

NOT TO CITED WITHOUT PRIOR REFERENCE TO THE AUTHOR(S)

Serial No. N4988

## NAFO SCR Doc. 04/37

# **SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL MEETING – JUNE 2004**

Fisheries Organization

Standardized Catch Rate Indices for Greenland Halibut in SA2+3KLMNO

by

D. Power

Science Branch, Department of Fisheries and Oceans P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada A1C 5X1

## Abstract

Catch and effort data were analysed with a multiplicative model to derive a standardized catch rate index for the directed Greenland halibut otter trawl fishery in NAFO SA2+3KLMNO. Two measures of effort were used (hours fished and days fished) in separate analyses because of the lack of hours fished data for some fleets. Separate models were also run for CANADIAN FLEETS and NON-CANADIAN FLEETS because Canadian fleet operates within the 200-mile limit in Div. 2HJ+3KL while non-Canadian vessels have fished in the NAFO Regulatory area (NRA) outside the 200-mile limit in Div. 3LMNO since the mid-1980s. The results indicate that these fleets should be standardized separately, although there were some consistencies between some models in recent years. Various models suggest recent catch rates are amongst the lowest in the time series for both Canadian and non-Canadian fleets.

## Introduction

Catch and effort data from directed Greenland halibut otter trawl fisheries, standardized with a multiplicative model, have been presented as information for the assessment of this resource in SA2+Div. 3KLMNO since 2001. Although the analyses have utilized all fleets within any particular standardization, it has been recognized that fleets fish in different areas within the management unit. The Canadian fleet have operated totally within the 200-mile limit in Div. 2GHJ+3KL while non-Canadian fleets have fished in the NAFO Regulatory area (NRA) since the mid-1980s primarily in Div. 3LMN. However, there was a period prior to the mid-1980s when certain non-Canadian fleets operated within the 200-mile limit. The purpose of this paper is to investigate whether there are differences in trends in standardized CPUE between these area/fleet components.

## **Materials and Methods**

Catch and effort data from the directed fishery for Greenland halibut during the period 1975 to 2000 were obtained from ICNAF/NAFO Statistical Bulletins. These data were combined with provisional 2001-2003 NAFO STATLANT 21B data and 2003 Canadian data obtained from logbook records. The catch/effort data were analysed with a multiplicative model (Gavaris, 1980) to derive a standardized catch rate index separately for hours fished and days fished as measures of effort. The reason for the additional days fished standardization was due to the deficiency of hours-fished data within the NAFO database from two major fleets, EU-Portugal since 1992 and EU-Spain since 1995. Subsequently, within each measure of effort standardization, three analyses were considered: (a) All fleets, (b) Non-Canadian fleets since 1988, which corresponds to the entry of a principal fleet into the fishery (EU-Portugal) and (c) the Canadian fleets.

LN (CPUE) was the dependent variable in the models. Independent variables (category types) were: (1) a combination country-gear-tonnage-class category type (CGT), (2) month, (3) NAFO Division and (4) Year. Consistent with previous catch rate standardizations, individual observations with catch less than 10 tons or effort

less than 10 hours were eliminated prior to analysis for the "hours fished" models. Subsequently, within each dependent variable, categories with arbitrarily less than five observations were also eliminated, with the exception of the variable "year", which is the purpose of the standardization. For the "days fished" models the only difference in data elimination was for those observations where the effort was less than 5 days fished. When these arbitrary data selection criteria were applied, the analyses for non-Canadian fleets could only be conducted on the data from 1992 onward. Residual plots for all runs did not indicate model misspecification. An initial run of the ALL FLEETS hours fished data did not indicate problematic interaction effects and so all subsequent runs were conducted only on the four main effects noted previously.

## **Results and Discussion**

# (Model 1) ALL FLEETS 2G to 3N

For the "hours fished" standardization, the regression was significant (p < 0.05), explaining 57% of the variation in catch rates (Table 1). Although there was a significant year effect, there were only two years (1997 and 2002) that were significantly different from the 1975 reference year. Based on the regression coefficients, over the entire time series catch rates were better in winter, highest in Subarea 2 and lowest in Div 3M. The standardized catch rate index (Table 2; Fig. 1, upper panel) shows high between and within year variability, especially in the late-1970s to mid-1980s. There was an increasing trend in catch rate from the mid-1970s that peaked in 1982. CPUE subsequently fluctuated but declined by 60% to the lowest rate estimated in 1997. Catch rate increased from 1997 to 2000, which was the highest rate in the previous 10 years, declined to the lowest rate in the series in 2002 and increased by 17% in 2003. The increase between 1997 and 2000 is consistent with improved recruitment of several successive year-classes born between 1993-1995 (Bowering, 2001; Mahe and Bowering, 2001). The 2003 estimate is based solely on preliminary Canadian data. The percentage of otter trawl catch with reported hours fished effort utilized in the analysis, after the selection criteria were applied, ranged from 5% in 1980 to 80% in 1994 and averaged 17% since 1995.

For the "days fished" standardization, the regression was also significant (p < 0.05), explaining 52% of the variation in catch rates (Table 3). Similar to the "hours fished" index, over the whole time period, catch rates were generally higher in winter, highest in Subarea 2 and lowest in Div. 3M, based on the coefficients in Table 3. The standardized catch rate index (Table 4, Fig. 2 upper panel) also shows high between and within year variability prior to the 1990s. The catch rate index shows a similar trend to the hours-fished model. From the mid-1970s to the highest estimate in the series in 1982 the index increased by about 10%. Catch rate subsequently declined by 46% to 1988, with the exception of an anomalous increase in 1987. Between 1988 and 1995 the index shows two cycles of increase followed by a decrease. The index declined gradually to the second lowest value in the series in 1998. Catch rate in the series in 2002 and increased by 23% in 2003. The 2003 estimate is based on preliminary data from Canada and Statlant 21B data from Estonia which was incorporated into the model for the first time. The percentage of otter trawl catch with reported days fished effort utilized in the analysis, after the selection criteria were applied, ranged from 5% in 1980 to 85% in 1994 and averaged 33% from 1995-2002.

### (Model 2) NON-CANADIAN FLEETS in the NRA (3LMN)

For the "hours fished" standardization, the regression was significant (p < 0.05), explaining 56% of the variation in catch rates (Table 5). Based on the regression coefficients, over the whole time period catch rates were highest in winter and drop off as the year progresses, and, were similar in 3LNO and much lower in Div. 3M. The standardized catch rate index (Table 5, Fig. 1 middle panel) increased by 22% from 1992 to 1993, the highest in the series. Catch rate then declined in each year to 1997, the lowest in the series, and then increased in sequence to 2000. The index declined substantially in 2001 and remained at that level in 2002. These values are the second lowest in the time series and are about 50% lower than the highest in the series in 1993. The percentage of otter trawl catch with reported hours fished effort utilized in the analysis, after the selection criteria were applied, ranged from 9% in 2001 to 84% in 1994 and averaged 17% since 1995.

For the "days fished" standardization, the regression was also significant (p < 0.05), explaining 54% of the variation in catch rates (Table 6). Similar to the "hours fished" index, over the whole time period, catch rates were generally higher in winter and dropped off as the year progresses, and, that Div. 3M catch rate was comparatively the lowest.

The standardized catch rate index (Table 6, Fig. 2 middle panel) shows a similar trend to the hours fished model. Catch rate increased from 1992 to 1993, the highest in the series, and subsequently declined by 43% to 1997. The index increased each year to 2000 then declined rapidly to 2002. The 2002 value is the lowest in the series and represented a 42% reduction from the 2000 estimate, which was comparable to the highest rate in the series in 1993. The percentage of otter trawl catch with reported days fished effort utilized in the analysis, after the selection criteria were applied, ranged from 20% in 2002 to 89% in 1994 and averaged 38% since 1995.

### (Model 3) CANADIAN FLEETS (2HJ3KL inside 200-mile limit)

For the "hours fished" standardization, the regression was significant (p < 0.05), explaining 59% of the variation in catch rates (Table 7). Based on the regression coefficients, over the entire time series catch rates were better in late summer, highest in Div. 2H and similar but lower in Div 2J+3KL. The standardized catch rate index (Table 8, Fig. 1 lower panel) shows much within year variability. Catch rate more than doubled from the lowest value in the series in 1976 to 1978. There was a period of stability from 1978 to 1984. During this period of stability, the highest catch rates over the series were realized. Catch rate declined by 65% from 1984 to 1992 although there were some sporadic increases over this period. The 1992 value was the second lowest in the series. Between 1992 and 2001 catch rates increased gradually while doubled over this period. Catch rate declined in 2002 and again in 2003. The 2003 value is amongst the lowest in the time series. The percentage of otter trawl catch with reported hours fished effort utilized in the analysis, after the selection criteria were applied, ranged from 10% in 1976 to 99% in 2000 and averaged 83% since 1995.

For the "days fished" standardization, the regression was also significant (p < 0.05), explaining 56% of the variation in catch rates (Table 9). Similar to the "hours fished" index, over the whole time period, catch rates were better in late summer, highest in Div. 2H and similar but lower in Div 2J+3KL. The standardized catch rate index (Table 10, Fig. 2 lower panel) shows much within year variability. Catch rate more than doubled from the lowest value in the series in 1976 to 1978. There was a period of stability from 1978 to 1983. During this period of stability, the highest catch rates over the series were realized. Catch rate declined by 60% from 1983 to 1988 although there were some sporadic increases over this period. The 1988 value was the second lowest in the series. Catch rate increased by 85% in 1989 and was stable to 1997. Catch rate declined to the lowest value in the series in 1998 and subsequently increased each year to 2001, more than doubling over the period. Catch rate declined in 2002 and again in 2003. The 2003 value was similar to the catch rates in the stable period from 1989 to 1997. The percentage of otter trawl catch with reported days fished effort utilized in the analysis, after the selection criteria were applied, ranged from 10% in 1976 to 99% in 2002 and averaged 79% since 1995.

## **Summary and Conclusions**

Based on differences in trends in the catch rate models between CANADIAN and NON-CANADIAN fleets for the years since 1992, it appears that separate standardizations should be considered in future. This may be related to the fact that Canadian fleets fish within the 200-mile limit and all other fleets operate in the NAFO regulatory, outside the 200 mile limit. However, despite these findings there were some consistencies between some models in recent years. Various models suggest recent catch rates are amongst the lowest in the time series for both Canadian and non-Canadian fleets. A substantial number of deficiencies exist in the NAFO database since the mid-1990s for important fleets, particularly for the typically utilized hours-fished measurement of effort. Therefore, the NAFO STATLANT 21B data should not be used as data source for models utilized for standardization CPUE for Greenland halibut.

#### References

- Bowering, W.R. 2001. Population Trends in the Greenland halibut (*Reinhardtius hippoglossoides*) Resource of NAFO Subarea 2 and Divisions 3KLMNO based on Canadian Research Vessel Survey Results during 1978-2000. NAFO SCR Doc. 01/39, Ser. No. N4417, 42 p.
- Gavaris, S. 1980. Use of a multiplicative model to estimate catch rate and effort from commercial data. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 37:2272-2275.
- Mahe, J-C and Bowering, W.R. 2001. An Assessment of Stock Status of the Greenland Halibut Resource in NAFO Subarea 2 and Divisions 3KLMNO based on Extended Survivors Analysis. NAFO SCR Doc. 01/80, Ser. No. N4459, 18 p.

Table 1.ANOVA results and regression coefficients from a multiplicative model utilized to derive a standardized CPUE for<br/>Greenland halibut in NAFO SA2 + Div. 3KLMNO based on HOURS FISHED. Results are from the ALL FLEETS<br/>model (2003 based on preliminary data).

REGRESSION OF M MULTIPLE R MULTIPLE R	ULTIPLI SQUARE	ICATIV  ED	E MODEL • 0 • 0	.748 .560	
ANALYSIS O	F VARI	ANCE			
SOURCE OF VARIATION INTERCEPT REGRESSION Cntry Gear TC( Month( Division( Year(	DF  68 1) 22 2) 11 3) 7 4) 28	SUMS SQUAR 9.08 1.97 3.79 1.28 9.18 2.83	OF ES  E2 E2 E1 E1 E1 E0 E1	MEAN SQUARE 9.08E2 2.89E0 1.72E0 1.16E0 1.31E0 1.01E0	F-VALUE 15.850 9.447 6.366 7.186 5.536
RESIDUALS TOTAL	846 915	1.54 1.26	E2 E3	1.83E-1	
R	EGRESSI	ON CO	EFFICIEN	ITS	
CATEGORY	CODE	VAR #	REG. COEF	STD. ERR	. NO. OBS
Cntry Gear TC Month Division	3125 9 22 75	INT	-0.784	0.210	915
2	1/3         3123         3126         9125         10127         11125         11125         14124         14126         14127         15126         16127         19124         19125         20125         20126         20127         34125         34126         34127         1         2         3         4         5         6         7         8         10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	$\begin{array}{c} -0.335\\ -0.073\\ 0.647\\ 1.056\\ 0.207\\ -0.125\\ 0.356\\ 0.327\\ 0.694\\ 0.255\\ -0.349\\ -0.062\\ 0.253\\ 0.295\\ -0.120\\ -0.295\\ -0.120\\ -0.295\\ -0.120\\ -0.247\\ 0.422\\ 0.067\\ 0.247\\ 0.422\\ 0.067\\ 0.247\\ 0.422\\ 0.067\\ -0.269\\ \end{array}$	0.145 0.140 0.152 0.184 0.130 0.201 0.122 0.065 0.111 0.090 0.198 0.087 0.089 0.088 0.115 0.142 0.094 0.115 0.142 0.094 0.154 0.113 0.147 0.081 0.072 0.072 0.072 0.072 0.072 0.072 0.068 0.065 0.061 0.063	10 11 12 8 16 6 17 143 23 6 51 102 75 28 7 12 37 26 17 32 13 44 49 64 67 64 67 64 76 84 95 88

11	32 33	-0.062 0.067	0.062	96 79	
3 21	34	0.070	0.081	52	
23	35	-0.005	0.062	122	
31	36	-0.248	0.072	128	
32	3/	-0.198	0.077	295	
33	30	-0.233	0.094	94 70	
35	40	-0.265	0.135	21	
4 76	41	-0.067	0.223	11	
77	42	0.077	0.214	19	
78	43	0.291	0.231	18	
79	44	0.106	0.227	10	
80	45	0.322	0.235	15	
82	47	0.391	0.217	19	
83	48	0.350	0.210	24	
84	49	0.300	0.212	23	
85	50	0.091	0.213	21	
86	51	-0.149	0.212	24	
07 88	52	-0.242	0.204	22	
89	54	-0.054	0.217	22	
90	55	-0.003	0.215	26	
91	56	-0.285	0.211	51	
92	57	-0.413	0.208	102	
93	58	-0.215	0.211	102	
95	59 60	-0.370 -0.167	0.212	21	
96	61	-0.354	0.219	23	
97	62	-0.476	0.219	24	
98	63	-0.272	0.226	34	
99	64	-0.247	0.219	49	
100	65 66	-0.062	0.222	19	
101	67	-0.275	0.215	47	
103	68	-0.356	0.220	22	
		-			
CCT CODES, All are	RESULT:	<u>S:</u> n Travic	ra		
3123 = Can(NFLD)	TC 3	1114 $114$	= Poland		TC 7
3125 = Can(NFLD)	TC 5	19124	= Spain		TC 4
3126 = "	TC 6	19125	= "		TC 5
9125 = Fra(SPM)	TC 5	19126	= "		TC 6
10127 = Former FRG	TC 7	20125	= Former	USSR	TC 5
11125 = FORMER DDR	TC 5	20126	_ "		TC 6
11127 = "	TC 7	27125	= Can(M)		TC 5
14124 = Japan	TC 4	34125	= Russia		TC 5
14126 = "	TC 6	34126	- "		TC 6
14127 = "	TC 7	34127	= "		TC 6
<u>15126 = Norway</u>	'I'C 6	Ļ			
21 = 2G, $22 = 2H$	23 = 2	T. 31 -	3K. 32 -	31.	
33 = 3M, 34 = 3N, 34	35 = 30	0	510, 52 -	21	
,					

Table 2. Standardized CPUE for Greenland halibut in NAFO SA2+ Div. 3KLMNO based on a multiplicative model based utilizing HOURS FISHED as a measure of effort. Results are from the ALL FLEETS model (2003 based on preliminary data).

#### PREDICTED CATCH RATE

	LN TR	ANSFORM	RETRAN	ISFORMED	FLEET		% OF CATCH IN
YEAR	MEAN	S.E.	MEAN	S.E.	CATCH	EFFORT	THIS ANALYSIS
1975	-0.7837	0.0443	0.489	0.102	28814	58873	9.1
1976	-0.8506	0.0234	0.463	0.070	24611	53206	9.5
1977	-0.7068	0.0180	0.536	0.072	32048	59842	17.2
1978	-0.4926	0.0207	0.663	0.095	39070	58965	6.7
1979	-0.6777	0.0282	0.549	0.092	34104	62167	9.5
1980	-0.4613	0.0210	0.684	0.099	32867	48082	5.1
1981	-0.6543	0.0182	0.564	0.076	30754	54493	12.6
1982	-0.3932	0.0145	0.734	0.088	26278	35795	34.5
1983	-0.4333	0.0125	0.706	0.079	27861	39465	31.6
1984	-0.4832	0.0119	0.672	0.073	26711	39761	33.4
1985	-0.6922	0.0140	0.545	0.064	20347	37367	27.9
1986	-0.9324	0.0127	0.429	0.048	17976	41947	22.4
1987	-0.6542	0.0128	0.566	0.064	32442	57322	35.8
1988	-1.0254	0.0141	0.390	0.046	19215	49241	20.7
1989	-0.8373	0.0131	0.471	0.054	20034	42516	11.3
1990	-0.7867	0.0110	0.496	0.052	47454	95642	8.5
1991	-1.0691	0.0103	0.374	0.038	65008	173717	10.9
1992	-1.1970	0.0093	0.329	0.032	63193	191809	59.3
1993	-0.9985	0.0104	0.402	0.041	62455	155518	60.4
1994	-1.1534	0.0110	0.344	0.036	51029	148405	80.4
1995	-0.9506	0.0175	0.420	0.055	15272	36378	13.8
1996	-1.1378	0.0145	0.349	0.042	18840	54037	14.6
1997	-1.2596	0.0146	0.309	0.037	19858	64339	14.2
1998	-1.0556	0.0180	0.378	0.050	19946	52788	19.3
1999	-1.0306	0.0147	0.388	0.047	24226	62430	26.9
2000	-0.8456	0.0161	0.467	0.059	34177	73251	11.1
2001	-1.0588	0.0121	0.378	0.041	38232	101210	12.1
2002	-1.3084	0.0127	0.294	0.033	34062	115769	21.4
2003	-1.1393	0.0120	0.349	0.038	35151	100840	7.6

AVERAGE C.V. FOR THE RETRANSFORMED MEAN: 0.124  $\,$ 

Table 3.ANOVA results and regression coefficients from a multiplicative model utilized to derive a standardized CPUE for<br/>Greenland halibut in NAFO SA2 + Div. 3KLMNO based on DAYS FISHED. Results are from the ALL FLEETS<br/>model (2003 based on preliminary data).

MULTIPLE R SQUARED 0.522	
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE	
SOURCE OF SUMS OF MEAN	
VARIATION DF SQUARES SQUARE F-VAL	
INTERCEPT 1 2.48E3 2.48E3	
REGRESSION 71 2.25E2 3.17E0 15.11	L3
Cntry Gear TC(1) 25 6.47E1 2.59E0 12.33	37
Division(3) 7 2.34E1 3.34E0 15.91	10
Year(4) 28 2.64E1 9.43E-1 4.49	93
RESIDUALS 983 2.06E2 2.10E-1 TOTAL 1055 2.92E3	
REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS	
CATEGORY CODE # COEF ERR OBS	
Cntry Gear TC 3125 INT 2.052 0.233 1055	
Month 9 Division 22	
Division 22 Year 75	
1 3123 1 -0.546 0.157 10	
3126 2 -0.100 0.156 10	
9125 3 0.451 0.111 28	
11125  4  -0.078  0.135  18 11126  5  -0.277  0.238  5	
11120 $5 - 0.277$ $0.238$ $311127$ $6$ $0.166$ $0.138$ $16$	
14124 7 0.410 0.073 137	
14126 8 0.538 0.137 19	
14127 9 0.367 0.100 37	
16127 11 0.176 0.102 46	
17126 12 -0.335 0.082 123	
19124 13 -0.263 0.091 101	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
19126 15 0.423 0.124 28	
20125 17 0.324 0.213 6	
20126 18 -0.365 0.166 10	
20127 19 -0.263 0.105 35	
27125  20  0.174  0.128  17 31126  21  0.481  0.225  5	
32127 22 -0.079 0.175 13	
34125 23 0.482 0.150 15	
34126 24 0.065 0.101 41	
34127 25 0.070 0.125 21 2 1 26 0.268 0.079 57	
2  1  20  0.200  0.078  57 2  27  0.259  0.074  67	
3 28 0.083 0.069 88	
4 29 0.177 0.070 82 5 30 0.311 0.070 80	

6

31

0.192

0.068

84

	7 8 10 11 12	32 33 34 35 36	0.128 0.155 -0.229 -0.100 0.064	0.067 0.063 0.065 0.064 0.067	86 103 94 103 94	
3	21 23 31 32	37 38 39 40	0.156 0.053 -0.255 -0.242	0.097 0.073 0.085 0.088	43 110 113 405	
4	34 35 76 77	42 43 44 45	-0.466 -0.411 -0.144 -0.092	0.102 0.101 0.141 0.246 0.235	133 23 9 15	
	78 79 80 81 82	46 47 48 49 50	-0.064 -0.046 0.066 -0.299 0.096	0.268 0.257 0.273 0.249 0.236	8 8 12 18	
	83 84 85 86 87	51 52 53 54 55	-0.025 0.074 -0.147 -0.327 -0.078	0.226 0.232 0.238 0.238 0.238 0.226	25 21 17 16 27	
	88 89 90 91 92	56 57 58 59 60	-0.526 -0.320 -0.313 -0.450 -0.552	0.232 0.239 0.236 0.230 0.230	21 19 24 45 99	
	93 94 95 96	61 62 63 64	-0.331 -0.312 -0.518 -0.542	0.228 0.227 0.236 0.231	88 112 33 42	
1	98 99 LOO LO1	65 66 67 68 69	-0.822 -0.636 -0.384 -0.182 -0.439	0.232 0.228 0.231 0.230 0.228	98 60 50 54	
LEGEND FOR ANOU	L02 L03 <u>/A R</u> are	70 71 <u>ESULTS</u> Sterr	-0.679 -0.470 <u>5:</u> 1 Trawle	0.232 0.245 ers	47 31	<b>E</b> C <b>E</b>
3123 = Caff (NFL) 3125 = Can (NFL) 3126 = " 9125 = Fra (SPM) 10127 = Former I	FRG	TC 5 TC 6 TC 5 TC 5 TC 7	19124 19125 19126 20125	= Poland = Spain = " = " = Former	USSR	TC 4 TC 5 TC 6 TC 5
11125 = Former I 11126 = " 11127 = " 14124 = Japan 14126 = " 14127 = "	DDR	TC 5 TC 6 TC 7 TC 4 TC 6 TC 7	20126 20127 27125 34125 34126 34127	= " = Can(M) = Russia = " = "		TC 6 TC 7 TC 5 TC 5 TC 6 TC 6
15126         = Norway           DIVISION CODES:         21           21         2G, 22         2H           33         3M, 34         3N	ł, 2 ł, 3	<u>TC 6</u> 3 = 20 5 = 30	L J, 31 =	3K, 32 =	3L	

Table 4.Standardized CPUE for Greenland halibut in NAFO SA2+ Div. 3KLMNO based on a multiplicative<br/>model based utilizing DAYS FISHED as a measure of effort. Results are from the ALL FLEETS model<br/>(2003 based on preliminary data).

# PREDICTED CATCH RATE

	LN TR	ANSFORM	RETRAN	ISFORMED	FLEET		% OF CATCH IN
YEAR	MEAN	S.E.	MEAN	S.E.	CATCH	EFFORT	THIS ANALYSIS
1975	2.0522	0.0542	8.416	1.934	28814	3424	9.1
1976	1.9079	0.0334	7.361	1.334	24611	3343	9.4
1977	1.9603	0.0248	7.791	1.220	32048	4114	17.0
1978	1.9884	0.0338	7.976	1.455	39070	4898	4.9
1979	2.0067	0.0385	8.105	1.576	34104	4208	9.3
1980	2.1181	0.0340	9.080	1.662	32867	3620	4.8
1981	1.7529	0.0273	6.324	1.039	30754	4863	12.5
1982	2.1484	0.0183	9.434	1.271	26278	2785	36.1
1983	2.0275	0.0152	8.373	1.029	27861	3328	40.4
1984	2.1264	0.0157	9.241	1.155	26711	2891	33.2
1985	1.9049	0.0195	7.390	1.027	20347	2753	27.6
1986	1.7254	0.0202	6.174	0.874	17976	2912	21.1
1987	1.9743	0.0190	7.923	1.089	32442	4095	35.4
1988	1.5262	0.0182	5.064	0.681	19215	3795	20.6
1989	1.7318	0.0171	6.223	0.811	20034	3219	11.1
1990	1.7397	0.0139	6.283	0.738	47454	7553	8.4
1991	1.6026	0.0128	5.481	0.619	65008	11861	10.7
1992	1.5004	0.0121	4.950	0.543	63193	12766	59.2
1993	1.7215	0.0124	6.174	0.685	62455	10115	61.1
1994	1.7404	0.0125	6.292	0.700	51029	8111	84.9
1995	1.5343	0.0168	5.108	0.660	15272	2990	20.9
1996	1.5101	0.0144	4.992	0.597	18840	3774	28.4
1997	1.4307	0.0146	4.611	0.555	19858	4307	26.5
1998	1.4163	0.0130	4.549	0.518	19946	4385	67.1
1999	1.6685	0.0142	5.850	0.696	24226	4141	35.6
2000	1.8703	0.0138	7.159	0.839	34177	4774	32.7
2001	1.6130	0.0130	5.538	0.630	38232	6904	28.5
2002	1.3730	0.0145	4.353	0.522	34062	7825	21.4
2003	1.5819	0.0157	5.361	0.669	35151	6557	11.4

AVERAGE C.V. FOR THE RETRANSFORMED MEAN: 0.138

 Table 5.
 ANOVA results and regression coefficients from a multiplicative model utilized to derive a standardized CPUE for<br/>Greenland halibut in NAFO Div. 3LMNO based on HOURS FISHED. Results are from the NON-CANADIAN<br/>FLEETS model.

REGRESSION MULTIPLE F MULTIPLE F	N OF MU R R SQUAR	LTIPLI  ED	CATIVE N . 0. . 0.	MODEL .746 .556	%OF	YEAR	LN TR MEAN	ANSFORM S.E.	RETRAN MEAN	SFORMED S.E.	FLEET CATCH	% EFFORT	OF CATCH IN THIS ANALYSIS
ANALYSIS (	OF VARI	ANCE				1992	-0.8347	0.0097	0.462	0.045	56190	121651	62.7
SOURCE OF VARIATION	DF 	SUMS SQUAR	OF ES 	MEAN SQUARE	F-VALUE	1993 1994 1995 1996	-0.6352 -0.8991 -0.9640 -1.1413	0.0107 0.0095 0.0119 0.0137	0.564 0.433 0.405 0.339	0.058 0.042 0.044 0.040	48076 12037 12661	102108 110988 29689 37319	63.3 84.2 14.5 15.0
INTERCEPT REGRESSION Cntry Gear TC	1 32 8	6.61 6.55 2.45	E2 E1 E1	6.61E2 2.05E0 3.06E0	15.278 22.833	1997 1998 1999	-1.4838 -1.0998 -1.0491	0.0126 0.0135 0.0098	0.241 0.354 0.373	0.027 0.041 0.037	13578 15825 20210	56337 44744 54216	13.7 24.2 30.7
Month Division Year	11 3 10	9.83 5.92 1.07	E0 E0 E1	8.94E-1 1.97E0 1.07E0	6.669 14.724 7.971	2000 2001 2002	-0.8259 -1.3420 -1.3498	0.0186 0.0128 0.0105	0.464 0.278 0.276	0.063 0.031 0.028	23584 29867 27772	50833 107554 100682	10.6 9.4 19.9
RESIDUALS TOTAL	390 423 REGRES	5.23 7.79 SION C	E1 E2 OEFFICIE	1.34E-1 ENTS		AVERA	GE C.V. E	FOR THE RI	ETRANSFO	RMED MEAI	N: 0.109		
CATEGORY	CODE	VAR #	REG. COEF	STD ERR	. NO. OBS								
Cntry Gear TC Month Division Year	14124 11 32 92	INT	-0.835	0.099	423								
1	9125 14127 19124 19125	1 2 3	0.346 0.013 -0.975	0.139 0.080 0.081	10 33 101 75								
	19126 34125 34126	5 6 7	-0.410 0.229 -0.231	0.107 0.136 0.093	28 16 32								
2	34127 1 2 3	8 9 10 11	-0.253 0.441 0.367 0.245	0.128 0.092 0.089 0.085	13 31 35 42								
	4 5 6 7	12 13 14 15	0.235 0.333 0.138 0.121	0.086 0.086 0.089 0.091	40 39 35 31								
	8 9 10	16 17 18 19	0.109 0.091 -0.172	0.091 0.088 0.089	31 35 33								
3	33 34 35	20 21 22	-0.310 -0.011 -0.006	0.050 0.057 0.096	93 69 21								
4	93 94 95 96	23 24 25 26	0.200 -0.064 -0.129 -0.307	0.078 0.075 0.121 0.130	64 98 19 14		<u>LEGEND</u> CGT COD 9125 =	<u>FOR ANOVA</u> ES: All a Fra(SPM)	RESULTS re Stern TC 5	<u>:</u> Trawler 19126 =	s Spain	TC	: 6
	97 98 99 100	27 28 29 30	-0.649 -0.265 -0.214 0.009	0.123 0.126 0.110 0.144	17 32 46 10		14124 = 14127 = 19124 = 19125 =	Japan " Spain "	TC 4 TC 7 TC 4 TC 5	34125 = 34126 = 34127 =	Russia "	TC TC TC	5 6 7
PREDICT	101 102 ED CATC	31 32 CH RATE	-0.507 -0.515	0.124	15 36		$\frac{1}{2} = 3L,$	CODES: 33 = 3M,	34 = 3N	, 35 = 3	0		

Table 6.ANOVA results and regression coefficients from a multiplicative model utilized to derive a standardized CPUE for<br/>Greenland halibut in NAFO Div. 3LMNO based on DAYS FISHED. Results are from the NON-CANADIAN<br/>FLEETS model.

REGRESSION MULTIPLE R MULTIPLE R	I OF MUI	LTIPLI  ED	CATIVE 0 . 0	MODEL .724 .524			CATEGOF	<u>AY CODE</u> 4 100 101	# 33 34	COEF 0.133 -0.218	ERR 0.109 0.111	OBS 42 39	
ANALYSIS C	F VARIA	ANCE						102	30	-0.420	0.117	30	
SOURCE OF VARIATION	DF	SUMS SQUAR	OF ES	MEAN SQUARE	F-VALUE								
INTERCEPT REGRESSION Cntry Gear TC Month Division	1 35 11 11 3	1.10 1.13 4.85 1.67	E3 E2 E1 E1 E1	1.10E3 3.23E0 4.41E0 1.52E0 5.69E0	18.1780F 24.847 8.562 32.034	YEAR	PREDI LN TRA MEAN	CTED CATO NSFORM S.E.	CH RATE RETRAI MEAN	NSFORMED S.E.	FLEET CATCH	۶ EFFORT	OF CATCH IN THIS ANALYSIS
RESIDUALS TOTAL	10 577 613 REGRES	1.02 1.32	E1 E2 E3 COEFFICI	1.57E0 1.77E-1	8.822	1992 1993 1994 1995 1996	1.8548 2.0048 1.9596 1.6375 1.5975	0.0109 0.0095 0.0081 0.0110 0.0104	6.946 8.076 7.725 5.590 5.372	0.725 0.787 0.693 0.585 0.546	56190 57549 48076 12037 12661	8089 7126 6224 2153 2357	62.6 64.1 89.0 23.5 35.5
CATEGORY	CODE	VAR # 	REG. COEF	STD ERR 	. NO. OBS	1997 1998 1999	1.4503 1.5714 1.7817	0.0100 0.0081 0.0089	4.637 5.240 6.464	0.463 0.470 0.607	13578 15825 20210	2928 3020 3127	30.0 80.8 41.1
Cntry Gear TC Month Division	14124 9 32	INT	1.855	0.105	613	2000 2001 2002	1.9879 1.6370 1.4350	0.0101 0.0098 0.0108	7.938 5.590 4.565	0.796 0.551 0.473	23584 29867 27772	2971 5343 6083	42.1 30.5 19.9
l l 2 3	92 9125 14127 17126 19124 19125 19126 31126 34125 34125 34127 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 10 11 2 33	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	0.022 -0.049 -0.732 -0.828 -0.651 -0.198 -0.145 0.171 0.086 -0.308 0.393 0.346 0.199 0.295 0.372 0.161 0.092 0.126 -0.182 -0.182 -0.138 -0.138	0.110 0.092 0.060 0.073 0.118 0.161 0.2055 0.131 0.084 0.110 0.089 0.083 0.082 0.082 0.082 0.082 0.082 0.082 0.082 0.082 0.082 0.082 0.082 0.082 0.082 0.082 0.082 0.082 0.082 0.082 0.084 0.086 0.086 0.086 0.086 0.086 0.086 0.086 0.086 0.086 0.086 0.086 0.086 0.086 0.086 0.086 0.086 0.086 0.084	19 29 123 101 111 28 8 5 15 41 21 43 56 67 58 58 58 58 58 58 50 42 43 47 48 51 110	AVE	RAGE C.V.	FOR THE	RETRANS	FORMED N	1EAN: 0.C	999	
4	33 34 93 94 95 96 97 98 99	23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 VAR	-0.239 -0.132 0.150 0.105 -0.217 -0.257 -0.405 -0.283 -0.073 REG.	0.032 0.049 0.103 0.086 0.083 0.115 0.113 0.114 0.094 0.104 STD	130 23 70 108 31 34 32 92 57 . NO.	1 1 1 <u>1</u> D 3	DESEMPTION           CGT CODES           9125 = Fr           4124 = Ja           4127 =           7126 = Pc           9125 =           IVISION C           2 = 3L, 3	S: All ar ca (SPM) apan " prtugal pain " CODES: 33 = 3M,	$\frac{\text{TC 5}}{\text{TC 4}}$ $\frac{\text{TC 7}}{\text{TC 6}}$ $\frac{\text{TC 4}}{\text{TC 7}}$ $\frac{\text{TC 4}}{\text{TC 5}}$ $34 = 3N$	Trawler 19126 = 19166 = 31126 = 34125 = 34126 = 34127 =	s Spain " Latvia Russia " 0	TC 0 TC 0 TC 1 TC 0 TC 0	5

Table 7.ANOVA results and regression coefficients from a multiplicative model utilized to derive a standardized CPUE for<br/>Greenland halibut in NAFO Div. 2HJ3KL based on HOURS FISHED. Results are from the CANADIAN FLEETS<br/>model (2003 based on preliminary data).

REGRESSION MULTIPLE R	OF MUI	JTIPLI	CATIVE I	MODEL .771	
MULTIPLE R	SQUARI	ED	. 0	.594	
ANALYSIS O	F VARIA	NCE			
SOURCE OF VARIATION	ਸਹ	SUMS	OF	MEAN	F-VALUE
INTERCEPT	1	2.38	BE2	2.38E2	
REGRESSION	44	5.02	E1	1.14E0	7.243
Cntry Gear TC	3	7.96	E-L	2.65E-1	1.686
Division	3	3.97	EU EO	3.61E-1	2.291
Year	27	2.55	EU E1	9.46E-1	6.010
RESIDUALS	218	3.43	E1	1.57E-1	
R	∠63 EGRESSI	3.23 ON CO	EFFICIEN	ITS	
		VAR	REG.	STD.	NO.
CATEGORY	CODE	#	COEF	ERR 	OBS
Cntry Gear TC Month	3125 9	INT	-1.186	0.306	263
Division	22				
Year	76	1	0 01 5	0 1 4 4	1.0
T	3123	1	-0.215	0.144	10
	3120 27125	2	0.110	0.146	25
2	27123	4	-0.239	0.149	11
_	2	5	-0.173	0.151	12
	3	6	-0.485	0.133	18
	4	7	-0.386	0.126	24
	5	8	-0.193	0.127	21
	6	9	-0.135	0.112	29
	/	10	-0.143	0.101	34
	10	12	-0.244	0.093	37
	11	13	-0.331	0.137	14
	12	14	-0.137	0.161	9
3	23	15	-0.154	0.095	68
	31	16	-0.245	0.100	113
	32	17	-0.147	0.115	49
4	77	18	0.300	0.338	5
	78	19	0.946	0.329	8
	80	20	1 101	0.370	12
	81	22	0.998	0.318	12
	82	23	0.981	0.322	10
	83	24	0.981	0.309	18
	84	25	1.114	0.316	12
	85	26	0.617	0.315	13
	86 97	∠/ 28	0.506	0.334	/
	07 88	20 29	0.015	0.342	4
	89	30	0.577	0.335	6
	90	31	0.530	0.315	12
	91	32	0.249	0.310	15

CODE	#	COEF	ERR	OBS
92	33	0.069	0.309	20
93	34	0.121	0.320	15
94	35	0.181	0.356	4
95	36	0.283	0.407	2
96	37	0.234	0.326	8
97	38	0.610	0.330	7
98	39	0.510	0.410	2
99	40	0.472	0.414	2
100	41	0.557	0.324	9
101	42	0.780	0.313	17
102	43	0.341	0.319	11
103	44	0.195	0.304	22
	CODE 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103	CODE         #           92         33           93         34           94         35           95         36           96         37           97         38           98         39           99         40           100         41           101         42           102         43           103         44	CODE         #         COEF           92         33         0.069           93         34         0.121           94         35         0.181           95         36         0.234           97         38         0.610           98         39         0.510           99         40         0.472           100         41         0.557           101         42         0.780           102         43         0.341           103         44         0.195	CODE         #         COEF         ERR           92         33         0.069         0.309           93         34         0.121         0.320           94         35         0.181         0.356           95         36         0.283         0.407           96         37         0.234         0.326           97         38         0.610         0.330           98         39         0.510         0.410           99         40         0.472         0.414           100         41         0.557         0.324           101         42         0.780         0.313           102         43         0.341         0.319           103         44         0.195         0.304

LEGEND F	OR ANOVA	RESU	JLTS :					
CGT CODE	S: All ar	ce St	ern	Traw	lers			
3123 = C	an (NFLD)	TC	3					
3125 = C	an (NFLD)	TC	5					
3126 =	"	TC	6					
27125 = C	an(M)	TC	5					
DIVISION	CODES:							
21 = 2G,	22 = 2H,	23 =	= 2J,	31	= 3K,	32	=	ЗL

Table 8.Standardized CPUE for Greenland halibut in NAFO 2HJ3KL based on a multiplicative model based utilizing<br/>HOURS FISHED as a measure of effort. Results are from the CANADIAN FLEETS model (2003 based on<br/>preliminary data).

## PREDICTED CATCH RATE

	LN TR	ANSFORM RETRANSFO		ISFORMED	FLEET		% OF CATCH IN
YEAR	MEAN	S.E.	MEAN	S.E.	CATCH	EFFORT	THIS ANALYSIS
1976	-1.1861	0.0933	0.315	0.094	767	2432	9.5
1977	-0.8863	0.0452	0.436	0.092	2866	6572	20.9
1978	-0.2400	0.0338	0.837	0.153	3951	4720	30.0
1979	-0.2359	0.0708	0.825	0.216	5183	6283	35.4
1980	-0.0854	0.0276	0.980	0.162	3946	4027	42.5
1981	-0.1878	0.0258	0.885	0.142	6155	6952	55.8
1982	-0.2053	0.0222	0.872	0.129	8143	9342	73.4
1983	-0.2050	0.0177	0.874	0.116	7085	8108	87.4
1984	-0.0722	0.0195	0.997	0.139	6070	6088	90.4
1985	-0.5694	0.0198	0.606	0.085	4847	7994	91.2
1986	-0.6804	0.0300	0.540	0.093	1896	3512	73.7
1987	-0.3710	0.0421	0.731	0.149	2465	3371	85.6
1988	-1.0913	0.0533	0.354	0.081	629	1778	38.8
1989	-0.6088	0.0376	0.578	0.111	988	1710	21.2
1990	-0.6559	0.0233	0.555	0.084	2402	4327	75.9
1991	-0.9368	0.0240	0.419	0.065	3254	7766	68.1
1992	-1.1170	0.0202	0.351	0.050	2502	7136	50.2
1993	-1.0647	0.0307	0.367	0.064	1034	2814	87.7
1994	-1.0049	0.0529	0.386	0.088	575	1490	96.5
1995	-0.9027	0.0912	0.419	0.124	632	1508	56.2
1996	-0.9518	0.0314	0.411	0.072	1043	2536	81.0
1997	-0.5763	0.0352	0.598	0.111	1017	1702	94.7
1998	-0.6765	0.0926	0.525	0.157	46	88	63.0
1999	-0.7144	0.0966	0.505	0.153	81	161	81.5
2000	-0.6288	0.0308	0.568	0.099	1285	2261	99.3
2001	-0.4061	0.0237	0.713	0.109	1833	2573	99.2
2002	-0.8446	0.0274	0.459	0.076	1784	3889	98.7
2003	-0.9908	0.0158	0.399	0.050	3710	9307	72.2

AVERAGE C.V. FOR THE RETRANSFORMED MEAN: 0.192

Table 9.ANOVA results and regression coefficients from a multiplicative model utilized to derive a standardized CPUE for<br/>Greenland halibut in NAFO 2HJ3KL based on DAYS FISHED. Results are from the CANADIAN FLEETS model<br/>(2003 based on preliminary data).

REGRESSION OF MULTIPLICATIVE MODEL MULTIPLE R 0.749 MULTIPLE R SQUARED 0.562										
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE										
SOURCE OF VARIATION	DF	SUMS SQUAR	OF ES	MEAN SQUARE	F-VALUE					
INTERCEPT REGRESSION Cntry Gear TC Month Division Year	1 44 3 11 3 27	6.39 4.31 1.82 5.38 1.19 1.88	E2 E1 E0 E0 E0 E1	6.39E2 9.79E-1 6.08E-1 4.90E-1 3.97E-1 6.97E-1	5.239 3.253 2.620 2.126 3.732					
RESIDUALS TOTAL R	180 225 EGRESSI	3.36 7.16	E1 E2 EFFICIEN	1.87E-1						
CATEGORY	CODE	VAR #	REG. COEF	STD. ERR	. NO. OBS					
Cntry Gear TC Month Division	3125 9 22	INT	1.565	0.345	225					
1	3123 3126 27125	1 2 3	-0.503 -0.008 -0.001	0.161 0.171 0.127	10 10 17					
2	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 10 11	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	-0.243 -0.124 -0.490 -0.451 -0.104 -0.023 0.023 0.119 -0.289 -0.386 -0.237	0.171 0.184 0.151 0.149 0.146 0.134 0.124 0.107 0.151 0.160 0.206	11 9 17 20 18 24 24 24 35 13 12 7					
3	23 31 32	15 16 17	-0.239 -0.320 -0.293	0.121 0.128 0.144	57 102 41					
4	77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91	18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32	0.221 0.803 1.045 1.071 0.913 0.893 0.833 1.140 0.615 0.564 1.101 -0.048 0.560 0.380 0.380	0.381 0.374 0.405 0.355 0.359 0.359 0.359 0.354 0.353 0.397 0.453 0.397 0.453 0.390 0.349 0.349	4 6 3 8 9 9 9 14 10 11 4 2 4 4 11 15					

		VAR	REG.	STD.	NO.
CATEGORY	CODE	#	COEF	ERR	OBS
	92	33	0.087	0.342	19
	93	34	0.351	0.358	14
	94	35	0.312	0.392	4
	95	36	0.319	0.448	2
	96	37	0.305	0.360	8
	97	38	0.609	0.364	7
	98	39	-0.140	0.555	1
	99	40	0.214	0.458	2
	100	41	0.515	0.363	8
	101	42	0.779	0.348	15
	102	43	0.408	0.353	11
	103	44	0.213	0.341	18

LEGEN	ND	FOR AND	DVA I	REST	JLT	s :						
CGT (	COI	DES: All	are	e St	cer	n	Trawl	er	s			
3123	=	Can (NFI	D)	ТC	3		15126	=	Norway		TC	6
3125	=	Can (NFI	D)	ТC	5	İ	16127	=	Poland		TC	7
3126	=	"		ТC	6		19124	=	Spain		TC	4
9125	=	Fra(SPN	1)	TC	5		19125	=	- "		TC	5
0127	=	Former	FRG	ТC	7	İ	19126	=	"		TC	6
1125	=	Former	DDR	ТC	5		20125	=	Former	USSR	TC	5
1126	=	"		ТC	6		20126	=	"		TC	6
1127	=	"		TС	7	İ	20127	=	"		TC	7
4124	=	Japan		ТC	4		27125	=	Can(M)		TC	5
4126	=	- "		ТC	6		34125	=	Russia		TC	5
4127	=	"		ТC	7	İ	34126	=	"		TC	6
IVISI	ION	I CODES:	:									
1 = 2	2G,	22 = 2	2н, 2	23 =	= 2	J,	31 =	3	K, $32 =$	3L		
3 = 3	3М,	34 = 3	3N, 3	35 =	= 3	О						
	LEGEI CGT ( 3123 3125 3126 9125 0127 1125 1126 1127 4124 4126 4127 IVIS 1 = 1 3 = 1	LEGEND CGT COI 3123 = 3125 = 0127 = 1125 = 1126 = 4124 = 4124 = 4124 = 4127 = IVISION 1 = 2G, 3 = 3M,	LEGEND FOR ANC CGT CODES: All 3123 = Can (NFI 3125 = Can (NFI 3126 = " 9125 = Fra (SPM 0127 = Former 1125 = Former 1125 = " 1127 = " 4124 = Japan 4126 = " 4127 = " IVISION CODES: 1 = 2G, 22 = 2 3 = 3M, 34 = 3	LEGEND FOR ANOVA 1 CGT CODES: All are 3123 = Can(NFLD) 3125 = Can(NFLD) 3126 = " 9125 = Fra(SPM) 0127 = Former FRG 1125 = Former DDR 1126 = " 1127 = " 1127 = " 1127 = " IVISION CODES: 1 = 2G, 22 = 2H, 2 3 = 3M, 34 = 3N, 32	LEGEND FOR ANOVA RESI           CGT CODES: All are St           3123 = Can (NFLD) TC           3125 = Can (NFLD) TC           3126 = " TC           9125 = Fra (SPM) TC           0127 = Former FRG TC           1125 = Former DDR TC           1126 = " TC           4124 = Japan TC           4124 = " TC           4126 = " TC           4127 = " TC           IVISION CODES:           1 = 2G, 22 = 2H, 23 =           3 = 3M, 34 = 3N, 35 =	$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{LEGEND FOR ANOVA RESULT} \\ \mbox{CGT CODES: All are Ster:} \\ \mbox{3123} = Can(NFLD) TC 3 \\ \mbox{3126} = Can(NFLD) TC 5 \\ \mbox{3126} = Can(NFLD) TC 5 \\ \mbox{3126} = Can(NFLD) TC 5 \\ \mbox{3126} = Fra(SPM) TC 5 \\ \mbox{3127} = Former FRG TC 7 \\ \mbox{3125} = Former DDR TC 5 \\ \mbox{3126} = & TC 6 \\ \mbox{3127} = & TC 6 \\ \mbox{3127} = & TC 7 \\ \mbox{3126} = & TC 7 \\ \mbox{3126} = & TC 6 \\ \mbox{3127} = & TC 7 \\ \mbox{3126} = & TC 7 \\ \mbox{3126} = & TC 6 \\ \mbox{3127} = & TC 7 \\ \mbox{3126} = & TC 7 \\ $	LEGEND FOR ANOVA RESULTS:           CGT CODES: All are Stern           3125 = Can (NFLD) TC 3           3125 = Can (NFLD) TC 5           3126 = " TC 6           9125 = Fra (SPM) TC 5           0127 = Former FRG TC 7           1125 = Former DDR TC 5           1127 = " TC 6           1127 = " TC 7           4124 = Japan TC 4           4126 = " TC 6           4127 = " TC 7           IVISION CODES:           1 = 2G, 22 = 2H, 23 = 2J,           3 = 3M, 34 = 3N, 35 = 30	LEGEND FOR ANOVA RESULTS:           CGT CODES: All are Stern Trawl           3123 = Can(NFLD) TC 3         15126           3125 = Can(NFLD) TC 5         16127           3126 = " TC 6         19124           9125 = Fra(SPM) TC 5         19125           0127 = Former FRG TC 7         19126           1125 = Former DDR TC 5         20125           1126 = " TC 6         20126           1127 = " TC 7         20127           4124 = Japan TC 4         27125           4126 = " TC 6         34125           4127 = " TC 7         34126           IVISION CODES:         1           1 = 2G, 22 = 2H, 23 = 2J, 31 = 3         3	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

Table 10.Standardized CPUE for Greenland halibut in NAFO 2HJ3KL based on a multiplicative model based<br/>utilizing DAYS FISHED as a measure of effort. Results are from the CANADIAN FLEETS model<br/>(2003 based on preliminary data).

## PREDICTED CATCH RATE

	LN TR	ANSFORM	RETRANSFORMED		FLEET		% OF CATCH IN
YEAR	MEAN	S.E.	MEAN	S.E.	CATCH	EFFORT	THIS ANALYSIS
1976	1.5652	0.1192	4.949	1.663	767	155	9.5
1977	1.7862	0.0692	6.330	1.641	2866	453	20.4
1978	2.3686	0.0533	11.424	2.609	3951	346	29.0
1979	2.6102	0.0931	14.259	4.262	5183	363	35.4
1980	2.6359	0.0466	14.976	3.205	3946	263	40.0
1981	2.4780	0.0441	12.804	2.666	6155	481	55.0
1982	2.4584	0.0304	12.642	2.195	8143	644	73.2
1983	2.3980	0.0269	11.923	1.946	7085	594	85.6
1984	2.7054	0.0291	16.194	2.751	6070	375	89.6
1985	2.1800	0.0281	9.581	1.600	4847	506	90.4
1986	2.1288	0.0626	8.947	2.210	1896	212	71.5
1987	2.6662	0.1182	14.890	4.985	2465	166	84.1
1988	1.5173	0.0686	4.839	1.249	629	130	38.8
1989	2.1253	0.0646	8.907	2.233	988	111	18.2
1990	1.9451	0.0327	7.558	1.359	2402	318	75.4
1991	1.9447	0.0341	7.550	1.387	3254	431	68.1
1992	1.6520	0.0308	5.643	0.986	2502	443	49.5
1993	1.9161	0.0466	7.291	1.560	1034	142	86.7
1994	1.8770	0.0679	6.936	1.782	575	83	96.5
1995	1.8846	0.1131	6.833	2.241	632	92	56.2
1996	1.8702	0.0418	6.981	1.416	1043	149	81.0
1997	2.1737	0.0464	9.434	2.015	1017	108	94.7
1998	1.4254	0.2178	4.095	1.816	46	11	34.8
1999	1.7792	0.1202	6.127	2.068	81	13	81.5
2000	2.0800	0.0438	8.601	1.786	1285	149	98.4
2001	2.3440	0.0345	11.252	2.078	1833	163	97.2
2002	1.9727	0.0373	7.752	1.487	1784	230	98.7
2003	1.7781	0.0219	6.430	0.950	3710	577	70.5

AVERAGE C.V. FOR THE RETRANSFORMED MEAN: 0.235



Fig. 1. Standardized Mean CPUE ± 2 standard errors for Greenland Halibut in SA2 + Div. 3KLMNO utilizing effort in HOURS fished. Upper panel is from the ALL FLEETS model, middle panel from NON-CANADIAN FLEETS model and lower panel from CANADIAN FLEETS model.



Fig. 2. Standardized Mean CPUE ± 2 standard errors for Greenland Halibut in SA2 + Div. 3KLMNO utilizing effort in DAYS fished. Upper panel is from the ALL FLEETS model, middle panel from NON-CANADIAN FLEETS model and lower panel from CANADIAN FLEETS model.