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## Abstract

Linear programming simulations of 1975 expected national catches are made using 1973 and 1871 by-catch ratios in directed fisheries and 1975 national species quotas. The expected total catch derived from each set of by-catch ratios is only about $55 \%$ of the sum of the species quotas and $70 \%$ of the 1975 Total Allowable Catch for all species combined.

## Introduction

The control of fishing mortality by means of individual species catch quotas is very difficult to accomplish whenever a significant proportion of the fishing mortality on any given species is generated as a result of the incidental catch or by-catch of that species in fisheries directed toward other species. Since 1973 the catch of all major species in ICNAF Subarea 5 and Statistical Area 6 has been regulated by national quotas and the estimated by-catch of the major directed fisheries is large. Under these circumstances, attempting to catch the entire quota of a given species by means of a directed fishery for that species may cause the total catch to exceed the allowable catch because of the associated by-catch of that species in the other fisheries.


Fig. 1. Map of the southern part of the ICNAF Area and Statiotical Area 6.

ICNAF has modified its regulatory measures several times in an attempt to account for by-catches of species under quota restrictions. The initial haddock quota regulations (Subarea 5 and Div. 4X) stated that the directed fishery should cease whenever the accumulated catch (directed catch plus by-catch) reported to ICNAF bi-weekly reached $80 \%$ of the quota, anticipating in advance that the catch after closure (a by-catch by definition) would be $20 \%$ of the quota. When the yellowtail flounder was added to the list of species under quota, the closure procedures were changed. The Assessments Subcommittee of STACRES first estimated the expected monthly by-catch after closure of directed fisheries. The decision to cease directed fishing was then made when the accumulated total catch reported to ICNAF on a bi-weekly basis plus the expected by-catch during the remainder of the year equaled the quota. With the introduction of national quota allocations in 1872, the procedure again changed, requiring each country to control its directed fishery so that the sum of its directed catch and the estimated by-catches would not exceed its quota allocation.

Despite these procedures it became evident as simulated by Brown etal. (1973) that with the by-catch ratios that existed in 1971 the expected total catch in 1073 would be less than the sum of the individual species total allowable catches (TAC) if none of the latter were to be exceeded. The by-catch question was considered in the setting of 1974 and 1975 TAC's (ICNAF 1974 Meeting Proceedings). Anthony and Brennan (1974) applied the linear programming techniques utilized by Brown etal. (1973) using 1972 by-catch ratios. The present paper simulates 1875 catches with 1973 by-catch ratios and also with 1971 by-catch ratios. The latter simulation was run to examine the stability of the results using these techniques. Linear programming techniques are used to determine a country's directed catch level considering its national species quotas which would maximize its total catch. A comparison is made between the estimated total values with each country's total quotas for all species combined.

## Methods and materials

## Data base

Nominal landings and effort for designated main species (or species group) sought categories are submitted annually by almost all countries fishing in Subarea 5 and Statistical Area 6. These data are published in Table 5 of the ICNAF Statistical Bulletin. 1973 and 1971 data were the bases from which the proportions of by-catch and directed catch were estimated. The nominal catches do not include fish caught and discarded at sea.

In 1971 and 1973, the nominal catch and effort (days fished) for finfish only were summarized over months for each of the "main species sought" categories reported in Tables 4 and 5 of the ICNAF Statistical Bulletin, 1971 and 1973, respectively. Catches made with fixed gears as well as catches of menhaden, halibut, and large pelagic fishes, i.e., tuna, billfish, and sharks (other than dogfish), were excluded. In instances where no "main species sought" category was indicated or where landings were attributed to a mixed fishery, the monthly landings were assigned to "species sought" categories according to the species which formed a simple plurality of the catch. The term "fishery" as used in this paper refers to the vessels and associated catch on these "main species sought" categories. The term "species" refers to both individual species and species groups. All reported landings were thus identified by two factors: species and fisheries. Such tabulations were prepared for all nations for which data were available. For Romania, which has had a herring fishery but did not report a directed herring fishery in 1973, values for 1872 (ICNAF Statistical Bulletin 1972) were used for that species fishery. The only countries with an allocated national quota for which 1971 or 1973 data were not available and thus could not be analyzed were Italy (1971 and 1973) and France (1971).

The national restraints (TAC's) needed for each species and country to simulate the 1975 fishery were derived from several different sources. The proposed 1975 national quota allocations for Member Countries in Subarea 5 and Statistical Area 6 (ICNAF Meeting Proceedings 1974) was the main basis. For species in which a country was not allocated a quota, individual country quotas were proportioned from the "Others" allocation category for each individual species. This apportionment was based on the 1973 nominal catch for each particular species and the catch of that species in all countries who constituted the "Others" group in the same situation. The quota for "other groundfish" and "other pelagic" was proportioned from the "other fish" TAC for each country. The quotas for "American plaice and witch" were proportioned from the "other flounder" TAC for each individual country. Each country's national quota allocation for "pollock" was set by ICNAF for Div, 4VWX plus Subarea 5. This simulation is based on setting each
country's pollock quota for Subarea 5 and Statistical Area 6 as a percentage of the 1975 national quota allocations for pollock. The percentage for Subarea 5 was determined by an average percent of the nominal "pollock" catches in Div. 4VWX and Subarea 5 during 1971, 1972, and 1973. In this paper, the catch limitations described above will all be referred to as "quotas."

## Analytical methods

For each country, the catch of each species in a fishery in 1973 was first expressed as a percentage of the total catch (column total) for that species (CH percent in Appendix I, Tables 1-11). Similar tables using 1971 data can be found in Brown et al. This indicates the extent to which a given country's catch of a species was in a directed fishery or in a by-catch.

For both the 1871 and 1873 catch data, within each fishery the catch of each species was expressed as a proportion of the catch of the main species sought (CH ratio ( $r$ ) in Appendix Tables 1-11). This computation showed the by-catch as a proportion of the main species sought catch in a given fishery. These CH ratios ( $r$ ) and the quota restraints were then used to simulate the 1975 fishery of each country using linear programming techniques.

Linear programming is a decision model for which the effectiveness of an allocation scheme distributed over several variables is measured by the maximum value of some linear function of those variables, when those variables are subject to linear constraints. The solution used in this paper was devised using the Simplex Algorithm (Hadley, 1963. p. 132f) computed using a Honeywell Computer program LINPRO: a description of this use of linear programming is given in Appendix II of Brown et al (1973). In this analysis the linear constraints were that no country would exceed its national allocation for any species. The output of the LINPRO program includes the vector $X$ of directed catches of the species along with the resultant total catches of the species and the overall total catch.

## Results and Discussion

The results of each country's simulation are given in Appendix Tables 12 through 32 . As would be expected, in each case the sum of the species quota allocations exceeded the country maximum catch as determined by the linear programming model in every instance. Table 1 lists the percentage of the sum of a country's TAC's, the predicted total catches, using 1973 by-catch ratios (Table 1A), and 1971 by-catch ratios (Table 1B). In general, the percentages derived from 1973 by-catch ratios were equal to or greater than those derived from 1971 fishing patterns. The exceptions to this trend were Canada and Japan, each of whom would take a smaller percentage under their 1973 fishing regime. Poland, USA, France, and FRG were the only countries predicted to take greater than $80 \%$ of the sum of their species TAC's by 1971 or 1973 fishing patterns.

Closer inspection of the results using 1873 by-catches reveals the species which are the limiting factors in a country's inability to take the sum of its species quotas at present. In Appendix Tables 12-22 these are the species which are caught in significant amounts as by-catch and for which a species quota is met. The most frequent species whose catch is limiting is yellowtail flounder. The next major grouping consisted of those species regulated by ICNAF in the "other fish" category and appearing in these tabulations in the "other fish," "other groundfish," and "other pelagic" groupings. Others with potential for being limiting are "other flounder" and herring. Haddock, of course, has traditionally been limiting and is still a critical factor in fisheries which take groundfish.

The sum of the linear programming estimates over countries using 1973 and 1971 data is presented in Tables 2 A and 2B, respectively. In each case the sum of the maximum catches determined by the linear programming runs is only about $55 \%$ of the sum of the species quotas. The simulated directed fisheries catch levels comprise only $77 \%$ of the total using 1973 by-catch ratios, and $69 \%$ using 1971 by-catch ratios, the rest being taken as by-catch. The highest percentages of TAC's which were caught in directed fisheries were for redfish, herring, mackerel, and "other pelagics" using 1973 by-catch ratios, and for redfish, silver hake, herring, and "other pelagics" using 1971 by-catch ratios.

| Country | Sum $\frac{\text { Maximum catch }}{\text { of species quotas }}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Bulgaria | . 19 |
| Canada | . 45 |
| France | . 89 |
| Federal Republic of Germany | . 98 |
| German Democratic Republic | . 40 |
| Japan | . 65 |
| Poland | . 95 |
| Romania | . 07 |
| Spain | . 71 |
| USSR | . 27 |
| USA | . 86 |

Table 1B. Comparison of maximum catches from linear programming species "quotas."

| Country | Sum $\frac{\text { Maximum catch }}{\text { of }}$ specjes quotas |
| :---: | :---: |
| Bulgaria | . 19 |
| Canada | . 75 |
| France | . 75 |
| Federal Republic of Germany | . 87 |
| German Democratic Republic | . 64 |
| Japan | . 26 |
| Poland | . 94 |
| Romania | . 02 |
| Spain | . 10 |
| USSR | . 27 |
| USA | . 88 |

Table 2A. Sum of individual country's linear programing simulation of 1975 catches, maximizing total catch ('000 tons), and using 1973 by-catch ratios.

| Species sought | Total allowable catch restraint | Directed catch | Total catch |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cod | 45.0 | 14.6 | 31.1 |
| Haddock | 6.0 | 1.0 | 5.4 |
| Redfish | 25.0 | 19.0 | 22.1 |
| Silver hake | 175.0 | 78.9 | 86.2 |
| Red hake | 45.0 | 38.2 | 24.3 |
| Pollock | 22.6 | 12.6 | 20.0 |
| American plaice | 2.7 | - | 2.4 |
| Witch | 4.3 | - | 3.9 |
| Yellowtail | 20.0 | 11.8 | 20.0 |
| Other flounder | 18.0 | 11.8 | 17.5 |
| Other groundfish | 41.5 | 11.7 | 26.9 |
| Herring | 166.0 | 98.7 | 110.9 |
| Mackerel | 285.0 | 113.2 | 136.6 |
| Other pelagic | 21.4 | 20.7 | 20.7 |
| Other fish | 48.8 | 2.8 | 25.8 |
| Squid | 66.2 | 29.5 | 46.0 |
| Total | 992.5 | 464.5 | 599.8 |

Table 2B. Sum of individual country's linear programming simulation of 1975 catches, maximizing total catch (' 000 tons), and using 1971 by-catch ratios.

|  | Total allowable <br> catch restraint | Directed <br> catch | Total <br> catch |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Species sought | 45.0 | 1.7 | 16.6 |
| Cod | 6.0 | 0.0 | 5.1 |
| Haddock | 25.0 | 16.3 | 21.9 |
| Redfish | 175.0 | 36.7 | 50.3 |
| Silver hake | 45.0 | 8.1 | 33.7 |
| Other flounder | 109.1 | 128.4 | 55.4 |
| Other groundfish | 166.0 | 156.2 | 166.0 |
| Herring | 306.4 | 10.9 | 181.8 |
| Other pelagic | 115.0 |  | 38.4 |
| Other fish |  | 393.8 | 569.2 |
| Total | 992.5 |  |  |
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Referring to the individual country linear programming output tables in the Appendix, it is obvious that under 1973 and 1971 by-catch ratios, national patterns ran the gamut from almost a total mixed fishery by the USSR, and to a somewhat lesser extent by the German Democratic Republic, to very specific species fisheries of the Federal Republic of Germany and Poland.

A summary of the 1973 catches, the 1974 and 1875 total allowable catches, and the linear program estimates of total catch by country, is presented in Table 3. It is qbvious that the overall TAC of 923,500 MT for 1874 and 850,000 MT for 1975 would not be attained without exceeding certain species TAC's unless by-catch was reduced. The expected catches of $589,864 \mathrm{MT}$ (1973) and $585,016 \mathrm{MT}$ (1971) are only $71 \%$ and $87 \%$, respectively, of the 1975 total TAC. On a country basis, and using the results derived from the 1873 by-catches, it can be seen that the country total TAC's were set for 1974 at approximately appropriate levels for Spain and the USA, too low for the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, and Poland, and too high for the other countries. In fact, summing the national total TAC's rather than the linear program estimates of country catch, when the former are limiting, to obtain an overall estimated catch, results in an expected total catch of $557,016 \mathrm{MT}$, only $86 \%$ of the overall TAC. The analagous expected total catch derived from 1971 by-catch ratios is $551,426 \mathrm{MT}$, only $64 \%$ of the overall TAC. By-catch may be reduced through actions initiated by fishing fleets or by regulations such as the closure to bottom trawling by larger vessels in the Southern New England and Middle Atlantic areas, adopted by ICNAF at the Fifth Special Commission Meeting, November 1974 (ICNAF Summ.Doc. 75/1).

Table 3. Comparison of linear programming estimates of maximum total catch by
overall country TAC's.

| Country of | 1973 nominal catch species regulated by the Total TAC | Sum of species TAC's | 1975 <br> Total TAC | 11near programing estimate of1973 by-catal catch <br> ratiosrati by-catchratios |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bulgaria | 37,291 | 30,620 | 24,650 | 5,735 | 5,989 |
| Canada | 16,799 | 24,457 | 26,000 | 11,107 | 17,687 |
| France | 3,623 | 5,220 | 2,950 | 4,620 | 4,620* |
| Federal <br> Republic of Germany | f 38,278 | 30,290 | 24,850 | 29,648 | 26,370 |
| German Democratic Republic | 150,853 | 100,860 | 82,850 | 39,940 | 63,650 |
| Italy | 3,915 |  | 4,150 | No estimate available | No estimate available |
| Japan | 32,898 | 45,720 | 21,250 | 29,650 | 11,896 |
| Poland | 190,552 | 153,000 | 129,250 | 144,700 | 144,270 |
| Romanja | 7,142 | 7,240 | 3,850 | 454 | 124 |
| Spain | 22,195 | 20,700 | 14,800 | 14,630 | 2,040 |
| USSR | 449,037 | 351,440 | 301,800 | 95,240 | 93,790 |
| USA | 203,093 | 224,600 | 211,600 | 224,200 | 199,200 |
| Total | 1,155,676 | 994,147 | 850,000 | 599,924 | 569,636* |

[^0]It should be noted, however, that despite the above potential for change as well as the inadequacies of the reporting to ICNAF which may combine more than one directed fishery under a mixed category, there are other factors which work in the opposite direction. The first is the inadequate recording of by-catch noted during international inspections (ICNAF Comm.Doc. 74/41). Some of this is discard and never reported (Lopez-Veiga, 1974) and some is apparently utilized in the fisheries but not accurately reported on logbooks. Both the lack of reporting and any underestimates of by-catch can cause the by-catch ratios used in this analysis to be underestimated.
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Table 1. 1973 nominal landings for Buigaria (ICNAF Subarea 5 and Statistical Area 6), expressed as per-
Table 1.
main species sought within fisheries (CH Ratio). See text for explanation.

|  |  | Species caught |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species sought |  | Cod | Redfish | Silver hake | Red hake | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yellow- } \\ & \text { tail } \end{aligned}$ | Other groundfish | Herring | Mackerel | Other pelagic | Other fish | Squid |
| Herring | CH Ratio (R) <br> CH Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 0.006 \\ & 7.50 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.064 \\ 100.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.060 \\ & 2.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.050 \\ & 6.70 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.010 \\ & 5.60 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & 29.30 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.243 \\ & .40 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.049 \\ 10.50 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ |
| Mackerel | CH Ratio (R) CH Percent | $\begin{array}{r} 0.001 \\ 92.50 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.048 \\ 98.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.011 \\ 93.30 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.003 \\ 94.40 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.007 \\ 100.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.039 \\ 70.70 \end{gathered}$ | $99.60$ | $89.50$ | $100.026$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.013 \\ 100.0 \end{gathered}$ |

Table 2. 1973 nominal landings for Canada (ICNAF Subarea 5 and Statistical Area 6 ), expressed as percentages sought within fisheries (CH Ratio). See text for explanation.

|  |  | Species caught |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species sought |  | Cod | Haddock | Redfish | Pollock | American Plaice | Witch | Yellowtail | Other flounder | Other groundfish | Herring | Mackerel | Other pelagic |
| Cod | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} \text { CH Ratio ( } & (R) \\ \text { CH } & \text { Percent } \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & 72.33 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.214 \\ 31.20 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.009 \\ 62.86 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.081 \\ 11.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.003 \\ 26.09 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.002 \\ 50.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.004 \\ 90.91 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.011 \\ 71.05 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.125 \\ 38.86 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.000 \\ .00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.000 \\ .00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.000 \\ .00 \end{gathered}$ |
| Haddock | CH Ratio (R) CH Percent | $\begin{gathered} 0.549 \\ 13.85 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.000 \\ 50.87 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.002 \\ & 5.71 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.126 \\ & 5.96 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.015 \\ 52.17 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.004 \\ 30.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.001 \\ & 9.09 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.004 \\ & 7.89 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.059 \\ & 6.37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ |
| Other groundfish | CH Ratio (R) CH Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 1.087 \\ & 13.81 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.700 \\ 17.93 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.027 \\ 31.43 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.472 \\ 83.03 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.012 \\ & 21.74 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.005 \\ 20.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.019 \\ 21.05 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.000 \\ 54.78 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ |
| Herring | CH Ratio (R) <br> CH Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.000 \\ 100.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.006 \\ 100.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ |
| Other pelagic | CH Ratio (R) CH Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.000 \\ 100.00 \end{array}$ |

Table 3. 1973 nominal landings for France (ICNAF Subarea 5 and Statistical Area 6), expressed as percentages of species catch distribution over fisheries (CH Percent) and ratios of by-catch to main species sought within fisheries (CH Ratio). See text for explanation.

|  |  | Species caught |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Species <br> Sought |  | Other <br> groundfish | Herring | Squid |
| Herring | CH Ratio (R) | 0.000 | 1.000 | 0.000 |
|  | CH Percent | 0.00 | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| Squid | CH Ratio (R) | 0.023 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | CH Percent | 1.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 |

Table 4. 1973 nominal landings for Federal Republic of Germany (ICNAF Subarea 5 and Statistical Area 6), expressed as percentages of species catch distribution over fisheries (CH Percent) and ratios of by-catch to main species sought within fisheries (CH Ratio). See text for explanation.

|  |  | Species caught |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species sought |  | Cod | Silver hake | Pollock | Other groundfish | Herring | Mackerel | Other pelagics | Other fish | Squid |
| Pollock | CH Ratio (R) <br> CH Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 0.005 \\ & 100.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.027 \\ 96.67 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & 99.08 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.065 \\ & 8.61 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ |
| Other groundfish | CH Ratio (R) CH Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | 0.000 0.00 | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & 2.95 \end{aligned}$ | 0.000 0.00 | 0.083 0.13 | 0.000 0.00 | 0.000 0.00 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.500 \\ & 0.73 \end{aligned}$ |
| Herring | CH Ratio (R) CH Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.92 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & 100.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.010 \\ 22.13 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.008 \\ 53.45 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.010 \\ 97.62 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.24 \end{aligned}$ |
| Mackere1 | CH Ratio (R) CH Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | 1.000 59.66 | $\begin{gathered} 0.094 \\ 18.53 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.080 \\ & 4.45 \end{aligned}$ |
| Squid | CH Ratio (R) CH Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.001 \\ & 3.33 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.463 \\ 88.31 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.178 \\ & 18.07 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.084 \\ & 28.02 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.005 \\ & 2.38 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & 94.58 \end{aligned}$ |

Taule 51973 nomina landings for German Demiocratic Republic (ICNAF Subarea 5 and Statistical Area 6),

|  |  | Species caught |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species sought |  | Cod | Redfish | Silver hake | Pollock | Other groundfish | Herring | MackereI | Other pelagic | Other fish | Squid |
| Pallock | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CH Ratio (R) } \\ & \text { CH Percent } \end{aligned}$ | 0.004 5.33 | 0.002 5.71 | 0.000 0.00 | ${ }_{94.62}^{1.000}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.042 \\ & 0.06 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.009 \\ & 0.01 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ |
| Herring | CH Ratio (R) CH Percent | $\begin{array}{r} 0.001 \\ .44 .00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.001 \\ & 91.43 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.003 \\ & 76.29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.001 \\ & 4.43 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & 95.55 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.008 \\ & 0.61 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 8.15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.211 \\ 86.67 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.005 \\ & 97.76 \end{aligned}$ |
| Mackerel | CH Ratio (R) CH Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 34.66 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.001 \\ 20.62 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.32 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.000 \\ 50.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.031 \\ & 4.02 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & 99.06 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.003 \\ 89.63 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.010 \\ & 5.48 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 2.24 \end{aligned}$ |
| Other fish | CH Ratio (R) CH Percent | $\begin{array}{r} 0.011 \\ 16.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 2.86 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.006 \\ & 3.09 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.006 \\ & 0.63 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.001 \\ 50.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.204 \\ & 0.37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.225 \\ & 0.31 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.006 \\ & 2.22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & 7.84 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ |

Table 6- 1973 nominal landings for Japan (ICNAF Subarea 5 and Statistical Area 6) expressed as percentages

|  |  | Species caught |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species sought |  | Cod | Redfish | Silver hake | Red hake | Pollock | Other flounder | Other groundfish | Herring | Mackerel | Other pelagic | Other fish | Squid |
| Other groundfish | CH Rat10 (R) CH Percent | 0.000 0.00 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | 0.044 3.08 | 1.000 26.47 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.067 \\ & 0.02 \end{aligned}$ |
| Herring | $\begin{array}{\|ll} \mathrm{CH} & \text { Ratio (R) } \\ \mathrm{CH} & \text { Percent } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.015 \\ 83.33 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.011 \\ & 3.95 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.001 \\ & 1.54 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & 94.19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.057 \\ & 0.74 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.038 \\ 30.01 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.012 \\ & 0.12 \end{aligned}$ |
| Mackerel | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \text { CH Ratio (R) } \\ \text { CH Percent } \end{array}$ | 0.000 0.00 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.813 \\ 92.86 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & 3.59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.813 \\ & 0.10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.062 \\ & 0.05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.875 \\ & 0.09 \end{aligned}$ |
| Other <br> pelagic | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CH Ratio (R) } \\ & \text { CH Percent } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.015 \\ 16.67 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \\ 41.67 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.000 \\ 100.00 \end{array}$ | 0.000 7.14 | $\begin{gathered} 0.003 \\ 50.77 \end{gathered}$ | 0.003 15.29 | 0.007 4.01 | 0.017 35.20 | 1.000 76.37 | 0.055 25.58 | 0.334 20.41 |
| Other fish | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CH Ratio (R) } \\ & \text { CH Percent } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.005 \\ 100.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.012 \\ & 1.54 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.002 \\ & 0.59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.025 \\ & 0.87 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.407 \\ & 1.93 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.000 \\ 29.03 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.447 \\ & 1.69 \end{aligned}$ |
| Squid | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CH Ratio (R) } \\ & \text { CH Percent } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \\ 52.85 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.002 \\ 44.61 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.008 \\ 57.65 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.001 \\ & 0.93 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.023 \\ 61.21 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.215 \\ 20.86 \end{gathered}$ | ${ }_{42.34}^{0.071}$ | ${ }_{77.66}$ |

Table 7. 1973 nominal landings for Poland (ICNAF Subarea 5 and Statistical Area 6), expressed as percentages of

|  |  | Species caught |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species sought |  | Cod | Redfish | Silver hake | Red hake | Pollock | Other groundfish | Herring | Mackerel | Other pelagic | Other fish | Squid |
| Red hake | CH Ratio (R) CH Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & 40.51 \end{aligned}$ | $10.031$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.047 \\ & .01 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.172 \\ .36 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.031 \\ & 0.02 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ |
| Pollock | CH Ratio (R) ${ }^{\circ}$ CH Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.000 \\ 40.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.250 \\ & 0.02 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ |
| Herring | CH Ratio (R) | $\begin{gathered} 0.004 \\ 33.49 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 2.33 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 2.53 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.000 \\ 10.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.012 \\ 22.50 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & 83.02 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.258 \\ & 9.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.034 \\ 44.96 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.039 \\ 18.27 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.024 \\ 10.86 \end{gathered}$ |
| Mackere 1 | CH Ratio (R) | $\begin{gathered} 0.003 \\ 66.51 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.000 \\ 100.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.001 \\ 41.11 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.000 \\ 18.99 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 5.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.012 \\ 60.70 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.075 \\ 16.08 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.000 \\ 89.82 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.006 \\ 19.88 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.056 \\ 67.71 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.027 \\ 30.77 \end{gathered}$ |
| Other pelagic | CH Ratio (R) CH Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.142 \\ 25.32 \end{array}$ | ${ }_{35.005}^{0.025}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.039 \\ .55 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.025 \\ & 0.01 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.352 \\ & 0.08 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & 9.14 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{0}^{0.167}$ | 0.000 0.00 |
| Other fish | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CH Ratio (R) } \\ & \text { CH Percent } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.092 \\ & 3.21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.167 \\ 12.66 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.017 \\ & 0.10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.033 \\ & 0.01 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.317 \\ & 0.03 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.125 \\ & 0.49 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & 1.37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ |
| Other shellfish | $\underset{\text { CH Patio (R) }}{\text { CH }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.034 \\ 53.35 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.057 \\ 15.15 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.080 \\ & 0.87 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.231 \\ & 1.06 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.144 \\ 25.18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.197 \\ 12.07 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.000 \\ 58.36 \end{gathered}$ |

Table 8. 1973 nominal landings for Romania (ICNAF Subarea 5 and Statistical Area 6), (CH Ratio). See text for explanation.

|  | Species caught |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species sought | Haddock | Redfish | Silver hake | Yellowtail | Other groundfish | Herring | Mackerel | Other pelagic | Other fish | Other shellfish |
| Herring $C H$ Ratio $(R)$ * CH Percent | $\begin{array}{r} 0.007 \\ 100.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.007 \\ 100.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.020 \\ 46.15 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.016 \\ 100.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{1.000}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.223 \\ & 7.23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.035 \\ 17.52 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ |
| Mackerel CH Ratio(R) CH Percent | 0.000 0.00 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.008 \\ 53.85 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.000 \\ 100.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.064 \\ 100.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.051 \\ 12.63 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.000 \\ 92.77 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.058 \\ 82.48 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.010 \\ 100.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.026 \\ 100.00 \end{array}$ |

Table 9. 1973 nominal landings for Spain (ICNAF Subarea 5 and Statistical Area 6), expressed as percentages of species catch distribution over fisheries (CH Percent) and ratios
of by-catch to main species sought within fisheries (CH Ratio). See text for
explanation.

|  |  | Species caught |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species <br> sought |  | Cod | Haddock | Red hake | Pollock | Other <br> groundfish | Squid |
| Cod |  | CH Ratio (R) | 1.000 | 0.065 | 0.001 | 0.134 | 0.008 |
| Squid | CH Percent | 100.000 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 52.67 | 0.000 |
|  | CH Ratio (R) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.003 | 1.000 |

Table 10. 1973 nominal landings for USSR (ICNAF Subarea 5 and Statistical Area 6), expressed as percentages



|  |  | Species caught |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species sought |  | Cod | Haddock | Redfish | Silver hake. | Red hake | Pollock | Anterican plaice | Witch | Yellowtall | Other flounder | Other groundfish | Kerring | Mackerel | Other <br> pelagic | Other fish | Squid |
| cod | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CH Ratio (R) } \\ & \text { CH Percen: } \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{52.91}^{1.000}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.075 \\ 25.45 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.013 \\ & 1: 26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.002 \\ & 0.11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.052 \\ 10.31 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.009 \\ & 7.75 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{0.004}$ | $0.035^{\circ}$ 1.44 | ${ }_{10.63}^{0.088}$ | 0.056 4.33 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.001 \\ & 0.50 \end{aligned}$ | 0.000 0.25 |
| Haddock | CH Ratio (R) CH Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 0.343 \\ & 0.58 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & 10.96 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.006 \\ & 0.01 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.087 \\ & 0.55 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.006 \\ & 0.09 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.056 \\ & 0.07 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.045 \\ & 0.17 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{0}^{0.017}$ | 0.000 0.00 | 0.000 0.00 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | 0.000 0.00 | ${ }_{0}^{0.003}$ |
| Redfish | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CH Patio (R) } \\ & \text { CH Percent } \end{aligned}$ | 0.039 1.94 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.006 \\ & 1.85 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & 90.59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.001 \\ & 0.09 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.066 \\ 12.41 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.005 \\ & 3.84 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.007 \\ & 3.49 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.03 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.046 \\ & 3.33 \end{aligned}$ | 0.000 0.00 | 0.000 0.00 | 0.000 0.00 | 0.000 0.00 | 0.201 0.69 |
| Silver hake | $\begin{aligned} & C H \text { Ratio (R) } \\ & C H \text { Percent } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.054 \\ & 3.27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.003 \\ & 1.29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.010 \\ & 1.13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.000 \\ 81.49 \end{array}$ | ${ }_{8.45}^{0.022}$ | 0.010 2.22 | ${ }_{7}^{0.007}$ | ${ }_{3.68}^{0.006}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.004 \\ & 0.18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.016 \\ & 2.25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.058 \\ & 5.15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.014 \\ & 0.68 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.002 \\ & 2.93 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.008 \\ & 9.79 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.009 \\ & 6.72 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{0.025}$ |
| Red nake | $\left.\begin{gathered} C H \text { Ratio }(R) \\ \text { CH Percent } \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.023 \\ & 0.20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.241 \\ & 3.02 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.000 \\ 60.32 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | 0.148 1.06 | 0.132 2.80 | 0.357 4.85 | ${ }_{0}^{0.011}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.001 \\ & 0.31 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.096 \\ & 17.44 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.216 \\ 26.38 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.077 \\ & 9.40 \end{aligned}$ |
| Pollock | CH Ratio (R) CH Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 0.168 \\ & 1.64 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.054 \\ & 3.39 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.045 \\ & 0.81 \end{aligned}$ | 0.028 0.37 | 0.008 0.50 | 1.000 36.55 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.007 \\ & 1.07 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.021 \\ & 1.98 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.007 \\ & 0.05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.004 \\ & 0.10 \end{aligned}$ | 0.130 1.87 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.001 \\ & 0.01 \end{aligned}$ | 0.000 0.00 | 0.000 0.00 | ${ }_{0}^{0.001}$ | 0.005 0.62 |
| Yeiowtall | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{CH} \text { ?atio ( } \mathrm{R}) \\ \mathrm{CH} \text { Percent } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.091 \\ 10.26 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.014 \\ 10.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.001 \\ & 0.10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.001 \\ & 0.16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.28 \end{aligned}$ | 0.001 0.41 | 0.010 18.80 | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \\ 22.02 \end{gathered}$ | ${ }_{86.96}^{1.000}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.053 \\ 13.80 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.004 \\ & 0.65 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.001 \\ & 1.12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.25 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{4.65}^{0.003}$ |
| Pther flounder | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{CH} \\ & \mathrm{CH} \text { Ratio } \\ & \mathrm{CH} \text { Percent } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.492 \\ 11.19 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.074 \\ 10.83 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.063 \\ & 0.11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.013 \\ & 0.38 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.003 \\ & 0.37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.014 \\ & 1.18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.125 \\ 45.82 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.230 \\ 50.41 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.423 \\ & 7.40 \end{aligned}$ | 1.000 52.03 | 0.072 2.39 | 0.000 0.01 | 0.000 0.00 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.003 \\ & 1.40 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.005 \\ & 1.38 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.032 \\ & 0.56 \end{aligned}$ |
| O:ner groundfish | $\begin{aligned} & C H \text { Ratio }(R) \\ & C H \text { Percent } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.344 \\ 17.90 \end{array}$ | ${ }_{36.23}^{0.108}$ | 0.063 5.95 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.197 \\ 13.92 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.088 \\ 29.80 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.188 \\ 36.58 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.019 \\ { }_{15.66} \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.033 \\ 16.36 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.070 \\ & 2.82 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.148 \\ 17.66 \end{gathered}$ | 1.000 76.39 | 0.023 0.99 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.003 \\ & 5.25 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{17.017}$ | 0.069 47.30 | 0.041 28.26 |
| Her:ing | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{CH} \text { Ratio (R) } \\ & \mathrm{CH} \text { Percent } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.001 \\ & 0.09 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | 0.000 0.03 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.06 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.030 \\ & 0.04 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.08 \end{aligned}$ | 98.11 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.002 \\ & 9.72 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.006 \\ & 13.71 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.050 \\ & 0.50 \end{aligned}$ |
| Mackere1 | Ch Retio (R) | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.018 \\ & 0.05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.014 \\ & 0.21 \end{aligned}$ | 0.018 0.16 | 0.000 0.00 | 0.000 0.00 | 0.004 0.01 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.016 \\ & 0.08 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.148 \\ & 0.52 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.059 \\ & 0.11 \end{aligned}$ | 78.24 | 0.087 4.10 | 0.024 0.75 | 0.164 5.23 |
| Pelagic | $\begin{aligned} & C H \text { Ratio }(R) \\ & C H \text { Percent } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.003 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.125 \\ & 0.26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.003 \\ & 0.03 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.003 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.006 \\ & 0.02 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.039 \\ & 0.07 \end{aligned}$ | 0.000 0.00 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.064 \\ & 3.24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.000 \\ & 30.60 \end{aligned}$ | 0.107 2.20 | 0.189 3.91 |
| Other fish | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{CH} \text { Ratio (R) } \\ & \text { CH Percent } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.010 \\ & 0.01 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.010 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.01 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.160 \\ & 3.45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.000 \\ 14.26 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.003 \\ & 0.03 \end{aligned}$ |
| 5quid | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CH Katio (R) } \\ & \text { CH Percent } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.015 \\ & 0.03 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.002 \\ & 0.03 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.091 \\ & 0.40 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.110 \\ & 0.32 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.000 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.005 \\ & 0.31 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.025 \\ & 0.93 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.005 \\ & 0.12 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{25.74}^{1.000}$ |

Table 12. Linear progranming simulation of 1975 Bulgaria's catches maximizing total catch ('000 tons).

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species sought | Total allowable <br> catch constraint | Directed catch | Total catch |
| Cod | 0.7 | - | 0.005 |
| Redfish | 0.5 | - | 0.0 |
| Silver hake | 2.0 | - | 0.2 |
| Red hake | 1.9 | - | 0.06 |
| Yellowtail | 0.02 | - | 0.02 |
| Other groundfish | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.04 |
| Herring | 1.1 | 5.2 | 0.2 |
| Mackerel | 0.7 | - | 0.04 |
| Other pelagic | 2.5 | - | 0.1 |
| 0ther fish | 1.7 |  | 0.07 |
| Squid | 30.62 |  | 5.735 |
| Total |  |  |  |

Table 13. Linear programming simulation of 1975 Canada's catches maximizing total catch ('000 tons).

| Species sought | Total allowable catch constraint | Directed catch | Total catch |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cod | 4.8 | 0.4 | 1.2 |
| Haddock | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.8 |
| Redfish | 0.5 | - | 0.02 |
| Pollock | 3.4 | - | 2.0 |
| American plaice | 0.01 | - | 0.01 |
| Witch | . 005 | - | 0.005 |
| Yellowtail | . 002 | - | 0.002 |
| Other flounder | 0.03 | - | 0.6 |
| Other groundfish | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 |
| Herring | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 |
| Mackerel | 7.5 | $\stackrel{-}{0}$ | 0.04 |
| Other pelagic | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| Total | 24.457 |  | 11.107 |

Table 14. Linear programming simulation of 1975 France's catches maximizing total catch ('000 tons).

| Species sought | Total allowable catch constraint | Directed catch | Total catch |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Other groundfish | 0.02 | - | 0.02 |
| Herring | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 |
| Squid | 3.4 | 0.7 | 2.8 |
| Total | 5.22 |  | 4.62 |

Table 15. Linear programming sfmulation of 1975 Federal Republic of Germany's catches maximizing total catch ('000 tons).

| Species sought | Total allowable catch constraint | Directed catch | Total catch |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cod | 0.09 | - | 0.008 |
| Stlver hake | 0.500 | - | 0.04 |
| Pollock | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Other groundfish | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.7 |
| Herring | 24.3 | 24.3 | 24.3 |
| Mackerel | 1.4 | 1.0 | 1.4 |
| Other pelagic | 0.4 | 1. | 0.4 |
| Other fish | 0.3 | - | 0.2 |
| Squid | 1.0 | 0.8 | 1.0 |
| Total | 30.29 |  | 29.648 |

Table 16. Linear programing simulation of 1975 German Democratic Republic's catches maximizing total catch ('000 tons).

| Species sought | Total allowable catch constraint | Directed catch | Total catch |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cod | 1.3 |  |  |
| Redfish | 0.7 | - | 0.03 |
| Silver hake | 3.1 | - | 0.06 |
| Pollock | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.06 |
| Other groundfish | $<0.001$ | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Herring | 31.7 | 13.0 | 13.8 |
| Mackere1 | 56.3 | 19.3 | 19.5 |
| Other pelagic Other fish | 0.06 | - | 0.06 |
| Other fish Squid | 2.9 | 0 | 2.9 |
| Squid | 1.3 | - | 0.07 |
| Total | 100.86 |  | 39.94 |

Table 17. Linear programning simulation of 1975 Japan's catches maximizing total catch ('000 tons).

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species sought | Total allowable <br> catch constraint | Directed catch | Total catch |
| Cod | 0.05 | - | 0 |
| Redfish | 0.5 | - | 0.1 |
| Silver hake | 7.3 | - | 0.4 |
| Red hake | 0.01 | - | 0 |
| Pollock | 0.7 | - | 0.3 |
| Other flounder | 0.06 | 1.1 | 0.05 |
| Other groundfish | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| Herring | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.1 |
| Mackere | 9.8 | 0.8 | 9.3 |
| Other pelagic | 1.5 | 13.6 | 1.5 |
| Other fish | 24.3 |  | 16.0 |
| Squid |  |  | 29.65 |
| Total | 45.72 |  |  |

Table 18. Linear programming simulation of 1975 Poland's catches maximizing total catch ('000 tons).

| Species sought | Total allowable <br> catch constraint | Directed catch | Total catch |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cod | 0.5 |  |  |
| Redfish | 0.4 | - | 0.4 |
| Silver hake | 5.3 | - | 0.1 |
| Red hake | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.8 |
| Pollock | 0.9 | -.7 | 0.7 |
| Other groundfish | 1.4 | 32.1 | 1.4 |
| Herring | 98.4 | 81.3 | 38.4 |
| Mackerel | 2.0 | 0.3 | 90.0 |
| Other pelagic | 6.3 | 1.4 | 2.2 |
| Other fish | 6.8 |  | 6.3 |
| Squid |  |  | 4.4 |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 19. Linear programming simulation of 1975 Romania's catches maximizing total catch ('000).

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total allowable |  |  |  |
| catch constraint |  |  |  |$\quad$ Directed catch $\quad$ Total catch

Table 20. Linear programming simulation of 1975 Spain's catches maximizing total catch ('000).

|  | Total allowable |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species sought |  |
| catch constraint |  |$\quad$ Directed catch $\quad$ Total catch

Table 21. Linear programming simulation of 1975 USSR catches maximizing total catch ('000 tons).

| Species Sought | Total allowable catch constraint | Directed catch | Total catch |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cod | 2.5 | - | 0.2 |
| Haddock | 0.05 | - | 0.05 |
| Redfish | 1.4 | - | 1.4 |
| Silver hake | 113.3 | 41.4 | 42.4 |
| Red hake | 30.4 | 0 | 11.5 |
| Pollock | 0.8 | - | 0.2 |
| American plaice | 0.2 | - | 0.05 |
| Witch | 0.2 | - | 0.05 |
| Yellowtall | 0.09 | - | 0.09 |
| Other flounder | 0.6 | - | 0.2 |
| Other groundfish | 16.7 | 0 | 2.9 |
| Herring | 42.1 | 2.0 | 5.4 |
| Mackerel | 101.3 | 1.7 | 14.9 |
| Other pelagic | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.4 |
| Other fish | 28.9 | 0 | 8.4 |
| Squid | 8.5 | - | 3.1 |
| Total | 351.44 |  | 95.24 |

Table 22. Linear programming simulation of 1975 USA catches maximizing total catch ('000 tons).

|  | Total allowable <br> catch constraints | Directed catch | Total catch |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Spectes sought |  |  |  |
|  | 28.0 | 12.9 | 28.0 |
| Cod | 4.5 | 0.7 | 4.5 |
| Haddock | 20.6 | 19.0 | 20.6 |
| Redfish | 43.0 | 37.5 | 43.0 |
| Silver hake | 11.9 | 9.9 | 11.9 |
| Red hake | 11.5 | 6.8 | 11.5 |
| Pollock | 2.5 | - | 2.3 |
| American plaice | 4.1 | 12.0 | 3.9 |
| Witch | 19.9 | 11.6 | 19.9 |
| Yellowtail | 17.3 | 11.0 | 17.3 |
| Other flounder | 21.1 | 18.0 | 21.1 |
| Other groundfish | 19.2 | 4.4 | 19.2 |
| Herring | 4.7 | 1.8 | 4.7 |
| Mackerel | 4.3 | 2.8 | 4.3 |
| 0ther pelagic | 6.4 | 2.3 | 6.4 |
| Other fish | 5.6 |  | 5.6 |
| Squid |  |  |  |

Table 23. Linear programming simulation of 1975 Bulgaria's catches maximizing total catch ('000 tons).

|  | Total allowable <br> catch constraint | Directed catch | Total catch |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Species sought | 0.70 | - |  |
| Cod | 0.04 | - | 0.002 |
| Haddock | 0.50 | 0.000 |  |
| Redfish | 2.00 | 0.00 | 0.004 |
| Silver hake | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.142 |
| Other flounder | 2.60 | 1.00 | 0.020 |
| Other groundfish | 1.10 | 3.60 | 0.231 |
| Herring | 19.50 | 0.00 | 1.100 |
| Other pelagic | 4.20 | 4.650 |  |
| Other fish | 30.66 |  | 0.810 |

Table 24. Linear programming simulation of 1975 Canada's catches maximizing total catch ('000 tons).

| Species sought | Total allowable <br> catch constraint | Directed catch | Total catch |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cod | 4.80 | 0.00 | 0.72 |
| Haddock | 1.20 | 0.00 | 0.35 |
| Redfish | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.05 |
| Other flounder | 0.047 | 0.00 | 0.047 |
| Other groundfish | 4.00 | 1.39 | 2.61 |
| Herring | 6.40 | 0.00 | 6.40 |
| Other pelagic | 7.51 |  | 7.51 |
| Total | 24.457 | 1.39 | 17.687 |

Table 25. Linear programming simulation of 1975 Federal Republic of Germany's catches maximizing total catch ('000 tons).

| Species sought | Total allowable <br> catch constraint | Directed catch | Total catch |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| Cod | 0.09 | - | 0.00 |
| Silver hake | 0.50 | - | 0.00 |
| Other groundfish | 2.30 | - | 0.27 |
| Herring | 24.30 | 24.30 | 24.30 |
| Other pelagic | 1.80 | 1.27 | 1.80 |
| Other fish | 1.30 | - | 0.00 |
| Total | 30.29 | 25.57 | 26.37 |

Table 26. Linear programming simulation of 1975 German Democratic Republic's catches maximizing total catch ('000 tons).

| Species sought | Total allowable <br> catch constraint | Directed catch | Total catch |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Cod | 1.30 | - |  |
| Redfish | 0.70 | - | 0.00 |
| Silver hake | 3.10 | 0.56 | 0.00 |
| Other groundfish | 3.50 | 30.43 | 3.50 |
| Herring | 31.70 | 19.98 | 31.70 |
| Other pelagic | 56.36 | 0.00 | 24.25 |
| Other fish | 4.20 |  | 4.20 |

Table 27. Linear programming simulation of 1975 Japan's catches maximizing total catch ('000 tons).

| Species sought | Total allowable <br> catch constraint | Directed catch | Total catch |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.05 |  |  |
| Cod | 0.50 | - | 0.004 |
| Redfish | 7.3 | - | 0.001 |
| Silver hake | 0.06 | - | 0.100 |
| Other flounder | 0.81 | 1.08 | 0.021 |
| Other groundfish | 1.10 | 9.76 | 0.800 |
| Herring | 10.10 | 0.00 | 9.760 |
| Other pelagic | 25.80 |  | 0.110 |
| Other fish |  |  |  |

Table 28. Linear programming simulation of 1975 Poland's catches maximizing total catch ('000 tons).

|  | Total allowable <br> catch constraint | Directed catch | Total catch |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species sought | 0.50 | - |  |
| Cod | 0.40 | - | 0.14 |
| Redfish | 5.30 | - | 0.09 |
| Silver hake | 3.10 | 0.09 |  |
| Other groundfish | 98.40 | 0.25 | 0.09 |
| Herring | 13.10 | 1.37 | 98.40 |
| Other pelagic | 153.00 | 113.38 | 13.10 |
| Other fish |  |  | 144.27 |

Table 29. Linear programming simulation of 1975 Romania's catches maximizing total catch ('000 tons).

|  | Total allowable <br> catch constraint | Directed catch | Total catch |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Species sought | 0.005 |  |  |
| Haddock | 0.500 | 0.00 | 0.001 |
| Silver hake | 0.005 | - | 0.010 |
| Other flounder | 0.315 | 0.005 |  |
| 0ther groundfish | 2.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Herring | 3.813 | - | 0.010 |
| Other pelagic | 0.602 | 0.073 |  |
| Other fish | 7.240 |  | 0.025 |

Table 30. Linear programming simulation of 1975 Spain's catches maximizing total catch ('000 tons).

| Species sought | Total allowable <br> catch constraints | Directed catch | Total catch |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cod | 7.10 | 1.70 |  |
| Haddock | 0.30 | - | 1.70 |
| Redfish | 0.02 | - | 0.30 |
| Pollock | 0.20 | - | 0.00 |
| Other groundfish | 0.10 | - | 0.00 |
| Other fish | 13.00 | 1.70 | 0.00 |
| Total | 20.72 |  | 2.04 |

Table 31. Linear programming simulation of 1975 USSR's catches maximizing total catch (' 000 tons).

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species sought | Total allowable <br> catch constraint | Directed catch | Total catch |
| Cod | 2.50 | - |  |
| Haddock | 0.05 | - | 0.26 |
| Redfish | 1.40 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Silver hake | 113.30 | 0.00 | 1.15 |
| Other flounder | 1.09 | 0.00 | 1.04 |
| Other groundfish | 47.9 | 38.01 | 3.24 |
| Herring | 42.1 | 27.80 | 42.01 |
| Other pelagic | 105.7 | 0.00 | 3.62 |
| Other fish | 37.4 |  | 5.38 |

Table 32. Linear programming simulation of 1975 USA catches maximizing total catch (' 000 tons).

| Species sought | Total allowable <br> catch <br> constraint | Directed catch | Total catch |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Cod | 28.00 |  |  |
| Haddock | 4.50 | 0.00 | 13.80 |
| Redfish | 20.60 | 0.00 | 4.50 |
| Silver hake | 43.00 | 16.30 | 20.60 |
| Other flounder | 43.80 | 36.70 | 43.00 |
| Other groundfish | 44.50 | 8.10 | 32.60 |
| Herring | 19.20 | 5.50 | 44.50 |
| Other pelagic | 9.00 | 7.80 | 19.20 |
| Other fish | 12.00 | 8.90 | 9.00 |
|  |  |  | 12.00 |
| Total | 224.60 |  |  |


[^0]:    *Due to absence of by-catch ratios for 1971 data, estimate of total catch of France
    is that derived from 1973 by-catch
    is that derived from 1973 by-catch ratios.

