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#### Abstract

This study estimates total marine and brackish-water catches made by Finland in the Baltic Sea from 1950-2007. We used ICES electronic database landing statistics as the officially-reported data baseline, and then added 'adjustments' to reported landings (from various sources including the Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute) as well as estimates of unreported landings, discards, and recreational catches. The total of these components represents reconstructed total catches and provides a more comprehensive view of the total exploitation of marine resources. We believe these estimates are underestimates due to our conservative estimation procedures. ICES landing statistics report 4.5 million tonnes of marine landings from 1950-2007, our reconstruction estimates the total catch to be $29 \%$ higher ( 5.8 million tonnes). The majority of this discrepancy is due to unreported landings and discarding of herring (Clupea harengus), while cod (Gadus morhua) catches are low compared to other Baltic countries. Finland has recorded recreational fishing since 1953, although it is not known whether they submit estimates of unreported landings or discards (other than seal-induced discards). In an effort to contribute to better management of Baltic fish stocks and the Baltic Sea ecosystem, Finland could allocate more resources towards decreasing the amount of unreported catches and discards.


## INTRODUCTION

The Nordic Republic of Finland has borders with Sweden, Russia and Norway, and with Estonia to the south across the Gulf of Finland (Figure 1). With a population of $5,329,000$ and an area of $302,348 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (Anon., 2009), Finland is the third least densely populated country in the European Union after Norway and Iceland. Finland entered into a free trade agreement with the European Community (EC) in 1973, before experiencing a significant economic recession in the early 1990s. Finland joined the European Union (EU) in 1995, however, and has since developed into a highly-industrialized free-market economy (Melender and Repo, 2006).

Finnish fisheries can be divided into five main sectors: 1) commercial marine; 2) commercial inland; 3) recreational or subsistence in both inshore marine and inland lakes; 4) small-scale marine; and 5) aquaculture. The recreational fishing sector is relatively more important in Finland than in other Scandinavian countries as about half of marine landings are accounted for by recreational fishers, when herring catches are excluded (FAO, 2005). Aquaculture also supplies a substantial portion of fish for human consumption, particularly since the late 1980 s when the quality of the Baltic environment and many fish stocks began to decline (Setälä et al., 1998). Our paper, however, will address only wild fisheries catches taken in marine and brackish-water.

Table 1. Percent distribution (\%) of Finland's reported landings by ICES subdivision, by decade. Prior to the 1980 all landings were reported from ICES division IIId.

| Percentage of catch | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0 s}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0 s}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0 s}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ICES subdivision 24 | $<0.1$ | 0.2 | 0.39 |
| ICES subdivision 25 | $<0.1$ | 1.4 | 2.0 |
| ICES subdivision 26 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 1.1 |
| ICES subdivision 27 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| ICES subdivision 28 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.9 |
| ICES subdivision 29 | 12.2 | 24.5 | 18.5 |
| ICES subdivision 30 | 8.9 | 52.3 | 57.9 |
| ICES subdivision 31 | 2.6 | 7.4 | 5.0 |
| ICES subdivision 32 | 6.3 | 12.0 | 13.8 |

[^0]

Figure 1. Map of the Baltic Sea with ICES subdivisions and surrounding countries. Finland's coastline borders ICES subdivisions 29-32.

Despite a high rate of fish consumption in Finland, marine fisheries have never contributed significantly to the economy. In 2000, the industry accounted for approximately $0.1 \%$ of the GDP (FAO, 2005). The bulk of fish for human consumption are usually imported from Norway, Denmark, Iceland or Sweden (Setälä et al., 1998). Finnish catches are used mainly for industrial purposes, and as a result, the processing sector in Finland is substantial. In 2001, 1,265 people were employed by some 228 plants processing 35,000 tonnes of fish (FAO, 2005). Small-scale fisheries account for $65 \%$ of those employed by fisheries, and consequently are more important in economic terms than vessels acquiring the greatest volumes of catches offshore. Small-scale fisheries are especially important in sparsely populated areas where there are few alternative opportunities for employment (FGFRI, 2009).

The three main species caught by Finland according to landings reported by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES), are herring (Clupea harengus), sprat (Sprattus sprattus) and cod (Gadus morhua). The majority are caught by pelagic trawlers less than 24 meters long (a fleet of about 65 vessels in 2002). Herring and sprat landings account for approximately $90 \%$ of the total Finnish reported landings, and the majority of herring are usually caught during the spring spawning period (May-June). There are no significant fisheries targeting cod, and the majority of this species is caught as bycatch in herring trawls ( $\sim 60 \%$ ), in mixed fisheries operating with gillnets, or as bycatch on salmon (Salmo salar) longlines (Sjöblom and Parmanne, 1975). Some herring and sprat are frozen or filleted for human consumption, but about $80 \%$ of the total catch is sold as fishmeal to the fur farming industry (FAO, 2005). Annual catches are highly dependent on consumer demands for these products, as in the late 1980s, when animal welfare awareness was on the rise, herring landings experienced a significant depression.

A fleet of trawlers greater than 24 meters in length (about 21 vessels in 2002) catch a higher quality and more diversified catch for human consumption (as compared to pelagic trawlers <24m targeting herring for industry [see above]). Targeted species include herring, sprat, salmon, whitefish (Coregonus lavaretus), smelt (Osmerus eperlanus) and cod. Salmon are also caught by gill- and trap-net, but increasing damage to trap-nets in traditional sites have caused a significant decrease in their use. Approximately $35 \%$ of the commercial salmon catch in 2004 had to be discarded due to seal damage (ICES, 1995). Some flounder (Platichthys flesus) is also targeted by gill-net (ICES, 1993). Small-scale fisheries target mainly non-quota species, the most important being whitefish.

Prior to the 1990s, herring were mainly caught by trap-net, but by 2004, the fraction obtained by commercial trawl had increased to $90 \%$ (Rahikainen et al., 2004). The most important trawling sites in Finland are the southern and southwestern coasts, as the majority of Finland's catches are reported in ICES subdivisions 29, 30 and 32 (Figure 1; Table 1). Trap netting sites are more evenly distributed along the coast, with some concentration in the Archipelago Sea (subdivision 29; Sjöblom and Parmanne, 1975). More than $50 \%$ of Finland's total landings have been reported in subdivision 30 (the Bothnian Sea) since the early 1990 (Table 1).

In early periods of reporting, landings were recorded by ICES divisions IIIb, IIIc and IIId. Division IIIb represents the Sound, IIIc the Belt Sea (located between the Kattegat and Baltic Sea [collectively known as the transition zone]), and IIId the Baltic Sea (Table 2). These divisions were segregated into subdivisions by ICES in the late 1970s (ICES, 1987). In Finland, all reporting prior to the 1980 occurred in ICES
division IIId, which was followed by reporting in the corresponding subdivisions (24-32) beginning in the 1980s (Table 1; Table 2).

Fisheries management in Finland has traditionally been the responsibility of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Department of Fish and Game. Before joining the EU, Finland had the most centralized fisheries management system of any Nordic country. Commercial and recreational fishers were marginally

Table 2. ICES divisions and corresponding subdivisions representing the Danish Sound, Belt and Baltic Sea. Source: (ICES, 1987).

| ICES Division | ICES Subdivision |
| :--- | :---: |
| IIIb- Sound | 23 |
| IIIc- Belt Sea | 22 |
| IIId- Baltic Sea | $24-32$ | represented in management agencies and rarely involved in governmental decisions (Jentoft and McCay, 1995). This changed slightly when Finland joined the EU in 1995, as the overarching principles of the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) became the basis of fisheries governance. Though structural and marketoriented activities are set by this policy, there is some subjectivity as to how the Department of Fish and Game can interpret EU rules [e.g., at what time of year to enforce particular closures (FAO, 2005)]. Total Allowable Catches (TACs) are key elements of management in Finland, and reflect advice from ICES. The five key species in Finland subject to TACs are herring, salmon, sprat, cod, and plaice (FAO, 2005).

National and EU authorities mainly govern offshore waters and marine reserves, while coastal waters (a distance of 500 m from the 2 m depth line) are privately owned and managed. The Fishery Act requires stakeholders to design management plans for the fisheries in their area of water, including aspects on utilization, conservation and restoration. Owners form associations which collect revenue from license sales which are invested in management. All privately owned waters are also part of nationally administrated fisheries regions which provide opportunity for cooperation between owners and commercial fishers. Commercial fishers are heavily dependent on access to private waters and these associations address issues of minimum mesh and fish landing sizes as well as temporal closures. Recent developments and urbanization have fragmented private waters triggering complications in management which has initiated requests for re-evaluation of protocol.

On a larger scale, Finland shares many of the management challenges with other EU countries whose resource policies now fall under the CFP. Fishing fleet overcapacity is estimated to be $60 \%$ in the EU, and Finland struggles to balance the size and capacity of its fleet with available resources (FAO, 2005). In 2004, the offshore fleet was reduced from 47 to 16 vessels (ICES, 2005b).

The purpose of the present study is to provide an estimate of total fisheries catches in the Baltic Sea by Finland (1950-2007) and contrast these total catches with officially reported data. The ICES catch statistics database offers time series data on marine fisheries landings for this time period, but there has been no apparent effort to fully represent total catches (including Illegal, Unreported and Unallocated catches [IUU]) in contrast to landings. Therefore, for the purposes of our study, the ICES electronic database will be referred to as the 'ICES landings statistics', to better reflect the nature of the data presented, and represents the officially reported data. Sources of IUU include data source adjustments to reported landings data, unreported landings, discards, and recreational catches. Our approach utilizes data by the Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute (FGRI), a review of the academic and grey literature, as well as correspondence with local fishers and authorities.

## Methods

Reported landings extracted from the ICES landings statistics database (ICES, 2009) were used as the reported data baseline for our reconstruction of Finland's total catches in the Baltic Sea from 1950-2007. ICES landings statistics were used as the reported data foundation as they are the only publicly available data that present all countries' landings for all taxa and years (since 1950) in all areas of the Baltic Sea.

All catches that are not included in the ICES landings statistics were considered part of IUU. Here, IUU catches were considered in four components: a) 'adjustments' to ICES landings statistics based on time series data from reliable sources (e.g., ICES stock assessment working group data, national government agencies); b) 'unreported' landings (referred to as 'unallocated' catches by ICES); c) 'discards' being catches or mortality caused by fishing but where fish are not landed or utilized; and d) 'recreational' catches. The sum of these components plus the officially reported ICES landings statistics provided our total reconstructed catch for Finland from 1950-2007.

Using all available data and information, anchor points were derived or formed through an assumptionbased approach (see 'Methods' in Zeller et al., this volume). From these anchor points, a complete time series of data from 1950-2007 was constructed using linear interpolations and extrapolations for years when data were not available.

Here, our reconstruction presents the main commercially targeted species for Finland including cod (Gadus morhua); herring (Clupea harengus); sprat (Sprattus sprattus); salmon (Salmo salar); a flatfish grouping, which included plaice (Pleuronectes platessus), European flounder (Platichthys flesus), and turbot (Psetta maxima); and an additional 18 individual taxa grouped here for reporting as 'others'.

## Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) catches

Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) catches are a major source of underreporting in many country's fisheries catches (Zeller and Pauly, 2007) and are also of concern in the Baltic Sea (Menn, 2006; Anon., 2007b; Crona and Österblom, 2009). Below, we present the methods and data sources used to estimate the four IUU components defined above: a) ‘adjustments'; b) ‘unreported’ landings; c) ‘discards'; and d) 'recreational' catches.

Estimates of IUU catch components were based on information obtained through a range of primary and secondary sources. Information was primarily obtained through interviews and collaborations with fisheries experts at the Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute (FGFRI) who provided national fisheries catches (commercial landings and recreational catches; A. Ahvohenen and P. Söderkultalahti, pers. comm., FGFRI), although we also searched sources such as the European Union's DirectorateGeneral for Maritime Affairs, the ICES library, and the archives of Finnish newspapers, magazines and fisheries-related organizations.

Adjustments to ICES landings statistics
The reported ICES landings statistics were adjusted using Finnish landings data provided by FGFRI for the period from 1953-2007, for most taxa including cod, herring, sprat, salmon, flatfishes and 'others'. For some species in our group flatfishes and 'others', FGFRI data were available for slightly different periods of time (Table 3). Landings reported by FGFRI were considered more reliable than the ICES landings statistics for two reasons. Firstly, Finland is unique among the Baltic countries in that recreational catches have been estimated and reported nationally since the late 1950s. Secondly, Finland updated its national catch estimation methods in 1988, which led to a revision of reported landings for Finland from 1980-1986 (Ahvonen, 2001); yet, the ICES landings statistics database was not amended retroactively to account for these updated landings estimates (E. Aro, pers. comm., FGFRI). Thus, negative adjustments to ICES landings statistics were made to account for the inclusion of recreational catches and also to account for the new catch estimation methods by Finland. These adjustments made to ICES landings statistics to account for the

Table 3. Years when landings data provided by FGFRI were used as adjustments to the ICES landings statistics for some taxa included in our grouping of flatfishes and 'others'.

| Common name $^{\text {a }}$ | Scientific Name | Years |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Ide | Leuciscus idus | $1969-2007$ |
| Flounder | Platichthys flesus | $1974-2007$ |
| Trout | Salmonidae | $1974-2007$ |
| Eel | Anguilla anguilla | $1976-2007$ |
| Roach | Rutilus rutilus | $1979-2007$ |
| Freshwater species nei | - | $1980-2007$ |
| Turbot | Psetta maxima | $1996-2007$ |
| European plaice | Pleuronectes platessa | $2006-2007$ |
| Whiting | Merlangius merlangus | $2006-2007$ |
| Other (various) | - | $1953-1979$ |

as defined by FGFRI inclusion of Finland's recreational catches made Finland's landings data comparable to all other Baltic countries by reflecting commercial fisheries landings only.

Adjustments were made for all taxa in years when FGFRI data indicated that catches were different than what was presented in the ICES landings statistics. However, careful attention was paid to not adjust landings for taxa that may have been included in another taxon or group. For example, a gap in cod data from 1959-1961 was not interpolated, as Finnish cod catches were so small during this period that they

Table 4. Anchor points (\%) used for estimating unreported landings for cod, salmon and other taxa from 1950-2007 based on sources (Tables 2.3.1 and 2.4.1 in ICES, 2007; Table 2.1.2. in ICES, 2008a). Dashed lines (-) indicate years when linear interpolations were used.

| Year | Western <br> cod | Eastern <br> cod | Salmon | Other <br> taxa |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1950 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| $1951-1979$ | - | - | - | - |
| 1980 | 20.1 | 43.9 | 19.9 | 12.3 |
| 1981 | - | - | 6.4 | - |
| 1982 | - | - | 6.5 | - |
| 1983 | - | - | 7.1 | - |
| 1984 | - | - | 6.4 | - |
| 1985 | - | - | 5.8 | - |
| 1986 | - | - | 7.0 | - |
| 1987 | - | - | 6.5 | - |
| 1988 | - | - | 7.1 | - |
| 1989 | - | - | 7.1 | - |
| 1990 | - | - | 7.2 | - |
| 1991 | - | - | 5.8 | - |
| 1992 | - | - | 5.6 | - |
| 1993 | 40.2 | 87.7 | 5.9 | 24.6 |
| 1994 | 39.6 | 123.6 | 5.9 | 30.3 |
| 1995 |  | 29.7 | 6.2 | - |
| 1996 | 5.3 | 13.1 | 6.4 | - |
| 1997 | - | - | 6.5 | - |
| 1998 | - | - | 6.7 | - |
| 1999 | - | - | 6.6 | - |
| 2000 | - | 46.0 | 6.8 | - |
| 2001 | - | 47.5 | 6.6 | - |
| 2002 | - | 47.5 | 6.5 | - |
| 2003 | - | 59.8 | 6.7 | - |
| 2004 | 0.1 | 52.9 | 6.0 | 12.3 |
| 2005 | $0.0^{\text {b }}$ | 46.4 | 6.2 | 11.2 |
| 2006 | $0.0^{\text {b, c }}$ | 46.9 | 6.0 | $11.2^{\text {c }}$ |
| 2007 | $0.0^{\text {b, c }}$ | 43.2 | 6.5 | $11.2^{\text {c }}$ |
| andudes $a l l$ |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ includes all taxa except cod and salmon. ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ less than 0.05 . ${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$ rate from 2005 carried forward.
may have been included as part of the grouping 'others'. Trout were not adjusted either, as they were reported as a component of salmon catches from 1953-1973. Thus, our aim was to not risk double counting catches in order to remain conservative when making adjustments on a taxonomic basis.

## Unreported landings

Percentage rates for unreported landings were applied to the sum of ICES landings statistics plus adjustments to estimate total unreported landings for each respective taxon or group. Despite a dearth of information on Finnish unreported landings, it is likely that Finland did have some unreported landings between 1950 and 2007. For example, Finnish fishers are known to have Table 5. Anchor points (\%) been involved in for estimating underwater large-scale operations to catch and sell unreported cod caught and sold in Sweden in the $1980 s$ (P.-O. Larsson, pers. comm., Swedish Board of Fisheries). We estimated unreported landings from ICES stock assessment working group for cod (ICES, 2007; 2008a) and salmon data (ICES, 2008b); and for all other taxa using our assumed default approach (Table 4; see 'Methods' in Zeller et al., this volume). Other data sources also suggest that Finland has unreported landings. For example, when comparing import/export data and consumption patterns with landings, Ahvonen (1998) found that the unreported landings of salmon were approximately 16-33\%. Ahvonen's method for estimating unreported catches was not used here, because unfortunately Finland's trade statistics for fisheries products have become much more aggregated since joining the EU in 1995. Unreported landings in the Baltic Sea have mainly focused on cod, and Finland has traditionally caught very little relative to the other Baltic countries. For this reason, the EU did not include Finland in its recent evaluation of the reliability of Baltic countries in reporting cod catches (Anon., 2007a).
discards for Finnish herring and sprat catches adjusted to reflect all landings based on Rahikainen et al. (2004)

| Year | Underwater <br> discard |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1950-1979$ | $2.50^{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| 1980 | 2.54 |
| 1981 | 2.06 |
| 1982 | 2.90 |
| 1983 | 3.86 |
| 1984 | 5.18 |
| 1985 | 5.59 |
| 1986 | 6.29 |
| 1987 | 5.36 |
| 1988 | 5.78 |
| 1989 | 6.70 |
| 1990 | 6.61 |
| 1991 | 7.23 |
| 1992 | 7.52 |
| 1993 | 7.21 |
| 1994 | 7.77 |
| 1995 | 8.12 |
| 1996 | 8.00 |
| 1997 | 8.30 |
| 1998 | 8.10 |
| 1999 | 8.50 |
| 2000 | 8.46 |
| $2001-2007$ | $8.46^{\mathrm{b}}$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ 1980-1982 average carried back to 1950; ${ }^{\text {b }} 2000$ rate carried forward unaltered to 2007.

## Discards

Discards were considered as four separate categories, each calculated as a rate by estimating discard tonnage as a proportion of reported landings from the respective sources. The four discard categories considered for Finland were: a) 'underwater discards', which accounted for the mortality of fish lost from actively fishing gear prior to being brought on board; b) 'ghostfishing' due to lost or abandoned fishing gear that continues to fish; c) 'boat-based discards' usually resulting from fishers' catch retention behavior; and d) 'seal-damaged discards' representing the fraction of catch discarded because of seal damage. To avoid the chance of double counting, seal discard data were used in place of boat-based discards when estimated seal-damaged discards where higher than boat-based discards. Rates for each
category were applied to the estimated total landings of each respective taxon (i.e., ICES landings statistics + adjustments + unreported landings), giving an estimated total discard amount for each category. The sum of the discard amounts for each category gave us a total discards amount for Finland from 1950-2007.
'Underwater discards': An underwater discard rate for herring of approximately $9 \%$ was estimated for catches from Finland's trawl fisheries in subdivision 32 from 1980-2000 based on Rahikainen et al. (2004). We applied this rate to all of herring landings by trawl for all years and subdivisions.

Data on the proportion of Finnish landings that were caught in trawl fisheries were only available from 1980-2000. The rate from 2000 was carried forward to 2007. To estimate the rate from 1950-1979, we used the average rate from 1980-1982. We used the same rates for sprat as both herring and sprat are pelagic species that are caught in a mixed fishery using similar gear-types. We adjusted the above rates to reflect landings by all gear-types (Table 5).
'Ghostfishing': Ghostfishing is a worldwide problem that was highlighted in recent work by Macfadyen et al. (2009). Our estimate of Finland's ghostfishing discards was derived from a study by Tschernij and Larsson (2003), which estimated the amount of cod caught by lost gear in Sweden, and related these ghostfishing discards to commercial landings in Sweden. Estimates from this source were converted by Brown et al. (2005) into a range of ghostfishing rates. Here, we used the average of this range, which was estimated to be $1.65 \%$. This rate was then applied to all taxa, except herring and sprat, for all years. Ghostfishing is mostly associated with lost gear that ends up on the bottom of the ocean so it is not a major concern for pelagic species such as herring and sprat.
'Boat-based discards': Finland specific boat-based discard data were not available. Therefore, we relied on information from ICES stock assessment working group reports to estimate boat-based discards for salmon (ICES, 2008b) and cod (ICES, 2007; 2008a), and information from a Danish study (Anon., 2006) to derive estimates for the flatfishes and the group 'others' (see 'Methods' in Zeller et al., this volume). For herring and sprat, we assumed a boat-based discard rate of o\% for herring and sprat during the entire study period, based on an ICES reports that indicates that boat-based discards for herring and sprat were almost non-existent (ICES, 2005a; 2007; 2008a).
'Seal-damaged discards': Seal-damaged discards have been a political concern in the Baltic Sea since the 198 os when seal populations increased again from a previously depleted state (Österblom et al., 2007). We assumed seal-damaged discards to be mostly a commercial fishing issue; therefore, we applied sealdiscard rates to total landings data (ICES landings statistics + adjustments + unreported landings), but not to recreational catches. It is likely that a proportion of seal-damaged discards may have been included in accounts of boat-based discards for species targeted by seals. To avoid the possibility of double counting, seal-damaged discard rates replaced the boat-based discard rate in years when the seal-discard rate was higher.

Estimates of Finland's yearly seal-damaged discard tonnage were made available by FGFRI from 2000-2007 for herring, salmon, trout, whitefish, perch, pikeperch and vendace in ICES subdivisions 24-32. However, these estimates do not account for fish that are completely removed from fishing nets by seals prior to gear retrieval. A separate study investigating the removal of fish by seals from fixed gear in Sweden (Königson et al., 2005; Anon., 2005) quantified this loss as 7.4 times the sealdamaged discards that were retained in the gear and brought to the surface. Thus, to account for total seal discards in coastal waters of Finland (Subdivisions 29-32) by fixed-gears, the reported discards provided by FGFRI were raised by a factor of 7.4. These discards were then transformed into a percentage of FGFRI reported commercial landings for the respective species or groups. We assumed a zero percent sealdamaged discarding rate for years prior to 1980, and interpolated rates linearly between 1980 and 2000 (Table 6). For herring, seal-damaged discard rates replaced boat-based discard rates from 1980-2007, as we assumed conservatively that boat-based discarding for these taxa was likely zero for the entire study period (see above).

Table 6. Anchor points (\%) used for estimating for sealdamaged discard rates for herring based on sources (FGFRI, 2009; Königson, 2005). Boat-based discards were assumed to be zero from 1950-2007. Dashed line (-) indicates interpolated rates.

| Year | Seal-damaged <br> discard |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1980 | 0.00 |
| $1981-1999$ | - |
| 2000 | 0.09 |
| 2001 | 0.33 |
| 2002 | 0.10 |
| 2003 | 0.51 |
| 2004 | 0.06 |
| 2005 | 0.16 |
| 2006 | 0.25 |
| 2007 | 0.39 |

Seal-damaged discard rates for salmon, derived from FGFRI data, were compared to the boat-based salmon discard rates derived from ICES stock assessment working group data (see 'Methods' in Zeller et al., this volume) for the period 1980-2007 (Table 7). To avoid potential double accounting due to damage caused by seals, only the higher discard rate between the two categories was used.

Species specific, seal-damaged discard rates for trout, whitefish, perch, pikeperch, and vendace were derived from FGFRI data and compared to the default boat-based discard rates for these species derived from a Danish study (Anon., 2006). The higher discard rate was chosen to avoid double accounting, in cases where seal-discards may have already been accounted for in the boat-based discards.

Recreational catches
Estimates of Finland's recreational catches from the Baltic Sea were provided by our collaborators at FGFRI. FGFRI has undertaken studies to estimate recreational catches throughout most of the time period considered here (FGFRI, 2009). Recreational catches were estimated by FGFRI starting in 1953 and since 1986 these estimates have been done every other year with the exception of 1955-1958 and 1960-1961 when recreational catch surveys were not carried out. In years when recreational catch surveys were not done, FGFRI provided estimates of recreational catches for the non-surveyed years. For the period 1950-1952, we estimated annual recreational catches based on the average catch from 1953-1955 as reported by FGFRI.

Overall, our total reconstructed catch was the sum of ICES landings statistics, reported landings adjustments and estimates of unreported landings, discards and recreational catches. The estimated total reconstructed catch was then compared to the officially reported data, defined here as the ICES landings statistics.

## Results

ICES landing statistics for Finland totaled $4,468,766 \mathrm{t}$ over the 1950-2007 time period (Figure 2). Landings according to ICES showed a steady increase over the study period from around 20,000 $t$ in 1950 to approximately $100,000 \mathrm{t} \cdot$ year $^{-1}$ in the late 1970s. A significant decline in reported landings occurred in the early 1990 s to roughly $75,000 t \cdot y e a r^{-1}$, followed by an increase from the mid-1990s to the early 2000s, with the highest reported landings of almost 130,000 $t$ in 2007 (Figure 2).

## Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) catches

Catches that were not presented in the ICES landings statistics were considered components of IUU. These included data source adjustments to ICES landings, unreported ('unallocated') landings, discards and recreational catches.

## Adjustments to ICES landings statistics

Negative adjustments of $180,437 \mathrm{t}$ were made to the ICES landings statistics for Finland using national data sources. These adjustments were, in part, due to recreational catches being included in the ICES landings for some years over the period 1950-2007. Given that we accounted for recreational catches separately (see below), we excluded the recreational component from reported landings here, resulting in negative adjustments. Adjustments to landings were greatest in the late 1970 a throughout the 2000s (Table 8;


Figure 2. ICES landings statistics (solid line) and adjustments to ICES landings (dashed line) for Finland from 1950-2007 Appendix Table A1). The most substantial adjustments to landings were for the group 'others'.

Table 8. Total adjustments (tonnes) to ICES landings statistics for Finland Unreported landings
from 1950-2007.

| Common name | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1950- \\ 1959 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1960- \\ 1969 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1970 \\ & 1979 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1980- \\ 1989 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1990 \\ 1999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2000- \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cod | 216 | -167 | -3,390 | -2 | 1 | -38 |
| Herring | -2,910 | -10,246 | -5,894 | -1 | -2 | -5,532 |
| Sprat | 3,060 | -107 | -385 | 1 | -2 | -407 |
| Flatfishes | 0 | 0 | -914 | 1 | -6 | -1,588 |
| Salmon | 127 | -504 | -473 | 3 | 1 | -832 |
| 'Others' | -4,520 | -35,333 | -43,994 | 304 | -157 | -66,745 |

Table 9. Total estimated unreported landings (tonnes) of commercially targeted species in Finland from 1950-2007.

| Common | $\mathbf{1 9 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0 -}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| name | $\mathbf{1 9 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ |
| Cod | 60 | 17 | 650 | 13,660 | 4,792 | 3,593 |
| Herring | 16,061 | 36,046 | 76,596 | 135,787 | 203,381 | 86,074 |
| Sprat | 1062 | 1,365 | 2,362 | 1,293 | 20,678 | 20,206 |
| Flatfishes | 0 | 0 | 49 | 92 | 199 | 72 |
| Salmon | 242 | 408 | 937 | 562 | 814 | 221 |
| 'Others' | 4,777 | 5,354 | 6,683 | 4,917 | 10,452 | 4,053 |

Estimated unreported landings for all taxa from 1950-2007 totaled approximately $663,500 \mathrm{t}$. Unreported landings increased steadily over the study period from about $1,000 t \cdot y e a r^{-1}$ in 1950 to almost 21,000 t•year-1 in 1988. After this, there was a slight decline before unreported landings increased again to a likely peak of over $31,000 t \cdot y e a r^{-1}$ in 1994 (Figure 3; Appendix Table A1). Unreported landings declined steadily after that to about $13,000 \mathrm{t} \cdot$ year $^{-1}$ in 2007.

Herring represented the largest component of unreported landings, which were estimated to be about 29,600 $t \cdot$ year $^{-1}$ in 1994. Estimated unreported landings of herring increased steadily from 675 $t \cdot$ year $^{-1}$ in 1950 to about 29,600 t•year ${ }^{-1}$ in 1994 and then decreased to an average of approximately 8,700 $t \cdot y e a r^{-1}$ from 2003-2007. During the period 1950-2007, unreported landings of herring totaled over $550,000 \mathrm{t}$.


Figure 3. Finland's unreported landings by taxa for the period 1950-2007.

Unreported landings of cod were highest in 1984 adding approximately $3,000 \mathrm{t}$ to the reported landings of $2,137 \mathrm{t}$ for that year. Unreported landings of sprat were low from 19501994, averaging $146 \mathrm{t} \cdot \mathrm{year}^{-1}$. After this period, a dramatic increase occurred during which unreported landings averaged approximately $3,100 \mathrm{t} \cdot$ year $^{-1}$ from 1995-2007 (Figure 3, Appendix Table A4. Unreported landings of salmon were relatively low over the entire study period, ranging from approximately $20 \mathrm{t} \cdot$ year $^{-1}$ to $150 \mathrm{t} \cdot$ year $^{-1}$ (Figure 3). Unreported landings of


Figure 4. Finland's discards by taxa for the period 1950-2007.
flatfishes were minimal totaling about 400 t over the time period 1974-2007. The group of flatfishes, which included European flounder, European plaice and turbot, represented a very small proportion of estimated unreported landings due in part to our assumption that from 1950-1973 landings of flatfishes were reported as one of the 'miscellaneous' categories included within the group 'others'. From 19502007, unreported landings of 'others' totaled approximately 36,000 t (Appendix Table A7).

## Discards

Estimated total discards for all species from 1950-2007 were approximately 372,800 t (Figure 4). Discards increased steadily over the study period from about $1,400 \mathrm{t}$ •year ${ }^{-1}$ in 1950 to a peak of over 15,000 $t \cdot$ year $^{-1}$ in 1997. Discards were highest throughout the 1990s and into the 2000s. Herring accounted for the largest amount of discards and totaled approximately 291,000 t over the study period, with a peak in 1994 of over 12,000 $t \cdot$ year $^{-1}$ (Appendix Table A3). Over the study period, cod discards totaled 5,000 t. Salmon discards were substantial in comparison to reported salmon landings, adding nearly $16,000 \mathrm{t}$ to the total reported ICES landings for salmon of 37,625 t from 1950-2007. Sprat discards were low throughout the

Table 10. Total estimated discards (tonnes) of commercially targeted species in Finland from 1950-2007.

| Common | $\mathbf{1 9 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0 -}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| name | $\mathbf{1 9 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ |
| Cod | 90 | 13 | 445 | 2,414 | 789 | 850 |
| Herring | 11,267 | 18,810 | 31,922 | 61,142 | 96,551 | 71,694 |
| Sprat | 770 | 723 | 973 | 526 | 10,517 | 16,513 |
| Flatfishes | 0 | 0 | 237 | 318 | 492 | 258 |
| Salmon | 587 | 595 | 1,019 | 1,897 | 8,120 | 3,514 |
| 'Others' | 6,569 | 5,402 | 5,362 | 2,747 | 4,165 | 5,158 |

Table 11. Total recreational catches ( t ) for Finland, 1950-2007.

| Common | $\mathbf{1 9 5 0 -}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 6 0 -}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}-$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}-$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0 -}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| name | $\mathbf{1 9 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ |
| Cod | 72 | 168 | 3,528 | 12,667 | 646 | 30 |
| Herring | 1,390 | 15,658 | 9,321 | 10,532 | 12,798 | 5,176 |
| Sprat | 132 | 390 | 475 | 433 | 30 | 340 |
| Flatfishes | - | - | 1,001 | 3,338 | 5,922 | 1,366 |
| Salmon | 141 | 513 | 629 | 1,293 | 1,736 | 644 |
| Others' $^{\prime}$ | 17,015 | 37,053 | 52,704 | 64,920 | 128,01 | 66,786 | first four decades of the study period, increasing dramatically in the mid-1990s and remaining substantial throughout the 2000 (Table 10). Flatfish discards were quite low, totaling around 1,300 t over the study period (Figure 4).

## Recreational catch

Total catches for Finland's recreational fisheries in the Baltic Sea from 1950-2007 were reported as $456,679 \mathrm{t}$ (Figure 5). Note that Finland reports recreational catches nationally and that the national data set provided by FGRI had separate accounting for commercial landings and for recreational catches.

Recreational catches increased steadily from around $1,600 \mathrm{t} \cdot \mathrm{year}^{-1}$ in 1950 to between 10,000 $t \cdot$ year $^{-1}$ and 20,000 $\mathrm{t} \cdot \mathrm{year}^{-1}$ in the 1990s (Figure 5, Appendix Table A1). The majority of recreational catches were of 'other species', which represented $80 \%$ of the total recreational


Figure 5. Finland's recreational catches by taxa from 1950-2007.
catch for Finland from 1950-2007. Herring represented $12 \%$, cod $4 \%$, salmon $1 \%$, and sprat contributed less than $0.4 \%$ of total recreational catches over the entire study period (Figure 5). Recreational catches of 'others' totaled over 366,000 t from 1950-2007 and were most substantial during the 1990s (Table 11).

## Total reconstructed catches

The total catch for Finland as reconstructed here combined reported ICES landings statistics, adjustments,


Figure 6. Finland's total reconstructed catch by component from 1950-2007. unreported landings, discards and recreational catches, (Table 12, Figure 6). The total reconstructed catch was estimated to be 5,781,000 t for the period 1950-2007 (Appendix Table A1). This compares to the 4,468,766 t that was reported in the ICES landings statistics for the same period (Figure 7).

This discrepancy of over 29\% between officially reported landings and estimated total catches was due to significant quantities of unreported landings and discards (since recreational catches were included, at least partially, in the data reported by ICES on

Table 12. Total reconstructed catches (tonnes) of commercially targeted species in Finland from 1950-2007.

| Common | $\mathbf{1 9 5 0 -}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0 -}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0 -}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| name | $\mathbf{1 9 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ |
| Cod | 924 | 290 | 6,839 | 61,978 | 19,866 | 12,916 |
| Herring | 284,129 | 487,684 | 810,368 | $1,020,216$ | $1,123,617$ | 769,876 |
| Sprat | 19,450 | 18,528 | 24,887 | 11,028 | 117,288 | 180,182 |
| Flatfishes | 0 | 0 | 1,714 | 4,298 | 7,409 | 2,154 |
| Salmon | 4,374 | 4,806 | 7,984 | 11,107 | 23,735 | 7,812 |
| 'Others' | 106,839 | 110,913 | 126,018 | 102,481 | 184,960 | 104,331 | behalf of Finland).

Unreported landings and discard estimates added over 1 million $t$ to the reported landings (Figure 7). The majority of unreported landings and discards were attributed to fisheries involving herring. Recreational fisheries, dominated by the group 'others', accounted for approximately 500,000 $t$ from 1950-2007. The cod fishery in Finland was modest compared to those in other Baltic countries; however, unreported landings, discards and recreational catches of cod together totaled approximately 45,000 t between 1950 and 2007, an increase of $67 \%$ to data reported in the ICES landings statistics (Figure 7). Overall, unreported landings, discards and recreational catches represented $12 \%, 6 \%$ and $8 \%$ of the total reconstructed catch for Finland, respectively (Figure 6).

## DISCUSSION

Our reconstruction of Finland's total catch, including reported landings from ICES landings statistics (ICES, 2009), adjustments to landings, unreported landings, discards, and recreational catches, totaled approximately 5.8 million tonnes for the period 1950 to 2007. Finland's annual landings data as reported by ICES total approximately 4.5 million tonnes for the same period (19502007). The difference of approximately 1.3 million tonnes (29\%) between ICES data and our total catch reconstruction suggests the magnitude of IUU catches in


Figure 7. Total reconstructed catch and ICES landings statistics for Finland from 1950-2007.

Finland between 1950 and 2007. The discrepancy between these datasets (estimating landings versus estimating catches) displays the significant mortality rates and impacts on the Baltic ecosystem that are not accounted for. This discrepancy can mislead the public and complicates the decision making process for policy makers who are forced to rely on incomplete or underestimated catch records when setting TACs or deciding upon other management strategies (closures, gear restrictions, etc.).

Our estimates of IUU catches were based on conservative methods and our catch reconstruction is thought to underestimate the total catch between 1950 and 2007. However, it undoubtedly provides a more accurate baseline than current statistics available from ICES which assume zero IUU catches. Even though our catch reconstruction presents a $29 \%$ increase in catches between 1950 and 2007 (as compared to ICES landings statistics), Finland's total estimate of IUU was one of the lowest of all Baltic countries. This is due in part because of Finland's exemplary efforts at accounting for the recreational fishing sector since 1953. Landings reported to ICES since this time have included recreational catches, meaning the majority of IUU catches unaccounted for in Finland were comprised of unreported landings and discards. The Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute (FGFRI) provided us with all commercial and recreational landings data from 1953 to present. FGFRI data were more comprehensive than data presented by ICES on behalf of Finland. Adjustments were made to ICES data with a national dataset that displayed a greater degree of transparency and accountability in Finnish fisheries management compared to other Baltic countries.

Our catch reconstruction showed herring to be the species most affected by IUU fishing in Finland since 1950. This is due in part to the fact that herring is the most important species fished in Finland by volume. Unreported landings of herring were estimated to be about 560,000 tonnes, and discards of herring were estimated to total approximately 300,000 tonnes between 1950 and 2007. Unreported landings of cod in Finland were only $4 \%$ of the amount of unreported landings of herring when summed over the period of study (1950-2007). The Finish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry reports that the majority of cod fishing occurs outside of the Finnish EEZ and that in 2005, most cod landings were made in Swedish and Danish ports, with zero cod landings in Finnish ports (Anon., 2007b). Finland's unreported landings of cod still represented about $37 \%$ of cod landings reported to ICES between 1950 and 2007 (i.e., catch volumes of cod are low, but the rate of underreporting is relatively high.

As a Member of the EU, Finland is required to enforce the regulations of the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP), and to report details on serious infringements to the European Commission (EC; the legislative arm of the EU). These rules were formed in an effort to encourage transparency and consistency between Member States with regards to CFP enforcement. In 2003, 18 serious infringements were reported by Finland ( $50 \%$ of the total number of infringements in Finland) and the average fine was a low $€ 282$. This is compared to already low Baltic-wide average fine of $€ 464$. However, little direct comparison can be made between these figures, since there are no standards for evaluating fishers' behaviors among EU members. When a Member state is believed to be in noncompliance with Community laws, the Commission can issue a request for a written description of the country's observations relating to the subject of investigation. If the opinion of the Community remains unchanged after receiving this written report, court proceedings can be initiated. In 2004, two procedures were initiated against Finland for exceeding catch quotas, and one procedure was initiated for failing to provide catch or fishing effort data to the EC (Anon., 2007b).

Little information regarding discards in Finland was available from national or ICES datasets. However, estimates of discards caused by seal-induced damages were available from the FGFRI. These records were augmented using a Swedish study to include the mortalities of fish removed completely from nets by seals. The most significantly affected species by seal-induced damages was salmon, as approximately $26 \%$ of the total reconstructed salmon catch was discarded (this proportion includes boat-based, ghostfishing and seal-induced discards). Some progress has been made in modified gear designs and the choice of netting material used to build trap-nets to protect fish from seal damage. Three out of five modified gear models examined by Siira, (2007) were considered to be successful. The pontoon trap was noted as the most successful of those tested, where seal-induced damages were practically non-existent (Hemmingsson et al., 2008). Protection from seal damage is necessary, as coastal salmon fishers in the Gulf of Bothnia have been severely challenged by related socio-economic factors in recent decades. Salmon populations were considered to have recovered in the early 1990s after reductions were made in the Baltic TAC for the species, and strict seasonal closures were enforced. However, drastic increases in recreational fishing of salmon since this time, in addition to vast increases in grey seal populations have left commercial salmon fishers with inadequate stock sizes to maintain their livelihoods. Less vulnerable trapping methods will
lessen the pressures induced by fisheries on salmon stocks, as well as allow more accurate accounting of salmon catches, as estimates of salmon taken by seals from set trap-nets would be unnecessary.

Discards of herring were the most substantial by volume. The total discards of herring accounted for almost $80 \%$ of the discards of all taxa between 1950 and 2007. Though discards of herring were substantial by volume, they accounted for only $8 \%$ of the total reported landings of herring by ICES, and $6.5 \%$ of the overall reconstructed catch of herring between 1950 and 2007. This emphasizes how little economic incentive there is to high-grade fish destined for industrial purposes. The second most affected species by discards was sprat, which is due to it being caught as bycatch in the pelagic herring fishery. Discards of flatfishes were the least severe (by volume) out of all Finnish fisheries, but represented about $25 \%$ of the total landings of flatfishes reported to ICES and the responsible fishing behaviors may be of significant concern. Flatfishes also represented a fairly large portion of the recreational catches, with over 11,000 tonnes reported over the period of study.

Recently, ICES reported some improvement of the eastern Baltic cod stock and recommended an increase of the TAC by $15 \%$. This is the maximum amount allowed under the EU's management plan for Baltic cod fishing (Veem, 2009). The observed improvement in stock size, however, has not elevated cod abundance beyond what are considered historically low levels, which are still far from what would be considered sustainable in the long-term. Historically, ICES' scientifically-recommended TAC levels for the management of cod stocks have been increased due to so-called socio-economic factors within the fishing industry. It has been commonplace for ICES TAC recommendations to be increased by a factor of 3 during negotiations with the European Council of Ministers (WWF, 2006) and Russia.

Our methods used all the information available to combine reported landings with estimates of IUU catches. Apart from the adjustments to commercial landings and recreational catches that were obtained from the dataset provided by the FGFRI, the majority of our estimates were derived from Baltic-wide data presented in ICES stock assessment working group reports. The number of countries whose discards or unreported ('unallocated') landings are included in these Baltic-wide estimates is unknown due to publicly non-transparent confidentiality agreements. Thus, in some sense, under current regulations, countries are able to remain anonymous and relatively unaccountable for IUU fishing. Though some of these data are available to the stock assessment community within ICES, the 'true' level of catches lacks transparency to the public who are the ultimate beneficiaries and owners of a common resource.

Increased transparency with regard to all fisheries catches is necessary in order for all stakeholders to be informed and to become involved in the future well-being of the Baltic Sea ecosystem. In addition to increased accountability and transparency of IUU catches of target species, regulations should require accountability for all species caught by fishing gear whether or not they are economically valuable, or whether they are discarded or brought to port. When all catches resulting from fishing gear are accounted for, management can begin to evolve towards an ecosystem-based management system that considers the whole ecosystem rather than focusing on single species in isolation from their environment. Records of these catches will facilitate the modeling of Baltic Sea ecosystems and key ecosystem processes governing some of the observed issues. Such baseline data would also provide the tools required to generate scenarios illustrating various management protocols and allow decision-makers and the public to make decisions based upon various biological, social and economic factors that incorporate both short- and long-term goals. An ecosystem-based management system will also require the cooperation of all Baltic countries to contribute such data, so the ecosystem can be considered in its entirety.
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## ApPENDIX A

Appendix Table A1. ICES landing statistics, adjustments to ICES landing statistics, unreported landings, discards, recreational catch, and reconstructed total for Finland ( t ).

| Year | ICES landing statistics | Adjustments | Unreported | Discards | Recreational | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1950 | 18,838 | 4,756 | 1,180 | 1,394 | 1,643 | 27,811 |
| 1951 | 15,725 | 5,037 | 1,090 | 1,268 | 1,643 | 24,763 |
| 1952 | 17,705 | 5,178 | 1,258 | 1,368 | 1,643 | 27,152 |
| 1953 | 42,669 | -1,780 | 2,346 | 2,155 | 1,643 | 47,033 |
| 1954 | 45,800 | -4,911 | 2,447 | 2,160 | 1,643 | 47,139 |
| 1955 | 44,100 | -3,211 | 2,547 | 2,166 | 1,643 | 47,245 |
| 1956 | 41,500 | -611 | 2,648 | 2,171 | 1,643 | 47,351 |
| 1957 | 44,100 | -3,211 | 2,748 | 2,176 | 1,643 | 47,456 |
| 1958 | 42,200 | -1,311 | 2,849 | 2,181 | 1,643 | 47,562 |
| 1959 | 46,871 | -3,963 | 3,089 | 2,245 | 3,963 | 52,204 |
| 1960 | 46,700 | -3,792 | 3,193 | 2,250 | 3,964 | 52,315 |
| 1961 | 46,900 | -3,992 | 3,298 | 2,255 | 3,965 | 52,426 |
| 1962 | 41,361 | -7,019 | 2,728 | 1,830 | 10,711 | 49,611 |
| 1963 | 60,349 | -3,198 | 4,671 | 2,846 | 6,576 | 71,244 |
| 1964 | 46,230 | -3,819 | 3,577 | 2,174 | 3,791 | 51,953 |
| 1965 | 56,958 | -4,092 | 4,581 | 2,693 | 4,093 | 64,233 |
| 1966 | 52,909 | -3,831 | 4,371 | 2,479 | 4,106 | 60,034 |
| 1967 | 54,834 | -4,160 | 4,641 | 2,581 | 4,161 | 62,057 |
| 1968 | 70,820 | -7,765 | 5,927 | 3,173 | 7,764 | 79,919 |
| 1969 | 69,002 | -4,689 | 6,202 | 3,262 | 4,651 | 78,429 |
| 1970 | 62,814 | -4,704 | 5,745 | 2,958 | 5,100 | 71,913 |
| 1971 | 63,798 | 13 | 6,464 | 3,187 | 6,298 | 79,761 |
| 1972 | 62,615 | 0 | 6,500 | 3,239 | 6,879 | 79,233 |
| 1973 | 80,638 | -5,842 | 7,950 | 3,769 | 5,842 | 92,356 |
| 1974 | 86,928 | -5,900 | 8,824 | 4,161 | 5,900 | 99,913 |
| 1975 | 85,626 | -6,250 | 8,846 | 4,069 | 6,591 | 98,882 |
| 1976 | 92,166 | -6,591 | 9,736 | 4,324 | 6,875 | 106,510 |
| 1977 | 94,057 | -6,646 | 10,165 | 4,418 | 6,646 | 108,640 |
| 1978 | 106,655 | -9,271 | 11,597 | 4,921 | 8,462 | 122,364 |
| 1979 | 102,671 | -9,859 | 11,449 | 4,912 | 9,065 | 118,238 |
| 1980 | 83,558 | -1 | 10,739 | 4,241 | 10,601 | 109,137 |
| 1981 | 74,663 | 42 | 10,493 | 3,395 | 8,866 | 97,459 |
| 1982 | 82,229 | 37 | 12,465 | 4,637 | 9,348 | 108,715 |
| 1983 | 92,337 | 37 | 15,001 | 6,124 | 8,879 | 122,377 |
| 1984 | 96,031 | 43 | 16,630 | 7,684 | 7,497 | 127,885 |
| 1985 | 96,074 | 31 | 17,237 | 8,263 | 7,194 | 128,800 |
| 1986 | 91,016 | 21 | 17,049 | 8,593 | 10,393 | 127,072 |
| 1987 | 88,914 | 55 | 17,374 | 7,775 | 10,393 | 124,511 |
| 1988 | 100,002 | 38 | 20,644 | 9,197 | 9,916 | 139,797 |
| 1989 | 87,619 | 2 | 18,679 | 9,137 | 9,916 | 125,353 |
| 1990 | 73,716 | 12 | 16,275 | 8,178 | 10,003 | 108,184 |
| 1991 | 60,249 | -15 | 13,907 | 7,268 | 10,003 | 91,412 |
| 1992 | 79,143 | -31 | 18,511 | 9,802 | 20,991 | 128,416 |
| 1993 | 83,570 | 37 | 20,308 | 10,066 | 20,991 | 134,971 |
| 1994 | 103,420 | 0 | 31,479 | 13,269 | 12,784 | 160,952 |
| 1995 | 106,093 | -35 | 29,996 | 13,862 | 12,784 | 162,701 |
| 1996 | 116,597 | -32 | 30,420 | 14,599 | 14,843 | 176,428 |
| 1997 | 117,619 | -25 | 29,004 | 15,229 | 14,843 | 176,671 |
| 1998 | 118,829 | -55 | 27,367 | 14,740 | 15,951 | 176,831 |
| 1999 | 107,711 | -23 | 23,049 | 13,622 | 15,951 | 160,309 |
| 2000 | 121,643 | -11,621 | 21,773 | 13,797 | 11,542 | 157,134 |
| 2001 | 115,268 | -11,746 | 18,681 | 13,038 | 11,542 | 146,784 |
| 2002 | 110,030 | -11,628 | 15,791 | 12,128 | 8,273 | 134,595 |
| 2003 | 86,314 | -8,326 | 11,463 | 10,105 | 8,273 | 107,828 |
| 2004 | 99,163 | -7,169 | 11,597 | 11,257 | 7,111 | 121,959 |
| 2005 | 95,476 | -7,180 | 9,964 | 10,692 | 7,111 | 116,062 |
| 2006 | 109,780 | -7,162 | 11,602 | 12,377 | 10,245 | 136,842 |
| 2007 | 128,164 | -10,311 | 13,360 | 14,611 | 10,245 | 156,068 |

Appendix Table A2. ICES landing statistics, adjustments to ICES landing statistics, unreported landings, discards, recreational catch, and reconstructed total for cod (Gadus morhua) for Finland ( t ).

| Year | ICES landing statistics | Adjustments | Unreported | Discards | Recreational | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1950 | 0 | 78 | 4 | 10 | 8 | 100 |
| 1951 | 0 | 78 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 100 |
| 1952 | 0 | 78 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 101 |
| 1953 | 86 | -8 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 102 |
| 1954 | 100 | -22 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 103 |
| 1955 | 100 | -22 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 103 |
| 1956 | 100 | -22 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 104 |
| 1957 |  | 78 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 105 |
| 1958 | 100 | -22 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 106 |
| 1959 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1960 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1961 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1962 | 27 | -13 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 32 |
| 1963 | 12 | -5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 14 |
| 1964 | 16 | -9 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 18 |
| 1965 | 23 | -3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 29 |
| 1966 | 26 | -12 | 3 | 2 | 12 | 30 |
| 1967 | 27 | -21 | 1 | 1 | 21 | 29 |
| 1968 | 70 | -54 | 3 | 2 | 54 | 75 |
| 1969 | 58 | -50 | 2 | 1 | 50 | 61 |
| 1970 | 70 | -50 | 4 | 2 | 50 | 77 |
| 1971 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 50 | 54 |
| 1972 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 68 | 79 |
| 1973 | 95 | -77 | 5 | 2 | 77 | 102 |
| 1974 | 160 | -90 | 18 | 11 | 90 | 189 |
| 1975 | 298 | -170 | 34 | 20 | 182 | 364 |
| 1976 | 278 | -182 | 27 | 5 | 190 | 317 |
| 1977 | 310 | -183 | 36 | 5 | 183 | 351 |
| 1978 | 1,446 | -1,013 | 127 | 96 | 1,013 | 1,669 |
| 1979 | 2,938 | -1,625 | 397 | 302 | 1,625 | 3,637 |
| 1980 | 2,317 | -1 | 720 | 160 | 2,724 | 5,921 |
| 1981 | 3,249 | 0 | 1,088 | 142 | 1,892 | 6,371 |
| 1982 | 3,904 | 0 | 1,400 | 398 | 2,054 | 7,756 |
| 1983 | 4,677 | 0 | 1,789 | 410 | 1,699 | 8,575 |
| 1984 | 5,257 | 0 | 2,137 | 296 | 1,302 | 8,992 |
| 1985 | 3,793 | 0 | 1,632 | 258 | 980 | 6,663 |
| 1986 | 2,917 | 0 | 1,325 | 122 | 732 | 5,097 |
| 1987 | 2,309 | -1 | 1,104 | 256 | 732 | 4,399 |
| 1988 | 2,903 | 0 | 1,457 | 269 | 276 | 4,905 |
| 1989 | 1,913 | 1 | 1,007 | 104 | 276 | 3,300 |
| 1990 | 1,667 | 1 | 917 | 121 | 276 | 2,983 |
| 1991 | 1,662 | 1 | 954 | 102 | 276 | 2,995 |
| 1992 | 460 | 2 | 276 | 38 | 27 | 803 |
| 1993 | 203 | 0 | 126 | 17 | 27 | 373 |
| 1994 | 521 | -1 | 533 | 39 | 10 | 1,102 |
| 1995 | 1,851 | 1 | 540 | 97 | 10 | 2,499 |
| 1996 | 3,133 | 0 | 320 | 106 | 7 | 3,565 |
| 1997 | 1,537 | -1 | 294 | 102 | 7 | 1,939 |
| 1998 | 1,034 | 0 | 288 | 69 | 3 | 1,393 |
| 1999 | 1,571 | -2 | 543 | 99 | 3 | 2,214 |
| 2000 | 1,825 | -7 | 762 | 227 | 7 | 2,813 |
| 2001 | 1,725 | -8 | 729 | 133 | 7 | 2,586 |
| 2002 | 1,052 | -7 | 376 | 75 | 5 | 1,500 |
| 2003 | 1,168 | -6 | 678 | 90 | 5 | 1,937 |
| 2004 | 889 | -3 | 454 | 48 | 3 | 1,391 |
| 2005 | 287 | -3 | 130 | 20 | 3 | 436 |
| 2006 | 673 | -3 | 201 | 118 | 0 | 989 |
| 2007 | 853 | 0 | 273 | 140 | 0 | 1,265 |

Appendix Table A3. ICES landing statistics, adjustments to ICES landing statistics, unreported landings, discards, recreational catch, and reconstructed total for herring (Clupea harengus) for Finland ( t ).

| Year | ICES landing statistics | Adjustments | Unreported | Discards | Recreational | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1950 | 13,454 | 0 | 673 | 586 | 72 | 14,785 |
| 1951 | 10,669 | 0 | 559 | 466 | 72 | 11,766 |
| 1952 | 12,759 | 0 | 700 | 559 | 72 | 14,089 |
| 1953 | 31,000 | -187 | 1,765 | 1,352 | 72 | 34,002 |
| 1954 | 32,600 | -1,787 | 1,840 | 1,355 | 72 | 34,080 |
| 1955 | 31,700 | -887 | 1,915 | 1,358 | 72 | 34,158 |
| 1956 | 30,000 | 813 | 1,989 | 1,361 | 72 | 34,236 |
| 1957 | 31,300 | -487 | 2,064 | 1,365 | 72 | 34,314 |
| 1958 | 29,900 | 913 | 2,139 | 1,368 | 72 | 34,391 |
| 1959 | 34,939 | -1,288 | 2,418 | 1,497 | 742 | 38,308 |
| 1960 | 34,400 | -749 | 2,499 | 1,500 | 743 | 38,394 |
| 1961 | 34,400 | -749 | 2,581 | 1,504 | 744 | 38,480 |
| 1962 | 31,140 | -4,866 | 2,079 | 1,177 | 7,122 | 36,652 |
| 1963 | 48,632 | 942 | 4,043 | 2,225 | 2,112 | 57,954 |
| 1964 | 34,904 | -225 | 2,912 | 1,560 | 162 | 39,313 |
| 1965 | 44,916 | -532 | 3,835 | 2,001 | 532 | 50,752 |
| 1966 | 41,141 | -96 | 3,646 | 1,855 | 224 | 46,770 |
| 1967 | 42,931 | -221 | 3,898 | 1,934 | 220 | 48,762 |
| 1968 | 58,700 | -3,527 | 5,169 | 2,504 | 3,575 | 66,421 |
| 1969 | 56,252 | -223 | 5,385 | 2,549 | 224 | 64,187 |
| 1970 | 51,205 | -984 | 4,949 | 2,290 | 979 | 58,438 |
| 1971 | 57,188 | 0 | 5,774 | 2,613 | 1,557 | 67,132 |
| 1972 | 53,758 | 0 | 5,558 | 2,462 | 1,980 | 63,758 |
| 1973 | 67,071 | -850 | 7,007 | 3,039 | 850 | 77,117 |
| 1974 | 73,066 | -1,060 | 7,794 | 3,312 | 1,060 | 84,172 |
| 1975 | 69,581 | -560 | 7,639 | 3,182 | 436 | 80,277 |
| 1976 | 75,581 | -436 | 8,499 | 3,472 | 455 | 87,570 |
| 1977 | 78,051 | -440 | 8,966 | 3,593 | 440 | 90,610 |
| 1978 | 89,792 | -788 | 10,498 | 4,130 | 788 | 104,420 |
| 1979 | 83,130 | -776 | 9,913 | 3,829 | 776 | 96,873 |
| 1980 | 74,852 | 0 | 9,192 | 3,521 | 795 | 88,361 |
| 1981 | 65,389 | 0 | 8,648 | 2,752 | 775 | 77,564 |
| 1982 | 73,501 | 0 | 10,415 | 3,824 | 1,076 | 88,816 |
| 1983 | 83,679 | 0 | 12,647 | 5,319 | 1,009 | 102,654 |
| 1984 | 86,545 | 0 | 13,898 | 6,880 | 877 | 108,200 |
| 1985 | 88,702 | 0 | 15,082 | 7,536 | 810 | 112,130 |
| 1986 | 83,800 | 0 | 15,041 | 7,878 | 1,285 | 108,003 |
| 1987 | 82,522 | -1 | 15,591 | 6,908 | 1,285 | 106,304 |
| 1988 | 92,824 | 0 | 18,414 | 8,302 | 1,220 | 120,760 |
| 1989 | 81,122 | 0 | 16,859 | 8,223 | 1,220 | 107,424 |
| 1990 | 66,078 | 0 | 14,357 | 6,681 | 1,220 | 88,335 |
| 1991 | 51,546 | 0 | 11,686 | 5,648 | 1,220 | 70,100 |
| 1992 | 72,171 | -1 | 17,044 | 8,226 | 1,880 | 99,320 |
| 1993 | 77,353 | 0 | 18,998 | 8,595 | 1,880 | 106,826 |
| 1994 | 97,674 | -1 | 29,617 | 12,071 | 1,285 | 140,646 |
| 1995 | 94,613 | -1 | 26,980 | 11,962 | 1,285 | 134,839 |
| 1996 | 93,337 | 1 | 24,931 | 11,492 | 1,210 | 130,971 |
| 1997 | 90,334 | 0 | 22,498 | 11,316 | 1,210 | 125,358 |
| 1998 | 85,545 | 0 | 19,760 | 10,356 | 804 | 116,465 |
| 1999 | 82,237 | 0 | 17,511 | 10,204 | 804 | 110,756 |
| 2000 | 81,648 | -951 | 15,726 | 9,835 | 951 | 107,209 |
| 2001 | 82,867 | -951 | 14,484 | 10,062 | 951 | 107,413 |
| 2002 | 76,530 | -950 | 11,999 | 8,945 | 663 | 97,187 |
| 2003 | 64,021 | -663 | 8,915 | 7,672 | 663 | 80,607 |
| 2004 | 71,073 | -521 | 8,653 | 8,054 | 520 | 87,779 |
| 2005 | 66,978 | -521 | 7,442 | 7,593 | 520 | 82,012 |
| 2006 | 79,955 | -522 | 8,895 | 9,149 | 454 | 97,932 |
| 2007 | 89,392 | -453 | 9,960 | 10,384 | 454 | 109,737 |

Appendix Table A4. ICES landing statistics, adjustments to ICES landing statistics, unreported landings, discards, recreational catch, and reconstructed total for sprat (Sprattus sprattus) for Finland ( t ).

| Year | ICES landing statistics | Adjustments | Unreported | Discards | Recreational | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1950 | 552 | 1,227 | 89 | 78 | 5 | 1,950 |
| 1951 | 693 | 1,086 | 93 | 78 | 5 | 1,955 |
| 1952 | 522 | 1,257 | 98 | 78 | 5 | 1,959 |
| 1953 | 1,797 | -18 | 102 | 78 | 5 | 1,964 |
| 1954 | 1,900 | -121 | 106 | 78 | 5 | 1,968 |
| 1955 | 1,700 | 79 | 111 | 78 | 5 | 1,973 |
| 1956 | 1,600 | 179 | 115 | 79 | 5 | 1,977 |
| 1957 | 1,800 | -21 | 119 | 79 | 5 | 1,982 |
| 1958 | 2,300 | -521 | 123 | 79 | 5 | 1,986 |
| 1959 | 1,562 | -87 | 106 | 66 | 87 | 1,734 |
| 1960 | 1,500 | -25 | 110 | 66 | 87 | 1,737 |
| 1961 | 1,600 | -125 | 113 | 66 | 87 | 1,741 |
| 1962 | 1,557 | 5 | 124 | 70 | 19 | 1,775 |
| 1963 | 1,399 | -23 | 112 | 62 | 21 | 1,571 |
| 1964 | 2,111 | 12 | 178 | 96 | 17 | 2,414 |
| 1965 | 1,637 | -40 | 138 | 72 | 40 | 1,847 |
| 1966 | 2,048 | 189 | 199 | 101 | 20 | 2,557 |
| 1967 | 1,896 | -11 | 172 | 85 | 11 | 2,153 |
| 1968 | 1,291 | -42 | 117 | 57 | 42 | 1,465 |
| 1969 | 1,118 | -47 | 103 | 49 | 46 | 1,269 |
| 1970 | 1,265 | -90 | 116 | 54 | 90 | 1,434 |
| 1971 | 994 | 0 | 100 | 45 | 24 | 1,164 |
| 1972 | 972 | 0 | 100 | 45 | 35 | 1,152 |
| 1973 | 1,854 | -38 | 192 | 83 | 38 | 2,130 |
| 1974 | 1,035 | -40 | 108 | 46 | 40 | 1,188 |
| 1975 | 2,854 | -20 | 314 | 131 | 49 | 3,327 |
| 1976 | 3,778 | -49 | 422 | 172 | 51 | 4,374 |
| 1977 | 3,213 | -49 | 366 | 146 | 49 | 3,725 |
| 1978 | 2,373 | -50 | 274 | 108 | 50 | 2,755 |
| 1979 | 3,125 | -49 | 370 | 143 | 49 | 3,638 |
| 1980 | 2,137 | 0 | 262 | 101 | 53 | 2,554 |
| 1981 | 1,895 | 0 | 251 | 80 | 57 | 2,282 |
| 1982 | 1,468 | 0 | 208 | 76 | 70 | 1,822 |
| 1983 | 828 | 0 | 125 | 53 | 47 | 1,053 |
| 1984 | 374 | 0 | 60 | 30 | 47 | 511 |
| 1985 | 364 | 0 | 62 | 31 | 47 | 504 |
| 1986 | 705 | 0 | 126 | 66 | 56 | 953 |
| 1987 | 287 | 0 | 54 | 24 | 56 | 421 |
| 1988 | 495 | 0 | 98 | 44 | 0 | 638 |
| 1989 | 222 | 0 | 46 | 22 | 0 | 291 |
| 1990 | 162 | 0 | 35 | 16 | 0 | 214 |
| 1991 | 99 | 0 | 22 | 11 | 0 | 132 |
| 1992 | 893 | -1 | 211 | 101 | 0 | 1,204 |
| 1993 | 206 | -1 | 50 | 23 | 0 | 278 |
| 1994 | 497 | -1 | 151 | 61 | 0 | 708 |
| 1995 | 4,103 | 1 | 1,170 | 515 | 0 | 5,790 |
| 1996 | 14,351 | 0 | 3,833 | 1,754 | 0 | 19,939 |
| 1997 | 19,852 | -1 | 4,944 | 2,468 | 0 | 27,263 |
| 1998 | 27,014 | 0 | 6,240 | 3,244 | 15 | 36,513 |
| 1999 | 18,886 | 0 | 4,021 | 2,324 | 15 | 25,246 |
| 2000 | 23,242 | -108 | 4,508 | 2,795 | 108 | 30,545 |
| 2001 | 15,849 | -107 | 2,783 | 1,873 | 108 | 20,506 |
| 2002 | 17,354 | -109 | 2,738 | 2,020 | 12 | 22,015 |
| 2003 | 8,961 | -12 | 1,259 | 1,032 | 12 | 11,253 |
| 2004 | 16,584 | -8 | 2,033 | 1,881 | 6 | 20,497 |
| 2005 | 17,894 | -11 | 2,003 | 2,010 | 6 | 21,902 |
| 2006 | 19,020 | -7 | 2,129 | 2,137 | 44 | 23,324 |
| 2007 | 24,626 | -45 | 2,753 | 2,763 | 44 | 30,142 |


| Year | ICES landing statistics | Adjustments | Unreported | Discards | Recreational | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1950 | 399 | 0 | 20 | 67 | 12 | 498 |
| 1951 | 352 | 0 | 19 | 60 | 12 | 443 |
| 1952 | 383 | 0 | 23 | 65 | 12 | 483 |
| 1953 | 350 | -15 | 22 | 57 | 12 | 426 |
| 1954 | 300 | 35 | 23 | 58 | 12 | 428 |
| 1955 | 300 | 35 | 25 | 58 | 12 | 430 |
| 1956 | 300 | 35 | 27 | 58 | 12 | 432 |
| 1957 | 300 | 35 | 28 | 58 | 12 | 434 |
| 1958 | 300 | 35 | 30 | 59 | 12 | 436 |
| 1959 | 293 | -33 | 25 | 46 | 33 | 363 |
| 1960 | 300 | -40 | 26 | 46 | 33 | 365 |
| 1961 | 300 | -40 | 27 | 46 | 33 | 366 |
| 1962 | 265 | 41 | 34 | 55 | 36 | 430 |
| 1963 | 368 | -60 | 35 | 55 | 61 | 460 |
| 1964 | 465 | -58 | 49 | 73 | 61 | 590 |
| 1965 | 339 | -40 | 37 | 54 | 41 | 431 |
| 1966 | 324 | -70 | 33 | 46 | 57 | 390 |
| 1967 | 425 | -42 | 52 | 70 | 43 | 547 |
| 1968 | 513 | -115 | 56 | 73 | 67 | 594 |
| 1969 | 495 | -80 | 60 | 76 | 81 | 632 |
| 1970 | 450 | -124 | 49 | 60 | 124 | 559 |
| 1971 | 401 | 0 | 62 | 74 | 77 | 614 |
| 1972 | 456 | 0 | 73 | 85 | 83 | 697 |
| 1973 | 640 | -87 | 91 | 104 | 87 | 835 |
| 1974 | 747 | -40 | 120 | 133 | 40 | 1,000 |
| 1975 | 703 | -50 | 114 | 123 | 44 | 934 |
| 1976 | 686 | -44 | 115 | 122 | 46 | 925 |
| 1977 | 699 | -44 | 121 | 125 | 44 | 945 |
| 1978 | 532 | -41 | 93 | 94 | 41 | 719 |
| 1979 | 558 | -43 | 100 | 99 | 43 | 757 |
| 1980 | 550 | -2 | 109 | 106 | 51 | 814 |
| 1981 | 658 | 0 | 42 | 70 | 66 | 836 |
| 1982 | 505 | -3 | 32 | 54 | 66 | 654 |
| 1983 | 544 | 0 | 39 | 84 | 66 | 732 |
| 1984 | 946 | 0 | 61 | 187 | 143 | 1,337 |
| 1985 | 815 | 0 | 47 | 197 | 143 | 1,202 |
| 1986 | 843 | -1 | 59 | 243 | 234 | 1,378 |
| 1987 | 817 | 9 | 53 | 275 | 234 | 1,388 |
| 1988 | 653 | 0 | 46 | 248 | 145 | 1,093 |
| 1989 | 1,021 | 0 | 73 | 434 | 145 | 1,673 |
| 1990 | 2,058 | 0 | 148 | 969 | 145 | 3,320 |
| 1991 | 1,935 | 0 | 112 | 986 | 145 | 3,178 |
| 1992 | 1,886 | -2 | 105 | 1,042 | 288 | 3,319 |
| 1993 | 1,619 | 2 | 96 | 972 | 288 | 2,978 |
| 1994 | 1,049 | 0 | 62 | 676 | 139 | 1,926 |
| 1995 | 1,160 | 0 | 71 | 801 | 139 | 2,172 |
| 1996 | 975 | 0 | 62 | 719 | 217 | 1,973 |
| 1997 | 1,051 | 0 | 68 | 823 | 217 | 2,159 |
| 1998 | 720 | 0 | 49 | 597 | 79 | 1,445 |
| 1999 | 612 | 0 | 40 | 535 | 79 | 1,266 |
| 2000 | 744 | -153 | 40 | 544 | 152 | 1,327 |
| 2001 | 596 | -152 | 29 | 496 | 152 | 1,122 |
| 2002 | 594 | -153 | 29 | 457 | 33 | 960 |
| 2003 | 377 | -34 | 23 | 473 | 33 | 872 |
| 2004 | 607 | -102 | 30 | 514 | 103 | 1,153 |
| 2005 | 562 | -101 | 29 | 416 | 103 | 1,008 |
| 2006 | 413 | -104 | 19 | 320 | 34 | 682 |
| 2007 | 372 | -33 | 22 | 294 | 34 | 689 |

Appendix Table A6. ICES landing statistics, adjustments to ICES landing statistics, unreported landings, discards, recreational catch, and reconstructed total for the category

| Year | ICES <br> landing statistics | Adjustments | Unreported | Discards | Recreational | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1950 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1951 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1952 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1953 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1954 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1955 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1956 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1957 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1958 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1959 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1960 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1961 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1962 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1963 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1964 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1965 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1966 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1967 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1968 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1969 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1970 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1971 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1972 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1973 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1974 | 55 | 0 | 6 | 30 | 0 | 91 |
| 1975 | 100 | -50 | 6 | 28 | 131 | 214 |
| 1976 | 194 | -131 | 7 | 35 | 137 | 242 |
| 1977 | 203 | -132 | 8 | 39 | 132 | 251 |
| 1978 | 390 | -303 | 10 | 48 | 303 | 449 |
| 1979 | 399 | -298 | 12 | 56 | 298 | 467 |
| 1980 | 52 | 0 | 6 | 29 | 304 | 392 |
| 1981 | 78 | 0 | 10 | 44 | 304 | 437 |
| 1982 | 50 | 0 | 7 | 28 | 310 | 396 |
| 1983 | 39 | 0 | 6 | 22 | 286 | 353 |
| 1984 | 43 | 0 | 7 | 25 | 224 | 299 |
| 1985 | 37 | 0 | 6 | 22 | 310 | 375 |
| 1986 | 52 | 0 | 9 | 31 | 426 | 518 |
| 1987 | 58 | 0 | 11 | 34 | 426 | 529 |
| 1988 | 70 | 0 | 14 | 41 | 374 | 499 |
| 1989 | 70 | 0 | 15 | 42 | 374 | 501 |
| 1990 | 59 | -1 | 13 | 35 | 374 | 481 |
| 1991 | 76 | -1 | 17 | 46 | 374 | 512 |
| 1992 | 65 | 0 | 15 | 40 | 1,009 | 1,128 |
| 1993 | 85 | -1 | 21 | 52 | 1,009 | 1,166 |
| 1994 | 79 | -1 | 24 | 51 | 486 | 638 |
| 1995 | 89 | 0 | 25 | 57 | 486 | 657 |
| 1996 | 99 | 0 | 26 | 62 | 617 | 804 |
| 1997 | 85 | 1 | 21 | 53 | 617 | 777 |
| 1998 | 82 | -3 | 18 | 48 | 475 | 621 |
| 1999 | 83 | 0 | 18 | 49 | 475 | 624 |
| 2000 | 454 | -373 | 16 | 47 | 374 | 518 |
| 2001 | 504 | -373 | 23 | 76 | 374 | 603 |
| 2002 | 452 | -375 | 12 | 44 | 155 | 289 |
| 2003 | 200 | -157 | 6 | 24 | 155 | 227 |
| 2004 | 121 | -84 | 5 | 20 | 79 | 141 |
| 2005 | 106 | -79 | 3 | 15 | 79 | 124 |
| 2006 | 103 | -72 | 3 | 16 | 75 | 125 |
| 2007 | 107 | -74 | 4 | 16 | 75 | 128 |

Appendix Table A7. ICES landing statistics, adjustments to ICES landing statistics, unreported landings, discards, recreational catch, and reconstructed total for the category 'others' for Finland ( t ).

| Year | ICES landing statistics | Adjustments | Unreported | Discards | Recreational | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1950 | 4,433 | 3,451 | 394 | 653 | 1,546 | 10,477 |
| 1951 | 4,011 | 3,873 | 413 | 655 | 1,546 | 10,498 |
| 1952 | 4,041 | 3,843 | 432 | 656 | 1,546 | 10,519 |
| 1953 | 9,436 | -1,552 | 452 | 658 | 1,546 | 10,539 |
| 1954 | 10,900 | -3,016 | 471 | 659 | 1,546 | 10,560 |
| 1955 | 10,300 | -2,416 | 490 | 661 | 1,546 | 10,581 |
| 1956 | 9,500 | -1,616 | 509 | 662 | 1,546 | 10,601 |
| 1957 | 10,700 | -2,816 | 528 | 664 | 1,546 | 10,622 |
| 1958 | 9,600 | -1,716 | 547 | 665 | 1,546 | 10,643 |
| 1959 | 10,077 | -2,555 | 540 | 636 | 3,101 | 11,800 |
| 1960 | 10,500 | -2,978 | 559 | 638 | 3,101 | 11,819 |
| 1961 | 10,600 | -3,078 | 577 | 639 | 3,101 | 11,839 |
| 1962 | 8,372 | -2,186 | 489 | 527 | 3,520 | 10,722 |
| 1963 | 9,938 | -4,052 | 480 | 502 | 4,377 | 11,245 |
| 1964 | 8,734 | -3,539 | 436 | 444 | 3,542 | 9,618 |
| 1965 | 10,043 | -3,477 | 567 | 563 | 3,477 | 11,173 |
| 1966 | 9,370 | -3,842 | 491 | 475 | 3,793 | 10,287 |
| 1967 | 9,555 | -3,865 | 519 | 490 | 3,866 | 10,565 |
| 1968 | 10,246 | -4,027 | 583 | 537 | 4,026 | 11,364 |
| 1969 | 11,079 | -4,289 | 653 | 587 | 4,250 | 12,280 |
| 1970 | 9,824 | -3,456 | 627 | 552 | 3,857 | 11,404 |
| 1971 | 5,212 | 13 | 528 | 454 | 4,590 | 10,796 |
| 1972 | 7,421 | 0 | 767 | 646 | 4,713 | 13,547 |
| 1973 | 10,978 | -4,790 | 655 | 540 | 4,790 | 12,173 |
| 1974 | 11,865 | -4,670 | 779 | 629 | 4,670 | 13,273 |
| 1975 | 12,090 | -5,400 | 740 | 586 | 5,749 | 13,766 |
| 1976 | 11,649 | -5,749 | 667 | 518 | 5,996 | 13,081 |
| 1977 | 11,581 | -5,798 | 668 | 509 | 5,798 | 12,758 |
| 1978 | 12,122 | -7,076 | 595 | 445 | 6,267 | 12,353 |
| 1979 | 12,521 | -7,068 | 656 | 482 | 6,274 | 12,865 |
| 1980 | 3,650 | 1 | 448 | 323 | 6,674 | 11,097 |
| 1981 | 3,394 | 42 | 454 | 307 | 5,772 | 9,969 |
| 1982 | 2,801 | 41 | 403 | 256 | 5,772 | 9,272 |
| 1983 | 2,570 | 37 | 394 | 237 | 5,772 | 9,010 |
| 1984 | 2,866 | 42 | 467 | 266 | 4,904 | 8,546 |
| 1985 | 2,363 | 31 | 407 | 221 | 4,904 | 7,925 |
| 1986 | 2,699 | 22 | 488 | 253 | 7,660 | 11,123 |
| 1987 | 2,921 | 49 | 561 | 279 | 7,660 | 11,470 |
| 1988 | 3,058 | 38 | 614 | 293 | 7,901 | 11,904 |
| 1989 | 3,271 | 1 | 680 | 312 | 7,901 | 12,165 |
| 1990 | 3,691 | 12 | 805 | 356 | 7,988 | 12,851 |
| 1991 | 4,931 | -15 | 1,114 | 476 | 7,988 | 14,494 |
| 1992 | 3,669 | -29 | 860 | 355 | 17,787 | 22,641 |
| 1993 | 4,103 | 36 | 1,017 | 407 | 17,787 | 23,349 |
| 1994 | 3,600 | 4 | 1,093 | 371 | 10,864 | 15,931 |
| 1995 | 4,277 | -36 | 1,209 | 430 | 10,864 | 16,744 |
| 1996 | 4,702 | -32 | 1,247 | 467 | 12,792 | 19,176 |
| 1997 | 4,760 | -23 | 1,180 | 467 | 12,792 | 19,175 |
| 1998 | 4,434 | -52 | 1,012 | 426 | 14,575 | 20,394 |
| 1999 | 4,322 | -21 | 916 | 412 | 14,575 | 20,203 |
| 2000 | 13,731 | -10,028 | 722 | 349 | 9,950 | 14,723 |
| 2001 | 13,728 | -10,154 | 632 | 398 | 9,950 | 14,554 |
| 2002 | 14,048 | -10,033 | 637 | 588 | 7,405 | 12,645 |
| 2003 | 11,586 | -7,454 | 581 | 815 | 7,405 | 12,933 |
| 2004 | 9,889 | -6,451 | 422 | 739 | 6,400 | 10,998 |
| 2005 | 9,649 | -6,465 | 357 | 639 | 6,400 | 10,580 |
| 2006 | 9,616 | -6,454 | 354 | 637 | 9,638 | 13,792 |
| 2007 | 12,814 | -9,706 | 348 | 1,012 | 9,638 | 14,106 |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cite as: Rossing, P., Bale, S., Harper, S., and Zeller, D. (2010) Baltic Sea fisheries catches for Finland (1950-2007). pp. 85-106. In: Rossing, P., Booth, S. and Zeller, D. (eds.), Total marine fisheries extractions by country in the Baltic Sea: 1950-present. Fisheries Centre Research Reports 18 (1). Fisheries Centre, University of British Columbia, Canada [ISSN 1198-6727].

