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## 1. PARTICIPANTS

The Nephrops Working Group met in Aberdeen from 28 February - 4 March 1977, with the following participants:

| Dr O Bagge | Denmark |
| :--- | :--- |
| Mr C J Chapman | United Kingdom |
| M A Charuau | France |
| Dr E Edwards | United Kingdom |
| Mr H Eirfksson | Iceland |
| MA Fernández-García | Spain |
| Mr H Hallbäck | Sweden |
| Dr J P Hillis | Ireland |
| Mr R Jones (Chairman) | United Kingdom |
| Mr P J Warren | United Kingdom. |

2. OBJECTIVES

The objectives (C.Res.1976/2:36) were:

1. To review and collate data obtained since the last meeting in 1975.
2. To offer advice on the implications to the Nephrops fishery and its by-catches of a change in the mesh size of nets.
3. Also, as a result of a request from NEAFC, the Group was asked to provide information on the distribution, biology and state of exploitation of Nephrops stocks with reference to 200 -mile zones.
4. SUMMARY
3.1 Review of Data

Landings, effort and catch per unit effort data were updated to 1976. These and other data are tabulated in Tables l-3.3.

### 3.2 Mesh assessments

Estimates were made of the immediate and long-term effects on the catch per recruit of changes in mesh size, using length composition and such growth and selectivity data as were available to the Group.

An increase in mesh size would lead to a short-term loss in catch. It was noted that such losses would primarily consist of smaller individuals of sizes that would normally be discarded. Table 14 shows estimates of the immediate losses in catch. These are likely to be overestimates of the immediate losses in landings.

Estimates of long-term effects were of a very approximate nature (Table 15) due to uncertainties about growth, selectivity and natural mortality. Nevertheless it was noted that in NEAFC Region 2, an increase in mesh size to the size of mesh used for NEAFC Recommendation 4 species, was not likely to decrease, and in many instances, should increase catches per recruit. Such increases should also decrease the proportion of the smaller and less valuable individuals in the catch.
For Iceland, it was thought that the mesh size used for NEAFC
Recommendation 4 species would be much too large for Nephrops. An
increase in mesh size from 80 to 90 mm should improve the yield per recruit if $M=0.1$, but not if $M=0.2$.

### 3.3 State of Stocks with Reference to 200-mile Fisheries Zones

Nephrops is a demersal species that lives on the sea bottom, spending most of its time in a mud burrow. The distribution is in discrete stocks with little or any migration of individuals beyond individual stock boundaries. Within the EEC zone there are discrete fisheries in Sub-areas IV, VI, VII and VIII and Division IIIa.
In Division IIIa, the grounds fished by Denmark and Sweden meet close to the border between Swedish and Danish waters (Figure 2). Evidence suggests that the Danish fishery may extend to a very small extent into Swedish waters. It seems likely that the Swedish fishery extends into Danish waters.
Outside the EEC zone there are stocks in the Norwegian zone (Divisions IVa and IIIa), at Iceland (Division Va), off the Portuguese coast (Division IXa) and off the north and southwest coasts of Spain (Divisions IXa and VIIIc). Each of these stocks is within the national waters of one of these countries and does not extend into any other national fishery zone.
Little is known about the state of exploitation of the Nephrops stocks. The assessments showed that for the large individuals of both sexes, in all stocks, values of $F / Z$ were mostly in the range of $0.6-0.8$.

## 4. RECOMMENDATION

The Group recommended that to improve the reliability of the assessments, further data should be collected on:

1. Length compositions of the landings and catches for the various fisheries.
2. Estimates of the growth rate for different fisheries.
3. Selectivity data, with particular reference to the escape of Nephrops from different parts of the net, under commercial conditions.
4. Discards, with particular reference
a) to survival
b) to the proportions discarded in each length group.
5. By-catches, with particular reference to length compositions and quantities caught. It was thought that this information could be of value to other Working Groups and might be incorporated in their assessments.

## 5. REVIEW OF FISHERIES

5.1 Denmark

The main fishing area is in Division IIIa (Figure 2) although a small part of the catch comes from Divisions IVa and b. Before 1950, the Danish yield was about 600 tons. Since 1953 landings have fluctuated between one and two thousand tons without discernible trend (Table l.l).
Within Division IIIa, more than half of the Danish landings come
from the Kattegat (Table I.2).

The main landing ports are Gilleleje, Grenß, Anholt, Læsø, Frederikshavn, and Skagen.

The catch comes mainly from a Nephrops-directed trawl fishery, the mesh size in the cod end being 35 mm (stretched). A small part of the catch comes from the Pandalus fishery in the Skagerrak and the North Sea.

Most of the vessels are about 50 feet and less in size with engines of 75-250 hp.

### 5.2 Sweden

The Swedish fishery is in Division IIIa, near the Swedish coast (Figure 2). The number of boats fishing Nephrops in 1976 was about 45. The trawlers are mostly $15-20 \mathrm{~m}$ in size with engines between 150-250 bhp. Most Nephrops are caught during July-November in 2 main areas, one off Lysekil and the other near and to the south of Gothenburg. A very small part of the Nephrops landings comes from the Pandalus fishery.

### 5.3 United Kingdom

5.3.1 Scotland

Scottish vessels fish for Nephrops off the east (Divisions IVa,IVb) and west coasts (Division VIa) of Scotland and on the Fladen Ground in the North Sea (Figure 1).
The main fishery is undertaken by Nephrops trawlers of $12-20 \mathrm{~m}$ with engines generally of $60-250 \mathrm{hp}$. There is also a creel fishery for Nephrops on the west coast by smaller vessels. The landings have risen steadily (Table l.l) to 11000 tonnes in 1976. The creel fishery accounted for about $5 \%$ of the total landings. Catch per unit effort (Table 3.1) has remained fairly steady. High recent catch rates at some ports probably result from exploitation of new grounds further offshore.

### 5.3.2 England, Wales_and N.Ireland

Landings of Nephrops come from two fishing areas, one in the North Sea (Division IVb) and the other in the Irish Sea (Division VIIa). (Figure 1.) The North Sea stock is centred around the Farn Deeps off the northeast coast and appears to be discrete. The main ports of landing are Seahouses, Amble, Blyth, North Shields and Hartlepool. Total annual landings in metric tonnes for these five ports (1970-76) are tabulated below:

| 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 425 | 727 | 1045 | 663 | 489 | 582 | 1123 |

Daily landings at the major port of North Shields for the years 1974-76 are presented in Figures $5-7$ and demonstrate the short and medium term fluctuations in availability within the fishery.
Daily catches per unit effort ( $\mathrm{kg} /$ boat day) for North Shields, 1976, are also presented in Table 3.3.
In the Irish Sea, landings are made at Whitehaven and Fleetwood, on the English coast, and at Portavogie, Kilkeel, and Ardglass in Northern Ireland.

### 5.4 Ireland

The main fishery takes place in the Irish Sea (Division VIIa) chiefly at the ports of Skerries and Clogherhead, where it is mainly Nephropsdirected (Figure 1). There is also a smaller fishery in Divisions VIIg-k, mainly at Castletownbere, and scattered irregular landings from Divisions VIIb, c and VIa.

### 5.5 France

Half of the French landings come from the Bay of Biscay, whilst the other half come from the Celtic Sea and the Irish Sea. Vessels are of three classes:

- In Sub-area VIII, "artisan" trawlers (25-50 GRT, 18-20 m long, $150-300 \mathrm{bh}$ ) fish exclusively for Nephrops all the year round.
- In Divisions VIIa,b,f,g "artisan" trawlers (50-90 GRT, 21 m long, 300-450 bhp) fish chiefly for Nephrops.
- In Divisions VIIb,g,h "semi-industrial" trawlers fish for white fish, but Nephrops is also an important part of the catch.

Recently, in spite of an increase in fishing effort in all areas, catches have tended to stabilize (average for 1974-76 was 12000 tonnes).

### 5.6 Spain

In the north-east Atlantic there are two important Spanish fisheries for Nephrops. One is on the Continental Shelf off the northwest of Spain and the other is to the west of Ireland.
The fishery off the northwest of Spain is situated to the west of Division VIIIc and to the north of Division IXa. The fishery is operated by about 220 industrial trawlers with 380 bhp power. This fishery is primarily directed at hake. These are mainly young individuals and the principal by-catch consists of Nephrops, Micromesistius poutassou, and Trachurus trachurus.
Off the west of Ireland the Nephrops is taken as a by-catch in a fishery for hake, megrim, and angler fish. These are fished by about 280 industrial trawlers, with a mean horse power of 705 bhp .
Nephrops is also taken as the principal species in an area from $52-53^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ and $12-14^{\circ} \mathrm{W}$ fished by a group of $25-30$ trawlers with a mean horse power of 450 bhp . These take about $50 \%$ of the Spanish catch.

### 5.7 Iceland

The Nephrops fishery is a summer one (May-August) and a special
Nephrops trawl with a minimum legal mesh size of 80 mm is used (Figure 3). Landings are shown in Tables 1.1 and 1.2. Table 2.1 gives fishing effort data, and Table 3.1 summarises landings per unit effort.

## 6. MESH SIZES IN USE

Details of mesh sizes in use in the various fisheries, are given in Table 7.
Cod-end mesh sizes range from 35 mm for Denmark and Norway and around 40 mm for Ireland to 80 mm for Iceland.
Mesh sizes for Nephrops fisheries are not regulated by international agreement, but national regulations exist for some countries.

For the United Kingdom, mesh sizes are restricted to 70 mm , except in the Irish Sea, where mesh sizes of up to 50 mm are permitted for vessels fishing for whiting.
At Iceland, there is a minimum cod-end mesh size for Nephrops vessels of 80 mm .

Spanish vessels that fish for Nephrops south of latitude $48^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ use cod-end mesh sizes of about 40 mm . Vessels fishing for Nephrops off the west of Ireland use 60 mm .
For Sweden, vessels fishing for Nephrops generally have cod-end mesh sizes of 70 mm . In addition, in three specified areas inside territorial limits, trawling with a mesh size of $60-65 \mathrm{~mm}$ is permitted.

## 7. MINIMUM LANDING SIZES

For some countries, the minimum size of Nephrops that may be landed is regulated. Details for those countries that impose restrictions are given in Table 7 .
For Denmark, the minimum legal landing size is 130 mm total length, or 72 mm tail length if only tails are landed. For Norway and Sweden the minimum landing size is 130 mm total length, and for the Faroe Islands, where there is a trap fishery, the minimum landing size is 150 mm total length.
In the United Kingdom there is no regulation controlling the minimum size for Nephrops landed for sale, but on the northeast coast of England a voluntary agreement exists to limit landed size to approximately 30 mm carapace length (equivalent to 100 mm total length). This agreement is implemented on the market using a count per pound of Nephrops graded at sea. Figure 8 shows the relationship between count per pound and carapace length.

In Spain, the minimum legal landing size is 120 mm measured from the posterior margin of the orbit to the end of the last segment (i.e., to the beginning of the telson). This is equivalent to 152.5 mm total length or 45.5 mm carapace length.

At Iceland there is a minimum legal landing size of 70 mm tail length, or 10 g tail weight.

## 8. SELECTIVITY DATA

Estimates of the selection factor range from approximately $0.3-0.5$. A value of 0.3 can be obtained from data in Garrod (1976). Values ranging from $0.39-0.50$ were obtained by Charuau depending on duration of haul (see below).

Duration of Haul
30 mins
60 mins
150 mins (duration
of commercial hauls)

## Selection Factor

0.39 ) covered cod-end method
0.42 )
0.50 both covered cod-end and alternate hauls

Work in the northwest Irish Sea by Cole and Simpson (1965), and Hillis (unpubl. data) showed that substantial numbers of Nephrops escape through various parts of the trawl other than the cod-end.

For Iceland, data provided by Eiríksson suggested a selection factor of 0.4.

In January 1976 a comparison of 70 mm and 50 mm Nephrops/whitefish trawls made of the same mesh size throughout was undertaken in the Farn Deeps fishery, northeast England. Six l-hour hauls were completed, working each trawl on alternate days. The results are summarised as length/frequency distributions in Figures 9A and 9B. Using a 70 mm unimesh trawl, the mean carapace length of all Nephrops was 29.6 mm (both sexes, $\mathrm{n}=1621$ ) and $58 \%$ of the catch was below the agreed minimum landing size of 30 mm carapace length. Using a 50 mm unimesh trawl, the mean carapace length was 28.8 mm (both sexes, $n=1949$ ) and $63 \%$ of the catch was below 30 mm carapace length.
Similar results were obtained by Pope and Thomas (1975).
A comparison of Nephrops trawls with 60 mm and 40 mm cod-ends was undertaken in September 1976 in the northern part of the Bay of Biscay. The duration of hauls was uniformly $2 \frac{1}{2}$ hours ( 15 hauls with each gear). The following results were obtained:

| Numbers of Nephrops ${ }^{1)}$ | Mesh size |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 40 mm | 60 mm |
| Undersized | 4979 | 1940 |
| Commercial size: |  |  |
| Small (22-29 mm) | 3927 | 1620 |
| Big | 803 | 478 |
| Weight of Nephrops ${ }^{2)}$ |  |  |
| Undersized | 28.3 | 11.1 |
| Commercial size: |  |  |
| Small | 43.4 | 18.1 |
| Big' | 18.9 | 11.8 |

1) Numbers per 10 hours fishing.
2) Kg per 10 hours fishing.

The immediate losses were $52 \%$ in weight.

## 9. GROWTH

Growth has been investigated:
a. in the aquarium by direct observation, and
b. in the field by tagging and from observations on the rate of progression of prominent length modes.

In the Bay of Biscay, studies of the intermoult cycle by means of a microscopic examination of the setae on the pleopods (according to Drach's method) suggest two moult periods, one in spring and one in late summer. Mature females begin moulting in January, and the individuals that moult in spring are always more numerous. (Charuau, unpubl. data.)
Observations on the intermoult increments of individuals maintained in large containers in the sea are recorded in Table 9. Irish data on Nephrops growth are presented in Table 8. Further data are published in papers by Thomas (1965), Farmer (1973), Conan (1975), Charuau (1975) and Hillis (1977).

In many Nephrops fisheries, there is a by-catch of other species. in other instances Nephrops is taken as a by-catch in a fishery for other species.

In Division IIIa, Danish and Swedish vessels take various gadoid and flatfish species as by-catches. For Danish vessels, sole is frequently the principal species taken in NovemberFebruary. For Swedish vessels, the most important species in the by-catches are cod, whiting, pollack and plaice.
In the Irish Sea, considerable numbers of young whiting are taken by United Kingdom and Irish vessels along with Nephrops at certain times of the year. The mixed fishery by French "semi-industrial" trawlers is mainly directed at demersal species, principally whiting, cod and hake.
In the Celtic Sea, fishing for demersal species by French vessels (chiefly for hake and whiting) is important.

Off the west of Ireland, Nephrops is taken as a by-catch in the fishery by Spain for hake, megrim and angler fish (Table 6.4).
In the northern part of the Bay of Biscay, the French artisan fishery is primarily directed at Nephrops. Many young hake are caught, and a large proportion of these are rejected (40-95 percent in number). (Table 6.8.) This fishery is near the 12 -mile limit in depths of $90-110 \mathrm{~m} .59 .2$ percent of landings (in weight) consist of Nephrops $22-29 \mathrm{~mm}$ (carapace length).

The Group recognised that in certain instances (e.g., whiting in the Irish Sea and hake in the Bay of Biscay) substantial numbers of young fish were destroyed by fisheries using small mesh nets. It was agreed that further data on by-catches should be collected and made available for other Working Groups to take into account in their assessments.

## 11. DISCARDING

Discarding is normal practice in most Nephrops fisheries, either because of the capture of individuals too small to be of much value, or to comply with a minimum landing regulation where one exists.

Experiments by Charuau in the Bay of Biscay in June 1975 have shown that only 31 percent of undersized Nephrops exposed on the deck for 30 minutes subsequently survived for 3 days in a cage on the bottom. For individuals exposed on deck for 60 minutes, only $25 \%$ subsequently survived.

Some data on the percentages discarded at various lengths are given in Tables l2.1-12.3.
Table 5.3 shows the length compositions of the discarded and the landed components of the Irish catches. This shows the relatively large numbers discarded.
12. NESH ASSESSMENTS

Mesh assessments were made to take account of both the immediate and the long-term effects of changes in mesh size.
Fishing effort was assumed to be constant throughout.

### 12.1 Data Used <br> 12.1.1 Length compositions

The length compositions used in the assessments are shown in Tables 5.5 and 5.6. Males and females were treated separately. Each of the distributions was chosen so as to be representative of the length composition of Nephrops in the catch before discarding had taken place.
Seasonal length compositions of the catch in the Irish Sea (Div.VIIa) are shown in Table 5.3. These show the effect of the strong, but brief influx of adult females in mid-summer.
12.1.2 Selectivity data

Since estimates of the selection factor are variable, and this could influence results significantly, the assessments were done using values of 0.3 and 0.5 . A value of 0.03 was used for the slope of the selection curve at the $50 \%$ release lengths (based on data in Garrod, 1976).

### 12.1.3 Growth and mortality parameters

Using the limited data available on growth increments and frequencies of moult interval, estimates were made of annual growth increments.

Tables 11.1 and 11.2 summarise the annual increments estimated from the various sources of data that were available. Using these, it was possible to determine values of the Bertalanffy parameter $K$ corresponding to any chosen value of $\mathrm{L}_{\infty}$. The formula used for doing this and the values obtained for each fishery are shown in Tables 11.1 and 11.2
Many of the values obtained for the different fisheries do not necessarily differ significantly. However, since each fishery can be treated separately and since there was no basis for preferring one set of estimates to another, it was agreed that rather than attempt to standardise the values obtained, the assessments would be done using the particular values obtained for each fishery individually.

### 12.1.4 Natural mortality

No estimates were available of natural mortality. For the Irish Sea, Z is believed to be about l.0 (Anon., 1976). For Denmark and Sweden in the Kattegat, values of $M=0.05$ and 0.1 were adopted for females. For other sexes and areas, assessments were done using $\mathrm{M}=0.1$ and $\mathrm{M}=0.2$.
Differences between the values reflect the uncertainty about the correct values to use.
12.1.5 Rate_of exploitation (F/Z)

Preliminary analyses of the length compositions gave values of $F / Z$ for the larger individuals of about $0.7-0.8$ for most stocks. For the final assessments the value of $F / Z$ for the largest individuals was taken as 0.7 .
12.1.6 Weight/length_relationship

Various relationships between carapace length and body weight were used. These were:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{W} & =0.00078 \mathrm{~L}^{2.936} \\
\mathrm{~W} & =0.00045 \mathrm{~L}^{3.15} \\
\mathrm{~W} & =0.00055 \mathrm{~L}^{3.0}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $L=$ carapace length in mm ,
and $\mathrm{W}=$ total body weight in g .
The differences between these relationships are not large enough to affect the assessments significantly.

### 12.2 Methods of Assessment

Immediate effects were calculated using the length composition and selectivity data. The results are shown in Table l4. The longterm effects of changes in mesh size were calculated using the method described by Jones (1977).
The values summarised below were obtained by averaging results for males and females assuming a 50:50 sex ratio.
12.3 Immediate Losses (Table 14)

For Denmark an increase from 35 to 50 mm should lead to losses of $1-6 \%$ whilst an increase to 70 mm should lead to losses of $5-24 \%$.
For Sweden an increase in mesh size from 60 to 70 mm should give an immediate loss of $2-12 \%$.
For Spain in Division IXa, an increase in mesh size from 40 to 60 mm should lead to immediate losses of $4-19 \%$. In Divisions VIIc,k an increase from 60 to 80 mm should lead to losses of $7-33 \%$ (based on males only). The exact value depends on the selection factor adopted.
For NE England an increase from 70 to 80 mm should lead to an immediate loss of $8-33 \%$.
For Ireland and Northern Ireland in Division VIIa an increase in mesh size to 70 mm should lead to losses of about $12-50 \%$.
For Scotland in the Firth of Forth an increase in mesh size from 70 to 80 mm should lead to losses of $6-27 \%$.
For Iceland an increase in mesh size from 80 to 90 mm should lead to losses of $3-21 \%$ (based on males only).
For France in Division VIIIa an increase from 39 to 60 mm should lead to immediate losses of $14-44 \%$.
In each instance the range of values depends on the selection factor used. Estimates based on a selection factor of 0.5 are all larger than estimates based on a factor of 0.3 .
In all fisheries, the immediate losses would consist of the smallest individuals of sizes that would in any event probably be discarded. As far as landings are concerned therefore, the immediate losses would be smaller than those shown in Table 14.
12.4 Long-term Changes

Table 15 shows estimates of the long-term effects of a change in mesh size on the catch per recruit. Estimates are given for each sex separately.
12.4.1 Effects_on the catches_per_recruit (Table 15)

For Denmark an increase in mesh size from 35 to 70 mm should lead to long-term gains of $2-12 \%$ for one combination of values of M. ( 0.05 for females and 0.1 for males.) For larger values of M ( 0.1 for females and 0.2 for males) the long-term gains would be zero. It was noted that when a selection factor of 0.3 was adopted, the immediate loss, even for an increase in mesh size to 70 mm , was so small, that little long-term change could be expected.

For Sweden an increase in mesh size from 60 to 70 mm should, to a first approximation, have very little effect on the catch per recruit.
For Spain in Division IXa, an increase in mesh size from 40 to 60 mm should lead to long-term gains of $2-15 \%$. In Divisions VIIc,k an increase in mesh size from 60 to 80 mm should lead to long-term gains of $2-20 \%$ (based on males only).
For the NE England fishery an increase in mesh size of 70 to 80 mm should lead to a long-term gain of $1-18 \%$.

For Ireland, an increase in mesh size to 70 mm should lead to long-term gains of 4-55\%.
For Northern Ireland, an increase in mesh size to 70 mm should lead to long-term gains of $0-51 \%$.
For Iceland, an increase in mesh size to 90 mm should lead to long-term gains of $0-9 \%$ (based on males only).
For France, an increase in mesh size of 39 to 60 mm should lead to long-term gains of $5-35 \%$.
For Scotland, increases in mesh size of up to 20 mm should lead to a long-term increase in the yield per recruit provided $\mathbb{M}$ is no greater than 0.2 (Jones, 1977).
12.4.2 Effect_on the size composition of the catch

In general, the net effect of an increase in mesh size should be to reduce the proportion of the smaller, and less valuable individuals, and to increase the proportion of larger and more valuable individuals.
12.5 Limitations of the Assessments

The Group recognised that the mesh assessments made in this report are necessarily provisional due to unavoidable
limitations in the data or lack of essential information.
For some fisheries the length composition was based on only one year's data and for this reason might have been influenced by the presence of either particularly strong or particularly weak year classes.

Estimates of growth rate were regarded as provisional, and for some stocks had to be based on data collected in other areas.
Selectivity experiments have led to rather variable estimates of the selection factor. Also there is some uncertainty about the escapement of Nephrops from parts of the net other than the cod-end.
No data were available for estimating $M$, and values had to be assumed.
It was also noted that the long-term effects related to catches per recruit rather than actual catches.

It was noted that the assessments were of a very approximate nature. Nevertheless the Group noted that:

1. Except for Iceland, an increase in mesh size to the size of mesh used for NEAFC Recommendation 4 species should not significantly decrease, and in many instances should increase the catch per recruit. In the case of Iceland, it was thought that the mesh size used for NEAFC Recommendation 4 species would be much too large for Nephrops. An increase in mesh size from 80 to 90 mm should improve the yield per recruit if $M=0.1$ but not if $M=0.2$.
2. Because of the discarding of many of the smallest individuals caught, an increase in mesh size should benefit landings more than catches.

It was concluded therefore that the minimum mesh sizes applicable to NEAFC Recommendation 4 species should be applied to Nephrops in NEAFC Region 2.
13. DISTRIBUTION AND STATE OF EXPLOITATION WITH REFERENCE TO 200-MILE FISHERY ZONES
13.1 Distribution of Stocks

The distribution of the main fisheries is shown in Figures 1-3.
Nephrops is a demersal species that spends most of its time in a mud burrow. The stocks are of limited extent, and except for the stocks exploited by Denmark and Sweden in Kattegat, are widely separated from one another.
According to the available information on the distribution of the Danish fishery in the Kattegat in 1975, about 160 tons of Nephrops was caught on the Swedish side of the midwater line. It must be stressed, however, that the sampling was not specially designed to give information on the distribution of the fishery as only one harbour was covered in the southern part of the Kattegat and the catches are referred to quarterrectangles. The dividing line crosses several of these.
With the possible exception of the stocks exploited by Denmark and Sweden in the Kattegat, none of these stocks extends from any exclusive fishery zone into any other exclusive fishery zone.

### 13.2 State of Exploitation

Little is known about the state of exploitation of the Nephrops stocks. The assessments showed that for the large individuals of both sexes in all stocks, values of $F / Z$ were mostly in the range of $0.6-0.8$.
14. SPAWNING TIMES AND AREAS

The spawning season varies broadly with temperature, getting later as mean annual sea temperature falls. After hatching, Nephrops larvae are pelagic for about $3-6$ weeks. During this period, larval drift appears to be negligible, and the larvae remain in the vicinity of the areas in which they are spawned.

## Divisions IVa,b,c and VIa

Spawning generally occurs in late summer, the eggs being carried by the female until they hatch in the following spring. Spawning takes place on the fishing grounds, there being no specific spawning areas.

Sub-area VII
Spawning is in August-September in Division VIIa, but probably slightly earlier in Divisions VIIg-k and VIIb,c. Spawning takes place in depths of 20-100 m off the Isle of Man. In Divisions VIIg-k and VIIb, c it is presumed to be fairly close to the Irish coast. Distribution of planktonic larvae during April-June in Division VIIa off the Irish coast has been described by Hillis (1974).

## Sub-area VIII

Spawning in the Bay of Biscay occurs in June-July.

## Division IIIa

Spawning in Division IIIa is from August to October. Spawning takes place in the eastern part of the Kattegat, northwards from the northern entrance of the Sound in depths of $30-80 \mathrm{~m}$. There is also spawning east and southeast of Skagen and Frederikshavn in depths of $40-70 \mathrm{~m}$, and off the Danish Skagerrak coast in depths of 50 to 150 m .

Division Va (Iceland)
There is a two-year breeding cycle (Eiriksson, 1970) with a peak of spawning in May-June and a peak of hatching in May-July. Spawning and hatching areas are thought to be essentially the same as the area of distribution.

## 15. SEX RATIO AND BREEDING CYCLE

Berried female Nephrops largely disappear from the catch and consequently the sex ratio varies seasonally according to the phase of the breeding cycle in different areas. Table 13 shows the seasonal variations in sex ratio (expressed as females per 100 males) and proportion of ovigerous females in the catches from several areas. The time of peak spawning and hatching tends to occur later in the year in more northerly grounds and this is reflected in the sex ratio. Overall sex ratios may be influenced by the size of mesh used, a large mesh depressing the proportion of females.

Nephrops spawn annually in some areas (Portugal, Irish Sea, Scotland). In other areas the occurrence of non-berried females in catches during the main spawning period indicates a longer breeding cycle (for example 2 years in Iceland waters).
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## ANNEX I

## CONVERSION FROM CARAPACE LENGTH TO TOTAL LENGTH

In biological investigations involving Nephrops, carapace length is usually employed as the measure of individual size. For other purposes, i.e., the enforcement of minimum landing sizes (where they apply) Nephrops sizes are quoted as total length. In order to provide a conversion between these two measures of length the following table has been constructed from Symonds' biometric relationships in "The fishery for the Norway lobster, Nephrops norvegicus (L.) off the northeast coast of England".

Symonds' equations for calculating total length (L) from carapace length (C) for both sexes are respectively:-

Males $L=3.02 \mathrm{C}+10.70$
Females $L=3.10 C+8.35$

| Carapace <br> length (mm) | Total length (mm) <br> Males | Total length (mm) <br> Females |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 41 |  |
| 15 | 56 | 39 |
| 20 | 71 | 75 |
| 25 | 86 | 86 |
| 30 | 101 | 101 |
| 35 | 116 | 117 |
| 40 | 132 | 132 |
| 45 | 147 | 148 |
| 50 | 162 | 163 |
| 55 | 177 | 179 |
| 60 | 192 | 194 |
| 65 | 207 | 210 |

ANNEX

NOTES ON THE PREPARATION OF LENGTH COMPOSITIONS FOR THE NORTHERN IRELAND DATA (1971-74)

## 1. Analysis of Sex, Length Compositions

Length compositions were available for Irish Sea catches by N.Ireland trawlers in two papers by Watson (1973; 1975; see p.13) (Table 1).

Table 1


Combined in 2 month periods gave 3-5 length compositions per period. The percentage of males and females in each 5 mm length group were tabulated for each sample and then averaged over each 2 month period. These data are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Average percentage of Nephrops by sex and length group in 2 month periods (1971-74).

| No. of samples | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{J} / \mathrm{F} \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { M/A } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{M} / \mathrm{J} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{J} / \mathrm{A} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 5 / 0 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{D} \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Length | $\sigma^{7}$ | 하 | $\sigma^{\circ}$ | 만 | $\sigma$ | 아 | ${ }^{2}$ | \% | $\sigma$ | 아 | ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 안 |
| 15-19 | 5.4 | 6.7 | 3.5 | 8.0 | 2.3 | 3.5 | 2.8 | 4.7 | 2.5 | 4.6 | 7.6 | 5.8 |
| 20-24 | 18.4 | 20.7 | 19.6 | 18.3 | 14.9 | 24.2 | 11.7 | 20.1 | 21.7 | 23.0 | 20.0 | 17.8 |
| 25-29 | 25.3 | 7.3 | 21.0 | 6.3 | 16.2 | 21.2 | 13.6 | 26.4 | 23.2 | 7.3 | 31.3 | 4.9 |
| 30-34 | 9.4 | 0.3 | 11.8 | 0.7 | 7.6 | 5.4 | 5.7 | 11.0 | 10.6 | 1.8 | 11.6 | 0.7 |
| 35-39 | 3.5 | 0.1 | 6.5 | 0.3 | 2.8 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 3.6 | 0.3 | 3.9 | 0.04 |
| 40-44 | 1.7 | 0 | 2.9 | 0 | 1.1 | 0 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0 | 1.0 | 0 |
| 45-49 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.9 | 0 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.06 | 0 |
| 50-54 | 0.06 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.07 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.07 | 0 |

These figures were used in the computation.

The average weight of Nephrops in each 5 mm group was estimated from carapace length to total weight data for the Irish Sea population given by Farmer (1974) (Table 3).

Table 3

| Length <br> (mm) <br> range | $15 / 19$ | $20 / 24$ | $25 / 29$ | $30 / 34$ | $35 / 39$ | $40 / 44$ | $45 / 49$ | $50 / 54$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Average <br> wt (kg) | 0.0029 | 0.0068 | 0.0134 | 0.0236 | 0.0382 | 0.0582 | 0.0846 | 0.1184 |

The product of average weight and the numbers given in Table 2 gave the relative weights of males and females for each 2 month period (Table 4).

Table 4
Relative weight of males and females in each 2 month period

|  | J/F | M/A | M/J | J/A | S/O | N/D |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Males | 1010 | 1209 | 710 | 513 | 946 | 1073 |
| Females | 270 | 261 | 606 | 824 | 322 | 222 |
| Total | 1280 | 1470 | 1316 | 1337 | 1268 | 1295 |
| $\%$ males | 79 | 82 | 54 | 38 | 75 | 83 |

These data were used to estimate the total catch weight of males and females for each 2 month period.

## 2. Analysis of Landinge

The annual landings from the Irish Sea by N Ireland Nephrops trawlers between 1971-74 are given in Table 5.

Table. 5

| Year | Landings ( $t$ ) |
| :--- | :---: |
| 1971 | 2190 |
| 1972 | 2998 |
| 1973 | 2733 |
| 1974 | 2490 |
| Average | 2603 |

Seasonal variation in landings was assumed to follow the trend given by Watson (1973, Figure 3) for the years 1968-72 (Table 6).

Table 6

| Month | Landings (tonnes) | Bi-monthly <br> landing <br> (tonnes) | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| J | $\left.\begin{array}{l}127.5 \\ 131.3\end{array}\right\}$ | 259 | 12 |
| M | 135.0 225.0 | 360 | 16.7 |
| M | $\left.\begin{array}{l}217.5 \\ 232.5\end{array}\right\}$ | 450 | 20.9 |
| J | $\left.\begin{array}{l}210.0 \\ 337.5\end{array}\right\}$ | 548 | 25.4 |
| S | $\left.\begin{array}{l}198.8 \\ 127.5\end{array}\right\}$ | 326 | 15.1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} \\ & \mathrm{D} \end{aligned}$ | $\left.\begin{array}{r}138.8 \\ 75.0\end{array}\right\}$ | 214 | 9.9 |
| Total | 2157 | 2157 |  |

The \% landings in each 2 month period were applied to the average annual landings in 1971-74 (2 603 tonnes). The average landings were converted to bi-monthly catches using discard data by length from Hillis (pers. comm.) converted to weight using the average weights given in Table 3. This gave the proportion of the catch by weight discarded at sea for each 2 month period (Table 7). Each bi-monthly catch was divided between the sexes using the data of Table 4.

## Table 7

|  | J/F | M/A | M/J | J/A | $0 / \mathrm{S}$ | N/D | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average landings <br> 1971-74 (tonnes) <br> \% discarded (by <br> weight) | 312 | 435 | 544 | 661 | 393 | 258 | 2603 |
| Average male + <br> female catch <br> 1971-74(tonnes) <br> Average catch $0^{\circ}$ <br> Average catch $\%$ | 34 | 28 | 34 | 31 | 35 | 35 |  |

Table 1.1. Annual landings of Nephrops in the ICES Area 1954-1975 (metric tons, whole body weight).

| Country | 1954 | 1955 | 1956 | 1957 | 1958 | 1959 | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 | 1964 | 1965 | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 ${ }^{\text {T }}$ | 1975 ${ }^{\text {w) }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Belgium | 456 | 441 | 374 | 649 | 831 | 970 | 788 | 895 | 668 | 766 | 789 | 536 | 705 | 477 | 456 | 468 | 479 | 378 | 299 | 392 | 444 | 451 |
| Denmark | 521 | 1014 | 1470 | 1638 | 1678 | 1530 | 2236 | 1452 | 1666 | 1752 | 2243 | 1744 | 1152 | 1495 | 1737 | 1176 | 1244 | 1233 | 2096 | 1339 | 1734 | 2613 |
| Faroe Islands | 3 | 2 | 2 | 51 | 91 | 96 | 73 | 35 | 39 | 78 | 54 | 49 | 43 | 36 | 23 | 23 | - | 38 | 31 | 43 | 31 | 44 |
| France | 4528 | 5136 | 5574 | 7440 | 6604 | 7213 | 8188 | 8410 | 8244 | 8706. | 9644 | 7783 | 7325 | 7703 | 8310 | 11227 | 10022 | 9025 | 9581 | 12098 | 12549 | 12828 |
| Germany, Fed.Rep. | 57 | 75 | 75 | 58 | 94 | 97 | 117 | 110 | 91 | 109 | 145 | 57 | 26 | 65 | 65 | 29 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 12 |
| Iceland | - | - | - | - | 728 | 1404 | 2081 | 1490 | 2662 | 5550 | 3487 | 3706 | 3465 | 2731 | 2489 | 3512 | 4026 | 4557 | 4321 | 2791 | 1983 | 2357 |
| Ireland | 52 | 209 | 206 | 340 | 599 | 736 | 397 | 715 | 840 | 1491 | 1016 | 801 | 1251 | 878 | 1493 | 1372 | 2019 | 1775 | 1823 | 2150 | 1380 | 1055 |
| Netherlands | + | + | + | + | + | + | 20 | 11 | 4 | 11 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | 29 | 29 |
| Norway | 19 | 121 | 72 | 189 | 88 | 66 | 69 | 58 | 50 | 15 | 102 | 161 | 36 | 15 | 84 | 74 | 18 | 52 | 29 | 37 | 38 | 28 |
| Portugal | 74 | 112 | 53 | 29 | 64 | 97 | 85 | 77 | 68 | 71 | 170 | 214 | 205 | 321 | 246 | 261 | 210 | 120 | 72 | 72 | 38 | 34 |
| Spain | 1667 | 1963 | 1716 | 1742 | 1701 | 1749 | 1697 | 2192 | 1626 | 1710 | 2468 | 3065 | 3576 | 4109 | 4047 | 4237 | 3234 | 3231 | 3759 | $4530{ }^{\text {7 }}$ | 4022 | 5331 |
| Sweden | 584 | 651 | 722 | 834 | 679 | 654 | 716 | 691 | 511 | 560 | 782 | 550 | 436 | 554 | 613 | 431 | 335 | 373 | 468 | 452 | 575 | 395 |
| England/Wales | 252 | 279 | 220 | 277 | 395 | 326 | 431 | 770 | 325 | 297 | 356 | 396 | 1064 | 768 | 983 | 859 | 612 | 1044 | 948 | 814 | 669 | 1157 |
| N. Ireland ${ }^{2}$ ) | 125 | 298 | 400 | 450 | 634 | 563 | 371 | 695 | 562 | 997 | 962 | 698 | 1045 | 1522 | 1436 | 1997 | 2107 | 2190 | 2998 | 2732 | 1887 | 2579 |
| Scotland | 575 | 1084 | 1058 | 1374 | 1144 | 2163 | 1969 | 2920 | 3482 | 3708 | 4940 | 5244 | 6344 | 6687 | 7203 | 8 189 | 8179 | 9029 | 10780 | 9780 | 8319 | 8223 |
| All countries | 9313 | 11385 | 11942 | 15071 | 15330 | 17664 | 19238 | 20521 | 20838 | 25821 | 27158 | 25004 | 26673 | 27361 | 29185 | 33855 | 32491 | 33148 | 37207 | 37233 |  |  |

${ }^{3)^{5}}$ Provisional. 1) Spanish data from 1973-1976 revised. 2) The N. Ireland landings have been maltiplied by 3/4 because incorrect conversion factor from tail - to total weight was used by all years before 1976.

Table 1．2．Annual catch of Nephrops（in metric tons）by country and by fishing areas 1960－1976．

|  | Va |  |  |  |  | IIa <br>  | IIIa |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { IIII } \\ \mathrm{b}, \mathrm{c} \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \end{array}$ | IVa |  |  |  |  | IVb |  |  |  |  |  |  | IVc |  |  | VIa |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 䔍 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E. } \\ & \text { dy } \\ & \text { © } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hy } \\ & \substack{0 \\ \hline ⿴ 囗 十} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rod } \\ & \text { H } \\ & \text { + } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ? } \\ & \text { dy } \\ & \text { E } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | Netherlande |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ? } \\ & \text { di } \\ & \text { "- } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | ¢ ¢ ＋ ¢ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}\right.$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { du } \\ & \text { ⿹\zh4 } \\ & \text { o } \\ & \text { ¢ } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { a } \\ & \text { a } \\ & \text { a } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r}0 \\ 0 \\ \text { ¢ } \\ \text {＋} \\ \hline\end{array}$ | － |
| 1960 | 451 | 2081 | ＋ | 2532 | 73 | － | 1095 | 1133 | 115 | 68 | 716 | 3127 | 1 | 5 | $\cdots$ | 2 | 539 | $56{ }^{\text {d }}$ | 121 | 7 | $\cdots$ | －． | 270 | 498 | 896 | 32 |  | 32 | 178 | 2 | 931 | 1 | 1112 |
| 1961 | 322 | 1490 | ＋ | 1812 | 35 | － | 828 | 618 | 110 | 57 | 691 | 2304 | － | 8 | ．． 89 | － | 765 | 863 | 372 | 6 | － | 11 | 582 | 590 | 1561 | 75 | 1 | 76 | 147 | 11 | 1554 | － | 1712 |
| 1962 | 154 | 2662 | － | 2816 | 39 | － | 783 | 878 | 88 | － | 511 | 2260 | 1 | 2 | ＊ 24 | 3 | 859 | 928 | 350 | 5 | － | 4 | 175 | 632 | 1206 | 62 | ． | 62 | 149 | 1 | 1950 |  | 2102 |
| 1963 | 510 | 5550 | 2 | 6062 | 79e） | － | 605 | 1141 | 109 | 12 | 560 | 2427 | 1 | 8 | ＊ 24 | ＋ 3 | 932 | 967 | 151 | 5 | ＋ | 7 | 198 | 685 | 1046 | 39 | 4 | 43 | 105 | － | 2087 | ， | 2195 |
| 1964 | 586 | 3487 | － | 4073 | 54 | － | 812 | 1416 | 138 | 102 | 782 | 3250 | 1 | 21 | － 12 | $1+$ | 1387 | 1421 | 107 | 14 | 4 | － | 234 | 907 | 1266 | 17 | － | 17 | 367 | 32 | 2645 |  | 3047 |
| 1965 | 409 | 3706 | － | 4115 | 49 | － | 736 | 996 | 57 | 142 | 550 | 2481 | ＋ | 2 | － 2 | － 19 | 1029 | 1052 | 36 | 13 |  | － | 293 | 1052 | 1444 | 10 | － | 10 | 367 | 1 | 3147 | － | 3515 |
| 1966 | 546 | 3465 | － | 4011 | 43 |  | 316 | 824 | 22 | 17 | 436 | 1615 | ＋ | 4 | ＊ 9 | － 19 | 1432 | 1464 | 112 | 12 | 4 | － | 828 | 1964 | 2920 | 22 | 1 | 23 |  | 5 | 2945 | － | 2950 |
| 1967 | 208 | 2731 | － | 2939 | 36 | 1f） | 509 | 949 | 60 | 15 | 554 | 2087 | 1 | 1 | － 5 | －＋ | 1386 | 1392 | 242 | 36 | 5 | － | 699 | 1451 | 2433 | 23 | ． | 23 | 315 | 2 | 3849 | ＋ | 4166 |
| 1968 | 157 | 2489 | － | 2646 | 23 | － | 973 | 838 | ， | 83 | 613 | 2407 |  | 2 | ， | ＋ | 1496 | 1 499 | 249 | 26 | 65 | － | 894 | 1135 | $2374{ }^{\text {g }}$ ） | 46 | ． | 46 | 315 | 11 | 4571 | － | 4897 |
| 1969 | 188 | 3512 | 1 | 3701 | 23 | － | 590 | 561 | 23 | 74 | 431 | 1679 | 5h） | ＋ | $\cdots$ | 1 | 1575 | 1576 | 230 | 25 |  | － | 688 | 1113 | 2056 | 45 | － | 45 | 224 | 6 | 5494 | － | 5724 |
| 1970 | 119 | 4026 | － | 4145 | － |  | 321 | 910 | 6 | 18 | 335 | 1590 | － | 3 | $\cdots$ | － | 1052 | $1 \begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 1\end{aligned}$ | 330 | 12 | 1 |  |  | 1654 | 2415 | 19 | － | 19 | － | － | 5431 | － |  |
| 1971 | 155 | 4657 | －－ | 4812 | 38 | 30i） | 333 | 881 | 2 | 18 | 373 | 1607 | － | 2 | ．． | 4 | 1638 | 1644 | 215 | 19 | 1 | － |  | 1412 | 2349 | 5 | － | 5 | 200 | － | 5972 | ＋ | 6172 |
| 1972 | 82 | 4321 | 1783） | 4581 | 31 | － | 675 | 1410 | 1 | 24 | 468 | 2578 | － | 1 | ．．－ | 5 | 1304 | 1310 | 213 | 11 | 1 | － | 827 | 1904 | 2956 | 3 | － | 3 | 108 | － | 7556 | － | 7664 |
| 1973 | 5 | 2791 | － | 2796 | 43 | － |  | 1064 | 2 | 28 | 452 | 1818 | － | ＋ | －－ | 9 | 1566 | 1575 | 358 | 3 | 1 | － | 446 | 1754 | 2562 | 29 | － | 29 | － | 2 | 6422 | － | 6424 |
| $1974{ }^{\text {P }}$ | 6 | 1983 |  |  | 31 |  |  | 1156 | 1 | 35 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 3 | 1557 |  | 404 |  |  | 28 | 489 | 1595 |  | 31 | 5 |  | － | 1 | 5140 |  |  |
| $1975{ }^{\text {1976 }}$ |  | 2357 2781 |  |  | 44 |  |  | 1756 1062 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | $\begin{array}{r} 985 \\ 2083 \end{array}$ |  | 424 | 5 | 3 | 23 | 583 | $\begin{array}{ll} 1 & 552 \\ 2 & 187 \end{array}$ |  | 26 |  |  | 215 26 | 12 | $\begin{aligned} & 5662 \\ & 6676 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |

a）France 1960－66 IVa includes IVb，c．b）Norway IVa includes IVb，c．o）Denmark IVb includes IVa．d） 1960 total includes Netinerlands 20 tons．e）Faroes 78 ，Scotland 1.
f）France．g） 1968 total includes France 5 tons．h）Denmark＋，Germany，FR 5．i）Norway 30 ．j）France 178． f）France．g） 1968 total includes France 5 tons．i）Denmark＋，Germany，FR 5．i）Norway 30．j）France 178 ．

|  | VIIa |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIIb，c |  |  |  | VIId，e |  | VIIf |  |  |  | VIIg－k |  |  |  |  |  | VIII |  |  | IX |  |  | X | $\begin{array}{\|l\|c\|} \hline \text { On- } & \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { yy } \\ & \text { on } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 硙 } \\ & \text { an } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { dy } \\ & \underset{y}{7} \\ & \text { 0 } \\ & \text { H } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hy } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{O}} \\ & \text { Bn } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | TH | $$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 見 } \\ & 6.0 \\ & 60 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 哥 } \\ & \text { H } \\ & \text { H } \end{aligned}$ | 岳 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \text { Hem } \\ & \text { Him } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{5}{4} \\ & \stackrel{a}{a} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hy } \\ & \text { H } \\ & \text { E } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| 1960 | 178 | 133 | 392 | － | 371 | 1 | 1075 | 191 | － | 3 | $218{ }^{1}$ | － 3 | 3 | ．．． | $\ldots$ | － | ． 0 | － | 4085 | － | － | 134 | 4219 | 3524 | 577 | 4101 | 84 | 1120 | 1204 | 1 | 77 | 19238 |
| 1961 | 11 | 139 | 688 | 179 | 695 | 11 | 1723 | 151 | － | 3 | 154 | 29 | 11 | $\cdots$ | ．．． | － | ．．． | 106 | 4258 | 13 | － | － | 4377 | 3607 | 744 | 4351 | 73 | 1448 | 1521 | 4 | 17 | 20521 |
| 1962 | 3 | 140 | 649 | 67 | 562 | 1 | 1422 | 171 | － | 2 | 173 | 4 － | 4 | 8 | ．．． | 1 | 9 | 47 | 4708 | 188 | － | 82 | 5025 | 3042 | 768 | 3810 | 62 | 858 | 920 | 6 | 56 | 20.839 |
| 1963 | ， | 449 | 1059 | 24 | 997 | 1 | 2531 | 588 | － | 2 | 590 | － 3 | 3 | 14 | ． | － | 14 | 37 | 3500 | 430 | － | 75 | 4042 | 4040 | 1053 | 5093 | 67 | 657 | 724 | 4. | － | 25821 |
| 1964 | 29 | 652 | 539 | 34 | 962 | 1 | 2217 | 493 | － | 80 | 573 | － 2 | 2 | 4 | $\cdots$ | － | 4 | 22 | 3522 | 365 | － | 88 | 3997 | 4596 | 1278 | 5874 | 166 | 1190 | 1356 | 4 | 2 | 27158 |
| 1965 | 8 | 489 | 557 | 35 | 698 | 16 | 1803 | 514 | － | 80 | 594 |  | 25 | ＋ |  | 6 | 6 | 20 | 2946 | 163 | － | 62 | 3191 | 3441 | 1721 | 5162 | 210 | 1344 | 1554 | 4. | － | 25005 |
| 1966 | 1 | ．．．．${ }^{\text {I }}$ | 886 | 193 | 1045 | 3 | 2128 | ．．．n） | － | 87 | 97 |  | － | 1 | $\ldots{ }^{\text {n）}}$ | － | 1 | 19 | $354981)$ | 273 | － | 42 | 3793 | 3857 | 2038 | 5895 | 201 | 1538 | 1739 | 4 |  | 26673 |
| 1967 | 2 | 1122 | 731 | 49 | 1522 | 1 | 3427 | 441 | － | 49 | 490 | － | － | － | 84 |  | 84 |  | 2488 | 96 | － | 20 | 2605 | 3245 | 2574 | 5819 | 317 | 1535 | 1852 | 4 | 2 | 27361 |
| 1968 | ＋ | 981 | 906 | 72 | 1436 | 1 | 3396 | 441 | － | 17 | 458 | 5 | 5 | － | 55 | － | 55 |  | 2649 | 559 | － | 17 | 3227 | 3859 | 2814 | 6673 | 242 | 1233 | 1475 | 4 | － | ${ }_{29}^{29} 185$ |
| 1969 | 3 | 762 | 941 | 161 | 1997 | 6 | 3870 | 609 | － | 3 | 612 | $26+$ | 26 | ＋ | 10 | － | 10 2 |  | 4786 | 422 | 750 | 10 | 5220 | 4810 | 2734 | 7544 | 257 | 1503 | 1 <br> 1 <br> 1 <br> 940 <br> 10 | 4 |  | $\begin{array}{ll}33 & 855 \\ 32 & 504\end{array}$ |
| 1970 | 7 | 547 | 1258 | 192 | 2107 | 2 | 4113 | 256 | 750 | 18 | 1024 | $64+$ | 64 | ＋ | 2 | － | 2 |  | 3699 | 743 | 750 | 1 | 5194 | 5454 | 15 | 5469 | 207 | 1733 | 1940 |  | － | 32504 |
| 1971 | 1 | 305 | 1415 | 342 | 2190 | 1 | 4260 | 500 | 722 | 1 | 1223 |  | 20 | － | 10 | － | 10 | － | 4000 | 359 | 722 | － | 5081 | 3990 | 50 | 4040 | 120 | 1781 | 1901 | ．． 0 | － | 33192 |
| 1972 | － | 7 | 1626 | 121 | 2998 | 16 | 4768 |  | 869 | 46 | 915 | 55 | 55 | ＋ | 190 | － | 150 | － | 3518 | 151 |  | － | 4538 | 5525 | 51 | 5576 | 72 | 1962 | 2034 | $\because{ }^{\circ}$ | － | 37199 |
| 1973 | － | － | 1862 | 368 | 2732 | 38 | 5000 | 811 | 1576 | 35 | 2422 | $297+$ | 297 | ＋ | 21 | － | 21 | － | 3529 | 251 | 1576 | － | 5756 | 7040 | 32 | 7072 | 72 | 2363 | 2435 | $\ldots$ | － | 38250 |
| 1974p | － | － | 982 | 180 | 1887 | 27 |  | 900 | 947 | 67 | 1914 | 300 |  | 1 | 50 |  |  | 2 | 4199 | 330 | 947 | － | 5478 | 7100 | 56 | 7156 | 38 | 2071 | 2109 |  |  |  |
| 1975․ |  | 771 | 907 | 574 | 2579 | 24 |  | 477 | 1131 | 9 | 1617 | 2 |  |  | 5 |  |  | 1 | 4574 | 118 | 1131 | － | 5824 | 6782 | 64 | 6846 | 34 | 3005 | 3039 |  |  |  |
| $1976{ }^{\text {P }}$ |  | 375 | 1812 |  |  |  |  | 638 | 639 | 30 | 1361 | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | － | 4316 | 258 | 693 | － | 5267 | 5477 | 59 | 5536 | － | 3085 | 3085 |  |  |  |

[^0]Table 1.3 Scotland.
Nephrops: landings (tonnes) by districts.

|  | Eyemouth | Leith | Anstruther | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1954 | 59.8 | 11.8 | 156.0 | 227.6 |
| 1955 | 43.9 | 329.5 | 430.0 | 803.5 |
| 1956 | 39.2 | 306.8 | 317.3 | 663.3 |
| 1957 | 54.6 | 446.7 | 481.4 | 982.8 |
| 1958 | 21.5 | 421.7 | 241.6 | 684.8 |
| 1959 | 40.5 | 405.0 | 383.8 | 829.4 |
| 1960 | 43.9 | 227.5 | 227.0 | 498.5 |
| 1961 | 74.6 | 290.8 | 223.0 | 588.4 |
| 1962 | 94.9 | 232.9 | 303.2 | 630.9 |
| 1963 | 41.3 | 280.2 | 362.9 | 684.3 |
| 1964 | 67.7 | 518.9 | 318.3 | 904.8 |
| 1965 | 147.3 | 419.4 | 478.9 | 1045.6 |
| 1966 | 286.9 | 668.3 | 947.8 | 1902.9 |
| 1967 | 216.9 | 687.6 | 443.7 | 1348.2 |
| 1968 | 237.3 | 510.9 | 299.4 | 1047.6 |
| 1969 | 165.4 | 576.5 | 348.8 | 1090.7 |
| 1970 | 252.2 | 759.3 | 601.3 | 1612.8 |
| 1971 | 212.5 | 680.0 | 464.1 | 1356.7 |
| 1972 | 455.5 | 776.4 | 637.7 | 1869.6 |
| 1973 | 296.5 | 710.6 | 689.5 | 1696.6 |
| 1974 | 223.1 | 683.1 | 600.4 | 1506.6 |
| 1975 | 232.7 | 683.2 | 577.4 | 1493.3 |
| 1976 | 391.6 | 931.9 | 728.0 | 2051.5 |

Table 1.4 France. Breakdown of landings by port and area for 1976 (in tonnes).

| Area | North of $48^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | South of $48^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | VI a | VII a | VII b | VII e | VII f | VII g | VII h | VII j | VIII a | VIII b |
| DOUARNENEZ | 12.7 | 37.3 | 18.6 |  |  | 457.7 | 353.9 | 5.8 |  |  |
| SAINT GUENOLE |  | 1.53 | 116.45 |  |  | 1654.88 | 3.06 |  | 174.52 |  |
| LE GUILVINEC |  |  |  |  |  | 217.16 | 21.53 |  | 1057.96 |  |
| LESCONIL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 945.63 |  |
| LOCTUDY |  |  | 3.69 | 1.01 | 0.92 | 659.30 | 32.15 |  | 936.28 |  |
| CONCARNEAU | 13.69 |  | 21.82 | 0.68 | 0.17 | 8.77 | 15.41 | 0.5 | 582.80 |  |
| LORIENT |  | 195.51 | 34.68 | 0.84 | 0.68 | 299.08 | 446.32 |  | 962.63 |  |
| SAINT NAZAIRE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 461.00 |  |
| LES SABLES D'OLONNE |  | 53.0 | 243.0 |  |  | 37.0 |  |  | 332.54 |  |
| LA ROCHELUE |  | 88.08 | 199.39 |  |  | 94.66 | 14.61 |  | 5.82 | 18.29 |
| TOTAL | 26.39 | 375.42 | 637.63 | 2.53 | 1.77 | 342855 | 886.98 | 6.3 | 5459.18 | 18.29 |

Table 2.1. Fishing effort 1960-1976.

| Year | Scotland |  | Fingland (NE) | Northern Ireland |  | Ireland | France |  | Denmark | Sweden | Faroe Isl. | Iceland | Spain VII, b.c.j.k |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hours fishing |  | Hours fisning | Hours fisining <br> Total $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & <50 \mathrm{~mm} \\ & \text { mesh }\end{aligned}\right.$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hours fishing } \\ & \times \text { BHP x } 10^{-2} \\ & \text { Skerries } \\ & \text { May - October } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total power } \\ & (50 \mathrm{GRT}) \\ & x \text { BHP } \times 10^{-3} \end{aligned}$ | Lesconil days fishing $\times$ BHP $\times 10^{-2}$ | Gilleleje (October) hours fishing | Hours fishing | Hoursfishing | Hours fisring | All vessels ${ }^{\text {I }}$ ) |  | Nephrops trswlers ${ }^{2}$ ) |  |
|  | Anstruther | Buckie |  |  |  | Fishing days |  |  |  |  |  |  | BHP | Fisining days | BHP |
| 1960 | - |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3721 | 25223 |  |  |  |  |
| 1961 | - |  |  | - | - | 7380 | 91.3 |  |  |  | 2876 | - |  |  |  |  |
| 1962 | - | 28290 | 9487 | - | 14533 | 6651 | 94.9 |  |  |  | 1633 | 34756 |  |  |  |  |
| 1963 | 7268 | 24685 | 6465 | - | 31336 | 7326 | 103.9 |  |  |  | 2538 | 63356 |  |  |  |  |
| 1564 | 7102 | 41869 | 7309 | - | 22688 | 6336 | 108.6 |  | 716 |  |  | 52753 |  |  |  |  |
| 1965 | 5090 | - | 9994 | 37475 | 11982 | 6120 | 116.6 |  | 291.5 |  |  | 57816 |  |  |  |  |
| 1966 | 22027 | - | 18490 | 54511 | 21803 | 6831 | 124.6 | 10941 | 1341 |  |  | 56342 |  |  |  |  |
| 1967 | 18155 | 26031 | 22380 | 75395 | 9720 | 8145 | 119.5 | 9296 | 803.5 |  |  | 65492 |  |  |  |  |
| 1968 | 14493 | 29046 | 22195 | 91791 | 32341 | 8973 | 121.1 | 9958 | 2223.5 | 14793 |  | 84373 |  |  |  |  |
| 1969 | 14589 | 28115 | 23165 | 106433 | 48740 | 9909 | 130.6 | 10912 | 822.5 | 12711 |  | 90502 |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 15001 | 17528 | 12653 | S9 162 | 43908 |  | 144.4 | 11259 | IIIa Jan-Dec | 11883 |  | 100125 | 21420 | 598 |  |  |
| 1971 | 18159 | 19470 | 22522 | 95259 | 47106 |  | 148.9 | 12049 |  | 11332 |  | 96219 | 25212 | 621 |  |  |
| 1972 | 22096 | 18307 | 18641 | 119082 | $78 \quad 094$ |  | 159.3 | 11011 |  | 11700 |  | 114615 | 28932 | 64.5 | 3360 | 463 |
| 1973 | 30817 | 26791 | 16436 | 126360 | 81684 |  | 170.9 | 12774 | 272154 | 10354 |  | 89169 | 27348 | 651 | 3912 | 388 |
| 1974 | - | - |  | 110700 | $69300^{*}$ ) |  | 180.6 | 12558 | 213951 | 11733 |  | 50458 | 27744 | 661 | 3756 | 386 |
| 1975 | 30312 | 8123 |  | 125700 | 85812 |  | 195.3 | 14541 | 341176 | 11292 |  | 61220 | 31212 | 712 | 5736 | 480 |
| 1976 | 32069 | 28178 |  | 147738 | 99 104 |  | 211.4 | 13760 | 296036 | 7123 |  | 76796 | 29880 | 728 | 1428 | 360 |

\#) Raised from January - October value.

1) 1 fishing day $=15$ hours' fisning.
2) Divisions VIIc, $k$ only.

Table 3.1. Landings per unit of effort (catch in kg per hour fishing unless otherwise stated)

| Year | Scotlan Anstruther | Buckie | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fongland } \\ & \hline(N E) \end{aligned}$ | Northern <br> Ireland |  | Ireland Skerries | France Lesconil Lorient |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{c} \text { Denmark } \\ \text { Gilleleje } \end{array} \\ & \hline \text { (October) } \end{aligned}$ | Faroe <br> Islands | Iceland | Spain |  | DenmarkIIIa <br> Jan-Dec | Sweden |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | All methods | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mesh } \\ & \text { <50mm } \end{aligned}$ |  | VIII | VIIb | VIIg |  |  |  | (VIIb, All vessels | $c, j, k)$ Nephrops trawlers |  |  |
| 1960 |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  | 19.6 | 82.5 |  |  |  |  |
| 1961 |  |  |  | - | - | 43.61 |  |  |  |  | 12.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1962 |  | 16.8 | 13.5 $5^{\text {² }}$ | - | 23 | 39.28 |  |  |  |  | 23.2 | 76.6 |  |  |  |  |
| 1963 | 27.2 | 21.1 | 21.8 | - | 30 | 71.98 |  |  |  |  | 30.5 | 87.6 |  |  |  |  |
| 1964 | 25.4 | 16.3 | 22.5 | - | 31 | 27.17 |  |  |  | 11.0 |  | 66.1 |  |  |  |  |
| 1965 | 36.6 | - | 22.6 | 19 | 31 | 36.62 |  |  |  | 7.7 |  | 64.1 |  |  |  |  |
| 1966 | 37.6 | - | 24.1 | 19 | 33 | 55.86 | 51.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  | 61.5 |  |  |  |  |
| 1967 | 24.4 | 27.4 | 17.0 | 20 | 31 | 30.34 | 39.4 |  |  | 8.0 |  | 41.7 |  |  |  |  |
| 1968 | 20.3 | 18.8 | 21.0 | 16 | 24 | 37.44 | 50.1 |  |  | 7.2 |  | 29.5 |  |  |  | 7.9 |
| 1969 | 23.9 | 17.8 | 17.5 | 19 | 27 | 47.45 | 62.7 |  |  | 10.1 |  | 38.8 |  |  |  | 6.6 |
| 1970 | 31.5 | 22.9 | 18.6 | 21 | 28 |  | 45.5 |  |  |  |  | 40.2 | 70 |  |  | 6.3 |
| 1971 | 25.4 | 29.0 | 15.7 | 23 | 24 |  | 44.7 | 128.44 | 75.60 |  | . | 48.4 | 57 |  |  | 6.5 |
| 1972 | 29.0 | 27.9 | 21.4 | 26 | 29 |  | 53.1 | 36.45 | 84.24 |  |  | 37.7 | 60 | 148 |  | 6.5 |
| 1973 | 22.4 | 29.5 | 14.0 | 22 | 25 |  | 70.3 | 79.50 | 47.54 |  |  | 31.3 | 78 | 220 | 4.92 | 7.2 |
| 1974 | 15.5 | 16.4 |  | 17 | $20^{\text {표 }}$ |  | 80.0 | 123.36 | 51.65 |  |  | 39.3 | 68 | 175 | 8.10 | 10.2 |
| 1975 | 19.0 | 40.8 |  | 20 | 23 |  | 77.35 | 128.65 | 46.46 |  |  | 38.5 | 72 | 179 | 7.65 | 10.6 |
| 1976 | 22.7 | 41.4 |  | 22 | 37 |  | 68.7 |  |  |  |  | 36.2 | 46 | 179 | 5.55 | 7.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3.2 Spain Catch per unit effort. $\mathrm{Kg} /$ fishing day, monthly values for 1974.

| Month | J | $F$ | M | A | M | J | J | A | S | 0 | N | D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Divs. IXa - VIIc ${ }^{\text {l }}$ | 40 | 70 | 76 | 67 | 89 | 108 | 92 | 75 | 47 | 51 | 66 | 70 |
|  | 29 | 33 | 33 | 38 | 83 | 96 | 187 | 150 | 50 | 33 | 33 | 50 |
| Divs. VIIc, ${ }^{2}$ ) | 138 | 155 | 154 | 177 | 230 | 324 | 326 | 177 | 92 | 139 | 189 | 157 |

1) All vessels. Data obtained in La Coruna 1974
2) Nephrops trawlers.

Table 3.3 United Kingdom (England).
Nephrops landings per unit effort in kg/boat day. Port of North Shields, northeast coast of England. January to December 1976.

| DAY | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  |  | 171 | 87 | 58 |  | 51 |  | 153 | 416 | 239 | 218 |
| 2 |  |  | 82 | 197 |  |  | 70 |  | 107 | 344 | 153 | 209 |
| 3 |  |  | 57 | 138 | 77 |  | 51 |  |  |  | 287 | 216 |
| 4 |  |  | 79 |  | 70 |  |  | 77 |  | 485 | 294 | 183 |
| 5 |  |  | 94 | 335 | 61 |  |  | 204 |  | 435 | 257 |  |
| 6 |  |  | 68 | 193 | 87 |  | 64 | 153 | 77 | 336 | 150 | 340 |
| 7 |  |  |  | 238 | 71 |  | 111 | 153 | 75 |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  | 176 | 51 |  | 102 |  | 72 | 255 | 140 | 251 |
| 9 | 94 | 151 | 128 | 197 |  |  | 96 | 51 | 85 | 238 | 115 | 222 |
| 10 | 125 | 105 | 127 | 196 | 82 |  | 128 | 51 |  |  | 128 | 167 |
| 11 |  | 109 | 194 |  | 58 |  |  | 71 |  | 252 | 179 | 240 |
| 12 | 162 | 98 | 177 | 181 | 51 |  | 189 | 82 |  |  | 194 |  |
| 13 | 97 | 97 | 86 | 96 |  |  | 128 | 68 |  | 136 | 231 | 295 |
| 14 | 51 |  |  | 90 |  |  | 117 | 122 | 51 | 231 |  | 293 |
| 15 | 51 |  |  | 51 |  |  | 102 |  |  |  | 279 | 197 |
| 16 | 77 | 90 |  |  |  |  | 163 | 51 |  |  | 176 | 155 |
| 17 | 106 | 77 |  |  |  |  | 82 | 89 |  |  | 129 | 143 |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  | 51 |  | 64 | 124 | 371 | 232 |  |
| 19 | 141 |  | 61 |  |  |  | 102 | 102 |  |  | 249 |  |
| 20 |  | 82 | 102 | 119 |  |  | 179 | 51 | 231 | 431 | 191 |  |
| 21 |  | 122 |  | 126 |  | 51 | 102 | 102 | 186 | 327 |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |  | 172 |  | 51 |  |  | 139 | 111 | 221 | 102 |
| 23 |  | 204 |  | 121 |  | 51 | 51 | 109 | 153 | 128 |  | 102 |
| 24 | 51 | 281 | 230 | 72 |  |  | 51 |  | $295$ |  |  |  |
| 25 |  | 193 | 228 |  |  |  |  | 82 | 284 | 102 |  |  |
| 26 |  | 194 | 311 | 68 |  |  |  | 102 |  | 69 | 68 |  |
| 27 | 51 | 239 | 185 | 51 |  |  | 51 | 85 |  | 132 | 132 |  |
| 28 | 91 | 197 |  |  |  | 51 | 77 |  | 286 | 122 |  |  |
| 29 | 57 |  | 204 | 51 |  | 51 |  |  | 357 | 158 | 216 |  |
| 30 |  |  | 132 | 68 |  | 82 | 51 |  | 486 |  | 283 |  |
| 31 |  |  | 128 |  |  |  |  | 102 |  |  |  |  |

These data illustrate the variability of seasonal and daily catch rates

Table 4. Mean carapace lengths, Males, 1958-74 (mm).

| Year | UK (Scotland) |  |  |  | Ireland <br> Skerries, summer (Median) | Iceland | Denmark |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FF | MF | NM | FC |  |  |  |
| 1958 | - | - | - | - | 29.9 | - |  |
| 1959 | - | - | - | - | 30.2 | - |  |
| 1960 | 47 | 38 | 44 | 37 | 26.2 | 51.2 |  |
| 1961 | 40 | - | - | - | 29.8 | 52.4 |  |
| 1962 | 38 | 32 | 40 | 34 | 30.4 | 46.6 |  |
| 1963 | 36 | 32 | 37 | 30 | - | 49.2 |  |
| 1964 | 36 | 29 | 36 | 30 | 27.6 | 50.9 |  |
| 1955 | 39 | 35 | 37 | 35 |  | 50.4 |  |
| 1966 | 36 | - | - | - | 28.7 | 46.5 |  |
| 1967 | 34 | 29 | 39 | 34 | 28.8 | 44.1 |  |
| 1968 | 33 | - | - | - | 25.3 | 44.2 |  |
| 1959 | 34 | - | 49 | 33 | 26.8 | 42.5 |  |
| 1970 | 31 | 32 | 43 | 35 | 28.3 | 43.0 |  |
| 1971 | 35 | 34 | - | 39 | 27.2 | 44.7 | 45.1 |
| 1972 | 32 | 31 | 34 | 34 | 25.9 | 43.0 | 43.8 |
| 1973 | 31 | 27 | 33 | 34 | 25.3 | 42.3 | 44.8 |
| 1974 | 30 | 28 | 38 | 31 | - | 44.8 | 42.4 |
| 1975 | 32 | 30 | 32 | 35 | - | 42.5 | 41.5 |
| 1976 | 31 | 31 |  | 32 | 24.3 | 43.0 | 40.1 |

```
FF = Firth of Forth
MF = Moray Firth
NM = North Minch
FG = Firth of Clyde
```

Table 5.1 Denmark.
Length compositions of Nephrops caught (numbers per sample) Div. IIIa 1971-76 (based on sampling from July-December)



Table 5.2 France.
Length composition of Nephrops caught (Lesconil).

| Carapace <br> length <br> (mm) | MALES |  |  |  |  | FEMALES |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 |
| 10-14 | 136 | 308 | 416 | 284 | 125 | 264 | 628 | 463 | 309 | 180 |
| 15-19 | 2340 | 7731 | 5881 | 6392 | 7029 | 2472 | 8628 | 6184 | 7519 | 7636 |
| 20-24 | 11430 | 23607 | 19222 | 23245 | 23395 | 11517 | 24224 | 21662 | 25890 | 22468 |
| 25-29 | 13682 | 18050 | 14703 | 19915 | 18584 | 14428 | 14823 | 11251 | 16245 | 15829 |
| 30-34 | 7898 | 6412 | 5984 | 7263 | 6757 | 4670 | 2378 | 3556 | 1572 | 2900 |
| 35-39 | 4022 | 2064 | 2048 | 1867 | 1966 | 1237 | 267 | 851 | 173 | 297 |
| 40-44 | 1250 | 483 | 624 | 433 | 607 | 282 | 29 | 113 | 22 | 33 |
| 45-49 | 372 | 139 | 85 | 103 | 145 | 2 |  | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| 50-54 | 82 | 29 | 42 | 30 | 38 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55-59 | 26 |  |  | 5 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |

France.
Percentage composition of Nephrops catch (by weight) at Lesconil.

| Carapace <br> length <br> (mm) | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $22-29$ | 57.50 | 56.0 | 61.2 | 56.5 | 57.0 | 61.0 | 61.2 | 61.7 | 63.2 | 56.5 |
| $\geq 30$ | 42.50 | 44.0 | 38.8 | 43.5 | 43.0 | 39.0 | 38.8 | 38.3 | 36.8 | 43.5 |

Length distributions in Irish (east) fishery, with totals (numbers and weights) caught and landed. (Based on 1970-71 length frequency distributions.)

|  | Carapace  <br> length <br> $(\mathrm{mm})$ $\%$ <br> landed/ <br> catch | Oct/Nov/Dec/ Jan/Feb/Mar $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{C}} \quad \mathrm{N}_{1}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Apr/May } \\ & \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{c}} \quad \mathrm{~N}_{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { June/July } \\ \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{C}} \quad \mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{l}} \end{gathered}$ | $$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{c}} \quad \mathrm{~N}_{1} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MALES | $15-19$ 0 <br> $20-24$ 12 <br> $25-29$ 60 <br> $30-34$ 100 <br> $35-39$ 100 <br> $40-44$ 100 <br> $45-49$ 100 <br> Total Numbers ('000) <br> Total Weight (metric tonnes) | 1498  - <br> 7517 902  <br> 10.296 6 178 <br> 4819 4819  <br> 1832 1832  <br> 695 695  <br> 171 171  <br> 26828 14597  <br> 438.6 325.6  | $\begin{array}{rrrr} \hline 599 & & - \\ 4072 & & 489 \\ 5 & 486 & 3 & 292 \\ 2883 & 2 & 883 \\ 1 & 170 & 1 & 170 \\ & 187 & & 187 \\ & 66 & & 66 \\ 14 & 464 & 8 & 087 \\ 236.2 & 176.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{rrr} \hline 275 & - \\ 3162 & 379 \\ 4710 & 2826 \\ 1681 & 1681 \\ 446 & 446 \\ 152 & 152 \\ 38 & 38 \\ 10463 & 5522 \\ 158.2 & 109.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{rrr} 1 & 024 & \\ 5040 & & 605 \\ 7536 & 4 & 522 \\ 3 & 544 & 3544 \\ 759 & & 759 \\ 150 & 150 \\ & 46 & \\ \hline 18 & 096 & 9626 \\ 270.7 & 191.3 \end{array}$ | 3 396  - <br> 19 791 2 375 <br> 28 028 16 817 <br> 12927 12 927  <br> 4 207 4 207 <br> 1 184 1 184 <br> 321  321  <br> 69 854 37 831 <br> 1 103.7 803.0  |
| FEMALES | $15-19$ 0 <br> $20-24$ 12 <br> $25-29$ 60 <br> $30-34$ 100 <br> $35-39$ 100 <br> $40-44$ 100 <br> $45-49$ 100 <br> Total Numbers ('000) <br> Total Weight (metric tonnes) | 1922  - <br> 8.853 1062  <br> 3537 2122  <br> 117 117  <br> 27 27  <br> - -  <br> 9  9 <br> 14465 3337  <br> 122.1 39.4  | $\begin{array}{rrr} 459 & & - \\ 5795 & 695 \\ 3 & 520 & 2112 \\ 300 & 300 \\ & 37 & 37 \\ & 9 & \\ & - & \\ & - \\ 10 & 120 & 3 \\ 98.5 & 153 \\ 90.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{rrr} 323 & - \\ 5 & 365 & 644 \\ 8 & 156 & 4894 \\ 3 & 105 & 3 \\ 788 & & 788 \\ & 161 & \\ & 9 & \\ & 961 \\ 17 & 908 & 9601 \\ 240.2 & 161.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{rrr} 1381 & & - \\ 3388 & 1 & 007 \\ 9435 & 5661 \\ 2531 & 2531 \\ 403 & & 403 \\ 115 & & 115 \\ & - & - \\ 22 & 253 & 9717 \\ 259.4 & 150.4 \end{array}$ | 4085  - <br> 28 401 3 <br> 2408   <br> 24 648 14 <br> 6053 6 053 <br> 1255 1 255 <br> 285  285 <br> 18  18 <br> 64745 25 808 <br> 720.2 391.8  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SEXES } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{rr} 41293 & 17934 \\ 560.7 & 365.0 \end{array}$ | 2458411240 $334.7 \quad 217.1$ | $\begin{array}{rrrr} 28 & 371 & 15 & 123 \\ 398.4 & 271.0 \end{array}$ | 4035219343 530.1341 .7 | $\begin{array}{lr} 134599 & 63639 \\ 1823.9 & 1 \\ 194.8 \end{array}$ |

Table 5.4 Numbers (thousands) of Nephrops caught annually at Anstruther. Mean for the period 1967-74. (Anon.,1976).

| Carapace <br> length <br> (mm) | Males | Females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10-14 | 1 | 2 |
| 15-19 | 163 | 155 |
| 20-24 | 1391 | 1512 |
| 25-29 | 4120 | 3660 |
| 30-34 | 4729 | 4027 |
| 35-39 | 3040 | 2593 |
| 40-44 | 1650 | 963 |
| 45-49 | 827 | 164 |
| 50-54 | 312 | 6 |
| 55-59 | 94 | 0.3 |
| 60-64 | 10 | - |
| 65-69 | 3 | - |
| Total | $\underbrace{16} 340 \sim \sim \sim^{13} 082$ |  |
|  | 29422 |  |

MALES

| Carapace <br> length <br> (mm) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Denmark }^{3)} \\ & \text { IIIa } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sweden }^{2)} \\ & \text { IIIa } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Spain }^{5)} \\ \text { IXa } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { France }{ }^{4)} \\ & \text { VIIIa } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Spain }^{6)} \\ & \text { VII c,k } \end{aligned}$ | Northern Ireland | Ireland ${ }^{\text {9) }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NE 1) } \\ & \text { England } \end{aligned}$ | Scotland ${ }^{8)}$ | Iceland ${ }^{7}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10-15 |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-20 | 1 |  | 3 | 120 |  | 65 | 71 | 7 | 10 | 1 |
| 20-25 | 5 | 6 | 128 | 395 | 1 | 307 | 386 | 120 | 85 | 10 |
| 25-30 | 37 | 27 | 177 | 316 | 68 | 365 | 332 | 377 | 252 | 56 |
| 30-35 | 132 | 157 | 187 | 117 | 248 | 161 | 153 | 262 | 289 | 153 |
| 35-40 | 219 | 181 | 192 | 35 | 312 | 60 | 42 | 142 | 186 | 227 |
| 40-45 | 247 | 228 | 183 | 10 | 240 | 24 | 13 | 63 | 101 | 206 |
| 45-50 | 182 | 201 | 81 | 2 | 95 | 7 | 2 | 20 | 51 | 157 |
| 50-55 | 110 | 99 | 29 | 1 | 28 | 11 |  | 8 | 19 | 108 |
| 55-60 | 48 | 71 | 12 |  | 6 |  |  | 1 | 6 | 56 |
| 60-65 | 17 | 27 | 4 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 1 | 22 |
| 65-70 | 1 | 4 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| 70-75 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 5.6 Length compositions used in the assessments (Nos. per mille).
FEMALES

| Carapace length (mm) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Denmark } \\ & \text { IIIa } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sweden }^{2)} \\ & \text { IIIa } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Spain }^{5)} \\ & \text { IXa } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { France } \\ & \text { VIIIa } \end{aligned}$ | Northern Ireland | Ireland ${ }^{\text {9) }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NE } \\ & \text { England } \end{aligned}$ | Scotland ${ }^{8}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10-15 | 1 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| 15-20 | 1 |  | 2 | 153 | 115 | 102 | 18 | 12 |
| 20-25 | 17 | 11 | 123 | 481 | 457 | 464 | 264 | 116 |
| 25-30 | 73 | 115 | 163 | 296 | 319 | 339 | 490 | 280 |
| 30-35 | 218 | 252 | 176 | 53 | 96 | 82 | 151 | 307 |
| 35-40 | 253 | 180 | 242 | 8 | 12 | 10 | 66 | 198 |
| 40-45 | 216 | 205 | 234 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | $74$ |
| 45-50 | 151 | 134 | 50 |  |  |  | 2 | 13 |
| 50-55 | 56 | 77 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55-60 | 12 | 20 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60-65 | 1 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65-70 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1) Jan. 1976 (Totals from 6 one-hour hauls with 70 mm unimesh trawl)
2) Autumn 1976. 3) For period 1971-76 (Jul-Dec only). 4) Mean for 1973-76.
3) Based on samples taken in 1974-76. 6) Jan-Feb 1977. 7) Mean for period 1969-75.
4) Mean for period 1967-74 at port of Anstruther. 9) 1976-77 data.

Table 6.1 By-catch data Denmark. Landings (kg per 100 kg Nephrops) from Division IIIa.

|  | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Pandalus | 2.0 | 1.6 | 3.5 | 2.5 |
| Plaice | 16.9 | 7.3 | 8.8 | 29.6 |
| Dab | 2.4 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 3.2 |
| Sole | 6.7 | 3.1 | 2.7 | 4.9 |
| Cod | 45.3 | 12.2 | 19.9 | 35.7 |
| Haddock | 2.2 | 0.4 | 2.1 | 4.5 |
| Whiting | 3.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 5.2 |
| Norway pout | 20.1 | - | - | - |
| Blue whiting | 6.7 | - | 1.6 | - |
| Unspecified | 442.2 | 414.8 | 307.8 | 265.6 |
| Total By-catch | 457.8 | 440.3 | 348.0 | 351.2 |
| Total Nephrops (tonnes) | 1339 | 1733 | 2610 | 1643 |
| Total By-catch (tonnes) | 7335 | 7630 | 9083 | 5770 |

Table 6.2 By-catch data France. Landings (kg per 100 kg Nephrops) from Sub-area VII 1975 (Artisan Nephrops trawlers landing at Rochelle and Lorient).

| Species composition | La Rochelle |  |  | Lorient |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | VIIa | VIIb | VIIg | VIIa | VIIb | VIIg | VIIh |
|  | 29.05 | 2.64 | 21.39 | 81.24 | 6.67 | 53.66 | 3.73 |
| Hadaock |  |  | 0.2 | 8.57 | 14.91 | 17.89 | 12.03 |
| Siithe | 1.45 |  | 7.54 | 13.73 | 1.26 | 10.56 | 2.07 |
| Ling |  |  | 0.62 | 6.16 | 4.76 | 9.65 | 4.16 |
| Whiting | 35.24 |  | 31.17 | 164.26 | 1.51 | 108.33 | 2.84 |
| Hake | 6.8 | 1.32 | 8.19 | 19.13 | 4.76 | 30.15 | 9.89 |
| Monk | 8.97 | 9.25 | 13.39 | 22.50 | 8.98 | 40.85 | 18.33 |
| Megrim | 1.76 |  | 5.71 | 4.05 | 11.35 | 26.24 | 26.45 |
| Plaice | 2.65 |  | 0.90 | 10.92 | 0.33 | 14.13 | 0.61 |
| Sole | 4.29 |  | 4.23 | 8.0 | 0.52 | 10.16 | 0.85 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 90.21 | 13.21 | 93.34 | 338.55 | 55.05 | 321.62 | 80.96 |

Total landings in
tonnes:
Nephrops $\quad$ N.......... $15.83 \quad 3.78 \quad 95.84 \quad 165.81 \quad 36.28 \quad 283.90 \quad 231.52$
By-catch ........... $19.70 \quad 2.25 \quad 137.88 \quad 917.75 \quad 33.491493 .20 \quad 334.21$

Table 6.3 By-catch data. France. Monthly landings by Nephrops trawlers (kg per 10 hrs fishing) in 1976 at Lesconil.

|  | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dogfish | 4.8 | 3.1 | 3.9 | 2.1 | 1.3 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 2.1 | 4.5 | 4.3 | 5.2 | 3.5 |
| Skate | 9.9 | 6.7 | 15.13 | 1.4 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 8.9 | 5.2 | 4.4 | 13.0 |
| M. merluccius | 43.9 | 29.3 | 16.9 | 29.09 | 42.6 | 45.9 | 40.8 | 34.7 | 26.5 | 36.5 | 46.9 | 62.0 |
| Trisopterus luscus | 12.0 | 9.3 | 9.5 | 6.6 | 7.0 | 6.3 | 7.7 | 6.5 | 5.2 | 14.7 | 9.8 | 14.0 |
| P. pollachius | 4.9 | 6.5 | 3.5 | 2.8 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 2.0 |
| Molva molva | 4.3 | 2.8 | 3.1 | 2.4 | 3.0 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 2.9 | 2.3 | 4.2 | 4.0 |
| Pagellus bogaraveo | 2.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11.8 | 3.3 | 5.5 | 6.3 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 0 |
| Solea vulgaris | 4.0 | 8.3 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 3.3 | 5.7 | 1.8 | 8.5 |
| Lophius | 30.0 | 26.8 | 27.5 | 13.1 | 18.1 | 14.2 | 12.7 | 14.1 | 36.2 | 32.5 | 25.8 | 39.2 |
| Cephalopods | 10.6 | 6.4 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 13.1 | 15.1 |
| Nephrops | 116.5 | 110.2 | 127.3 | 183.0 | 166.0 | 157.6 | 133.4 | 90.3 | 61.9 | 84.2 | 166.1 | 147.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nephrops (tonnes) | 47.7 | 49.7 | 77.5 | 129.6 | 114.5 | 132.3 | 114.8 | 72.6 | 35.1 | 29.3 | 85.0 | 57.5 |

```
Table 6.4 By-catch data. Spain.
    Monthly landings (metric tonnes) of Nephrops and principal fish
species from the Spanish demersal fishery in Divisions VIIb,c,j,k in 1974.
```

|  | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hake (Merluccius merluccius) | 1233 | 1374 | 1533 | 1518 | 1453 | 1202 | 853 | 850 | 949 | 994 | 1076 | 1248 |
| Megrim (Lepidorhombus sp.) | 518 | 664 | 1303 | 1257 | 1079 | 1331 | 1242 | 1079 | 976 | 1005 | 916 | 753 |
| Angler (Lophius sp.) | 450 | 511 | 720 | 824 | 824 | 839 | 749 | 748 | 673 | 644 | 601 | 493 |
| - (Nephrops) | 68 | 77 | 77 | 89 | 194 | 225 | 437 | 351 | 117 | 77 | 77 | 117 |

Table 6.5 By-catch data. Scotland: landings from 4 areas, 1970-1975 ${ }^{\text {1) }}$.

| Year | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \frac{\text { Nephrops }}{(100 \mathrm{~kg})} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { by-catch } \\ (100 \mathrm{~kg}) \end{gathered}$ | Cod | Haddock | Whiting | Saithe | Hake | Monk | Plaice | Others* | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Firth of Forth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 15964 | 8895 | 11.56 | 17.01 | 23.31 | - | - | 0.19 | 2.48 | 1.17 | 55.72 |
| 1971 | 13619 | 7350 | 28.88 | 8.97 | 11.15 | 0.12 | _ | 0.15 | 2.65 | 2.15 | 53.97 |
| 1972 | 18374 | 5921 | 15.53 | 9.11 | 3.34 | 0.13 | - | 0.12 | 2.10 | 1.90 | 32.23 |
| 1973 | 16799 | 5967 | 14.04 | 9.56 | 7.30 | 0.11 | + | 0.44 | 2.44 | 1.63 | 35.52 |
| 1974 | 14519 | 4806 | 14.99 | 3.91 | 9.26 | 0.07 | - | 1.52 | 1.27 | 2.08 | 33.10 |
| 1975 | 14681 | 5580 | 17.51 | 4.24 | 11.21 | 0.33 | - | 2.35 | 0.77 | 1.60 | 38.01 |
| Moray Firth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 8374 | 4610 | 5.64 | 28.15 | 9.90 | 0.32 | 1.36 | 1.71 | 2.91 | 5.06 |  |
| 1971 | 10669 | 5630 | 13.70 | 18.74 | 6.18 | 0.37 | 0.66 | 3.05 | 2.87 | 5.06 7.20 | 53.05 52.77 |
| 1972 | 10029 | 2582 | 7.40 | 6.96 | 1.72 | 0.37 | 0.46 | 2.22 | 0.92 | 5.70 | 25.75 |
| 1973 | 12523 | 3327 | 6.45 | 8.43 | 1.20 | 0.72 | 0.26 | 2.30 | 1.37 | 5.84 | 26.57 |
| 1974 | 12982 | 4305 | 8.08 | 8.60 | 3.60 | 0.12 | 0.15 | 4.34 | 2.16 | 6.11 | 33.16 |
| 1975 | 8122 | 3505 | 5.07 | 6.40 | 5.63 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 11.60 | 3.84 | 10.27 | 43.15 |
| South Minch |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 17925 | 21775 | 15.54 | 37.47 | 18.79 | 0.59 | 4.44 | 17.51 | 0.54 | 26.60 | 121.48 |
| 1971 | 18539 | 19292 | 13.10 | 18.08 | 24.76 | 0.45 | 3.20 | 17.65 | 0.66 | 26.16 | 104.06 |
| 1972 | 23795 | 24102 | 15.82 | 8.94 | 23.82 | 2.11 | 4.52 | 18.37 | 1.04 | 26.67 | 101.29 |
| 1973 | 17223 | 19952 | 16.91 | 5.81 | 24.29 | 7.62 | 8.36 | 21.61 | 0.71 | 30.54 | 101.29 115.85 |
| 1974 | 11139 10173 | 8280 7691 | 12.06 8.09 | 1.80 1.82 | 16.58 | 2.41 | 3.54 | 14.21 | 0.71 | 23.02 | 74.33 |
| 1975 | 10173 | 7691 | 8.29 | 1.82 | 26.71 | 1.58 | 6.13 | 11.32 | 1.14 | 18.61 | 75.60 |
| Clyde |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 19072 | 19759 | 14.96 | 2.46 | 6.01 | 48.42 | 12.71 | 2.85 | 1.42 | 14.77 | 103.60 |
| 1971 | 18338 | 21162 | 24.19 | 2.13 | 5.36 | 56.11 | 11.47 | 2.85 3.23 | 1.62 | 11.29 | 103.60 115.40 |
| 1972 | 26600 | 34766 | 20.47 21.33 | 2.97 | 10.00 | 67.02 | 12.71 | 3.96 | 1.10 | 12.47 | 130.70 |
| 1973 | 23533 15086 | 30259 35300 | 21.33 38.88 | 2.71 2.68 | 0.01 10.15 | 73.95 135.04 | 14.73 | 3.54 | 1.44 | 10.87 | 128.58 |
| 1975 | 13036 | 37785 2785 | 38.17 | 2.68 1.62 | 10.15 + | 135.04 114.75 | 21.02 27.46 | 5.50 5.88 | 2.71 2.18 | 18.01 | 233.99 |

[^1]Table 6.6 By-catch data (Nephrops). Sweden.
Effort (trawling hours), landings and catch/effort (kg/hour) from Leran, Sörgrundet and St Pölsan - Falkenberg during 1968-76.

| Year | COD |  |  | WHITING. |  |  | HAKE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Effort | Landings | kg/hour | Effort | Landings | kg/hour | Effort | Landings | kg/hour |
| 1968 | 14790 | 183390 | 12.40 | 14758 | 18300 | 1.24 | 14839 | 9942 | 0.67 |
| 1969 | 12704 | 146599 | 11.54 | 12678 | 15848 | 1.25 | 12731 | 17060 | 1.34 |
| 1970 | 11886 | 179482 | 15.10 | 11891 | 16529 | 1.39 | 23040 | 32026 | 1.39 |
| 1971 | 11323 | 141768 | 12.52 | 11291 | 12081 | 1.07 | 11332 | 11899 | 1.05 |
| 1972 | 11704 | 143963 | 12.30 | 11710 | 20376 | 1.74 | 11681 | 30722 | 2.63 |
| 1973 | 10349 | 153275 | 14.81 | 10352 | 20186 | 1.95 | 10336 | 26668 | 2.58 |
| 1974 | 11737 | 139321 | 11.87 | 9838 | 16626 | 1.69 | 11761 | 19876 | 1.69 |
| 1975 | 11184 | 138460 | 12.38 | 11180 | 22248 | 1.99 | 11170 | 28930 | 2.59 |
| 1976 | 7122 | 95642 | 13.43 | 7113 | 18777 | 2.64 | 7116 | 30883 | 4.34 |

Table 6.7 By-catch data (Nephrops). Sweden.
Effort (trawling hours), landings and catch/effort (kg/hour) from Leran, Sörgrundet and St Pölsan - Falkenberg during 1968-76.

| Year | POLLACK |  |  | PLAICE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Effort | Landings | kg/hour | Effort | Landings | kg/hour |
| 1968 | 14780 | 49069 | 3.32 | 14756 | 23904 | 1.62 |
| 1969 | 12701 | 81035 | 6.38 | 12716 | 26068 | 2.05 |
| 1970 | 11896 | 56505 | 4.75 | 11910 | 21438 | 1.80 |
| 1971 | 11338 | 57370 | 5.06 | 11327 | 24807 | 2.19 |
| 1972 | 11700 | 65755 | 5.62 | 11721 | 21333 | 1.82 |
| 1973 | 10346 | 49247 | 4.76 | 10356 | 16259 | 1.57 |
| 1974 | 11729 | 64977 | 5.54 | 11722 | 17348 | 1.48 |
| 1975 | 11172 | 46476 | 4.16 | 11183 | 18564 | 1.66 |
| 1976 | 7116 | 42766 | 6.01 | 7134 | 17693 | 2.48 |

Table 6.8 By-catch data. France.
Number per 10 hours' fishing of hake taken by Artisan trawlers from Lorient working $47^{\circ} 30^{\prime} N-3^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \mathrm{W}$.

| Length (cm) | Feb 73 | Mar | May | Jul | Aug | Jan 74 | Mar | Jul | Sep | Oct | Nov |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. DISCARDS ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $4-6$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $7-9$ |  |  |  |  | 98 |  |  | 77 |  |  |  |
| 10-12 |  | 12 | 7 |  | 94 | 7 | 44 | 19 | 164 | 40 |  |
| 13-15 | 3 | 340 | 642 | 11 | 2 | 18 | 250 | 1 | 1547 | 595 | 66 |
| 16-18 | 41 | 570 | 211 | 16 | 18 | 25 | 371 | 22 | 1606 | 1316 | 847 |
| 19-21 | 78 | 450 | 940 | 7 | 48 | 6 | 167 | 76 | 166 | 739 | 1459 |
| 22-24 | 6 | 156 | 52 |  | 8 |  | 29 | 21 |  | 46 | 339 |
| 25-. 27 |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| 28-30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| B. LANDINGS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16. - 18 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |
| 19-21 | 46 | 5 | 7 | 29 | 17 | 3 | 25 | 61 | 4 | 42 | 47 |
| 22-24 | 211 | 141 | 64 | 92 | 136 | 11 | 119 | 105 |  | 61 | 191 |
| 25-27 | 185 | 114 | 49 | 60 | 98 | 9 | 62 | 66 | 29 | 12 | 69 |
| 28-30 | 77 | 57 | 26 | 35 | 53 | 8 | 18 | 64 | 44 | 37 | 7 |
| 31-33 | 19 | 19 | 14 | 5 | 36 | 4 |  | 32 | 33 | 44 | 11 |
| 34-36 | 4 | 17 | 6 | 9 | 27 | 2 | 19 | 16 | 24 | 24 | 14 |
| 37-39 | 3 | 2 | 7 |  | 9 | 7 |  | 5 | 11 | 11 | 5 |
| 40-42 |  | 2 | 4 |  | 4 | 2 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 6 |
| 43-45 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 4 |
| 46-48 |  |  | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 3 |
| 49-51 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 4 |  |  |  | 3 |
| 52-54 |  |  |  | 8 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 55-57 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 7 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 58+ |  |  | 2 | 3 | 5 | 10 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 7 |

1) Based on samples taken at sea.

Table 6.9 By-catch data. Spain.
Size compositions of hake.

| Division | IXa - VIIc (west) | VIIb, c, j, k |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Length ( cm ) | Numbers (millions) ${ }^{\text {l }}$ ) | Number (millions) ${ }^{2)}$ |
| 5-9 | 5.57 |  |
| 10-14 | 104.30 | . 03 |
| 15-19 | 189.59 | 1.44 |
| 20-24 | 53.75 | 5.18 |
| 25-29 | 14.84 | 7.62 |
| 30-34 | 7.64 | 8.20 |
| 35-39 | 2.69 | 6.62 |
| $40-44$ | 1.75 | 4.26 |
| $45-49$ | 1.14 | 2.65 |
| 50-54 | . 70 | 1.25 |
| $55-59$ | . 68 | . 67 |
| $60-64$ | . 78 | . 42 |
| 65-69 | . 68 | . 23 |
| 70-74 | . 29 | . 22 |
| $75-79$ | . 10 | . 12 |
| 80-84 | . 04 | . 10 |
| $85-89$ | .04 .03 | .05 .03 |
| Total number (millions) | 383.25 | 39.10 |
| Weight (tonnes) | 22822 | 14500 |
| Mesh size in use | 40 | 60 |

1) Total numbers caught including an estimate of the undersized fish (based on samples taken just before landing).
2) Total number landed.

Hake is the most important species in the by-catch.
Data obtained from the ports of La Coruna and Vigo (1973-74-75-76).

Table 7. Mesh sizes in use, and minimum landing sizes.

| Country | Cod end mesh size (mm) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minimum } \\ \text { size } \left.^{2}\right)(\mathrm{mm}) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Denmark | 35 | 1305) |
| Faroe Islands | Trap fishery | 150 |
| France | $\begin{aligned} & 40\left(\text { south } 48^{\circ} \mathrm{N}\right) \\ & 60\left(\text { north } 48^{\circ} \mathrm{N}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 80 |
| Iceland | 80 | $70^{4}$ ) |
| Ireland | ca. $40^{6}$ ) | None |
| Norway | 351) | 130 |
| Spain | $\begin{aligned} & 40\left(\begin{array}{l} \text { south } 48^{\circ} \mathrm{N} \\ 60 \\ \text { north } 48^{\circ} \mathrm{N} \end{array}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 1203) |
| Sweden | 60-70 | 130 |
| UK (Engl. \& Wales) | 70 | 1007) |
| UK (Scotland) | 70 | None |
| UK (N.Ireland) | $50^{8}$ ) | None |

1) From Anon., 1976.
2) Total length unless otherwise stated.
3) From orbit to beginning of telson (equivalent to 152.5 mm total length).
4) Tail length.
5) Equivalent to a tail length of 72 mm .
6) Mesh size in rest of trawl, 45-60 mm.
7) Voluntary agreement for English NE coast only.
8) Cod end is 40 mm , but 50 mm was considered more appropriate for the assessments because of the larger meshes (up to 70 mm ) in other parts of the trawl.

Table 8. Growth data estimated from available Irish material (Hillis, unpubl. data). $P=$ Petersen's method; $L=$ laboratory observations; $M=$ marking results.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age group } \\ & \text { (July) } \end{aligned}$ | MALE |  |  | FEMALE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Carapace length (mm) | Annual increment (mm) | Data source | $\begin{gathered} \text { Carapace length } \\ (\mathrm{mm}) \end{gathered}$ | Annual increment (mm) | Data source |
| 0 | 4 | 10 | L, P | 4 | 10 | L, P |
| 1 | 14 | 7 | P , L | 14 | 7 | P , L |
| 2 | 21 | 5 | P | 21 | 4 | P |
| 3 | 26 | $4 \cdot 5$ | P | 25 | I. 5 | P |
| 4 | 30.5 | 4 | P | 26.5 | I: 5 | M |
| 5 | 34.5 |  | P | 28 |  | M |

Table 9. France. Moult increments of Nephrops ${ }^{1}$. Carapace lengths (mm).

| MALE |  |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Length before moult | Length after moult | Length before moult | Length after moult |  |
| 21.4 | 23.6 | 24.9 | 27.4 |  |
| 22.0 | 25.4 | 26.2 | 28.3 |  |
| 25.8 | 28.5 | 26.8 | 38.5 |  |
| 26.0 | 28.7 | 29.1 | 30.8 |  |
| 26.3 | 29.1 |  |  |  |
| 26.9 | 30.2 |  |  |  |
| 28.0 | 31.3 |  |  |  |

1) Based on observations on individuals maintained in large containers in the sea.

Table 10. Percentage of Nephrops about to moult ${ }^{1 \text { ) }}$ (Sub-area VIII).

| Year and month | Males | Females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1274 |  |  |
| Oct | 14.44 | 7.68 |
| Nov | 7.28 | 2.57 |
| Dec | 5.73 | 7.60 |
| 1975 |  |  |
| Jan | 9.61 | 11.54 |
| Feb | 12.34 | 11.66 |
| Mar | 25.51 | 12.84 |
| Apr | 27.97 | 17.35 |
| May | 15.59 | 12.08 |
| Jun | 10.68 | 5.79 |
| Jul | 12.14 | 4.54 |
| Aug | 19.46 | 11.20 |
| Sep | 26.58 | 15.02 |
| Oct | 7.81 | 4.32 |
| Nov | 5.97 | 2.41 |
| Dec | 13.34 | 11.67 |
| 1976 |  |  |
| Jan | 11.46 | 22.21 |
| Feb | 12.12 | 18.31 |
| Mar | 20.45 | 15.02 |
| Apr | 21.26 | 9.40 |
| May | 24.90 | 9.32 |
| Jun | 19.43 | 5.71 |
| Jul | 8.05 | 1.56 |
| Aug | 24.47 | 13.58 |
| Sep | 23.98 | 16.59 |
| Oct | 5.89 | 3.35 |

1) Based on unpublished data by Charuau.

Table ll. Growth increments and values for $L \infty, K$ and $M / K$ used in the assessments.
A. MALES

|  | $\mathrm{L}_{t}$ | $L_{t+1}$ | $\pm \infty$ | $\mathrm{K}^{\text {1) }}$ | $\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{K}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NE England | 20 | 25 | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.11 \\ & 0.088 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.9 \\ & 1.1 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 42 | $44 \cdot 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \\ & 0.074 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0 \\ & 1.4 \end{aligned}$ |
| Scotland ${ }^{4}$ | 20 | 25 | 70 | 0.11 | 0.95 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { France } 5 \text { ) } \\ & \text { VIIIa } \end{aligned}$ | 26 | 31.5 | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.13 \\ & 0.10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75 \\ & 0.93 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 39 | 42 | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.11 \\ & 0.075 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.98 \\ & 1.32 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Denmark } \\ & \text { and Sweden } \\ & \text { IIIa } \end{aligned}$ | 20 | 26 | 70 80 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.13 \\ & 0.10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.77 \\ & 1.00 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 42 | 46 | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.15 \\ & 0.11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.67 \\ & 0.90 \end{aligned}$ |
| NW Spain ${ }^{3}$ ) and W Ireland | 27.2 | 33.8 | $\begin{array}{r} 85 \\ 90 \\ 100 \\ 115 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.12 \\ & 0.11 \\ & 0.10 \\ & 0.08 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.83 \\ & 0.91 \\ & 1.00 \\ & 1.25 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Irish Sea 7) } \\ & \text { (N.Ireland } \\ & \text { and Ireland) } \end{aligned}$ | 30 30 30 | 34 34 34 | 60 70 80 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.14 \\ & 0.11 \\ & 0.08 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.71 \\ & 0.91 \\ & 1.25 \end{aligned}$ |
| Iceland ${ }^{4}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \\ & 42 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & 46 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.088 \\ & 0.11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.1 \\ & 0.9 \end{aligned}$ |

1) Calculated from $K=\ln \left\langle\left(L_{\infty}-L_{t}\right) /\left(L_{\infty}-L_{t+1}\right)\right]$.
2) Values of $M / K$ for $M=0.1$.
3) Increment based on Conan (1975).
4) Growth increment based on Thomas (1965).
5) Growth increments based on data of Charuau.
6) Growth increments based on Jensen (1965).
7) Growth increments from Farmer (1973).
8) Growth increments based on data of Hillis (Table 8).

Table ll. 2 Growth increments and values for $L_{\infty}, K$ and $M / K$ used in the assessments.

## B. FEMALES

|  | $L_{t}$ | $L_{t+1}$ | $L_{\infty}$ | $K^{1}$ ) | $\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{K}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NE England | $22$ | 25 | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.065 \\ & 0.053 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.5 \\ & 1.9 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 29 | 30.7 | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.04 \\ & 0.03 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.3 \\ & 2.9 \end{aligned}$ |
| Scotland 4) | 22 | 25 | 70 | 0.065 | 1.54 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { France }{ }^{5)} \\ & \text { VIIIa } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.5 \\ & 30.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & 80 \\ & 70 \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.057 \\ & 0.046 \\ & 0.04 \\ & 0.03 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.7 \\ & 2.14 \\ & 2.3 \\ & 2.9 \end{aligned}$ |
| ```Denmark}\mp@subsup{}{}{6 and Sweden IIIa``` | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \\ & 42 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \\ & 45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \\ & 70 \\ & 60 \\ & 70 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.06 \\ & 0.04 \\ & 0.18 \\ & 0.11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.66 \\ & 2.5 \\ & 0.56 \\ & 0.88 \end{aligned}$ |
| NW Spain ${ }^{3}$ ) and W Ireland | 26 | 31 | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.12 \\ & 0.10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.83 \\ & 1.0 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Irish Sea7)8) } \\ & (N . \text { Ireland }) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \\ & 20 \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23 \\ & 23 \\ & 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \\ & 60 \\ & 70 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.11 \\ & 0.08 \\ & 0.06 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.91 \\ & 1.25 \\ & 1.67 \end{aligned}$ |

1) Calculated from $K=\ln \left[\left(L_{\infty}-L_{t}\right) /\left(L_{\infty}-L_{t+1}\right)\right]$
2) Values of $M / K$ for $M=0.1$.
3) Increments based on Conan (1975).
4) Growth increment based on Thomas (1965).
5) Growth increments based on data of Charuau.
6) Growth increments based on Jensen (1965).
7) Growth increments from Farmer (1973).
8) Growth increments based on data of Hillis (Table 8).

Table 12.1 France.
Percentages of Nephrops discarded at various lengths in Div.VIIIa.

Table 12.2 Scotland.
Percentages of Nephrops discarded at various lengths based on Anstruther samples taken Jan-Aug 1966 (from Anon., 1976).

| Carapace <br> length <br> (mm) | \% rejected |
| :---: | :---: |
| 17 | 100 |
| 18 | 100 |
| 19 | 99 |
| 20 | 92 |
| 21 | 74 |
| 22 | 46 |
| 23 | 21 |
| 24 | 5 |
| 25 | 2 |
| 26 | 1 |
|  |  |


| Carapace <br> length <br> (mm) | \% rejected |
| :---: | :---: |
| 22 | 100 |
| 23 | 100 |
| 24 | 99 |
| 25 | 99 |
| 26 | 96 |
| 27 | 94 |
| 28 | 88 |
| 29 | 79 |
| 30 | 65 |
| 31 | 51 |
| 32 | 39 |
| 33 | 18 |
| 34 | 8 |
| 35 | 5 |
| 36 | 2 |
| 37 | 1 |

Table 12.3 Sweden.
Discards of Nephrops in weight and \% from the areas of Leran, Sörgrund and St Pölsan - Falkenberg during 1968-76.

| Year | Total catch | $\mathrm{kg}_{\mathrm{g}}$ discarded | \% disc. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1968 | 117306 | 20131 | 17.16 |
| 1969 | 84146 | 12435 | 14.78 |
| 1970 | 74388 | 11318 | 15.21 |
| 1971 | 73656 | 7371 | 10.01 |
| 1972 | 75932 | 6241 | 8.22 |
| 1973 | 75068 | 7300 | 9.73 |
| 1974 | 119908 | 19873 | 16.57 |
| 1975 | 107513 | 18322 | 17.04 |
| 1976 | 56126 | 8674 | 15.45 |
| $1968-76$ | 784042 | 111666 | 14.24 |


| Country | Sub-area/ Division | Details of ratio | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A FEMALES PER 100 MALES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iceland | Va | Total F/100M | 45 | 63 | 43 | 16 | 10 | 13 | 29 | 29 | 45 | 44 | 70 | 110 |
| Sweden | III | Total F/100M | 50 | 40 | 76 | 86 | - | 59 | - | 40 | 54 | 92 | 79 | 34 |
| England NE <br> (Storrow, 1912, 1913) | IVb | Total F/100M | 26 | 88 | 75 | 74 | 29 | 6 | 9 | 18 | 25 | 72 | 76 | 98 |
| England NE <br> (Symonds, 1972) | IVb | Total F/100M | 52 | 61 | 54 | 134 | 22 | 17 | 15 | 17 | 39 | 57 | 75 | 70 |
| ```Scotland (Thomas & Figueiredo, 1965)``` | IVa, b VIa | Total F/100M | - | - | 14 | - | 26 | 76 | 66 | 88 | 84 | 68 | 18 | 31 |
| Northern Ireland | VIIa | Total F/100M | 71 | 53 | 55 | 67 | 97 | 137 | 220 | 75 | 79 | 75 | 58 | 46 |
| Ireland | VIIa | Imm. F/100M | 33 | 29 | 38 | 47 | 32 | 56 | 39 | 80 | 60 | 49 | 54 | 60 |
|  |  | Mat. F/100M | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 43 | 178 | 122 | 36 | 44 | 15 | 2 | + |
|  |  | Total F/100M | 33 | 29 | 39 | 63 | 75 | 234 | 161 | 117 | 104 | 64 | 56 | 61 |
| France (Charuau, 1975) | VIII | Total F/100M | 90 | 100 | 115 | 118 | . 102 | 102 | 83 | 84 | 79 | 63 | 49 | 70 |
| Portugal <br> (Figueiredo \& Barraca 1963) | IX |  | 16 | 27 | 32 | 11 | 30 | 45 | 56 | 49 | 39 | 35 | 23 | 43 |
| OVIGEROUS FEMALES PER 100 FEMALES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iceland | Va | Tot Ov F/100F | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 15.6 | 21.8 | 3.9 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
| England NE | IVb | Old egg F/100F | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.2 | (7.1) | 0.0 | 1.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| (Storrow, 1912, 1913) |  | New egg F/100F | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | (0.0) | 7.3 | 16.2 | 57.2 | 13.4 | 7.7 | 0.6 |
| England NE <br> (Symonds, 1972 ( | IVb | Total Ov F/100F | 0.0 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 1.5 | 0.0 |
| Scotland <br> (Thomas \& Figueiredo, 1965) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IVa, } \mathrm{b} \text {, } \\ & \text { VIa } \end{aligned}$ | Total Ov F/100F | - | - | 2.0 | - | 1.3 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 6.7 | 18.7 | 5.9 | 6.6 | 2.4 |
| Northem Ireland | VIIa | Total Ov F/100F | 0.5 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 1.5 | 0.0 |
| Ireland | VIIa | Old egg $F / 100$. Mat F |  | * | (0.0) | 0.0 | 3.6 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (0.0) | (0.0) |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { New egg } F / 100 F \\ & \text { Mat } F \end{aligned}$ |  | * | (0.0) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 6.1 | 51.5 | 41.1 | (55.6) | (80.0) |
|  |  | Total F/100F | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0:0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 4.6 | 18.4 | 10.4 | 1.3 | 0.8 |
| Portugal | IX | Total F/100F |  | . 9 |  |  | 0 |  | - | - - | - | - |  | 1.8 |

$M=$ Male; $F=$ Female; Imm = Immature (non breeding); Mat = Mature; Ov = Ovigerous; Old egg = Bearing eggs extruded in the previous calendar year; New egg = Bearing eggs extruded in the current calendar year;

* = Mature females absent; $-=$ No sample. Brackets denote ratio values based on denominator sample $N$ of under 50 .

Table 14. Immediate losses.

|  | Current mesh (mm) | New mesh (mm) | Sex | SF | \% loss |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Denmark } \\ & \text { IIIa } \end{aligned}$ | 35 | 50 | $0^{7}$ <br> $q$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 5 \\ & 2 \\ & 8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 70 | $\begin{aligned} & \sigma^{7} \\ & q \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4 \\ 20 \\ 6 \\ 27 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Sweden IIIa | 60 | 70 | $\begin{aligned} & 0^{7} \\ & q \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ 10 \\ 3 \\ 13 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Spain } \\ & \text { IXa } \end{aligned}$ | 40 | 60 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \text { o } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4 \\ 17 \\ 5 \\ 20 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| FranceVIIIa | 39 | 50 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \circ \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6 \\ 21 \\ 7 \\ 25 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  |  | 60 | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & \hline \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & 41 \\ & 16 \\ & 48 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Spain } \\ & \text { VIIc,k } \end{aligned}$ | 60 | 80 | $0^{7}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7 \\ 33 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| NE England | 70 | 80 | $0^{\prime \prime}$ $q$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7 \\ 29 \\ 10 \\ 36 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Iceland | 80 | 90 | $0^{*}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3 \\ 21 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| N.Ireland VIIa | $50^{1)}$ | 70 | $\begin{aligned} & 0^{7} \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 40 \\ & 18 \\ & 50 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Ireland VIIa | 501) | 70 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \text { i } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \\ & 43 \\ & 17 \\ & 49 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Scotland IVa | 70 | 80 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \ddagger \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6 \\ 25 \\ 7 \\ 29 \end{array}$ |

1) Mesh size intermediate in size between mesh sizes in cod end and in other parts of the trawl.

Table 15. Long-term changes in the catch per recruit.

| New mesh (mm) | M | Sex | SF | \% change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DENMARK IIIa |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | 0.05 | 안 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +1 \\ & +3 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 0.1 | ¢ ¢ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline+0.4 \\ +2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | 0.2 | ${ }^{7}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
| 70 | 0.05 | ¢ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} +3 \\ +13 \end{array}$ |
|  | 0.1 | \% ¢ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} +2 \\ +10 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | 0.2 | $0^{\prime \prime}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| SWEDEN IIIa |  |  |  |  |
| 70 | 0.05 | ¢ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ +5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | 0.1 | 6 $\%$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.4 \\ +4 \\ -2 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | 0.2 | $0^{*}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -2 \\ & -1 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | IXa |  |  |
| 60 | 0.1 | 0 $\%$ | 0.3 0.5 0.3 0.5 | $\begin{array}{r} +4 \\ +16 \\ +4 \\ +13 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | 0.2 | 8 ¢ | 0.3 0.5 0.3 0.5 | +2 +9 +2 +6 |
|  |  | IIII |  |  |
| 50 | 0.1 | $\sigma^{\prime}$ \& | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} +5 \\ +19 \\ +4 \\ +13 \end{array}$ |
|  | 0.2 | 6 $\%$ | 0.3 0.5 0.3 0.5 | $\begin{array}{r} +4 \\ +14 \\ +1 \\ +3 \end{array}$ |

Table 15 (ctd)

| New mesh (mm) | M | Sex | SF | \% change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FRANCE, VIIIa (ctd) |  |  |  |  |
| 60 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.3 | +11 |
|  |  |  | 0.5 0.3 | +43 +8 |
|  |  |  | 0.5 | +28 |
|  | 0.2 | $\sigma$ | 0.3 | +8 |
|  |  |  | 0.5 | +27 |
|  |  | ¢ | 0.3 | +2 |
|  |  |  | 0.5 | +5 |
| 80 | SPAIN VIIc, $k$ |  |  |  |
|  | 0.1 | $0^{*}$ | 0.3 | +4 |
|  |  |  | 0.5 | +20 |
|  | 0.2 | $0^{*}$ | 0.3 | $\begin{array}{r} +2 \\ +11 \end{array}$ |
| 80 | NE ENGLAND (IV) |  |  |  |
|  | 0.1 | $0^{7}$ | 0.3 |  |
|  |  |  | 0.5 0.3 | $+21$ |
|  |  |  | 0.5 | +16 |
|  | 0.2 | $\sigma$ | 0.3 | +2 |
|  |  |  | 0.5 | +10 |
|  |  | ¢ | 0.3 | -1 |
|  |  |  | 0.5 | 0 |
| 90 | ICELAND ( Va ) |  |  |  |
|  | 0.1 | $0^{\circ}$ | 0.3 | +2 |
|  |  |  | 0.5 | +9 |
|  | 0.2 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | 0 |
| N.IRELAND (VIIa) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 | 0.1 | $8^{\prime \prime}$ | 0.3 |  |
|  |  |  | 0.5 |  |
|  |  | 앙 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | +70 +7 |
|  |  |  |  | +32 |
|  | 0.2 | $\sigma^{\circ}$ | 0.3 | -2+43 |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | ¢ |  | +2+8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 | IRELAND (VIIa) |  |  |  |
|  | 0.1 | $0^{7}$ | 0.3 | +8+64 |
|  |  |  | 0.5 |  |
|  |  | + | 0.3 | +64 +9 |
|  |  |  | 0.5 | $+47$ |
|  | 0.2 | ${ }^{6}$ | 0.3 | +4 |
|  |  |  | 0.5 | +40 |
|  |  | 9 | 0.3 | +5 |
|  |  |  | 0.5 | $+18$ |


|  |  |  |  |  |  | - ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \% | ) |  | Q |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 岩 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \% |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \% |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 88 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | IRELA |  | 12) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{SH}_{3}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | no | R |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Spaln |  | er |  |  |
|  |  |  | , | , | IIIIIN | ] vir, viri and |  |  |  |



Figure 2. Nephrops fishing areas in



Figure 4. Annual landings in Denmark, Norway and Sweden of Nephrops, 1960-75 (tonnes).
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Figure 7. Nephrops landings at North Shields, 1976.


Figure 8. North Shields. Nephrops market grades. Relationship of count per lb to carapace length.




Figure 10. Percentage of Nephrops about to moult.

$$
\text { Conwy, N. Wales, 24-26 May } 1977
$$

1. INTRODUCTION

The last meeting of the ICES Pandalus Working Group was in 1973 (ICES, Doc. C.M.1973/K:2). The Council decided (C.Res.1976/2:35) that the Group should meet during May 1977. The objectives were:
a) to review and collate any data obtained since the last meeting in 1973,
b) to attempt a yield assessment on various Pandalus fisheries, and
c) following a request from NEAFC, to provide information on the distribution, biology and state of exploitation of Pandalus stocks with reference to 200 mile zones.

The Working Group met at the Fisheries Experiment Station, Conwy, N.Wales from 24 to 26 May 1977 with the following scientists participating:

| D B Bennett - Rapporteur | United Kingdom (England \& Wales) |
| :--- | :--- |
| D Carlsson | Denmark (Greenland Fisheries) |
| E Edwards - Chairman | United Kingdom (England \& Wales) |
| F G Howard | United Kingdom (Scotland) |
| J Mason | United Kingdom (Scotland) |
| S Munch-Petersen | Denmark |
| B Sjöstrand | Sweden |
| S U Skúladottir | Iceland |

Apologies for absence were received from:

| R Boddeke | Netherlands |
| :--- | :--- |
| S Clarke | USA |
| R Meixner | Germany (Fed.Rep. of) |
| E J Sandeman | Canada |
| $\emptyset$ Ulltang | Norway. |

2. REVIEW OF FISHERIES

Members were requested to review the areas fished by their own country. The fishing areas in the North Sea, Skagerrak and around Iceland as defined by members are shown in Figures 1 and 2. Fishing areas off Greenland are shown in Figure 3.

### 2.1 ICES Area

Landings are shown in Tables $1-4$.
United_Kingdom_(England and Wales)
There is a small stock of Pandalus borealis in the Farn Deeps off the northeast coast of England (Figure l). Stocks had remained virtually unexploited by British vessels until quite recently (1970) (Table l) but German and Danish vessels had fished the area in some years. In 1976 boats from North Shields fished the stock in JuneAugust, the catch being sent to Scotland for peeling. Exploitation by British vessels is expected to increase in 1977.

## United Kingdom (Scotland)

The main fishing ground is Fladen (Figure l) where catches have increased greatly since fishing started in 1970 (Tables l-3). Up to 36 vessels worked these grounds in 1976, and fishing occurred during nine months of the year. Landings of Pandalus at Scottish ports increased from just over 100 tonnes in 1970 to almost 2000 tonnes in 1976 (Table 3). The fishery is continuing to expand and landings are increasing. Catch per unit of effort has increased (Table 5) as the efficiency of Scottish shrimp fishermen improved and also possibly due to increases in shrimp abundance. The catch is processed and 12 peeling machines have now been established at ports on the east coast of Scotland.

## Denmark

Since the mid-1960s, apart from the years 1973-74, Fladen (Figure 1) has been the main fishing ground. Following the sudden drop in 1973 the Danish catches from Fladen have slowly increased (Table 3). Catch per unit of effort by Danish boats in the area has fluctuated in recent years (Table 5). Catches from the Skagerrak (Figure 1) have been reasonably stable during the last seven years (Table 4).

## Sweden

Most of the Swedish catch is taken in the Skagerrak (Table 4), and a variable proportion from the northern North Sea (Norwegian Deeps) (Figure 1). Fishing effort has been reduced but catch per unit of effort, which fell from 1970 to 1973 increased (Table 5). Data on c.p.u.e. are available from selected boats, but from 1977 onwards it is obligatory for Swedish fishermen to record catches, fishing effort and area.

## Iceland

The fishery for Pandalus borealis is buoyant (Table I); new stocks have been located both of fshore and inshore (Figure 2) and the c.p.u.e. is high in some areas. The fishery is well managed by means of a quota system based on changes in c.p.u.e. which is closely monitored. Quotas relate to total annual catches but are modified on a weekly basis for the benefit of processors.

## Greenland

Fisheries exist close inshore and in deeper water offshore (Figure 3, Table 6). In general, the inshore stocks are heavily exploited but the offshore fishery is expanding rapidly with catch rates of up to 15 tonnes/hour recorded. The offshore grounds are also exploited by vessels from Faroe, Denmark, Norway, USSR, Spain, France and Japan. The effort from Greenland is increasing. The offshore fishery is regulated by ICNAF with a TAC of 36000 tonnes for 1977 .
3. DISTRIBUTION AND STATE OF EXPLOITATION WITH REFERENCE TO 200 MILE FISHERY ZONES
3.1 Distribution of Stocks

The distribution of the main fisheries for Pandalus borealis is shown in Figures l-3. Pandalus is a demersal species which forms discrete stocks. There is no evidence that juveniles or adults
migrate between stocks although there is evidence of movement within stocks and larval dispersal could occur over a wide area. With the exception of the offshore Greenland stock, most stocks are of limited extent geographically, determined by the nature of the bottom deposit. Except for the Skagerrak population, which is fished by Norway, Sweden and Denmark, most stocks are within the 200 mile zones of individual countries. For example, in the North Sea both the Farn Deep and Fladen stocks lie within the United Kingdom 200 mile fishery zone. Icelandic stocks are also within this country's own zone. In the Greenland fishery, a small proportion of the catch is taken from Canadian waters but the remainder comes from Greenland's 200 mile zone.

### 3.2 State of Exploitation

Little is known about the state of exploitation of Pandalus stocks the assessment completed by the Working Group suggests that fishing mortality varies for different fisheries but was mostly in the range $F=0.7-1.0$, although less than this at Iceland (Arnafjördur) (Table 10).
3.3 It should be recorded that observations by the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries for Scotland suggested that stocks of Dichelopandalus bonnieri exist off the Scottish west coast which are not at present exploited.

## 4. NESH SIZES IN USE

Pandalus borealis is included in the species listed under NEAFC Recommendation 2, which permits the use of cod end meshes of less than 50 mm , but not smaller than 16 mm . There are national regulations existing in some countries. Details of mesh sizes in use in the various countries are given below:

| d K | minimum of 16 mm cod end LÜnder the Fishing Nets (NE Atlantic) Order 1977], cod ends usually 25-28 mm |
| :---: | :---: |
| Denmark: | no regulations, cod ends usually $25-28 \mathrm{~mm}$ |
| Sweden: | no regulations, cod ends usually 35 mm |
| Iceland: | national regulations stipulate a 35 mm cod end. It has been proposed to increase this to 38 mm in 1979 |
| Greenland: | offshore fishery 40 mm cod end enforced by ICNAF. Inshore - no regulation. |

## 5. MINIMUM LANDING SIZE

Only Iceland regulates the size of Pandalus borealis landed for commercial use, and has a minimum standard of 300 shrimps per kg . Greenland has a minimum landing weight of 2 g but this is based on a market requirement and is not a national regulation.

## 6. BIOLOGY

### 6.1 Reproduction

Sex reversal in most shrimps seems to occur in all areas considered, except Greenland, at $16-17 \mathrm{~mm}$ carapace length. In Greenland it occurs at a larger size of 20-25 mm carapace length.

Data were presented to estimate size and age at maturity for females (Table 9). The following criteria have been used to describe maturity first berried, $50 \%$, and $100 \%$ berried. The more northern stocks mature at a large size and considerably greater age. Data on the fecundity of the species were limited: Allen (1959) reported that in the Farn Deep (NE England) the number of eggs carried varied between 300 and 1 500. Hjort and Ruud (1938) and Horsted and Smidt (1956) working in Greenland waters reported much higher counts, up to 3860 eggs per shrimp. It appears that females in northern waters are more fecund than in the North Sea. The eggs are spawned in August to November and are carried until the following spring.

### 6.2 Migrations

The Group agreed that no data were available to suggest any definite migration patterns between the main Pandalus stocks. After hatching the larvae are pelagic for about $3-4$ months, little is knorm about larval drift but it could form a source of recruitment to other stocks. There is evidence, based on limited tagging studies and observation by fishermen that local movements occur within stocks. Reference was made to the vertical distribution of Pandalus in relation to light intensity (Barr, 1970).

### 6.3 Predation

Cod is a main predator on Pandalus, followed in the central North Sea by the hagfish. Other recorded predators include Greenland halibut, hake, seals and, to a small extent, haddock. Predation pressure on Pandalus borealis is considered to be considerable, resulting in quite high levels of mortality, particularly on Fladen and in the Skagerrak.

## 7. YIELD ASSESSMENT

Yield assessments were carried out on the Fladen, Skagerrak and Iceland (Arnafjördur) P. borealis stocks using the Beverton and Holt (1959) dynamic pool yield model.

### 7.1 Input Parameters

Growth - The constants (K, Wo and $t_{0}$ ) of the von Bertalanffy (1938) growth equation (Table 7) necessary for the Beverton and Holt yield equation, were obtained by analysis of size composition data. Polymodal size-frequency distributions were analysed either by Cassie's (1954) or Bhattacharya's (1967) techniques (Fladen and Skagerrak) or Skúladottir's (1976) deviation method (Iceland) to identify the modes which were assumed to be year classes; the differences in length between modes being the annual growth rate. There were some very noticable differences between the growth constants for the three P. borealis stocks considered. The rate of growth (K) in the Skagerrak, and more so in Iceland, was lower than for the Fladen stock.
Conversely $W_{\infty}$ was low ( $W_{\infty}=10.5 \mathrm{~g}, I_{\infty}=27.2 \mathrm{~mm}$ carapace length) for the Fladen and higher for Iceland ( $W_{\infty}=18.3 \mathrm{~g}, L_{\infty}=31.0 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) and the Skagerrak $\left(W_{\infty}=22.0 \mathrm{~g}, \mathrm{~L}_{\infty}=34.5 \mathrm{~mm}\right)$. The number of year classes is similarly related with only 4 present in the Fladen stock and up to 10 in Iceland. Thus, in more northern and colder waters, although the growth rate is reduced, it appears that the survival rate is greater.
The following length/weight relationships were used where necessary:
(CL = carapace length)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Fladen: Wt }(\mathrm{g})=0.00264 \cdot \mathrm{CL}^{2.551}(\mathrm{~mm}) \\
& \text { Skagerrak: } \mathrm{Wt}(\mathrm{~g})=0.00207 \cdot \mathrm{CL}^{2.618(\mathrm{~mm})} \\
& \text { Iceland: Wt }(\mathrm{g})=0.00519 \cdot \mathrm{CL}^{3.05(\mathrm{~mm})}
\end{aligned}
$$

Maximum age ( $t \lambda$ ) and age at recruitment ( $t_{r}$ ) - the last observed mode $\overline{\mathrm{o}} \mathrm{f}^{-}$the polymodal size frequencies was taken to be the maximum age for the Fladen and Skagerrak stocks. As no migrations are known to occur, it was assumed that the stock is fully recruited to the potentially fishable stock from age zero.

Natural mortality (M) - considerable attention was given to the ēstimation of nātural mortality. Size composition data from a stock of $\underline{P}$. borealis off southwest Iceland have been examined by the deviation method and an estimate of natural mortality of $M=0.5$ obtained from the "catch curve" produced. The values of $M$ chosen for the assessment of the Arnafjördur Icelandic stock were 0.3 and 0.2 as less large cod are present there than off southwest Iceland.However, a higher natural mortality was believed to be more appropriate for the Fladen and Skagerrak stocks. No direct estimate of $M$ was possible. The Skagerrak stock, and particularly the Fladen stock have fewer year classes present than the Icelandic stocks and the growth rate is higher, with a higher $K$ and larger $W_{\infty}$ (Table 7). This suggests that $\mathbb{M}$ is higher in these two stocks. Values of $M=0.5$ and 1.0 were chosen for the assessment.

Selectivity - data from selectivity experiments conducted by Denmark, $\bar{I} c e \bar{l} \bar{a} \bar{d}, \bar{N}$ orway, Scotland and Sweden were collated and a selection factor of $0.436 \pm 0.016$ calculated by linear regression through the origin (Figure 4). This selection factor was used for all the stocks considered in the assessment.
Fishing mortality (F) and mean selection age ( $t_{c}$ ) - to analyse the
 from $F=0.2$ to 2.0 and $t_{c}^{c}=0.5$ to $3.5,5.5$ or 6.0 (Fladen, Skagerrak and Iceland, respectively) were used in the assessment.

### 7.2 Yield Assessment Results and Conclusions

The maximum yield in weight-per-recruit $\left(\left(Y_{W} / R\right)_{\max }\right)$ is very
sensitive to the level of natural mortality (M). An increase in $M$ from 0.5 to 1.0 resulted in a $61 \%$ drop in $\left(Y_{W} / R\right)_{\max }$ for the Fladen and a 68\% drop for the Skagerrak (Table 8, Figures 5 and 6). The $\left(t_{c}\right)_{\max }$ was reduced from 2.0 to 1.0 for the Fladen and 2.5 to 1.0 for the Skagerrak when M was increased from 0.5 to l.0 (Table 8).
Lower values of $M$ were used for the assessment of the Icelandic stock. An increase in $M$ from 0.2 to 0.3 resulted in a $40 \%$ drop in $\left(Y_{W} / R\right)_{\max }$, with $\left(t_{c}\right)_{\max }$ dropping from 5.5 to 4.0 years (Table 8 , Figure 7 ).
The $\left(Y_{W} / R\right)_{\text {max }}$ occurred at an ( $\left.F\right)_{\max }$ of 2.0 for all three stocks assessed (Table 8, Figures 5-7). In fact, the true (F) max was probably greater than 2.0, the maximum $F$ input used.
With such high estimated natural mortalities, particularly for the Fladen and Skagerrak stocks of P. borealis, maximum yields were obtained with a high fishing mortality and low mean selection age - the ideal conditions for recruitment failurel The high natural mortality rates used result in flat-topped $Y_{W} / R$ curves (Figure 8) in which, above fairly low levels of fishing mortality, further increases in F produce only small gains in $Y_{W} / R$. For example, for the Fladen when $M=0.5$, an increase in $F$ from 1.0 to 2.0 at a $t_{c}$ of 2.0 would result in an increase of only $15 \%$ in $Y_{W} / R$ from 915 to $1056 \mathrm{~g} / 1000$ recruits. For the

Skagerrak when $M=0.5$, an increase in $F$ from 1.0 to 2.0 at a $t_{c}$ of 2.5 would result in an increase of only $6 \%$ in $Y_{W} / R$ from 894 to $949 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l} 000$ recruits.
Although the estimated natural mortality for the Arnafjördur, Iceland stock is lower (0.2-0.3) than for the Fladen and Skagerrak, the lower growth rate of $P$. borealis in the colder Icelandic waters also produces a flat-topped yield curve (Figure 8). Thus, when $M=0.2$, an increase in $F$ from 1.0 to 2.0 at $a t_{c}$ of 5.5 results in an increase of only $3 \%$ in $Y_{W} / R$ from 1929 to $1978 \mathrm{~g} / 1000$ recruits. There would seem to be little advantage in having a level of fishing mortality above 1.0 .
The mean selection ages $\left(t_{c}\right)_{\text {max }}$ at maximum yield per recruit $\left(Y_{W} / R\right)_{\max }$ were low for the Fladen and Skagerrak P. borealis stocks (Table 8), being 2.0 and 2.5 years, respectively when $M=0.5$, and 1.0 years for both stocks when $\mathbb{M}=1.0$. For Iceland $\left(t_{c}\right)_{\max }$ was 5.5 with $\mathbb{M}=0.2$ and 4.0 when $M=0.3$, both being considerably higher than for the other two stocks - a consequence of the lower natural mortality. Comparison of these $\left(t_{c}\right)$ max values (Table 8) with age at maturity for females data (Table 9) shows that for the Fladen and Skagerrak stocks the $\left(t_{C}\right)_{\max }$ for $M=0.5$ is at about the age of $50 \%$ berried, while the $\left(t_{c}\right)_{\max }$ for $M=1.0$ is below the age when berried females are first recorded. For the Icelandic stock the $\left(t_{c}\right)_{\max }$ values at $M=0.2$ and 0.3 correspond to the age at $100 \%$ berried and $50 \%$ berried, respectively (Table 9).
Nothing is known about the stock/recruitment relationship for P. borealis, but it is clearly undesirable to fish the Fladen and Skagerrak stocks at the $\left(t_{c}\right)_{\text {max }}$ when $M=1.0$, or even to have a high rate of exploitation at the $\left(t_{c}\right)_{\max }$ if $\mathbb{M}=0.5$. The Icelandic stock could probably be fished at the $\left(t_{c}\right)_{\max }$ values without the likelihood of recruitment overfishing as long as the fishing mortality was not excessive.

## 8. MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS

The yield assessment carried out suffers from a lack of certain reliable estimates of input parameters - particularly natural mortality. However, utilisation of the assessment results, together with known data on age at maturity, in a comparison with the present estimated mean selection age and fishing mortality suggests certain management actions.

### 8.1 Fladen

The present mesh size used by both the Danish and Scottish fishermen exploiting this stock is 25 mm (Table lo). This is equivalent to $a t_{c}$ of 0.7 yr ( 11.0 mm carapace length), and age well below the age at first maturity for females (Table 9 ) and below the $\left(t_{c}\right)_{\max }$ even if $M$ is as high as 1.0 (Table 8). This is clearly an undesirable situation, particularly in relation to future recruitment.
It is proposed (Table 10) that the mesh size for both Denmark and Scotland (or any other country) fishing on the Fladen be increased to 35 mm . This is equivalent to a tc of 1.5 yr ( 1.5 .4 mm carapace length).

The present level of fishing mortality is believed to be about $F=1.0$. This level of $F$ should not be allowed to increase.

### 8.2 Skagerrak

The Danish fishery in the Skagerrak uses a mesh size of 25 mm (as on the Fladen), while the Swedish fishery uses a mesh of 35 mm (Table 10).

These sizes are equivalent to a $t_{c}$ of 1.0 yr ( 11.0 mm carapace length) and 1.7 yr ( 15.0 mm carapace length) respectively, ages well below or at about the age at first maturity for females (Table 9). They are below the $\left(t_{c}\right)_{\max }$ when $M=0.5$ and above or equal to the $\left(t_{c}\right)_{\max }$ at $M=1.0$ (Table 8). Again, this is an undesirable situation.
It is proposed (Table 10) that the mesh size for both Denmark and Sweden (or any other country) fishing in the Skagerrak be increased to 45 mm . This is equivalent to $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{c}}$ of 3 yr ( 20 mm carapace length).
The present level of fishing mortality is believed to be about $F=0.7$. This level of $F$ should not be allowed to increase.

### 8.3 Iceland

The Icelandic authorities have already made management proposals which have been accepted. These recommendations are repeated here, together with the assessment results to allow comparison with the more southern stocks considered.

The present mesh size in use in Arnafjördur, Iceland is 35 mm (Table 10). This size is equivalent to a $t_{c}$ of 2.6 yr ( 15.4 mm carapace length), at an age below the age at first maturity for females (Table 9) and well below the ( $t_{c}$ ) max, even if $M=0.3$ (Table 8).

It has been proposed to increase by 1979 the mesh size in use on the Icelandic fishery to 38 mm . This is equivalent to a $t_{c}$ of 3 yr ( 16.7 mm carapace length).
The present level of fishing mortality is $F=0.3$, as a result of quota management in recent years. It has been proposed that $F$ should be allowed to increase to $F=0.4-0.5$.

## 9. EFFECTS OF PROPOSED CHANGES IN MESH SIZE

### 9.1 Yield

If the mean selection age and fishing mortality were selected to maximise yield per recruit (Table 8) recruitment failure would be expected. For this reason, although little is known of the stock/recruitment relationship, the proposed mean selection age and fishing mortalities have been chosen to ensure adequate recruitment. This could result in losses in yield per recruit, particularly if natural mortality is high. The increase in mesh size to 45 mm in the Skagerrak could result in a $50 \%$ drop in yield per recruit. However, the over-riding necessity to conserve the breeding stock and ensure adequate recruitment justifies this loss in yield per recruit. It is expected, of course, that the total yield from the fisheries will increase as a result of these management measures.

### 9.2 By-catch

Considerable quantities of fin-fish by-catches result from the Pandalus fisheries. The Scottish fishery on Fladen lands a by-catch of normal commercial sized cod, Norway pout, haddock, monk and dogfish (Table ll). The proportion of by-catch landed varies from $19 \%$ to $59 \%$ of the total landed catch by weight and from $12 \%$ to $28 \%$ by value (Table 12). The proposed increase in mesh size from 25 mm to 35 mm on the Fladen is not expected to affect the composition or proportion of landed by-catch from Scottish vessels.

The Danish fishery for Pandalus both at Fladen and in the Skagerrak lands a by-catch, mainly of Norway pout, for reduction to fish meal.

$$
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This by-catch can be nearly 10 times the weight of the Pandalus landed, but only $3-37 \%$ by value, and has become less important in recent years (Table 12). The increases in mesh size proposed, to 35 mm for the Fladen and 45 mm for the Skagerrak, would undoubtedly reduce the by-catch, particularly of Norway pout. It has not been possible to assess these losses, but the loss in value is likely to be small and the expected increase in Pandalus landings resulting from the mesh increases will more than compensate for these losses.

In Iceland shrimp fisheries are stopped in an area when the number of young gadoids caught exceeds that which is considered desirable at the time. This depends upon certain conditions, such as, the year class strength of the gadoids.
The beneficial effect on fin-fish fisheries from a reduction in the by-catch from Pandalus fisheries could not be assessed by the Working Group. It was noted that recent Norwegian trials on selective trawls were encouraging (Thomassen and Ulltang, 1975).

## 10. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Although the Working Group was able to carry out a yield assessment for three of the stocks in the ICES area and put forward management proposals, there is plenty of scope for future research.
The major assessment input requiring study is natural mortality, followed closely by age determination and growth rates. There is a need to consider more carefully stock identity and to consider the origin of recruitment, particularly in relation to larval distribution. Although data on selectivity were presented to the meeting, there is a need for further studies, particularly of selection in parts of the trawl, other than the cod end. Further studies on reproduction, such as identifying first time spawners, would be useful. The management proposals have raised a number of questions in relation to the fin-fish by-catch. There is scope for the Working Group to consider this aspect of assessment more fully at a later date and to improve on the quality of the assessment.
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Table l. Pandalus borealis landings (tonnes) from the ICES area.
Source: Bulletin Statistique and pers.comm.

| Year | Denmark | $\begin{gathered} \text { Germany } \\ (\text { Fed.Rep. } \end{gathered}$ | Iceland | Norway | Sweden | England | Scotland | Spain | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1960 | 2580 | - | 1336 | 9616 | 4039 | - | - | - | 17571 |
| 1961 | 3174 | - | 1375 | 10036 | 4462 | - | - | - | 19047 |
| 1962 | 4448 | - | 700 | 10816 | 5725 | - | - | - | 21689 |
| 1963 | 4735 | - | 678 | 11658 | 5161 | - | - | 71 | 22273 |
| 1964 | 3602 | - | 572 | 11017 | 4654 | - | - | - | 19815 |
| 1965 | 5074 | - | 901 | 10434 | 3867 | - | - | - | 20276 |
| 1966 | 4697 | 68 | 1790 | 7406 | 1788 | - | - | - | 15749 |
| 1967 | 4791 | 23 | 1508 | 8355 | 1930 | - | - | - | 16607 |
| 1968 | 5175 | 41 | 2451 | 7201 | 2025 | - | - | - | 16893 |
| 1969 | 5434 | 0 | 3276 | 6353 | 1822 | - | - | - | 16885 |
| 1970 | 4217 | - | 4510 | 7597 | 2742 | 14 | 104 | - | 19184 |
| 1971 | 4432 | 33 | 6326 | 7773 | 2906 | - | 436 | - | 21906 |
| 1972 | 3221 | - | 5291 | 9111 | 2524 |  | 187 | 1941 | 22275 |
| 1973 | 912 |  | 7286 | 9267 | 2130 | 1424 | 163 | - | 21182 |
| 1974 | 812 |  | 6058 |  | 2003 | 40 | 434 |  |  |
| 1975 | 2135 |  | 4525 |  | 2003 | 0 | 525 |  |  |
| 1976* | 2666 |  | 6256 |  | 2529 | 140 | 1940 |  |  |

[^3]Table 2. Pandalus borealis landings (tonnes) from ICES SUB-area IV (North Sea).
Source: Bulletin Statistique and pers.comm.

| Year | Denmark | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Germany } \\ & \text { (Fed.Rep.) } \end{aligned}$ | Norway | England | Scotland | Sweden | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1970 | 3460 | - | 1107 | 14 | 104 | 915 | 5600 |
| 1971 | 3572 | 33 | 1265 | - | 436 | 1358 | 6664 |
| 1972 | 2448 | - | 1216 | - | 187 | 1150 | 5001 |
| 1973 | 196 | - | 931 | 1424 | 163 | 936 | 2226 |
| 1974 | 337 |  |  | 40 | 434 | 520 |  |
| 1975 | 1392 |  |  | 0 | 525 | 252 |  |
| 1976* | 1801 |  |  | 140 | 1940 | 177 |  |

* Preliminary

Table 3. Estimated Pandalus borealis landings (tonnes) from the Fladen ground.

| Year | Denmark | Germany <br> (Fed.Rep.) | Norway | U.K. (Scotland) | Sweden | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1970 | 3115 | - |  | 104 |  |  |
| 1971 | 3216 | 33 |  | 436 |  |  |
| 1972 | 2204 | - | 187 |  |  |  |
| 1973 | 157 | 282 |  |  | 433 |  |
| 1974 | 1308 |  |  | 1925 |  |  |
| 1975 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1976 *$ | 1522 |  |  |  |  |  |

* Preliminary

Table 4. Pandalus borealis landings (tonnes) from ICES Division IIIa (Skaggerak-Kattegat). Source: Bulletin Statistique and pers.comm.

| Year | Denmark | Norway | Sweden | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1970 | 757 | 982 | 1827 | 3566 |
| 1971 | 834 | 1392 | 1548 | 3774 |
| 1972 | 773 | 1123 | 1374 | 3270 |
| 1973 | 716 | 1415 | 1194 | 3325 |
| 1974 | 475 |  | 1483 |  |
| 1975 | 743 |  | 1751 |  |
| $1976 *$ | 865 |  | 2352 |  |

* Preliminary

Table 5. Reported Pandalus borealis catch ( kg ) per hour from Danish and Scottish vessels fishing Fladen, and Danish and Swedish vessels fishing the Skagerrak and Norwegian Channel.

| Year | Fladen |  | Skagerrak and Norwegian <br> Channel |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Danish boats | Scottish boats | Danish boats | Swedish boats |
| 1970 | - | 31 | - | 17 |
| 1971 | - | 68 | - | 18 |
| 1972 | 117 | 45 | 69 | 14 |
| 1973 | 122 | 87 | 9 | 15 |
| 1974 | 187 | 124 | 23 | 14 |
| 1975 | 105 | 128 | 31 | 17 |
| 1976 |  | 115 | 38 | 20 |
|  |  |  |  | 26 |

Table 6. Annual landings (tonnes) of Pandalus borealis by all nations fishing at west Greenland (ICNAF Sub area 1) 1970-76 (including Greenland inshore catches).

| Countries | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | $1976 *$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Greenland | 8429 | 8941 | 7368 | 8135 | 10244 | 9893 | 9771 |  |
| Denmark | - | - | - | 196 | 308 | 1742 | 2717 |  |
| Faroe | 130 | 496 | 755 | 1371 | 2023 | 5300 | 11 | 179 |
| Norway | - | - | 1409 | 2940 | 5917 | 8678 | 11658 |  |
| Spain | - | - | - | - | - | 6948 | 6932 |  |
| USSR | - | - | - | - | - | 6033 | 6468 |  |
| France | - | - | - | - | - | - | 802 |  |
| Japan | - | - | - | - | - | - | 146 |  |
| Total | 8559 | 9437 | 9532 | 12642 | 18492 | 37994 | 49673 |  |

[^4]Table 7. Input parameters for the Beverton and Holt (1959) simple yield per recruit equation for the Fladen, Skagerrak and Iceland (Arnafjördur) Pandalus borealis stocks.

$$
(C L=\text { carapace length })
$$

| Input | Fladen | Skagerrak | Iceland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K | 0.41 | 0.24 | 0.16 |
| $W_{\infty}$ (g) | 10.5 | 22.0 | 18.3 |
| ( $\mathrm{L}_{\infty}: m \mathrm{~mm}$ CL) | (27.2) | (34.5) | (31.0) |
| $t_{0}$ ( yr ) | -0.57 | -0.64 | -1.70 |
| $\mathrm{t}_{\lambda}$ (yr) | 4 | 6 | 10 |
| $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{r}}$ (yr) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| R | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 |
| M | 0.5/1.0 | 0.5/1.0 | 0.2/0.3 |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {min }}$ | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {max }}$ | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {inc }}$ | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| ${ }^{t_{c_{\text {min }}}}$ (yr) | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{c}_{\max }}(\mathrm{yr})$ | 3.5 | 5.5 | 6.0 |
| $t_{\text {cinc }}(\mathrm{yr})$ | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |

Table 8. Summary of the results of the yield assessment for the Fladen, Skagerrak and Iceland Pandalus borealis stocks.

|  | Fladen |  | Skagerrak | Iceland |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $M$ | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| $\left(\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{W}} / \mathrm{R}\right)_{\max }$ | 1056 | 412 | 949 | 299 | 1978 | 1193 |
| $(\mathrm{~F})_{\max }$ | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| $\left(t_{c}\right)_{\max }$ | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 5.5 | 4.0 |

Table 9. Size (mm - carapace length) and age (yr) when Pandalus borealis are first berried ( $=$ ovigerous), $50 \%$ berried and $100 \%$ berried.

| Stock | 1st berried |  | $50 \%$ berried |  | $100 \%$ berried |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CL (mm) | Age (yr) | CL (mm) | Age (yr) | CL (mm) | Age (yr) |
| Fladen | 15 | 1.4 | 17 | 1.8 | 19 | 2.4 |
| Skagerrak | 15 | 1.7 | 18 | 2.4 | 21 | 3.3 |
| ICeland | 16 | 2.8 | 19 | 4.2 | 22 | 6.0 |
| (Arnafjördur) | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 10. Comparison of the present mesh sizes in use and the estimated level of fishing mortality, with the proposed management recommendations for the Fladen, Skagerrak and Iceland (Arnafjördur) fisheries for Pandalus borealis.


Table ll. Composition of the landings of Pandalus and bycatch (metric tonnes) in the Scottish fishery on the Fladen Ground 1970-76.

|  | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{\text { Pandalus }}{\text { catch }}$ | 104 | 436 | 187 | 163 | 434 | 525 | 1940 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Value } \\ & \text { (p.st.) } \end{aligned}$ | 20186 | 82190 | 32588 | 43131 | 150561 | 180469 | 770071 |
| Total <br> by-catch | 149.54 | 286.35 | 110.94 | 75.98 | 103.80 | 146.16 | 526.39 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Value } \\ & \text { (p.st.) } \end{aligned}$ | 7993 | 20010 | 12207 | 11718 | 21744 | 24217 | 147565 |
| Nephrops | 0.05 | 15.86 | 3.56 | 1.40 | 13.62 | 1.14 | 51.48 |
| Squid | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4.82 |
| Cod | 50.84 | 87.62 | 67.69 | 42.61 | 57.74 | 69.80 | 207.13 |
| Haddock | 41.81 | 35.10 | 14.12 | 3.47 | 2.95 | 5.52 | 15.12 |
| Whiting | 6.06 | 11.96 | 7.33 | 1.09 | 1.92 | 4.15 | 15.86 |
| Saithe | 0.72 | 1.48 | 3.70 | 1.02 | 4.43 | 8.84 | 19.59 |
| Hake | 0.17 | 0.37 | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.98 |
| Lythe <br> (Pollack) | - | - | - | - | - | 0.01 | - |
| Ling | 1.70 | 3.63 | 1.95 | 4.51 | 1.16 | 4.58 | 12.27 |
| Catfish | 1.31 | 2.23 | 1.67 | 1.61 | 2.56 | 2.10 | 3.74 |
| Monk | 5.17 | 9.94 | 4.28 | 4.88 | 13.10 | 27.23 | 101.68 |
| Plaice | 0.13 | 0.18 | 0.25 | 0.10 | 0.03 | - | 0.16 |
| Lemon Sole | 0.23 | 0.14 | 0.16 | 0.20 | 0.02 | - | 0.43 |
| Witch | 2.00 | 2.08 | 1.67 | 1.80 | 0.82 | 0.94 | 2.75 |
| Dab | - | - | - | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.20 |
| Halibut | 0.65 | 0.95 | 0.42 | 0.05 | 0.13 | 0.18 | 0.54 |
| Megrim | 0.20 | 0.14 | 0.23 | - | 0.15 | 0.37 | 0.56 |
| Turbot | 0.02 | 0.16 | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 0.03 | 0.08 |
| Skate | 0.44 | 1.00 | 0.43 | 0.51 | 0.29 | 0.87 | 1.07 |
| Dogfish | 0.64 | 9.37 | 2.85 | 3.59 | 4.51 | 14.27 | 20.78 |
| Herring | - | 0.12 | 0.36 | - | - | - | - |
| Mackerel | - | - | - | - | - | 0.04 | - |
| Norway Pout | 37.39 | 103.00 | - | 8.92 | - | 5.93 | 66.44 |
| Brill | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.01 |
| Unspecified | - | 1.02 | 0.13 | - | - | - | - |
| Roes | - | - | - | 0.01 | - | - | - |

Table 12. Comparison of Pandalus and by-catch weight (tonnes) and values from the Scottish and Danish fisheries on the Fladen.

|  | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scottish landings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pandalus ( $t$ ) | 104 | 436 | 187 | 163 | 434 | 525 | 1940 |
| Value (p.st. '000) | 20 | 82 | 33 | 43 | 151 | 180 | 770 |
| By-catch (t) | 150 | 286 | 111 | 78 | 104 | 146 | 526 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Value } \\ & \text { (p.st. 1000) } \end{aligned}$ | 8 | 20 | 12 | 11 | 22 | 24 | 148 |
| By-catch as \% of total value | 28.4 | 19.6 | 27.3 | 21.4 | 12.6 | 11.8 | 16.1 |
| Danish <br> landings* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pandalus ( $t$ ) | - | - | 2204 | 157 | 282 | 1309 | 1522 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Value } \\ & \text { (1000 D.Kr.) } \end{aligned}$ | - | - | 11990 | 1226 | 2262 | 8417 | 11916 |
| By-catch ( t ) | - | - | 27100 | 1161 | 801 | 685 | 841 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Value } \\ & \text { (1000 D.Kr.) } \end{aligned}$ | - | - | 7050 | 685 | 462 | 231 | 614 |
| By-catch as \% of total value | - | - | 37 | 36 | 17 | 3 | 5 |

[^5]


Figure 2. Fishing areas for Pandalus borealis around Iceland.



Figure 4. The relationship between mesh size (stretched) and mean selection carapace length of Pandalus borealis. Data from Denmark ( ${ }^{(1)}$ ), Iceland ( $\bar{\nabla}$ ), Norway ( ), Scotland (X) and Sweden ( $\mathbf{\Delta}$ ). Selection factor $\pm$ SE calculated by linear regression through the origin.


Figure 5. Yield-per-recruit (g/1000 recruits) isopleths for a range of fishing mortalities ( $F$ ) and mean selection ages ( $t_{c}$ ) for the Fladen stock of Pandalus borealis : (top) nătural mortality $(M)=1.0 ;$ (bottom) $M=0.5$.


Figure 6. Yield-per-recruit ( $g / 1000$ recruits) isopleths for a range of fishing mortalities ( $F$ ) and mean selection ages ( $t_{c}$ ) for the Skagerrak stock of Pandalus borealis : (top) natural mortality (in) $=$ 1.0; (bottom) $M=0.5$.



Figure 7. Yield-per-recruit (g/1000 recrui.ts) isopleths for a range of fishing mortalities (F) and mean selection ages ( $t$ ) for the Icel.and (Ar narfjurdur) stock of Pandalus borealis : (ton) natural mortality (M) = 0.3; (bottom) $M=0.2$.



Figure 8. The relationship between yield-per-recruit ( $Y_{W} / R=g / 1000$ recruits) and fishing mortality (F) for Pandalus borealis: i) continuous lines; Fladen (F1), mean selection age $(t)=2.0$, natural mortality $(M)=0.5$; Skagerrak (Sk), $t^{2}=2.5, M=0.5$; Iceland $\left.{ }^{C}(I c), t^{\prime}=5.5, M=0.2: i i\right)$ dotted lines; Fladen (FI), $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{c}}=1.0, \mathrm{M}=1.0$; Skagerrak $母_{\mathrm{Sk}}$ ), $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{c}}=1.0, \mathrm{M}=1.0$; Iceland (Ic), ${ }_{c}=4.0, M=0.3$.

## FOREWORD BY THE CHAIRMAN

The two reports of meetings of the Homarus Working Group held in Nantes, France, in 1975 and in Bergen. Norway, in 1977, have been combined into one document. Thus it has been possible to present a uniform account of the state of lobster stocks on both sides of the Atlantic.

In presenting the reports to ICES, I wish to take the opportunity to emphasise certain matters concerned with it. Firstly, I wish to place on record my thanks to all members of the Working Group, who by their contribution made possible the production of a highly significant appraisal of an important commercially valuable invertebrate animal, in a manner hitherto unavailable to scientists. Secondly, I wish to thank Mr K Gundersen of Norway who so ably deputised for me in Bergen, when I was prevented from being present. Finally, I wish to pay a special tribute to $\operatorname{Dr} D$ Bennett, who has acted as Rapporteur throughout the life of the Working Group, to date. Without his work, help and cooperation, the reports could not have been presented so capably and incorporate such substantive material.

F.A. Gibson

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The first meeting of the ICES Working Group on Homarus stocks met in Nantes, France, during 24-27 April 1975. Council Resolution 1974/2:10 from the 1974 Statutory Meeting of ICES asked the Working Group to evaluate the state of the lobster (Homarus sp.) stocks, the various methods of conservation, the potential for hatching and rearing, and to put forward proposals for future research. The following scientists participated:

| J Audouin | France | K Gundersen | Norway |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| D B Bennett | U.K. | J T Hughes | USA |
| (Rapporteur) |  | G De Kergariou | France |
| J D Castell | Canada | J Y Le Gall | France |
| G Conan | France | M Leglise | France |
| B I Dybern | Sweden | J Mason | U.K. |
| G P Ennis | Canada | H Quiroga | Spain |
| J M de Figueiredo | Portugal | D G Wilder | Canada |
| F A Gibson | Ireland |  |  |

Their report, Doc. C.M.1975/K:38, was well received by the Shellfish and Benthos Committee. In the following year the Committee recommended (Council Resolution 1976/2:37) that the Working Group should reconvene to consider and report on the significant progress in lobster research and development made since 1975. The Group met in Bergen, Norway, during 3-6 May with the following participants:

- 84 -

| V C Anthony | USA | G P Ennis | Canada |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| J Audouin | France | K Gundersen | Norway |
| D B Bennett | U.K. | Acting Chairman) | Sweden |
| (Rapporteur) |  | H Hallbäck | Sweland |

The report, Doc. C.M.1977/K:ll, recommended that fishing mortality should be significantly reduced and the minimum landing size increased to improve yields and ensure adequate breeding stocks. Failing such action recruitment failure in several Homarus fisheries could be expected and other stocks would continue to decline. Member countries were informed of these findings and the Advisory Committee on Fishery Management was requested to consider the management aspects arising from the report of the Working Group (C.Res.1977/4:21).
2. STATE OF THE LOBSTER STOCKS
2.1 Europe

The total recorded catch of the European lobster (Homarus gammarus) is about 1900 tonnes (1973), about $6 \%$ of the catch of the American lobster. Lobster catches (Table l) have continued to decline in the traditional fisheries of Sweden, W Norway, E Scotland and Wales. In England and France catches have been maintained at recent levels, which are below average. Catch per unit effort (c.p.u.e.) is low and falling in many areas. Fishermen are attempting to compensate for falls in c.p.u.e. by increasing the number of traps fished. Catches and c.p.u.e. have increased in the inner Skagerrak, in Norway, Ireland and W Scotland, the latter partly as a result of French, English and Channel Island vessels fishing previously unexploited stocks. Parttime fishermen continue to increase in many areas. In Sweden it is estimated that only $40 \%$ of the total catch is landed by full-time fishermen. The value per kg of lobsters has increased considerably in all fisheries.

The overall catch is being maintained in some countries by the development of socalled "offshore fisheries", fishing previously unexploited stocks. However, these stocks, which when first fished have a high c.p.u.e. and initially support a high fishing intensity, are quite quickly fished down to a c.p.u.e. which is uneconomic for the larger boats fishing these "offshore" grounds. Thus fishing effort on the offshore English Channel grounds was, within 4-5 years of their discovery, switched to the west coast of Scotland.

### 2.2 North America

Landings of the American lobster (Homarus americanus) in recent years by Canada and the United States have been valued in excess of \$ 80 million, making this fishery one of the most valuable in the Northwest Atlantic. The USA currently (1975-76) lands about 13000 tonnes annually (Table 2a). About $20 \%$ of the catch now comes from the offshore fishery. There has been a slow decline in landings and c.p.u.e. while the fishing effort (number of traps) has more than doubled. Stocks appear to be fully utilised.
Landings in the Canadian fishery (Table 2 b ) over the last decade have fluctuated from year to year with a slight downward trend, to the present level of $16000-17000$ tonnes per annum. Within the overall landing figures, trends have been evident from area to area along the Canadian Atlantic coast. While Newfoundland and Quebec landings have increased over the last 3 years, there have been declines in Maritimes inshore catches. These declines have not been totally offset by an offshore trap fishery from South Nova Scotia to the Gulf of Maine, which began in 1972, and has made an increasing contribution to Maritime landings up to a plateau of 500-600 tonnes over
the last few years. Other events in the fishery which have followed from the high fishing intensity in most areas, have been a limitation on numbers of traps per boat and numbers of licences in the fishery in the late l960s; more recently, buy-back schemes are being introduced in some areas, as a first attempt to reduce existing: effort levels. Another significant event has been the increasing use of large traps with wider entrance holes to exploit the small proportion of the population growing through the size range that can enter the $4-5$ inch ( $10-13 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) diameter entrance rings of the conventional inshore traps. Taken together with the generally low size limits (below the size at first female maturity in most areas), and the high exploitation rates, this development may have disturbing implications for future recruitment to the stocks.

### 2.3 Relationship between Inshore and Offshore Stocks

Soon after the development of the offshore fishery in $\mathbb{N}$ America the question of the relationship between inshore and offshore stocks was raised. In USA about 10000 sphyrion tagged lobsters were released on the offshore grounds and although 1000 were returned most were recaptured on the offshore areas. The possibility of recruitment from the offshore to the inshore stocks by larval drift was examined and in general the water currents appeared to be offshore. However, as further grounds are fished nearer to the inshore fishery this problem is likely to become more significant.

It was interesting to note that when the "offshore" fishery in the English Channel developed the stock was composed of about $50 \%$ large (average carapace length 120 mm ) females, of which up to $80 \%$ were berried. It is quite likely, bearing in mind the relatively small distance from the shore ( 65 km ) that larvae produced from this offshore stock contribute to the recruitment inshore. However, when the c.p.u.e. falls to say $45 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{boat} / \mathrm{day}$ many boats leave the offshore fishery and the stock, although reduced in abundance, is left to recover and to still produce larvae.
3. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT 1975 - 1976
3.1 Europe

England and Wales
Monitoring of population structure and catch and effort trends have continued in all the major fisheries. To estimate growth and mortality rates and migrations a tagging programme commenced in 1976 on the E and NE coasts of England. Biological studies have included work on larval recruitment, juvenile ecology and moult staging.

## France

Studies have continued on the size composition and catch rates of lobster stocks resulting from the prohibition of fishing and release of juvenile lobsters into sanctuary areas. Comparisons are being made in the laboratory on the growth rates of H. gammarus and H. americanus and hybrids.

## Ireland

Monitoring of size frequencies and catch and effort (boat-trap census) has continued with comparisons of the carapace length/total length ratio on the Atlantic and Irish Sea coasts. Branded lobsters were released in 1974. Only small movements of recaptures were recorded. Exploratory fishing in $72-126 \mathrm{~m}, 80 \mathrm{~km}$ offshore proved unsuccessful.

## Norway

Catch/effort and size composition data collected over a number of years have been analysed for a yield assessment. Tagged lobsters continue to be returned.

## Scotland and Sweden

Monitoring of catch, effort and papulation structure continued.

### 3.2 North America <br> Canada

Research effort is at present expanding. Size frequency, moult stages and fishing effort are sampled at key ports. Historical data are being prepared for analysis. The need for increased size limits is being considered. Escape gap studies have been completed on crabs (Cancer irroratus) and lobsters. Tagging studies to estimate growth, mortality rates, movements, standing stock, recruitment etc. are continuing in a number of areas. First estimates of population parameters suggest that in addition to yield/recruit considerations, present fishing strategy may be adversely affecting recruitment potential. Tagging studies in Canadian waters have so far shown few movements $>10$ miles although there appear to be seasonal vertical movements in some areas which may also result in horizontal displacements on a seasonal basis.

## United States

A State-Federal Scientific Committee, consisting of scientists from 11 coastal states (Maine to North Carolina) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), has been established to organise and conduct the necessary research to allow the formulation of lobster management plans. Every lobster-producing state has now initiated or intensified its own lobster R \& D. The Lobster Scientific Committee has conducted a preliminary assessment of lobster growth and mortality to determine levels of yield per recruit for various levels of minimum sizes and fishing mortality, and to identify research priorities.
4. RECENT OR IMMINENT CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT STRATEGY
4.1 Europe

England, Wales and Scotland in 1976 introduced carapace length for the measurement of minimum landing size at 80 mm , equivalent to the previous total length measurement of 9 inches ( 229 mm ). France, Norway and Sweden still use total length. Sweden has recently extended the summer closed season in an attempt to reduce the fishing activity of part-time fishermen, and to protect moulting lobsters. Ireland is in the process of introducing a licensing system for lobster boats, sellers and buyers, designed to control fishing effort, particularly of part-time fishermen.

### 4.2 North America

Efforts to develop a unified management programme in the United States resulted in the establishment of a Policy Committee, composed of state fishery administrators and the Regional Director of NMFS, which provides overall programme guidance and facilitates implementation of decisions through existing legal and institutional
channels. It is intended to increase the present size limits of $31 / 16 \mathrm{in}(78 \mathrm{~mm}), 3 \mathrm{l} / 8 \mathrm{in}(79 \mathrm{~mm})$ and $33 / 16 \mathrm{in} \mathrm{( } 81 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) to a uniform $3 \frac{1}{2}$ in ( 89 mm ) in the United States. Escape gaps are being introduced in various states.

Canada hopes to increase the size limits in some areas over the next few years. In an attempt to reduce fishing effort a licence buy-back scheme is being introduced. A closed season may be introduced for the offshore fishery. The management strategy favours full-time fishermen.
5. EVALUATION OF CONSERVATION METHODS
5.1 Minimum Size
5.1.a Method of measurement

The Group recommends that for both legal and scientific purposes carapace length shall be used. This should be measured in millimetres from the back of either eye socket to the dorsal midpoint of the posterior margin of the carapace. For scientific work the measurement should be taken to the nearest millimetre or l/lo millimetre below.
The Group also recommends that particularly for commercial and enforcement purposes uniformity of minimum legal sizes between countries is desirable.
5.1.b Can a lobster fishery be managed by minimum size alone?

In the light of the experience of several countries and the present state of the lobster stocks it was felt that effective management of a lobster fishery could not be achieved by minimum size regulations alone. However, the control of the minimum size does have an important role in lobster management. The appropriate size should be selected in relation to size at first maturity (5.3.a) and in terms of yield assessment (5.1.c); the utilisation of escape gaps is recommended (5.1.d).
5.l.c Yield assessment and optimum minimum size

If the maximum sustainable yield is the objective of lobster fishery management then there are two direct fishery management controls: i) size or age at first capture, and ii) level of fishing effort (see 5.2). Selection of the appropriate size at first capture and level of fishing effort should ideally be made using some yield assessment model. Most such models require certain basic parameters, in particular recruitment, growth and mortality rates. Information on recruitment is very limited and this is usually overcome by using yield per recruit theory. This still leaves the problems of quantifying growth and mortality rates.

A considerable amount of moult increment data are available but data on moult frequency under natural conditions are lacking to enable the determination of annual growth rates. Work is continuing in several countries to try to determine external morphological changes or internal physiological changes, e.g. serum protein or calcium levels, which may be correlated with the moult cycle and hence determine the moult frequency of lobsters at various sizes.
Determination of exploitation rates is possible over short periods outside the moulting season using non-persistant tagging methods. If longer-term estimates of mortality rates and of movements are to
be made it is necessary to develop a persistent tag, or at least quantify tag losses. Although the sphyrion tag is reasonably successful doubts were expressed concerning its persistence and the problem of infections caused by the anchor. Further development and testing of the Gundersen toggle tag and of branding was thought to be worthwhile. Where hatchery-reared juveniles are being released the use of natural tags, e.g. odd colours, should be considered (see 5.3.d).

It was thought preferable to have uniformity of minimum sizes within and between countries. As far as was known, growth and natural mortality rates do not vary appreciably from area to area within most countries, but may vary from country to country. Fishing mortality rates vary considerably both within and between countries and, therefore, to achieve the maximum sustainable yield different minimum sizes may be required. However, the international enforcement problems and market size requirements should be carefully considered when changes in minimum sizes are proposed.

## 5.1.d Escape gaps

The Group felt that the use of escape gaps has considerable conservation value. There is evidence to suggest that there is mortality, particularly by predation, of undersized lobsters returned to the sea after sorting on the fishing boats. Effective escape gaps would reduce the numbers of undersized lobsters brought to the surface and should reduce losses due to predation when returned. The temptation for fishermen to land undersized lobsters would also be reduced. If minimum sizes are increased in the future, the effectiveness and value of escape gaps increase.
There are certain problems in enforcing the use of escape gaps but if the principle of their use and the advantage of less sorting of the catch, less pot materials, less ballast and less damage to pots from wave action can be "sold" to fishermen, the enforcement problems would be reduced. It would be useful to establish more clearly the relationship between the size, shape, number and position of escape gaps and the size composition of the pot catch, and therefore the size composition of those released.
Escape hatches with bio-degradable fastenings are being tested in USA to prevent "ghost-fishing" by pots lost at sea. It was felt that "ghost-fishing" was not a significant problem in Europe.
5.2 Control of Fishing Effort
5.2.a Methods_of control

Licensing can be used to achieve four aims:
(i) control of the level of fishing effort by restricting the number of licences available.
(ii) control of the fishing effort of part-time fishermen.
(iii) suspension or withdrawal of licence is the best deterrent to enforce other regulations, e.g. minimum size.
(iv) to collect catch and effort information.

The majority of the Group felt that if one or more of these aims features in their fisheries management policy then licensing is recommended as a means of achieving these aims.

Number of traps per boat. This method of control of effort may be necessary in association with licensing. Although the number of boats or fishermen may be controlled by restricted entry and licensing, unless trap limits are imposed the licensed fishermen can still increase their fishing effort by increasing the number of pots fished.
In Canada the limits on the number of traps allowed were initially set too high, and some fishermen increased their number of pots to meet the limit imposed. However, some Canadian fishermen are now asking for the limit to be lowered! There are many enforcement problems associated with limiting the number of traps fished. This is to some extent overcome by identifying traps with coded markings, which enables enforcement officers to identify unmarked and therefore prohibited fishing gear.

Closed seasons have very little value in directly controlling fishing effort, unless coupled with other effort controls, e.g. trap number limits. They have certain advantages in marketing, e.g. the Canadian open season coincides with a period of low catches in the USA, and therefore enables exports to the USA when their own supplies are limited.
Where a mixed fishery for lobsters and crab exists, as in most of Europe, closed seasons for lobsters alone are very difficult to enforce.

Closed seasons during certain times of the year can be used to restrict the activities of part-time fishermen. Sweden has a summer closed season, primarily for biological reasons, but now considered valuable for stopping leisure fishing for lobsters.
In many areas natural closed seasons occur as the result of bad weather, cold water temperatures making lobsters inactive or moulting reducing catchability.
Closed areas can be used to provide a reservoir breeding stock (see 5.3.c) or as a means of reducing fishing effort on the whole stock. A fishery could be divided into areas which were closed for a few years on a rotational basis. This may be easier to enforce than trying to ensure that the trap limits are not exceeded.
Quotas were thought to be the most useful when applied to international fisheries where it is necessary to apportion a total allowable catch between nations. In a national fishery the imposition of a quota would tend to create a short period of intense fishing at the beginning of a season which would quickly catch the quota. It would also be difficult to know when the quota had been reached. In most countries the lobster catch is inadequately recorded.
Control of other fishing methods. Canada, France, Ireland, Spain and Sweden prohibit the catching of lobsters by divers. In Canada lobsters can only be caught by traps, i.e. no otter trawl in the offshore fishery, unlike USA where half the offshore landings are trawl-caught. Many part-time fishermen are divers and if it is thought necessary to control part-time fishing effort then control of diving for lobsters is appropriate.

## 5.2.b Determination of appropriate level of effort

Decisions on the appropriate level of effort for a fishery depend on whether the criteria used take account solely of biological yields or whether socio-economic factors are also considered.

Selection of the appropriate level of effort to achieve the maximum yield should ideally (as for the minimum size) be made using some yield assessment model. This need not be a complex mathematical model. Determination of the appropriate level of exploitation would enable the level of fishing effort to be controlled to achieve the required exploitation rate. There are many lobster fisheries where it is believed a reduction in fishing effort would result in increased catch rates and therefore increase the economic efficiency of the industry. Social considerations must play a part in decision making when controlling fishing effort, particularly where local communities are dependent upon fishing for employment.

If the data on growth and mortality are not available for yield assessment models it may be necessary to make decisions on controlling effort (and/or minimum size) which may only be judged in the light of future catches. The collection of adequate catch and effort information is therefore essential to observe the effects of fishery management changes. Even where sufficient data exist for a population model, it is necessary to prove the model by observing catch and effort data.
5.3 Improvement of Recruitment

Minimum size in relation to size at maturity
It would appear quite logical that, particularly where the rate of exploitation is high, the minimum size should be set above the size at maturity. This would ensure that breeding females, and males, are available in the stock. As male lobsters are able to mate with more than one female, the stock of mature males need not be as large as that of the females. However, no information is available on the stock/recruitment relationship and it is thus impossible to decide how large a stock of breeding females is required for adequate annual recruitment.

In certain parts of Canada although there are few mature females in the stock and fishing intensity is high, catches have remained relatively stable.
The Group felt that although the stock/recruitment relationship is not known it could be assumed that good recruitment is more likely from a larger breeding stock and therefore the minimum size should be set above the size at maturity.

## 5.3.b Protection of ovigerous females

The question of whether ovigerous females should be landed depends again on the unknown stock/recruitment relationship. Observations in Canada over a 16 year period failed to show any clear relationship between larval abundance and subsequent lobster catches.
At the present time Canada, USA and Spain prohibit the landing of ovigerous females. In many countries it would be difficult to enforce such a prohibition without tests to determine whether a lobster has been "scrubbed". The Group felt that it is necessary to ensure that the breeding stock is of a sufficient size to ensure adequate larval production and recruitment to the fishable stock. It is not possible to determine quantitatively the size of the breeding stock required. The necessity and advisability of having a regulation prohibiting the landing of ovigerous females depends upon the present relationship between the minimum size and size at maturity, the rate of exploitation, the origin of larval recruitment to the stock and the feasibility of adequately enforcing the regulation.

An alternative approach to prohibiting the landing of ovigerous females is to buy ovigerous females from fishermen and release them back into the fishery, in preference into closed sanctuary areas as in France. This would reduce the enforcement problems. It is necessary to attempt to monitor future catches and determine the value of this action. This is being done in France but the sanctuaries have not been in operation for a sufficient time to observe an increase in the fishable stock.
5.3.c Closed_areas to conserve a breeding stock

A simpler approach is to close off areas of the fishery to allow a large unfished breeding stock to build up. If larval drift occurs to other areas or juveniles disperse this would increase recruitment to the fishable stock. There would be enforcement problems because the closed areas would have a potentially high catch per unit effort which would encourage fishermen to fish inside the closed areas.
5.3.d Release_of juveniles_into the fishery or sanctuaries

The objective of releasing juveniles into the fishery or sanctuaries rather than protecting ovigerous females is to attempt to overcome the high mortality between the hatching of eggs and the settling of juveniles onto the sea bed. A hatchery is necessary to provide the young lobsters for release. This conservation approach is practised in France and JSA. In France the juveniles are released into closed sanctuary areas, whereas in USA releases are into the open fishery.
Again there are many problems in trying to evaluate the usefulness of this approach. It has not been possible to demonstrate an increase in commercial landings as a result of releasing juveniles. Work is progressing in USA and France to develop genetic tagging, using for example rare coloured sports, to enable estimation of the proportion of juveniles released which survive to enter the fishable stock.
Observations by divers in Canada showed almost $100 \%$ mortality by predation within 10 minutes after releasing 5 th to 7 th stage juveniles onto the sea bed. It is essential to ensure that juveniles released into the sea have readily accessible cover or that visual predation is avoided by, say, releasing at night.

### 5.4 Habitat Improvement

## 5.4.a Artificial reefs

The Group felt that the main problem with artificial reefs is cost effectiveness. In those areas where fishing intensity is high and stock abundance is low the availability of suitable habitat niches would not appear to be a limiting factor. There is some suggestion that where the lobster population is reduced the crab population may increase and provide competition for any future increase in the lobster stock either by natural or man-made recruitment.
There may be some value in establishing artificial reefs in areas where the habitat is not suitable for lobsters, perhaps in association with warm water from power stations. Present costings do not make such ventures economically viable.

## 5.4.b Control of the effects of other fishing_methods

The issue of competition between say trawlers and potters for suitable fishing grounds does not come under this heading. However, there is some evidence that heavy beam trawls and various dredges, e.g. Irish moss raking in Canada, could either cause direct damage to lobsters or destroy the habitat required by lobsters. This did not appear to be a significant problem in any of the countries represented.

## 5.4.c Pollution control

The Group recognised that relatively little information appeared to be available on the effects of various pollutants on adult, juvenile and larval lobsters. It was felt that the larvae are likely to be more sensitive to pollutants than adults. Although it has not been possible to demonstrate any significant mortality due to pollution the Group felt that more toxicological work, particularly with the larvae, would enable a closer assessment of the possible effects of pollutants on lobster stocks.

## 6. THE POTENTIAL FOR HATCHING AND REARING

The potential uses of lobster hatching and rearing are twofold:

1) to produce artificially reared lobsters for direct human consumption or 2) to provide juveniles for release into the natural fishery or sanctuary areas to aid recruitment to the natural stock. The value of the latter approach has been discussed in Section 5.3.d. Both uses require the same hatchery techniques, but rearing-on techniques need only be developed to artificially produce marketable lobsters. The necessary hatchery techniques appear to be available to produce Homarus americanus or Homarus gammarus at a size suitable for release into the sea. As it is difficult to evaluate the release of juveniles into the sea it is difficult to make an economic assessment of hatchery techniques used for this purpose.
Considerable interest has been shown for many years in the potential for rearing lobsters to a marketable size. Research work is being carried out in several countries by both government research establishments and private industry on both species of Homarus. As with all commercial projects the ultimate aim to make a profit will decide whether lobster rearing is a viable proposition.

Present research is concentrating upon the biological and technological problems of hatching and rearing. Attention is being focused upon optimal environmental conditions, particularly temperature, nutritional studies and formulation of artificial diets, disease problems and genetics and selective breeding. The future potential of rearing obviously depends upon the costeffectiveness of the hatching and rearing techniques being developed.
The present research into hatching and rearing is producing a lot of interesting biological information on lobster life histories, growth, feeding, diseases etc., which will be of value in the management of the natural fisheries.

Visit to the Ile diYeu_lobster hatchery
At the kind invitation of $M$ Audouin (ISTPM, France) the members of the 1975 Group visited the lobster hatchery on the Ile diYeu. The objective of this hatchery is to produce 6 th or 7 th stage juvenile lobsters for release into sanctuary areas around the French coast. In 1974 a total of 1500006 th or 7 th stage lobsters were released.

The techniques used were relatively simple but successful. Ovigerous females were brought by fishermen between June and October, allowed to hatch and the larvae transferred to large outside tanks. The lobster larvae were fed on Artemia larvae or the larvae of Maia squinado hatched in adjacent tanks. After about 14 days, and with a survival rate of between $50-80 \%$, the 3 rd or 4 th stage larvae were transferred to individual compartments in tanks inside the hatchery building. After about $l \frac{1}{2}$ months, being fed on frozen adult Artemia, the 6 th or 7 th stage juveniles are released into the sanctuary areas. During the Group's visit several thousand juvenile lobsters of about 30 mm total length were held in the hatchery. These juveniles had been held since September last year and were to be released into the sanctuaries this summer.

The Group wishes to record its appreciation of the hospitality offered by $\mathbb{M}$ Audouin and his colleagues, and the authorities on the Ile d'Yeu.

## 7. GROWTH AND MORTALITY RATES

Discontinuous growth (made up of two components, moult increment and moult frequency), the apparent lack of ageing structures, the difficulty of distinguishing the modes of a size frequency distribution which might indicate year classes or moult classes, and the need for special tagging techniques which ensure that tags are not lost at ecdysis are the inherent problems associated with the estimation of annual growth rates of large decapod Crustacea, such as Homarus. The von Bertalanffy growth equation has been extensively used to describe the growth of fin-fish. While this equation is not ideally suited to the discontinuous growth pattern of lobsters it is a useful approximation which allows the use of the Beverton and Holt dynamic pool model for yield per recruit assessment. This is especially so when lobsters are moulting once each year over the size range considered for an assessment.
Analysis of polymodal size frequency has provided some estimates of annual growth. The use of tagging data has provided good estimates of moult increments which have been coupled with sparse data on moult frequency. Von Bertalanffy's growth equations from a number of Homarus stocks were examined (Table 3, Figure 1). It is readily apparent that there is considerable variation in the growth curves (Figure 1) with the slowest growth from Norway females (H. gammarus) and the fastest from southern New England, USA (H. americanus). $K$ values ranged from 0.10 for the Norway females to 0.39 for Newfoundland males. There was also a wide range in $\mathrm{L} \infty$ from 105 mm CL for Newfoundland males to 267 mm CL for Maine, USA lobsters. Much of this variability in growth rates is due to variable moult frequencies - the parameter which is the most difficult to estimate accurately!
Fishing mortality (F) rates from various sources have been calculated from tag return data and/or size composition data. The values obtained (Table 3) range from $F=>0.67$ (last available estimate of 0.67 in 1971) for the American offshore fishery to $F=2.30$ in the Maine fishery. Generally, F values exceed 1.0 and are frequently as high as 2.0.

There are no direct estimates of natural mortality ( $M$ ) and the best available estimates range from $M=0.1$ to 0.25 with a general consensus from the Working Group that such a slow-growing long-lived animal has few predators and that therefore natural mortality can be expected to be low - say $M=<0.1$.

## 8. YIELD ASSESSMENT

At the present time it is obvious that some of the estimates for the parameter inputs for a yield assessment are not wholly reliable. However, the examination of the available data for a range of stocks from both Europe and North America does enable a preliminary assessment to be made utilising a range of probable values for growth, fishing and natural mortality rates. The choice of a suitable yield model is not critical at this stage. For convenience, the Beverton and Holt (1959) dynamic pool model was chosen. This model incorporates the von Bertalanffy growth equation, which as already discussed may not be an ideal description of the discontinuous growth of lobsters. (A yield per recruit analysis using a discontinuous growth curve was briefly examined at the meeting and found to give similar results to those obtained by the Working Group.) Isometric growth is also assumed by the model and although male lobsters show allometric growth of the chelae this model is a suitable approximation. The dynamic pool model also assumes constant mortality rates for various ages: this assumption may not be valid but the available data on mortality rates are not comprehensive enough to reject this assumption. Despite these reservations, the Group felt that useful management advice could be obtained from a yield per recruit assessment using this dynamic pool model with the parameter inputs at present available.
Three stocks were chosen for yield per recruit assessment incorporating a range of K values from 0.10 to 0.39 (Table 4). Two values of $M$ were chosen $M=0.1$, thought to be the more realistic value, and $M=0.3$ to observe the effect of incorporating a higher $\mathbb{M}$ value. Fishing mortality ( $F$ ) ranged from 0.1 to 1.5 and age at first capture - assuming knife-edged selection - from 4 to 15 years (Table 4).

### 8.1 Yield per Recruit Results

Newfoundland_males
The maximum yield in weight per recruit $\left(Y_{W} / R\right)_{\max }$ of
$552 \mathrm{~kg} / 1000$ when $\mathrm{M}=0.1$ occurs at a high fishing mortality ( $\mathrm{F}_{\max }=1.5$ ) and an age (size) at first capture ( $\left.\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{c}}\right)_{\text {max }}$ of 7 yr ( 96 mm CL) (Table 5, Figure 2). If $M=0.3$ the $\left(Y_{W} / R\right)_{\max }$ is reduced to $372 \mathrm{~kg} / 1000$ at an (F) max of 1.5 and a ( $\left.\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{c}}\right)_{\max }^{\max }$ of 4 yr (Table 5, Figure 2). Although the ( $\left.Y_{W} / R\right)_{\max }$ occurs at quite high values of ( $F)_{\text {max }}$ the low growth rates produce flat-topped yield per recruit curves in which, above fairly low levels of fishing mortality, further increases in F produce only small gains in yield per recruit. For example, if $M=0.1$ and $t_{c}=7 \mathrm{yr}$, the $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{W}} / \mathrm{R}$ at $F=0.5$ is $519 \mathrm{~kg} / 1000$, only $6 \%$ less than the $Y_{W} / \mathrm{R}$ at $(F)_{\text {max }}=$ 1.5, at $F=0.3$ the $Y_{W} / R$ is only $13 \%$ less than at $(F)_{\max }$.

## Norway_males

If $M=0.1$ the $\left(Y_{W} / R\right)_{\max }$ of $564 \mathrm{~kg} / 1000$ occurs at $(F)_{\max }=1.5$ and $\left(t_{c}\right)_{\text {max }}$ of $9 \mathrm{yr}(106 \mathrm{~mm} C L)$ (Table 5, Figure 3). The $\left(Y_{W} / R\right)_{\max }$ is reduced to $277 \mathrm{~kg} / 1000 \mathrm{at}(\mathrm{F})_{\max }=1.5$ and $\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{c}}\right)_{\max }=5 \mathrm{yr}$ if $\mathrm{M}=0.3$. As with the Newfoundland males, the yield per recruit curves are flat-topped. A reduction from ( $F)_{\max }=1.5$ to $F=0.3$ at $t_{c}=9$ and $M=0.1$ results in only a $9 \%$ loss in $Y_{W} / R$. If $M=0.3$ at $t_{c}=5$ the loss is $20 \%$.

## Norway females

Although the growth rate is low ( $\mathrm{K}=0.1$, Table 4). the $\mathrm{W}_{\infty}$ is higher ( 2448 kg ) than for the other two assessments. This results
in quite high $\left(t_{c}\right)_{\max }$ values when $M=0.1$, the $\left(Y_{W} / R\right)_{\max }$ of $371 \mathrm{~kg} / 1000$ occurs at $(F)_{\max }=1.5$ and $\left(t_{c}\right)_{\max }=14$ yr (Table 5 , Figure 4). Of course if $M$ is higher ( $M=0.3$ ) ( $t_{c}$ ) max is reduced to 7 yr , although ( F ) max remains high at l.5. As with the other assessments a considerable reduction in $F$ has little effect on $Y_{W} / R$ values. For example, if $M=0.1$ and $t_{c}=14$ a reduction from $(F)_{\max }=1.5$ to $F=0.3$ results in only a $19 \%$ drop in $\mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{R}$ to $300 \mathrm{~kg} / 1000$.

## 9. <br> MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

## Yield Per Recruit

The three assessments carried out have been used to show general conclusions regarding the relationships between $Y_{W} / R$ and $M, F$ and $t_{c}$. The model is obviously sensitive to $M$, the parameter which in most cases is estimated roughly. However, the general consensus is that $M$ is low and probably less than O.l. It is probably safe, therefore, to consider the assessments utilising $M=0.1$ as closer to reality than those with $M=0.3$. Although the $(F)_{\max }$ values were quite high $\sim 1.5$, it is clear that a considerable reduction in $F$ would result in relatively small losses in $Y_{W} / R$. This would of course increase the economic efficiency of a fishery as c.p.u.e. would be expected to increase (see 9.2 also). The present calculated or estimated values of $F$ (Table 3) generally exceed $F=1.0$. These yield per recruit assessments clearly show that $F$ values of the order of $0.3-0.5$ would be more suitable.

The present $l_{c}$ values in most fisheries are around 80 mm CL, although in one area in Canada, the southern Gulf of St Lawrence, the $l_{c}$ is as low as $64 \mathrm{~mm} C I$. If $M=0.1$ the ( $l_{c}$ ) max values at (F) $)_{\max }$ range from 96 to $117 \mathrm{~mm} \mathrm{CL}\left(t_{c}=7\right.$ to 14 yr ). At the suggested level of $F \sim 0.5$ the $l_{c}$ values range from 91 to $108 \mathrm{~mm} C L$ $\left(t_{c}=6\right.$ to 12 yr ) - still well above the present size (age) at first capture. An increase in $l_{c}$ would increase the yield per recruit from all these fisheries.

The conclusion from these preliminary assessments is clear - the present levels of fishing mortality are too high and the size (age) at first capture too low.

### 9.2 Recruitment

Little is known about the behaviour and ecology of larval and juvenile lobsters. The source of recruitment to many fisheries is not known and little is known of the stock/recruitment relationship. Despite these unknowns, it is clear that with the present situation where exploitation rates are high and the size (age) at first capture is often below the size (age) at first maturity, many of the lobster stocks on both sides of the Atlantic are heading for recruitment failure. The proposed reduction in fishing mortality and increases in size (age) at first capture would alleviate this situation. The reduced catch rates in recent years indicate a reduction in stock abundance. Although the stock/recruitment relationship is unknown, at some low level of spawning stock an increase in stock size (resulting from a reduction in $F$ and increase in $l_{c}$ ) will certainly increase recruitment.

### 9.3 Summary of Management Recommendations

To improve yield per recruit and to ensure an adequate breeding stock it is essential in most European and North American Homarus stocks to reduce fishing mortality significantly from the present level in excess of $F=1.0$ to an optimum level within the range $F=0.3-0.5$.

At the same time the present size (age) at first capture (minimum landing size) is too low and should be raised, at least above the size (age) at first maturity for each stock.

If these management recommendations are not implemented in the near future recruitment failure in several Homarus fisheries can be expected and other stocks will continue to decline.

For obvious reasons, the considerable reductions in fishing mortality proposed and the immediate losses in catches resulting from increases in minimum landing sizes will be difficult to accept in socioeconomic terms. The changes proposed will inevitably have to take place in measured steps. It is thus essential that the first steps in the right direction for the future management policy of Homarus stocks to be taken immediately. Further delay only makes the inevitable proposed action more difficult to implement.
10. PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH
10.1 Catch-Effort Statistics and Stock Relationships
10.1.a Improvement of the collection of catch and effort statistics is essential for both future research work and for adequate fishery management.
10.1.b Declines in the catches from traditional fishing areas have been observed. The available catch-effort data should be examined to attempt to determine the cause(s) of the observed declines in catches.
10.1.c To aid the interpretation of catch-effort data the effects of environmental conditions, e.g. climatic changes, on catchability should be examined.
10.1.d With the development of offshore fisheries it is now essential to understand the relationships between inshore and offshore stocks. Particular attention should be paid to possible movements of lobsters between inshore and offshore areas, and to the possible role of offshore lobsters as reservoir breeding stocks.
10.2 Sampling and Escape Gaps
10.2.a Most observations on lobster stocks are made using commercial traps as the sampling method. More information on the selectivity of this sampling gear would aid the interpretation of population structure data.
10.2.b Studies under natural conditions of the intraspecific and interspecific behavioural interactions to baited traps would facilitate the interpretation of catch, effort and catch composition data.
10.2.c As the Group felt that the use of escape gaps has considerable conservation value it would be useful to establish more clearly the relationship between the size, shape and number and position of escape gaps and the size composition of the pot catch.

| 10.3 | Recruitment |
| :--- | :--- |
| 10.3.a | Any research to elucidate the stock/recruitment relationships <br> would be most useful. |
| 10.3.b | Failing any direct information on the stock/recruitment it was <br> thought worthwhile to try to evaluate the possibility of <br> improving recruitment by releasing hatchery reared young lobsters <br> and/or providing sanctuaries to conserve a breeding stock. <br> Carefully controlled experiments with adequate monitoring would |
| be essential. The development of genetically tagged lobsters, |  |
| e.g., rare coloured sports, would help to assess the value of |  |
| releasing hatchery reared young lobsters into the fishery. |  |

lo.4.b A considerable amount of moult increment data are available for both species of Homarus, but data on moulting frequency in the wild are very sparse. As annual growth is an essential parameter for all population models it is necessary to determine moulting frequency and hence obtain estimates of annual growth.
10.4.c Similarly mortality rates, both natural and fishing, are essential to population models. The development of persistent tagging technique should encourage the estimation of mortality rates.
10.5 Rearing

The demand for lobsters at present exceeds the supply. There is probably a potential market for an alternative to the present live market, e.g., frozen small tails. Continued research into the biological and technological problems of hatching and rearing should be encouraged. Although economics will decide whether rearing is a viable proposition, a considerable amount of biological information, of value to the understanding of the natural stocks, will result from this research.

### 10.6 Pollution

Research into the acute and chronic toxicological effects of various common pollutants on lobsters, particularly larvae, would enable a better assessment of the possible effects of pollution on lobster stocks.
10.7 Yield Assessment and Research Priorities

The 1975 Group found it extremely difficult to agree on the priority that should be given to the various proposals for future research. It is essential to halt the decline in traditional lobster stocks and to provide adequate scientific advice for management of these important fisheries. The ability of the various countries represented to carry out these research proposals obviously depends upon their own resources and research priorities. As the decline in lobster stocks is common to most European countries and to North America it was felt that a cooperative research approach would be beneficial.
Although the preliminary assessments made by the 1977 Working Group used data which in many cases should be improved, clear management recommendations have been justifiably produced. Future research must concentrate on improving the parameter inputs for a yield assessment together with the additional information on the biology, particularly reproduction and recruitment, necessary to evaluate yield assessments and make valid management conclusions.
The Group felt that a considerable amount of data, both published and unpublished, existed which should be collated in such a way as to benefit those whose task it is to manage the Homarus stocks. In particular it was felt that a review of the growth data available and a consideration of the modelling of growth in homarids were essential. There is an obvious need to re-examine data and make better estimates of mortality parameters. Data on size and age at maturity together with information on recruitment are necessary, particularly in the light of the likelihood of recruitment failure in a number of stocks. The assessments in this report can only be regarded as preliminary. The Group believes that many of the necessary data are available for more accurate assessments to be made of many stocks other than those considered here.
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Table 1. European lobster landings (tonnes).
Source: Bulletin Statistique - ICES.

| Year | Denmark | E \& W | France | Ireland | Norway | Scotland | Spain | Sweden | All European countries |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1950 | 216 | 352* | 304 | 170 | 969 | 784 | 19 | 215 | 3074 |
| 1951 | 157 | 346 | 368 | 139 | 862 | 643 | 29 | 252 | 2833 |
| 1952 | 186 | 331 | 449 | 164 | 712 | 635 | 32 | 210 | 2751 |
| 1953 | 145 | 403 | 485 | 200 | 848 | 635 | 37 | 216 | 3006 |
| 1954 | 124 | 450 | 499 | 189 | 648 | 597 | 34 | 188 | 2765 |
| 1955 | 108 | 506 | 497 | 253 | 632 | 662 | 34 | 167 | 2889 |
| 1956 | 101 | 492 | 537 | 308 | 708 | 688 | 32 | 178 | 3074 |
| 1957 | 74 | 528 | 568 | 270 | 655 | 728 | 53 | 148 | 3059 |
| 1958 | 75 | 495 | 625 | 300 | 714 | 704 | 68 | 164 | 3174 |
| 1959 | 72 | 489 | 401 | 347 | 684 | 819 | 57 | 160 | 4159 |
| 1960 | 85 | 465 | 497 | 267 | 787 | 890 | 37 | 168 | 3226 |
| 1961 | 76 | 565 | 509 | 180 | 681 | 991 | 26 | 147 | 3211 |
| 1962 | 67 | 469 | 437 | 167 | 551 | 898 | 24 | 120 | 2767 |
| 1963 | 71 | 480 | 318 | 153 | 498 | 805 | 5 | 105 | 2470 |
| 1964 | 50 | 477 | 388 | 217 | 353 | 793 | 23 | 92 | 2443 |
| 1965 | 35 | 398 | 426 | 205 | 350 | 643 | 20 | 86 | 2194 |
| 1966 | 30 | 420 | 446 | 278 | 248 | 586 | 20 | 78 | 2325 |
| 1967 | 30 | 387 | 422 | 279 | 239 | 567 | 161 | 64 | 2411 |
| 1968 | 24 | 371 | 361 | 287 | 276 | 616 | 99 | 66 | 2358 |
| 1969 | 25 | 383 | 340 | 298 | 218 | 568 | 17 | 66 | 1954 |
| 1970 | 22 | 491 | 324 | 277 | 202 | 602 | 47 | 71 | 2108 |
| 1971 | 15 | 451 | 310 | 285 | 133 | 678 | 20 | 50 | 1952 |
| 1972 | 16 | 429 | 373 | 221 | 161 | 585 | 16 | 43 | 1893 |
| 1973 | 13 | 457 | 420** | 258 | 150 | 545 | 13 | 42 | 1898 |
| 1974 | 11 | 377 | 400* | 253 | 139 | 600 | 12 | 38 | $1830 *$ |
| 1975 | 14 | 342 | 400* | 332 | 128 | 503 | - | 43 | $1762^{*}$ |
| 1976 | 12 | 348 | 400* | 370 | 116 | 531 | - | 33 | $1810 *$ |
| Averages 1950-59 | 126 | 439 | 573 | 234 | 743 | 690 | 40 | 190 | 3078 |
| Averages 1960-69 | 49 | 442 | 414 | 233 | 420 | 736 | 43 | 99 | 2536 |
| Averages 1970-76 | 15 | 414 | $357^{*}$ | 285 | 147 | 578 | $22^{*}$ | 46* | 1 893** |

* Approximate or estimated as available.

Table 2a. Lobster landings (tonnes) from the United States inshore and offshore (traps and trawls) fisheries for 1965-76.

| Year | Inshore traps | $\begin{gathered} \text { Offshore } \\ \text { traps } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Offshore } \\ \text { trawls } \end{gathered}$ | Other* | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1965 | 11218 | 0 | 2481 | 20 | 13719 |
| 1966 | 11609 | 0 | 1776 | 15 | 13400 |
| 1967 | 10068 | 0 | 2048 | 15 | 12131 |
| 1968 | 12253 | 0 | 2490 | 25 | 14768 |
| 1969 | 12165 | 52 | 3086 | 22 | 15325 |
| 1970 | 11604 | 666 | 3199 | 23 | 15492 |
| 1971 | 11308 | 1480 | 2477 | 16 | 15281 |
| 1972 | 10626 | 2890 | 1093 | 17 | 14626 |
| 1973 | 10518 | 1945 | 671 | 16 | 13150 |
| 1974 | 10398 | 1749 | 940 | - | 13087 |
| 1975 | 10476 | 1939 | 726 | - | 13141 |
| 1976 | 11708 | 1914 | 598 | - | 14220 |

* Includes scuba diving and fish pots.

Table. 2b. Lobster landings (tonnes) in Canada.

| Year | Maritimes |  |  | P.Q. | Nfld. | Canada |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Inshore | $\begin{gathered} \text { Offshore } \\ \text { (trap) } \end{gathered}$ | Total |  |  |  |
| 1965 | 15193 | - | 15193 | 1494 | 1695 | 18382 |
| 1966 | 13584 | - | 13584 | 1773 | 1580 | 16937 |
| 1967 | 12926 | - | 12926 | 1501 | 1414 | 15841 |
| 1968 | 13842 | - | 13842 | 1274 | 1808 | 16924 |
| 1969 | 15406 | - | 15406 | 1083 | 1730 | 18219 |
| 1970 | 13937 | - | 13937 | 1195 | 1463 | 16595 |
| 1971 | 14720 | 100 | 14820 | 1108 | 1381 | 17309 |
| 1972 | 12471 | 334 | 12805 | 1009 | 1237 | 15051 |
| 1973 | 13422 | 481 | 13903 | 981 | 1263 | 16147 |
| 1974 | 11496 | 410 | 11906 | 1005 | 1326 | 14237 |
| 1975 | 14040 | 547 | 14587 | 1204 | 1697 | 17488 |
| 1976 | 11669 | 636 | 12305 | 1247 | 2229 | 15781 |

Table 3. Calculated or estimated von Bertalanffy growth constants, fishing and natural mortality, minimum landing size and size at maturity for a number of $\underline{H}$. gammarus and H. americanus stocks.

| Country | Sex | K | $\mathrm{L} \infty$ (mm) | $\mathrm{W} \infty$ (kg) | $t_{0}$ | - F | M | Present$I_{c}(m m)$ | Size at: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 50 \% \\ \text { maturity } \end{gathered}$ |
| H. gammarus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | $0^{7}$ | 0.12 | 196 | 6.55 |  | 1.17 | 0.25 | 80 |  |  |
|  | ¢ | 0.17 | 160 | 2.59 |  | 1.17 | 0.25 | 80 | 77 | 85+ |
| Ireland | $0^{7}$ | 0.121 | 174 |  | 0.34 | 0.8 | 0.06 | 83 | 76-83 |  |
| Norway | $0^{7}$ | 0.20 | 129 | 1.65 | (0.34) | 1.5 | <0.1 | 78 |  |  |
|  | ¢ | 0.10 | 157 | 2.45 | (0.34) | 1.5 | $<0.1$ | 78 |  |  |
| H. americanus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Canada (Nfld.) | $\sigma^{*}$ | 0.390 | 105 | 0.99 | 0.796 | 1.77 | 0.11 | 81 |  |  |
|  | 아 | 0.240 | 112 | 1.06 | 0.689 | 1.77 | 0.11 | 81 | 67 | 75 |
| USA: <br> Maine | ¢ | 0.048 | 267 | 12.2 | -0.772 | 2.30 | 0.1-0.2 | 81 | 83 |  |
| S New England | $\sigma^{\circ}$ | 0.115 | 253 | 11.2 | -0.140 | $>0.67$ | 0.1-0.2 | 81 |  |  |

Table 4. Input parameters for the Beverton and Holt (1959) yield per recruit equation for the Newfoundland male, and Norway male and female Homarus stocks.

| Input | Newfoundland ${ }^{\circ}$ | Norway ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Norway ${ }^{\text {P }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K | 0.39 | 0.20 | 0.10 |
| $W_{\infty}$ ( kg ) | 0.992 | 1.654 | 2.448 |
| ( $\mathrm{L} \infty \mathrm{mmCL}$ ) | (105) | (129) | (157) |
| $\mathrm{t}_{0}$ ( yr ) | 0.8 | 0.34 | 0.3 .4 |
| $\mathrm{t}_{\lambda}$ ( yr r ) | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{r}}$ ( yr ) | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| R | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 |
|  | $0.1 / 0.3$ | $0.1 / 0.3$ | 0.1/0.3 |
| $F_{\text {min }}$ | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| $F_{\text {max }}$ | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Finc | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| $t_{c} \min (\mathrm{yr})$ | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| $t_{c} \max (\mathrm{yr})$ | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{c}}$ inc ( yr ) | 1 | 1 | 1 |

Table 5. Calculated age (size) at first capture $\left(t_{c}\right)_{\max }\left(\left(l_{c}\right)_{\max }\right)$ giving maximum yield $\left(Y_{W} / R\right)_{\max }$ for selected values of $M$ and $F$, and fishing mortality $(F)_{\text {max }}$ giving $\left(Y_{W} / R\right)_{\max }$ for selected values of $M$ and $t_{c}\left(I_{c}\right)$ for three Homarus stocks.

| Country | Sex | M | F | $\left(t_{c}\right)_{\text {max }}$ | $\left(I_{c}\right)_{\text {max }}$ | $\left(\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{W}} / \mathrm{R}\right)_{\max }$ | $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | $I_{c}$ | $(\mathrm{F})_{\text {max }}$ | $\left(\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{W}} / \mathrm{R}\right)_{\text {max }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Newfoundland | 6 | 0.1 | 0.2 0.5 1.5 | 5 6 7 | $\begin{aligned} & 85 \\ & 91 \\ & 96 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 458 \\ & 529 \\ & 552 \end{aligned}$ | 4 5 6 | 75 84 91 | 0.4 0.6 $>1.0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 480 \\ & 520 \\ & 545 \end{aligned}$ |
| Newfoundland | $\sigma$ | 0.3 | 0.2 0.5 1.5 | 4 4 4 | 75 75 75 | $\begin{aligned} & >240 \\ & >333 \\ & >372 \end{aligned}$ | 4 5 6 | 75 85 91 | $>1.4$ $>1.5$ $>1.5$ | $\begin{aligned} & >372 \\ & >365 \\ & >322 \end{aligned}$ |
| Norway | $\bigcirc$ | 0.1 | 0.2 0.5 1.5 | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & 8 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | 93 101 106 | 481 547 564 | 5 6 7 | $\begin{aligned} & 78 \\ & 87 \\ & 93 \end{aligned}$ | 0.3 0.4 0.6 | $\begin{aligned} & 469 \\ & 505 \\ & 533 \end{aligned}$ |
| Norway | $\sigma$ | 0.3 | 0.2 0.5 1.5 | 4 4 $<5$ | 60 60 $<78$ | $>201$ 253 277 | 5 6 7 | $\begin{aligned} & 78 \\ & 87 \\ & 93 \end{aligned}$ | $>1.5$ $>1.5$ $>1.5$ | $\begin{aligned} & >277 \\ & >272 \\ & >249 \end{aligned}$ |
| Norway | ¢ | 0.1 | 0.2 0.5 1.5 | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 12 \\ & 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 97 \\ 108 \\ 117 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 306 \\ & 359 \\ & 371 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7 \\ 10 \\ 12 \end{array}$ | 76 97 108 | 0.3 0.5 1.0 | $\begin{aligned} & 290 \\ & 346 \\ & 366 \end{aligned}$ |
| Norway | ¢ | 0.3 | 0.2 0.5 1.5 | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 6 \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58 \\ & 68 \\ & 76 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 87 \\ 106 \\ 113 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7 \\ 10 \\ 12 \end{array}$ | 76 97 108 | $>1.5$ $>1.5$ $>1.5$ | $\begin{aligned} & >113 \\ & >88 \\ & >65 \end{aligned}$ |



Figure 1. Lobster growth curves (von Bertalanffy) for various stocks of $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{H}}$ gammarus and $\mathrm{H}_{-}$americanus.
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Figure 2. Yield-per-recruit ( $\mathrm{kg} / 1000$ ) isopleths for a range of fishing mortalities (F) and age at first capture ( $t_{c}$ ) for Newfoundland, Canada, male H. americanus: (top) natural mortality $(M)^{c}=0.3$, (bottom) $M=0.1$.


Figure 3. Yield-per-recruit ( $\mathrm{kg} / 1000$ ) isopleths for a range of fishing mortalities ( $F$ ) and age at first capture ( $t_{c}$ ) for Norwegian male H. gammarus: (top) natural mortality (M) $=0.3$, (bottom) $M=0.1$.


| ${ }^{t^{\prime}} \boldsymbol{c}_{15}$ | 138 | 223 | 275 | $\beta 08$ | 329 | 342 | 350 | 356 | 359 | 362 | 363 | 364 | 365 | 366 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllll}14 & 160 & 248 & 390 & 329 & 346 & 355 & 361 & 365 & 367 & 368 & 369 & 370 & 370 & 371 & 371\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllllllllllllllll}13 & 180 & 272 & 319 & 343 & 356 & 362 & 366 & 268 & 367 & 370 & 370 & 370 & 370 & 370 & 370\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllll}12 & 198 & 288 & 330 & 35 & 359 & 363 & 365 & 365 & 366 & 366 & 366 & 365 & 365 & 365 & 365\end{array}$

$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllll}10 & 224 & 306 & 334 & 344 & 346 & 345 & 344 & 342 & 341 & 339 & 338 & 337 & 336 & 335 & 334\end{array}$
$9 \quad 231 \quad 305 \quad 327 \quad 330 \quad 329 \quad 326 \quad 323 \quad 320318 \quad 316 \quad 314$
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllll}8 & 235 & 29 & 312 & 310 & 306 & 300 & 296 & 292 & 288 & 285 & 283 & 281 & 279 & 277 & 276\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllllllllllll}7 & 234 & 286 & 290 & 284 & 275 & 258 & 262 & 256 & 252 & 248 & 245 & 243 & 240 & 238 \\ 236\end{array}$

$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllll}5 & 221 & 244 & 230 & 213 & 199 & 187 & 178 & 171 & 165 & 161 & 157 & 153 & 150 & 148 & 146\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllll}4 & 209 & 216 & 194 & 173 & 156 & 143 & 134 & 126 & 120 & 115 & 111 & 107 & 105 & 102 & 100\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllll}0.1 & 0.2 & 0.3 & 0.4 & 0.5 & 0.6 & 0.7 & 0.8 & 0.9 & 1.0 & 1.1 & 1.2 & 1.3 & 1.4 & 1.5 & \mathrm{~F}\end{array}$

Figure 4. Yield-per-recruit ( $\mathrm{kg} / 1000$ ) isopleths for a range of fishing mortalities ( $F$ ) and age at first capture ( $t$ ) for Norwegian female H. gammarus: (top) natural mortality $(M)=0.3,($ bottom $) M=0.1$.


[^6]
[^0]:    k）Dots（．．．）in VIIf signify that the catches have been included in VIIa．1） 1960 total includes mingland／Wales 24 tons．If） 1962 France 6 ；Norway 50 ；figures for other years． refer to France．n）France 1966 VIIg－k includes VIIa，VIIb，c，VIIf．o）Details not available．p）Provisional date only．qu）The N．Ireland landings have been multiplied by $3 / 4$

[^1]:    * Including skate, dogfish, witch, L sole, Megrim

    1) Landings by species expressed as kg per 100 kg of Nephrops
[^2]:    Figure 6. Nephrops landings at North Shields, 1975.

[^3]:    * Preliminary.

[^4]:    *Preliminary

[^5]:    * Estimated from the landings in the ports of Skagen, Hirtshals and Hanstholm.

[^6]:    

