BRIEFING SERIES: Recommendations to the EU and the UK on the setting of fishing opportunities

Fishing opportunities in an ecosystem context

Briefing 5 of 11 **July 2025**

About this Briefing Series

This Briefing Series, supported by the 29 undersigned organisations, is designed to assist the responsible decision-makers in the European Union (the European Commission, the Council of the EU and the Member States) and the United Kingdom (the UK Government and devolved administrations) in managing fishing opportunities in a way that:

- Finally ends overfishing,
- Significantly contributes to restoring and/or maintaining all fish stocks above healthy levels and to minimising levels of incidental catches, and
- Safeguards marine ecosystem functioning and resilience, also in light of mounting pressures like climate change.

The Series consists of 11 Briefings covering the following topics related to the setting of fishing opportunities:[1,2]

- 1. Cover Briefing: Key recommendations on setting fishing opportunities
- 2. Context and legal framework
- 3. "Best available" is not good enough - addressing shortcomings in the current scientific advice
- 4. Shared fish stocks
- 5. Fishing opportunities in an ecosystem context (this briefing)
- 6. Mixed fisheries considerations
- 7. The fishing effort regime in the Western Mediterranean Sea
- 8. Landing obligation challenges
- 9. Depleted stocks with zero or very low catch advice
- 10. Stocks not managed by a Total Allowable Catch
- 11. Deep Sea stocks

In order to ensure that fishing opportunities support thriving fisheries while safeguarding ocean health, resilience and productivity, we call on decision-makers to follow all of our recommendations across the entire Briefing Series.

About this Briefing

A healthy, resilient and productive ocean is a fundamental prerequisite for thriving fisheries and coastal communities. This Briefing explains why and how EU and UK decision-makers should ensure that the fishing opportunities they set - and the scientific advice that these are underpinned by - are explicitly geared towards:

- Rapid rebuilding of fish populations that are below sustainable biomass levels;
- Reaching and maintaining population levels well above B_{MSY} (the biomass capable of producing the maximum sustainable yield), with a healthy age/size structure; and
- Taking full account of climate change and other ecosystem dynamics, including the need to leave a sufficient food supply in the ocean for dependent predators.

In order to achieve this, we recommend that they (1) request fully recovery-focused and ecosystem-based advice (also see Briefing 3), and – where this is not yet available – (2) incorporate the necessary precaution into their fishing opportunities by setting them below the single-stock advice (also see Briefing 1).

The need for ecosystem-based fishing opportunities

Both the EU and the UK must deliver on their legal requirement to apply an ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management. This means that decisions on fishing opportunities, including Total Allowable Catches (TACs), other catch limits and fishing effort restrictions, must reflect the ecosystem role of harvested species (both targeted and taken as bycatch). This includes their relationship to other species in the food web (for example as forage fish for seabirds or marine mammals), and the ecological consequences of target species exploitation. Similarly, additional pressures or stressors impacting on harvested stocks or the ecosystem they live in, such as consequences of climate change and offshore renewables development or other ocean uses, must be factored in when setting fishing limits. The single-stock focus of the current approach to setting fishing opportunities lacks consideration of interspecies dynamics as well as size and age distribution, fails to reflect the need to consider sub-populations at risk, and does not factor in the impact of mixed fisheries on bycatch of vulnerable or depleted stocks.[3]

1 Over the years, the NGOs working on fishing opportunities have been providing a range of annually updated recommendations for different sea basins and groups of species. Many of our key recommendations and concerns are cross-cutting and do not change from year to year. For 2025 onwards, we have consolidated these points into this Briefing Series which is intended to remain valid for years to come. The Series will be complemented by bespoke regionally or topically specific recommendations as appropriate and current scientific state of the art findings.
2 Cross-references will be included throughout the text using the relevant Briefing numbers. Full references to all Briefings are listed in ANNEX 1.
3 For example, in the Baltic Sea, bycatch of cod in flatfish fisheries or herring caught in sprat fisheries.

Shortcomings in the current scientific advice on fishing opportunities

It is the responsibility of the clients of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES), such as the EU and the UK, to request catch advice that effectively prioritises healthy and productive fish populations and ecosystems in the long-term, by taking full account of climate change, predator needs and other relevant factors.[4,5] This also applies to the European Commission when requesting scientific advice from the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) for the Mediterranean (also see Briefing 7).

As already explained in Briefing 3, the current ICES and STECF single-stock advice aims for MSY-based exploitation and is not designed to maximise long-term population and ecosystem health and resilience. For example, following a request from the EU and the UK in 2023, ICES confirmed that its current single-stock advice for forage fish species like sandeel does not ensure that sufficient biomass is left for predator species that depend on these populations.[6] Fisheries targeting species at MSY level typically ensure that 40% of the unfished population remains in the ocean, but the scientific literature recommends that for key forage fish species (e.g., sprat, herring, sandeel) up to 75% of the unfished population should be left in the ocean.[7] **While urgently advancing the development of ecosystem science and the full incorporation of relevant ecosystem considerations into the ICES catch advice is crucial, decision-makers must not postpone action until scientists are ready to provide all the answers.**

The case for investing in larger, healthier fish populations as part of a resilient and productive ocean

In line with the fundamental precautionary approach, the EU, the UK and their international negotiation partners must therefore set fishing opportunities below the single-stock advice,[8] especially in the face of uncertainty and data limitations and of the ongoing biodiversity and climate crises and other mounting pressures. This requires a new approach to the setting of fishing opportunities that by default prioritises the rebuilding of all stocks, including shared ones, well above sustainable levels, rather than aiming to merely keep them at or near those (often diminished) levels (also see Briefing 9 on depleted stocks).

For example, a recent study by Froese et al. 2025 emphasised that "*it should be understood and accepted that the scientific estimate of the maximum catch that a stock can support given its ecosystem role and environmental conditions is a hard upper limit that is not open for political negotiation or compromise. Instead, political and societal discussions of allowed catch can focus on debating how far TACs shall be set below the scientific limit to account for uncertainty and to maximise resilience, minimize risks, and ensure long-term profitable fisheries*."[9]

4 For further details on how better requests for scientific advice can help accelerate momentum towards ecosystem-based fisheries management, see for example this briefing by the Pew Charitable Trusts (2024): To Improve Fisheries Management and Protect Ecosystems, Decision Makers Must Ask Better Questions. February 2024. https://www.pewtrusts.org/-/media/assets/2024/02/to-improve-fisheries-management-and-protect.pdf.
5 See Briefing 3 on shortcomings in the scientific advice on fishing opportunities and recommendations for how to address them..
6 EU-UK request on ecosystem considerations in the provision of single stock advice for forage fish species. ICES Advice: Technical Services. Report. https://doi.org/10.17895/ices.advice.24638433.v1. For example, this states in the overall conclusion that "*What is not conducted in the assessments is specific analysis of whether the forage fish biomass is kept high enough for specific predator requirements*" (p. 1). Regarding the use of $B_{escapement}$ as a basis for catch advice for example for sandeel and Norway pout, this document makes clear that this is "*not set based on the needs of predators and may or may not be appropriate for ensuring a good provision of ecosystem services*" (sandeel, p. 4) and aims to "*protect recruitment, which may or may not also protect the role as a food source*" (Norway pout, p. 5).
7 Smith, A.D., Brown, C.J., Bulman, C.M., Fulton, E.A., Johnson, P., Kaplan, I.C., Lozano-Montes, H., Mackinson, S., Marzloff, M., Shannon, L.J. and Shin, Y.J., 2011. Impacts of fishing low–trophic level species on marine ecosystems. Science, 333(6046), pp.1147-1150. https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.1209395.
8 Also see the study by Edgar et al. (2024) and the related perspective by Froese & Pauly (2024) published in Science in 2024, which suggest that scientific stock assessments tend to overestimate biomass levels and recovery trajectories particularly for overfished fish populations. Edgar, G (2024). Investigation reveals global fisheries are in far worse shape than we thought – and many have already collapsed. 23 August 2024. https://theconversation.com/investigation-reveals-global-fisheries-are-in-far-worse-shape-than-we-thought-and-many-have-already-collapsed-237306. The underlying study is: Edgar et al. (2024). Stock assessment models overstate sustainability of the world's fisheries. Science, 385(6711), pp. 860-865. https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.adl6282. Froese, R & Pauly, D (2024). Taking stock of global fisheries. Current stock assessment models overestimate productivity and recovery trajectory. Science, 385(6711), pp. 824-825. https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.adr5487..
9 Froese, R; Steiner, N; Papaioannou, E; MacNeil, L; Reusch, T B H; Scotti, M (2025). Systemic failure of European fisheries management. Science 388(6749), pp. 826-828. DOI: 10.1126/science.adv4341. May 2025.

Along the same line of argument, a scientific paper by Kemp *et al.* 2023 concluded that the "*biomass of fish stocks should be allowed to regenerate to a minimum of 120% of that which will achieve MSY to provide a buffer against the uncertainty in ecological response to climate change*".[10] Similarly, an earlier study by Beaugrand et al. 2022 investigating the impacts of fishing pressure and climate-induced environmental change on cod found that "*alleviating fishing effort is the only way to maintain a stable SSB when the environmental regime becomes less suitable*" and that "*preventing collapse is easier than trying to reverse a collapse*".[11]

There also needs to be an explicit focus on ensuring a healthy age/size structure,[12] which fishing below F_{MSY} could contribute to and which is a key element of Good Environmental Status (GES) under the EU's Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD)[13] and the UK's Marine Strategy Regulations and should already have been achieved by 2020 (also see Briefings 2 and 3). **The reasons for and benefits of investing in larger stocks with a healthy proportion of larger fish are manifold**:

- Such stocks are likely to be a) more resilient to challenges posed by climate change and other mounting pressures, such as pollution or eutrophication, including recruitment failures caused or exacerbated by environmental factors, as well as b) more productive since larger fish tend to produce more offspring per spawner.
- They can improve carbon efficiency of fishing operations[14] and potentially increase the value or marketability of the catch since less fuel and time is needed to catch the same amount of fish compared to a situation where fish are less abundant and smaller.
- Year-to-year fluctuations in stock size may be more effectively mitigated by larger overall stock sizes. Adopting a habit of not fully exhausting every advised catch increase can buffer future decreases in fishing opportunities if the perception of the stock deteriorates, offering more stability for fishers.
- Ultimately, it is an investment into the long-term profitability of the fleet as well as access to sustainable seafood for current and future generations. Meanwhile, a continuation of unsustainable fishing levels and practices jeopardises long-term sustainability across all three dimensions referred to in Article 2(1) of the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) basic regulation and the "sustainability objective" of the UK Fisheries Act (environmental, social, economic).

Setting fishing opportunities below single-stock advice to safeguard ocean health

The EU, the UK and third parties fishing shared stocks must urgently put an end to the irresponsible habit of as a default maxing out on (or even exceeding) the single-stock headline advice provided by ICES and STECF. Instead they must finally request fully ecosystem-based and recovery-focused advice and stop using the absence of such advice as an excuse to keep defaulting to the single-stock headline advice. To this end, as already outlined in Briefings 1 and 3, the EU and the UK should work with ICES - and STECF in the case of fisheries management in the Mediterranean[15] - and other ICES advice clients where relevant to ensure that future requests for scientific advice on fishing opportunities are explicitly geared towards:

10 Kemp, PS, Subbiah, G, Barnes, R, Border, K, O'Leary, BC, Stewart, B, Williams, C (2023). The future of marine fisheries management and conservation in the United Kingdom: Lessons learnt from over 100 years of biased policy. Marine Policy 147 (2023) 105075, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2022.105075, p. 1 (abstract).
11 Beaugrand, G, Balembois, A, Kléparski, L, Kirby, RR (2022). Addressing the dichotomy of fishing and climate in fishery management with the FishClim model. Communications Biology 5, Article number: 1146 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-022-04100-6, pp. 4 and 8.
12 As also advocated for at an event on "More big fish in the sea! Questioning the MSY paradigm for a sustainable long-term marine fisheries management" held by the European Parliament Forum on Recreational Fisheries and Aquatic Environment on 25 April 2023. Event report.
13 Descriptor 3: "*Populations of all commercially exploited fish and shellfish are within safe biological limits, exhibiting a population age and size distribution that is indicative of a healthy stock*." Directive 2008/56/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 2008 establishing a framework for community action in the field of marine environmental policy (Marine Strategy Framework Directive). Annex I.
14 COM(2023) 303 final. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council. Sustainable fishing in the EU: state of play and orientations for 2024. For example, pp. 2 and 6. SWD(2023) 172 final. Commission Staff Working Document accompanying COM(2023) 303 final, for example p. 19.
15 In the case of the species covered by the West Med MAP, reductions in fishing days are the primary tool to reach the target fishing mortality. However, the link between fishing mortality and fishing days is still unclear. Further research should be carried out to provide robust guidance on the setting of fishing effort restrictions that ensures that target fishing mortality is not exceeded.

(1) rapid rebuilding of populations that are below sustainable biomass levels;
(2) reaching and maintaining population levels well above B_{MSY} with a healthy age/size structure; and
(3) fully accounting for and safeguarding ecosystem health and dynamics.

In the meantime, while fully ecosystem-based and recovery-focused advice is not yet available, it is the responsibility of the EU and its negotiation partners to urgently develop an approach for incorporating the necessary precaution into the setting of fishing opportunities. As already outlined in Briefings 1 and 3, this could involve setting fishing opportunities that are geared towards a certain biomass increase or towards recovering/maintaining stocks at a certain percentage (e.g. 120% or 150%) above existing reference points like MSY $B_{trigger}$, B_{MSY} or relevant proxies. Similar approaches, based on the concept of maximum economic yield (MEY), are already in use for example in Australia.[16] Decision-makers could also by default set TACs no higher than a certain fraction (e.g. 80% or less) of the single-stock ICES headline advice (see Briefing 1), in order to integrate a buffer against climate change and other impacts and ease fishing pressure where ecosystem health and dynamics are not yet fully reflected and safeguarded in the available ICES advice.

To adequately account for and safeguard ecosystem health and dynamics, as well as factoring in and mitigating against risks posed by climate change and other pressures, we therefore urge EU and UK decision-makers to follow the recommendations below.

Recommendations for TAC-setting in an ecosystem context

- **Ensure that TAC decisions are based on scientific advice that fully incorporates ecosystem considerations, for example regarding predator-prey interactions, commission such advice where these considerations are not yet fully reflected, and - in its absence - explicitly build additional precaution into TAC-setting** (see Briefings 1 and 3 and below). We note the current use by ICES of multispecies modelling to account for food web dynamics in natural mortality values in the assessments of several species. However, there are concerns that this approach does not ensure that a sufficiently large biomass of forage fish (and other fish forming part of the prey of dependent predators) remains in the water or that areas closed to fishing are fully accounted for[17] to allow dependent predators to meet their needs. In light of various political commitments around maintaining food web integrity, conserving seabirds and marine mammals, and in line with the precautionary approach and the ecosystem-based approach, decision-makers should therefore:

  (1) Adopt an ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management by incorporating the needs of marine predators (e.g., seabirds and cetaceans) into the TAC-setting of forage fish (e.g., sprat, herring, sandeel), by setting TACs for such species well below the current single-stock advice from ICES;

  (2) Adjust TAC-setting downwards to account for areas where fishing is no longer permitted (e.g., marine protected areas and relevant sandeel closures) to prevent a concentration of fishing effort into an area smaller than the one which the advice was given for,[18,] while respecting and supporting the UK and Scottish sandeel

16 Department of Agriculture and Water Resources (2018). Guidelines for the Implementation of the Commonwealth Fisheries Harvest Strategy Policy, Canberra, June. CC BY 4.0, p. 19. "*Some commercial fish stocks around the world are managed to a biomass target that achieves maximum sustainable yield (B_{MSY}). This target maximises the long-term catch that can be taken in a fishery, but ignores the increasing costs of fishing as stocks are fished down to B_{MSY} levels. MEY is generally achieved at a lower catch level (and conversely a higher biomass, B_{MEY}) and aims to maximise the economic returns from fishing rather than maximise the quantity of fish landed.*" The guidelines further explain that for stocks for which bioeconomic models, needed to determine MEY-based reference points and targets, are not available or feasible, MEY proxies are used, including for example the proxy of 1.2 * B_{MSY}. This proxy is explicitly geared towards a biomass 20% larger than B_{MSY}.
17 Dunn, E (2021). Revive our Seas: The case for stronger regulation of sandeel fisheries in UK waters. Royal Society for the Protection of Birds. June 2021.
18 It is important to note that an impact assessment report produced in response to a request from DEFRA also highlighted that ICES "*takes no account of area closures when advising on TACs*". Natural England, Cefas and Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) (2023). What are the ecosystem risks and benefits of full prohibition of industrial Sandeel fishing in the UK waters of the North Sea (ICES Area IV). March 2023. p. 41. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evidence-report-on-the-ecosystem-impacts-from-industrial-sandeel-fishing. Similarly, ICES confirmed in its single-stock advice for sandeel that the UK and Scottish area closures were not accounted for in the stock assessment. ICES (2024). Sandeel (Ammodytes spp.) in divisions 4.a–b, Sandeel Area 4 (northern and central North Sea). ICES Advice: Recurrent Advice. Report. https://doi.org/10.17895/ices.advice.25019657.v1, p. 3. In this and similar situations, ideally ICES could be requested to

closures as a key step towards ecosystem-based fisheries management;[19,20] and

(3) Request that ICES explores more ecologically robust alternative reference points, which set safe ecological limits for predators by accounting for not only the fish biomass predators consume (i.e. their physiological requirements) when breeding successfully, but also the much greater biomass they require access to in order to do so (i.e. their ecological requirements).[21,22]

- **Swiftly act on the ICES response confirming that its single-stock advice for forage fish does not ensure a sufficient food supply for dependent predators, and that solely relying on quota advice is insufficient to ensure ecosystem-based management and wider ecosystem resilience in line with GES.[23]** This request represents a key step in the right direction, but it will be crucial to ensure that any gaps identified (i.e. occasions where the single-stock advice does not yet fully and robustly account for all relevant ecosystem considerations) are urgently addressed. Recognising that developing or adopting the relevant methodologies may take some time, it is the responsibility of the decision-makers in the meantime to use the currently available scientific advice in a much more precautionary way, for example by setting TACs below the single-stock headline advice where relevant ecosystem considerations are not yet fully reflected (also see Briefings 1 and 3). In order to clearly identify such cases, the EU and the UK could request ICES to specify in future on a stock-by-stock basis (for all stocks, not just forage fish species):

  a. which ecosystem considerations are (likely to be) relevant for each stock;

  b. to what extent they and any other conservation measures (e.g. area closures) have (not yet) been factored into the advice; and

  c. what the consequences of a failure to reflect these aspects are likely to be for the stock in question and for the sustainability of the respective headline advice.

  A comprehensive review of the inclusion of ecosystem trends and variability in ICES advice on fishing opportunities by Trenkel *et al.* 2023[24] already presents important findings in this regard that such further work should build on. Such information could be provided as part of the single-stock advice by default and support ecosystem-based TAC-setting even where ecosystem considerations are not yet fully incorporated into the advice in a quantitative manner.

- **Set TACs below the single-stock advice where stocks are subject to additional pressures or stressors such as climate-related and other impacts that are not (yet) fully and explicitly factored into the advice**. One option to integrate the necessary precaution in the face of uncertainty or knowledge gaps on ecosystem needs or dynamics into TAC-setting could be, as a minimum, to default to setting TACs below the single-stock ICES headline advice by at least a certain percentage and/or explicitly aim for larger stock sizes than B_{MSY} (or relevant proxies) (see Briefings 1 and 3), while in parallel supporting the incorporation of all relevant ecosystem considerations into ICES advice on sustainable catches going forward (see above).

adjust its advice on fishing opportunities by removing the amount of sandeel (or other species in question) no longer available to fishing due to area closures from its headline advice. If this aspect is not reflected in the ICES advice itself, it will have to be accounted for at the TAC-setting stage in order to prevent concentration of fishing effort into an area smaller than that for which the advice was given.

19 NGOs on both sides of the English Channel released a joint statement earlier in 2024 in support of the decision to close sandeel fishing in all Scottish waters and English waters of the North Sea. https://rspb.org.uk/media-centre/sandeel-closures-eu-challenge.

20 Following the EU's request for the establishment of an arbitration tribunal over the UK and Scottish sandeel closures in 2024 (https://oceans-and-fisheries.ec.europa.eu/news/eu-requests-establishment-arbitration-tribunal-over-uks-prohibition-fishing-sandeel-2024-10-25_en), the tribunal confirmed that the sandeel closures were based on the best available science and had sufficient regard to the principle of non- discrimination. The tribunal also found that the Scottish closures had sufficient regard to the principle of proportionality, but that regarding the closures in English waters, the UK needed to take further steps to be brought into compliance with the TCA in this regard. In response, the UK Government has committed to undertaking "*a process in good faith to bring the UK into compliance*" while the English closure remains in place for the time being. https://www.gov.uk/government/news/response-to-arbitration-tribunal-final-report-uk-sandeel-the-european-union-v-the-united-kingdom-of-great-britain-and-northern-ireland.

21 Hill, SL, Hinke, J, Bertrand, S, Fritz, L, Furness, RW, Ianelli, JN, Murphy, M, Oliveros-Ramos, R, Pichegru, L, Sharp, R, Stillman, RA, Wright, PJ, Ratcliffe, N (2020) Reference points for predators will progress ecosystem-based management of fisheries. Fish and Fisheries. 2020; 00:1–11.

22 Note for example, that the MSC Fisheries Standard aims to leave up to 75% of the unfished population of "low trophic level" species (such as forage fish like sandeel) in the ocean to meet ecosystem needs, compared to 40% as is typically the case for species managed based on MSY. See Marine Stewardship Council (2023). Clarifying the assessment of key low trophic level stocks.

23 ICES (2023). EU-UK request on ecosystem considerations in the provision of single stock advice for forage fish species. ICES Advice: Technical Services. Report. https://doi.org/10.17895/ices.advice.24638433.v1.

24 Trenkel, VM, Ojaveer, H, Miller, DCM, Dickey-Collas, M (2023). The rationale for heterogeneous inclusion of ecosystem trends and variability in ICES fishing opportunities advice. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 704:81-97. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps14227.

Environmental organisations remain committed to the objectives of the Common Fisheries Policy, the UK Fisheries Act, the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and the UK's Marine Strategy Regulations 2010, as well as the Trade and Cooperation Agreement and other international agreements. We will continue to scrutinise the progress in ending overfishing and boosting long-term population and ecosystem health and resilience as we urge the European Commission, the Council of the EU, the Member States, the UK Government and devolved administrations to finally deliver the EU's and UK's transition to truly sustainable fisheries. This Briefing Series provides a clear and comprehensive list of recommendations on how to get there.

CONTACT DETAILS

The below contact details refer to the main contacts for each of the organisations supporting this Briefing Series, and are not Briefing-specific. We can help redirect any queries to the most appropriate colleagues for each individual Briefing.

Angling Trust: Hannah Rudd, Head of Marine, hannah.rudd@anglingtrust.net

Bass Angling Conservation: David Curtis, Director, david.curtis@bassanglingconservation.co.uk

BirdLife Europe: Cyrielle Goldberg, Marine Policy Officer, cyrielle.goldberg@birdlife.org

BLOOM Association: Alessandro Manzotti, Research and Advocacy Officer, alessandromanzotti@bloomassociation.org

Blue Marine Foundation: Jonny Hughes, Senior Policy Manager, jonny@bluemarinefoundation.com

ClientEarth: Jenni Grossmann, Science and Policy Advisor - Fisheries, jgrossmann@clientearth.org

Coalition Clean Baltic: Aimi Hamberg, Marine Policy Officer, aimi.hamberg@ccb.se

The Danish Society for Nature Conservation (Danmarks Naturfredningsforening): Morten Rosenvold Villadsen, Oceans Political Advisor, morten@dn.dk

Deep Sea Conservation Coalition: Matthew Gianni, Political and Policy Advisor, matthewgianni@gmail.com, and Sandrine Polti, Europe Lead, sandrine.polti@gmail.com

Deutsche Umwelthilfe e.V. (DUH): Lioba Schwarzer**,** Team Lead Marine Conservation, schwarzer@duh.de

Ecologistas en Acción: Cecilia del Castillo Moro, Fisheries Policy Officer, pesca@ecologistasenaccion.org

Estonian Fund for Nature (ELF): Joonas Plaan, Board Member, Sustainable Fisheries Expert, joonas.plaan@elfond.ee

Finnish Association for Nature Conservation (Suomen luonnonsuojeluliitto): Tapani Veistola, Executive Director, tapani.veistola@sll.fi

FishSec: Niki Sporrong, Interim Director, Senior Policy Officer & European Eel Project Manager, niki.sporrong@fishsec.org

Friends of the Irish Environment (FIE): Tony Lowes, Director, admin@friendsoftheirishenvironment.org

German Foundation for Marine Conservation (Deutsche Stiftung Meeresschutz, DSM): Dr Iris Ziegler, Head of Fisheries Policies and Ocean Advocacy, iris.ziegler@stiftung-meeresschutz.org

Lithuanian Fund for Nature (LFN): Dr. Robertas Staponkus, Fisheries Expert, robertas.s@glis.lt

Marine Conservation Society: Chris Graham, Head of Ocean Regeneration & Sustainable Seafood, chris.graham@mcsuk.org

Northern Ireland Marine Task Force: Robert Walsh, NI Marine Task Force Officer, robert.walsh@nimtf.org

North Sea Foundation: Merel den Held, Project Lead Nature & Sustainable Fisheries, m.denheld@noordzee.nl

Oceana: Alec Taylor, Director of Policy and Research, ataylor@oceana.org, for Total Allowable Catches (TACs) in NE Atlantic; Giulia Guadagnoli, Senior Policy Advisor for Sustainable Fisheries, gguadagnoli@oceana.org and Javier Lopez, Campaign Director for Sustainable Fisheries, jlopez@oceana.org, for Western Mediterranean

Open Seas: Lucy Kay, Public Affairs Manager (Westminster), lucy@openseas.org.uk

Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB): Bernadette Butfield, Marine Senior Policy Officer, bernadette.butfield@rspb.org.uk

Sciaena: Gonçalo Carvalho, Executive Coordinator, gcarvalho@sciaena.org

Seas At Risk: Rémi Cossetti, Marine Policy Officer, rcossetti@seas-at-risk.org

Shark Trust: Jack Renwick, Fisheries Conservation Officer, jack@sharktrust.org

Whale and Dolphin Conservation: Bianca Cisternino, Bycatch Coordinator, bianca.cisternino@whales.org

Wildlife and Countryside Link: Tom Ash, Senior Policy Officer, tom@wcl.org.uk

World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF): Jacob Armstrong, Manager, Ocean Policy, WWF European Policy Office, jarmstrong@wwf.eu; Clarus Chu, Senior Policy Advisor (Production), WWF-UK, cchu@wwf.org.uk

ANNEX 1 - FULL REFERENCES TO ALL BRIEFINGS IN THIS SERIES

This Briefing Series is supported by 29 organisations, including environmental NGOs and recreational representatives. Briefing 3 is additionally supported by the Low Impact Fishers of Europe (LIFE), European Anglers Alliance (EAA), Baltic Salmon Fund and Baltic Salmon Rivers Association. Briefing 7 about fisheries management in the Western Mediterranean Sea features fewer logos than the rest of the series since not all of the NGOs signatory to the Briefing Series are active in the Mediterranean.

Briefing 1: Cover briefing: Key recommendations on setting fishing opportunities. Briefing 1 of 11 in the Briefing Series "Recommendations to the EU and the UK on the setting of fishing opportunities". July 2025. https://www.clientearth.org/latest/documents/joint-briefing-series-recommendations-on-fishing-opportunities-briefing-1-cover-briefing-key-recommendations-on-setting-fishing-opportunities/

Briefing 2: Context and legal framework. Briefing 2 of 11 in the Briefing Series "Recommendations to the EU and the UK on the setting of fishing opportunities". July 2025. https://www.clientearth.org/latest/documents/joint-briefing-series-recommendations-on-fishing-opportunities-briefing-2-context-and-legal-framework/

Briefing 3: "Best available" is not good enough - addressing shortcomings in the current scientific advice. Briefing 3 of 11 in the Briefing Series "Recommendations to the EU and the UK on the setting of fishing opportunities". July 2025. https://www.clientearth.org/latest/documents/joint-briefing-series-recommendations-on-fishing-opportunities-briefing-3-addressing-shortcomings-in-the-current-scientific-advice/

Briefing 4: Shared fish stocks. Briefing 4 of 11 in the Briefing Series "Recommendations to the EU and the UK on the setting of fishing opportunities". July 2025. https://www.clientearth.org/latest/documents/joint-briefing-series-recommendations-on-fishing-opportunities-briefing-4-shared-fish-stocks/

Briefing 5: Fishing opportunities in an ecosystem context. Briefing 5 of 11 in the Briefing Series "Recommendations to the EU and the UK on the setting of fishing opportunities". July 2025. https://www.clientearth.org/latest/documents/joint-briefing-series-recommendations-on-fishing-opportunities-briefing-5-fishing-opportunities-in-an-ecosystem-context/

Briefing 6: Mixed fisheries considerations. Briefing 6 of 11 in the Briefing Series "Recommendations to the EU and the UK on the setting of fishing opportunities". July 2025. https://www.clientearth.org/latest/documents/joint-briefing-series-recommendations-on-fishing-opportunities-briefing-6-mixed-fisheries-considerations/

Briefing 7: The fishing effort regime in the Western Mediterranean Sea. Briefing 7 of 11 in the Briefing Series "Recommendations to the EU and the UK on the setting of fishing opportunities". July 2025. https://www.clientearth.org/latest/documents/joint-briefing-series-recommendations-on-fishing-opportunities-briefing-7-the-fishing-effort-regime-in-the-western-mediterranean-sea/

Briefing 8: Landing obligation challenges. Briefing 8 of 11 in the Briefing Series "Recommendations to the EU and the UK on the setting of fishing opportunities". July 2025. https://www.clientearth.org/latest/documents/joint-briefing-series-recommendations-on-fishing-opportunities-briefing-8-landing-obligation-challenges/

Briefing 9: Depleted stocks with zero or very low catch advice. Briefing 9 of 11 in the Briefing Series "Recommendations to the EU and the UK on the setting of fishing opportunities". July 2025. https://www.clientearth.org/latest/documents/joint-briefing-series-recommendations-on-fishing-opportunities-briefing-9-depleted-stocks-with-zero-or-very-low-catch-advice/

Briefing 10: Stocks not managed by a Total Allowable Catch. Briefing 10 of 11 in the Briefing Series "Recommendations to the EU and the UK on the setting of fishing opportunities". July 2025. https://www.clientearth.org/latest/documents/joint-briefing-series-recommendations-on-fishing-opportunities-briefing-10-stocks-not-managed-by-a-total-allowable-catch/

Briefing 11: Deep-sea stocks. Briefing 11 of 11 in the Briefing Series "Recommendations to the EU and the UK on the setting of fishing opportunities". July 2025. https://www.clientearth.org/latest/documents/joint-briefing-series-recommendations-on-fishing-opportunities-briefing-11-deep-sea-stocks/