Monterey Bay Aquarium Seafood Watch

Draft Assessment for Review

Crab, King (Norway Barents Sea)

Paralithodes camtschaticus

Atlantic, Northeast

Pots

Report ID 28192

Seafood Watch Standard used in this assessment: Fisheries Standard v4

Table of Contents

About Seafood Watch

Monterey Bay Aquarium's Seafood Watch program evaluates the environmental sustainability of wild-caught and farmed seafood commonly found in the United States marketplace. Seafood Watch defines sustainable seafood as originating from sources, whether wild-caught or farmed, which can maintain or increase production in the long-term without jeopardizing the structure or function of affected ecosystems. The program's goals are to raise awareness of important ocean conservation issues and empower seafood consumers and businesses to make choices for healthy oceans.

Seafood Watch's science-based ratings are available at www.SeafoodWatch.org. Each rating is supported by a Seafood Watch assessment, in which the fishery or aquaculture operation is evaluated using the Seafood Watch standard.

Seafood Watch standards are built on our guiding principles, which outline the necessary environmental sustainability elements for fisheries and aquaculture operations. The guiding principles differ across standards, reflecting the different impacts of fisheries and aquaculture.

- Seafood rated Best Choice comes from sources that operate in a manner that's consistent with our guiding principles. The seafood is caught or farmed in ways that cause little or no harm to other wildlife or the environment.

- Seafood rated Good Alternative comes from sources that align with most of our guiding principles. However, one issue needs substantial improvement, or there's significant uncertainty about the impacts on wildlife or the environment.

- Seafood rated Avoid comes from sources that don't align with our guiding principles. The seafood is caught or farmed in ways that have a high risk of causing harm to wildlife or the environment. There's a critical conservation concern or many issues need substantial improvement.

Each assessment follows an eight-step process, which prioritizes rigor, impartiality, transparency and accessibility. They are conducted by Seafood Watch scientists, in collaboration with scientific, government, industry and conservation experts and are open for public comment prior to publication. Conditions in wild capture fisheries and aquaculture operations can change over time; as such assessments and ratings are updated regularly to reflect current practice.

More information on Seafood Watch guiding principles, standards, assessments and ratings are available at www.SeafoodWatch.org.

Guiding Principles

Seafood Watch defines sustainable seafood as originating from sources, whether fished[1] or farmed, that can maintain or increase production in the long term without jeopardizing the structure or function of affected ecosystems.

The following guiding principles illustrate the qualities that fisheries must possess to be considered sustainable by the Seafood Watch program (these are explained further in the Seafood Watch Standard for Fisheries):

- Follow the principles of ecosystem-based fisheries management.
- Ensure all affected stocks are healthy and abundant.
- Fish all affected stocks at sustainable levels.
- Minimize bycatch.
- Have no more than a negligible impact on any threatened, endangered, or protected species.
- Managed to sustain the long-term productivity of all affected species.
- Avoid negative impacts on the structure, function, or associated biota of aquatic habitats where fishing occurs.
- Maintain the trophic role of all aquatic life.
- Do not result in harmful ecological changes such as reduction of dependent predator populations, trophic cascades, or phase shifts.
- Ensure that any enhancement activities and fishing activities on enhanced stocks do not negatively affect the diversity, abundance, productivity, or genetic integrity of wild stocks.

These guiding principles are operationalized in the four criteria in this standard.Each criterion includes:

- Factors to evaluate and score
- Guidelines for integrating these factors to produce a numerical score and rating

Once a rating has been assigned to each criterion, Seafood Watch develops an overall recommendation. Criteria ratings and the overall recommendation are color coded to correspond to the categories on the Seafood Watch pocket guides and online guide:

Best Choice/Green: Buy first; they're well managed and caught or farmed responsibly.

Good Alternative/Yellow: Buy, but be aware there are concerns with how they're caught, farmed or managed.

Avoid/Red: Take a pass on these for now; they're caught or farmed in ways that harm other marine life or the environment.

[1] "Fish" is used throughout this document to refer to finfish, shellfish and other invertebrates

Summary

The red king crab is a large crustacean that was intentionally introduced into the Barents Sea in the 1960s by Soviet scientists seeking to establish a valuable pot fishery. Initially the principal countries of Norway and Russia set cooperative management measures to encourage the stock's further westward expansion and to increase densities in the area in which it was released. After initiation of a commercial fishery, and confirmation that Norwegian management had no effect on Russian stock size, Norway and Russia agreed to manage the stock separately, each pursuing its own goals and objectives. Since the advent of the commercial fishery, Russian landings have dominated Norwegian landings and imports into the US.

Because of its status as a nonnative species with harmful ecosystem impacts, abundance and fishing mortality are not of concern. The use of pot trap gear for catching red king crab has little impact on bottom habitat because harvesters fish on mud substrates with little structure. Bycatch species are not well known, although this gear type typically has low amounts in other areas of the world; especially when outfitted with biodegradable panels and other management measures to reduce interaction. However, the risk crab pot gear poses to marine mammals is of concern due to their high vulnerability to entanglement and presence in Norwegian waters.

Norwegian managers currently pursue a policy of reducing the stock west of 26°E through an open access fishery, while east of this line, in areas bordering their Russian neighbors, harvest is at MEY (maximum economic yield). This policy is reflected in the higher quotas, allowances on removal of females, and lack of regulation in areas not adjacent to Russia. These practices, while troubling if invoked on a native species, have earned Norway's fishery a "Good Alternative Choice" rating when successfully used on a harmful invasive stock such as red king crab.

Final Seafood Recommendations

SPECIES | FISHERY	C 1 TARGET SPECIES	C 2 OTHER SPECIES	C 3 MANAGEMENT	C 4 HABITAT	OVERALL	VOLUME (MT) YEAR
Red king crab | Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway	5.000	1.000	3.000	3.000	**Good Alternative (2.590)**	---

Summary

The red king crab is a large crustacean that was intentionally introduced into the Barrens Sea in the 1960's by then Soviet scientists seeking to establish a valuable pot fishery. Both Norway and Russia currently harvest this nonnative.

The **Good Alternative** rating for the red king crab pot fishery in Norway reflects that country's current policies of keeping a low biomass to prevent further westward spread of the species and maintain a long term fishery in most of its territorial seas, while acknowledging the risk of bycatch and entanglement with crab pot gear.

Scoring Guide

Scores range from zero to five where zero indicates very poor performance and five indicates the fishing operations have no significant impact.

Final Score = geometric mean of the four Scores (Criterion 1, Criterion 2, Criterion 3, Criterion 4).

Best Choice/Green = Final Score >3.2, and no Red Criteria, and no Critical scores

Good Alternative/Yellow = Final score >2.2-3.2, and neither Harvest Strategy (Factor 3.1) nor Bycatch Management Strategy (Factor 3.2) are Very High Concern2, and no more than one Red Criterion, and no Critical scores

Avoid/Red = Final Score ≤2.2, or either Harvest Strategy (Factor 3.1) or Bycatch Management Strategy (Factor 3.2) is Very High Concern or two or more Red Criteria, or one or more Critical scores.

[2] Because effective management is an essential component of sustainable fisheries, Seafood Watch issues an Avoid recommendation for any fishery scored as a Very High Concern for either factor under Management (Criterion 3).

Introduction

Scope of the analysis and ensuing recommendation

This reports covers recommendations for the Barents Sea red king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*) landed by Norway and caught using crab pot gear.

Species Overview

The large-bodied red king crab was intentionally introduced into the Barents Sea, near Kola Bay, by Soviet researchers in the 1960s. The goal was to increase economic opportunities for communities in this part of the Barents Sea by establishing a new fishery. The species started to grow and spread west into Norwegian waters and first became abundant in the region in the 1990s. (Jørgensen 2013)



Figure 1: Generalised distribution and spread of the red king crab from its release region in the Barents Sea. From Jorgensen (2013): their figure 5.

By 1994 an experimental research fishery was taking place, during which both countries agreed to keep landing levels conservative to increase the population. (Sundet and Hoel 2016)

This was relaxed in 2002 with the advent of the commercial fishery for which Norway and Russia agreed to a single quota via the Mixed Russian-Norwegian Fishery Commission. This ended in 2007 when both countries pursued management of the stock separately and independently determined fishery management goals, quotas, and assessment methodologies, although cooperative research still continued across the two countries. (Jørgensen and Nilssen 2011)

Red king crab distribution now covers approximately 12% of the Barents Sea and nearly 23,500km^2 of that area is under Norwegian management, including both an open access area to limit further westward expansion and a quota-regulated area to maintain a viable long-term fishery. (Skonhoft and Kourantidou 2021)(Sundet and Hoel 2016)



Figure 2: Map showing the approximate distribution of the red king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*) in the Barents Sea (light shaded), and the area of the quota-regulated area in Norwegian waters (double shaded). From Sundet and Hoel (2016): their figure 1.

Production Statistics

Norway landings of red king crab have recently hovered around 2,000 tons (OECD 2022).



Figure 3: Annual total landings of red king crab in Norway from 2010-2020. Data from OECD (2022).

Importance to the US/North American market.

Import/export statistics and analysis of king crab is complicated by market name/species ambiguity, trade data discrepancies, and illegal activity. (WWF 2014) Despite this, some inferences can be drawn.

The majority of live red king crab caught in Norway is destined for the export market of South Korea, followed by the United States, while Japan is the primary market for frozen cluster exports. (Lorentzen et al. 2018) Over the past decade, of the 1,900 t average annual landings, approximately 6.8% (130 t on average) of that is destined for U.S. markets. (OECD 2022) (U.S. Census Bureau 2022)



Figure 4: Total annual landings (tonnes) of red king crab in Norway (blue bars) and annual imports to the United States (tonnes) of Norwegian red king crab (orange line) from 2010-2020. Data from OECD (2022) and US Census Bureau (2022).

With reductions in world-wide red king crab quotas, more live exports, and the shift of the Norwegian crab season to begin in January (a season which typically lacks supply worldwide), its importance in US markets is expected to rise. (Voldnes et al. 2020)(Lorentzen et al. 2018)

Common and market names.

Red king crab is commonly referred to by that name or simply as king crab. It may also appear as Kamchatka crab or Alaskan king crab when mislabeled. (Jørgensen 2013)

Primary product forms

Common product forms include either live crabs or cooked, frozen clusters. (Lorentzen et al. 2018) (Voldnes et al. 2020)

Assessment

This section assesses the sustainability of the fishery(s) relative to the Seafood Watch Standard for Fisheries, available at www.seafoodwatch.org. The specific standard used is referenced on the title page of all Seafood Watch assessments.

Criterion 1: Impacts on the species under assessment

This criterion evaluates the impact of fishing mortality on the species, given its current abundance. When abundance is unknown, abundance is scored based on the species' inherent vulnerability, which is calculated using a Productivity-Susceptibility Analysis. The final Criterion 1 score is determined by taking the geometric mean of the abundance and fishing mortality scores. The Criterion 1 rating is determined as follows:

- ***Score >3.2=Green or Low Concern***
- ***Score >2.2 and ≤3.2=Yellow or Moderate Concern***
- ***Score ≤2.2 = Red or High Concern***

Rating is Critical if Factor 1.3 (Fishing Mortality) is Critical.

Guiding principles

- *Ensure all affected stocks are healthy and abundant.*
- *Fish all affected stocks at sustainable level*

Criterion 1 Summary

RED KING CRAB			
REGION / METHOD	**ABUNDANCE**	**FISHING MORTALITY**	**SCORE**
Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway	5.000: Very Low Concern	5.000: Low Concern	Green (5.000)

As an intentionally introduced nonnative species, with harmful ecological impacts, stock abundance and fishing mortality are of very low concern. Therefore, the impacts to this stock warrant a green rating.

Criterion 1 Assessments

SCORING GUIDELINES

Factor 1.1 - Abundance

Goal: Stock abundance and size structure of native species is maintained at a level that does not impair recruitment or productivity.

- *5 (Very Low Concern) — Strong evidence exists that the population is above an appropriate target abundance level (given the species' ecological role), or near virgin biomass.*
- *3.67 (Low Concern) — Population may be below target abundance level, but is at least 75% of the target level, OR data-limited assessments suggest population is healthy and species is not*

highly vulnerable.

- *2.33 (Moderate Concern) — Population is not overfished but may be below 75% of the target abundance level, OR abundance is unknown and the species is not highly vulnerable.*
- *1 (High Concern) — Population is considered overfished/depleted, a species of concern, threatened or endangered, OR abundance is unknown and species is highly vulnerable.*

Factor 1.2 - Fishing Mortality

Goal: Fishing mortality is appropriate for current state of the stock.

- *5 (Low Concern) — Probable (>50%) that fishing mortality from all sources is at or below a sustainable level, given the species ecological role, OR fishery does not target species and fishing mortality is low enough to not adversely affect its population.*
- *3 (Moderate Concern) — Fishing mortality is fluctuating around sustainable levels, OR fishing mortality relative to a sustainable level is uncertain.*
- *1 (High Concern) — Probable that fishing mortality from all source is above a sustainable level.*

Red king crab

Factor 1.1 - Abundance

Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway

Very Low Concern

Barents Sea red king crabs are a non-native species that has been shown to reduce species diversity and biomass, negatively impact habitats, and alter population level dynamics. (Falk-Petersen et al. 2011) (Jørgensen & Spiridonov 2013)(Oug et al. 2018) Annual stock assessments confirm this population is stable and being managed within limits so it maintains good reproductive capacity, yet does not continue westward expansion. (Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment 2020) (Sundet and Hoel 2016) Therefore, the stock's abundance warrants a score of very low concern.

Factor 1.2 - Fishing Mortality

Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway

Low Concern

The Barents Sea red king crabs are a non-native species that is harvested within quota regulations to the east of the 26°E boundary to maintain a fishery that supports local communities and without limits west of the 26°E boundary to reduce westward spread of the species. (Jørgensen and Nilssen 2011) (Sundet and Hoel 2016) The total allowable catch in the quota regulated zone has increased in recent years, including year-round harvests and females, although the fishing mortality has been kept at or above the rate that maintains the maximum sustainable yield. (Hjelset 2014)(Kourantidou and Kaiser 2021) (Lorentzen et al. 2018) (Voldnes et al. 2020) Therefore, the fishing mortality of this species is of low concern.

Criterion 2: Impacts on Other Species

All main retained and bycatch species in the fishery are evaluated under Criterion 2. Seafood Watch defines bycatch as all fisheries-related mortality or injury to species other than the retained catch. Examples include discards, endangered or threatened species catch, and ghost fishing. Species are evaluated using the same guidelines as in Criterion 1. When information on other species caught in the fishery is unavailable, the fishery's potential impacts on other species is scored according to the Unknown Bycatch Matrices, which are based on a synthesis of peer-reviewed literature and expert opinion on the bycatch impacts of each gear type. The fishery is also scored for the amount of non-retained catch (discards) and bait use relative to the retained catch. To determine the final Criterion 2 score, the score for the lowest scoring retained/bycatch species is multiplied by the discard/bait score. The Criterion 2 rating is determined as follows:

- ***Score >3.2=Green or Low Concern***
- ***Score >2.2 and ≤3.2=Yellow or Moderate Concern***
- ***Score ≤2.2 = Red or High Concern***

Rating is Critical if Factor 2.3 (Fishing Mortality) is Crtitical

Guiding principles

- *Ensure all affected stocks are healthy and abundant.*
- *Fish all affected stocks at sustainable level.*
- *Minimize bycatch.*

Criterion 2 Summary

Criterion 2 score(s) overview

This table(s) provides an overview of the Criterion 2 subscore, discards+bait modifier, and final Criterion 2 score for each fishery. A separate table is provided for each species/stock that we want an overall rating for.

RED KING CRAB			
REGION / METHOD	SUB SCORE	DISCARD RATE/LANDINGS	SCORE
Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway	1.000	1.000: < 100%	Red (1.000)

Criterion 2 main assessed species/stocks table(s)

This table(s) provides a list of all species/stocks included in this assessment for each 'fishery' (as defined by a region/method combination). The text following this table(s) provides an explanation of the reasons the listed species were selected for inclusion in the assessment.

BARENTS SEA | ATLANTIC, NORTHEAST | POTS | NORWAY			
SUB SCORE: 1.000	DISCARD RATE: 1.000	SCORE: 1.000	
SPECIES	ABUNDANCE	FISHING MORTALITY	SCORE
Marine mammals	1.000: High Concern	1.000: High Concern	Red (1.000)
Benthic inverts	2.330: Moderate Concern	5.000: Low Concern	Green (3.413)
Finfish	2.330: Moderate Concern	5.000: Low Concern	Green (3.413)
Red king crab	5.000: Very Low Concern	5.000: Low Concern	Green (5.000)

The bycatch and retained species caught in the Barents Sea red king crab pot fishery are generally unknown. Bycatch is scored according to the Seafood Watch unknown bycatch matrix, based on a synthesis of peer reviewed literature and expert opinion on the bycatch impacts of each gear type. The Unknown Bycatch Matrix ranks the bycatch susceptibility of different taxonomic groups in various gear types. More information is available in Appendix 2 of the Seafood Watch criteria.

The taxa that are most likely to interact with the Barents Sea red king crab pot fishery include: marine mammals, benthic invertebrates, and finfish. For the Barents Sea red king crab pot fishery, marine mammals limit the score for Criterion 2 due to their high vulnerability and potential to interact with this gear type.

Criterion 2 Assessment

SCORING GUIDELINES

Factor 2.1 - Abundance
(same as Factor 1.1 above)

Factor 2.2 - Fishing Mortality
(same as Factor 1.2 above)

Factor 2.3 - Modifying Factor: Discards and Bait Use
Goal: Fishery optimizes the utilization of marine and freshwater resources by minimizing post-harvest loss. For fisheries that use bait, bait is used efficiently.

Scoring Guidelines: The discard rate is the sum of all dead discards (i.e. non-retained catch) plus bait use divided by the total retained catch.

Ratio of bait + discards/landings	Factor 2.3 score
<100%	1
>=100	0.75

Benthic inverts

Factor 2.1 - Abundance

Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway

Moderate Concern

Drops and hauls of pots have been shown to have some impacts on benthic invertebrates, although the magnitude of the impacts is highly dependent on ocean conditions, substrate, and pot design. (Eno et al. 2001) (Fuller et al. 2008) Most stocks of benthic invertebrates are moderately vulnerable to interactions with pot fishing gear, therefore this taxonomic group warrants a score of moderate concern.

Factor 2.2 - Fishing Mortality

Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway

Low Concern

This score was calculated using the Seafood Watch Unknown Bycatch Matrix. Benthic invertebrates generally have a low susceptibility to interactions with pot fisheries and although they may potentially be impacted through drops and hauls of pot fishing gear, the magnitude of impacts is considered to be less in soft-bottom habitats and recovery times are still unknown. (Stevens 2021) (Fuller et al. 2008) Therefore, the fishing mortality of benthic invertebrates warrants a score of low concern.

Finfish

Factor 2.1 - Abundance

Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway

Moderate Concern

Most stocks of teleost fish are moderately vulnerable to interactions with pot fishing gear, therefore this taxonomic group warrants a score of moderate concern.

Factor 2.2 - Fishing Mortality

Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway

Low Concern

This score was calculated using the Seafood Watch Unknown Bycatch Matrix. Finfish have a low susceptibility to interactions with pot fisheries, therefore the fishing mortality of finfish warrants a score of low concern.

Marine mammals

Factor 2.1 - Abundance

Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway

High Concern

We included this taxonomic group based on results of the Seafood Watch Unknown Bycatch Matrix. Marine mammals that frequent the region and are primarily at risk of entanglement in the red king crab pot fishing gear include humpback whales, fin whales, and harbor seals. (Blanchet et al. 2021) (Løviknes et al. 2021)

Marine mammals are highly vulnerable to interactions with pot fishing gear, although this fishery has few documented instances of bycatch or entanglement. (A. Hjelset, personal communication, November 25, 2022) However, it can be difficult to maintain a comprehensive database of gear entanglements and it is likely more instances would be found if more studies were conducted. (Stelfox et al. 2016) Therefore, this taxonomic group warrants a score of high concern.

Factor 2.2 - Fishing Mortality

Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway

High Concern

Marine mammals are highly susceptible to interactions with trap/pot fisheries in nearly all regions.

Along with the occasional entanglement report through the press, a ghost gear retrieval trip in 2019 found one deceased humpback whale entangled in pot trap ropes and one deceased seal in one of the traps. (Directorate of Fisheries 2020b) This fishery has few documented instances of bycatch or entanglement which are not likely to have a significant impact on marine mammal populations. (A. Hjelset, personal communication, November 25, 2022) However, the threat of entanglement is one of unknown magnitude and information regarding interactions between this fishery and marine mammals is limited, therefore this taxonomic group warrants a score of high concern.

Factor 2.3 - Discard Rate/Landings

Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway

< 100%

Discard rates are not reported, however quota fishers are allowed to catch and land up to 9% damaged male crabs and 5% female crabs calculated from the catch of blemish-free male crabs each week. (Ministry of Trade, Industry, and Fisheries 2015) The bait primarily used in this fishery is herring and of the approximately 800,000 tons landed annually in Norway, it is

expected that the amount used for the red king crab fishery is negligible. (ICES 2022) (A. Hjelset, personal communication, November 25, 2022)

The discard rate and bait use for this fishery can be assumed to be of a moderate value, therefore it warrants a score of <100%.

Criterion 3: Management Effectiveness

Five factors are evaluated in Criterion 3: Management Strategy and Implementation, Bycatch Strategy, Scientific Research/Monitoring, Enforcement of Regulations, and Inclusion of Stakeholders. Each is scored as either 'highly effective', 'moderately effective', 'ineffective,' or 'critical'. The final Criterion 3 score is determined as follows:

- *5 (Very Low Concern) — Meets the standards of 'highly effective' for all five factors considered.*
- *4 (Low Concern) — Meets the standards of 'highly effective' for 'management strategy and implementation' and at least 'moderately effective' for all other factors.*
- *3 (Moderate Concern) — Meets the standards for at least 'moderately effective' for all five factors.*
- *2 (High Concern) — At a minimum, meets standards for 'moderately effective' for Management Strategy and Implementation and Bycatch Strategy, but at least one other factor is rated 'ineffective.'*
- *1 (Very High Concern) — Management Strategy and Implementation and/or Bycatch Management are 'ineffective.'*
- *0 (Critical) — Management Strategy and Implementation is 'critical'.*

The Criterion 3 rating is determined as follows:

- ***Score >3.2=Green or Low Concern***
- ***Score >2.2 and ≤3.2=Yellow or Moderate Concern***
- ***Score ≤2.2 = Red or High Concern***

Rating is Critical if Management Strategy and Implementation is Critical.

Guiding principle

- The fishery is managed to sustain the long-term productivity of all impacted species.

Five factors are evaluated in Criterion 3: Management Strategy and Implementation, Bycatch Strategy, Scientific Research/Monitoring, Enforcement of Regulations, and Inclusion of Stakeholders. Each is scored as either 'highly effective', 'moderately effective', 'ineffective,' or 'critical'. The final Criterion 3 score is determined as follows:

Criterion 3 Summary

FISHERY	MANAGEMENT STRATEGY	BYCATCH STRATEGY	DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS	ENFORCEMENT	INCLUSION	SCORE
Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway	Moderately Effective	Moderately Effective	Moderately Effective	Highly effective	Highly effective	**Yellow (3.000)**

While the enforcement of regulations and inclusion of stakeholders in the management process are highly effective, the overall management strategy, bycatch strategy, and approach to data collection and

analysis are moderately effective. Therefore, the management effectiveness of this fishery warrants a yellow rating.

Bycatch and discards in the Norwegian fishery are not well known, but is thought to be very small given the type of gear used the location of fishing, and other factors.

Red king crab in the Barents is managed by Norway and Russia. Until 2005 both countries jointly managed the stock with a goal of maximizing economic output. Since then, each country has managed this invasive species differently with different goals. Norway sets quotas maximum economic yield near the Russian border but a policy of eradication outside this zone. Russian fishery managers set quotas to increase abundance and density for maximum long-term economic output and spread. Russia additionally has released larval crabs and has further documented the spread of the species eastward.

Criterion 3 Assessment

SCORING GUIDELINES

Factor 3.1 - Management Strategy and Implementation

Considerations: What type of management measures are in place? Are there appropriate management goals, and is there evidence that management goals are being met? Do manages follow scientific advice? To achieve a highly effective rating, there must be appropriately defined management goals, precautionary policies that are based on scientific advice, and evidence that the measures in place have been successful at maintaining/rebuilding species.

Factor 3.2 - Bycatch Strategy

Considerations: What type of management strategy/measures are in place to reduce the impacts of the fishery on bycatch species and when applicable, to minimize ghost fishing? How successful are these management measures? To achieve a Highly Effective rating, the fishery must have no or low bycatch, or if there are bycatch or ghost fishing concerns, there must be effective measures in place to minimize impacts.

Factor 3.3 - Scientific Research and Monitoring

Considerations: How much and what types of data are collected to evaluate the fishery's impact on the species? Is there adequate monitoring of bycatch? To achieve a Highly Effective rating, regular, robust population assessments must be conducted for target or retained species, and an adequate bycatch data collection program must be in place to ensure bycatch management goals are met.

Factor 3.4 - Enforcement of Management Regulations

Considerations: Do fishermen comply with regulations, and how is this monitored? To achieve a Highly Effective rating, there must be regular enforcement of regulations and verification of compliance.

Factor 3.5 - Stakeholder Inclusion

Considerations: Are stakeholders involved/included in the decision-making process? Stakeholders are individuals/groups/organizations that have an interest in the fishery or that may be affected by the

management of the fishery (e.g., fishermen, conservation groups, etc.). A Highly Effective rating is given if the management process is transparent, if high participation by all stakeholders is encouraged, and if there a mechanism to effectively address user conflicts.

Factor 3.1 - Management Strategy And Implementation

Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway

Moderately Effective

The Barents Sea red king crab is considered to be established in the region and efforts to completely remove it in Norwegian waters would be futile due to the influx of crabs from Russian territory and may even have negative impacts for local fishing communities and ecosystems that have grown accustomed to their presence as a predator. (Jørgensen 2013) (Jørgensen and Nilssen 2011)

The quota regulated zone east of the 26°E boundary is managed within safe biological limits so that the established crab stocks have the reproductive capacity to maintain the local fishery and so that mortality is kept at a rate that maintains maximum sustainable yield. (Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment 2020) The Institute of Marine Research annually estimates these stocks for the Directorate of Fisheries, which advises the Ministry of Fisheries and Coastal Affairs for setting the total allowable catch (TAC) each year. (Kourantidou and Kaiser 2021) The 2023 TAC for male king crab in the quota-regulated area has been set at 2,375 metric tons and 120 metric tons for female king crabs.

The open access region west of this boundary was established to prevent further westward establishment of the crab population and is considered to have been generally successful in doing so over the past decade as the crab population is stable and westward spread is limited. However, there have been cases of crabs appearing in regions further west and the role of ballast water transfer is unknown at this time. (Jørgensen 2013) (Jørgensen and Nilssen 2011) (Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment 2020)

Although TAC is the primary management approach, fishery managers also use closed areas, gear modifications, and soak time limits for trapslimitations, and limits regarding catch of females to manage the red king crab fishery. (Directorate of Fisheries 2008) (Ministry of Trade, Industry, and Fisheries 2015) (A. Hjelset, personal communication, December 13, 2022) Therefore, the management strategy and implementation warrants a score of moderately effective.

Factor 3.2 - Bycatch Strategy

Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway

Moderately Effective

There is little bycatch or entanglement documented in the Barents Sea red king crab pot fishery, although there are many instances in other regions where pot fishery equipment leads to the landing of non-target species or entanglement of vulnerable species. (A. Hjelset, personal communication, November 25, 2022) (George et al. 2020) One ghost gear retrieval trip in 2019 found one deceased humpback whale entangled in pot trap ropes and one deceased seal in one of

the traps in Norwegian waters. (Directorate of Fisheries 2020b)

Annual retrieval trips have been conducted for more than four decades and in 2020, 100 tons of lost fishing equipment was retrieved. Of this, 2,669 pot traps were removed, 119 of which were from the red king crab fishery specifically. (Directorate of Fisheries 2020b) Ghost fishing due to lost pot fishing gear is a concern of the Norwegian government, so measures to mitigate this are regularly enforced including these annual retrieval trips, the obligation of fishers to search for lost gear, and the legal requirement to report the details if gear cannot be found. (Directorate of Fisheries 2008) (Directorate of Fisheries 2020a) As of 2022, all traps are required to be equipped with biodegradable cotton thread to avoid ghost fishing. (A. Hjelset, personal communication, December 13, 2022)

Additional requirements in place to reduce bycatch, include the use of collapsible traps with escape vents and a soak time limit for the traps. including gear modifications (e.g., biodegradable panels), are generally unknown for this fishery.(A. Hjelset, personal communication, December 13, 2022) Aside from the efforts to minimize ghost fishing impacts and the implementation of closed areas and some gear limitsations, the effectiveness of bycatch reduction measures are relatively unknown for this fishery, warranting its bycatch strategy a score of moderately effective.

Factor 3.3 - Scientific Data Collection and Analysis

Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway

Moderately Effective

Norway's Institute of Marine Research regularly collects data and performs research to inform scientific opinions and management strategies, including annual scientific cruises to estimate stock abundance and health and further inform management strategies. (Kourantidou and Kaiser 2021) (Oug et al. 2018) In addition, Norway takes part in the joint IMR-PINRO (Institute of Marine Research-Polar Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography), which documents distributions and abundances for several stocks in the Barents Sea.

The Forum for Integrated Ocean Management, in coordination with a number of Norwegian ministries and advisory groups, draws this scientific basis to further develop ocean management plans. (Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment 2020) Historically, less research has been conducted in the open access fishing region due to a lower abundance of red king crabs, although when data is limited catch rates and other relevant sources have been used to infer stock status. (OECD 2021) (Skonhoft and Kourantidou 2021)

While there are requirements in place for the reporting of all fishing activity and lost fishing gear, data regarding ghost fishing, bycatch, and potential range expansion through ballast water transfer is limited and unclear. (Jørgensen and Nilssen 2011) Interactions between pot fishing gear and marine mammals are known, however the impact of these interactions is uncertain so improved data collection in this area may help better understand the extent of any impacts.

Therefore, the scientific data collection and analysis in this fishery warrants a score of moderately effective.

Factor 3.4 - Enforcement of and Compliance with Management Regulations

Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway

Highly effective

Norwegian managers use logbooks, landing and sales notes, and a vessel monitoring system (VMS) to track catch and landings and all catches of fish must be landed. (Directorate of Fisheries 2008) (Directorate of Fisheries 2015) All vessels must submit reporting regularly to the Directorate of Fisheries which can also inspect any stage of the fishing process and place observers on vessels to ensure compliance and detect and prevent illegal fishing. The Directorate of Fisheries may also assign fines and penalties in the case regulations are not adhered to. (Directorate of Fisheries 2008) (Ministry of Trade, Industry, and Fisheries 2015)

Although the Barents Sea red king crab is an invasive species, it is understood that total eradication is not possible or desirable and so the current management and enforcement plan adheres to the voluntary international Convention of Biodiversity agreement to control alien species "as far as possible and as appropriate". (Sundet and Hoel 2016) Therefore, the enforcement of and compliance with management regulations warrants a score of highly effective.

Factor 3.5 - Stakeholder Inclusion

Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway

Highly effective

Integrated ocean management plans are developed through collaboration of all relevant parts of public administration, including multiple government ministries, the Forum for Integrated Ocean Management, the Institute of marine Research, and an advisory group on monitoring. (Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment 2020) After considering monitoring data, the Directorate of Fisheries proposes annual regulations and participation conditions at two regulatory meetings a year, during which stakeholders from administration, industry, and environmental interests can provide input before being finalized and implemented. (Kourantidou and Kaiser 2021) (Directorate of Fisheries 2022)

Therefore, Norway has a inclusive process that is transparent and allows for stakeholder input and warrants a score of highly effective.

Criterion 4: Impacts on the Habitat and Ecosystem

This Criterion assesses the impact of the fishery on seafloor habitats, and increases that base score if there are measures in place to mitigate any impacts. The fishery's overall impact on the ecosystem and food web and the use of ecosystem-based fisheries management (EBFM) principles is also evaluated. Ecosystem Based Fisheries Management aims to consider the interconnections among species and all natural and human stressors on the environment. The final score is the geometric mean of the impact of fishing gear on habitat score (factor 4.1 + factor 4.2) and the Ecosystem Based Fishery Management score. The Criterion 4 rating is determined as follows:

- ***Score >3.2=Green or Low Concern***
- ***Score >2.2 and ≤3.2=Yellow or Moderate Concern***
- ***Score ≤2.2 = Red or High Concern***

Guiding principles

- Avoid negative impacts on the structure, function or associated biota of marine habitats where fishing occurs.
- Maintain the trophic role of all aquatic life.
- Do not result in harmful ecological changes such as reduction of dependent predator populations, trophic cascades, or phase shifts.
- Ensure that any enhancement activities and fishing activities on enhanced stocks do not negatively affect the diversity, abundance, productivity, or genetic integrity of wild stocks.
- Follow the principles of ecosystem-based fisheries management.

Rating cannot be Critical for Criterion 4.

Criterion 4 Summary

FISHERY	FISHING GEAR ON THE SUBSTRATE	MITIGATION OF GEAR IMPACTS	ECOSYSTEM-BASED FISHERIES MGMT	FORAGE SPECIES?	SCORE
Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway	Score: 3	Score: 0	Moderate Concern		**Yellow (3.000)**

Managers have prioritized the incorporation of ecosystem-based fisheries management methods for this invasive non-native species but have notand implemented significantsome mitigation efforts to limit the impacts of pot fishing gear on the substrate, which are generally of moderate concern. Therefore, the impacts on the habitat and ecosystem warrant a yellow rating.

Criterion 4 Assessment

SCORING GUIDELINES

Factor 4.1 - Physical Impact of Fishing Gear on the Habitat/Substrate
Goal: The fishery does not adversely impact the physical structure of the ocean habitat, seafloor or associated biological communities.

- *5 - Fishing gear does not contact the bottom*
- *4 - Vertical line gear*
- *3 - Gears that contacts the bottom, but is not dragged along the bottom (e.g. gillnet, bottom longline, trap) and is not fished on sensitive habitats. Or bottom seine on resilient mud/sand habitats. Or midwater trawl that is known to contact bottom occasionally. Or purse seine known to commonly contact the bottom.*
- *2 - Bottom dragging gears (dredge, trawl) fished on resilient mud/sand habitats. Or gillnet, trap, or bottom longline fished on sensitive boulder or coral reef habitat. Or bottom seine except on mud/sand. Or there is known trampling of coral reef habitat.*
- *1 - Hydraulic clam dredge. Or dredge or trawl gear fished on moderately sensitive habitats (e.g., cobble or boulder)*
- *0 - Dredge or trawl fished on biogenic habitat, (e.g., deep-sea corals, eelgrass and maerl) Note: When multiple habitat types are commonly encountered, and/or the habitat classification is uncertain, the score will be based on the most sensitive, plausible habitat type.*

Factor 4.2 - Modifying Factor: Mitigation of Gear Impacts
Goal: Damage to the seafloor is mitigated through protection of sensitive or vulnerable seafloor habitats, and limits on the spatial footprint of fishing on fishing effort.

- *+1 —>50% of the habitat is protected from fishing with the gear type. Or fishing intensity is very low/limited and for trawled fisheries, expansion of fishery's footprint is prohibited. Or gear is specifically modified to reduce damage to seafloor and modifications have been shown to be effective at reducing damage. Or there is an effective combination of 'moderate' mitigation measures.*
- *+0.5 —At least 20% of all representative habitats are protected from fishing with the gear type and for trawl fisheries, expansion of the fishery's footprint is prohibited. Or gear modification measures or other measures are in place to limit fishing effort, fishing intensity, and spatial footprint of damage caused from fishing that are expected to be effective.*
- *0 —No effective measures are in place to limit gear impacts on habitats or not applicable because gear used is benign and received a score of 5 in factor 4.1*

Factor 4.3 - Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management
Goal: All stocks are maintained at levels that allow them to fulfill their ecological role and to maintain a functioning ecosystem and food web. Fishing activities should not seriously reduce ecosystem services provided by any retained species or result in harmful changes such as trophic cascades, phase shifts or reduction of genetic diversity. Even non-native species should be considered with respect to ecosystem impacts. If a fishery is managed in order to eradicate a non-native, the potential impacts of that strategy on native species in the ecosystem should be considered and rated below.

- *5 — Policies that have been shown to be effective are in place to protect species' ecological roles and ecosystem functioning (e.g. catch limits that ensure species' abundance is maintained at sufficient levels to provide food to predators) and effective spatial management is used to protect spawning and foraging areas, and prevent localized depletion. Or it has been scientifically demonstrated that fishing practices do not have negative ecological effects.*
- *4 — Policies are in place to protect species' ecological roles and ecosystem functioning but have*

not proven to be effective and at least some spatial management is used.

- *3 — Policies are not in place to protect species' ecological roles and ecosystem functioning but detrimental food web impacts are not likely or policies in place may not be sufficient to protect species' ecological roles and ecosystem functioning.*
- *2 — Policies are not in place to protect species' ecological roles and ecosystem functioning and the likelihood of detrimental food impacts are likely (e.g. trophic cascades, alternate stable states, etc.), but conclusive scientific evidence is not available for this fishery.*
- *1 — Scientifically demonstrated trophic cascades, alternate stable states or other detrimental food web impact are resulting from this fishery.*

Factor 4.1 - Physical Impact of Fishing Gear on the Habitat/Substrate

Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway

Score: 3

Barents Sea red king crab are harvested using square pot traps which are considered to be lighter and have less benthic disturbance than traps used for fish species, particularly in soft bottom habitats. (Fuller et al. 2008)(Lorentzen et al. 2018) Square pot traps contact the sea floor but are not actively dragged, although potential for dragging on the seafloor due to strong tides, storm swell, or trap retrieval may magnify habitat impacts. (Eno et al. 2001)(Stevens 2021) Therefore, the physical impact of fishing gear on the habitat and substrate warrants a score of 3.

Factor 4.2 - Modifying Factor: Mitigation of Gear Impacts

Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway

Score: 0

Norwegian fishery managers utilize satellite-based vessel monitoring, closed areas, gear limits, and other measures to reduce the impact of this gear on the sea floor and associated habitat. (Directorate of Fisheries 2008)

The open access approach west of the 26°E boundary to prevent further spread of the red king crab has led to an increase in fishing effort in the area, potentially increasing habitat impacts. The use of pot traps is generally considered to have low to medium impacts on soft bottom habitats and their associated species, although the magnitude of these impacts is unknown and dependent on many factors including the amount of fishing pressure, storm swell, tides, and dragging during retrieval. (Eno et al. 2001) (Fuller et al. 2008) (Stevens 2021)

Therefore, the efforts to mitigate this fishery's impacts on benthic habitat warrant a score of 0.

Factor 4.3 - Ecosystem-based Fisheries Management

Barents Sea | Atlantic, Northeast | Pots | Norway

Moderate Concern

Red king crab have been shown to have detrimental food web impacts once introduced into an ecosystem including the reduction of species richness and biomass, shifts in community compositions, changes in population dynamics, and an increase in hypoxic conditions. (Falk-Petersen et al. 2011)(Jørgensen & Spiridonov 2013)(Oug et al. 2018) Despite these documented impacts, in regions where the species has been established for decades, such as the quota-regulated zone, total eradication would likely not be possible or desired due to an influx of crabs from Russian waters in the east, economic impacts on local fishermen, and the potential of trophic cascades as they are already established predators. (Sundet and Hoel 2016) In the quota-

regulated region, red king crab populations have been managed within limits so that the spawning stock maintains reproductive capacity. (Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment 2020)

The open access region for red king crab harvesting aims to prevent further westward expansion of the crab population, which has slowed down the rate of invasion yet not prevented it entirely as crabs are appearing in new areas and altering community composition. (Jørgensen 2013) (Jørgensen and Nilssen 2011) (Skonhoft and Kourantidou 2021)(Sundet and Hoel 2016) The open access approach has been effective in preventing the long-term establishment of red king crab populations further west, although the heightened fishing presence introduces the potential for other negative impacts on the ecosystem and native species. It is unclear if the impacts of a heightened pot fishing presence are reversible and recovery times of species have yet to be identified. (Sundet and Hoel 2016) (Stevens 2021)

Therefore, the policies to manage this non-native species and the associated fishery warrant a score of moderate concern.

Acknowledgements

Scientific review does not constitute an endorsement of the Seafood Watch® program, or its seafood recommendations, on the part of the reviewing scientists. Seafood Watch® is solely responsible for the conclusions reached in this report.

Seafood Watch would like to thank the consulting researcher and author of this report, Sarah Hayroyan from MBA, as well as four anonymous reviewers for graciously reviewing this report for scientific accuracy.

References

A. Hjelset. December 13, 2022. Personal Communication.

A. Hjelset. November 25, 2022. Personal Communication.

Blanchet, M., C. Vincent, J.N. Womble, et al. 2021. Harbour seals: population structure, status, and threats in a rapidly changing environment. Oceans 2: 41-63.

Directorate of Fisheries. 2008. The marine resources act. Act of 6 June 2008 no. 37 relating to the management of wild living marine resources. 15pp.

Directorate of Fisheries. 2015. Electronic Reporting Systems. 2pp.

Directorate of Fisheries. 2020a. Reporting of lost fishing gear from commercial fisheries.

Directorate of Fisheries. 2020b. Lost fishery equipment removed from the seabed. 4pp.

Directorate of Fisheries. 2022. The Regulatory Meeting.

Eno, N.C., D.S. MacDonald, J.A.M. Kinnear, et al. 2001. Effects of crustacean traps on benthic fauna. ICES Journal of Marine Science 58:11-20.

Falk-Petersen, J., P. Renaud, and N. Anisimova. 2011. Establishment and ecosystem effects of the alien invasive red king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*) in the Barents Sea–a review. ICES Journal of Marine Science 68(3): 479-488.

Fuller, S.D., C Picco, J. Ford, et al. 2008. How we fish matters: Addressing the ecological impacts of Canadian fishing gear. Ecology Action Centre, Living Oceans Society, and Marine Conservation Biology Institute. 25pp.

George, J.C., G. Sheffield, B.J. Tudor, et al.. 2020. Fishing gear entanglement and vessel collisions. In *Balaena mysticetu: Biology and Human Interactions.* pp. 577-590.

Hjelset, A. M.. 2014. Fishery-induced changes in Norwegian red king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*) reproductive potential. ICES Journal of Marine Science 71(2): 365-373.

International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES). 2022. Herring (*Clupea harengus*) in subareas 1, 2, and 5, and in divisions 4.a and 14.a, Norwegian spring-spawning herring (Northeast Atlantic and Arctic Ocean). ICES Advice on fishing opportunities, catch, and effort Ecoregions in the Northeast Atlantic and the Arctic Ocean. 8pp.

Jørgensen, L.L. and E.M. Nilssen. 2011. The Invasive History, Impact and Management of the Red King Crab *Paralithodes camtschaticus* off the Coast of Norway. In B.S. Galil et al. (Eds.), *In the Wrong Place - Alien Marine Crustaceans: Distribution, Biology and Impacts*, Invading Nature - Springer Series in

Invasion Ecology 6. Springer Science+Business Media B.V.. 521-536.

Jørgensen, L.L.. 2013. NOBANIS – Invasive Alien Species Fact Sheet – *Paralithodes camtschaticus*. Online Database of the European Network on Invasive Alien Species – NOBANIS. 11pp.

Kourantidou, M. and B.A. Kaiser. 2021. Allocation of research resources for commercially valuable invasions: Norway's red king crab fishery. Fisheries Research 237: 105871.

Lorentzen, G., G. Voldnes, R.D. Whitaker, et al.. 2018. Current Status of the Red King Crab (*Paralithodes camtchaticus*) and Snow Crab (*Chionoecetes opilio*) Industries in Norway. Reviews in Fisheries Science & Aquaculture 26(1): 42-54.

Løviknes, S., K.H. Jensen, B.A. Krafft, et al. 2021. Feeding hotspots and distribution of fin and humpback whales in the Norwegian Sea from 2013 to 2018. Front Mar Sci 8: 632720.

Ministry of Trade, Industry, and Fisheries. 2015. Regulations on quota catching of king crab [translated]. 5pp.

Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment. 2020. Meld. St. 20 (2019 – 2020) Report to the Storting (white paper) - Norway's integrated ocean management plans. 171pp.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). 2021. Fisheries and aquaculture in Norway. Review of Fisheries Country Notes. 8pp.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). 2022. Dataset: Marine landings of red king crab in Norway. 2010-2020.

Oug, E., J.H. Sundet, S.K.J. Cochrane. 2018. Structural and functional changes of soft-bottom ecosystems in northern fjords invaded by the red king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*). Journal of Marine Ecosystems 180: 255-264.

Skonhoft, A., and M. Kourantidou. 2021. Managing a natural asset that is both a value and a nuisance: competition versus cooperation for the Barents Sea red king crab. Marine Resource Economics 36(3): 229-254.

Stelfox, M., J. Hudgins, and M. Sweet. 2016. A review of ghost gear entanglement amongst marine mammals, reptiles and elasmobranchs. Marine Pollution Bulletin 111: 6-17.

Stevens, B.G.. 2021. The ups and downs of traps: environmental impacts, entanglement, mitigation, and the future of trap fishing for crustaceans and fish. ICES Journal of Marine Science 78(2): 584-596.

Sundet, J.H. and A.H. Hoel. 2016. The Norwegian management of an introduced species: the Arctic red king crab fishery. Marine Policy 72: 278-284.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2022. Annual Imports of Red King Crab from Norway into the United States.

Foreign Trade Data Series.

Voldnes, G., I. Kvalvik, and B. Nostvold. 2020. Taking care of a highly valuable resource throughout the value chain - lack of market orientation in red king crab export? Marine Policy 117: 103965.

World Wildlife Fund (WWF). 2014. Illegal Russian Crab: An Investigation of Trade Flow. 40 pp.