# Proposed South Atlantic Council ABC Control Rule

Report of the SAFMC SSC

September 2009

## Background

The SAMFC SSC first discussed acceptable biological catch (ABC) control rules in June 2008 in response to publication of a proposed rule addressing National Standards 1 (NS1) guidelines for the Magnuson-Stevens Reauthorization (MSRA). An issue paper outlining various alternative approaches to establishing ABC was provided to the Council in September 2008. The Council supported further developing a control rule approach which specified ABC as a function of yield at maximum sustainable yield (MSY) and assessment uncertainty. The Council further specified that ABC should be set at a level providing a 25% chance of overfishing, with a range of values corresponding to 10 to 50% chance of overfishing. The Council intends to specify ABC control rules in its comprehensive annual catch limit (ACL) amendment.

Although the approach suggested in September 2008 provides guidance for assessed stocks for which the probability of overfishing can be provided in terms of yield, it does not address those stocks that lack assessments. Therefore, the SSC requested a special meeting for March 2009 devoted solely to developing an ABC control rule that could be applied to all managed stocks. During that meeting, the SSC developed the control rule reflected in this document after much deliberation and discussion.

First, the group decided on general characteristics and components of the rule and developed a framework of dimensions and tiers. Dimensions reflect the critical characteristics to evaluate, including data and assessment information availability and life history traits. Tiers are objective levels within dimensions that reflect the range of information available. Each tier is assigned a score which contributes to the overall adjustment factor.

Once the general approach was established, a number of example stocks were put through the framework to ensure that it included adequate tiers to accommodate a variety of

circumstances and appropriate dimensions to adequately address uncertainty. This exercise led to considerable further discussion that better defined the concepts and resulted in some tiers being combined to keep the rule as parsimonious as possible. The following sections of this document describe the tiers and summarize critical discussions that occurred during development.

**An important caveat must be stated upfront. The approach described here is applicable when the OFL can be stated in weight and some measure of statistical uncertainty about the OFL can be estimated. Future discussions and development will focus on ways to apply this methodology in a consistent manner to stocks for which the OFL or its statistical uncertainty cannot be estimated.**

## Control Rule Concept

The SSC agreed that the ABC control rule should provide an objective means of determining the buffer, or amount of separation, between the overfishing level (typically MSY) and the ABC. The desired rule should evaluate multiple characteristics, accommodate varying data levels and assessment information, and incorporate productivity and susceptibility measures. Finally, the control rule should provide objective adjustments to the probability of overfishing according to key risk factors, with actual ABCs expressed as yield in mass obtained through a probability density distribution or a "P*" analysis.

Discussion of the general concept and approach led to creation of a system of dimensions composed of multiple tiers that are scored to provide a value that can be used to select the appropriate probability of overfishing for each stock. Each stock evaluated receives a single "adjustment factor", which is the sum of tier scores across dimensions and which ultimately determines the amount of buffer or separation between OFL and ABC. Adjustment factors are subtracted from the "base probability of overfishing" to provide the "critical probability". The base probability of overfishing is the value used to determine OFL. The critical probability is a probability of overfishing that is used to determine ABC in the same manner that the base probability is used to determine MSY and OFL. Through this process, tier scores equate to an adjustment in the probability of overfishing occurring, and do not represent, or necessarily correspond to, a specific poundage or percentage of the OFL. Recommended ABC values are derived from probability density functions that provide the probability of overfishing occurring for any particular yield.

## Control Rule Characteristics

The SSC began deliberations by developing a list of desirable characteristics and principles for ABC control rules. These included:

- Incorporate a tiered system based on data and assessment information availability
- Include objective criteria with numerical scoring that can be applied to all stocks
- Incorporate stock status
- Reflect the degree to which uncertainty is characterized
- Acknowledge the cumulative nature of uncertainty
- Provide a means to incorporate vulnerability and life history traits, ideally through inclusion of productivity-susceptibility analyses (PSA) scores
- Provide flexibility to accommodate a wide range of biological characteristics, assessment methods and information, data availability, and assessment age
- Provide an objective means of incorporating potential changes in data and assessment information availability over time

## Control Rule Dimensions

The SSC incorporated these general characteristics and principles into a series of tiers and dimensions that form the foundation of the control rule. Four dimensions are included in the proposed control rule framework: assessment information, characterization of uncertainty, stock status, and productivity/susceptibility of the stock. Each dimension contains multiple levels or tiers that can be evaluated for each stock to determine a numerical score for the dimension. The four dimensions and their tiers are described in detail in the following section and summarized in Table 1. Application to particular stocks is illustrated in Table 2.

*Dimension 1. Assessment Information*

The assessment information dimension reflects available data and assessment outputs. The five tiers within this dimension range from a full quantitative assessment which provides biomass, exploitation, and MSY-based reference points to the bottom tier for those stocks which lack reliable catch records.

The age or degree of reliability of an assessment can be incorporated when determining the scoring for an individual stock. For example, a stock having a pre-SEDAR assessment may be ranked at a lower tier despite that assessment having the required outputs for a higher tier, because the reliability of an output value cannot be determined or the method by which an output was obtained is not clearly documented. Estimates from an assessment may be considered

unreliable or inapplicable when considered at a later date (e.g. assumed equilibrium conditions may have changed). Similarly, an age-aggregated assessment approach may provide an estimate of MSY, but in some instances such estimates may be considered less reliable than estimates from an age-structured approach. The intent is that tier rankings are based on the data and outputs considered reliable at the time the ranking is made. Scores for these tiers increase as the level of available information declines.

Assessment Information Tiers Scoring

1. Quantitative assessment provides estimates of exploitation and biomass; includes MSY-derived benchmarks. (0)
2. Quantitative assessment provides estimates of either exploitation or biomass, but not MSY benchmarks; requires proxy reference points. (-2.5)
3. Quantitative assessment that provides relative measures of exploitation or biomass; absolute measures of status are unavailable; references may be based on proxy. (-5)
4. Reliable catch history available (-7.5)
5. Scarce or unreliable catch records (-10)

*Dimension 2. Characterization of Uncertainty*

This dimension is considered critical because it specifically addresses language in the MSRA stating that ABC should be reduced from OFL to account for assessment uncertainty. Because accounting for uncertainty tends to be a cumulative process, an incomplete or partial accounting of know uncertainties will tend to underestimate the underlying uncertainty in the results. Tiers for this dimension reflect how well uncertainty is characterized, not the actual magnitude of the uncertainty. The magnitude is incorporated through the assessment and is reflected in the distribution of yield estimates. Adjustment scores for this tier increase as the degree and completeness of uncertainty characterizations decrease..

Uncertainty Tiers, Examples, and Scoring

1. Complete. This tier is for assessments providing a complete statistical (e.g. Bayesian re-sampling approach) treatment of major uncertainties, incorporating both observed data and environmental variability, which are carried forward into reference point calculations and stock projections. A key determinant of this level is that uncertainty in both assessment inputs and environmental conditions are included. (0)

   Example: No currently assessed stocks meet this level.

2. High. This tier represents those assessments that include re-sampling (e.g. Bootstrap or Monte Carlo techniques) of important or critical inputs such as natural mortality, landings, discard rates, age and growth parameters. Such re-sampling is also carried forward and combined with recruitment uncertainty for projections and reference point calculations, including reference point distributions. . The key determinant for this level is that reference point estimates distributions reflect more than just uncertainty in future recruitment. (-2.5)

   Example: SEDAR 4, South Atlantic snowy grouper and tilefish.

3. Medium: This tier represents assessments in which key uncertainties are addressed via statistical techniques and sensitivities, but the full uncertainties are not carried forward into the projections and reference point calculations. Projections may, however, reflect uncertainty in recruitment and population abundance. Although outputs include distributions of F, $F_{MSY}$ as in the 'High' category above, in this category fewer uncertainties are addressed in developing such distributions. One example for this level is a distribution of $F_{MSY}$ which only reflects uncertainty in recruitment. (-5)

   Examples: SEDAR 15, South Atlantic red snapper and greater amberjack; SEDAR 17, South Atlantic Spanish mackerel and vermilion snapper

4. Low. This tier represents those assessments lacking any statistical treatment of uncertainty. Sensitivity runs or explorations of multiple assessment models may be available. The key determinant for this level is that distributions for reference points are lacking. (-7.5)

   Example: SEDAR 2, South Atlantic black sea bass

5. None. This tier represents assessments that only provide single point estimates, with no sensitivities or other evaluation of uncertainties. (-10)

Example: None.

*Dimension 3. Stock Status*

Stock status is included among the dimensions so that an additional adjustment to ABC can be added for stocks that are overfished or overfishing. Five tiers are included, ranging from a high biomass and low exploitation level where no additional buffer is applied to the situation where either is unknown and the highest buffering is applied. With the exception of distinguishing between the top two tiers which both reflect stocks that are neither overfished nor experiencing overfishing, application of these tiers is straightforward and based directly on the

final status determinations, independent of the sensitivity or uncertainty in that final determination. Scores for these tiers increase for decreasing and unknown stock status.

Stock Status Tiers and Scoring.

1. Neither overfished nor overfishing, and stock is at high biomass and low exploitation relative to benchmark values. (0)
2. Neither overfished nor overfishing, but stock may be in close proximity to benchmark values (-2.5)
3. Stock is either overfished or overfishing (-5)
4. Stock is both overfished and overfishing (-7.5)
5. Either status criterion is unknown. (-10)

*Dimension 4. Productivity and Susceptibility Considerations*

The final dimension addresses biological characteristics of the stock. This includes productivity, which reflects a population's reproductive potential, and susceptibility to overfishing, which reflects a stocks propensity to be harvested by various fishing gears. Efforts to quantify these characteristics, generally termed "PSA analyses", typically incorporate a variety of life history characteristics in a framework that distills many metrics into a single risk score. The two primary approaches currently available, one from NMFS and the other from MRAG, follow similar procedures, but incorporate slight differences in how characteristics are scored and how missing information is addressed. For example, the MRAG formulation incorporates a scoring value for parameter for which values are unknown into the overall score, whereas the NMFS formulation omits from scoring those parameters where the values are unknown.

After presentations on both approaches and considerable discussion on their differences, the SSC decided to incorporate the MRAG formulation of PSA into the SAFMC ABC control rule. The SSC believed this approach to be preferable based on the broad suite of attributes considered in the scoring and the inclusion of unknowns in the scoring. In general, it is believed that including unknowns in the scoring will provide stronger encouragement to address the unknown parameters since doing so will in many cases tend to moderate the buffer contributed by the PSA value. Further, because unknown information contributes to overall uncertainty,

accounting for potential unknowns in the scoring is consistent with the underlying control rule framework.

PSA Tiers and Scoring

1. Low Risk. High productivity, low vulnerability and susceptibility, score <2.64[1] (0)
2. Moderate Risk. Moderate productivity, vulnerability, susceptibility, score 2.64-3.18[1] (-5)
3. High Risk. Low productivity, high vulnerability and susceptibility, score >3.18[1] (-10)

[1]Scores as described in Hobday *et al.*, 2007

## Determining Total Adjustment and Final ABC Recommendations

The uncertainty buffer, or difference between OFL and ABC, is expressed in terms of a reduction in the "probability of overfishing", or "P*". The adjustment score provided by the tiers and dimensions represents the amount by which P* is reduced to obtain the critical value for P*.Therefore, the key product of the control rule is the sum the scores for all the dimensions because that is the ABC adjustment factor that is used to calculate the critical value for P* from the base P*. The scoring of tiers within dimensions is designed to provide a maximum P* adjustment of 40% and a minimum of 0%. When applied to the base MSY specified at the 50% level, this range of possible adjustment results in a range of critical values for P* from 10% to 50%. These critical values are then used to determine the actual ABC using projection tables that provide the level of annual yield that corresponds to a particular P*.

The ABC adjustment factor is obtained by summing the scores across dimensions once the data are evaluated and tier assignments are made within each dimension. The scoring system is designed so that low values are assigned for the 'best' circumstances and the values increase as circumstances worsen. Considering dimension 1 for example, a stock which has an assessment providing estimates of biomass, exploitation, and MSY-based reference points would have a score of 0, while a stock which is unassessed and has unreliable catch records would receive a score of 10. Each stock will be categorized by tiers before the score is tallied so that categorizations are made independent of the final outcome.

The critical P* is expressed as a probability of overfishing and is derived by subtracting the ABC adjustment factor from 50%. For example, if the adjustment factor (sum of the

dimension scores) is 20, the critical value for P* will be 30% (50%-20), and the ABC recommendation will be based on a 30% probability of overfishing occurring in the year for which the recommendation is made. Note that, due to varying shapes in the distribution of estimated yield, it is unlikely that the observed difference between MSY and ABC will equal the difference between the P* that defines MSY and the critical P*, and it is also unlikely the two stocks receiving identical critical P* values will reflect equal differences between ABC and OFL when such differences are compared in weight units.

Setting ABC equal to OFL implies a P* equal to 50%, where 50% represents the chance of overfishing occurring. Reducing P* will reduce ABC and provide a reduction in the probability of overfishing occurring. The relationship between the amount of reduction in P* and the resulting reduction in ABC is determined by the shape of the distribution of yield about the management parameters. For a given reduction in P*, broad distributions (suggesting higher uncertainty) will result in larger reductions in ABC whereas narrower distributions (suggesting lower uncertainty) will result in smaller reductions in ABC.

Using the ABC control rule described here, the range of P* that is considered acceptable is from 50% to 10%. This range was derived after considering Council guidance directing the SSC to consider ABCs based on probabilities of overfishing between 10% and 40%, general guidance under the MSA that management actions must have at least a 50% chance of success, and the common practice of specifying MSY based on the midpoint of a distribution of possible outcomes. The top tier in each dimension does not reduce P*, so the ABC recommendation for a stock receiving the top score across all dimensions would be the same as the OFL recommendation and there would be no buffer applied between ABC and OFL. While this may be perceived as potentially risk-prone, and inconsistent with some interpretations of the language describing ABC with regard to OFL, the only situation in which this would occur in this framework is for a stock with a complete assessment including full, probability-based uncertainty evaluations that is at low exploitation and high biomass, and is considered highly productive with low vulnerability and susceptibility. It should be noted that none of the stocks examined so far meet these criteria, and those stocks that have not been examined lack stock assessments and therefore they too will fail to meet these criteria.

The SSC considered whether each dimension should be equally scored and contribute the same relative weight to the final adjustment factor. After discussing various weighting schemes and approaches, the SSC determined that there was insufficient justification at this time to weight any particular dimension greater than another as all are considered important to objectively evaluating overall uncertainty. However, the SSC also recognizes that this could change and the ABC could be modified in the future if evidence develops that suggests one dimension should be more influential than the others.

The SSC is cognizant that ABCs, and the degree of separation between ABC and OFL, will be compared across stocks when recommendations are reviewed. The SSC also recognizes the importance of being consistent when evaluating the level of information for a wide range of stocks. In discussing ways of promoting consistency when multiple stocks must be evaluated, the SSC decided that tier assignments should be made within a single dimension for all stocks under consideration, as opposed to evaluating single stocks across all dimensions. This will help ensure that the data level for each stock is evaluated relative to and consistent with other stocks being considered. It is anticipated that approaching the process in this order will help avoid situations where stocks with similar conditions receive different tier ratings.

## Overfished Stocks and Rebuilding Plan Selection

The adjustment factor can also be used to derive a probability of rebuilding success for selecting rebuilding schedules. The probability of rebuilding success is determined by subtracting the P* critical value from 100%, such that stocks with high P* values could be managed using a rebuilding schedule that approaches the 50% level commonly used now, and those with the lowest P* values will require rebuilding schedules with higher probability of success, up to a maximum of 90%.

The adjustment factor for stocks achieving the lowest scores across all dimension would be 0, resulting in a P* of 50% which would lead to recommendation of a rebuilding schedule with a 50% (100-50) probability of success by the end of the rebuilding period (Tmax), consistent with most current rebuilding schedules. The adjustment factor for stocks receiving the highest scores across all dimensions would be 40%, resulting in a critical P* of 10% (50 baseline – 40 for buffer adjustment) and compelling a recommendation for rebuilding projections based on 90% probability of success by the end of the rebuilding period.

Values for the rebuilding success probability are provided for all stocks in Table 2 for illustration of the concept, although in application only stocks with status 'overfished' would require this parameter. Because the decisions required to develop the rebuilding plan are the same ones required to develop ABC, this framework allows estimation of both the rebuilding schedules and the final yield for a rebuilt stock from a single set of decisions. The only change required once a stock reaches the rebuilt status would be to calculate an updated adjustment factor reflecting the change in stock status from 'overfished' to 'not overfished and not overfishing'. Any such changes can be evaluated efficiently and quickly, and the system is essentially self-adjusting to critical events such as a change in stock status because the criteria and scorings are all determined in advance.

Using red porgy as an example, the total buffer adjustment factor of 15 results in a critical P* of 35% (50% baseline – buffer adjustment of 15) and a rebuilding probability of success of 65% (100% baseline – P* of 35). However, once the stock is rebuilt and the stock is neither overfished nor is overfishing occurring, scoring within the status dimension changes from tier 3 (adjustment value of 5) to tier 2 (adjustment value of 2.5) and the overall adjustment factor decreases by 2.5 to 12.5. The expected critical P* for the rebuilt stock becomes 37.5 and the expected ABC for the rebuilt stock can be determined from the probability distribution table of MSY at equilibrium or rebuilt conditions. In management terms, the resultant recommendations for red porgy would be to select a rebuilding plan with at least a 65% chance of achieving $SSB>SSB_{MSY}$ within the allotted rebuilding time period, followed by a recommendation to manage not to exceed a 37.5% chance of overfishing occurring once the stock is rebuilt.

## Depletion Threshold

The NS1 guidelines state that an 'ABC control rule…may establish a stock abundance level below which fishing would not be allowed.' Currently the Pacific Fishery Management Council uses a 10% threshold. Specifically, if biomass is estimated below 10% of the virgin condition, then directed fishing is not allowed. The SAFMC SSC supports the concept of a depletion threshold and elimination of directed fishing when SSB falls below the threshold, and recommends that the threshold be established at 10% of unfished conditions. The SSC will recommend that directed fishing not be allowed if there is a reliable indication that current

biomass is at or below 10% of the unfished biomass or, in cases where biomass estimates are considered unreliable, if SPR is at or below 10%.

## Future Control Rule Modifications

The SSC began working on this ABC control rule in June 2008, following approval of the MSRA but before finalization of revised National Standard Guidelines and before finalization of implementation guidelines. The Final Rule on establishing ACL's became available during the period that the SSC discussed the control rule and helped direct this final version. Although the SSC believes the rule described herein is consistent with the language of the MSRA and ACL Final Rule, and that Council guidance as to the overall acceptable level of risk and base P* that determines MSY and OFL is considered and incorporated, the Committee recognizes that this rule may require modification in the future as final guidance on MSRA implementation becomes available. The Committee also recognizes that this document provides scientific advice to the Council, which will ultimately adopt the Control Rule and in so doing may make modifications.

Experience in applying the rule and future scientific advances may also trigger changes in the control rule. Although the SSC attempted to consider the full range of situations and scenarios expected across stocks managed by the South Atlantic Council, it is acknowledged that situations may arise that cause difficulties in actual application and interpretation the rule and hinder the resultant ABC recommendations. Changes in the dimensions, tiers, and scoring approach may be needed in the future as the rule is tested through application to the many stocks managed by the Council. Further development in methods of analyzing and expressing probabilities of overfishing could also lead to changes in how ABC is determined from the adjustment factor provided by the control rule. Finally, the eight SSCs of the eight Fishery Management Councils are all working along a similar path to develop ABC control rules. These SSCs include many of the top fisheries scientists in the Country and it is expected that many good ideas will emerge from this collective effort. Such ideas will be shared amongst all SSCs through the annual National SSC Meetings initiated in 2008, and the SAFMC SSC intends to take full advantage of the insights, shared experiences, and potential improvements to ABC control rules offered by such national collaboration.

Table 1. Hierarchy of dimensions and tiers within dimensions used to characterize uncertainty associated with stock assessments in the South Atlantic. Parenthetical values indicate (1) the maximum adjustment value for a dimension; and (2) the adjustment values for each tier within a dimension.

I. Assessment Information (10%)
1. Quantitative assessment provides estimates of exploitation and biomass; includes MSY-derived benchmarks. (0%)
2. Reliable measures of exploitation or biomass; no MSY benchmarks, proxy reference points. (2.5%)
3. Relative measures of exploitation or biomass, absolute measures of status unavailable. Proxy reference points. (5%)
4. Reliable catch history. (7.5%)
5. Scarce or unreliable catch records. (10%)

II. Uncertainty Characterization (10%)
1. **Complete**. Key Determinant – uncertainty in both assessment inputs and environmental conditions are included. (0%)
2. **High**. Key Determinant – reflects more than just uncertainty in future recruitment. (2.5%)
3. **Medium**. Uncertainties are addressed via statistical techniques and sensitivities, but full uncertainty is not carried forward in projections. (5%)
4. **Low**. Distributions of Fmsy and MSY are lacking. (7.5%)
5. **None**. Only single point estimates; no sensitivities or uncertainty evaluations. (10%)

III. Stock Status (10%)
1. Neither overfished nor overfishing. Stock is at high biomass and low exploitation relative to benchmark values. (0%)
2. Neither overfished nor overfishing. Stock may be in close proximity to benchmark values. (2.5%)
3. Stock is either overfished or overfishing. (5%)
4. Stock is both overfished and overfishing. (7.5%)
5. Either status criterion is unknown. (10%)

IV. Productivity and Susceptibility – Risk Analysis (10%)
1. **Low risk**. High productivity, low vulnerability, low susceptibility. (0%)
2. **Medium risk**. Moderate productivity, moderate vulnerability, moderate susceptibility. (5%)
3. **High risk**. Low productivity, high vulnerability, high susceptibility. (10%)

Table 2. Example of tier assignments, scores, adjustment factors, and critical probability values as applied to assessed stocks in the South Atlantic.

| Stock | | Dimension I | II | III | IV | Adjustment Factor (total score) | Critical P* | P(Successful Rebuild) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Golden Tilefish | Tier Within Dimension | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | | 32.5 | 67.5 |
| | Score | 0.0 | 2.5 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 17.5 | | |
| Snowy Grouper | Tier Within Dimension | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | | 30.0 | 70.0 |
| | Score | 0.0 | 2.5 | 7.5 | 10.0 | 20.0 | | |
| Gag Grouper | Tier Within Dimension | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | 30.0 | 70.0 |
| | Score | 0.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 20.0 | | |
| Red Snapper | Tier Within Dimension | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | | 30.0 | 70.0 |
| | Score | 2.5 | 5.0 | 7.5 | 5.0 | 20.0 | | |
| Vermilion Snapper | Tier Within Dimension | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | | 27.5 | 72.5 |
| | Score | 2.5 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 22.5 | | |
| Black Sea Bass | Tier Within Dimension | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | | 35.0 | 65.0 |
| | Penalty | 0.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 15.0 | | |
| Red Porgy | Tier Within Dimension | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | | 35.0 | 65.0 |
| | Score | 0.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 15.0 | | |
| Yellowtail Snapper | Tier Within Dimension | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | | 37.5 | 62.5 |
| | Score | 0.0 | 5.0 | 2.5 | 5.0 | 12.5 | | |
| Hogfish | Tier Within Dimension | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | | 12.5 | 88.5 |
| | Score | 7.5 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 37.5 | | |
| Goliath Grouper | Tier Within Dimension | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | | 12.5 | 88.5 |
| | Score | 7.5 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 37.5 | | |
| Mutton Snapper | Tier Within Dimension | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | | 32.5 | 67.5 |
| | Score | 0.0 | 5.0 | 2.5 | 10.0 | 17.5 | | |
| Greater Amberjack | Tier Within Dimension | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | | 37.5 | 62.5 |
| | Score | 0.0 | 5.0 | 2.5 | 5.0 | 12.5 | | |
| King Mackerel | Tier Within Dimension | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | | 27.5 | 72.5 |
| | Score | 5.0 | 5.0 | 2.5 | 10.0 | 22.5 | | |
| Spanish Mackerel | Tier Within Dimension | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | | 25.0 | 75.0 |
| | Score | 5.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 25.0 | | |