Report for Ministry for Primary Industries project PRO2010-01 (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington).

Anderson, O F; Ballara, S L; Edwards, C T T (2017) Fish and invertebrate bycatch and discards in New Zealand orange roughy and oreo trawl fisheries from 2001–02 until 2014–15. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 190*. 216 p.

Baird, S J (2001) Estimation of the incidental capture of seabird and marine mammal species in commercial fisheries in New Zealand waters, 1998–99. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/14*.43 p.

Baird, S J (2004a) Estimation of the incidental capture of seabird and marine mammal species in commercial fisheries in New Zealand waters, 1999–2000. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2004/41*. 56 p.

Baird, S J (2004b) Incidental capture of seabird species in commercial fisheries in New Zealand waters, 2000–01. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2004/58*. 63 p.

Baird, S J (2004c) Incidental capture of seabird species in commercial fisheries in New Zealand waters, 2001–02. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2004/60*. 51 p.

Baird, S J (2005) Incidental capture of seabird species in commercial fisheries in New Zealand waters, 2002–03. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2005/2*. 50 p.

Baird, S J; Hewitt, J E; Wood, B A (2015) Benthic habitat classes and trawl fishing disturbance in New Zealand waters shallower than 250 m. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 144*. 184 p.

Baird, S J; Mules, R (2019) Extent of bottom contact by New Zealand commercial trawl fishing for deepwater Tier 1 and Tier 2 target species determined using CatchMapper software, 2008–17. Draft New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report prepared for Fisheries NZ project BEN201701.

Baird, S J; Smith, M H (2007) Incidental capture of New Zealand fur seals (*Arctocephalus forsteri*) in commercial fisheries in New Zealand waters, 2003–04 to 2004–05. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 14*. 98 p.

Baird, S J; Tracey, D; Mormede, S; Clark, M (2013) The distribution of protected corals in New Zealand waters DOC12303 / POP2011-06. NIWA Client Report No: WLG2012-43. Prepared for Marine Conservation Services, Department of Conservation and Te Papa Atawhai 93 p. https://www.doc.govt.nz/Documents/conservation/marine-and-coastal/marine-conservation-services/pop-2011-06-coral-distribution.pdf

Baird, S J; Wood, B A (2012) Extent of coverage of 15 environmental classes within the New Zealand EEZ by commercial trawling with seafloor contact. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report 89*. 43 p.

Baird, S J; Wood, B A (2018) Extent of bottom contact by New Zealand commercial trawl fishing for deepwater Tier 1 and Tier 2 target fishstocks, 1989–90 to 2015–16. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 193*. 102 p

Baird, S J; Wood, B A; Bagley, N W (2011) Nature and extent of commercial fishing effort on or near the seafloor within the New Zealand 200 n. mile Exclusive Economic Zone, 1989–90 to 2004–05. *New Zealand Aquatic Environmental and Biodiversity Report No. 73*. 48 p.

Baker, C S; Chilvers, B L; Childerhouse, S; Constantine, R; Currey, R; Mattlin, R; van Helden, A; Hitchmough, R; Rolfe, J (2016) Conservation status of New Zealand marine mammals, 2013. *New Zealand Threat Classification Series 14*. Department of Conservation, Wellington. 18 p.

Baker, C S; Chilvers, B L; Constantine, R; DuFresne, S; Mattlin, R H; van Helden, A; Hitchmough, R (2010) Conservation status of New Zealand marine mammals (suborders Cetacea and Pinnipedia), 2009. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research 44*: 101–115.

Ballara, S L; Anderson, O F (2009) Fish discards and non-target fish catch in the trawl fisheries for arrow squid and scampi in New Zealand waters. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 38*. 102 p.

Black, J; Wood, R; Berthelsen, T; Tilney, R (2013) Monitoring New Zealand's trawl footprint for deepwater fisheries: 1989–1990 to 2009–2010. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 110*. 57 p.

Black, J; Tilney, R (2015) Monitoring New Zealand's trawl footprint for deepwater fisheries: 1989– 1990 to 2010–2011. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 142*. 56 p.

Black, J; Tilney, R (2017) Monitoring New Zealand's trawl footprint for deepwater fisheries: 1989–90 to 2012–13. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 176*. 65 p.

Clark, M R; Anderson, O F; Gilbert, D J (2000) Discards in trawl fisheries for southern blue whiting, orange roughy, hoki, and oreos in waters around New Zealand. *NIWA Technical Report 71*. 73 p.

Clark, M R; King, K J; McMillan, P J (1989) The food and feeding relationships of black oreo, *Allocyttus niger*, smooth oreo, *Pseudocyttus maculatus*, and eight other fish species from the continental slope of the south-west Chatham Rise, New Zealand. *Journal of Fish Biology* 35: 465–484.

Clark, M; O'Driscoll, R (2003) Deepwater fisheries and aspects of their impact on seamount habitat in New Zealand. *Journal of Northwest Atlantic Fishery Science 31*: 441–458.

Clark, M R; Rowden, A A (2009) Effect of deepwater trawling on the macro-invertebrate assemblages of seamounts on the Chatham Rise, New Zealand. *Deep Sea Research I 56*: 1540–1554.

Coburn, R P; McMillan, P J (2006) Descriptions of the black oreo and smooth oreo fisheries in OEO 1, OEO 3A, OEO 4, and OEO 6 from 1977–78 to the 2004–05 fishing years. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2006/60*. 70 p.

Coburn, R P; McMillian, P J; Gilbert, D J (2007) Inputs for a stock assessment of smooth oreo, Pukaki Rise (part of OEO 6). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/23*. 32 p.

Department of Internal Affairs. (2006) Seabird Scaring Devices – Circular Issued Under Authority of the Fisheries (Commercial Fishing) Amendment Regulations 2006 (No. F361). *New Zealand Gazette 6 April 2006* : 842–846.

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Hart, A C (1997) Revision of smooth oreo life history parameters. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1997/9. 11 p. (Unpublished document held in NIWA library, Wellington.)

Doonan, I J; McMillian, P J; Hart, A C (2008) Ageing of smooth oreo otoliths for stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/08*. 29 p.

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Kalish, J M; Hart, A C (1995) Age estimates for black oreo and smooth oreo. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document. 1995/14. 26 p. (Unpublished document held in NIWA library, Wellington.)
Dunn, M R; Szabo, A; McVeagh, M S; Smith, P J (2010) The diet of deepwater sharks and the benefits of using DNA identification of prey. *Deep-Sea Research I 57* 923–930.
Fosså, J H; Mortensen, P B; Furevik, D M (2002) The deep-water coral *Lophelia pertusa* in Norwegian waters: distribution and fishery impacts. *Hydrobiologia* 471: 1–12.
Hart, A C; McMillan, P J (1998) Trawl survey of oreos and orange roughy on the south Chatham Rise, October–November 1995 (TAN9511). *NIWA Technical Report 27*. 48 p.
Hart, A C; McMillan, P J (2006) A summary of observer biological information on the New Zealand black oreo and smooth oreo fisheries from 1979–80 to 2004–05. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2006/55*. 39 p.
Hermsen, J M; Collie, J S; Valentine, P C (2003) Mobile fishing gear reduces benthic megafaunal production on Georges Bank. *Marine Ecology Progress Series 260*: 97–108.
Hiddink, J G; Jennings, S; Kaiser, M J; Queiros, A M; Duplisea, D E; Piet, G J (2006) Cumulative impacts of seabed trawl disturbance on benthic biomass, production, and species richness in different habitats. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 63*: 721–36.
Jennings, S; Dinmore, T A; Duplisea, D E; Warr, K J; Lancaster, J E (2001) Trawling disturbance can modify benthic production processes. *Journal of Animal Ecology 70*: 459–475.
Leathwick, J R; Rowden, A; Nodder, S; Gorman, R; Bardsley, S; Pinkerton, M; Baird, S J; Hadfield, M; Currie, K; Goh, A (2012) A Benthic–optimised Marine Environment Classification (BOMEC) for New Zealand waters. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 88.* 54 p.
McKenzie, A (2007) Stock assessment for east Pukaki Rise smooth oreo (part of OEO 6). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/34*. 27 p.
McMillan, P J; Doonan, I J; Hart, A C (1997) Revision of black oreo life history parameters. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1997/8. 13 p. (Unpublished document held in NIWA library, Wellington.)
Middleton, D A J; Abraham, E R (2007) The efficacy of warp strike mitigation devices: Trials in the 2006 squid fishery. Final Research Report for research project IPA2006/02. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington).
Morgan, M J; Deblois, E M; Rose, G A (1997) An observation on the reaction of Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) in a spawning shoal to bottom trawling. *Symposium on the Biology and Ecology of Northwest Atlantic Cod, St. John's, NF (Canada)*, 24–28 Oct 1994.
Morgan, M J; Wilson, C E; Crim, L W (1999) The effect of stress on reproduction in Atlantic cod. *Journal of Fish Biology 54*: 477–488.
Mortensen, P B; Buhl-Mortensen, L; Gebruk, A V; Krylova, E M (2008) Occurrence of deep-water corals on the Mid-Atlantic Ridge based on MAR-ECO data. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography 55*: 142–152.
MPI (2017) Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Annual Review 2017. Compiled by the Fisheries Management Science Team, Ministry for Primary Industries, Wellington, New Zealand. 724 p.
O'Driscoll, R L; Booth, J D; Bagley, N W; Anderson, O F; Griggs, L H; Stevenson, M L; Francis, M P (2003) Areas of importance for spawning, pupping or egg-laying, and juveniles of New Zealand deepwater fish, pelagic fish, and invertebrates. *NIWA Technical Report 119*. 377 p.
Ramm, K C (2011) Conservation Services Programme Observer Report for the period 1 July 2008 to 30 June 2009. Available at: www.doc.govt.nz/documents/science-and-technical/2008-09-csp-observer-report.pdf
Ramm, K (2012a) Conservation Services Programme Observer Report: 1 July 2009 to 30 June 2010. Department of Conservation, Wellington. 130 p.
Ramm, K (2012b) Conservation Services Programme Observer Report: 1 July 2010 to 30 June 2011. Department of Conservation, Wellington. 121 p.
Reiss, H; Greenstreet, S P R; Siebe, K; Ehrich, S; Piet, G J; Quirijns, F; Robinson, L; Wolff, W J; Kronke, I (2009) Effects of fishing disturbance on benthic communities and secondary production within an intensively fished area. *Marine Ecology Progress Series 394*: 201–213.
Rice, J (2006) Impacts of Mobile Bottom Gears on Seafloor Habitats, Species, and Communities: A Review and Synthesis of Selected International Reviews. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Research Document 2006/057. 35 p. (available from http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/CSAS/Csas/DocREC/2006/RES2006_057_e.pdf).
Richard, Y; Abraham, E R (2013) Risk of commercial fisheries to New Zealand seabird populations. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 109*. 62 p.
Richard, Y; Abraham, E R (2015). Assessment of the risk of commercial fisheries to New Zealand seabirds, 2006–07 to 2012–13. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report 162*. 85 p.
Richard, Y; Abraham, E R; Berkenbusch, K (2017). Assessment of the risk of commercial fisheries to New Zealand seabirds, 2006–07 to 2014–15. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report 191.* 133 p.
Richard, Y; Abraham, E R; Filippi, D (2011) Assessment of the risk to seabird populations from New Zealand commercial fisheries. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries research projects IPA2009-19 and IPA2009-20. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.). 66 p.
Robertson, H A; Baird, K; Dowding J E; Elliott, G P; Hitchmough, R A; Miskelly, C M; McArthur, N; O'Donnell, C F J; Sagar, P M; Scofield, R P; Taylor, G A (2017) Conservation status of New Zealand birds (2016). *New Zealand Threat Classification Series 19.*
Smith, P; McMillan, P; Proctor, C; Robertson, S; Knuckey, I; Diggles, B; Bull, B (1999) Stock relationships of smooth oreo in New Zealand waters. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project DEE9801. 76 p.
Smith, P; Proctor, C; Robertson, S; McMillan, P; Bull, B; Diggles, B (2000) Stock relationships of black oreo in New Zealand waters. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project DEE9801. Objective 1 (Part two). 79 p.
Stevens, D W; Hurst, R J; Bagley, N W (2011) Feeding habits of New Zealand fishes: a literature review and summary of research trawl database records 1960 to 2000. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 85*. 218 p.
Stewart, B D; Smith, D C (1994) Development of methods to age commercially important dories and oreos. Final Report to the Fisheries Research and Development Corporation. (Available at http://frdc.com.au/research/final-reports/Pages/1991-036.aspx)
Stone, R P (2006) Coral habitat in the Aleutian Islands of Alaska: depth distribution, fine-scale species associations, and fisheries interactions. *Coral Reefs 25*: 229–238.
Thompson, F N; Berkenbusch, K; Abraham, E R (2013) Marine mammal bycatch in New Zealand trawl fisheries, 1995–96 to 2010–11. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 105*. 73p.
Tracey, D M; Rowden, A A; Mackay, K A; Compton, T (2011) Habitat-forming cold-water corals show affinity for seamounts in the New Zealand region. *Marine Ecology Progress Series 430*: 1–22.
Tuck, I; Cole, R; Devine, J (2009) Ecosystem indicators for New Zealand fisheries. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 42*. 188 p.
Ward, R D; Elliot, N G; Yearsley, G K; Last, P R (1996) Species and stock delineation in Australasian oreos (Oreosomatidae). Final Report to Fisheries Research and Development Corporation. 144 p. (Report held by National Library of Australia.)
Williams, A; Schlacher, T A; Rowden, A A; Althaus, F; Clark, M R; Bowden, D A; Stewart, R; Bax, N J; Consalvey, M; Kloser, R J (2010) Seamount megabenthic assemblages fail to recover from trawling impacts. *Marine Ecology 31 (Suppl. 1)*: 183–199.

OREOS — OEO 3A BLACK OREO AND SMOOTH OREO

1. FISHERY SUMMARY

This is presented in the Fishery Summary section at the beginning of the Oreos report.

2. BIOLOGY

This is presented in the Biology section at the beginning of the Oreos report.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

This is presented in the Stocks and Areas section at the beginning of the Oreos report.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

The smooth oreo stock assessment is unchanged from 2009. The black oreo stock assessment for 2008 has been withdrawn but the CPUE series has been updated to 2012.

4.1 Introduction

The following assumptions were made in the stock assessment analyses to estimate biomasses and yields for black oreo and smooth oreo.

(a) The acoustic abundance estimates were unbiased absolute values.
(b) The CPUE analyses provided indices of abundance for either black oreo or smooth oreo in the whole of OEO 3A. Most of the oreo commercial catches came from the CPUE study areas. Research trawl surveys indicated that there was little habitat for, and biomass of, black oreo or smooth oreo outside those areas.
(c) The ranges used for the biological values covered their true values.
(d) The maximum fishing mortality (F_{MAX}) was assumed to be 0.9, varying this value from 0.5 to 3.5 altered B_0 for smooth oreo in OEO 3A by only about 6% in the 1996 assessment.
(e) Recruitment was deterministic and followed a Beverton and Holt relationship with steepness of 0.75.
(f) Catch overruns were 0% during the period of reported catch.
(g) The populations of black oreo and smooth oreo in OEO 3A were discrete stocks or production units.
(h) The catch histories were accurate.

4.1.1 Black oreo

The last accepted assessment was in 2008. A three-area population model was used to accommodate the structure of the catch and length data, with age-dependent migration between areas. However, new age data collected within each area suggest that, based on 2013 analyses, assumptions made by this model are incorrect. Specifically, differences in the size distribution between areas now seem likely to be due to differential growth rates, rather than to movement. The model applied in 2008 was therefore considered inadequate and has been withdrawn. No stock assessment is presented here; a new approach needs to be developed.

4.1.2 Smooth oreo

A new assessment of smooth oreo in OEO 3A was completed in 2009. This used a CASAL age-structured population model employing Bayesian methods. Input data included research and observer-collected length data, one absolute abundance estimate from a research acoustic survey carried out in 1997 (TAN9713), and three relative abundance indices from standardised catch per unit effort analyses.

4.2 Black oreo

Partition of the main fishery into 3 areas

The main fishery area was split into three areas: a northern area that contained small fish and was generally shallow (Area 1), a southern area that contained large fish in the period before 1993 and which was generally deeper (Area 3), and a transition area (Area 2) that lay between Areas 1 and 3 (Figure 1).



Figure 1: The three spatial areas used in the CASAL model and 2002 acoustic abundance survey. Area 1 at the top with right sloping shading; Area 2 in the middle with vertical shading; Area 3 at the bottom with left sloping shading. The thick dark line encloses management area OEO 3A.

The boundary between Areas 1 and 2 was defined in terms of the northern edge of the area that enclosed 90% of the total catch from the fishery. Areas 2 and 3 contained most of the fishery while Area 1 consisted of lightly fished and unfished ground. The boundary between Areas 2 and 3 was defined by the 32.5 cm contour in mean fish length for data before 1993 so that the fishery is split into an area containing smaller fish and another that has larger fish. The population outside the main fishery was assumed to follow the same relative dynamics.

Rejection of spatial model based on migration

The previous model reconciled the differences in commercial length distribution by using three areas. No age data were incorporated and instead lengths were used as a proxy for age. The dynamics were assumed to be recruitment in the shallow area (Area 1), with migration from Area 1 to Area 2, and also from Area 2 to Area 3, i.e., a one way movement to generally deeper water. The differences in the length distributions between areas drove the estimated migration rates by age. The stock assessment predicted that mature fish in the relatively unfished area (Area 1) comprised about 25% B_0 and so there were no sustainability concerns as this area was largely not fished.

To test the above migration hypothesis, otoliths sampled from acoustic survey mark identification trawls were aged and age distributions estimated for Area 1 and for the combined Areas 2 and 3 (Doonan, pers. comm.). The results showed deficiencies in the use of length data as a proxy for age in the stock assessment model. The age frequency in Area 1 was similar to that from Areas 2 and 3, but the model predicted them to be very different. Growth in Areas 2 and 3 appears to be faster than in Area 1 and this may drive the observed differences in length distributions. The migration model assumed the same growth in all areas. Maturity may be related to length rather than age, but it is age-based in the model. For these reasons, the Working Group rejected the stock assessment model in 2013. No formal stock assessment is presented here.

4.2.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

Catches by area

Catches were partitioned into the three areas by scaling up the estimated catch of black oreo from each area to the total reported catch (see tables 2 and 3 in the Fishery Summary section at the beginning of the Oreos report) and are given in Table 1.

Table 1: Estimated black oreo catch (tonnes) for each fishing year in the three spatial model areas.

Year	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Total
1972–73	110	2 010	1 320	†3 440
1973–74	130	2 214	1 456	†3 800
1974–75	170	2 970	1 960	†5 100
1975–76	40	736	484	†1 260
1976–77	130	2 260	1 490	†3 880
1977–78	190	3 350	2 210	†5 750
1978–79	27	750	30	806
1979–80	39	2 189	4 762	6 990
1980–81	793	7 813	4 090	12 696
1981–82	12	7 616	3 851	11 479
1982–83	57	3 384	2 577	6 018
1983–84	682	5 925	3 192	9 800
1984–85	148	1 478	2 218	3 844
1985–86	13	814	1 112	1 938
1986–87	33	1 863	1 908	3 805
1987–88	49	2 399	1 439	3 888
1988–89	244	3 532	811	4 588
1989–90	696	1 164	1 288	3 148
1990–91	753	1 947	1 330	4 030
1991–92	289	1 250	1 816	3 355
1992–93	180	2 221	1 717	4 117
1993–94	339	2 509	1 353	4 200
1994–95	139	1 894	845	2 878
1995–96	231	2 744	1 099	4 074
1996–97	418	2 095	1 035	3 548
1997–98	257	874	1 267	2 397
1998–99	138	2 047	572	2 756
1999–00	133	2 246	906	3 285
2000–01	89	1 804	761	2 653
2001–02	58	1 447	620	2 126
2002–03	82	997	236	1 314
2003–04	233	775	464	1 471
2004–05	61	766	360	1 187
2005–06	55	1 315	312	1 682
2006–07	48	914	698	1 659
2007–08	53	926	629	1 607
2008–09	59	920	671	1 649
2009–10	115	973	885	1 973
2010–11	38	859	762	1 659
2011–12	31	534	910	1 475

† Soviet catch, assumed to be mostly from OEO 3A and to be 50:50 black oreo: smooth oreo.

Observer length frequencies by area

Catch at length data collected by observers in Areas 1, 2, and 3 were extracted from the *obs_lfs* database (Table 2). Derived length frequencies for each group were calculated from the sample length frequencies weighted by the catch weight of each sample.

Table 2: Number of observed commercial tows where black oreo was measured for length frequency. A total of 60 tows were excluded because they had fewer than 30 fish measured, extreme mean lengths or missing catch information.

Year	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Other
1985–86	0	1	0	0
1986–87	0	2	6	0
1987–88	0	6	3	0
1988–89	30	8	4	2
1989–90	12	6	1	0
1990–91	2	5	7	1
1991–92	0	10	1	0
1992–93	0	0	0	0
1993–94	8	16	2	5
1994–95	0	4	2	2
1995–96	2	3	2	6
1996–97	0	1	1	2
1997–98	13	2	5	0
1998–99	2	1	0	3
1999–00	7	94	11	6
2000–01	3	110	22	2
2001–02	8	23	8	5
2002–03	3	17	4	4
2003–04	9	1	2	3
2004–05	3	5	3	1
2005–06	0	38	7	7
2006–07	6	1	2	5
2007–08	0	9	5	7
2008–09	4	16	9	3
2009–10	4	14	4	2
2010–11	1	15	7	2
2011–12	3	6	1	0

Research acoustic survey length frequencies by area

The 1997, 2002, 2006 and 2011 acoustic survey abundance at length data were converted to a length frequency using the combined sexes fixed length-weight relationship (“unsexed” in table 1, Biology section above) to convert the abundance to numbers at length (Table 3).

Absolute abundance estimates from the 1997, 2002, 2006 and 2011 acoustic surveys

Absolute estimates of abundance for black oreo are available from four acoustic surveys of oreos carried out from 10 November to 19 December 1997 (TAN9713), 25 September to 7 October 2002 (TAN0213), 17–30 October 2006 (TAN0615) and 17 November to 1 December 2011 (SWA1102). The 1997 survey covered the “flat” with a series of random north-south transects over six strata at depths of 600–1200 m. Seamounts were also sampled using parallel and “starburst” transects. Targeted and some random (background) trawling was carried out to identify targets and to determine species composition. The 2002 survey was limited to flat ground with 77 acoustic transect and 21 mark identification tows completed. The 2006 (78 transects and 22 tows) and 2011 (72 transects and 25 tows) surveys were very similar to the 2002 survey and covered the main area of the black oreo fishery. The estimated total abundance (immature plus mature) for each survey by area is shown in Table 4.

Relative abundance estimates from standardised CPUE analysis

Standardised CPUE indices were obtained for each area. Because of the apparent changes in fishing practice attributable to the introduction of GPS, the data were split into pre- and post-GPS series. There were also major changes in the fishery from 1998–99 to 2001–02 when there were TACC reductions and the start of a voluntary industry catch limit on smooth oreo (1998–99). Two post-GPS series were therefore developed. The first of these was from 1992–93 to 1997–98 (early series) and the second was from 2002–03 onwards (late series) with data from the intervening years ignored. Since there are no new data for either the pre-GPS series or the post-GPS early series, these are left unchanged from previous standardisation results. Only the post-GPS late series is updated here, using data that extends from 2002–03 to 2011–12.

Table 3: Research length frequency proportions for the model area for the 1997, 2002, 2006 and 2011 acoustic surveys. - no data for 1997 to 2006, lengths below 25 cm and greater than 38 were pooled.

	1997			2002			2006			2011		
Length (cm)	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3
22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.001	0.001	0.000
23	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.007	0.008	0.002
24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.021	0.019	0.007
25	0.015	0.013	0.009	0.022	0.016	0.008	0.009	0.017	0.015	0.031	0.029	0.010
26	0.035	0.027	0.019	0.039	0.030	0.013	0.026	0.035	0.032	0.027	0.027	0.019
27	0.113	0.061	0.029	0.051	0.038	0.018	0.066	0.073	0.055	0.044	0.047	0.032
28	0.165	0.090	0.038	0.085	0.062	0.029	0.118	0.105	0.077	0.083	0.086	0.055
29	0.153	0.104	0.064	0.117	0.091	0.044	0.152	0.143	0.113	0.112	0.114	0.072
30	0.143	0.105	0.065	0.139	0.119	0.060	0.175	0.153	0.132	0.153	0.154	0.107
31	0.131	0.119	0.089	0.123	0.122	0.086	0.156	0.157	0.154	0.159	0.157	0.125
32	0.102	0.121	0.105	0.137	0.133	0.127	0.117	0.136	0.169	0.121	0.119	0.153
33	0.046	0.094	0.098	0.112	0.123	0.141	0.073	0.089	0.119	0.121	0.118	0.175
34	0.041	0.086	0.097	0.065	0.084	0.138	0.059	0.056	0.076	0.069	0.067	0.126
35	0.029	0.058	0.083	0.054	0.064	0.100	0.032	0.026	0.037	0.026	0.029	0.057
36	0.015	0.043	0.091	0.021	0.052	0.104	0.014	0.009	0.014	0.018	0.018	0.034
37	0.006	0.037	0.080	0.015	0.025	0.049	0.001	0.001	0.004	0.005	0.005	0.018
38	0.006	0.042	0.131	0.020	0.041	0.083	0.003	0.001	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.005
39	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.000	0.000	0.002
40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.000	0.000	0.000
41	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.000	0.000	0.000
42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.000	0.000	0.000

Table 4: Total (immature plus mature) black oreo abundance estimates (t) and CVs for the 1997, 2002, 2006 and 2011 acoustic surveys for the three model areas in OEO 3A.

Acoustic survey	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Total
1997	148 000 (29)	10 000 (26)	5 240 (25)	163 000 (26)
2002	43 300 (31)	15 400 (27)	4 710 (38)	64 000 (22)
2006	56 400 (37)	16 400 (30)	5 880 (34)	78 700 (30)
2011	138 100 (27)	36 800 (30)	7 400 (34)	182 300 (25)

Only data within a pre-defined spatial area were considered useful for assessing abundance (Figure 2).



Figure 2: Spatial areas from which CPUE data were collected for inclusion in the standardisation. Areas A1 and A3 are shown, with A2 being the area between the two.

This area corresponds to the main fishing area and overlaps with the acoustic survey area (Figure 1). Tows were initially selected for inclusion in the CPUE standardisation if they targeted or caught black oreo within this area.

Uncertainty was assessed by bootstrapping the data, re-estimating the indices for each iteration, and estimating the coefficient of variation (CV) for each year/area from this distribution. The indices and CV estimates are listed in Table 5 and shown in Figure 3.

Table 5: OEO 3A black oreo pre-GPS and post-GPS time series of standardised catch per unit effort indices and bootstrapped CV estimates (%). Values for each series have been renormalized to a geometric mean of one. -, no estimate.

Fishing	Pre-GPS						Post-GPS					
Year	Area1		Area2		Area3		Area1		Area2		Area3	
	Index	CV	Index	CV	Index	CV	Index	CV	Index	CV	Index	CV
1979–80	-	-	1.45	39	1.52	125	-	-	-	-	-	-
1980–81	-	-	1.84	17	2.55	15	-	-	-	-	-	-
1981–82	-	-	1.71	22	2.15	9	-	-	-	-	-	-
1982–83	-	-	1.41	8	1.80	14	-	-	-	-	-	-
1983–84	-	-	0.99	8	1.04	19	-	-	-	-	-	-
1984–85	-	-	0.95	27	0.99	12	-	-	-	-	-	-
1985–86	-	-	0.63	31	0.66	33	-	-	-	-	-	-
1986–87	-	-	0.81	22	0.88	36	-	-	-	-	-	-
1987–88	-	-	0.45	20	0.49	23	-	-	-	-	-	-
1988–89	-	-	0.72	21	0.23	44	-	-	-	-	-	-
1989–90	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1990–91	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1991–92	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Early series			
1992–93	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.62	14	2.46	20
1993–94	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.17	17	1.20	15
1994–95	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.96	13	0.82	17
1995–96	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.89	15	0.68	22
1996–97	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.06	18	0.96	17
1997–98	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.58	47	0.64	63
1998–99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1999–00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2000–01	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2001–02	-	-	-	-	-	-	Late series					
2002–03	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.62	90	1.11	24	0.9	38
2003–04	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.99	45	1.15	27	1.05	37
2004–05	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.33	63	0.85	32	0.8	56
2005–06	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.1	63	1.34	23	0.99	31
2006–07	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.51	78	1.05	27	1.49	24
2007–08	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.52	44	0.67	66	0.84	33
2008–09	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.65	73	0.84	44	0.75	30
2009–10	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.17	29	1.02	26	1.06	30
2010–11	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.38	52	0.89	30	0.9	22
2011–12	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.37	44	1.28	24	1.49	18

4.3 Smooth oreo

2009 assessment

The stock assessment analyses were conducted using the CASAL age-structured population model employing Bayesian statistical techniques. The 2005 assessment was updated by including five more years of catch, CPUE and observer length data, and used two new series of post-GPS standardised CPUE, one before and the second after major TACC and catch limit changes. The modelling took account of the sex and maturity status of the fish and treated OEO 3A as a single smooth oreo fishery, i.e., no sub-areas were recognised. The base case model used the 1997 absolute acoustic abundance estimate, pre-GPS and early and late post-GPS series of standardised CPUE indices, and the mean natural mortality estimate (0.063 yr^{-1}). Acoustic and observer length frequencies were used in a preliminary model run to estimate selectivity and the base case fixed these selectivity estimates but did not use the length frequencies. Other cases investigated the sensitivity of the model to data sources including:

- Use of the upper and lower 95% confidence interval values for estimates of natural mortality (0.042–0.099 yr^{-1});
- Use of only the left hand limb of the 1994 observer length frequency (plus the 1997 acoustic survey length frequency) with growth not estimated by the model.



Figure 3: Standardised commercial CPUE series for black oreo in each area within OEO 3A. Pre-GPS and post-GPS (early and late) series are shown, each renormalized to a geometric mean of one. Error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals assuming a log-normal error distribution and using the CVs listed in Table 5.

4.3.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

Catch history

The estimated catches were scaled up to the total reported catch (see tables 2 and 3 in the Fishery Summary section at the beginning of the Oreos report) and are given in Table 6.

Table 6: Reconstructed catch history (t)

Year	Catch	Year	Catch	Year	Catch	Year	Catch
1972–73	†3 440	1981–82	1 288	1990–91	5 054	1999–00	1 789
1973–74	†3 800	1982–83	2 495	1991–92	6 622	2000–01	1 621
1974–75	†5 100	1983–84	3 979	1992–93	4 334	2001–02	1 673
1975–76	†1 260	1984–85	4 351	1993–94	4 942	2002–03	1 412
1976–77	†3 880	1985–86	3 142	1994–95	4 199	2003–04	1 254
1977–78	†5 750	1986–87	3 190	1995–96	4 022	2004–05	1 457
1978–79	650	1987–88	5 905	1996–97	3 239	2005–06	1 445
1979–80	5 215	1988–89	6 963	1997–98	4 733	2006–07	1 306
1980–81	2 196	1989–90	6 459	1998–99	2 474	2007–08	1 526

† Soviet catch, assumed to be mostly from OEO 3A and to be 50:50 black oreo:smooth oreo.

Observer length frequencies

Observer length data were extracted from the observer database. These data represent proportional catch at length and sex. All length samples were from the CPUE study area (see Figure 4). Only samples where 30 or more fish were measured, and the catch weight and a valid depth were recorded, were included in the analysis. Data from adjacent years were pooled because of the paucity of data in some years. The pooled length frequencies were applied in the model at the year that the median observation of the grouped samples was taken (Table 7).



Figure 4: Locations of all tows in OEO 3A with a reported catch of smooth oreo from 1979–80 to 2002–03 (dots). The study area is shown along with the line chosen to split north from south Chatham rise catches.

Table 7: Observer length frequencies; numbers of length samples (tows sampled), number of fish measured, groups of pooled years, and the year that the length data were applied in the stock assessment model. -, not applicable.

Year	Number of length samples	Number of fish measured	Year group code	Year the grouped data were applied
1979–80	32	3 499	1	Applied
1980–81	0	0	-	-
1981–82	0	0	-	-
1982–83	0	0	-	-
1983–84	0	0	-	-
1984–85	0	0	-	-
1985–86	1	106	2	-
1986–87	4	387	2	-
1987–88	10	1 300	2	Applied
1988–89	14	1 512	2	-
1989–90	0	0	-	-
1991–92	9	919	3	-
1992–93	0	0	-	-
1993–94	13	1 365	4	Applied
1994–95	7	752	4	-
1995–96	2	207	4	-
1996–97	3	365	5	-
1997–98	13	1 720	5	-
1998–99	5	770	5	-
1999–00	77	7 595	5	Applied
2000–01	93	9 389	6	Applied
2001–02	20	3 030	7	Applied
2002–03	14	1 427	8	Applied
2003–04	4	321	8	-
2004–05	9	840	8	-
2005–06	26	3 207	9	Applied
2006–07	2	205	9	-
2007–08	8	816	9	-

Length frequency data from the 1997 acoustic survey

Length data collected during the 1997 survey were used to generate a population length frequency by sex. A length frequency was generated from the trawls in each mark-type and also for the seamounts. These frequencies were combined using the fraction of smooth oreo abundance in each mark-type. The overall frequency was normalised over both male and female frequencies so that the sum of the frequencies over both sexes was 100%. The CV for each length class was given by the regression, log(CV) = 0.86 + 8.75/log(proportion). This regression was estimated from the CVs obtained by bootstrapping the data and provides a smoothed estimate of the CVs. The estimated length frequency is in Figure 5.

Absolute abundance estimates from the 1997 acoustic survey

Absolute estimates of abundance for smooth oreo are available from the acoustic survey on oreos carried out from 10 November to 19 December 1997 (TAN9713) using the same approach as described for OEO 3A black oreo. The abundance estimates used in the 1999 OEO 3A smooth oreo assessment were revised in 2005 using new target strength estimates for smooth oreo, black oreo and a number of bycatch species. The revised estimate was 25 200 t with a CV of 23% (the 1999 estimate was 35 100 t with a CV of 27%). There is uncertainty in the estimates of biomass because the acoustic estimate includes smooth oreo in layers that are a mixture of species for which the acoustic method has potential bias problems.



Figure 5: Population length frequency derived from the 1997 acoustic survey data. The bold line is the estimated value and the shaded area is the spread from 300 bootstraps.

Relative abundance estimates from standardised CPUE analysis

The CPUE study area is shown in Figure 4. Three analyses were carried out; a pre-GPS analysis (unchanged from 2005) that included data from 1980–81 to 1988–89 and two post-GPS analyses that included data from 1992–93 to 1997–98 and 2002–03 to 2007–08. The years from 1998–99 to 2001–02 were not included because a voluntary smooth oreo catch limit (1400 t) was introduced and substantial oreo TACC reductions were made during that time (6600 down to 3100 t). The pre-GPS series shows a downward trend, and declines to approximately a third of the initial level over the nine-year period. The early post-GPS also has a downward trend but the late post-GPS series has an upward trend and then flattens out. The base case stock assessment used all three indices (Table 8).

Fishing Industry members of the Deepwater Fishery Assessment Working Group expressed concern about the accuracy of the historical Soviet catch and effort data (pre-GPS series) and felt that it was inappropriate to use those data in the stock assessment.

Table 8: CPUE indices by year and jackknife CV (%) estimates from the pre-GPS and the two post-GPS analyses.

	Pre-GPS						Post-GPS	
Year	**Index**	**CV**	**Year**	**Index**	**CV**	**Year**	**Index**	**CV**
1980–81	1.00	27	1992–93	1.00	24	2002–03	0.55	23
1981–82	0.82	26	1993–94	0.88	11	2003–04	0.77	22
1982–83	0.72	62	1994–95	0.74	14	2004–05	0.99	22
1983–84	0.59	61	1995–96	0.48	17	2005–06	0.96	31
1984–85	0.72	22	1996–97	0.56	15	2006–07	1.00	20
1985–86	0.61	19	1997–98	0.50	19	2007–08	0.92	21
1986–87	0.46	16						
1987–88	0.42	16						
1988–89	0.26	28						

4.3.2 Biomass estimates

The posterior distributions from the MCMC on the base case are shown in Figure 6. The probability that the current mature biomass (2008–09) and the biomass 5 years out (2013–14) are above 20% B_0 is 1 for both.

Biomass estimates derived from the MCMC are in Table 9. Total mature biomass for 2008–09 was estimated to be 36% of the initial biomass (B_0). Sensitivity case results for the base case using the lower and upper 95% confidence interval value estimates for *M* gave estimates of current biomass between 26% and 49% of B_0. The sensitivity case that used the left hand limb of the 1994 observer length frequency (plus the 1997 acoustic survey length frequency) with growth not estimated by the model gave estimates of current biomass for the mean estimate of *M* (0.063 yr^{-1}) of 30 % of B_0 while estimates using the lower and upper 95% confidence interval value estimates for *M* gave estimates of 2008 biomass between 12% and 59% of B_0.

Projections were carried out for five years with the current catch limit of 1400 t. The trajectory shows increasing biomass (Figure 6).

4.3.3 Other factors

Because of differences in biological parameters between the species, it would be appropriate to split the current TACC for black oreo and smooth oreo. The WG noted that separate species catch limits are in place to reduce the risk of over- or under-fishing either smooth oreo or black oreo.

The model estimates of uncertainty are unrealistically low. Uncertainties that are not included in the model include:

- the assumption that recruitment is deterministic;
- that the acoustic index is assumed to be an absolute estimate of abundance;
- the selectivity in the base case is fixed at the MPD estimate from the preliminary case where all length data is used;
- uncertainty in the estimate of *M*.

In addition, the growth is fixed and known. The WG has previously noted the impact of the different ages of maturity for males and females. Due to the fact that males mature at a much smaller size than females (age at 50% maturity is 18–19 years for males and 25–26 for females), the sex ratio needs to be taken into account when assessing the sustainability of any particular catch level.

Table 9 (a): Base case (in bold) and sensitivity to M values (biomass estimates). Bcurr is 2008.

	M = 0.063			†*M* = 0.042			†*M* = 0.099		
	Median	**CI.05**	**CI.95**	Median	CI.05	CI.95	Median	CI.05	CI.95
B_0	**85 000**	**77 300**	**96 500**	97 700	90 100	110 000	68 500	60 300	79 600
B_cur	**30 900**	**22 400**	**43 000**	26 300	18 000	38 800	33 800	25 000	45 500
B_cur(%B_0)	**36**	**29**	**45**	27	20	35	49	41	57

(b) Sensitivity (biomass estimates). In these runs the left hand limb of the 1994 observer length was fitted, the 1997 acoustic survey length frequency was included and growth was not estimated by the model:

	†*M* = 0.063			†*M* = 0.042			†*M* = 0.099		
	Median	CI.05	CI.95	Median	CI.05	CI.95	Median	CI.05	CI.95
B_0	77 400	74 800	80 200	82 800	81 600	84 200	82 300	76 700	89 200
B_cur	23 100	19 900	26 400	10 200	8 480	12 100	48 800	42 900	56 200
B_cur(%B_0)	30	27	33	12	10	14	59	56	63



Figure 6: Smooth oreo OEO 3A: posterior distribution for the virgin biomass (top plot) and the mature biomass trajectories as a percentage of virgin biomass (bottom plot) from the MCMC analysis of the "NoLF" case with M = 0.063 (base case). In the top plot, the vertical line is the median of the distribution. In the bottom plot, the grey area is the point-wise 95% confidence intervals of the trajectories and the solid line is the median.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

The smooth oreo stock assessment is unchanged from 2009. The black oreo stock assessment is updated using CPUE data up to 2011–12.

Stock Structure Assumptions
The two oreo stocks in FMA 3A are assessed separately but managed as a single stock. For both the black oreo and smooth oreo stocks it is assumed that there is potential mixing with stocks outside of the OEO 3A area.

- **OEO 3A (Black Oreo)**

Stock Status	
Year of Most Recent Assessment	2013
Assessment Runs Presented	Age-structured CASAL spatial assessment model rejected by the Working Group; CPUE accepted
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: $F_{40\% B0}$
Status in relation to Target	Unknown
Status in relation to Limits	Unknown
Status in relation to Overfishing	Unknown

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status
-

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Unknown
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Catch has decreased with TACC since the early 1990s and remained low and relatively constant over the last 10 years.
Other Abundance Indices	CPUE since 2002–03 has stabilised in all three areas after significant declines in the two deeper areas in the 1980s and 1990s.
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	-
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unknown

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 2 – Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	CPUE	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment: 2013	Next assessment: 2019
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	CPUE abundance	1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)		
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	The three area model with migration based on age is thought to be flawed and the previous model has been withdrawn.	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	-	

Qualifying Comments
-

Fishery Interactions
Both species of oreo are sometimes taken as bycatch in orange roughy target fisheries, mostly in other areas e.g. OEO 4. The main bycatch species in the OEO 3A black oreo target fishery include smooth oreo, hoki, javelinfish, Baxter's dogfish, pale ghost shark, ridge scaled rattail, and basketwork eel. Bycatch species that may be vulnerable to overfishing include deepwater sharks and rays. Protected species catches include seabirds and deepwater corals.

- **OEO 3A (Smooth Oreos)**

Stock Status	
Year of Most Recent Assessment	2009
Assessment Runs Presented	One base case and 5 sensitivity runs
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold:
Status in relation to Target	For the base case, B_{2009} was estimated at 36% B_0, About as Likely as Not (40–60%) to be at or above the target.

Status in relation to Limits	B_{2009} is Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the Soft Limit and Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below the Hard Limit.

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



Mature biomass trajectories as a percentage of virgin biomass from the base case. The grey area is the point-wise 95% confidence intervals of the trajectories and the solid line is the median.

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Biomass is projected to have been increasing since the late 1990s.
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	Unknown
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis (2009)	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	The biomass is expected to increase over the next 5 years given the current catch limit of 1400 t.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%)
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	-

Assessment Methodology		
Assessment Type	Level 1 - Quantitative stock assessment	
Assessment Method	Age-structured CASAL model with Bayesian estimation of posterior distributions	
Assessment dates	Latest assessment: 2009	Next assessment: 2019
Overall assessment quality rank	-	
Main data inputs (rank)	- One acoustic absolute abundance estimate (1997) - three standardised CPUE indices (1981–82 to 1988–89, 1992–93 to 1997–98, 2002–03 to 2007–08) - Natural mortality estimate (0.063) - Selectivity estimated from acoustic and	

	observer length frequencies New information from previous (2005) assessment: - Updated with additional catch, CPUE, observer length data collected since last assessment - two new standardised post-GPS CPUE series	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- The single acoustic index (1997) is assumed to be an absolute estimate of abundance - Sex ratio needs to be taken into account, as males mature at a much smaller size than females. - Recruitment is assumed to be deterministic. - Uncertainty in the estimates of natural mortality (*M*) - Selectivity is fixed in the base case at the MPD estimate from the preliminary study	

Qualifying Comments
-

Fishery Interactions
Both species of oreo are sometimes taken as bycatch in orange roughy target fisheries, mostly in other areas e.g. OEO 4. The main bycatch species in the OEO 3A smooth oreo target fishery include black oreo, hoki, javelinfish, Baxter's dogfish, pale ghost shark, ridge scaled rattail and basketwork eel. Low productivity bycatch species include deepwater sharks and rays. Protected species catches include seabirds and deepwater corals.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Coburn, R P; Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J (1999) Black oreo abundance indices from standardised catch per unit of effort data for OEO 3A. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1999/32. 18 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)

Coburn, R P; Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J (2006) Smooth oreo OEO 3A abundance estimates from standardised catch per unit of effort data, 1979–80 to 2002–03. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2006/35*. 38 p.

Coburn, R P; McMillan, P J; Gilbert, D J (2007) Inputs for a stock assessment of smooth oreo, Pukaki Rise (part of OEO 6). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/23*. 32 p.

Cordue, P L (1996) A model-based method for bounding virgin biomass using a catch history, relative biomass indices, and ancillary information. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1996/8. 48 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)

Doonan, I J; Coburn, R P; McMillan, P J (2009) Assessment of OEO 3A black oreo for 2006–07. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2009/12*. 46 p.

Doonan, I J; Coburn, R P; McMillan, P J; Hart, A C (2004) Assessment of OEO 3A black oreo for 2002–03. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2004/52*. 54 p.

Doonan, I J; Coombs, R F; McMillan, P J; Dunn, A (1998) Estimate of the absolute abundance of black and smooth oreo in OEO 3A and 4 on the Chatham Rise. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project OEO9701. 47 p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J (2001) A non-parametric age selectivity ogive for OEO 3A black oreo for 2001–02. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/40*. 17 p.

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (1996) Assessment of Chatham Rise smooth oreo (OEO 3A and OEO 4) for 1996. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1996/17. 21 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (1997) Assessment of Chatham Rise smooth oreo (OEO 3A and OEO 4) for 1997. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1997/21. 26 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (1999a) Assessment of OEO 3A smooth oreo for 1999–2000. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1999/45. 21 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (1999b) Assessment of OEO 3A black oreo for 1999–2000. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1999/52. 30 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (2003) Assessment of OEO 4 smooth oreo for 2002–03. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/50*. 55 p.

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C; Cordue, P L (1995) Assessment of smooth oreo for 1995. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1995/12. 31 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Hart, A C (2008) Ageing of smooth oreo otoliths for stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/08*. 29 p.

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Hart, A H (2016) Comparison of the fraction of mature black oreo between Area 1 and Area 2&3 (OEO 3A). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2016/20.*

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Hart, A C; Coombs, R F (2003) Smooth oreo abundance estimates from the October–November 2001 acoustic survey of the south Chatham Rise (OEO 4). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/26*. 21 p.

Francis, R I C C (1992) Recommendations concerning the calculation of maximum constant yield (*MCY*) and current annual yield (*CAY*). New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1992/8. 27 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)

McKenzie, A (2007) Stock assessment for east Pukaki Rise smooth oreo (part of OEO 6). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/34*. 27 p.

McMillan, P J; Doonan, I J; Hart, A C; Coburn, R P (1998) Oreo stock assessment. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project OEO9702. 16 p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)

McMillan, P J; Hart, A C (1991) Assessment of black and smooth oreos for the 1991–92 fishing year. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1991/10. 29 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)

Smith, M H; Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Hart, A C (2006) Black oreo abundance estimates from the September–October 2002 acoustic survey of the south Chatham Rise (OEO 3A). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2006/33*. 20 p.

OREOS – OEO 4 BLACK OREO AND SMOOTH OREO

1. FISHERY SUMMARY

This is presented in the Fishery Summary section at the beginning of the Oreo report.

2. BIOLOGY

This is presented in the Biology section at the beginning of the Oreo report.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

This is presented in the Stocks and Areas section at the beginning of the Oreo report.

4. STOCK ASSESMENT

4.1 Introduction

In 2018, the stock assessment was updated for smooth oreo in OEO 4.

4.2 Black oreo

Investigations were carried out in 2009 using age-based single sex single step preliminary models in CASAL. The data used in these models were four standardised CPUE indices (pre– and post–GPS in the east and west), and observer length frequencies. Growth and maturity were also estimated in some of the runs.

4.2.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

Absolute abundance estimates from the 1998 acoustic survey

Absolute estimates of abundance were available from an acoustic survey on oreos which was carried out from 26 September to 30 October 1998 on *Tangaroa* (voyage TAN9812). Transects on flat ground were surveyed to a stratified random design and a random sample of seamounts were surveyed with either a random transect (large seamounts) or a systematic "star" transect design. For some seamounts the flat ground nearby was also surveyed to compare the abundance of fish on and near the seamount either by extending the length of the star transects or by extra parallel transects. Acoustic data were collected concurrently for flat and seamounts using both towed and hull mounted transducers. The OEO 4 survey covered 59 transects on the flat and 29 on seamounts. A total of 95 tows were carried out for target identification and to estimate target strength and species composition. In situ and swimbladder samples for target strength data were collected and these have yielded revised estimates of target strength for both black oreo and smooth oreo.

Acoustic abundance estimates for recruit black oreo from seamounts and flat for the whole of OEO 4 are in Table 1. About 59% of the black oreo abundance came from the background mark-type. This mark-type is not normally fished by the commercial fleet and this implies that the abundance estimate did not cover the fish normally taken by the fishery. In addition the scaling factor to convert the acoustic area estimate to the trawl survey area estimate was 4.3, i.e., the acoustic survey area only had about 23% of the abundance. The magnitude of this ratio suggests that the size of the area surveyed was borderline for providing a reliable abundance estimate.

Relative abundance estimates from standardised CPUE analyses – 2009 analysis

The CPUE analysis method involved regression based methods on the positive catches only. Sensitivities were run where the positive catch tow data and the zero catch tow data were analysed separately to produce positive catch and zero catch indices. All data were included, whether they were target or bycatch fisheries, with the target offered to the model (and not accepted).

Table 1: OEO 4 recruit black oreo seamount, flat, and total acoustic abundance estimates (t) and recruit CV (%) based on knife-edge recruitment (23 years).

	Abundance (t)	CV (%)
Seamount	127	91
Flat	13 800	56
Total	13 900	55

The best data-split was investigated using the Akaike Information Criteria (AIC) on a number of potential regressions. Four indices were subsequently used, pre- and post-GPS in the east and west areas respectively. These two areas are very distinct: the west consists of flat fishing and the east of hill fishing, the west area was fished 10 years prior to the east, and there has been a move by the fishery since the early 1990s from the west to the east. However, despite these differences, the two series present almost identical patterns of decline in relative standardised CPUEs from the time fishing started in earnest (1980 in the west and 1992 in the east) which would suggest that for this fishery CPUE might be a reasonable index of abundance (because less influenced by technology, fishing patterns, hills or flats etc).

The standardised CPUE series and CVs are described in Table 2. Over comparable time periods and data sets, the trends from the updated series were similar to those from the 2000 analyses (Coburn et al 2001b). The west CPUE reduced to between 5% of the 1980 value and 15% of the 1981 value by 1990. The post-GPS west series is either flat or slightly increasing. The east CPUE reduced to 4% of the 1984 value and 21% of the 1985 value by 1990 even though catches were low. The post-GPS east series showed a further steep initial decline with total reduction to 15% of the 1993 value by 2008.

Table 2: OEO 4 black oreo standardised CPUE analyses in 2009 (expressed in t / tow).

Fishing year	Pre-GPS east		Pre-GPS west		Fishing year	Post-GPS east		Post-GPS west	
	Index	CV	Index	CV		Index	CV	Index	CV
1980			8.97	0.17	1993	0.71	0.15	0.73	0.41
1981			4.00	0.11	1994	0.63	0.13	0.45	0.32
1982			2.24	0.10	1995	0.31	0.15	0.41	0.31
1983			2.20	0.09	1996	0.21	0.15	0.28	0.27
1984	0.47	0.95	1.54	0.10	1997	0.24	0.12	0.61	0.27
1985	0.41	0.28	1.51	0.07	1998	0.20	0.11	0.45	0.23
1986	0.38	0.32	1.28	0.10	1999	0.16	0.12	0.46	0.23
1987	0.65	0.30	0.67	0.10	2000	0.17	0.12	0.68	0.25
1988	0.10	0.18	0.54	0.13	2001	0.14	0.08	0.62	0.24
1989	0.02	0.20	0.48	0.12	2002	0.18	0.07	0.47	0.29
					2003	0.13	0.06	0.49	0.24
					2004	0.13	0.06	0.93	0.24
					2005	0.14	0.07	0.91	0.26
					2006	0.13	0.07	0.68	0.26
					2007	0.12	0.07	1.00	0.27
					2008	0.10	0.09	0.88	0.24

Relative abundance estimates from trawl surveys

The estimates, and their CVs, from the four standard *Tangaroa* south Chatham Rise trawl surveys are treated as relative abundance indices (Table 3).

Table 3: OEO 4 black oreo research survey abundance estimates (t). N is the number of stations. Estimates were made using knife-edge recruitment set at 33 cm TL. Previously knife-edge recruitment was set at 27 cm and estimates of abundance based on that value are also provided for comparison.

Year	Mean abundance		CV (%)	N
	27 cm	33 cm		
1991	34 407	13 065	40	105
1992	29 948	12 839	46	122
1993	20 953	6 515	30	124
1995	29 305	9 238	30	153

Observer length frequencies

Observer length frequencies were available for about 20% of the yearly catch from 1989 to 2008. Analyses conducted on these data indicated that they were not representative of the spatial spread of the fishery. When stratified by depth, the length frequencies had double-modes, centred around 28 cm and 38 cm, with inconsistent trends in the modes between years. Alternative stratification by subarea, hill, etc, did not resolve the problem; some tows showed bimodality. These patterns in length frequencies were an issue because the yearly shifts in length frequencies and double mode cannot be representative of the underlying fish population since black oreo is a slow growing long-lived fish. They are more likely linked with discrete spatial sub-groups of the population.

A similar double mode was reported for some strata in the same area from the 1994 *Tangaroa* trawl survey (Tracey & Fenaughty 1997). It is likely that there is further spatial stock structure that is currently unaccounted for.

4.2.2 Biomass estimates

The 2009 stock assessment of OEO 4 black oreo was inconclusive as assessment models were unable to represent the observer length frequency structure, and were considered unreliable. The CPUE was fitted satisfactorily under a two-stock model but could not be fitted in a single homogeneous stock model. However, the WG agreed that:

1. The CPUE indices are consistent with a two-stock structure or at least a minimally-mixing single stock.
2. The updated CPUE estimates were probably a reasonable indicator of abundance (at the spatial scale of the east and west analyses).

4.2.3 Estimation of Maximum Constant Yield (MCY)

In 2000, MCY was estimated using the equation, MCY = $c*Y_{AV}$ (Method 4). There was no trend in the annual catches, nominal CPUE, or effort from 1982–83 to 1987–88 so that period was used to calculate the MCY estimate (1200 t). The MCY calculation was not updated in 2009.

4.2.4 Estimation of Current Annual Yield (CAY)

CAY cannot be estimated because of the lack of current biomass estimates.

4.3 Smooth oreo

Smooth oreo was assessed in 2018 using a CASAL age-structured population model with Bayesian estimation, incorporating stochastic recruitment, life history parameters (table 1 of the Biology section at the beginning of the Oreo report), and catch history up to 2017–18. In early assessments (Doonan et al 2001, 2003, 2008), the stock area was split at 178° 20′ W into a west and an east fishery based on an analysis of commercial catch, standardised CPUE, and research trawl and acoustic result, and data fitted in the model included acoustic survey abundance estimates, standardised CPUE indices, observer length data, and the acoustic survey length data. In 2012, the Deepwater Working Group decided that using CPUE to index abundance should be discontinued, due to changes in fishing patterns over time within the stock area. With no CPUE indices, the 2012 assessment was simplified to a single area model using only the observations of vulnerable biomass from acoustic surveys carried out in 1998, 2001, 2005, and 2009.

A 2014 stock assessment updated the 2012 assessment model using the same single area model structure and used an additional observation of biomass from the research acoustic survey carried out in 2012. The assessment also revised the previous assessments by including the age frequency estimates from the 1998 and 2005 acoustic surveys and by estimating relative year class strengths. The 2018 assessment updated the 2014 assessment with the inclusion of an additional acoustic survey biomass estimate in 2016 and the associated age frequency. An age frequency from a 1991 trawl survey was also included together with an age frequency from the commercial fishery in 2009. With the addition of three new age frequencies natural mortality was estimated within the model (with a Normal prior with the mean equal to 0.063 and CV=25% – see table 1 in the Biology section).

Year class strengths (YCS) were estimated for 1940–2005 (based on the range of age estimates in the age frequency data). A “near uniform” prior was used (parameterised as a lognormal distribution with a mode of 1 and sigma of 4), which places minimum constraint on the free YCS parameters (Haist parameterisation).

An informed prior was used for the acoustic survey proportionality constant q (lognormal with mean of 0.83 and CV of 0.3). The prior was based on limited information on target strength, the QMA scaling-factor, and the proportion of vulnerable biomass in the vulnerable acoustic marks (Fu & Doonan 2013).

A brief description of the base case and sensitivity runs presented are summarised in Table 4. The following assumptions were made in the stock assessment analyses:

(a) Recruitment followed a Beverton–Holt relationship with steepness of 0.75.
(b) Catch overruns were 0% during the period of reported catch.
(c) The population of smooth oreo in OEO 4 was a discrete stock or production unit.
(d) The acoustic biomass selectivity and the commercial fishery selectivity were assumed to be identical (logistic, estimated within the model).
(e) A separate selectivity was estimated for the age frequencies that were derived from trawl catches during the acoustic surveys (double normal, estimated within the model).

Bayesian estimation was used in the assessment to capture the uncertainties in model estimates of biomass and other parameters:

1. Model parameters were estimated using maximum likelihood and the prior probabilities;
2. Samples from the joint posterior distribution of parameters were generated with the Monte Carlo Markov Chain procedure (MCMC) using the Hastings-Metropolis algorithm;
3. A marginal posterior distribution was found for each quantity of interest by integrating the product of the likelihood and the priors over all model parameters; each marginal posterior distribution was described by its median and a 95% credibility interval (95% CI).

Bayesian estimates were based on results from three 15 million long MCMC chains. After a burn-in of 1 million, the last 14 million of the chain was sampled at each 1000th value. Posterior distributions were obtained from samples combined over the three chains (after the burn-in).

Table 4: Descriptions of the model runs of the 2018 smooth oreo assessment. LN, lognormal distribution with mean and CV given in the bracket. N, normal distribution with mean and CV in the bracket. All use Haist parameterisation for YCS.

Model run	Description
Base	Acoustic q estimated with a LN(0.83, 0.3) prior, nearly uniform prior on YCS, *M* estimated with a N(0.063, 0.25) prior, adult biomass indices (school marks)
LowM-Highq	M fixed at 0.0632 (20% less than the base estimate) and the mean of the acoustic q prior 20% higher
HighM-Lowq	M fixed at 0.0948 (20% higher than the base estimate) and the mean of the acoustic q prior 20% lower
Plus LFs	Base but with commercial length frequencies included
Fixed M	Base but with fixed M = 0.063 (as assumed in the 2014 assessment)

4.3.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

The 2018 assessment incorporated the catch history and the adult acoustic biomass indices. Five age frequencies were fitted. Commercial length frequencies (five scaled length frequencies between 1996 and 2008) were not included in the base model but were fitted in a sensitivity run (see Table 4).

Catch history

A catch history for smooth oreo in OEO 4 was developed by scaling the estimated catch to the QMS values (Table 5). A catch of 2876 t was recorded for 2017–18.

Biomass estimates from the 1998, 2001, 2005, 2009, 2012, and 2016 acoustic surveys

Estimates of biomass were available from six acoustic surveys:

(i) 26 September to 30 October 1998 on *Tangaroa* (voyage TAN9812);
(ii) 16 October to 14 November 2001 using *Tangaroa* for acoustic work (voyage TAN0117) and *Amaltal Explorer* (voyage AEX0101) for trawling;

(iii) 3–22 November 2005 using *Tangaroa* for acoustic work (voyage TAN0514) and 3–20 November 2005 using *San Waitaki* (SWA0501) for mark identification trawling;
(iv) 2–18 November 2009 using *Tangaroa* for acoustic work (voyage TAN0910) and 2–18 November 2009 using *San Waitaki* (SWA0901) for mark identification trawling;
(v) 8–26 November 2012 using *Tangaroa* for acoustic work (voyage TAN01214) and 8–26 November 2012 using *San Waitaki* (SWA1201) for mark identification trawling;
(vi) 16 October to 17 November 2016 on *Amaltal Explorer* (AEX1602).

Table 5: Catch history for OEO 4 smooth oreo

Year	Catch (t)	Year	Catch (t)
1978–79	1 321	1999–00	6 357
1979–80	112	2000–01	6 491
1980–81	1 435	2001–02	4 291
1981–82	3 461	2002–03	4 462
1982–83	3 764	2003–04	5 656
1983–84	5 759	2004–05	6 473
1984–85	4 741	2005–06	5 955
1985–86	4 895	2006–07	6 363
1986–87	5 672	2007–08	6 422
1987–88	7 764	2008–09	6 090
1988–89	7 223	2009–10	6 118
1989–90	6 789	2010–11	6 518
1990–91	6 019	2011–12	6 357
1991–92	5 508	2012–13	5 964
1992–93	5 911	2013–14	6 016
1933–94	6 283	2014–15	6 318
1994–95	6 936	2015–16	1 992
1995–96	6 378	2016–17	2 279
1996–97	6 359	2017–18	2 867
1997–98	6 248		
1998–99	6 030		

The method of estimating variance and bias was the same as in previous oreo surveys (Doonan et al 1998, 2000). Variance was estimated separately for the flat and for hills and then combined. Sources of variance were:

- sampling error in the mean backscatter
- the proportion of smooth oreo and black oreo in the acoustic survey area
- sampling error in catches which affects the estimate of the proportion of smooth oreo
- error in the target strengths of other species in the mix
- variance in the estimate of smooth oreo target strength
- sampling error of fish lengths (negligible)
- variance of the mean weight, for smooth oreo

Vulnerable smooth oreo was estimated based on the acoustic mark types, where vulnerable biomass was the sum over two flat mark types: DEEP SCHOOLS and SHALLOW SCHOOLS, with the hill biomass added on. These estimates were made for smooth oreo in the whole of OEO 4 (Table 6).

One major source of uncertainty in the 2012 survey estimates was that about 25% of the total estimate came from one school mark on the flat. The species composition of this mark was not able to be verified by trawling. Excluding this mark, i.e., assuming they were not smooth oreo, reduced the total biomass for smooth oreos to 36 550 t. However, the consensus of skippers consulted about the mark is that it was likely to be smooth oreo.

Table 6: Estimated smooth oreo vulnerable biomass (t) and CV (%, after the addition of 20% process error) from acoustic surveys in 1998, 2001, 2005, and 2009, 2012, and 2016; includes school marks and hills.

Year	Biomass (t)	CV (%)
1998	65 679	33
2001	81 633	33
2005	63 237	32
2009	26 953	33
2012	58 603	36
2016	34 022	38

Age frequencies from the 1998, 2005, and 2016 acoustic surveys
Age frequency distributions were derived from trawl samples taken for smooth oreo in OEO 4 during three acoustic surveys carried out in 1998 and 2005 (Doonan et al 2008) and 2016. All of the sampled otoliths (n = 546) from the 1998 survey and randomly selected otoliths (n = 500) from the 1800 otoliths collected during the 2005 survey were read, with 398 otoliths used from the 2016 survey.

The age frequency distribution was estimated using the aged otoliths from tows in each mark-type weighted by the catch rates and the proportion of abundance in the mark-type. Age frequencies were estimated by sex and combined over sexes. The variance was estimated by bootstrapping the tows within mark-types (e.g., Doonan et al 2008). The ageing error was estimated by comparing age estimates from two readers and also by using repeated readings from the same reader. The age frequencies had a mean weighted CV of 36% (1998) and 45% (2005). The ageing error was estimated to be about 8.5% which was used in the assessment. The age frequencies (male and female combined) were included in order to estimate year class strength.

Other age frequencies
Two additional age frequencies were constructed for the 2018 assessment. The first was for the commercial catch in 2008–2009. The 1284 otoliths available from the observer programme were sampled at random (with replacement) until 400 unique otoliths were obtained. The probability of selection was proportional to the tow catch and inversely proportional to the number of otoliths sampled in the tow. The mean weighted CV was 30% (obtained by bootstrapping). The second age frequency was constructed for the 1991 trawl survey of OEO 4 (TAN9104). Otoliths collected during the trawl survey were sampled at random until 400 unique otoliths were obtained. The probability of selection was proportional to the stratum biomass estimate and by tow catch within stratum, divided by the number of otoliths available from the tow. The mean weighted CV was 35% (obtained by bootstrapping).

Observer length frequencies
Observer length data were extracted from the observer database. These data were stratified by season (October-March and April-September) and into west and east parts. The length frequencies were combined over strata by the proportion of catch in each stratum.

Five scaled length frequencies from 1996 to 2008 were used in a sensitivity run but not used in the base model.

4.3.2 Biomass estimates, year class strengths, and exploitation rates
For the base model, and all of the sensitivities, B_0 was estimated at about 140 000 t with 95% CIs ranging from about 110 000 t to 210 000 t (Table 7). Current stock status is estimated to be at the target level of 40% for the base case. However, it is estimated to be just above 30% B_0 for the LowM-Highq and Fixed M runs (Table 7). For all of the runs the estimated probability of current stock status being below the soft limit of 20% B_0 is less than 5% (Table 7). The probability of current stock status being below the hard limit of 10% B_0 was estimated at 0 for all runs (Table 7).

Table 7: Bayesian estimates of M, B_0, and current stock status (B_{18}/B_0) for the base model and sensitivities (the median and 95% CIs are given). The probability of current stock status being below 10% or 20% B_0 is also given.

	M (yr^{-1})	B_0 (000 t)	ss_{18} (%B_0)	P(ss_{18} < 10%)	P(ss_{18} < 20%)
Base	0.079 (0.057–0.01)	138 (111–184)	40 ((23–59)	0.00	0.01
LowM-Highq	0.0632	138 (118–173)	31 (19–46)	0.00	0.04
HighM-Lowq	0.0948	146 (111–208)	50 (33–67)	0.00	0.00
Incl. LFs	0.085 (0.067–0.011)	133 (111–172)	42 (26–60)	0.00	0.00
Fixed M	0.063	143 (121–184)	33 (21–50)	0.00	0.02

The spawning biomass trajectory for the base model shows a decreasing trend from the start of the fishery in the 1980s with a flattening off in 2015–16 when catches were substantially reduced (Figure 1, Table 5). Current stock status is estimated to be at the target biomass although the 95% CIs are very wide (Figure 1, Table 7).

The estimated year class strengths show a pattern (in the medians) from 1972 to 1987 of above average cohort strength with below average cohort strength from 1990 to 2005 (Figure 2), consistent with the age composition data.



Figure 1: Base, MCMC estimated spawning-stock biomass trajectory. The box in each year covers 50% of the distribution and the whiskers extend to 95% of the distribution. The soft limit (red) and target biomass (green) are marked by horizontal lines.



Figure 2: Base, MCMC estimated "true" YCS (R_y/R_0). The box in each year covers 50% of the distribution and the whiskers extend to 95% of the distribution.

Exploitation rates in the fishery were estimated to be generally increasing from the start of the fishery up until 2014–15 (Figure 3). Catches in the years immediately prior to the TACC reduction in 2015–16 were at a level increasingly above the exploitation rate corresponding to the target biomass, $U_{40\%B0}$.

With the substantial catch reduction in 2015–16 the estimated exploitation rate (median) dropped to below 5% where it has remained (Figure 3).



Figure 3: Base, MCMC estimated exploitation rate trajectory. The box in each year covers 50% of the distribution and the whiskers extend to 95% of the distribution. The exploitation rate, $U_{40\%B0}$, corresponding to the biomass target of 40% B_0 is marked by the middle horizontal line ($U_{x\%B0}$ is the exploitation rate that will drive deterministic spawning biomass to x% B_0). $U_{30\%B0}$ and $U_{50\%B0}$ are also marked by horizontal lines.

4.3.3 Yield estimates and projections

Five year projections were made from the base model at a constant catch of 2300 t which is the approximate level of the last reported annual catch (2279 t in 2016–17) and also at 3000 t (the TACC for OEO 4). Year class strengths from 2006 onwards were sampled at random from the last 10 estimated year class strengths (1996–2005). Based on the projections, stock status is expected to stay fairly constant over the next five years for annual catches in the range 2300–3000 t (Figures 4 and 5, Table 8). There is a small upward trend in median stock status at annual catches of 2300 t (Figure 4, Table 8).



Figure 4: Base, MCMC projections at a constant annual catch of 2300 t. The box in each year covers 50% of the distribution and the whiskers extend to 95% of the distribution. The target biomass (40% B_0) is marked by the horizontal green line and the soft limit (20% B_0) by the horizontal red line.



Figure 5: Base, MCMC projections at a constant annual catch of 3000 t. The box in each year covers 50% of the distribution and the whiskers extend to 95% of the distribution. The target biomass (40% *B_0*) is marked by the horizontal green line and the soft limit (20% *B_0*) by the horizontal red line.

Table 8: The expected value of stock status in 2023 (E(ss_{23})) and the probabilities of being above the target biomass (40% *B_0*) or below the soft limit (20% *B_0*) or below the hard limit (10% *B_0*) under projected annual catches of 2300 t or 3000 t.

Annual catch (t)	E(ss_{23}) (%B_0)	P(ss_{23} > 40%)	P(ss_{23} < 20%)	P(ss_{23} < 10%)
2300	42	0.57	0.01	0.00
3000	40	0.49	0.02	0.00

4.3.4 Other factors

The Working Group considered that there were a number of other factors that should be considered in relation to the stock assessment results presented here. These include:

- uncertainty in the estimates of species composition of catch histories,
- confounding of estimates of M with others parameters in the model, and
- the assumption that acoustic selectivity is the same as the commercial selectivity.

4.3.5 Future research considerations

- Regular acoustic surveys are required to monitor the trend in adult biomass.
- Improved estimates of smooth oreo target strength would reduce the uncertainty in the assessment as would additional age frequency data.
- A continued emphasis on mark identification of large schools during the surveys is important.
- Sensitivities to assumptions about the species composition in deriving catch histories could be insightful.
- It would also be useful to investigate correlations between model parameters.
- A more generic research consideration, possibly to be undertaken by the Stock Assessment Methods Working Group, is to develop guidelines for when M should be estimated in models, and when (and how) it should be independently estimated.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

There is an updated stock assessment in 2018 for the smooth oreo stock in OEO 4.

Stock Structure Assumptions
Black and smooth oreo in OEO 4 are assessed separately but managed as a single stock (although catches are often estimated separately). For black oreos the population has been found to be genetically similar to other oreo stocks and it is likely that some mixing occurs. Smooth oreos in OEO 4 are assumed to be distinct from OEO 1 and 6 stocks but may mix with the 3A stock.

- **OEO 4 (Black Oreos)**

Stock Status	
Year of Most Recent Assessment	2009
Assessment Runs Presented	No quantitative stock assessment model
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: Not defined
Status in relation to Target	Unknown
Status in relation to Limits	Unknown
Status in relation to Overfishing	-

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status
<No plot available>

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	CPUE has been stable for the last 5 years, after initial substantial decline during the 1980s and 1990s.
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	Unknown
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unknown

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 2 – Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Age-based model in CASAL	
Period of Assessment	Latest assessment: 2009	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	-	
Main data inputs (rank)	- 4 standardised CPUE indices (pre/post GPS and east/west) - Observer length frequencies	- -
Data not used (rank)	N/A	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	None	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Assessments unable to represent observer length frequency data.	

	- CPUE could be fitted to a two-stock model but not a homogenous model. - A portion of the abundance estimates were based on data from areas not normally covered by the trawl fishery, and the surveyed area was scaled by a factor of 4.3 – the area surveyed was borderline for providing a reliable abundance estimate.

Qualifying Comments
The Working Group agreed that the stock might be split into east and west areas that were independent or at least minimally mixing for future assessments.

Fishery Interactions
Both species of oreo are sometimes taken as bycatch in orange roughy target fisheries and in smaller numbers in hoki target fisheries. Target fisheries for oreos do exist, with main bycatch being orange roughy, rattails and deepwater sharks. Bycatch species recorded include deepwater sharks and rays, seabirds and deepwater corals.

- **OEO 4 (Smooth Oreos)**

Stock Status	
Year of Most Recent Assessment	2018
Assessment Runs Presented	Base model fitted to vulnerable acoustic biomass estimates, based on school marks, and age frequencies
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 Soft limit: 20% B_0 Hard limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: $U_{40\%B0}$
Status in relation to Target	B_{2018} was estimated at 40% B_0 for the base model. B_{2018} is About as Likely as Not (40-60%) to be at or above the target.
Status in relation to Limits	B_{2018} is Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below the Soft limit and Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%) to be below the Hard Limit.
Status in relation to Overfishing	Overfishing is Unlikely (< 40%) to be occurring.

Historical Stock Status and Exploitation Rate Trajectory



Historical trajectory of spawning biomass (%B_0) and exploitation rate (%) (base model, medians of the marginal posteriors). A reference range of 30-50% B_0 and the corresponding exploitation rate range are coloured in green. The soft limit (20% B_0) is marked by a red line and the target biomass (40% B_0) and corresponding exploitation rate are marked by blue lines.

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	There has been little change in estimated biomass in the last 4 years.
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Following the large reduction in TACC and catch in 2015–16, estimated exploitation rates declined.
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	Below average cohort strength was estimated from 1990 to 2005.

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	Little change in projected biomass over the next five years at annual catches of 2300–3000 t
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) Hard Limit: Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%)
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unlikely (< 40%) for the current catch or TACC

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Type 1 – Full Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Age-structured CASAL model with Bayesian estimation of posterior distributions	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment : 2018	Next assessment: 2022
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Six acoustic biomass indices (1998, 2001, 2005, 2009, 2012, 2016) - Age frequencies from acoustic surveys (1998, 2005, 2016) - Trawl survey age frequency (1991) - Commercial age frequency (2009) - Observer length data (used in a sensitivity)	1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	- Commercial CPUE	3 – Low Quality: substantial changes in fishing patterns over time
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	- Added age data (trawl survey and commercial) and estimated M in the model	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Uncertainties in the prior for the survey catchability (q) o estimated target strength o scaling factor from the trawl survey area to acoustic area o scaling factor from acoustic area to the QMA area o proportion of vulnerable biomass in the surveyed marks o acoustic mark identification - Single commercial age frequency - Confounding of estimates of M with other parameters in the model - Assumption that acoustic selectivity is the same as the commercial selectivity	

Qualifying Comments
-

Fishery Interactions
Both species of oreo are sometimes taken as bycatch in orange roughy target fisheries and in smaller numbers in hoki target fisheries. Target fisheries for oreos do exist, with main bycatch being orange roughy, rattails and deepwater sharks. Low productivity species taken in oreo fisheries include orange roughy, rattails, and deepwater sharks and rays. Incidental captures have also been recorded for seabirds and deepwater corals.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Bull, B; Francis, R I C C; Dunn, A; Gilbert, D J (2002) CASAL (C++ algorithmic stock assessment laboratory): CASAL User Manual v1.02.2002/10/21. *NIWA Technical Report 117*. 199 p.

Coburn, R P; Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J (2001a) Smooth oreo abundance indices from standardised catch per unit of effort data for OEO 4. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/11*. 39 p.

Coburn, R P; Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J (2001b) Black oreo abundance indices from standardised catch per unit of effort data for OEO 4. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/39*. 24 p.

Doonan, I J; Coombs, R F; McMillan, P J; Dunn, A (1998) Estimate of the absolute abundance of black and smooth oreo in OEO 3A and 4 on the Chatham Rise. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project OEO9701. 47 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)

Doonan, I.J.; Hart, A.C.; Ladroit, Y.; McMillan, P.J. (2018). Smooth oreo abundance estimates from the October-November 2016 acoustic survey of the south Chatham Rise (OEO 4). New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2018/XX. XX p.

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J (2011) Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project OEO2009-01. 10 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New ZealandWellington.)

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (1996) Assessment of Chatham Rise smooth oreo (OEO 3A and OEO 4) for 1996. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1996/17. 21p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library.)

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (1997) Assessment of Chatham Rise smooth oreo (OEO 3A and OEO 4) for 1997. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1997/21. 26p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library.)

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (2001) Assessment of OEO 4 black oreo for 2000–01. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/30*. 32p.

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (2001) Assessment of OEO 4 smooth oreo for 2000–01. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/21*. 37 p.

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (2003) Assessment of OEO 4 smooth oreo for 2002–03. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/50*. 55 p.

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (2008) Assessment of OEO 4 smooth oreo for 2006–07. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/40*. 45 p.

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C; Cordue, P L (1995) Assessment of smooth oreo for 1995. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1995/12. 31p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library.)

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Hart, A C (2001) The use of mean length data for stock assessments of black oreo and smooth oreo in OEO 4. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/34*. 16 p.

Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Hart, A C (2008) Ageing of smooth oreo otoliths for stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/8*. 29 p.

Francis, R I C C (1999) The impact of correlations in standardised CPUE indices. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1999/42. 30p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library.)

Francis, R I C C (1992) Recommendations concerning the calculation of maximum constant yield (MCY) and current annual yield (CAY). New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1992/8. 27p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library.)

Fu, D; Doonan, I J (2013) Assessment of OEO 4 smooth oreo for 2009–10. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/22*. 35 p.

Fu, D.; Doonan, I J (2015). Assessment of OEO 4 smooth oreo for 2012–13. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/7*. 41 p.

McMillan, P J; Doonan, I J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (1996) Is the south Chatham Rise trawl survey providing an index of smooth oreo abundance in OEO 4?. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1996/16. 18p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library.)

McMillan, P J; Doonan, I J; Hart, A C; Coburn, R P (1998) Oreo stock assessment. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project OEO9702. 16p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand Wellington.)

McMillan, P J; Hart, A C (1991) Assessment of black and smooth oreos for the 1991–92 fishing year. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1991/10. 29p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library.)

Tracey, D M; Fenaughty, J M (1997). Distribution and relative abundance of orange roughy on the Chatham Rise, May-July 1994. *N.Z. Fisheries Technical Report No. 44*. 43 p.

OREOS - OEO 1 AND OEO 6 BLACK OREO AND SMOOTH OREO

1. FISHERY SUMMARY

This is presented in the Fishery Summary section at the beginning of the Oreos report.

2. BIOLOGY

This is presented in the Biology section at the beginning of the Oreos report.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

This is presented in the Stocks and Areas section at the beginning of the Oreos report.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

4.1 Introduction

New assessments for Pukaki Rise black oreo and Pukaki Rise smooth oreo were attempted in 2013 but were rejected by the Working Group and are only briefly discussed here. The previously reported assessments for Southland (OEO 1/OEO 3A) and Bounty Plateau smooth oreo (only MPD results) are repeated.

4.2 Southland smooth oreo fishery

This assessment was updated in 2007 and applies only to the study area as defined in Figure 1 and does not include areas to the north (Waitaki) and east (Eastern canyon) of the main fishing grounds.

This fishery is mostly in OEO 1 on the east coast of the South Island but catches occur at the northern end of the fishery straddle and cross the boundary line between OEO 1 and OEO 3A at 46ºS. This is an old fishery with catch and effort data available from 1977–78. Smooth oreo catch from Southland was about 480 t (mean of 2003–04 to 2005–06). There is an industry catch limit of 400 t smooth oreo implemented after the previous (2003) assessment. There were no fishery-independent abundance estimates, so relative abundance estimates from pre- and post-GPS standardised CPUE analyses and length frequency data collected by Ministry (SOP) and industry (ORMC) observers were used.

The following assumptions were made in this analysis.

1. The CPUE analysis indexed the abundance of smooth oreo in the study area of OEO 1/3A.
2. The length frequency samples were representative of the population being fished.
3. The ranges used for the biological values covered their true values.
4. Recruitment was deterministic and followed a Beverton-Holt relationship with steepness of 0.75.
5. The population of smooth oreo in the study area was a discrete stock or production unit.
6. Catch overruns were 0% during the period of reported catch.
7. The catch histories were accurate.
8. The maximum fishing pressure (U_{MAX}) was 0.58.

An age-structured CASAL model employing Bayesian statistical techniques was developed. A two-fishery model was employed with a split into deep and shallow fisheries because of a strong relationship found between smaller fish in shallow water and large fish in deeper water. The boundary between deep and shallow was 975 m. The 2007 analysis used five extra years of catch and observer length frequency data compared to the 2003 assessment. The model was partitioned by the sex and maturity status of the fish and used population parameters previously estimated from fish sampled on the Chatham Rise and Puysegur Bank fisheries. The maturity ogive used was estimated from Chatham Rise research samples.

4.2.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

Catch history

A catch history (Table 1) was derived using declared catches of OEO from OEO 1 (see table 2 in the Fishery Summary section at the beginning of the Oreos report) and tow-by-tow records of catch from the study area (Figure 1). The tow-by-tow data were used to estimate the species ratio (SSO/BOE) and therefore the SSO taken. It was assumed that the reported landings provided the best information on total catch quantity and that the tow-by-tow data provided the best information on the species and area breakdown of catch.

Table 1: Catch history of smooth oreo from Southland rounded to the nearest 10 t.

Fishing year	Shallow	Deep	Fishing year	Shallow	Deep
1977–78	210	0	1992–93	410	250
1978–79	10	0	1993–94	220	150
1979–80	40	0	1994–95	80	150
1980–81	0	0	1995–96	600	500
1981–82	0	0	1996–97	440	70
1982–83	0	0	1997–98	320	230
1983–84	480	660	1998–99	480	620
1984–85	170	510	1999–00	650	480
1985–86	480	3 760	2000–01	400	610
1986–87	30	160	2001–02	580	1 470
1987–88	130	860	2002–03	130	1 320
1988–89	0	240	2003–04	330	420
1989–90	210	430	2004–05	140	290
1990–91	410	420	2005–06	120	140
1991–92	530	380			



Figure 1: Smooth oreo estimated catch from all years up to (and including) 2005–06. The area was divided into cells that are 0.1 degrees square and catches were summed for each cell. Circles proportional in area to the catch are plotted centred on the cells. Catches less than 10 tonnes per cell are not shown. Circles are layered so that smaller circles are never hidden by larger ones. The assessment area and bottom topography are also shown.

Length data

All SOP records where smooth oreo were measured from within the assessment area are shown in Table 2: 78 samples were shallow and 51 deep. Only 13 shallow and 4 deep samples were collected before 1999–2000 (Table 2). Composite length frequency distributions were calculated for each year. Each sample was weighted by the catch weight of the tow from which the sample was taken. This was modified slightly by estimating the number of fish that would be in a unit weight of catch and multiplying by that.

Table 2: Summary of length frequency data for smooth oreo available for the study area. Year group, year applied, and the total number of length frequency samples for the shallow and deep year groups.

Year group	Year applied	No. of lfs
Shallow		
a=1993–94 to 1997–98	1995–96	13
b=1999–2000	1999–00	30
c=2000–01 to 2001–02	2001–02	22
d=2002–03 to 2005–06	2004–05	13
Deep		
e=1997–98 to 2001–02	2001–02	27
f=2002–03 to 2004–05	2003–04	21

Relative abundance estimates from CPUE analyses

The standardised CPUE analyses used a two part model which separately analysed the tows which caught smooth oreo using a log-linear regression (referred to as the positive catch regression) and a binomial part which used a Generalised Linear Model with a logit link for the proportion of successful tows (referred to as the zero catch regression). The binomial part used all the tows, but considered only whether or not the species was caught and not the amount caught. The yearly indices from the two parts of the analysis (positive catch index and zero catch index) were multiplied together to give a combined index. The pre-GPS data covered the years from 1983–84 to 1987–88, was left unmodified from 2003, and was used as an index of the deep fishery as most fishing in that period was deep (Table 3). The post-GPS data covered 1992–93 to 2005–06 split into shallow and deep fisheries but the indices for the last two years (2004–05, 2005–06) were dropped because catch was constrained by the industry catch limit of 400 t for smooth oreo introduced after the 2003 assessment (Table 4).

Table 3: Smooth oreo pre-GPS combined index estimates by year, and jackknife CV estimates from analysis of all tows in the study area that targeted smooth oreo, black oreo, or unspecified oreo.

Year	Combined index	Jackknife CV (%)
1983–84	1.75	22
1984–85	1.65	29
1985–86	1.19	33
1986–87	0.48	23
1987–88	0.61	27

Table 4: Smooth oreo post-GPS combined index estimates by year, and jackknife CV estimates from analysis of all tows in the study area that targeted smooth oreo, black oreo, or unspecified oreo.

	Shallow		Deep	
Fishing year	Index (kg/tow)	Bootstrap CV (%)	Index (kg/tow)	Bootstrap CV (%)
1992–93	1 489	57	1 401	73
1993–94	956	47	916	53
1994–95	1 521	72	428	121
1995–96	1 173	37	1 862	84
1996–97	511	84	2 117	41
1997–98	1 477	39	502	59
1998–99	939	42	915	50
1999–00	842	44	611	48
2000–01	758	46	385	72
2001–02	573	44	658	53
2002–03	303	48	406	76
2003–04	480	57	719	218

4.2.2 Biomass estimates

Biomass estimates were made based on a Markov Chain Monte Carlo analysis which produced a total of about 1.4 million iterations. The first 100 000 iterations were discarded and every 1000th point was retained, giving a final converged chain of about 1300 points.

Biomass estimates for the base case are given in Table 5 and Figure 2. These biomass estimates are uncertain because of the reliance on commercial CPUE data for abundance indices.

Table 5: Biomass estimates (t) for the base case.

		5%	Median	Mean	95%	CV (%)
Free parameters						
Virgin mature biomass (B_0)		15 600	17 400	17 900	21 700	12
Selectivity, shallow	a1	17.2	19.0	19.0	21.0	6
	sL	3.9	4.8	4.8	5.8	12
	sR	5.9	8.3	8.4	11.2	20
Selectivity, deep	a50	22.1	26.0	26.2	30.8	10
	to95	1.9	7.1	7.0	11.0	37
Derived quantities						
Current mature biomass (% initial)		19	27	28	41	25
Current selected shallow biomass (% initial)		56	65	65	73	8
Current selected deep biomass (% initial)		12	20	22	36	36



Figure 2: Estimated biomass trajectories from the 2007 base case assessment — mature biomass and selected biomass for the shallow and deep fisheries. Also shown are the CPUE indices from the pre- and post-GPS analysis for the deep fishery (in gray) and the post-GPS analyses for the shallow fishery (in black). CPUE indices are shown with ±2 s.e. confidence interval indicated by the vertical lines (the post-GPS CPUE data are slightly offset to avoid over plotting). The CPUE data were scaled by catchability coefficients to match the biomass scale.

4.3 Pukaki Rise smooth oreo fishery (part of OEO 6)

A second assessment for this fishery was attempted in 2013, applying only to the assessment area as defined in Figure 3. The first assessment for this fishery was in 2006–07 (Coburn et al 2007; McKenzie 2007). This is the main smooth oreo fishery in OEO 6 with an annual catch in 2011–12 of

290 t, taken mainly by New Zealand vessels, down substantially from previous years (Table 6). There was also a small early Soviet fishery (1980–81 to 1985–86) with mean annual catches of less than 100 t. There were no fishery-independent abundance estimates, so relative abundance estimates from a post-GPS standardised CPUE analysis and length frequency data collected by Ministry and industry observers were considered. Biological parameter values estimated for Chatham Rise and Puysegur Bank smooth oreo were used in the assessment because there are no research data from Pukaki Rise. However, the CPUE analysis was not accepted as an index of abundance for smooth oreo in the Pukaki Rise (OEO 6) assessment area, principally due to the complex temporal and spatial patterns of this fishery and associated fisheries, and the small number of vessels. As a result, the assessment was not accepted by the Working Group, and only catch history, length frequencies and unstandardised catch and effort data are reported here.



Figure 3: The Pukaki Rise fishery assessment area (polygon) abutting the north boundary of OEO 6. The dots show all tows where the target species or catch was OEO, SSO, BOE or ORH, with the red dots being those within the Pukaki assessment area.

4.3.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

Catch history

A catch history was derived using declared catches of OEO from OEO 6 (table 2 in the "Fishery Summary" section of the Oreos report) and tow-by-tow records of catch from the assessment area (Figure 3). The tow-by-tow data were used to estimate the species ratio (SSO/BOE) and therefore the amount of SSO taken. It was assumed that the reported landings provided the best information on total catch quantity and that the tow-by-tow data provided the best information on the species and area breakdown of catch. There may be unreported catch from before records started, although this is thought to be small. Before the 1983–84 fishing year the species catch data were combined over years to get an average figure that was then applied in each of those early years. For the years from 1983–84 onwards, each year's calculation was made independently. The catch history used in the population model is given in Table 6.

Length data

Smooth oreo length frequency data collected by observers are available for the years 1997–98 to 2011–12 (Table 7). An in-depth analysis of these data in the previous assessment (covering fishing years 1998–2005) indicated that they were reasonably representative of the fishery in terms of spatial, depth and temporal coverage in those years that had adequate data (Coburn et al 2007). The depths fished by the sampled fleet varied between years so the length data were stratified by depth resulting in shallow (less than 900 m), middle (900–990 m) and deep strata (greater than 990 m). The data from adjacent years were also grouped because some years had few samples. The resulting length frequencies are shown in Figure 4. There is a trend towards a flatter distribution over the last three grouped distributions (2000–01, 02, and 03–05).

Table 6: Catch history of smooth oreo from the Pukaki Rise fishery assessment area. Catches are rounded to the nearest 10 t.

Year	Catch	Year	Catch	Year	Catch	Year	Catch
1980–81	30	1988–89	0	1996–97	1 650	2004–05	1 370
1981–82	20	1989–90	0	1997–98	1 340	2005–06	1 470
1982–83	0	1990–91	10	1998–99	1 370	2006–07	1 790
1983–84	640	1991–92	0	1999–00	2 270	2007–08	1 260
1984–85	340	1992–93	70	2000–01	2 580	2008–09	1 200
1985–86	10	1993–94	0	2001–02	2 020	2009–10	770
1986–87	0	1994–95	130	2002–03	1 340	2010–11	820
1987–88	180	1995–96	1 360	2003–04	1 660	2011–12	290
						2012–13	136

Table 7: Summary of length frequency data for smooth oreo available for the assessment area. The table shows the number of tows sampled by year, the sample source, and the year group. -, no data.

	Year group	Number of tows sampled		
Year		ORMC	SOP	All
1997–98	98–99	-	15	15
1998–99	98–99	64	9	73
1999–00	00–01	5	36	41
2000–01	00–01	37	17	54
2001–02	01–02	42	22	64
2002–03	03–04	4	12	16
2003–04	03–04	-	19	19
2004–05	05–06	-	30	30
2005–06	05–06	-	20	20
2006–07	06–07	-	205	205
2007–08	07–08	-	124	124
2008–09	08–09	-	66	66
2009–10	09–10	-	46	46
2010–11	10–11	-	107	107
2011–12	10–11	-	21	21
Totals		152	149	301

Catch and effort data

Core vessels for the fishery were defined in order to develop a standardised CPUE series, but the standardised series was rejected by the Working group. Unstandardised catch and effort data are presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Catch and effort data for vessels with three or more consecutive years with at least 10 records from 1995–96 to 2011–12.

	No. of tows	No. of vessels	Estimated catch (t)	Mean t/tow	Zero catch tows (%)	SSO target (%)
1996	193	2	810	4.20	-	6
1997	322	3	1 270	3.90	4	4
1998	264	4	1 020	3.90	6	9
1999	262	4	1 050	4	1	15
2000	528	5	2 030	3.90	32	37
2001	588	7	2 280	3.90	49	52
2002	409	5	1 920	4.70	9	9
2003	498	5	1 230	2.50	14	18
2004	512	4	1 300	2.50	9	13
2005	588	6	1 170	2	21	27
2006	656	5	1 260	1.90	13	14
2007	806	5	1 550	1.90	23	25
2008	933	2	1 110	1.20	13	16
2009	918	3	1 200	1.30	21	23
2010	948	3	740	0.80	8	11
2011	593	3	720	1.20	22	25
2012	397	2	260	0.70	10	12



Figure 4: Length frequencies for Pukaki Rise smooth oreo, stratified by depth (see text), and grouped by years. [Continued on next page].



Figure 4 [Continued].

4.4 Bounty Plateau smooth oreo fishery (part of OEO 6)

The first assessment for this fishery was developed in 2008 and applies only to the study area as defined in Figure 5. There were no fishery-independent abundance estimates, so relative abundance estimates from a post-GPS standardised CPUE analysis and length frequency data collected by Ministry (SOP) and industry (ORMC) observers were considered. Biological parameter values estimated for Chatham Rise and Puysegur Bank smooth oreo were used in the assessment because there are no research data from Bounty Plateau.

The following assumptions were made in this analysis.

1. The CPUE analysis indexed the abundance of smooth oreo in the Bounty Plateau (OEO 6) assessment area.
2. The length frequency samples were representative of the population being fished.
3. The biological parameters values used (from other assessment areas) are close to the true values.
4. Recruitment was deterministic and followed a Beverton & Holt relationship with steepness of 0.75.
5. The population of smooth oreo in the assessment area was a discrete stock or production unit.
6. Catch overruns were 0% during the period of reported catch.
7. The catch histories were accurate.
8. The maximum exploitation rate (E_{MAX}) was 0.58.

Data inputs included catch history, relative abundance estimates from a standardised CPUE analysis, and length data from SOP and ORMC observers. The observational data were incorporated into an age-based Bayesian stock assessment (CASAL) with deterministic recruitment to estimate stock size. The stock was considered to reside in a single area, with a partition by sex. Age groups were 1–70 years, with a plus group of 70+ years.

The length-weight and length-at-age population parameters are from fish sampled on the Chatham Rise and Puysegur Bank fisheries (table 1 of the "Biology" section of the Oreos report). The natural mortality estimate is based on fish sampled from the Puysegur Bank fishery. The maturity ogive is from fish sampled on the Chatham Rise, and the age at which 50% are mature is between 18 and 19 years for males and between 25 and 26 years for females.

4.4.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

Catch history

Table 9: Catch history (t) of smooth oreo from the Bounty Plateau fishery assessment area. Catches are rounded to the nearest 10 t.

Year	Catch	Year	Catch
1983–84	620	1996–97	610
1984–85	0	1997–98	650
1985–86	0	1998–99	1 200
1986–87	0	1999–00	870
1987–88	10	2000–01	550
1988–89	0	2001–02	980
1989–90	0	2002–03	1 530
1990–91	20	2003–04	1 420
1991–92	0	2004–05	2 190
1992–93	110	2005–06	1 790
1993–94	490	2006–07	670
1994–95	1 450	2007–08	670
1995–96	900		

A catch history was derived using declared catches of oreo from OEO 6 (table 2 in the "Fishery Summary" section of the Oreos report) and tow-by-tow records of catch from the assessment area (Figure 5). The tow-by-tow data were used to estimate the species ratio (SSO/BOE) and therefore the SSO taken. The catch history used in the population model is given in Table 9.



Figure 5: The Bounty Plateau fishery assessment study area.

Length data

Smooth oreo length frequency data collected by SOP and ORMC observers are available from 1991–92. An in-depth analysis indicated that these data were reasonably representative of the fishery in terms of spatial, depth and temporal coverage in those years that had adequate data. Length frequencies were based on tows from the core area (a subset of the study area where about 80% of the catch is taken). The data from adjacent years were grouped because some years had few samples (Table 10). The resulting length frequencies are shown in Figure 6. In the final model runs the 1994–95 year of the length frequency series was omitted as it contained very few samples.

Table 10: Core length analysis Year group, year applied and the number of length frequency samples. Smooth oreo sample catch weight, fishery catch and sample catch as percentage of the fishery.

Year group	Year applied	No. of lfs	Catch sampled (t)	Fishery catch (t)	% fishery
1991–92 to 1995–96	1994–95	7	88	1 505	6
1998–99 to 1999–2000	1998–99	30	246	1 121	22
2000–2001 to 2002–03	2001–02	25	398	2 261	18
2003–04 to 2004–05	2004–05	29	261	2 280	11
2005–06	2005–06	32	379	1 121	34
2006–07 to 2007–08	2006–07	17	168	494	34

Relative abundance estimates from CPUE analyses

The small early Soviet fishery had too few data for a standardised CPUE analysis. The standardised CPUE analysis was, therefore, from the New Zealand vessel fishery and only included data from those vessels that had fished at least three years. Just a single vessel puts in significant continuous effort from 1995–2007, with the rest of the vessels' effort confined to mainly either 1995–2000 (early) or 2001–2007 (late). Because of this, in addition to the single standardised CPUE covering the entire time period, two separate standardised CPUE indices were calculated covering the early and late periods. The final indices are shown in Tables 11 and 12.

4.4.2 Biomass estimates

In all preliminary model runs the length-frequency data series were not well fitted, and gave a strong but contrasting biomass signal relative to the CPUE indices. Therefore, for final model runs, the length frequency data was down-weighted by using just the 1999 length frequency.

The base case model used early and late period CPUE indices, and the 1999 length frequency data. Current mature biomass was estimated to be 33% of a virgin biomass of 17 400 t (Figure 7).



Figure 6: Length frequency distribution plots for core data only (thick lines) with 95% confidence interval (thin lines).

Table 11: Early and late period CPUE combined index estimates by year, and bootstrap CV estimates.

Year Early	Kg/tow	CV	Late period	Kg/tow	CV
1995–96	3551	0.423	2000–01	850	0.487
1996–97	3322	0.496	2001–02	2976	0.274
1997–98	2306	0.980	2002–03	1489	0.243
1998–99	781	0.391	2003–04	1727	0.260
1999–2000	1536	0.306	2004–05	1604	0.227
			2005–06	1386	0.310
			2006–07	966	0.232

Table 12: Single period CPUE combined index estimates by year, and bootstrap CV estimates.

Year	Kg/tow	CV
1995–96	7472	0.286
1996–97	4453	0.735
1997–98	3366	1.264
1998–99	1444	0.406
1999–2000	2835	0.286
2000–01	2817	0.436
2001–02	632	0.680
2002–03	1973	0.663
2003–04	1296	0.615
2004–05	1284	0.445
2005–06	1289	0.563
2006–07	1056	1.200



Figure 7: Model run showing the MPD fit to the CPUE data (vertical lines are the 95% confidence intervals for the indices) and the trajectory of mature biomass.

Two sensitivity model runs were carried out with the 1999 length frequency data dropped from the model, but retaining the fishery selectivity estimated using the length data. The first model run used the early and late period CPUE indices and current biomass was estimated to be 39% of a virgin biomass of 19 300 t. The second model run used the single CPUE series covering the same period and current biomass was estimated to be 17% of a virgin biomass of 13 900 t. No MCMC runs were carried out with the base case model as the sensitivity runs showed that the assessment was quite different if the CPUE analysis was not split into two series.

Biomass estimates are uncertain because of the reliance on commercial CPUE data, the use of biological parameter estimates from other oreo stocks, and because of contrasting biomass signals from using either a single or split CPUE indices.

4.4.3 Projections

No projections were made because of the uncertainty in the assessment.

4.5 Pukaki Rise black oreo stock (part of OEO 6)

A second assessment for this fishery was attempted in 2013, applying only to the assessment area as defined in Figure 8. The first assessment for this fishery was in 2009 (Doonan et al 2010). This is currently the largest black oreo fishery in the New Zealand EEZ with both current (2011–12) and mean (1994–95 to 2011–12) annual catches of 1900 t, but with annual catches of 2800–3400 t between 2005–06 and 2009–10. There was an early Soviet and Korean fishery (1980–81 to 1984–85) with mean annual catches of about 1700 t. Fishery-independent abundance estimates were not available, so a series of relative abundance indices, based on an analysis of post-GPS standardised CPUE, was developed. Length frequency data collected by Ministry (SOP) and industry (ORMC) observers were included in the model. The assessment used biological parameter values estimated for Chatham Rise and Puysegur Bank black oreo because no biological data from Pukaki Rise are available. As stated above, the Pukaki Rise smooth oreo CPUE was thought to be unreliable until further investigations have been conducted. Since the black oreo fishery is in the same area, the Working Group determined that the black oreo CPUE analysis also could not be accepted as an index of abundance of black oreo in the Pukaki Rise (OEO 6) assessment area, and as a result the assessment was rejected. Therefore, only catch history, length frequencies and unstandardised catch and effort data are reported here.

4.5.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

Catch history

A catch history for black oreo was derived (Table 13) using declared catches of OEO from OEO 6 (table 2 in the "Fishery summary" section of the Oreos report) and tow-by-tow records of catch from the assessment area (Figure 8). The catch history used in the assessment is given in Table 13.

Table 13: Catch history (t) of black oreo from the Pukaki Rise fishery assessment area.

Year	Catch	Year	Catch	Year	Catch
1978–79	17	1990–91	15	2002–03	1 701
1979–80	5	1991–92	27	2003–04	1 530
1980–81	283	1992–93	27	2004–05	1 588
1981–82	4 180	1993–94	10	2005–06	2 811
1982–83	1 084	1994–95	242	2006–07	3 434
1983–84	1 150	1995–96	1 352	2007–08	3 346
1984–85	1 704	1996–97	2 413	2008–09	2 818
1985–86	46	1997–98	2 244	2009–10	3 093
1986–87	0	1998–99	1 181	2010–11	1 641
1987–88	0	1999–00	1 061	2011–12	1 671
1988–89	0	2000–01	1 158		
1989–90	0	2001–02	988		

Length data

Black oreo length frequency data collected by SOP and ORMC observers are available from 1996–97 to 2011–12 (Table 14). An analysis indicated that there was a trend in fish size across years (with smaller mean lengths in more recent years) and with depth (deeper fish being larger). The length data were considered to be representative of the fishery in terms of the spatial, depth, and temporal coverage for those years that had adequate data. The length data were stratified into two depth bins: shallow (less than 900 m), and deep (greater than 900 m). Length data from adjacent years were grouped because of the low number of samples in some years (Figure 9). There is no trend in mean length over the first six year-groups, but fish sizes appear to be generally smaller in the later year-groups, with the mode of the distributions shifting to the left between 2005–06 and 2007–08.

Table 14: Summary of length frequency data for black oreo available from the assessment area. The table shows the number of tows sampled by year, the sample source, and the year group.

		Number of tows sampled		
Year	**Year group**	**SOP**	**ORMC**	**All**
1996–97	97–98	7	0	7
1997–98	97–98	25	0	25
1998–99	99–00	7	44	51
1999–00	99–00	6	0	6
2000–01	01–02	8	18	26
2001–02	01–02	2	8	10
2002–03	03–05	7	2	9
2003–04	03–05	18	0	18
2004–05	03–05	21	0	21
2005–06	06	21	42	63
2006–07	07	154	11	165
2007–08	08	31	9	40
2008–09	08	61	9	70
2009–10	09	46	0	46
2010–11	10	57	0	57
2011–12	11–12	13	0	13
Total		477	134	611

Catch and effort data

The fishery taking Pukaki Rise black oreo divides into two distinct periods: a pre-GPS period 1980–81 to 1984–85 when much of the catch was taken by Soviet and Korean vessels, and a post-GPS period, 1995–96 to 2011–12 when most of the catch was taken by New Zealand vessels. The intervening period was characterised by low catches and the introduction of GPS technology in the fleet. Standardisation of CPUE for the pre-GPS period was attempted but rejected due to poor linkage of vessels across years and the shifting of fishing effort between areas. For the post-GPS period, the Working Group rejected CPUE as an index of abundance because of the variability in recorded target species over time and space in the overlapping Pukaki fisheries for black oreo, smooth oreo, and orange roughy. The Working Group believed that recording of target species in these fisheries was likely to have been inconsistent between vessels and skippers over time and that the practice of separately examining these fisheries according to recorded target species was inappropriate. Unstandardised catch and effort data for defined core vessels are presented in Table 15.



Figure 8: The Pukaki Rise fishery black oreo assessment area (polygon) abutting the boundary of OEO 6/OEO 1 in the north-west. The dots show tow positions where black oreo catch was reported between 1980–81 and 2011–12. A, B, and C are the three areas defined in the standardised CPUE analysis.



Figure 9: Observer length frequencies for Pukaki Rise black oreo, stratified by depth (see text), and grouped by years (in the legends 1997=1996–97 etc.). The vertical dashed lines indicate the approximate overall mean length as an aid to comparing the distributions.

4.5.2 Biomass estimates

No biomass estimates are reported.

4.5.3 Yield estimates and projections

No yield estimates were made.

Table 15: Catch and effort data for vessels fishing in the eastern areas (B and C in Figure 8) with a minimum of 15 successful tows for black oreo in at least three years from 1995–96 to 2011–12.

Year	No. of	CPUE	CV	Year	No. of	CPUE	CV
1995–96	63	1.94	0.09	2004–05	309	0.73	0.13
1996–97	55	1.44	0.13	2005–06	481	0.88	0.09
1997–98	219	1.53	0.07	2006–07	650	0.80	0.09
1998–99	235	0.98	0.11	2007–08	795	0.62	0.12
1999–00	252	0.82	0.12	2008–09	734	0.61	0.12
2000–01	199	1.11	0.10	2009–10	979	0.33	0.21
2001–02	175	1.07	0.11	2010–11	450	0.51	0.16
2002–03	320	0.91	0.10	2011–12	430	0.72	0.12
2003–04	343	0.97	0.09				

No projections were made because the assessment was not accepted by the Working Group.

4.6 Other oreo fisheries in OEO 1 and OEO 6

4.6.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

Relative abundance estimates from trawl surveys

Two comparable trawl surveys were carried out in the Puysegur area of OEO 1 (TAN9208 and TAN9409). The 1994 oreo abundance estimates are markedly lower than the 1992 values (Table 16).

4.6.2 Biomass estimates

Estimates of virgin and current biomass are not yet available.

4.6.3 Yield estimates and projections

MCY cannot be estimated because of the lack of current biomass estimates for the other stocks.

CAY cannot be estimated because of the lack of current biomass estimates for the other stocks.

4.6.4 Other factors

Recent catch data from this fishery may be of poor quality because of area misreporting.

Table 16: OEO 1. Research survey abundance estimates (t) for oreos from the Puysegur and Snares areas. N is the number of stations. Estimates for smooth oreo were made based on a recruited length of 34 cm TL. Estimates for black oreo were made using knife-edge recruitment set at 27 cm TL.

Smooth oreo					
Puysegur area (strata 0110–0502)					
	Mean biomass	Lower bound	Upper bound	CV (%)	N
1992	1 397	736	2 058	23	82
1994	529	86	972	41	87
Snares area (strata 0801–0802)					
	Mean biomass	Lower bound	Upper bound	CV (%)	N
1992	2 433	0	5 316	59	8
1994	118	0	246	54	7
Black oreo					
Puysegur area (strata 0110–0502)					
	Mean biomass	Lower bound	Upper bound	CV (%)	N
1992	2 009	915	3 103	27	82
1994	618	0	1 247	50	87
Snares area (strata 0801–0802)					
	Mean biomass	Lower bound	Upper bound	CV (%)	N
1992	3 983	0	8 211	53	8
1994	1 564	0	3 566	64	7

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

Stock Structure Assumptions

Oreos in the OEO 1 and 6 FMAs are managed as a single stock but assessed as four separate stocks, separated by species and geography.

The Southland smooth oreo stock is based along the east coast of the South Island in OEO 1 but extends slightly into OEO 3. It does not include the Waitaki and Eastern canyon areas but is likely to have some level of mixing with other smooth oreo fishstocks. The Pukaki Rise smooth oreo stock comprises the major part of OEO 6 stocks and is centred on its namesake. Some mixing with other smooth oreo fishstocks is thought to occur. The Bounty Plateau smooth oreo stock is located across the Bounty Plateau and the Bounty Islands. Some mixing is thought to occur with other smooth oreo fishstocks.

The Pukaki Rise black oreo stock is the main black oreo fishstock in OEO 6 and the largest black oreo fishstock in the New Zealand EEZ. It extends the entire length of the Rise towards OEO 1. It is assessed separately to other fishstocks but managed as a part of OEO 6. Black oreo on the Pukaki Rise are thought to be non-mixing with other black oreo fishstocks.

- **OEO 1 and OEO 3A Southland (Smooth Oreo)**

Stock Status	
Year of Most Recent Assessment	2007
Assessment Runs Presented	One base case only
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold:
Status in relation to Target	B_{2007} was estimated at 27% B_0, Unlikely (< 40%) to be at or above the target.
Status in relation to Limits	B_{2007} was estimated to be Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the Soft Limit and Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below the Hard Limit.
Status in relation to Overfishing	-

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



Predicted biomass trajectories for the 2007 base case assessment— mature biomass and selected biomass for the shallow and deep fisheries. Also shown are the CPUE indices from the pre- and post-GPS analysis for the deep fishery (in gray) and the post-GPS analyses for the shallow fishery (in black). CPUE indices are shown with ±2 s.e. confidence interval indicated by the vertical lines (the post-GPS CPUE data are slightly offset to avoid over plotting). The CPUE data were scaled by catchability coefficients to match the biomass scale.

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Biomass has been declining at a steady rate since the late 1980s.
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	Unknown
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	None because of assessment uncertainty.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	-

Assessment Methodology		
Assessment Type	Type 1 - Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Age-structured CASAL model with Bayesian estimation of posterior distributions.	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment: 2007	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	-	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Length-frequency data collected by SOP and ORMC observers - A second, earlier fishery based on Soviet vessels was included in the assessment using historical catch data. - Standardised CPUE indices were derived from the historical and modern datasets.	
Data not used (rank)	-	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Scarcity of observer length frequency data - Poor quality area catch data due to significant misreporting - Lack of fishery-independent abundance estimates creates reliance on commercial CPUE data.	

Qualifying Comments
-

Fishery Interactions
Both species of oreo are sometimes taken as bycatch in orange roughy target fisheries and in smaller numbers in hoki target fisheries. Target fisheries for oreos do exist, with main bycatch being orange roughy, rattails and deepwater sharks and rays. Other bycatch species recorded include seabirds and deepwater corals.

- **OEO 6 Pukaki Rise (Smooth Oreo)**

Stock Status	
Year of Most Recent Assessment	2013

Assessment Runs Presented	CASAL assessment based on CPUE rejected
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: $F_{40\% B0}$
Status in relation to Target	Unknown
Status in relation to Limits	Unknown
Status in relation to Overfishing	Unknown
Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status	
-	

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Biomass is likely to have been declining since 1996.
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Unknown
Other Abundance Indices	CPUE has steadily declined.
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-
Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	No projections were made due to the uncertainties in the assessment.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unknown

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Type 1 – Quantitative Stock Assessment, but rejected.	
Assessment Method	CASAL assessment based on CPUE (rejected)	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment: 2013	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	3 – Low Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	-	
Data not used (rank)	Commercial CPUE	3 – Low Quality: does not track stock biomass
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Lack of fishery-independent biomass estimates creates reliance on commercial CPUE data. - Lack of biological parameters specific to Smooth Oreo in the target area – data from Chatham Rise/Puysegur Bank had to be substituted instead.	

Qualifying Comments
Further investigations into CPUE are required.

Fishery Interactions
Both species of oreo are sometimes taken as bycatch in orange roughy target fisheries and in smaller numbers in hoki target fisheries. Target fisheries for oreos do exist, with main bycatch being orange roughy, rattails and deepwater sharks. Low productivity bycatch species include deepwater sharks and rays. Protected species interactions occur with seabirds and deepwater corals.

- **OEO 6 Bounty Plateau (Smooth Oreo)**

Stock Status	
Year of Most Recent Assessment	2008
Assessment Runs Presented	A base case with two sensitivity runs
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0
Status in relation to Targe	B_{2008} was estimated at 33% B_0; Unlikely (< 40%) to be at or above the target.
Status in relation to Limits	B_{2008} is Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the Soft Limit and Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below the Hard Limit.
Status in relation to Overfishing	-

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



Model run showing the MPD fit to the CPUE data (vertical lines are the 95% confidence intervals for the indices) and the trajectory of mature biomass.

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Biomass is estimated to have been decreasing rapidly since 1995.
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	Unknown
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	No projections were made because of the uncertainty of the assessment.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing overfishing to continue or to commence	

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation	
Assessment Type	Type 1 - Quantitative Stock Assessment
Assessment Method	Age-structured CASAL model with Bayesian estimation of

	posterior distributions	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment: 2008	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank		
Main data inputs (rank)	- Catch history - Abundance estimates derived from a standardised CPUE - Length data from SOP and ORMC observers	
Data not used (rank)	-	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Reliance on commercial CPUE data - To estimate biological parameters, data was used from different stocks (Puysegur Bank + Chatham Rise) to the target stock - Using a single CPUE index instead of split indices gives contrasting biomass signals	

Qualifying Comments
-

Fishery Interactions
Both species of oreo are sometimes taken as bycatch in orange roughy target fisheries and in smaller numbers in hoki target fisheries. Target fisheries for oreos do exist, with main bycatch being orange roughy, rattails and deepwater sharks. Other bycatch species recorded include deepwater sharks and rays, seabirds and deepwater corals.

- **OEO 6 Pukaki Rise (Black Oreo)**

Stock Status	
Year of Most Recent Assessment	2013
Assessment Runs Presented	CASAL assessment based on CPUE rejected
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: $F_{40\%\ B0}$
Status in relation to Target	Unknown
Status in relation to Limits	Unknown
Status in relation to Overfishing	Unknown
Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status	

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Biomass is likely to have been decreasing since the 1980s with a major decline starting about 1995.
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Unknown
Other Abundance Indices	CPUE declined, but has levelled out in the last four years.
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	-
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to	Unknown

continue or to commence		
Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Type 1 - Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	CASAL assessment based on CPUE (rejected)	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment: 2009	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	3 – Low Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	-	
Data not used (rank)	Commercial CPUE	3 – Low Quality: does not track stock biomass
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Lack of fisheries-independent data causes reliance on commercial CPUE data - Lack of biological parameter estimates specific to black oreo in this assessment area	

Qualifying Comments
Further investigations into CPUE are needed.

Fishery Interactions
Both species of oreo are sometimes taken as bycatch in orange roughy target fisheries and in smaller numbers in hoki target fisheries. Target fisheries for oreos do exist, with main bycatch being orange roughy, rattails and deepwater sharks. Low productivity bycatch species include deepwater sharks and rays. Protected species interactions occur with seabirds and deepwater corals.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Coburn, R P; Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J (2002) CPUE analyses for the Southland black oreo and smooth oreo fisheries, 1977–78 to 1999–2000. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2002/3.* 28 p.

Coburn, R P; Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J (2002) CPUE analyses for the major black oreo and smooth oreo fisheries in OEO 6, 1980–81 to 1999–2000. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2002/6.* 29 p.

Coburn, R P; Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J (2003) Stock assessment of smooth oreo in the Southland fishery (OEO 1 and 3A) for 2003. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/62*. 32 p.

Coburn, R P; Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J (2008) A stock assessment of smooth oreo in Southland (part of OEO 1 & OEO 3A). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/37*. 43 p.

Coburn, R P; McMillan, P J; Gilbert, D J (2007) Inputs for a stock assessment of smooth oreo, Pukaki Rise (part of OEO 6). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/23*. 32 p

Doonan, I J; Anderson, O F; McMillan, P J (2010) Assessment of Pukaki (OEO 6) black oreo for 2008–09. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2010/39*.

McKenzie, A (2007) Stock assessment for east Pukaki Rise smooth oreo (part of OEO 6). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/34*. 27 p.

McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C; Doonan, I J (2002) Descriptions of black oreo and smooth oreo fisheries in OEO 1, OEO 3A, OEO 4, and OEO 6 from 1977–78 to the 2000–01 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report. 2002/40*.