



RECOMMENDATIONS

LDAC advice in preparation for NEAFC 43rd Annual meeting (12-15 Nov. 2024)

Status: Adopted by consensus by the Executive Committee

Date of adoption: 20 September 2024

R-02-Ej.18 (2024-2025)/WG2

Background

The North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC) is responsible for managing fisheries in the high seas portion of one of the most abundant fishing areas in the world. The objective of the [NEAFC Convention](#) is “to ensure the long-term conservation and optimum utilisation of the fishery resources in the Convention Area, providing sustainable economic, environmental and social benefits”. The Convention highlights the need to safeguard the marine ecosystems in which the resources occur, and to encourage international cooperation and consultation with respect to these resources.

The [main fisheries](#) in the NEAFC Convention area are¹:

- Redfish (Oceanic Sebastes Mentella and Pelagic Deep-Sea Sebastes Mentella)
- Haddock
- Mackerel*
- Herring (Norwegian Spring- Spawning/Atlanto-Scandian)*
- Blue Whiting*
- Deep-sea Species

The regional and international contexts have evolved considerably since the NEAFC Convention was amended for the last time in 2006 (and entered into force in 2013):

- Brexit created a new situation for fisheries management in the North-East Atlantic (NEA), with changes in the balance of powers and in the relative positioning of coastal states and fishing nations. As developed in the [LDAC Advice on the Role of the European Union in NEA fisheries governance in a Post-Brexit Scenario \(February 2022\)](#), this shift to a new governance paradigm could be seized as an opportunity by the European Union (EU) to implement its conservation and sustainability objectives at regional level and bring the other coastal states towards sustainable joint management of fish stocks.

¹ The three fisheries highlighted (i.e. mackerel, ASH and blue whiting) are predominantly managed by the informal coastal states arrangements, which involve the same NEAFC parties in various configurations according to their status in relation to each stock. Within NEAFC, specific additional arrangements are agreed for fishing for these species in high seas areas.



- At global level, international treaties were recently adopted, like the UN agreement on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national Jurisdiction (BBNJ), or the Convention on Biological Diversity's Global Biodiversity Framework (CBD GBF), that provide a clear pathway to countries and Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs) to establish meaningful protections for biodiversity in the high seas. NEAFC has an important role to play in implementing these decisions for the NEA region.
- NEAFC started to discuss the consequences of these global environmental commitments for the NEA, including with OSPAR, through the [Collective Arrangement](#), a multilateral forum composed of all competent entities addressing the management of human activities in this region.
- At its annual meeting in December 2023, NEAFC took some important steps towards better considering environmental and ecosystem trends in its management and decisions, namely:
 - The [parties requested that three “approaches” to implement operational objectives for an ecosystem approach to fisheries management \(EAFM\)](#) be evaluated by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES);
 - The parties agreed to report already designated bottom-fishing closed areas to the Convention on Biological Diversity in 2024 as Other Effective Area Based Conservation Measures (OECM).
 - NEAFC also adopted a resolution on climate change, committing to address the issue through its management and science processes as well as aiming to reduce the environmental impacts of NEAFC meetings.

Technical considerations and Recommendations on selected themes:

1. Progress towards an Ecosystem Based Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) through inclusion of ecosystem considerations/ecological objectives in management.

Introductory remarks

NEAFC started to implement measures related to ecosystems and biodiversity in the early 2000s, with a general approach to the protection of vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs) in 2006, when several areas were closed to bottom fishing. In 2006 also, NEAFC amended its Convention to clarify its legal mandate to adopt conservation and management measures that were not aimed at the fish stocks or bycatches of fish, but rather aimed at minimising harmful impacts on other parts of the marine ecosystem and at conserving marine biodiversity.



In 2008, a Recommendation specified that regular bottom fisheries could only take place in areas that are defined as “existing bottom fishing areas”, on the basis of actual fishing taking place there within a specific reference period. This recommendation also defined “closed areas” for observed areas of VME habitat, in which all forms of “bottom fishing” are permanently restricted. Outside these areas, only exploratory bottom fisheries can be authorised, and these are subject to extensive restrictions. This general principle remains the main tool to protect VMEs at NEAFC.

Beyond VMEs, NEAFC developed an approach to the conservation and management of deep-sea species and a categorization of deep-sea species/stocks. NEAFC also has rules that prohibit directed fisheries on deep sea sharks like basking shark, porbeagle, spurdog, deep sea sharks, rays and chimaeras. It should also be noted that ICES, as NEAFC’s independent scientific advisor, is requested to provide advice based on the principles of an ecosystem approach, as it specified in the MoU between the two organisations.

One difference with a similar RFMO such as NAFO is that NEAFC has not yet developed a comprehensive plan for an ecosystem approach, while NAFO developed a roadmap towards an ecosystem approach, which includes specific actions and for example the adoption of ecosystem reference points to complement stock assessments. However, NEAFC is now starting to look at such an approach (see the 2024 NEAFC request to ICES about possible approaches to operational biodiversity and ecosystem objectives²).

A specificity of the Northeast Atlantic Region is that it is governed by a Regional Sea Convention, the OSPAR Convention on the Protection of the marine environment. OSPAR has a broad mandate to assess and manage most of the pressures on the ecosystems (but not fisheries, which are managed under NEAFC) and one of its objectives under its 2030 Environment Strategy is to have a regional ecosystem-based approach that includes all sectors.

In this respect, the LDAC is following with interest the work of ICES towards an advice following the NEAFC request about EAFM approaches to define biodiversity and ecosystem objectives; the work undertaken under the Collective arrangement of NEAFC in cooperation with OSPAR to develop a cross-sectoral ecosystem-based approach; and the discussion on long-term management strategies as a vehicle for EAFM.

² https://www.ices.dk/advice/Advice-activities/2024_%20attachements/NEAFC_request_EAFM.pdf



Recommendations

1.1. The LDAC notes that NEAFC has made important progress at the last Annual Meeting towards an EAFM by requesting ICES to provide advice on different approaches regarding the definition of ecosystem and biodiversity objectives. The LDAC supports this pathway as a way to implement EAFM.

1.2. Regarding ICES advice assessing three approaches to indicate which operational ecosystem objectives should be prioritized, while the EAFM advice is not yet available for comment, the LDAC recommends that NEAFC aims to achieve the appropriate balance between feasibility and ambition in whatever approach its parties select from those suggested by ICES. While any approach that is burdensome in terms of complexity and data requirement is to be discouraged, the parties must ensure that this discussion results in meaningful objectives and tangible actions for the approach chosen, with a focus on implementation.

1.3. NEAFC also committed to enhancing its collaboration with OSPAR. One of OSPAR's cross-cutting objectives, as stated in its 2030 Environment Strategy, is to develop a practical approach for regional-scale ecosystem-based management in order to strengthen ecosystem resilience to climate change and to safeguard the marine environment, its biodiversity and ecosystem services.

At the last NEAFC Commission meeting, NEAFC and OSPAR committed to jointly discuss how to progress on such a cross-sectoral ecosystem-based approach through their 'Collective Arrangement', which take the form of joint meetings organized once a year and which will also involve participation of ICES and other international bodies. Through this Collective Arrangement, other key issues are being addressed, like spatial management through the development of a joint narrative on OECMs (see our recommendations on spatial considerations below) and the consequences of the UN BBNJ treaty.

Regarding the work undertaken by NEAFC and OSPAR under the Collective Arrangement, the LDAC welcomes the decision to open this forum to observers. Any registered observer at the NEAFC annual Commission or at OSPAR will also be able to attend the Collective Arrangement annual meetings, from 2025 onwards. While specific rules of procedure for observer status at the Collective Arrangement are being agreed between the two organizations, the LDAC recommends making these rules as simple and straightforward as possible in order to facilitate the engagement of observers in the Collective Arrangement.



2. Management of the stocks in NEAFC

Introductory remarks

The LDAC mission is “to provide advice [...] on matters related to [...] relations with RFMOs in which the EU is a contracting party”. The LDAC annual work programme for 2024-2025 states that “The LDAC will rely on the DG MARE correspondent unit and its own industry members to be informed on updated information from Coastal States consultations. Also, it will provide advice on issues other than fishing opportunities [...]”.

The LDAC notes the need to strengthen dialogue and coordination with PelAC as the competent advisory body which has produced advice on the main commercial pelagic stocks for NEAFC.

While the LDAC acknowledges the remit of the PelAC to provide advice on fishing opportunities and technical measures for the small pelagic stocks, the LDAC could consider a joint recommendation with PelAC on certain aspects of shared interest; provide advice on demersal and deep-sea species not under the remit of the PelAC or the NWWAC (in the case of haddock); and/or comment on broader international governance aspects related to the functioning and performance of NEAFC as an RFMO.

Recommendations

2.1. The LDAC notes the poor management of the three large pelagic stocks by coastal states, including persistent failure to agree on shares leading to current overfishing, the unilateral setting of inflated quotas by some parties and a lack of progress on agreeing management plans/LTMPs. The LDAC urges the EU to quickly find an arrangement with other coastal states that brings fishing back to sustainable limits for these stocks, which is an obligation under the CFP.

2.2. The coastal states consultations and arrangements laid out as an informal setting are not fit for purpose for transparent and adequate decision-making within the NEAFC Convention area. The lack of sharing arrangements and the current situation of overfishing at unsustainable levels above the scientific recommendations issued by ICES and PECMAS provides evidence for this. The LDAC wishes to contribute to the discussions on how the EU and other parties can improve the functioning of the coastal states’ consultation informal process and of NEAFC with respect to the management of the pelagic fish stocks. An opportunity for this is the performance review of NEAFC, that will be carried out in the second half of 2024 and first half of 2025.

2.3. The European Union is encouraged to take a leading role in addressing the critical issue of overfishing. This should be achieved by proposing to other contracting parties to NEAFC the agreement of fair and reasonable sharing arrangements as well as other appropriate management tools for the relevant stocks to prevent unsustainable fishing practices.



Overfishing not only threatens the health of our marine ecosystems but also undermines the long-term viability of the fishing industry. By collaborating on the creation of robust measures, we can ensure that Total Allowable Catches (TACs) are set in line with sustainable practices and that unilateral actions that inflate quotas are effectively managed.

Furthermore, the EU should advocate for the establishment of comprehensive conflict resolution mechanisms within NEAFC. These mechanisms would provide a structured approach to resolving disputes and ensuring that all parties adhere to agreed-upon sustainability standards. By working together with other contracting parties, the EU can help develop a framework that promotes equitable and sustainable fisheries management. This initiative will not only protect fish stocks for future generations but also support the economic stability of fishing communities across the Northeast Atlantic region.

2.4. On long term management plans (LTMPs), the LDAC believes that LTMPs are an essential tool for the management of most of the NEAFC area's small pelagic and demersal stocks, and a facilitating element to improve the governance of these stocks, as is acknowledged by all of NEAFC members. The aim of LTMPs is to shift the management approach from short term reactive decision-making to more automated decision rules that can achieve longer-term objectives for a fishery. LTMPs also provide an ideal mechanism for managers to start implementing an ecosystem-based approach to fisheries by incorporating ecosystem or climate-related considerations in the discussion, for example around the selection of objectives for the LTMP. PelAC is already active in this work. The LDAC will wait and see what PelAC advice is and then consider supporting any statement/adding some elements to our advice as reference.

The LDAC would like to suggest the idea of incorporating the risks related to not having shared arrangements (and thus TAC overshoots) embedded in the LTMPs through undertaking a Management strategy evaluation (MSE) process for these stocks that would generate scenarios that visualise the impacts of current TAC overshoots. This is consistent with the views of the PelAC, as stated in its advice on 2024 Fishing Opportunities for blue whiting: "When revising the LTMP of blue whiting, the PelAC recommends the Commission to ask ICES to undertake a MSE process that would generate scenarios that visualise the impacts of current TAC overshoots".



3. Governance of NEAFC and performance review

3.1. Improving governance and stakeholder engagement in policy making:

Recommendations

3.1.1. Unlike for other RFMOs, the EU does not have a formal stakeholder consultation process in place for NEAFC. The LDAC would like to see a more formalized consultation process, similar to those in place for NAFO or ICCAT. A suggested first step would be to call for a technical meeting in preparation of the Annual Meeting in late September/early October when the mandate of the European Commission (EC) is being negotiated to exchange views on key agenda items. The LDAC also requests to meet the EC for preparing NEAFC intersessional meetings other than the Annual Meeting, such as PECMAS or relevant Working Group meetings. In terms of follow-up, the EC is advised to make further efforts in communicating the mandate provided by MS once agreed and how the stakeholders' advice (including the LDAC) is considered.

3.1.2. In the long term, the LDAC would like to see the creation or setup of a permanent stakeholder forum to foster transparency of decision making and inclusiveness and adequate participation of stakeholders in NEAFC committees and working groups. The LDAC is willing to discuss with the EU, different formats or scenarios for achieving this work and would like to encourage the EU to explore with the contracting parties the revamping of the work of a designated Working Group in NEAFC for such purposes. The LDAC acknowledges that the setup of a dedicated NEAFC Stakeholders' forum is considered a good idea but difficult to achieve in practice, as there are several conflicting interests between coastal states and stakeholders.

3.1.3. The LDAC is pleased to note that important progress has been achieved in relation to the Working Group on future development of NEAFC, where participation is now open to observers. However, the participation is hampered in practice by the requirement of annual obligation to apply for observer status in NEAFC, which adds an extra bureaucratic burden particularly for smaller organisations. The LDAC suggests extending the duration of observer status to a period of time similar to what is in place in other RFMOs, i.e. 5-10 years. The LDAC encourages the EU to raise this point with other delegations ahead of the next NEAFC Commission meeting and in the relevant working groups.



3.2. NEAFC Performance review

Introductory remarks

NEAFC is expected to undertake a third performance review in 2024. The Terms of Reference have been agreed by the parties with the aim of a report in 2025. A key point of this performance review is that it will address governance issues like the current mismanagement and overfishing by coastal states of the three pelagic stocks, as well as the lack of transparency and inclusiveness regarding NEAFC decision making.

In relation to governance, there is the outstanding issue in the Barents Sea on the role of the joint Norway-Russian Commission which is the decision making body in relation to stocks/areas that fall under the remittance of the NEAFC. Another example is the situation of redfish in the Irminger Sea, where Russia sets unilaterally its own TAC.

Recommendations

3.2.1. One of the key questions is how EU stakeholders in general, and the LDAC in particular, would fit in the consultation process of the NEAFC performance review. Given that the participation of the LDAC and formulation of specific recommendations are usually channelled via and submitted to the European Commission, we would like to ask for a dedicated meeting on this subject with the Commission in the last quarter of 2024 and/or the first quarter of 2025, depending on the timing agreed by NEAFC, with the possibility of extending the invitation to the designated independent experts panel, if possible.

3.2.2. The performance review should also address the functioning of the Northeast Atlantic fisheries management bodies in light of the chronic failure of the ad hoc coastal states consultations to manage the large pelagic stocks sustainably.

The performance review must address the issue of the separation of management of the same pelagic species between a high seas RFMO (NEAFC) and an informal inter-party forum (coastal states). Urgent changes to the pelagic species governance regime are needed, both to resolve immediate concerns around the failure by the coastal states to secure sharing arrangements for key species, and to ensure management stability in face of changing political and environmental conditions, like the impacts of climate change on these stocks and fisheries.

It must be noted that the last performance review³ already concluded that management of the large pelagic stocks should be integrated into a single forum. The LDAC calls the new performance review to go beyond repeating this same conclusion and identify specific barriers to this needed change and make recommendations to overcome these barriers.

³ Cochrane, K., Murawski, S., & Tahindro, A. (2015). Report of the Performance Review Panel 2014 Northeast Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC). https://nammco.no/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/neaftc_pr-2015.pdf



3.2.3. Finally, the LDAC calls for NEAFC members to be ready to make use of the recommendations that will be produced by the performance review. This is particularly relevant in a context where NEAFC, as the other RFMOs, needs to be proactive in the face of emerging new priorities in ocean governance, such as under the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) and the High Seas Treaty. These agreements necessitate more adaptive governance, wherein responsibilities for sustainable use and biodiversity protection are better integrated and decisions are made more coherently across sectoral management bodies.

4. Spatial measures for conservation of habitats and species:

4.1. Vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs)

Introductory remarks

The definition and need for protection of Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (VMEs) from bottom fishing was established in UN General Assembly Resolution 61/05 in 2006. The identification and protection of VMEs through VME Closed Areas (VME-CAs) has become a well-developed policy in the NEA, with monitoring, control and surveillance mechanisms to ensure compliance and a robust scientific peer review process carried out by ICES. The role of ICES is to provide scientific and technical advice underpinning VME candidate areas and to regularly monitor the biological effectiveness of these areas. As a result, ICES has produced advice on areas where VMEs are known to occur or are likely to occur in EU waters, and also provides recurring annual advice on the presence of VMEs in NEAFC waters and as described above, NEAFC has protected multiple VME areas since 2008.

The NEAFC VME-CAs were brought under a single management instrument in 2014 (Rec 19:2014) and this instrument also commits the parties to review its implementation on a five-yearly basis. The next iteration of this review is due in 2024.

Recommendations

4.1.1. LDAC recommends the timely completion of the five-yearly review of Rec 19:2014 and that observer organisations are included in the processes of designing and delivering the review.

4.1.2. LDAC requests that NEAFC parties note that other deep-sea RFMOs – most notably NAFO – have committed to protect VMEs and all seamount features under their equivalent VME protection instruments. Several identified seamounts exist in the NEAFC Regulatory Area and remain open to bottom fishing (most notably the Josephine Seamount) and LDAC recommends consideration of these sites for further protection in line with the provisions of UNGA Resolution 61/05.



4.1.3. LDAC notes that the original UNGA Resolution 61/05 text requires the closing of areas where VMEs and seamounts “are known to occur or likely to occur” and that the current approach of ICES to VME identification may not be sufficiently comprehensive to achieve this. LDAC recommends that the need to better consider areas where VMEs are “likely to occur” is addressed in the 2024 review of Rec 19:2014.

4.2. Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and Other Effective Conservation Measures (OECMs) under the CBD Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

Introductory remarks

All NEAFC parties are signatories to the GBF and, as such, are committed to contribute to the achievements of its 4 goals for 2050 and 23 targets for 2030. Several targets present specific obligations for RFMOs, including the sustainable, safe and legal use of wild species, applying an ecosystem approach (Target 5), the sustainable management of wild species that benefits people (Target 9) and the substantial increase in the application of biodiversity-friendly practices in areas under fisheries management (Target 10).

Much political attention has been paid to the “30 by 30” Target 3: the effective conservation and management of 30% of marine and coastal areas through “ecologically representative, well-connected and equitably governed systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures”. Where these areas should be, how they should be managed and the extent to which sustainable use should be permitted in them, has been a challenging discussion within the global community. While Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) are relatively well-defined and well-established (albeit with many examples of under-managed MPAs or so-called “*paper parks*”), the concept of “Other effective area-based conservation measures” (OECMs) remains novel.

OECMs are defined by CBD parties as: “a geographically defined area other than a Protected Area, which is governed and managed in ways that achieve positive and sustained long-term outcomes for the *in situ* conservation of biodiversity, with associated ecosystem functions and services and where applicable, cultural, spiritual, socio-economic, and other locally relevant values”. This definition comes from OECM guidance adopted by CBD parties in 2018⁴ which also notes that sector-specific spatial measures introduced by fisheries managers (referred to as area-based fisheries management measures or ABFMs) exist amongst the suite of area-based measures already applied. This guidance also defines specific considerations to be made when applying OECMs in marine environments and criteria for evaluating whether an area conforms to the definition of an OECM.

⁴ CBD/COP/DEC/14/8. <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-14/cop-14-dec-08-en.pdf>



RFMOs, like any national or international sectoral management bodies, can evaluate whether their existing portfolios of ABFMs conform to the definition and criteria of an OECM (and can therefore be considered contributions to GBF Target 3). The candidacy of ABFMs as OECMs present particular challenges around sites that host overfished stocks and/or industrial-scale fishing, sites that protect biodiversity features on the seabed but not in the water column and sites where the only sectoral use that is directly managed is fisheries.

NEAFC is among a small group of RFMOs that has already evaluated its existing portfolio of ABFMs as candidate OECMs. In 2023, NEAFC parties agreed to recognise its VME Closed Areas (VME-CAs) as OECMs and to inform the CBD of this decision. They also decided to take more time to consider some of its restricted bottom fishing areas (RBFAs) as candidate OECMs. ICES was requested to provide another advice on these restricted areas regarding their ability to achieve in situ biodiversity/ecosystem benefits as long as no bottom fishing activities occur.

Further discussions on OECM are expected to be held at the PECMAS meeting (or similar meeting) in October 2024, once the ICES advice is published.

Recommendations

4.2.1 The LDAC recommends that NEAFC parties contribute actively to the spatial protection of biodiversity in the Regulatory Area through MPA designation, OECM designation and OECM recognition. All existing and possible future site designations should be considered in line with guidance from the CBD and NEAFC should collaborate with all relevant multilateral and sectoral bodies in delivering appropriate management to support the objectives of these sites.

4.2.2. The LDAC recommends that NEAFC parties maintain clear conformity with CBD Decision 14/8 in both how candidate OECMs are identified and evaluated and how the process of identification and evaluation is conducted (noting the CBD's own guidance that "It is important that other effective area-based conservation measures be documented in a transparent manner").

4.2.3. Regarding the potential candidacy of RBFAs as OECMs, LDAC recommends that NEAFC carefully consider and discuss at the next PECMAS or other relevant NEAFC meeting, the upcoming ICES advice regarding the biodiversity benefits delivered by the RBFAs based on the polygons identified above 1 400 m isobar.

If the ICES advice shows that these depth-delineated sub-sets of the RBFAs contain VME indicator species, then they should first be recognised as VME Closed Areas, which would remove the concerns around whether these areas subject to the possibility of future exploratory fishing can be OECMs.



Alternatively, if the ICES advice shows that these sub-set areas contain non-VME biodiversity attributes, these attributes must be named, their characteristics understood and an assessment of what management is needed to ensure the protection of that biodiversity completed, before moving towards OECM recognition.

While we acknowledge the need to progress on OECM designation in a timely manner, we recommend that NEAFC parties consider the global precedent potentially being set here and the need to ensure the right OECM candidates are identified.

4.3. Fisheries measures that can achieve CBD Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) targets:

Recommendations

4.3.1. Although the GBF was adopted as a package, the LDAC perceives that there is an overly heavy focus on target 3 which risks weakening the implementation of other relevant targets. The LDAC believes that other GBF targets, and in particular targets 5,9 and 10, are also important as they bring new responsibilities for the fishing sector, allowing the sector to contribute to halting and reversing biodiversity loss. Fisheries-specific guidance on these targets, and indicators to help gauge progress, are still in development, and urgently needed to help fisheries managers take the necessary steps to meet the targets. The LDAC is of the view that a concrete step for fisheries managers to progress on these targets is to evaluate progress towards existing commitments and available tools such as the existing body of knowledge on ecosystem-based fisheries management.

4.3.2. The LDAC notes that CBD showed some concern at its last Global Dialogue meeting between the RFBs and the RSOs and highlighted the need for strengthening coordination at regional and national level between fisheries bodies and environmental bodies, stressing the importance of inter-agency and inter-sectorial collaboration. In this respect, NEAFC and OSPAR relation is quite unique and important for further discussing and implementing the BBNJ agreement and the GBF.



5. Climate change considerations for decision making

Introductory remarks

NEAFC parties, based on a proposal from the UK, adopted at the last Annual Meeting in 2023 a resolution that calls on parties to “*discuss how best integrate climate change science in the NEAFC decision-making processes as to better mitigate, prepare for and respond to climate change impacts including through adaptation measures that can ensure ecosystem resilience*”.

Recommendations

5.1. The LDAC calls NEAFC parties to deepen existing coordination and undertake new initiatives that prepare for future climate conditions and their effects. These efforts should include the use of adaptive management tools, particularly long-term management plans, which should be considered as “climate adaptation strategies” and incorporate them into the fisheries they manage to anticipate the effects of future climate scenarios on target species.

5.2. Furthermore, likely climate-induced changes in the distribution and productivity of important stocks, like the pelagic stocks currently managed under the coastal states’ consultations, may exacerbate political tensions around access and sharing. NEAFC parties should therefore examine the governance regimes of the fisheries they manage and assess how robust they are to potentially major changes in the location, abundance, and accessibility of currently fished stocks (see section 3.2. above).

-END-