

Current and potential contributions of the Gulf of Lion Fisheries Restricted Area to fisheries sustainability in the NW Mediterranean Sea

Daniel Vilas, Marta Coll, Xavier Corrales, Jeroen Steenbeek, Chiara Piroddi, Diego Macias, Alessandro Ligas, Paolo Sartor, Joachim Claudet

► To cite this version:

Daniel Vilas, Marta Coll, Xavier Corrales, Jeroen Steenbeek, Chiara Piroddi, et al.. Current and potential contributions of the Gulf of Lion Fisheries Restricted Area to fisheries sustainability in the NW Mediterranean Sea. Marine Policy, 2021, 123, pp.104296. 10.1016/j.marpol.2020.104296 . hal-03025079

HAL Id: hal-03025079 https://hal.science/hal-03025079v1

Submitted on 7 Dec 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés. 1 Current and potential contributions of the Gulf of Lion Fisheries Restricted

2 Area to fisheries sustainability in the NW Mediterranean Sea

3

4 Authors

- 5 Daniel Vilas*^{1,2,3}, Marta Coll^{1,4}, Xavier Corrales^{1,4,5}, Jeroen Steenbeek⁴, Chiara
- 6 Piroddi⁶, Diego Macias⁶, Alessandro Ligas⁷, Paolo Sartor⁷ and Joachim Claudet⁸

7 Affiliations

- ¹ Institut de Ciències del Mar (ICM-CSIC), P. Marítim de la Barceloneta, 37-49, 08003
- 9 Barcelona, Spain.
- ² Nature Coast Biological Station, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of
- 11 Florida, Cedar Key, FL 32625, United States.
- ³ Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences Program, School of Forest Resources and Conservation,
- 13 University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, United States.
- ⁴ Ecopath International Initiative (EII), Barcelona, Spain.
- ⁵ AZTI, Marine Research, Txatxarramendi Ugartea z/g. E-48395, Sukarrieta, Spain.
- ⁶ European Commission, Joint Research Centre, Institute for Environment and
- 17 Sustainability, Via Fermi 2749, 21027 Ispra, Italy.
- ⁷ Consorzio per il Centro Interuniversitario di Biologia Marina ed Ecologia Applicata
- 19 "G.Bacci", Italy.
- ⁸ National Center for Scientific Research, PSL Université Paris, CRIOBE, USR 3278
- 21 CNRS-EPHE-UPVD, Maison des Océans, 195 rue Saint-Jacques 75005 Paris, France.
- 22

23 Abstract

Among FAO's Major Fishing Areas, the Mediterranean and the Black Sea had the highest percentage (62.5%) of stocks fished at unsustainable levels, especially demersal stocks. Spatial-temporal restrictions of fishing activities are important measures used for the management of marine stocks. However, sometimes these regulations are not fully 28 implemented due to a lack of effectiveness and compliance, which contributes to their 29 failure. Here, we developed a food-web model approach using the Ecopath with Ecosim 30 (EwE) model representing the Fisheries Restricted Area (FRA) of the Gulf of Lion ecosystem (CoSEGoL model) prior to the establishment of the fisheries restrictions (2006-31 32 2008). We characterized the structure and functioning of the ecosystem before and after 33 its establishment. The constructed food-web model was then fitted to the available time 34 series of data from 2008 to 2016 to verify whether this FRA has contributed to the recovery 35 of target demersal species and the demersal community. The fitted model was used to explore alternative future management scenarios to explore feasible management options 36 37 in order to ensure a full ecosystem recovery under climate change conditions. Our results 38 suggest a failure in the recovery of target species in the restricted area under the current management scenario, potentially revealing a lack of protection efficiency and/or 39 40 enforcement. Scenarios of management options under plausible climate futures revealed possible recovery of targeted species, especially European hake. The study highlighted 41 the importance of considering trophic interactions between predators and prey to identify 42 43 trade-offs and synergies in fisheries management outcomes and the need to consider both 44 fishing and climate dynamics.

45

46

Keywords: Fisheries rebuilding, future management scenarios, Ecopath with Ecosim, Gulf
 of Lion, food webs, ecological indicators.

49

50

51

52 **1.** Introduction

53

Fishing is considered one of the most harmful stressors of marine ecosystems [1] with impacts on habitat [2], biodiversity [3], and ecosystem structure [4]. Overexploitation of marine resources is widely distributed [5], and it has substantially reduced fish biomass and caused significant ecological changes in the global ocean [6,7]. In the Mediterranean Sea, many assessed demersal stocks are either fully exploited or overexploited [8]. Despite that the percent of sustainable exploited stocks is improving globally, the Mediterranean Sea is the one among FAOs major fishing areas with the highest percentage (62.5%) of stocks fished at unsustainable levels, several demersal stocks continue to experience high fishing mortality rates, and selectivity is decreasing [8,9].

63 Spatial-temporal restrictions of fishing activities and the establishment of technical 64 measures are the main management tools used in the Mediterranean Sea for marine 65 exploited stocks [10]. A Fisheries Restricted Area (FRA) is a geographically-defined area 66 where all or certain fishing activities are temporally or permanently banned or restricted to 67 protect marine ecosystems and improve the conservation and sustainable exploitation of marine resources [11]. They fall within the category of ABFMs (Area-based Fisheries 68 Management Measures) and specifically OECMs (Other Effective Area-based 69 70 Conservation Measures) when the FRA is established to protect biodiversity features of 71 concern.

72 In the Mediterranean Sea, fishing activities as well as conserving fish stocks are 73 managed by the European Union (EU) Commission through a set of rules named Common 74 Fisheries Policy (CFP). The CFP sets guotas for which the EU Member States are allowed 75 to catch for some species. These quotas are shared between EU countries and each country distributes national quotas among their fishermen. However, quotas have never 76 77 been considered useful for highly diverse Mediterranean demersal fisheries [12] and its 78 introduction will create management problems such as an increase in illegal fishing [13]. 79 Among CFP rules, there is a regulation to prevent, deter, and eliminate illegal, unreported, 80 and unregulated fishing [14]. To do that, the European Commission established a community control system for ensuring compliance with the rules of the CFP [15]. This 81 82 system uses information from different sources to improve the quality of fisheries data: electronic recording and reporting system, vessel monitoring system, automatic 83 identification system, and more traditional control and surveillance methods, such as 84 inspection on board. However, despite this, in May 2017, the European Court of Auditors 85 examined the effectiveness of the Control Regulation and found that Member States of the 86 EU do not fully implement the required controls and lack of effectiveness [16]. 87

In the Mediterranean Sea, the European Union (EU) and the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) called for advancing the spatial-temporal measures for recovering populations of demersal stocks in the Western Mediterranean Sea [15,16]. Consequently, since 2016 eight Fisheries Restricted Areas (FRAs) have been established to ensure the protection of deep-sea sensitive habitats and essential fish

93 habitats in well-defined areas of the Mediterranean Sea. Additionally, all Mediterranean waters below 1000 meters were officially declared as a FRA by the EU Commission in 94 95 2016 [11]. Among these FRAs is the continental slope of the Eastern Gulf of Lion (CoSEGoL) FRA, the only FRA located in the Western Mediterranean Sea outside 96 97 territorial waters. The CoSeGoL FRA was established in 2009, following a 98 Recommendation by GFCM (GFCM/33/2009/1) [17], which froze the fishing effort in the 99 area. In fact, the Scientific Advisory Committee advised "to ban the use of towed and fixed 100 gear and longlines for demersal resource in an area of the continental shelf and slope of the eastern Gulf of Lion" [17]. The CoSEGoL FRA was established for the protection of the 101 102 spawners that support the demersal fishery of the Gulf of Lions and Spanish coasts in 103 order to help maintain the status quo of the stocks [18].

104 Despite the fact that benefits of regulated and well-enforced marine protected 105 areas (MPAs) and FRAs have been widely demonstrated in the Mediterranean Sea (e.g. 106 [19]), protected areas with the most effective level of protection reach only 0.23% of the 107 basin, while 72% of MPAs lack basic regulation to be effective [20]. As such, a lack of 108 effective management and/or enforcement in restricted areas may hinder ecological 109 benefits [21,22] In addition, the number of studies on the benefits of FRAs on the living 110 resources is scarce in the Mediterranean Sea. For example, Dimarchopoulou et al. [23] demonstrated the positive effect of fishing restrictions on commercial demersal species in 111 112 the Thermaikos Gulf, the Eastern Mediterranean Sea. However, Petza et al., [24] reviewed 113 the effectiveness of several national FRAs in the Aegean Sea and found that more than 114 50% of the studied national FRAs (n=516) were slightly effective based on a multi-criteria 115 analysis (restriction measures, biodiversity and conservation objectives, etc.).

By 2020 10% of the Mediterranean Sea should be conserved through effectively managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas [25] to ensure the improvement of the status of fish stocks and fisheries. Well established and effective FRAs could contribute to increase the protected surface in the Mediterranean Sea [23,26]. Currently, official spatial protection in the Mediterranean Sea covers more than 10% of its surface [27], although most of these areas are poorly protected or unprotected [28] and the surface of fully protected areas is around 0.04% [29].

123 In such a context, it is important to assess the effectiveness of the proposed FRAs to 124 rebuild and protect demersal commercial stocks in the Northwestern Mediterranean Sea 125 and to ensure a resilient structure and functioning of the ecosystems. Too often, fishing 126 restricted areas are established without time-bound impact assessments and recovery indicators of success. Here, we developed a food-web model using the Ecopath with 127 Ecosim (EwE) approach [30,31] representing the CoSEGoL area (2006-2008) prior to the 128 establishment of the FRA. The food-web model was fitted to available time series of data 129 130 from 2008 to 2016 using the temporal dynamic module Ecosim [31,32] to simulate how the 131 structural and functional traits of the ecosystem changed since the establishment of the 132 FRA, and to verify if its establishment resulted in the recovery of commercially targeted 133 species. The fitted model was then used to explore the viability of alternative future 134 management scenarios under climate change conditions (accounting for changes in the 135 water temperature and primary productivity dynamics), following similar approaches 136 applied in other modeling studies [33-35]. This study complements existing modeling studies of protected areas in the Mediterranean Sea [e.g. 36-38] using the EwE approach, 137 by explicitly representing the FRA in the basin. 138

139 To our knowledge, this is the first attempt to build a FRA food-web model in the 140 Western Mediterranean Sea. In the Aegean Sea (the Eastern Mediterranean Sea), 141 Dimarchopoulou et al. [39] built an Ecopath and Ecosim model for a FRA and reported 142 higher biomass values when reducing fishing effort and so contributing to rebuilding 143 marine resources. In the Western Mediterranean Sea, despite assessing small-scale fisheries, some previous studies have modeled food-webs in MPAs evaluating the effects 144 145 of fisheries. For instance, Corrales et al. [36] showed slight recoveries of some target 146 species and ecological indicators in three small MPAs and indicated contrasting results 147 related to the effectiveness of the protection and fishing activities allowed in each MPA.

148

149 **2. Material & Methods**

150 **2.1. Study area**

The CoSEGoL FRA is located in the Gulf of Lion of the Northwestern Mediterranean Sea, bounded by the following geographic coordinates: 42°40'N, 4°20' E; 42°40'N, 5°00' E; 43°00'N, 4°20' E; 43°00'N, 5°00' E (Figure 1). The Gulf of Lion is one of the most productive regions of the Mediterranean Sea because of the inputs from the Rhone river and experiences annual upwelling [40]. The bathymetry of the CoSEGoL FRA ranges from 100 to 1500 meters and covers an area of 2,051 km² [41]. This area has been identified as containing essential fish habitats (nurseries and spawning areas) for European hake (*Merluccius merluccius*) and other commercial species [42]. It is characterized by an intricate network of submarine canyons [43], and important benthonic communities of echinoderms, gorgonians, sponges [44], and deep-sea corals [45,46] occur in the area.

162



163

Figure 1. Location of the continental slope of the Eastern Gulf of Lion Fisheries RestrictedArea (Northwestern Mediterranean Sea).

166

167

The CoSEGoL FRA has historically been exploited by Spanish bottom trawlers (BTW), Spanish longliners (LON), and French midwater trawlers (MTW) [17]. French trawlers are the main component of the fleet exploiting the marine resources of the Gulf of Lion, and can be divided in two main components: one directed to the catch of small pelagic fish, and the other exploiting a great diversity of demersal species [44]. The aim of CoSEGoL FRA was to protect spawning stocks of several commercially important species in the Northwestern Mediterranean Sea, the most important one being European hake, and also including anglerfish (*Lophius piscatorius*), Norway lobster (*Nephrops norvergicus*), and the blue and red shrimp (*Aristeus antennatus*), while conserving accompanying species (blue whiting *Micromesisitius poutassou* and silver sabbardfish *Lepidopus caudatus*) [44].

In the recommendation from which the CoSEGoL FRA was adopted [17], the GFCM called for ensuring that fishing effort for demersal stocks of vessels using towed nets, bottom and mid-water longlines, and bottom-set nets shall not exceed the level of fishing effort applied in 2008. Officially, the fleet operating that area in 2008 was composed of 29 fishing vessels, 70% from France, and 30% from Spain [17].

184 **2.2. Ecosystem modeling approach**

The CoSEGoL FRA model was developed using the Ecopath with Ecosim ecosystem modeling approach (EwE, version 6.6) and it was built using the best available information to represent the FRA ecosystem just before its establishment. Specifically, the model represented a situation of the CoSEGoL FRA for the 2006-2008 time period. Subsequently, an Ecosim model representing the CoSEGoL FRA ecosystem during the 2008–2016 period was fitted to time series of historical data (See detailed information about ecosystem modeling approach in Supplementary material Appendix A).

192 **2.3. Model parametrization**

193 The CoSEGoL FRA model represented the state of the ecosystem in 2006-2008, 194 previously to the official establishment of the FRA in 2009. Information about species presence and their biomasses were aggregated into functional groups (FGs) of species or 195 196 groups of species clustered according to key information about their trophic ecology, 197 commercial value, and abundance in the ecosystem. We used the same meta-web 198 structure as defined for the SafeNet Project¹ Western Mediterranean Sea model [37]. We 199 adapted this meta-web structure to local conditions by removing those FGs that did not occur in the study area. The final food-web structure of the CoSEGoL FRA model contains 200 201 72 functional groups (five marine mammals, one seabird, one sea turtle, 13 pelagic fishes, 202 24 demersal fishes, four cephalopods, 18 invertebrates, two zooplankton, two 203 phytoplankton, and two detritus groups) (Supplementary material Table B.1).

¹ http://www.criobe.pf/recherche/safenet/

204 FGs' biomasses were obtained from different sources from the study area or surrounding areas (see Supplementary Material Table B.1 and C.1. for details on the 205 206 parameterization of each functional group). Most of the biomasses of demersal and 207 benthic species were calculated from the EU-funded Mediterranean International bottom 208 Trawl Surveys project [47], carried out from spring to early summer (April to June) from 1994 to the present. Species biomass was estimated for each haul as the total weight of 209 each species (kg) per km² of trawling. This information was extracted from the MEDITS 210 dataset to account for bathymetric sampling per strata. For pelagic species, we also used 211 212 the data available from the EU-funded Mediterranean International Acoustic Survey 213 (MEDIAS), which contained information of abundance and biomass per Geographical Sub-Area (GSA). 214

215 Annual production (P/B) and consumption (Q/B) rates were either estimated using empirical equations [48] or taken from literature or other models developed in the 216 217 Mediterranean Sea [37] (Supplementary Material Table B.1 and C.1.). The diet information 218 was compiled using published studies (Supplementary Material Table B.1) on stomach 219 content analyses, giving preference to local or surrounding areas (Supplementary Material 220 Table C.2). We used the Diet Calculator (Steenbeek 2018), a custom-built extraction tool 221 that facilitates the process of vetting and incorporating diet data into EwE. Drawing on a 222 large library of published diet studies, the Diet Calculator selects the most likely suitable 223 diet studies for a specific model area, based on a weighted evaluation of diet study 224 characteristics, and generates a diet composition matrix with accompanying pedigree 225 index for each predatory functional group. For migratory species (large pelagic fishes, sea 226 birds, turtles, and dolphins), we set a fraction of the diet composition as import based on 227 the time that these species feed outside the system [30,48].

228 Fisheries data were obtained from different sources (database, literature, and unpublished data) (Supplementary Material Table B.1. and C.1.). Available fishery data 229 230 were not geolocated, and so we had to scale catches by the fishing area where operates each fleet. We divided fisheries into three commercial fishing fleets for the CoSEGoL FRA 231 232 model (Spanish Bottom trawlers, Spanish longliners, and French Midwater trawlers). We 233 calculated catches in two different ways: 1) for French fleets, we scaled total catches [49] 234 by FRA area belonging to Gulf of Lion area, and then by the number of vessels working in 235 the study area [17]; and 2) for Spanish fleets, we obtained landings from the official dataset of the Regional Government of Catalonia managed by the Institute of Marine
Sciences (ICM-CSIC) [50], and were scaled to the area where these fleet were operating.

238 2.4. Quality of the model

239 The guality of the models were evaluated using the EwE pedigree routine, which categorizes the origin of the input parameters (B, P/B, Q/B, diets, and catches) and 240 241 assigns a measure of confidence and specifies the uncertainty associated with these inputs [30,31]. All pedigree values were manually calculated except for diets, which were 242 243 obtained from the Diet Calculator algorithm [51]. The algorithm computes a total pedigree 244 value for each diet record as a weighted average of four attributes assigned to each diet 245 study (region and year of collection, data representativeness of the species population, 246 and data collection method). Pedigree values were used to identify parameters with low 247 quality that could be modified during the balancing procedure and were used to calculate 248 the pedigree index of the overall model, which varies between zero (lowest quality) and 249 one (highest quality) [31], for the FRA model. The confidence intervals used to describe 250 the uncertainty of the balanced Ecopath model are described in the Supplementary Material (Supplementary Material Table D.1). 251

252 2.5. Fitting to time series procedure

Relative fishing effort data available for the fishing fleets included in the model 253 254 were used to drive the model. Due to the lack of local fishing effort time series, and to test 255 the hypothesis of compliance and enforcement failure in the CoSEGoL FRA, we tested 256 alternative relative fishing effort time series that considered annual declines (-1%, -5%, -257 10%), annual increases (+1%, +5%, +10%) or no changes in effort with time. These 258 changes were applied to all fisheries in the model. Available absolute or relative observed 259 biomass time series were incorporated in Ecosim to compare the model outputs to 260 observations.

261 **2.6. Model analyses and ecological indicators**

The food web structure of the CoSEGoL FRA ecosystem before and after the establishment of the FRA was visualized using a flow diagram built from the biomass and TL (output) of each FG, and the direct trophic interactions among them. The TL identifies the position of organisms within food webs by tracking the source of energy for each organism, and it is calculated by assigning primary producers and detritus a TL of 1 (e.g. phytoplankton), and consumers to a TL of 1, plus the average TL of their prey weighted bytheir proportion in weight in the predator's diet [52].

269 With both before and after FRA models, the mixed trophic impact (MTI) analysis 270 was performed to quantify direct and indirect trophic interactions among functional groups 271 [53]. This analysis quantifies the direct and indirect impacts that a hypothetical increase in 272 the biomass of one functional group would have on the biomasses of all the other 273 functional groups in the ecosystem, including the fishing fleets. We also used the Valls keystone index [54] to identify keystone species in both before and after FRA models. A 274 275 keystone species is a species that may show relatively low biomass but has a relatively 276 important role in the ecosystem [55].

277 Several additional ecological indicators were computed to describe the state and 278 functioning trend of the CoSEGoL FRA before and after the establishment of the fisheries 279 restrictions following [56]:

Biomass-based. These indicators are calculated from the biomass of components included in the food-web model. We included five biomass-based indicators: biomass of demersal species (t·km⁻²·year⁻¹) biomass of fish species (t·km⁻²·year⁻¹), biomass of commercial species (t·km⁻²·year⁻¹), biomass of predatory species (t·km⁻²·year⁻¹), and biomass of invertebrates species (t·km⁻²·year⁻¹).

Trophic-based. These indicators reflect the TL position of different groups of the food web. Trophic level indicators may reflect ecosystem "health" because fishing pressure removing predators can cause a decline in the trophic level of the catch and/or the community [52]. We selected four trophic-based indicators: TL of the community (TLc), TL of the community including organisms with TL \geq 2 (TL2), TL of the community including organisms with TL \geq 3.25 (TL3.25), and TL of the community including organisms with TL \geq 4 (TL4).

Flows-based. We used two indicators related to the total flows of the system. The Average Path Length (APL, μ) is defined as the average number of groups that flows passes through and is an indicator of stress [57]. Finn's Cycling Index (FCI, %) is the fraction of the ecosystem's throughput that is recycled [58].

Catch-based. These indicators are based on catch and discard species data. We included six indicators: total catch ($t \cdot km^{-2} \cdot year^{-1}$), total demersal catch ($t \cdot km^{-2} \cdot year^{-1}$), total fish catch 298 ($t \cdot km^{-2} \cdot year^{-1}$), total invertebrates catch ($t \cdot km^{-2} \cdot year^{-1}$), total discarded catch ($t \cdot km^{-2} \cdot year^{-1}$), 299 and trophic level of the catch.

300 2.7. Assessment of FRA impact and uncertainty

301 After fitting the model to time series using Ecosim, we investigated if the establishment 302 of the CoSEGoL FRA resulted in noticeable changes in the structure and functioning of the 303 ecosystem. We compared the ecosystem structure and functioning before and after the 304 establishment of the FRA using the baseline model (2008) and a second FRA model 305 (2016) that was obtained after the fitting procedure. FRA effectiveness and compliance were measured through changes in ecological and keystone species indicators to discern 306 307 expected biomass increases according to theory [59]. For example, a positive trend in the 308 biomass of a targeted species is to be expected in a FRA after several years of its 309 protection [23]. In addition, changes in mixed trophic impacts (MTI) from the industrial 310 fleets were examined to quantify the direct and indirect impact of each fleet on functional 311 groups, their potential competitions, and trade-offs.

312 Pedigree and associated confidence intervals for key input values were used in the 313 EwE Monte Carlo (MC) routine to evaluate input parameter uncertainty over time 314 (Supplementary Material Table D.1) [31,48]. 200 MC simulations were run, and 95% and 315 5% percentile confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated for main target species biomasses and ecological indicators focusing on M. merluccius, L. piscatorius, N. 316 317 norvergicus, A. antennatus, M. poutassou and L. caudatus. The significance and correlation between our suite of ecological indicators and time were measured using the 318 319 non-parametric Spearman rank correlation coefficient [60]. To evaluate the impact of the 320 CoSEGoL FRA on the fisheries, catch-based indicator trends were examined over time to 321 capture changes of the potential effects of the FRA establishment. This procedure to capture uncertainty was developed to evaluate historical changes (2008-2016) and the 322 forecasting scenarios (see Section 2.8 for more details). 323

324 **2.8. Future alternative management simulations**

After the model was fitted to data from 2008 to 2016, eight future scenarios including fishing regulation and environmental variables (Table 1) were tested in order to evaluate future alternative management scenarios and their potential effects on marine resources and the ecosystem structure and functioning in the 2017-2040 period. The original configuration of the dynamic model was used as a baseline simulation keeping parameters with default values from 2017 to 2040 (Business as usual - BAU). The rest of the scenarios applied new fishing regulations: for instance, scenario "50" simulated a decreasing 50% of fishing effort, scenario "100" simulated a decreasing 100% of fishing effort as suggested, and scenario " F_{msy} " simulated fishing at Maximum Sustainable Yield (F_{msy}) in comparison to fishing at F current (using fishing mortality levels of 2016).

335 For the environmental variables (sea water temperature and primary production) 336 (Supplementary material, Figures E.1. and E.2), we used projections of the Med-ERGOM hydro-dynamical biochemical model under two contrasting scenarios of greenhouse 337 338 emissions (RCP4.5 and RCP8.5) [61,62] (Table 1). To consider changes in sea water temperature, we used the environmental response functions of Ecosim, which links the 339 340 species or FGs dynamics to the environmental drivers. We first obtained the response functions from AquaMaps [63], which is a global database on species distribution. These 341 342 environmental response functions are given as curves showing the minimum and 343 maximum tolerance levels and 10th and 90th preferable quintiles to the environmental 344 parameters (in our case, temperature). The final environmental preferences for each FG 345 were obtained by weighting the values of the species included in a FG to their relative biomass. Finally, selected ecological indicators and biomass predictions of targeted 346 347 species were extracted in 2025 and 2040 and were used to assess the effects of future alternative simulations over time. 348

349

350	Table 1.	List of fisheries	and Representa	tive Concentration	Pathway	(RCP)	scenarios
-----	----------	-------------------	----------------	--------------------	---------	-------	-----------

Scenario	Fishing regulation	Temperature	PP	
BAU 4.5	Kept at levels 2016	RCP4.5	RCP4.5	
BAU 8.5	Kept at levels 2016	RCP8.5	RCP8.5	
100 4.5	Reducing 100% fishing effort	RCP4.5	RCP4.5	
100 8.5	Reducing 100% fishing effort	RCP8.5	RCP8.5	
504.5	Reducing 50% fishing effort	RCP4.5	RCP4.5	
508.5	Reducing 50% fishing effort	RCP8.5	RCP8.5	
F _{msy} 4.5	Maximum sustainable yield	RCP4.5	RCP4.5	
F _{msy} 8.5	Maximum sustainable yield	RCP8.5	RCP8.5	

351

352

To obtain the F_{msy} values, we first reviewed fishing mortality values at current levels ($F_{current}$) and F0.1 (defined as the fishing mortality at which the slope of the Yield per Recruit curve is 10 percent of its slope at the origin) reported by the GFCM and the 356 Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) in the last evaluations of Western Mediterranean marine resources (Supplementary material, Table 357 D.2.). Values of F_{current} and F_{msv} for European sardine (*Sardina pilchardus*) and European 358 anchovy (Engraulis encrasicolus) were obtained from the EU Tender SPELMED for 359 360 GSA06 and GSA07 [64]. We estimated the reduction of fishing mortality comparing $F_{current}$ 361 with F0.1 for evaluated species, which yielded an average reduction of 64% for the 362 CoSEGoL FRA. This estimate was applied to the rest of the commercial species that were 363 not assessed but also occurred in the model as fisheries targeted or by-catch species.

364

365

366 **3. Results**

367

368 3.1. Baseline parameterization, model quality, and temporal fitting

The pedigree index of the CoSEGoL FRA model (0.50) revealed that input data was of acceptable quality when compared to the distribution of pedigree values in other existing models [65]. The pedigree value of the CoSEGoL FRA was similar to other published MPAs and FRAs EwE models for the Mediterranean Sea [36,38,39].

373 The best fitted model was obtained for an annual increase in fishing effort of 5% (F_{+5}) (Supplementary material Table F.1.). The parameterization with 30 vulnerabilities 374 375 (trophic interactions between predators and their prey) and 6 spline points was identified 376 as the best model based on the AIC test criteria (Supplementary material Table F.1). 377 However, the best fitting model did not reproduce observed trends of some target species; 378 these were obtained for a scenario with an increase of 10% in fishing effort. This model was adopted as most likely representative for the ecosystem because of its capability to 379 380 best reproduce the trends in target species over time (Supplementary material Table F.1) with exception of Norway lobster (SS 11.87) - one of the target groups of the study (Figure 381 382 2).

- 383
- 384
- 385
- 386





Figure 2. Predicted (solid lines) versus observed (dots) biomass (t·km⁻²) for targeted groups in the continental slope of the Eastern Gulf of Lion Fisheries Restricted Areaecosystem model for the period 2008-2016. Blue shadows represent 5% and 95% percentiles obtained using the Monte Carlo routine. Sum of squares (SS) values indicate their contribution to the total SS.

402 **3.2.** Ecosystem structure and functioning

403 Ecosystem structure and functioning changes occurred following the establishment 404 of the FRA. The flow diagram showed higher trophic levels for the model prior to the establishment of the FRA (Figure 3). Both models highlighted the same FGs for Valls 405 keystone index (Figure 4), although keystone index values for individual groups differed 406 from one ecosystem state to the other. Ecological indicators showed generally small 407 408 variation. Of biomass-based indicators, only invertebrates showed noticeable differences 409 (Figure 5), with an increase from 2008 to 2016. The TL community, TL community 2, and APL decreased after the implementation of the FRA (Figure 6 and 7). 410

411



Figure 3. Flow diagram of the continental slope of the Eastern Gulf of Lion Fisheries Restricted Areaecosystem before its establishment (year 2008, light grey) and after (year 2016, dark grey). The size of each circle is proportional to the biomass of the functional group. The numbers identify the functional groups of both CoSEGoL FRA models (Table A.1). The width and color of trophic links indicate the magnitude of the trophic flows (low - blue; high - red).



Figure 4. Keystone Index analysis of the continental slope of the Eastern Gulf of Lion Fisheries Restricted Area before its establishment (year 2008, light grey) and after (year 2016, dark grey). The numbers identify the functional group of the model (listed in Table A.1) with a higher keystoneness index and relative total impact and trophic level (TL).



Figure 5. Biomass-based indicators of the continental slope of the Eastern Gulf of Lion
Fisheries Restricted Area model before its establishment (year 2008, light grey) and after

441 (year 2016, dark grey). B: Biomass. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.



Figure 6. Trophic-based indicators of the continental slope of the Eastern Gulf of Lion
Fisheries Restricted Area model before its establishment (year 2008, light grey) and after
(year 2016, dark grey). TL: Trophic Level. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.



Figure 7. Flow-based indicators of the continental slope of the Eastern Gulf of Lion Fisheries Restricted Area model before its establishment (year 2008, light grey) and after (year 2016, dark grey). APL: Average Path Length; FCI: Finn's Cycling Index. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

460 3.3. The impact of industrial fisheries

461 The Total catch, Fish catch, and Discards increased once the FRA was 462 established, while the TL of the catch and Demersal catch decreased (Figure 8). The MTI analysis applied to the industrial fisheries showed different patterns among fleets and 463 464 CoSEGoL FRA states (2008 and 2016) (Figure 9). The highest positive impacting values were mostly found for the mid-water trawlers (MWT) (e.g. FG 12 (other large pelagic fish) 465 or FG 55, (Norway lobster)). The most negative impacting values did not show any pattern 466 467 among fleets. For example, while longliners (LON) impacted negatively on FG 11, 29, and 468 43 (swordfish, common dentex, and rays and skates, respectively), the bottom trawlers (BTW) impacted on FG 40, 51, and 52 (small-spotted catshark, Deep-water rose shrimp 469 470 and blue and red shrimp, respectively) and the MTW on FG 10 (bluefin tuna). Although 471 both models highlighted the same impacted FGs, the impact value of industrial fisheries 472 over most FGs was different between both ecosystem states. Several FGs obtained lower 473 positive values or higher negative values after the establishment of the CoSEGoL FRA. 474 For example, other large pelagic fish (FG12) obtained an impacting value of 0.75 by MTW in 2008 while it was reduced to 0.64 in 2016, and blue and red shrimp (FG52) obtained an 475 476 impacting value of -0.74 by BTW in 2008 while it increased to -0.81 in 2016.

477



Figure 8. Catch-based indicators of the continental slope of the Eastern Gulf of Lion
Fisheries Restricted Area model before its establishment (year 2008, light grey) and after
(year 2016, dark grey). TL: Trophic Level, C: Catches. Error bars represent 95%
confidence intervals.



Figure 9. Industrial fisheries impacting values for each functional group of both ecosystem states of the continental slope of the
Eastern Gulf of Lion Fisheries Restricted Area (2008 and 2016). X-axis identifies the FG number (except for 73, Midwater trawling:
74, Bottom trawling; and 75 Longliner) (MTW – Midwater trawling from France; BTW – bottom trawling from Spain and France; LON –
Longliners from Spain).

502 **3.4. Future scenarios of alternative management**

Under baseline scenarios considering both RCP projections (BAU RCP4.5 and BAU 503 504 RCP 8.5), the model predicted that European hake would decrease in both scenarios 505 except in 2025 for scenario BAU RCP 4.5, while blue and red shrimp and Norway lobster 506 showed decreasing biomass for both scenarios except in 2025 for scenario BAU RCP 8.5 507 (Figure 10). On the contrary, results showed an increase of biomass of anglerfish after 10 508 and 25 years of simulation (2025 and 2040, respectively) and blue whiting after 10 years (Figure 10). Within these scenarios, although biomass indicators increased in 2025, 509 invertebrates, fish and commercial biomass indicators decreased in 2040 (Figure 11). 510 511 Regarding catch-based indicators, invertebrates and demersal catch, and total catch and discards under RCP8.5 increased, while most indicators decreased in 2040 (Figure 12). 512



Figure 10. Mean percentage of change in biomass for targeted species under eight future
scenarios of management of the continental slope of the Eastern Gulf of Lion Fisheries
Restricted Area in 2025 and 2040. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. Hollow

517 points indicate scenarios under RCP4.5 projection, and solid points indicate scenarios 518 under RCP8.5 projection.



Figure 11. Mean percentage of change in biomass-based indicators under eight future scenarios of management of the continental slope of the Eastern Gulf of Lion Fisheries Restricted Area in 2025 and 2040. B: Biomass. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. Hollow points indicate scenarios under RCP4.5 projection, and solid points indicate scenarios under RCP8.5 projection.



525

Figure 12. Mean percentage of change in catch-based indicators under eight future scenarios of management of the continental slope of the Eastern Gulf of Lion Fisheries Restricted Area in 2025 and 2040. TL: Trophic Level, C: Catches. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. Hollow points indicate scenarios under RCP4.5 projection, and solid points indicate scenarios under RCP8.5 projection.

532 Applying a reduction of 100% on the fishing effort, both models with different RCP projections (scenarios 100 RCP 4.5 and 100 RCP 8.5) predicted increases on European 533 534 hake biomass, and on anglerfish except for scenario 100 RCP 4.5 in 2040 (Figure 10), but 535 predicted lower anglerfish biomass compared to scenarios BAU (Figure 10). On the 536 contrary, blue whiting decreased as it did Norway lobster that decreased for both 537 scenarios except for 100 RCP 8.5 in 2025. Blue and red shrimp increased on biomass for both scenarios except for 100 RCP 8.5 in 2040. We note that blue and red shrimp and 538 539 Norway lobster obtained higher biomass predictions compared to baseline results except for Norway lobster for scenario 100 RCP 8.5 in 2025 (Figure 10). 540

541 Simulating a reduction of 50% of the fishing effort, the model predicted increases in 542 the biomass of European hake, too. The percentages of change in biomass under 543 scenarios 50 were higher than BAU scenarios but lower than scenarios 100. Results 544 showed a higher increase in anglerfish biomass than scenarios 100 and BAU, except in 545 2040 under RCP4.5 (Figure 10). In contrast, scenarios 50 RCP 4.5 and 50 RCP 8.5 546 predicted a decrease in biomass trends for blue whiting as scenario 100 but this reduction 547 was smaller. Scenarios 50 RCP 4.5 and 50 RCP 8.5 also predicted a decreasing biomass 548 trend for blue and red shrimp and Norway lobster. This pattern was similar to their baseline 549 scenario predictions except for BAU RCP 8.5 in 2025 (Figure 10).

Under fishing at Maximum Sustainable Yield scenarios, both models (Fmsv RCP 4.5 550 and F_{msv} RCP 8.5) predicted an increase in biomass trends for European hake, which was 551 higher than baseline predictions. Scenarios F_{msv} RCP 4.5 and F_{msv} RCP 8.5 predicted an 552 553 increase in 2025 and a decrease in 2040 for anglerfish biomass, respectively (Figure 10). These anglerfish predictions were lower than baseline predictions. Conversely, scenario 554 F_{msy} predicted a decreasing biomass trend for blue whiting, which was much lower than 555 baseline projections (Figure 10). For blue and red shrimp and Norway lobster, these two 556 models predicted an increase in biomass trends except for F_{msv} RCP 4.5 in 2040. Blue and 557 red shrimp and Norway lobster predictions under scenario F_{msv} were higher than the 558 baseline ones except for Norway lobster under RCP 8.5 in 2025 (Figure 10). 559

560 Under fishing scenarios, biomass-based indicators increased in 2025 except for the commercial and fish biomass indicators which decreased for scenario 100 and F_{msv} (Figure 561 562 11). In 2040, these indicators decreased except for demersal, predatory, and 563 invertebrates' biomass. Scenarios 100 obtained higher biomass values than scenarios 50, 564 except for fish and commercial biomass. Generally, most biomass-based scenarios 565 showed higher mean values under RCP 8.5. Catch-based indicators showed decreasing 566 trends for total and fish catch and discards, while invertebrates catch, demersal catch, and trophic level of the catch increased (Figure 12). Most catch-based indicators obtained 567 higher mean values under RCP8.5. 568

569

570 **4. Discussion**

571

572 Overall, according to our results, the CoSEGoL FRA failed at improving the condition 573 of the ecosystem over time. Most ecological indicators showed higher values prior to the 574 establishment of the FRA compared to after. The biomass-based indicators did not show positive effects of the establishment of the FRA on commercial, fish, and predatory 575 576 biomass neither demersal community biomass after eight years of protection in the study area. Trophic-based indicators showed a reduction in TL community and TL community 2 577 578 from 2008 to 2016, which could evidence an ecosystem degradation with time [4]. After the 579 implementation of the CoSEGoL FRA, the APL decreased which could suggest higher 580 stress, less maturity, and lower resilience of the ecosystem [57]. These results may show 581 that the measure to freeze the fishing effort to 2008 levels established by GFCM was 582 insufficient to allow the rebuilding and protection of demersal commercial stocks. This 583 difference could also be due to a failure on the enforcement of the FRA and the consecutive degradation of the system over time due to the higher impacts of fishing. 584

In accordance with our results, a recent report developed in European waters [66] pointed out that the fleet operating in the Gulf of Lion is the one with the highest noncompliance rate regarding the relative fishing power of the vessels. In addition, the Automatic Identification System (AIS) data provided by Global Fishing Watch [67] were recently used to demonstrate the illegal fishing activities inside several Mediterranean FRAs including the CoSEGoL FRA [68], documenting the lack of enforcement in these areas.

592 Our study shows that most FGs were highly impacted by industrial fisheries after the 593 implementation of the FRA, and this impact was higher compared to the pre-establishment 594 of the FRA. This pattern reinforces our ecological indicators results and it is likely 595 highlighting an increase in the impact of fisheries after the establishment of the FRA [69]. 596 In accordance with this, most catch-based indicators increased in their values, which may 597 suggest illegal fishing activities in the FRA. Even though the lack of enforcement can not 598 be a major conclusion from the fitting procedure, we acknowledge that catch-based 599 indicators were consistent with the possibility of illegal fishing, and hence a lack of 600 effective enforcement follows by implication. The low effectiveness of the FRA was also suggested through the fitting procedure of the ecosystem model to historical time series of 601 data, which showed that the best model configuration was achieved when an annual 602 603 increase of 10% on the fishing effort was included in the initial parameterization. Using 604 food-web models, previous simulations on other FRAs in the Mediterranean Sea demonstrated a declining trend for exploitation species when the fishing effort was kept 605 606 constant with time [39]. Additionally, Corrales et al. [36] identified low effectiveness on one MPA in the Northwestern Mediterranean Sea through ecological indicators, which may bedue to the level of enforcement and the nature of the fishing activities allowed.

609 Our study also illustrates that future management simulations are useful to explore 610 trade-offs on species' recovery as well as potential effects at the ecosystem level. In 611 general, baseline scenarios showed different biomass historical trends for target species, 612 such as an increase in anglerfish and blue whiting with a decrease in European hake, blue 613 and red shrimp, and Norway lobster. These contrasting biomass trends suggested direct and indirect impacts of fisheries on the food-web, as seen in the MTI analysis. For 614 615 instance, European hake is targeted by all fleets operating in the CoSEGoL FRA, 616 especially by longliners, and a high negative impact is expected. Other negative biomass 617 trends can be explained by the profound impacts of just one fleet, such as Norway lobster targeted by bottom trawlers as highlighted in previous studies and assessments in the 618 619 Northwestern Mediterranean Sea [70,71]. This may be due to high fishing mortality rates 620 [71] and/or high discarding rate [72]. Increasing biomass trends are due to multiple trophic 621 effects triggered by decreases of various predators and competitors. Since baseline 622 historical scenarios showed a lack of positive biomass trends for key target species (including European hake), these results are likely suggesting that fishing regulations 623 624 established in 2008 have not been effective, in accordance with previous results and 625 reports [66,68] and that management was not enough to achieve the CoSEGoL FRA 626 objectives [17].

627 Alternative fishing management scenarios showed different biomass trends for 628 target species. In general, none of these scenarios showed simultaneous biomass 629 increases for all five target species. Even scenario 100, where all fishing activities were 630 banned, failed to show recovery effects for all target species. This suggests an important role of trophic interactions between some of the currently targeted species in the demersal 631 632 community. For instance, blue whiting is an important prey of European hake [73] and as 633 such when hake recovers it has a negative effect on its prey. Food-web models can 634 represent a useful tool for MPA assessment that can help to identify ecological trade-offs and synergies [74]. Results also show that trade-offs must be considered between 635 636 fisheries management and climate change [75] and emphasize the need to include other stressors than fisheries to appropriately assess the future of marine ecosystems [33,34]. 637

Despite these trade-offs, overall, demersal and invertebrates' biomass showed increasing trends with recovery scenarios, which indicates that the improvement on the 640 status of the demersal community may be possible under alternative management. In 641 accordance with biomass-based indicators, catch-based indicators showed positive values for demersal and invertebrates catches. Additionally, although total catch and discards 642 decreased, more substantial decreases in discards may indicate a move towards 643 644 sustainable fishing due to the reduction of unwanted catch under alternative future management scenarios. These results are in line with a previous study [39], which 645 646 confirmed that targeted species biomass increased under fishing pressure reduction 647 scenarios in the Pagasitikos Gulf, the Eastern Mediterranean Sea. Our results also showed that the establishment of specific objectives should be the main aspect of 648 649 implementing a restricted area to fisheries [76,77] and managers should focus on 650 indicators related to the overall objective of this protection [78]. The CoSEGoL FRA was focused on demersal species [44], and our study showed that reducing fishing effort in the 651 652 CoSEGoL FRA could benefit demersal species, in accordance with findings by other 653 studies [23]. Regarding target species, biomass and catch-based indicators changed 654 under different RCP scenarios in 2040, and thus climate change predictions under multiple 655 scenarios should be considered for management purposes in the future [79].

656 During the study, we dealt with several limitations. One was the lack of spatialtemporal series of catches and fleet distribution data, which could improve the analysis on 657 the effect of the FRA potential benefits on the industrial fisheries. Although biomass data 658 659 came from MEDITS survey database and are characterized spatially and temporally, 660 catches within the FRA were assumed to be proportional to catches in the Geographical 661 Sub-Area 7 (Gulf of Lion), scaled to fishing vessel presence at fishable velocities in the 662 FRA. These assumptions decreased the pedigree value of the model and increased the 663 uncertainty in catch estimates as well as catch indicators results. Consequently, possible 664 negative effects identified in the CoSEGoL FRA could be the result of high fishing pressure 665 in adjacent areas and they call for additional assessments on the spatio-temporal fisheries 666 and biological dynamics from the area. Additionally, the organization in charge to regulate the CoSEGoL FRA, the GFCM, reported the list of vessels operating in this area², which 667 668 differs from AIS data available at Global Fishing Watch [68]. Considering that enforcement 669 has demonstrated to be an important feature to achieve ecological benefits in an MPA [80], this calls for a better understanding of the catch data inside the FRA and probably an 670 improvement in the surveillance. Collecting time series of fishing activities inside the 671

² <u>https://gfcmsitestorage.blob.core.windows.net/contents/DB/GoL/Html</u> and <u>http://www.fao.org/gfcm/data/fleet/fras</u>)

CoSEGoL FRA should be a monitoring priority, as previously highlighted for other MPAs
[36,38,81]. In addition, response functions to sea temperature were included from a global
database [63] because we lacked specific response functions in the study area. Specific
sea temperature response function could improve the predictions under different RCP
projections (e.g. [82]).

677 To our knowledge, this study represents the first attempt to develop a FRA food-678 web model in the Western Mediterranean Sea and provides an assessment of the current management and potential outcomes of alternative fishing management scenarios. Our 679 results suggest a failure in the recovery of target species in the restricted area under the 680 current management scenario. Results on future scenarios highlight the need to undertake 681 682 important reductions in fishing effort in the FRA area, with the highest benefits for marine resources and the ecosystem if the area were to be closed to fishing. The CoSEGoL FRA 683 could act as an important refugee of large spawners of commercial species which can 684 685 contribute to rebuilding demersal stocks in the Northwestern Mediterranean Sea [44]. However, the lack of enforcement and/or effectiveness of the FRA is contributing to its 686 687 failure. The study also highlights the importance of considering trophic interactions when assessing the impacts of fishing management options, especially when target species are 688 689 trophically related and include both predators and prey.

690

691

692 Acknowledgments

This work was funded by the EU Research Project SAFENET project ("Sustainable
Fisheries in EU Mediterranean Waters through Network of MPAs." Call for proposals
MARE/2014/41, Grant Agreement n. 721708).

696

697 **5. References**

S. Diaz, J. Settele, E. Brondízio, Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity
 and Ecosystem Services. Summary for policymakers of the global assessment report on
 biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on
 Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, (2019).

702 [2] M.R. Clark, F. Althaus, T.A. Schlacher, A. Williams, D.A. Bowden, A.A. Rowden, The impacts of 703 deep-sea fisheries on benthic communities: A review, ICES J. Mar. Sci. (2016). 704 https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsv123. [3] S.F. Thrush, K.E. Ellingsen, K. Davis, Implications of fisheries impacts to seabed biodiversity 705 706 and ecosystem-based management, ICES J. Mar. Sci. (2016). 707 https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsv114. 708 [4] D. Pauly, V. Christensen, J. Dalsgaard, R. Froese, F. Torres, Fishing down marine food webs, 709 Science. 279 (1998) 860-863. 710 [5] R.A. Watson, W.W.L. Cheung, J.A. Anticamara, R.U. Sumaila, D. Zeller, D. Pauly, Global 711 marine yield halved as fishing intensity redoubles, Fish Fish. 14 (2013) 493–503. 712 V. Christensen, M. Coll, C. Piroddi, J. Steenbeek, J. Buszowski, D. Pauly, A century of fish [6] 713 biomass decline in the ocean, Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. (2014). 714 https://doi.org/10.3354/meps10946. 715 D. Pauly, D. Zeller, Catch reconstructions reveal that global marine fisheries catches are [7] 716 higher than reported and declining, Nat. Commun. 7 (2016) ncomms10244. 717 [8] FAO, The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2020. Sustainability in action, Rome, 718 2020. 719 [9] P. Vasilakopoulos, C.D. Maravelias, G. Tserpes, The alarming decline of Mediterranean fish stocks, Curr. Biol. 24 (2014) 1643-1648. 720 [10] F. Colloca, M. Cardinale, F. Maynou, M. Giannoulaki, G. Scarcella, K. Jenko, J.M. Bellido, F. 721 722 Fiorentino, Rebuilding Mediterranean fisheries: a new paradigm for ecological sustainability, 723 Fish Fish. 14 (2013) 89–109. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-2979.2011.00453.x. 724 [11] FAO, The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2018 - Meeting the sustainable 725 development goals. Rome. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO., (2018). 726 [12] J.L. Sánchez Lizaso, I. Sola, E. Guijarro-García, J.M. Bellido, R. Franquesa, A new management framework for western Mediterranean demersal fisheries, Mar. Policy. 112 (2020) 103772. 727 728 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2019.103772. 729 [13] S. Villasante, M. do Carme García-Negro, F. González-Laxe, G.R. Rodríguez, Overfishing and 730 the Common Fisheries Policy: (un) successful results from TAC regulation?, Fish Fish. 12 731 (2011) 34-50. 732 [14] European Council, Council Regulation (EC) No 1288/2009 of 27 November 2009 establishing 733 transitional technical measures from 1 January 2010 to 30 June 2011, 2009. 734 [15] EU Council Regulation, Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 404/2011 of 8 April 735 2011 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 736 1224/2009 establishing a Community control system for ensuring compliance with the rules 737 of the Common Fisheries Policy, 2011. [16] European Union, Special Report No 08/2017: EU fisheries controls: more efforts needed, 738 739 2017. 740 [17] GFCM, Recommendation CM-GFCM/33/2009/1. On the Establishment of a Fisheries 741 Restricted Area in the Gulf of Lions to Protect Spawning Aggregations and Deep Sea Sensitive 742 Habitats, (2009). 743 [18] GFCM, Report of the ninth session of the sub-committee on marine environment and 744 ecosystems., Antalya, Turkey, 2008. 745 [19] A. Di Franco, S. Bussotti, A. Navone, P. Panzalis, P. Guidetti, Evaluating effects of total and 746 partial restrictions to fishing on Mediterranean rocky-reef fish assemblages, Mar. Ecol. Prog. 747 Ser. 387 (2009) 275-285. 748 [20] J. Claudet, C. Loiseau, M. Sostres, M. Zupan, Underprotected Marine Protected Areas in a 749 Global Biodiversity Hotspot, One Earth. 2 (2020) 380–384.

750	[21]	A. Di Franco, P. Thiriet, G. Di Carlo, C. Dimitriadis, P. Francour, N.L. Gutiérrez, A.J. De Grissac,
751		D. Koutsoubas, M. Milazzo, M. del Mar Otero, Five key attributes can increase marine
752		protected areas performance for small-scale fisheries management, Sci. Rep. 6 (2016) 38135.
753	[22]	S. Giakoumi, C. Scianna, J. Plass-Johnson, F. Micheli, K. Grorud-Colvert, P. Thiriet, J. Claudet,
754		G. Di Carlo, A. Di Franco, S.D. Gaines, Ecological effects of full and partial protection in the
755		crowded Mediterranean Sea: a regional meta-analysis, Sci. Rep. 7 (2017) 8940.
756	[23]	D. Dimarchopoulou, A. Dogrammatzi, P.K. Karachle, A.C. Tsikliras, Spatial fishing restrictions
757	[]	benefit demersal stocks in the northeastern Mediterranean Sea, Sci. Rep. (2018).
758		https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-24468-v.
759	[24]	D. Petza, C. Chalkias, N. Koukourouyli, M. Coll, V. Vassilopoulou, P.K. Karachle, V.
760	[]	Markantonatou, A.C. Tsikliras, S. Katsanevakis, An operational framework to assess the value
761		of fisheries restricted areas for marine conservation. Mar. Policy. (2019).
762	[25]	CBD. Convention on Biological Diversity. Strategic Plan 2011-2020. Aichi Biodiversity Targets.
763	[]	(2010).
764	[26]	D. Petza, I. Maina, N. Koukourouvli, D. Dimarchopoulou, D. Akrivos, S. Kavadas, A.C. Tsikliras,
765	[]	P.K. Karachle. S. Katsanevakis. Where not to fish - Reviewing and mapping fisheries restricted
766		areas in the Aegean Sea. Mediterr. Mar. Sci. (2017). https://doi.org/10.12681/mms.2081.
767	[27]	European Environment Agency. Marine protected areas conserve life. 2018.
768		https://doi.org/10.2800/405185.
769	[28]	B. Horta e Costa, J. Claudet, G. Franco, K. Erzini, A. Caro, E.J. Goncalves, A regulation-based
770		classification system for Marine Protected Areas (MPAs), Mar. Policy. 72 (2016) 192–198.
771	[29]	MedPAN, SPA/RAC, The 2016 status of Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean, Tunis,
772		2019.
773	[30]	V. Christensen, C.J. Walters, D. Pauly, R. Forrest, Ecopath with Ecosim version 6: user guide.
774		November 2008, Fish. Cent. Univ. Br. Columbia Vanc. Can. 235 (2008).
775	[31]	V. Christensen, C.J. Walters, Ecopath with Ecosim: methods, capabilities and limitations, Ecol.
776		Model. 172 (2004) 109–139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2003.09.003.
777	[32]	C. Walters, V. Christensen, D. Pauly, Structuring dynamic models of exploited ecosystems
778		from trophic mass-balance assessments, Rev. Fish Biol. Fish. 7 (1997) 139–172.
779	[33]	X. Corrales, M. Coll, E. Ofir, J.J. Heymans, J. Steenbeek, M. Goren, D. Edelist, G. Gal, Future
780		scenarios of marine resources and ecosystem conditions in the Eastern Mediterranean under
781		the impacts of fishing, alien species and sea warming, Sci. Rep. 8 (2018).
782	[34]	N. Serpetti, A.R. Baudron, M.T. Burrows, B.L. Payne, P. Helaouet, P.G. Fernandes, J.J.
783		Heymans, Impact of ocean warming on sustainable fisheries management informs the
784		Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries, Sci. Rep. 7 (2017) 13438.
785	[35]	D. Vilas, M. Coll, T. Pedersen, X. Corrales, K. Filbee-Dexter, M.F. Pedersen, K.M. Norderhaug,
786		S. Fredriksen, T. Wernberg, E. Ramírez-Llodra, Kelp-carbon uptake by Arctic deep-sea food
787		webs plays a noticeable role in maintaining ecosystem structural and functional traits, J. Mar.
788		Syst. 203 (2020) 103268.
789	[36]	X. Corrales, D. Vilas, C. Piroddi, J. Steenbeek, J. Claudet, J. Lloret, A. Calò, A. Di Franco, T.
790		Font, A. Ligas, G. Prato, R. Sahyoun, P. Sartor, P. Guidetti, M. Coll, Multi-zone marine
791		protected areas: Assessment of ecosystem and fisheries benefits using multiple ecosystem
792		models, Ocean Coast. Manag. 193 (2020) 105232.
793		https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2020.105232.
794	[37]	M. Coll, D. Vilas, X. Corrales, C. Piroddi, J. Steenbeek, Report describing the quantitative
795		models. Sustainable Fisheries in EU Mediterranean waters through network of MPAs -
796		Safenet MARE/2014/41 Deliverable 4.2.:17, 2019.

797 [38] G. Prato, C. Barrier, P. Francour, V. Cappanera, V. Markantonatou, P. Guidetti, L. Mangialajo, R. Cattaneo-Vietti, D. Gascuel, Assessing interacting impacts of artisanal and recreational 798 799 fisheries in a small Marine Protected Area (Portofino, NW Mediterranean Sea), Ecosphere. 7 800 (2016). 801 [39] D. Dimarchopoulou, I. Keramidas, K. Tsagarakis, A.C. Tsikliras, Ecosystem Models and Effort 802 Simulations of an Untrawled Gulf in the Central Aegean Sea, Front. Mar. Sci. 6 (2019) 648. 803 https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2019.00648. [40] P. Raimbault, X. de Madron, Research activities in the Gulf of Lion (NW Mediterranean) 804 805 within the 1997–2001 PNEC project, Oceanol. Acta. 26 (2003) 291–298. 806 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0399-1784(03)00030-6. 807 [41] E. Massutí, F. Ordinas, N. González, A. Pérez, B. Guijarro, U. Fernández, Informe del 808 seguimiento científico de la acción piloto RAI/AP-26/2007: Pesca experimental de arrastre de 809 fondo en el Golfo de León (Mediterráneo Noroccidental), (2008) 112. [42] M. Giannoulaki, A. Belluscio, F. Colloca, S. Fraschetti, M. Scardi, C. Smith, P. Panayotidis, V. 810 811 Valavanis, M.T. Spedicato, Mediterranean Sensitive Habitats. DG MARE Specific Contract 812 SI2.600741, Final Report, 557 p., 2013. [43] M. Canals, J.L. Casamor, G. Lastras, A. Monaco, J. Acosta, S. Berne, B. Loubrieu, P. Weaver, A. 813 814 Grehan, B. Dennielou, The role of canyons on strata formation, Oceanography. 17 (2004) 80– 815 91. 816 [44] UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA, Description of the ecology of the Gulf of Lions shelf and slope area and 817 identification of the areas that may deserve to be protected. By Sard‡, J.M.G. and 818 Domlnguez-Carrió, C. Ed. RAC/SPA, Tunis. 64pp., (2013). 819 [45] G. Chimienti, M. Bo, M. Taviani, F. Mastrototaro, 19 Occurrence and Biogeography of 820 Mediterranean Cold-Water Corals, in: Mediterr. Cold-Water Corals Past Present Future, 821 Springer, 2019: pp. 213–243. 822 [46] G. Chimienti, M. Bo, F. Mastrototaro, Know the distribution to assess the changes: Mediterranean cold-water coral bioconstructions, Rendiconti Lincei. (2018). 823 824 https://doi.org/10.1007/s12210-018-0718-3. 825 [47] J.A. Bertrand, L.G. de Sola, C. Papaconstantinou, G. Relini, A. Souplet, The general 826 specifications of the MEDITS surveys, Sci. Mar. 66 (2002) 9–17. 827 [48] J.J. Heymans, M. Coll, J.S. Link, S. Mackinson, J. Steenbeek, C. Walters, V. Christensen, Best 828 practice in Ecopath with Ecosim food-web models for ecosystem-based management, Ecol. 829 Model. 331 (2016) 173–184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2015.12.007. 830 [49] S. Demaneche, C. Merrien, P. Berthou, P. Lespagnol, Rapport R3, Méditerranée continentale, 831 échantillonnage des marées au débarquement, Méthode D'élévation Éval. Captures L'effort 832 Pêche Flot. Façade Méditerranée Cont. Sur Période. 2008 (2007) 217. 833 [50] P. Tudó, Unpubl. Data. Directorate of Fishing and Maritime Affairs, Government of Catalonia, 834 Avinguda Diagonal 523-525, 08029 Barcelona, Spain, (2017). 835 [51] J. Steenbeek, Diet Calculator - Quick Reference Guide. Version 0.8.5, 11 June 2018. Safenet 836 project - EU-DGMARE (MARE/2014/41), Barcelona, (2018). 837 [52] V. Christensen, Managing fisheries involving predator and prey species, Rev. Fish Biol. Fish. 6 838 (1996) 417 - 442.839 [53] R.E. Ulanowicz, C.J. Puccia, Mixed trophic impacts in ecosystems, Coenoses. (1990) 7–16. 840 [54] A. Valls, M. Coll, V. Christensen, Keystone species: toward an operational concept for marine 841 biodiversity conservation, Ecol. Monogr. 85 (2015) 29–47. 842 [55] M.E. Power, D. Tilman, J.A. Estes, B.A. Menge, W.J. Bond, L.S. Mills, G. Daily, J.C. Castilla, J. 843 Lubchenco, R.T. Paine, Challenges in the quest for keystones, BioScience. 46 (1996) 609–620.

- 844 [56] M. Coll, J. Steenbeek, Standardized ecological indicators to assess aquatic food webs: The
 845 ECOIND software plug-in for Ecopath with Ecosim models, Environ. Model. Softw. 89 (2017)
 846 120–130.
- 847 [57] V. Christensen, Ecosystem maturity towards quantification, Ecol. Model. (1995).
 848 https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3800(93)E0073-C.
- [58] J.T. Finn, Measures of ecosystem structure and function derived from analysis of flows, J.
 Theor. Biol. 56 (1976) 363–380.
- [59] J. Claudet, P. Guidetti, D. Mouillot, N.T. Shears, F. Micheli, Ecology–Ecological effects of
 marine protected areas: conservation, restoration, and functioning, Mar. Prot. Areas
 Multidiscip. Approach Camb. Univ. Press Camb. (2011) 37–71.
- [60] C. Spearman, The proof and measurement of association between two things, Am. J. Psychol.
 15 (1904) 72–101.
- 856 [61] D. Macias, E. Garcia-Gorriz, C. Piroddi, A. Stips, Biogeochemical control of marine
 857 productivity in the Mediterranean Sea during the last 50 years, Glob. Biogeochem Cycles. 28
 858 (2014) 897–907. https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GB004846.
- [62] D.M. Macias, E. Garcia-Gorriz, A. Stips, Productivity changes in the Mediterranean Sea for the
 twenty-first century in response to changes in the regional atmospheric forcing, Front. Mar.
 Sci. (2015). https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2015.00079.
- K. Kaschner, K. Kesner-Reyes, C. Garilao, J. Rius-Barile, T. Rees, R. Froese, AquaMaps:
 Predicted range maps for aquatic species. World wide web electronic publication,
 www.aquamaps.org, Version 08/2016., (2016).
- [64] J.G. Ramirez, A. Giráldez, J.M. Bellido, M. Coll, F. Maynou, Report on stock status and
 reference points. SC NR 02 TENDER EASME/EMFF/2016/32 SPELMED: Evaluation of the
 population status and specific management alternatives for the small pelagic fish stocks in
 the Northwestern Mediterranean Sea:119No Title, 2018.
- 869 [65] L. Morissette, Complexity, cost and quality of ecosystem models and their impact on
 870 resilience: a comparative analysis, with emphasis on marine mammals and the Gulf of St.
 871 Lawrence, University of British Columbia, 2007.
- 872 [66] European Commission, Study on engine power verification by Member States, 2019.
 873 https://doi.org/10.2771/945320.
- [67] D.A. Kroodsma, J. Mayorga, T. Hochberg, N.A. Miller, K. Boerder, F. Ferretti, A. Wilson, B.
 Bergman, T.D. White, B.A. Block, P. Woods, B. Sullivan, C. Costello, B. Worm, Tracking the
 global footprint of fisheries, Science. (2018). https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aao5646.
- 877 [68] Oceana, Building a GFCM framework to combat IUU fishing. Oceana case studies and
 878 recommendations (Oceana submission to the Working Group on IUU Fishing Beirut, Lebanon
 879 24-27 April, 2018), 2018.
- [69] EU Council Regulation, No 1967/2006 of 21 December 2006, concerning management
 measures for the sustainable exploitation of fishery resources in the Mediterranean Sea,
 amending Regulation (EEC) No 2847/93 and repealing Regulation, Off. J. Eur. Union. L
 409(30.1 (2006).
- [70] D. Bănaru, C. Mellon-Duval, D. Roos, J.L. Bigot, A. Souplet, A. Jadaud, P. Beaubrun, J.M.
 Fromentin, Trophic structure in the Gulf of Lions marine ecosystem (north-western
 Mediterranean Sea) and fishing impacts, J. Mar. Syst. 111–112 (2013) 45–68.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2012.09.010.
- [71] E.J. Simmonds, I. Bitetto, G. Daskalov, B. Guijarro, A. Ligas, A. Mannini, D. Mantopoulou
 Palouka, C. Musumeci, P. Martin, J.L. Perez, P. Pesci, C. Pinto, G. Romagnoni, M. Sbrana, V.
 Ticina, Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) Stock

- Assessments: demersal stocks in the western Mediterranean Sea (STECF-19-10)., 2019.
 doi:10.2760/5399, JRC119055.
- I. Moranta, E. Massuti, B. Morales-Nin, Fish catch composition of the deep-sea decapod
 crustacean fisheries in the Balearic Islands (western Mediterranean), Fish. Res. 45 (2000)
 253–264.
- 896 [73] C. Mellon-Duval, M. Harmelin-Vivien, L. Métral, V. Loizeau, S. Mortreux, D. Roos, J.M.
 897 Fromentin, Trophic ecology of the European hake in the Gulf of Lions, northwestern
 898 Mediterranean Sea, Sci. Mar. 81 (2017) 7–18.
- [74] E.A. Fulton, N.J. Bax, R.H. Bustamante, J.M. Dambacher, C. Dichmont, P.K. Dunstan, K.R.
 Hayes, A.J. Hobday, R. Pitcher, É.E. Plagányi, Modelling marine protected areas: insights and hurdles, Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 370 (2015) 20140278.
- 902 [75] M. Barange, T. Bahri, M.C. Beveridge, K.L. Cochrane, S. Funge-Smith, F. Poulain, Impacts of
 903 climate change on fisheries and aquaculture, Synth. Curr. Knowl. Adapt. Mitig. Options Rome
 904 Food Agric. Organ. U. N. (2018).
- 905 [76] J. Day, N. Dudley, M. Hockings, G. Holmes, D. d'A Laffoley, S. Stolton, S.M. Wells, Guidelines
 906 for applying the IUCN protected area management categories to marine protected areas,
 907 IUCN, 2012.
- 908 [77] J. Claudet, D. Pelletier, Marine protected areas and artificial reefs: A review of the
 909 interactions between management and scientific studies, Aquat. Living Resour. 17 (2004)
 910 129–138.
- 911 [78] D. Pelletier, J. Claudet, J. Ferraris, L. Benedetti-Cecchi, J.A. Garcia-Charton, Models and
 912 indicators for assessing conservation and fisheries-related effects of marine protected areas,
 913 Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 65 (2008) 765–779.
- 914 [79] J.F. Bruno, A.E. Bates, C. Cacciapaglia, E.P. Pike, S.C. Amstrup, R. Van Hooidonk, S.A. Henson,
 915 R.B. Aronson, Climate change threatens the world's marine protected areas, Nat. Clim.
 916 Change. (2018). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0149-2.
- 917 [80] G.J. Edgar, R.D. Stuart-Smith, T.J. Willis, S. Kininmonth, S.C. Baker, S. Banks, N.S. Barrett, M.A.
 918 Becerro, A.T.F. Bernard, J. Berkhout, C.D. Buxton, S.J. Campbell, A.T. Cooper, M. Davey, S.C.
 919 Edgar, G. Försterra, D.E. Galván, A.J. Irigoyen, D.J. Kushner, R. Moura, P.E. Parnell, N.T.
- Shears, G. Soler, E.M.A. Strain, R.J. Thomson, Global conservation outcomes depend on
 marine protected areas with five key features, Nature. (2014).
- 922 https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13022.
- 923 [81] J. Claudet, P. Guidetti, Improving assessments of marine protected areas, Aquat. Conserv.
 924 Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst. 20 (2010) 239–242.
- 925 [82] M. Coll, M.G. Pennino, J. Steenbeek, J. Solé, J.M. Bellido, Predicting marine species
 926 distributions: Complementarity of food-web and Bayesian hierarchical modelling
 927 approaches, Ecol. Model. 405 (2019) 86–101.
- 928
- 929
- 930
- 931
- 932
- 933
- 934

935			
936			
937			
938			
939			
940			

- 942 Additional Supplementary material may be found in the online version of this article:
- 943 **Appendix A.** Supplementary information about the ecosystem modeling approach.

Appendix B. Supplementary table: The CoSEGoL FRA FGs species composition and
 methods and references used to estimate the basic input parameters (Table B.1).

Appendix C. Supplementary table: Input parameters and outputs estimate for the
CoSEGoL FRA model (Table C.1). Diet composition matrix for the CoSEGoL FRA model
(Table C.2).

949 Appendix D. Supplementary tables: Confidence intervals used to describe the uncertainty

950 for each functional group (FG) and each input parameter of the balanced Ecopath model

- 951 (Table D.1). Reference points used to develop the F_{msy} simulations for CoSEGoL FRA
- 952 (Table D.2).
- 953 Appendix E. Supplementary figures: Historic and future trends under the two scenarios of
- 954 IPCC projections of environmental variables considered in the CoSEGoL FRA model: sea
- 955 water temperature (Figure E.1) and primary production (Figure E.2)
- Appendix F. Supplementary table: Results of the fitting procedure of the CoSEGoL FRA
 ecosystem fitted to time series of data from 2008 to 2016 (Table F.1).