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## SUMMARY

An analysis was made of length frequency data collected between 1990 and 1991 from landings of commercial reef fish in Koror. Most samples were collected from the main landing site at the Palau Federation of Fishing Associations (PFFA). Commercial landings data for reef fish species at PFFA between 1976 and 1990 were also summarised and used as supplementary information for this preliminary assessment.

The length data were used to generate life-history parameters which in turn were used to assess the status of the stocks and the optimum minimum sizes at first capture. The data suggested that at present Palau's reef fish stocks are only moderately exploited, with observed minimum capture lengths similar to optimum capture lengths predicted from the length-frequency data. The notable exception was the humphead wrasse or maml (Cheilinus undulatus), for which the average size at first capture considerably lower than the optimum generated from length-frequency analysis.

A nominal estimate was made of reef fish yield in Palau, based on an empirical subsistence catch figure and the volume of commercial landings. The results suggested that Palau's reef fish stocks were moderately exploited and supported conclusions derived from length-frequency data analysis.

Based on the analysis of length-frequency data, an initial minimum mesh size of three inches is suggested for kesokes, and other seine and gill nets deployed in Palau. Specific conservation measures may be necessary for certain species such as maml and the large parrotfish or kemedukl \{Bolbometopon muricatum). It was recommended that a size limit of 70 cm be imposed on catches of maml and that exports of both species be prohibited.

The data presented here for other reef species may also useful for setting size limits if required, in conjunction with the conservation measures proposed by Johannes ${ }^{1}$ for a range of reef fish species in Palau.

Collection of further data is recommended to corroborate the initial conclusions gained from this preliminary study. Further attempts should also be made to estimate the total reef fish harvest, including the subsistence catch and the volume of non-commercial reef fish exports from Palau.

[^0]
## RESUME

Une analyse a été faite des données de fréquence de tailles, recueillies entre 1990 et 1991 à partir des quantités de poissons de récif d'importance commerciale débarquées à Koror. La plupart des échantillons ont été prélevés au principal point de débarquement, que constitue la Fédération des associations de pêcheurs de Palau (PFFA). Les données concernant les quantités de poissons de récif d'importance commerciale débarquées à la PFFA entre 1976 et 1990 ont également été récapitulées et utilisées comme information complémentaire aux fins de cette première évaluation.

Les données de fréquence de tailles ont permis d'établir les paramètres du cycle de vie, lesquels ont à leur tour permis d'évaluer l'état des stocks et la taille minimale à la première capture. Ces données ont également permis de conclure qu'en l'état actuel des choses, les stocks de poissons de récif à Palau ne sont exploités que modérément, la longueur minimale des captures observée des captures étant semblable à la longueur optimale, déterminée à partir des données de fréquence des tailles. Le napoléon ou maml (Cheilinus undulatuś) est la seule grande exception, dont la taille moyenne à la première capture a été considérablement inférieure à la taille optimale dérivée de l'analyse des données de fréquence des tailles.

Une évaluation nominale des prises de poisson de récif débarquées à Palau a été faite à partir de données empiriques sur les prises destinées à l'autoconsommation et du volume des prises de la pêche industrielle. Les résultats ont permis de constater que les stocks de poissons de récif à Palau étaient modérément exploités et d'étayer les conclusions de l'analyse des données de la fréquence des tailles.

A partir de cette analyse des données, il a été proposé dans un premier temps un maillage minimum de trois pouces pour les kesokes (filets) et autres sennes et filets maillants utilisés à Palau. L'adoption de mesures spéciales pourrait se révéler nécessaire pour protéger certaines espèces comme le maml et le gros perroquet à bosse, dit kemedukl (Bolbometopon muricatum). Il a donc été recommandé de limiter à 70 cm la taille des prises de maml et d'interdire les exportations des deux espèces.

Les données présentées sur les autres espèces récifales dans le document qui fait l'objet du présent résumé pourraient également se révéler utiles s'il devenait nécessaire d'imposer des limites pour la taille des prises d'individus de ces espèces et de prendre les mesures de protection proposées par Johannes ${ }^{2}$ dans son ouvrage pour une variété d'espèces récifales à Palau.

Il est recommandé de recueillir des informations complémentaires pour corroborer les conclusions de cette étude préliminaire. Il conviendrait également de s'employer à évaluer une nouvelle fois la totalité des prises de poissons de récif, et notamment les prises destinées à l'autoconsommation et le volume des exportations de prises non commercialisables effectuées par Palau.
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## INTRODUCTION

The Republic of Palau lies in the Western Pacific Ocean, between $131^{\circ}-135^{\circ} \mathrm{E}$ and $2^{\circ}-8^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$, and forms the western boundary of Micronesia (Fig 1). Most of the islands that form the Palau Archipelago are fringed with coral reefs. To the west there is a barrier reef that extends in a north-south direction for about 440 km . Harvests of reef fish have a been a traditional source of animal protein for Palauans and continue to form a major component of the diet. A strong domestic demand for fish from the local population, the growing tourist and restaurant industry-has formed an additional market for the disposal of reef fish catches. Further, the growing demand for reef fish from overseas markets has led to the development of exports of reef fish to Guam and Saipan.


Figure 1. Map of the Palau Archipelago showing the major islands

Despite the importance of reef fish in the subsistence and domestic economies, there is relatively little written information on the, status of reef fish stocks in PaJau. The only documented stock assessment of an inshore species is a study on the small stolephorid anchovy, Encrasicholina heteroloba ( $=$ Stolephorus heterolobus), used for live bait by the now defunct pole-and-line fishery (Muller 1976). Some studies have been carried out on the biology of rabbitfish (Siganidae) in Palau (Drew 1973; May et al. 1974; Hasse et al. 1977); but these, have not addressed the question of the effects of exploitation on these or amy: odther, reeff finshpopulationss.

Such limited information on inshore reef fish stocks is common throughout Micronesia and indeed in the rest of the tropical Pacific. Izumi (1988) presents a convenient summary of the published and unpublished documents concerning Palau's fisheries, including reef fish stocks. More recently Preston (1990) has reviewed most of the relevant information on inshore reef fisheries in Palau with the aim of formulating management proposals for the conservation of these stocks. Perhaps the most notable study of reef fisheries in Palau is the documentation during the 1970s of Palauans' rich heritage of traditional fisheries knowledge by R.E. Johannes in his book Words of the Lagoon (Johannes 1981). In the summaries of the principal target fishes in the inshore fishery, Johannes noted that Palauans expressed concern about the declining abundance of certain species.

Recently, Johannes (1991) carried out a short-term follow-up study of Palau's inshore fisheries and found that fishermen were still worried about the declining abundance of the same species reported in the earlier study. Preston (1990) recommended that a regular collection of length-frequency data be undertaken by the Palau Marine Resources Division to obtain estimates of growth and mortality parameters for the commonly exploited species, particularly those about which fishermen had expressed concern.

In this report, we present results of the analysis of length data collected between 1990 and 1991 and, where possible, make comparisons with length-frequency data collected during the early 1980s. The results were used in combination with a 14 -year time series of commercial catch data to assess the status of the commonly exploited species and to make management recommendations for the conservation of these stocks.

## METHODS

## Fishing methods and data collection

Most catch and length-frequency data were collected at the Palau Federation of Fishing Associations (PFFA) fish market, located at Malakal on Koror. Catch and length-frequency data were also collected from several smaller markets. Data on landings at the PFFA have been recorded since 1976 through copies of receipts issued at each financial transaction. Species names are recorded in Palauan, along with the name of the fisherman landing the catch. Some species are grouped under a collective grouping, but most of the important catch components are recorded singly. Summaries of the PFFA data are included in this report to show the composition of the landings and the trends in the volumes landed. These data do not represent the total commercial catch but account for between 50 and 70 per cent of landings from commercial fishing.

Johannes (1981) has documented the different gears employed by Palauans to catch fish. The principal gears used by commercial fishermen are nets, spears, handlines and trolling lines. The most common net-fishing method employed by commercial fishermen is the V-shaped stationary barrier net, known locally as kesokes. The kesokes is set on the reef flat to catch fish as they move into deeper water during the tidal ebb. Mesh sizes employed to construct kesokes are variable but fishermen landing catches into PFFA reportedly use 2.5 inch $(6.35 \mathrm{~cm})$ mesh net for the terminal portion of the kesokes.

Spearfishing underwater is common in Palau. Palauans make their own spear-guns rather than buying expensive commercially manufactured models. Two types of spear-gun are manufactured: a short model $(0.75-1.0 \mathrm{~m})$ used predominantly for night fishing in shallow water and a longer model ( $2.0-2.5 \mathrm{~m}$ ) for fishing during the day in deeper water. Spearfishing is normally practised with snorkels but recently, some fishermen have taken to using SCUBA gear to extend the range of fishing into depths beyond those accessible to free diving.

Handline fishing is carried out with monofilament nylon fishing lines (18-23 kg breaking strain) wound onto home-made reels or a piece of wood. Hook sizes commonly employed for handlining are Mustad

Nos. 5, 6 and 7. Baits employed for handline fishing include tuna, squid, octopus, sardines and sea cucumber.

## Length-frequency analysis

Length data on 44 reef fish species were collected at the PFFA fish market between February 1990 and April 1991. Lengths were measured to the nearest 0.1 cm from the snout tip to the caudal fork, except for fish with a rounded or truncate tail, for which total length was recorded. Length frequencies were then aggregated on a monthly basis in $1.0,2.0$ or 5.0 cm length classes, depending on the species and the maximum size attained.

Length-frequency data were analysed with the ELEFAN suite of programs (Pauly 1987) to determine growth, mortality and recruitment parameters, and to compute relative yield-per-recruit estimates for different sizes at recruitment to the fishery.

The following protocol was adopted using the ELEFAN approach. Growth in Palauan reef fish was assumed to conform to the von Bertalanffy growth function (VGBF) which takes the form for growth in length of:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& L_{t}-L_{\alpha}\left(1-e^{-K(t-t)}\right) \\
& \left.L_{t}-L S I-e^{\wedge}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $L_{\mu}$ is the asymptotic length, $K$ is a growth coefficient, $L t$ is length at time $t$ and $t_{0}$ is the origin of the growth curve.
Weatherall (1986) showed that the asymptotic length, $\mathrm{L}_{\mu}$, can be determined from length-frequency data by plotting the mean lengths $\left(\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{m}}\right)$ of a successive series of partially overlapping subsamples against the minimum cutoff length of each length class ( $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ). Pauly (1986) suggested a modification of this method where $L_{m}-L_{c}$ was plotted on $L_{c}$. This gives a descending line with an intercept on the ordinate equivalent to $\mathrm{L}_{\mu}$. This modification of Weatherall's method is incorporated into the ELEFAN suite within the ELEFAN II program.

The asymptotic length for each species set considered here was estimated from the application of Weatherall's method to the length-frequency data. These were used as inputs into the computer ELEFAN I along with values of K for the same or similar species taken from the literature. The program ELEFAN I will fit a growth curve to restructured sequential length-frequency data by iteration given seeded values of $\mathrm{L}_{\mu}$ and K . The restructuring of the length-frequency data is achieved by the use of a simple high-pass filter or running average described by Pauly \& David (1981).

After growth parameters had been estimated, the values of $\mathrm{L}_{\mu}$, and K were used to convert the length classes to relative ages and the summed frequencies to length-converted catch-curves. The descending slope of the right-hand limb of these catch-curves takes the form:

$$
\log _{\varepsilon}(N i / \Delta t)=a t+b t
$$

where t is the age of the fish, Dt is the time taken to grow through one-age class (i) and Ni is the number of fish in length-class (i). A regression of $\log _{e}(\mathrm{Ni} / \mathrm{Dt})$ against t for the descending limb of the catch-curve gives the intercept (a) and the slope of the line (b) which is also the total mortality rate (Z).

This routine is a function of ELEFAN II. An estimate of the natural mortality rate (M) is also computed in the same routine from the empirical equation of Pauly (1980):

$$
\log _{10} M=-0.0066-\log _{10} L_{\mu}+0.6543 \log _{10} K+0.4634 \log _{10} T
$$

where $L \mu$, and $K$ are the parameters of the von Bertalanffy equation and $T$ is the mean environmental temperature, here set at $28^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

From the estimation of Z and M , ELEFAN II estimates the fishing mortality rate from:

$$
F=Z-M
$$

and the exploitation rate (E) from:

$$
E=F / Z
$$

Following the estimation of mortality rates from the length-converted catch-curve, the ascending limb can be used to generate a resultant curve which expresses the interaction of gear selection with recruitment. The slope of the descending limb of the catch-curve is projected backwards, accounting for the decrease in fishing mortality to zero at the smallest size-classes. This generates a series of expected frequencies for the length-classes prior to full recruitment. The ratio of the observed values of the left hand-limb of the catch curve to the expected values from the backward projection generates points that can then be used to construct a logistic ('S'-shaped) curve or ogive.

The probability of retention by the fishing gear becomes greater as fish size increases, up to the apex of the catch-curve, where 100 per cent of the fish are retained. The average length at first capture ( $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ) or minimum capture length, is conventionally defined as the length at which 50 per cent of the fish are retained by the gear, and can be read off from the selection ogive. This procedure is performed automatically as a sub-routine of ELEFAN II.

The relative yield per recruit (YPR) (Beverton \& Holt 1957) for each species was calculated for a range of $L_{c}$ values to determine the optimum first capture length for each species. The optimum minimum first capture length is the size at which the relative yield per recruit is maximised. The relative yield per recruit was estimated from:

$$
Y P R=E(1-c)^{M / K}\left\{\frac{1-3(1-c)}{1+(1-E) /(M / K)}+\frac{3(1-c)^{2}}{1+2(1-E) /(M / K)}-\frac{(1-c)^{2}}{1+3(1-E) /(M / K)}\right\}
$$

where $\mathrm{c}=\mathrm{Lc} / \mathrm{L}_{\mu}$. This model is a simplified version of the yield-per-recruit formulation developed by Beverton \& Holt (1966),in which the only inputs for each species are c and M/K. This version of the model assumes a 'knife-edge selection' in which, above a certain critical length, all fish in a given stock are equally vulnerable to the fishing gear.

## RESULTS

## Length-frequency analysis

## General

For eight reef species sufficient length-frequency data were available for estimation of growth parameters with ELEFAN I. A summary of monthly sample sizes for these is given in Appendix I, together with length data for the large parrotfish, Bolbometopon muricatum and the wrasse, Cheilinus undulatus, for which some analyses were also attempted. Although the samples for these species were rather small, declines in their catches after peak landings in the mid-1980s have prompted concerns about the conservation of these stocks. This is particularly important for B. muricatum, which accounted for about 10 per cent of the total landings at PFFA between 1976 and 1990. The wrasse, C. undulatus, has traditional social significance; it is considered to be the best quality fish in Palau and is served to clan chiefs during ritual gatherings.

## Growth and mortality parameters

Estimates of growth and mortality rates generated from the application of ELEFAN I to the lengthfrequency data sets are summarised in Table 1. Estimates of $\mathrm{L}_{\mu}$, could be computed for B. muricatum and C. undulatus, but, as well as the fact that onily a small sample was available, their size and probable growth rates make them unsuitable for use with ELEFAN I. Monthly growth increments in the length data are probably too small and for the larger size-classes, a small length range may contain a wide variety of different year-classes. Instead, an arbitrary value of $K=0.1$ was used, which is comparable to the growth coefficient of similar large, slow-growing tropical demersal fish ${ }^{3}$.

Table 1: Growth and mortality parameters for ten reef fish species caught by commercial fishing in Palau

| Species |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L |  | K | Z | M | F | E |
| Bolbometopon muricatum | 106.4 | 0.100 | 0.398 | 0.278 | .0 .120 | .0 .302 |
| Cheilinus undulatus | 137.5 | 0.100 | 0.479 | 0.259 | 0.220 | 0.459 |
| Hipposcarus longiceps | 43.9 | 0.500 | 1.667 | 1.020 | 0.647 | 0.388 |
| Lethrinus ramak | 34.5 | 0.380 | 1.486 | 0.912 | 0.574 | 0.386 |
| Lutjanus gibbus | 39.8 | 0.400 | 1.144 | 0.906 | 0.238 | 0.208 |
| Naso lituratus | 35.1 | 0.350 | 1.683 | 0.860 | 0.823 | 0.489 |
| Naso unicornis | 57.0 | 0.140 | 0.683 | 0.413 | 0.270 | 0.395 |
| Siganus argenteus | 31.0 | 0.750 | 3.077 | 1.466 | 1.611 | 0.524 |
| Siganus canaliculatus | 28.1 | 1.950 | 5.717 | 2.816 | 2.901 | 0.507 |
| Siganus lineatus | 33.6 | 0.600 | 2.739 | 1.239 | 1.500 | 0.548 |

The length-converted catch-curves for the different reef fishes are shown in Figure 2. The exploitation rates of the different reef fishes ranged from a low of 0.2 for L. gibbus to 0.55 for S. lineatus, with a mean of 0.42 . Gulland (1971) has suggested that when the fishing mortality rate is equivalent to the

[^2]natural mortality rate $(F=M)$, a stock is optimally exploited or that $E_{\text {opt }}=0.5$. More recently, Pauly (1984), based on Beddington \& Cooke (1983), suggested a more conservative optimal exploitation rate, when the fishing mortality rate is 40 per cent of the natural mortality rate or $\mathrm{E}_{\text {opl }}=0.3$. From the exploitation rates reported here, most species would appear to be at or below the optimum fishing mortality defined by Gulland (1971) but above the optimum fishing mortality defined by Pauly (1984). Overall, the results suggest that reef fish stocks in Palau are at, or approaching, the optimum level of exploitation.

## Optimumcapturelengthandoptimummeshsize

The first-capture length $\left(\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{c}}\right)$ at which the YPR was maximised and the actual length at first capture observed from the length-frequency data are given in Table 2. The YPR model predicts that yields will be maximised at lengths between 50 and 65 per cent of the asymptotic length. For S. argenteus, $L$. ramak, $H$. longiceps, and especially $C$. undulatus, the predicted optimum first-capture lengths are larger than the $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{c}}$ values observed in the fishery.

The differences between the predicted and observed values for the siganids, emperor and parrotfish are small and suggest that raising the first capture length would have a minimal impact on yields. However, the difference in predicted and observed values is much higher for the wrasse and may have an impact on yields. Interestingly, the predicted optimum length at first capture for N. unicornis is much lower than found in the length-frequency data. This may be a consequence of the flat-topped catch curve (Figure 2) for this species and the concomitant difficulty in deciding the point at which fish are fully recruited to the fishery.

Table 2: Optimum minimum first-capture lengths from yieid-per-recruit analysis, observed minimum capture lengths, depth ratios, selection factors and optimum mesh sizes for ten reef fish species in commercial fish landings in Palau

| -. Species | Optimum minimum firstcapture length (cm) | Observed minimum first-capture length (cm) | Depth <br> ratio | Selection factor | Predicted optimum mesh size (inches) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bolbometopon muricatum | 53.2 | 69.9 | 2.29 | 2.1 | 10.0 |
| Cheilinus undulatus | 68.8 | 48.9 | 2.30 | 2.0 | 13.5 |
| Hipposcarus longiceps | 26.3 | 25.5 | 2.57 | 2.2 | 4.7 |
| Lethrinus ramak | 18.3 | 17.3 | 2.70 | 2.2 | 3.3 |
| Lutjanus gibbus | 19.0 | 20.5 | 2.33 | 2.0 | 3.2 |
| Naso lituivtus | 19.3 | 21.3 | 2.02 | 1.9 | 3.9 |
| Naso unicornis | 28.5 | 42.3 | 2.22 | 2.0 | 5.0 |
| Siganus argenteus | 18.6 | 16.7 | 2.28 | 2.0 | 3.7 |
| Siganus canaliculatus | 21.8 | 24.1 | 2.43 | 2.2 | 3.9 |
| Siganus lineatus | 20.1 | 24.4 | 2.22 | 2.0 | 3.6 |



Figure 2. Length-converted catch-curves for ten species of reef fish caught by commercial fishing in Palau, 1990-1991. Open circles not used in calculating regressions.

This analysis can be taken beyond the generation of optimum average first-capture lengths if mesh selection factors are known. The optimum capture length is proportional to the mesh size of the net employed; the proportionality constant is called the selection factor (SF). When known, it can be used with the optimum capture length to estimate the mesh size that would generate $L_{c}$ from:

## LJSF - mesh size

As no selectivity experiments have been carried out on kesokes or other types of fishing net at Palau, selection factors for the different species were estimated by the empirical graphical method of Pauly (1984) in which the depth ratio (standard length/maximum body depth) is estimated, and the selection factor can then be read from a curve or nomogram that relates SF to the depth ratio (see Chapter 3, Pauly 1984). Depth ratios for the species included in this study were estimated from measurements taken from taxonomic drawings, and these and the selection factors are included in Table 2.

From these figures the mesh size generating $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{c}}$, or optimum mesh size, was computed. This is shown in Table 2 (converted into inches, since mesh sizes of nets in Palau are measured in inches rather than centimetres). The optimum mesh sizes predicted for the large parrotfish, B. muricatum and the wrasse, C. undulatus, are naturally very large, given the maximum sizes of these species. However, these species are generally captured by spearfishing rather than nets. For the eight smaller species, the optimum mesh sizes ranged from 3.2 to 5.0 inches, with a simple mean of 3.9 inches. Cobmputation of a weighted mean based on the relative contribution of each species to the annual commercial catch yields the same figure.

## Comparison of contemporary length frequencies with historical data

The length data collected between 1990 and 1991 were compared with data collected for the same species between 1982 and 1984 (Appendix II). As the samples for each year were generally small, the data for the three earlier years were pooled to form a single length-frequency distribution. These data and the more recent data sets were converted into percentages for direct comparison (Figure 3). There was very little difference between the two sets of length data in mean lengths for the different species, although it should be stressed that, on average, the earlier samples are about only one third to one quarter the size of the contemporary samples.

## Landings

## Commercial landings

The mean percentage composition by family taxon of the PFFA landings data between 1976 and 1990 is given in Table 3. It is based on annual data contained in Appendix III. No data were available for 1982, the first three months of 1983 or the last three months of 1987. About 76 per cent of the landings (1976-1990) are from six families: the Scaridae (parrotfish), Acanthuridae (surgeonfish), Lethrinidae (emperors) -Lutjanidae (snappers), Siganidae (rabbitfish)) and Serranidae (groupers). The top ten species in the PFFA landings (1976-1990) are shown in Figure 4. They account for 67 per cent of the total. Unfortunately, the records for groupers at the PFFA are separated only to the generic level, i.e. Epinephelus spp. and Plectropomus spp. Based on observations during 1990 and 1991 by the senior author, the dominant groupers landed at PFFA are Epinephelus microdon, E. fuscoguttatus and Plectropomus areolatus.









Figure 3. Length-frequency data for eight reef fish species captured by commercial fishing in Palau, 1982-1984 (•) and 1990-1991 (•)

Table 3: Composition of commercial reef fish landings at PFFA between 1976 and 1990.

| Family | Percentage composition <br> $\mathbf{1 9 8 4 - 1 9 9 0}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acanthuridae | 14.12 | 12.88 | $\mathbf{1 9 7 6 - 1 9 9 0}$ |
| Carangidae | 2.63 | 4.01 | 13.66 |
| Gerridae | 0.73 | 0.24 | 3.57 |
| Haemulidae | 0.23 | 0.13 | 0.44 |
| Holocentridae | 0.39 | 0.13 | 0.20 |
| Labridae | 1.03 | 0.78 | 0.21 |
| Lethrinidae | 11.93 | 13.87 | 0.92 |
| Lutjanidae | 8.54 | 13.53 | 13.52 |
| Mugilidae | 1.93 | 0.53 | 11.99 |
| Mullidae | 1.01 | 1.16 | 1.06 |
| Scaridae | 16.29 | 18.68 | 1.09 |
| Serranidae | 9.09 | 9.25 | 17.88 |
| Siganidae | 11.55 | 10.48 | 9.05 |
| Others | 20.52 | 14.32 | 10.35 |

Annual landings at PFFA (1976-1990) are shown in Figure 5. Annual landings at PFFA have ranged from 62 to 287 tonnes, with an average of 144.5 tons. They showed a tendancy to increase between 1976 and 1985, followed by a decline between 1986 and 1990. (Figure 5). The annual patterns of landings for snappers (Lutjanidae), emperors (Lethrinidae), parrotfish (Scaridae), jacks (Carangidae), groupers (Serranidae) and surgeonfish (Acanthuridae) show broadly similar trends to the total landed volume, with a major peak in the mid-1980s and a smaller peak between 1979 and 1980.


Figure 4. The ten commonest species in the commercial reef fish landings in Palau, 1976-1990


Figure 5. Annual landings at PFFA of reef fish caught by commercial fishermen,

The composition of the reef fish catch landed at PFFA between 1976 and 1990 has remained more or less constant. The average composition of the landings in the first part (1976-1983) of this 15 -year period is very similar to the composition between 1984 and 1990 (Table 3). Johannes (1991) lists those species of fish perceived by Palauan fishermen to be getting scarcer. They include Herklotsichthys quadrimaculatus, Crenimugil crenilabis, Plectropomus spp., Epinephelus spp., Siganus canaliculatus, S. lineatus, Bolbometopon muricatum, Cheilinus undulatus, Nasolituratus and N. unicornis. The herring, Herklotsichthys quadrimaculatus, is not harvested commercially, but data on landings are available for all the other species (Appendix IV).

Commercial landings of Crenimugil crenilabis have undergone a long-term decline from the onset of the 1980s (Figure 6). Other species, such as Naso unicornis, Epinephelus spp., Chelinus undulatus and Bolbometopon muricatum, have shown more recent declines in landed volume after pronounced peaks in landings during the mid-1980s (Figure 5). By contrast, landings of Siganus canaliculatus, S. lineatus, Plectropomus spp and N. lituratus have shown an opposite trend, with increased volumes landed towards the end of the 1980s and at the start of the next decade.

## Subsistencecatches

Initial estimates of subsistence fisheries production were given by Perron et al. (1983). They were based on a household survey carried out by MRD in 1975, which included questions on the amount offish consumed per week. From these data Perron et al. estimated that the average annual per capita consumption of fish in Palau was 141 kg . The total population of Palau in 1990 was estimated at 14,291 . Using this figure, the per capita fish consumption translates to a total production of about 2,015 t/yr.

Sampson (1986) and Preston (1990) have both commented that the per capita consumption quoted by Perron et al. is too high. Sampson suggested 50 kg as a more reasonable estimate. This converts to a total production rate of $715 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{yr}$. A further adjustment to account for bones, scales and internal organs not consumed, which form about a third of the fish body-weight (Johannes 1981), results in an estimated subsistence production of $1074 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{yr}$. Preston quotes estimates offish consumption from other Pacific islands that range from 19 to $34 \mathrm{~kg} /$ person $/ \mathrm{yr}$, with a mean of 22.7 kg . For Palau, this converts to a total subsistence consumption of $325 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{yr}$, equivalent to a fish wet weight of $488 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{yr}$. Subsistence fisheries production in Palau could therefore be within the range of 488 to $1074 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{yr}$, averaging $780 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{yr}$.

Given the uncertainty surrounding these production estimates, it is probably most realistic to suggest that the subsistence fisheries production for Palau may lie somewhere between 500 and $1100 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{yr}$. Not all of this production is reef fish. Tuna and other large pelagic fish are caught by trolling on the open sea, away from the reef. The expense of fuel and lures probably prevents the large pelagic fishery being an important source of subsistence production. Troll fishing is thought to be more of a recreational pastime, limited mainly to weekends. However, seasonal tuna runs do provide large landings in close proximity to the reefs.

Palauan men and women harvest a variety of fishes and invertebrates from the nearshore reef areas. Matthews and Oiterong (1991) investigated the role of women in the subsistence production of Palau. They found that, in some instances, women were the major providers of animal protein to their households. However, the quantities involved and the proportion of the total subsistence catch harvested by women remain unknown at present.


Figure 6. Annual landings at PFFA of selected reef fish species, 1976-1990

## DISCUSSION

In this report, we have tried to present a contemporary account of the present status of reef fish resources in Palau and suggest ways in which this information can be used to manage the fishery. Length-frequency data collected over a period of one year were used to generate information on lifehistory parameters. Most of the length-frequency data was collected at one central location on Palau (PFFA), with about one third of landings coming mainly from Koror State (Anon 1991). Given the relatively small samples used for the length-frequency analysis, it was not possible to break down the data by location of capture and they were pooled for the whole of Palau.

Growth parameter estimates for all except two species in this study were generated from the application of ELEFAN I to length-frequency data. Many of the reef fisheries in Palau are seasonal, with bimodal peaks in spring and fall. There are several months in all but one data set where there are no samples. Sample sizes tend to be small; only the Siganus canaliculatus data set contained length measurements for over one thousand fish. Comparative estimates of growth parameters from elsewhere suggest that the results from the application of ELEFAN I are reasonable. However, apart from the rabbitfish, growth rates are slow and further studies may benefit from the application of more mathematically rigorous length-based analytical programs such as MULTIFAN (Fournier et al. 1990) or the MIXTURE routine (Macdonald \& Pitcher 1979). A limited series of investigations might be carried out to determine whether otoliths or another skeletal structure would be suitable for ageing the important component species in the catch and provide supportive evidence for the length-frequency analysis.

A key assumption in the length-frequency analysis is that the length distributions are not biased from the effects of gear selectivity and that they represent the size-frequencies of the natural populations. Rabbitfish, surgeonfish, snappers, emperors and the parrotfish, Hipposcarus longiceps, are captured by kesokes. The groupers, however, while also captured in kesokes tend mainly to be taken by handline fishing. The large parrotfish, Bolbometopon muricatum, is caught almost exclusively by spear fishing. Large specimens of the wrasse, Cheilinus undulatus, are taken by spearfishing, and smaller specimens are captured both by spears and handlines. However, hook size can also exert some effect on the size ranges captured by handlines. Ralston (1982) observed the effect of hook selection on handline catches of snappers and groupers from Hawaii and found that small hooks were almost as efficient as large hooks for catching large fish. Ralston suggested that hook selectivity is similar to the selection ogive or S-shaped curve observed for trawls and seines.

Selectivity of the kesokes is mainly a function of mesh size, particularly in the apex or 'cod-end' of the net. Pauly's (1984) empirical method for estimating selection factors is derived from trawl data and it is assumed here that mesh selectivity for the kesokes is similar to that of trawls, though it is a static rather than mobile gear. This assumption is probably reasonable given that the kesoke net simply acts as a barrier and fish are not snagged or 'gilled' as with a gillnet. The optimum lengths generated from the YPR model provide some guidelines on minimum sizes taken by the fishery and the possible consequences of catching fish at sizes smaller than the optimum. However, it should be clearly understood that these results are only as good as the data used to achieve them. Given the quality of the present data and the use of $a d$ hoc or empirical methods, some judgement is necessary before using this information to frame conservation and regulatory legislation.

Further, the Palau reef fishery is a multispecies fishery and any minimum mesh size will have to be a compromise between the optimum first-capture lengths of the component species. In this study we have looked at only ten species taken in the Palau reef fishery. Anon (1991) lists eight further species that make significant contributions to commercial reef fish landings, and about 80 species in total that comprise the commercial fishery. Gross differences in size and hence in optimum capture length are evident even at the generic level, for example between Lutjanus gibbus (max. length $\approx 45 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) and $L$. bohar (max. length $\sim 75 \mathrm{~cm}$ ), and Lethrinus ramak (max. length $\sim 34 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) and L. olivaceus ( $=$ miniatus) (max. length $\sim 100 \mathrm{~cm}$ ). Attempts to determine the optimum mesh size for tropical multi-species trawl
fisheries using a multi-species YPR approach have been made by Sainsbury (1984) and Silvestre (1986). These methods need more demanding data than were available for the present study. However, if sufficient data were available from the Palau fishery it might be possible to carry out an equivalent analysis for kesokes and other nets used to capture reef fish.

The analyses presented here for eight of the ten species in the reef fish catch indicate that optimum mesh sizes range from about 3.2 to 5.0 inches, with a mean of 3.9 inches. However, for five of these species (Siganus lineatus, S. canaliculatus, Lutjanus gibbus, Naso unicornis and N. lituratus), the optimum minimum capture length generated from YPR analysis is smaller than the minimum capture length presently observed in the fishery (Table 2). It would be prudent, therefore, to set an initial minimum mesh size of not less than three inches for the kesokes in Palau, with the option of increasing the size should;this be warranted by the future performance of the fishery. We note that a three-inch mesh-size limit for kesokes, gill nets and seine nets has also been recommended by Johannes (1991), based on more; generalised observations of fishing in Palau.

It should be clearly understood that optimum length generated from the YPR analysis is derived simply from the computation of the maximum relative yield for a combination of a given $\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{K}$ ratio and length at entry into the fishery.. Fish stocks are part of a complex biological system and factors such as the minimum spawning size and between-year variation in recruitment are not taken into consideration in the YPR analysis described above. The predicted maximum YPR may be achieved at biomass levels which are only a fraction of the original standing stock and where individual catches per unit of effort are correspondingly low. Regulation of fishing effort may also be necessary, to ensure that recruitment overfishing does not occur. Johannes (1991) has also recommended some limitation of effort in Palau in the form of closed seasons for rabbitfish and groupers, in tandem with mesh regulations.

If length-frequency data collection is to be continued, greater emphasis should be placed on the origin of landings when measurements are recorded. Although it appears from the foregoing discussion that selection effects may not be of critical importance for the analyses presented here, there are still some problems that need addressing. For example, the frequency distribution-for Naso unicornis is clearly biased towards larger individuals in the catch and has a relatively large minimum capture length. Similar uncertainty surrounds the size frequencies for Cheilinus undulatus, as handlines and spears may catch predominantly small and large specimens respectively:

Although the data on landings from PFFA extend over a 14 -year period, they concern only commercial landings and represent about 50 per cent of total commercial production. The trends apparent in these data may be only partially indicative of the dynamics operating in the fishery as a whole. Only a few direct records of fishing effort have been made, so CPUE cannot be computed. The absence of direct measures of fishing effort also precludes observations on the effects of technological innovation on changes in fishing power. A good example of this is the use by spear fishermen of SCUBA gear, which permits them to stay underwater for longer periods and fish at greater depths.

It is important to stress here that the PFFA data extend only from 1976 to the present, representing only a fraction of the time that Palau's reef fish stocks have been exploited. The population of Palau before European contact was believed to be around $40,000-50,000$ people (Semper 1873), who would presumably have a large demand for reef fish. Records from the period of the Japanese Administration of Palau for the years 1936-1938 report commercial harvests of reef fish of between 200 and 330 t annually (Izumi 1991 and pers. comm.), with landings possibly as high as 500 t in years prior to 1935 . Further, Johannes (1991) comments that, following the end of World War II, fish stocks had been severely depleted to supply the large Japanese population in Palau and necessitated the introduction of customary regulation of fishing. Palau's shallow-reef fish stocks are thus far from being in a pristine or virgin state.

Estimation of contemporary yields from Palau's reefs must by necessity be speculative. Subsistence production is currently thought to lie between 500 and $1100 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{yr}$. Commercial reef fisheries production during 1990 was about 278 mt (Anon 1991) of which about 110 t was exported overseas. An unknown amount of fish is also exported as passenger luggage. Nominal fish production from Palau's coral reefs is therefore in the order of 750 to $1350 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{yr}$. Shallow reef (depth $<20 \mathrm{~m}$ in Palau) extends over an area of $450 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$; the area of shallow lagoon is $1033.5 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$. This gives a nominal yield of 1.7 to $3.0 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{km}^{2} / \mathrm{yr}$ from the reef area, or a yield from reef and lagoon combined of 0.50 to $0.91 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{km}^{2} / \mathrm{yr}$.

Munro \& Williams (1986) and Russ (1991) have compiled information on yields of different reef fisheries from around the world. These range from a low yield of $0.42 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{km}^{2} / \mathrm{yr}$ in northern Papua New Guinea to a high yield of $36.9 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{km}^{2}$ from a small island reef in the Philippines, with a mean yield of $7.7 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{km}^{2} / \mathrm{yr}\left(95 \% \mathrm{CL}=3.0 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{km}^{2} / \mathrm{yr}\right)$. Caution must be exercised in making comparisons with other reef fishery yields. Yield is a function of fishing effort; low yields such as those in northern Papua New Guinea result from low levels of fishing effort in this location, and not from resource depletion. Secondly, the choice of area fished and maximum depth of fishing will greatly influence the magnitude of a yield from a given location.

Contemporary estimates of exploitation rates of the dominant species suggest that stocks are being moderately exploited, but this needs to be verified further by more rigorous sampling of landings. Anecdotal information collected by Johannes (1981, 1991) clearly suggests that fishermen are concerned with the scarcity of certain fishes but this is hard to quantify given the nature of the information. As a fishery approaches the point of optimum exploitation, the catch rates will fall by between one half and one third of their original levels, although catch volumes may approach a maximum (see references cited in Sparre et al. 1989). Such declines may be perceived by the fishermen as indications of overfishing, when in fact the fishery is at or approaching its most productive state.

Preston (1990) has recommended a programme of catch sampling and data acquisition for Palau's DMR to provide quantitative information for management. Part of this programme was instituted during 1990 and 1991 and has provided data for analysis here. This first year of data collection has permitted some preliminary conclusions about the status of Palau's reef fish stocks but is also indicative of the need to improve the quality of the data. If the present length-frequency data-sampling of commercial catches is to continue, there needs to be greater effort put into improving the quality of the data. Although the length data collected so far can be segregated by fishing grounds, the sample sizes are too small to be used for analysis. Greater numbers of fish will need to be measured to remedy this. Information also needs to be collected on the minimum spawning sizes of the dominant species in the commercial catch, for comparison with the optimum capture lengths suggested from the YPR analysis. These suggestions do not deviate from the programme outlined by Preston (1990), but focus on the technical aspects of data collection. Other approaches might be adopted to improve the quality of management information from biological sampling, particularly with respect to estimating age and growth rates for major component species in the catch.

The principal conclusions from this study are that Palau's reef fish stocks appear to be moderately to optimally exploited, although fishermen perceive declines in abundance of key species and are concerned about overfishing. Johannes (1991) has proposed a series of management measures based on interviews with fishermen and observations in Palau. These include the establishment of protected areas where species are known to form spawning aggregations, closed seasons on certain species that extend over part or all of the spawning season, and banning of spearfishing with SCUBA gear. Our findings reported here support Johannes' suggestion that a three-inch minimum mesh size for kesokes be introduced. In addition, it is suggested that a minimum commercial size limit of 70 cm be introduced on the wrasse, Cheilinus undulatus, and that exports of this species and the large parrotfish, Bolbometopon muricatum, be prohibited.

Finally, although we have made some estimate of the nominal fisheries production from Palau's coral reefs, this is necessarily speculative given the present status of data on landings. Some doubt has been
cast on the magnitude of subsistence production estimated by Perron et al. (1983). Both stock assessment and management regulation or control on commercial reef fisheries must take into account the size of harvests from the subsistence fisheries, and the main target species of subsistence fishing. It is beyond the scope of this report to discuss this in detail here, except to note that contemporary information on subsistence harvests is required to present a complete picture of the scale of reef fish exploitation in Palau.
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## APPENDICES

MONTHLY LENGTH-FREQUENCY DATA FOR SELECTED REEF FISH FROM PALAU, 1990-1991

Bolbometopon muricatum

| Length class (cm) | 15/4/90 | 15/5/90 | 15/9/90 | mpling date 15/10/90 | 15/12/90 | 15/5/90 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| 34 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| 36 |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  | 3 |
| 38 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| 40 | $\cdot 4$ |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |
| 42 |  |  |  | 2 | 3 |  | 5 |
| 44 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 4 |  | 6 |
| 46 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |
| 48 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 50 |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |  | 6 |
| 52 |  | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 |  | 7 |
| 54 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 56 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 58 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 3 | 5 |
| 60 | 1 | 3 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| 62 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 64 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  | 4 | 8 |
| 66 | 1 | 4 |  |  | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| 68 | 2 | 3 |  | 1 |  |  | 6 |
| 70 | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| 72 | 1 | 12 |  |  |  |  | 13 |
| 74 | 2 | 6 |  | 2 |  |  | 10 |
| 76 |  | 4 |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| 78 |  | 7 | - • . | 1 | - | - | 8 |
| 80 | 1 | 7 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 10 |
| 82 | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| 84 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 86 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| 88 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 90 | 2 | 4 |  |  | 1 |  | 7 |
| 92 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| 94 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 96 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 98 |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  | 4 |
| 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 102 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 20 | 77 | 11 | 15 | 24 | 13 | 159 |

Cheilinus undulatus

| Length class (cm) | 15/4/90 | 15/5/90 | $15 / 7 / 90$ | 15/9/90 | Samplin 15/10/90 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { date } \\ & 15 / 12 / 90 \end{aligned}$ | 15/5/91 | 15/8/91 | 15/9/91 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |
| 25 |  |  | 1 | 2 | 10 |  |  |  |  | 13 |
| 30 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 5 | . |  |  |  | 7 |
| 35 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |
| 40 | 2 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |  | 6 |  | 11 |
| 45 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 7 |
| 50 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 3 | 2 | 9 |
| 55 |  | 1 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 23 |
| 60 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 1 |  |  |  | 3 | 2 | 17 |
| 65 | 3 | 3 | 11 |  |  |  | 6 | 1 | 2 | 26 |
| 70 | 3 |  | 1 |  | 1 | : | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9 |
| 75 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| 80 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 | 5 |
| 85 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 90 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 95 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 100 | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| 105 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 110 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 115 | 1 |  |  |  |  | . |  |  |  | 1 |
| 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 125 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 130 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 135 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Total | 15 | 10 | 43 | 6 | 20 | 7 | 15 | 17 | 12 | 145 |

Hipposcarus longiceps

| Length class (cm) | Sampling date |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15/3/90 | 15/4/90 | 15/8/90 | 15/9/90 | 15/10/90 | 15/11/90 | 15/12/90 | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 19 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 20 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| 21 | 9 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 12 |
| 22 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 2 | 10 |
| 23 | 2 | 3 |  | 3 | 1 |  | 6 | 15 |
| 24 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 19 |
| 25 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 12 | 3 |  | 5 | 29 |
| 26 |  | 4 | 4 | 14 | 11 | 1 | 12 | 46 |
| 27 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 15 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 43 |
| 28 | 8 | 14 | 3 | 27 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 67 |
| 29 | 14 | 18 | 1 | 10 | 9 | 1 | 8 | 61 |
| 30 | 9 | 13 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 5 | 46 |
| 31 | 3 | 30 | . | 3 | 10 |  | 9 | 55 |
| 32 | 3 | 21 |  | 4 | 5 |  | 2 | 35 |
| 33 | 3 | 13 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 26 |
| 34 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 |  | 6 | 16 |
| 35 | 3 | 5 |  |  | 1 |  | 2 | 11 |
| 36 |  | 6 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 9 |
| 37 |  | 4 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 5 |
| 38 |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| 39 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 7 |
| 40 |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 4 |
| 41 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 44 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 68 | 164 | 19 | 102 | 80 | 9 | 88 | 530 |

Lethrinus ramak

| Length (cm) | Sampling date |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15/3/90 | 15/4/90 | 15/5/90 | 15/9/90 | 15/10/90 | 15/12/90 | 15/2/91 | Total |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 5 |
| 18 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 8 |
| 19 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 12 |
| 20 | 8 | 11 |  | 3 | 7 |  | 3 | 32 |
| 21 | 0 | 6 |  | 18 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 37 |
| 22 | 4 | 12 | 2 | 20 | 15 | 4 |  | 57 |
| 23 | 1 | 12 | 6 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 4 | 56 |
| 24 | 0 |  | 7 | 7 | 25 | 18 | 2 | 59 |
| 25 | 1 | 15 | 9 | 10 | 14 | 10 | 1 | 60 |
| 26 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 22 |  | 52 |
| 27 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 13 | 13 |  | 43 |
| 28 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 14 |  | 34 |
| 29 |  | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 6 |  | 14 |
| 30 |  |  | . | 8 | 4 | 2 |  | 14 |
| 31 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 32 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 34 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Total | :10 | 64 | 51 | 98 | 118 | 100 | 27 | 488 |

## Lutjanus gibbus

| Length class (cm) | Sampling date |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15/4/90 | 15/5/90 | 15/8/90 | 15/9/90 | 15/10/90 | 15/11/90 | 15/12/90 | 15/4/91 | 15/5/91 | 15/7/91 | Total |
| 19 |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| 20 |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 4 |  |  |  | 7 |
| 21 |  | 1 |  | 2 | 6 |  | 6 |  |  |  | 15 |
| 22 |  | 1 |  | 2 | 7 | 2 | 5 |  | 3 |  | 20 |
| 23 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 29 |
| 24 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 10 | 13 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 7 | 45 |
| 25 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  | 7 | 40 |
| 26 | 8 | 14 | 3 | 10 | 13 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 72 |
| 27 | 10 | 6 | 4. | 13 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 66 |
| 28 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 18 | 9 |  | 4 |  | 4 | 7 | 58 |
| 29 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 6 |  | 3 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 38 |
| 30 | 2 | 7 |  | 9 |  |  | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 28 |
| 31 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 1 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 7 | 28 |
| 32 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 14 |
| 33 | 2 |  | 1 | 9 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  | 4 | 19 |
| 34 | 1 | 4 |  | 6 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |
| 35 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |  |  | 3 | 2 |  | 6 | 15 |
| 36 |  |  |  | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 7 |
| 37 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 2 | 5 |
| 38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 49 | 67 | 18 | 118 | 95 | 12 | 47 | 20 | 28 | 69 | 523 |


| Length class (cm) | 15/3/90 | 15/4/90 | 15/9/90 | 15/10/90 | 15/12/90 | 15/2/91 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 18 |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 3 |
| 19 |  |  |  | 5 | 4 |  | 9 |
| 20 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 |  | 11 |
| 21 | 3 | 15 | 4 | 8 | 8 |  | 38 |
| 22 | 5 | 25 | 6 | 9 | 15 | 1 | 61 |
| 23 | 4 | 44 | 4 | 19 | 9 | 3 | 83 |
| 24 | 2 | 35 | 6 | 13 | 5 | 1 | 62 |
| 25 | 3 | 31 | 4 | 11 | 6 | 4 | 59 |
| 26 |  | 26 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 39 |
| 27 |  | 19 |  | 6 | 2 |  | 27 |
| 28 |  | 4 |  | 7 | 1 |  | 12 |
| 29 |  | 3 |  | 7 |  | 2 | 12 |
| 30 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |
| 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 34 |  |  | - |  | . | . | 0 |
| 35 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Total | 19 | 205 | 29 | 102 | 52 | 14 | 421 |

Naso unicornis

| Length <br> class (cm) | Sampling date |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15/3/90 | 15/4/90 | 15/5/90 | 15/12/90 | 15/1/91 | 15/4/91 | 15/8/91 | 15/9/91 | Total |
| 20 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 23 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| 24 |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| 25 |  |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  | 9 |
| 26 | 1 |  |  | 16 | 1 |  |  |  | 18 |
| 27 | 2 | 2 |  | 9 | 4 |  |  |  | 17 |
| 28 | 1 | 3 |  | 9 | 3 |  |  |  | 16 |
| 29 | 1 | 3 |  | 7 | 2 |  |  |  | 13 |
| 30 |  | 3 |  | 10 | 2 |  |  |  | 15 |
| 31 | 1 | 3 |  | 6 |  |  |  | 1 | 11 |
| 32 |  | 9 |  | 6 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 17 |
| 33 | 2 | 4 |  | 1 |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
| 34 |  | 8 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 11 |
| 35 | 3 | 4 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 3 | 5 | 17 |
| 36 | 1 | 7 |  | 5 |  | 1 |  | 2 | 16 |
| 37 | 5 | 3 |  | 5 |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 22 |
| 38 | 3 | 9 |  | 4 |  | 3 | 4 | 12 | 35 |
| 39 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 1 |  | 5 | 2 | 5 | 25 |
| 40 | 4 | 7 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 8 | 25 |
| 41 | 3 | 17 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 40 |
| 42 |  | 16 | 3 |  | 1 | 3 | 10 | 13 | 46 |
| 43 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 13 | 43 |
| 44 |  | 10 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 15 | 8 | 46 |
| 45 |  | 7 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 40 |
| 46 |  | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 27 |
| 47 |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 7 | 13 | 1 | 27 |
| 48 |  |  |  | 2 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 15 |
| 49 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 10 |
| 50 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 4 | 3 |  | 8 |
| 51 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| 52 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| 53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 56 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| Total | 33 | 133 | 17 | 120 | 29 | 63 | 99 | 101 | 595 |

Siganus argenteus

| Length class (cm) | 15/2/90 | 15/4/90 | 15/7/90 | Sampling date 15/10/90 | 15/11/90 | 15/12/90 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 |  |  |  | . . |  | 0 | 0 |
| 16 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 4 |
| 17 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 |  | 8 | 16 |
| 18 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 4 |  | 13 | 31 |
| 19 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 15 | 1 | 14 | 49 |
| 20 | 10 | 10 | 4 | 23 | 2 | 17 | 66 |
| 21 | 6 | 12 | 4 | 26 | 9 | 10 | 67 |
| 22 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 32 | 14 | 6 | 67 |
| 23 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 19 | 15 | 2 | 44 |
| 24 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 19 | 1 | 34 |
| 25 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 16 |
| 26 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 10 |
| 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Total | 42 | 54 | 23 | 141 | 82 | $73$ | 415 |

Siganuscanaliculatus

| Length class (cm) | 15/2/90 | 15/3/90 | 15/4/90 | 15/7/90 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Saml } \\ 15 / 9 / 90 \end{array}$ | ing date 15/10/90 | 15/12/90 | 15/1/91 | 15/3/91 | 15/4/91 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 95 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 10.0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 10.5 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 11.0 |  | 0 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 11.5 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 12.0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 12.5 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| 13.0 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 13.5 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 14.0 |  | 4 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 5 |
| 14.5 |  | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2 |  | 10 |
| 15.0 |  | 8 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |  | 11 |
| 15.5 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 4 |  | 16 |
| 16.0 | 0 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 7 | 1 | 14 |
| 16.5 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 5 | 12 | 5 | 41 |
| 17.0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 |  | 1 |  | 7 | 14 | 13 | 44 |
| 17.5 | 1 | 21 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 19 | 2 | 11 | 9 | 12 | 94 |
| 18.0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 13 |  | 12 | 9 | 23 | 79 |
| 18.5 | 3 | 18 | 14 | 14 | 11 | 11 |  | 9 | 13 | 40 | 133 |
| 19.0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 39 | 89 |
| 19.5 | 2 | 28 | 18 | 11 | 8 | 13 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 37 | 138 |
| 20.0 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 13 | 3 | 49 | 96 |
| 20.5 | 3 | 28 | 24 | 10 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 21 | 2 | 41 | 146 |
| 21.0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 2 | 31 | 55 |
| 21.5 | 1 | 15 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 14 | 1 | 14 | 65 |
| 22.0 |  | 0 | 3 |  | 5 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 12 | 36 |
| 22.5 |  | 5 | 7 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 9 |  | 22 | 48 |
| 23.0 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | 5 |  | 7 | 18 |
| 23.5 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |  | 9 | 19 |
| 24.0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 9 | 12 |
| 24,5 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 13 | 16 |
| 25.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 14 | 15 |
| 25.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 5 | 6 |
| 26.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 7 |
| 26.5 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 3 |
| 27.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 27.5 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 4 |
| Total | 14 | 183 | 115 | 76 | 56 | 101 | 28 | 146 | 101 | 409 | 1229 |

Sampling date

| Length class (cm) | 15/2/90 | 15/4/90 | 15/7/90 | 15/10/90 | 15/11/90 | 15/12/90 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14.5 |  | 2 | . |  |  |  | 2 |
| 15.0 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 15.5 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 16.0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 16.5 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  | 3 |
| 17.0 |  |  | 5 |  | 1 |  | 6 |
| 17.5 |  |  | 9 |  | 2 |  | 11 |
| 18.0 |  | 2 | 3 |  | 2 |  | 7 |
| 18.5 | 3 | 5 | 7 |  | 2 |  | 17 |
| 19.0 |  | 3 | 1 |  | 5 |  | 9 |
| 19.5 | 3 | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 1 | 18 |
| 20.0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 7 |  | 9 |
| 20.5 | 4 | 10 | 2 |  | 7 |  | 23 |
| 21.0 |  | 6 |  | 1 | 7 | 1 | 15 |
| 21.5 |  | 7 |  |  | 8 |  | 15 |
| 22.0 |  | 5 |  | 1 | 10 |  | 16 |
| 22.5 | 1 | 8 |  | 3 | 7 |  | 19 |
| 23.0 |  | 4 |  | 4 | 2 |  | 10 |
| 23.5 |  | 11 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 18 |
| 24.0 |  | 4 |  | 8 |  |  | 12 |
| 24.5 | 1 | 7 |  | 8 |  | 5 | 21 |
| 25.0 |  | 3 |  | 9 |  | 2 | 14 |
| 25.5 | 1 | 11 |  | 22 |  | 4 | 38 |
| 26.0 |  | 5 |  | 18 |  | 4 | 27 |
| 26.5 | 1 | 10 |  | 13 |  | 1 | 25 |
| 27.0 |  | 3 |  | 8 |  | 2 | 13 |
| 27.5 |  | 3 |  | 7 |  | 2 | 12 |
| 28.0 |  | 5 |  | 9 |  | 2 | 16 |
| 28.5 | 1 | 4 |  | 6 |  | 1 | 12 |
| 29.0 |  | 1 |  | 6 |  |  | 7 |
| 29.5 |  | 1 |  | 3 |  |  | 4 |
| 30.0 |  | 1 |  | 3 |  |  | 4 |
| 30.5 |  | 2 |  | 2 |  |  | 4 |
| 31.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 31.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 32.0 |  |  |  | - |  |  | 0 |
| 32.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 33.0 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |
| Total | 15 | 136 | 34 | $137$ | $65$ | $25$ | 412 |

Appendix II
LENGTH-FREQUENCY DATA FOR SELECTED REEF FISH SPECIES IN PALAU, 1982-1984

| Length class (cm) | A. nuricamum | H. kongioeps | L. gibbus | L. menat | N. Hiturntus | N. vicomis | S. canaliculatus | S. lineatus |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |
| 18 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 17 | 19 |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52 | 3 |
| 20 |  | 1 |  | 5 | 1 |  | 8 | 6 |
| 21 |  | 2 | 3 | 6 | 7 |  | 19 | 10 |
| 22 |  | 5 | 10 | 10 | 9 |  | 23 | 10 |
| 23 |  | 7 | 7 | 21 | 13 |  | 13 | 2 |
| 24 |  | 5 | 7 | 30 | 20 |  | 3 | 7 |
| 25 |  | 13 | 11 | 28 | 13 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 26 |  | 19 | 16 | 33 | 11 | 1 |  | 5 |
| 27 |  | 9 | 15 | 17 | 8 | 3 | 1 |  |
| 28 |  | 27 | 18 | 18 | 8 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 29 |  | 17 | 8 | 13 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 30 |  | 16 | 9 | 3 |  | 7 |  | 2 |
| 31 |  | 21 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 2 |  |  |
| 32 |  | 15 | 5 |  |  | 5 |  |  |
| 33 |  | 10 | 3 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| 34 |  | 4 | 12 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| 35 |  | 5 | 4 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| 36 |  | 3 | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| 37 |  | 3 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| 38 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |
| 39 |  |  |  |  |  | . 6 |  |  |
| 40 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 13 |  |  |
| 41 |  |  |  |  |  | 22 |  |  |
| 42 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 19 |  |  |
| 43 |  |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |
| 44 |  |  |  |  |  | 27 |  |  |
| 45 |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |
| 46 |  |  |  |  |  | 22 |  |  |
| 47 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| 48 |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |
| 49 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| 50 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| 51 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| 52 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 57 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 58 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 59 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Length <br> class (cm) | B. muricatum | H. longiceps | L. gibbus | L. ramak | N. lituratus |  | unicornis | S. canaliadatus | S. lineatus |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |
| 62 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 66 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 68 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 69 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 71 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 72 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 73 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 74 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 76 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 78 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 79 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 81 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 82 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 83 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 84 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 86 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 87 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 88 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 89 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 91 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 92 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 93 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 95 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 97 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 98 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 102 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 57 | 184 | 143 | 190 | 93 |  | 201 | 152 | . 72 |

Appendix III
ANNUAL LANDINGS OF REEF FISH TO THE PFFA FISH
MARKET, 1976-1990

| Family | 76 | 77 | 78 | 79 | 80 | 81 | Year |  | 85 | 86 | 87 | 88 | 89 | 90 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 83 | 84 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acanthuridae | 8.27 | 8.95 | 7.91 | 14.62 | 36.17 | 15.42 | 20.16 | 14.96 | 39.97 | 33.89 | 10.79 | 16.89 | 2.78 | 19.91 |
| Carangidae | 3.01 | 1.28 | 0.98 | 4.65 | 4.52 | 1.59 | 4.82 | 8.95 | 12.98 | 9.10 | 5.08 | 4.64 | 5.22 | 5.32 |
| Gerridae | 2.01 | 0.88 | 0.09 | 1.22 | 0.72 | 0.43 | 0.10 | 029 | 1.74 | 0.39 | 0.0 | 0.21 | 0.46 | 0.29 |
| Haemulidae | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.15 | 0.41 | 0.59 | 0.15 | 0.56 | 0.55 | 1.47 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Holocentridae | 0.03 | 0.12 | 0.01 | 0.27 | 0.13 | 1.58 | 0.39 | 0.66 | 0.53 | 0.39 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.13 |
| Labridae | 0.57 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 1.74 | 1.53 | 1.17 | 2.11 | 1.69 | 3.46 | 2.75 | 0.79 | 0.91 | 0.41 | 0.64 |
| Lethrinidae | 11.37 | 6.12 | 1.87 . | 17.08 | 33.13 | 10.83 | 19.21 | 25.76 | 42.95 | 28.12 | 8.67 | 20.41 | 21.86 | 25.95 |
| Lutjanidae | 8.33 | 4.57 | 1.77 | 8.56 | 18.56 | 8.33 | 18.84 | 19.07 | 44.98 | 37.4 | 7.08 | 28.49 | 23.10 | 13.24 |
| Mugilidae | 3.24 | 2.02 | 0.80 | 2.65 | 3.16 | 1.98 | 0.61 | 0.59 | 2.52 | 0.92 | 0.2 | 0.62 | 1.39 | 0.75 |
| Mullidae | 1.01 | 0.74 | 0.43 | 1.03 | 2.32 | 1.21 | 1.11 | 1.98 | 2.59 | 2.68 | 1.17 | 2.39 | 0.67 | 2.61 |
| Scaridae | 11.41 | 11.67 | 5.49 | 24.60 | 31.18 | 21.14 | 21.81 | 42.01 | 43.61 | 51.6 | 25.33 | 19.15 | 28.24 | 24.18 |
| Serranidae | 1.54 | 9.16 | 6.96 | 12.88 | 12.63 ' | 9.59 | 15.49 | 19.23 | 21.98 | 20.91 | 16.52 | 16.07 | 10.23 | 9.71 |
| Siganidae | 11.53 | 8.66 | 11.91 | 16.60 | 21.03 | 7.76 | 7.22 | 16.64 | 22.67 | 15.20 | 7.1 | 11.72 | 19.64 | 31.51 |
| Others | 29.68 | 62.47 | 22.78 | 14.02 | 5.60 | 0.62 | 6.53 | 3.67 | 45.64 | 8.15 | 85.46 | 16.44 | 15.07 | 8.14 |
| Total | 92.32 | 117.09 | 61.58 | 120.32 | 171.28 | 81.79 | 118.95 | 156.06 | 287.08 | 211.65 | 168.39 | 137.94 | 154.11 | 142.38 |

1. No data are available on 1982 landings.

Appendix IV
ANNUAL LANDINGS OF SELECTED REEF FISH SPECIES TO PFFA FISH MARKET, 1976-1990 ${ }^{1}$

| Year | 16 | 77 | 78 | 79 | 80 | 81 | 83 | 84 | 85 | 86 | 87 | 88 | 89 | 90 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bolbometopon muricatum | 4.02 | 9.43 | 2.45 | 15.15 | 11.27 | 10.77 | 10.25 | 33.65 | 25.23 | 28.93 | 14.26 | 5.57 | 8.69 | 7.47 |
| Cheilinus undulatus | 0.37 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 1.65 | 1.5 | 1.17 | 1.33 | 1.65 | 3.41 | 2.75 | 0.79 | 0.91 | 0.41 | 0.64 |
| Crenimugil crenilabis | 2.07 | 1.83 | 0.77 | 2.15 | 1.93 | 1.25 | 0.23 | 0.28 | 0.7 | 0.37 | 0.2 | 0.45 | 0.28 | 0.42 |
| Epinephelus spp. | 0.85 | 8.52 | 7.39 | 10.8 | 9.09 | 6.82 | 13.64 | 18.75 | 22.16 | 21.02 | 13.64 | 11.36 | 4.55 | 6.25 |
| Naso lituratus | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.56 | 1.79 | 4.47 | 2.53 | 1.34 | 0.98 | 2.48 | 4.6 | 2.76 | 5.92 | 13.04 | 7.81 |
| Naso unicomis | 7.68 | 8.56 | 6.74 | 8.98 | 27.4 | 11.79 | 16.04 | 11.98 | 35.28 | 28.38 | 7.52 | 10.77 | 14.72 | 12.01 |
| Plectropomus spp. | 0.63 | 1.69 | 0.42 | 2.96 | 4.23 | 5.5 | 2.75 | 2.11 | 1.2 | 1.48 | 4.02 | 5.92 | 6.13 | 3.8 |
| Siganus canaliculatus | 6.54 | 3.91 | 9.05 | 9.44 | 8.96 | 4.29 | 1.28 | 5.9 | 8.61 | 6.81 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 7.77 | 13.17 |
| Siganus lineatus | 4.52 | 2.67 | 2.84 | 6.11 | 10.6 | 3.33 | 3.88 | 7.48 | 10.9 | 6.25 | 2.12 | 6.24 | 10.05 | 16.99 |

1. No data are available on 1982 landings.

[^0]:    1 Johannes, R.E. 1991. Some suggested management initiatives in Palau's nearshore fisheries, and the relevance of traditional management. Consultancy Report, Marine Resources Division, Palau and South Pacific Commission, Noumea, New Caledonia.

[^1]:    2. Johannes, R.E. 1991. Some suggested management initiatives in Palau's nearshore fisheries, and the relevance of traditional management. Consultancy Report, Marine Resources Division, Palau and South Pacific Commission, Noumea, New Caledonia.
[^2]:    3 Recent studies on the age and growth of Cheilinus undulatus from the Australian Great Barrier Reef (G. McPherson, Northern Fisheries Research Centre, Cairns, Australia, pers. comm.) and Bolbometopon muricatum from New Caledonia (Couture \& Chauvet 1994) indicate life-spans for these fishes of about 25 years, with K values in the range 0.02-0.1.

