

The red king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*) in the Barents Sea: Soviet introduction, population expansion and the emergence of the Norwegian fishery

A narrative review

Renat Besolov

Independent researcher; BFISHERMAN

October 2026

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.23623088](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23623088) · CC BY 4.0

Abstract. The red king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*) was deliberately transferred from the North Pacific to the Barents Sea by Soviet scientists between 1961 and 1969, with the aim of creating a new commercial resource. This narrative review synthesises openly available peer-reviewed literature, reports of the Norwegian Institute of Marine Research (HI), Norwegian parliamentary and ministry documents and international assessments to trace the species from introduction to managed fishery. Releases of larvae, juveniles and adults into the Kola (Murmansk) Fjord area led to a reproducing population within about a decade; the crab was first recorded in Norwegian waters in the second half of the 1970s, became abundant in Varangerfjord in the early 1990s and has since spread westwards along the Finnmark coast to around Tromsø. A joint Norwegian-Russian research fishery began in 1994, Norway opened a commercial fishery in 2002 and Russia in 2004, and from 2007 each country has managed its own part of the stock. Norway has since 2008 run a dual regime: a quota-regulated fishery east of 26°E and an open fishery to the west intended to slow spread. HI assessments show a generally declining trend in the harvestable stock since the early 2000s with marked year-to-year swings, reflected in male quotas ranging from 900 to 2,275 tonnes between 2009 and 2025. The review discusses the crab's dual status as a valuable resource and an invasive species with documented effects on benthic communities, and identifies gaps in ecosystem quantification, Norwegian-Russian assessment coherence and socio-economic evaluation.

Keywords: red king crab; *Paralithodes camtschaticus*; Barents Sea; introduced species; invasive species; fisheries management; Finnmark; Norway

1 Introduction

Few marine species illustrate the tension between resource development and biological invasion as clearly as the red king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*) in the Barents Sea. Native to the North Pacific, the species was moved across the Eurasian continent by Soviet scientists in the 1960s with an explicit economic goal: to create a new, valuable commercial resource in northern European waters (ICES, 2005; Jørgensen & Nilssen, 2011). Six decades later, the crab supports high-value fisheries in both Russia and Nor-

way, while also being described in the scientific literature as an alien invasive species with substantial effects on the seabed communities of the regions it has colonised (Falk-Petersen et al., 2011; Sundet, 2014).

The trajectory from deliberate introduction to established fishery has been documented by Russian and Norwegian scientists, by ICES expert groups and in Norwegian policy documents. The material is, however, scattered across journals, grey literature, parliamentary papers and annual advisory reports, much of it in Norwegian or Russian. The purpose of this review is to bring this material together in a single chronological and thematic account aimed at fisheries professionals, students and readers interested in the management of commercially valuable invasive species.

The review addresses five questions: (1) how, when and from where the crab was introduced; (2) how the population became established and spread along the Murman and Finnmark coasts; (3) how the Joint Norwegian–Russian Fisheries Commission handled the early research fishery phase; (4) how commercial fisheries emerged and how the Norwegian stock has developed according to assessments by the Norwegian Institute of Marine Research (Havforskningsinstituttet, HI); and (5) how the crab’s dual status as a resource and as an invasive species has shaped management. A short practitioner perspective and a summary of knowledge gaps conclude the paper.

2 Methods

This paper is a narrative review of openly available literature and official statistics. Searches were carried out in October 2026 using general web search and direct retrieval of bibliographic records and documents. Search terms combined the species name (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*, red king crab, kongekrabbe, камчатский краб) with terms for introduction, invasion, spread, dispersal, benthos, fishery, quota, stock assessment and management. Bibliographic details of journal articles were checked against Crossref records and, where accessible, publisher landing pages.

Priority was given to peer-reviewed articles (for example in *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, *Marine Policy*, *Fisheries Research*, *Marine Biodiversity* and *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*), ICES reports, HI stock assessment and advisory reports, Norwegian parliamentary documents (Stortinget) and press releases of the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries (Nærings- og fiskeridepartementet). A small number of trade-press articles were used only to report the dates and figures of advice published by HI where the primary report could not be retrieved. Every source cited was opened during the search; a separate verification table records how each was checked and which statements it supports.

The review has several limitations. Many journal articles are behind paywalls; for some, only the abstract and metadata were available, and the review cites them only for statements supported by that accessible content. Russian-language primary literature on the introduction programme, including monographs by Russian institutes, could not be accessed directly and is represented through English-language syntheses (Orlov & Ivanov, 1978; ICES, 2005; Dvoretzky & Dvoretzky, 2018, 2022). The quota and assessment fig-

ures for the most recent years are taken from ministry press releases and HI reports; the final Norwegian quota for 2026 could not be verified and is therefore not reported. No original data were collected.

3 Introduction to the Barents Sea, 1961-1969

3.1 Motivation and origin

The transfer of the red king crab to the Barents Sea was part of a broader Soviet programme of deliberate acclimatisation of commercially valuable species. ICES (2005) and Jørgensen and Nilssen (2011) describe the transfer as intentional, with the aim of establishing a commercial fishery. The Norwegian parliamentary committee report on king crab management notes that the releases were made without prior notification to Norway (Innst. S. nr. 143 (2007–2008), 2008).

According to the ICES Cooperative Research Report on the introduction, the source material originated from western Kamchatka (ICES, 2005), that is, the Sea of Okhotsk side of the Kamchatka Peninsula, which is also home to one of the two main Russian red king crab populations (Dvoretsky & Dvoretsky, 2018). A later review by Dvoretsky and Dvoretsky (2022) refers to introductions from both the Sea of Japan and West Kamchatka waters. The Norwegian Institute of Marine Research describes the species' native range as the Kamchatka region of the northern Pacific (Havforskningsinstituttet, n.d.).

3.2 Scale of the releases

The most frequently cited figures derive from the Russian literature summarised by Orlov and Ivanov (1978) and by ICES (2005). Between 1961 and 1969, approximately 1.5 million zoea I larvae, 10,000 juveniles aged one to three years and 2,609 adults aged five to fifteen years (1,655 females and 954 males) were released (ICES, 2005; OSPAR Commission, 2010). Orlov and Ivanov (1978) give rounded figures of about 2,500 adults and 10,000 juveniles. The releases were made in the Kola (Murmansk) Fjord area of the Russian Barents Sea coast (ICES, 2005; Innst. S. nr. 143 (2007–2008), 2008); the OSPAR case study specifies an area east of Motovsky Bay (OSPAR Commission, 2010).

Some sources mention further releases after the 1960s. Sundet and Hoel (2016) state that crabs were released in Kola Bay in the 1960s and once in the 1970s, and Sundet (2014) refers to several introductions in the 1960s and 1970s. The core programme, however, is consistently dated to 1961–1969.

3.3 Early evidence of establishment

The first indications that the introduction had succeeded appeared in the 1970s. Orlov and Ivanov (1978) reported that a large egg-bearing female was caught in 1974 and that records increased in 1976, when at least one hundred reports were received, six of which the authors judged reliable. They concluded that the species appeared to have

become a permanent inhabitant of the Barents Sea, while stressing the need for records of juveniles to confirm reproduction. ICES (2005) and Jørgensen and Nilssen (2011) state that a reproducing population was established roughly ten years after the start of releases.

The first record in Norwegian waters is dated differently in different sources: 1976 in the OSPAR case study (OSPAR Commission, 2010) and 1977 in Norwegian sources, including Sundet (2014), Sundet and Hoel (2016) and a report published by the Norwegian Environment Agency (Miljødirektoratet, 2022). The Varangerfjord region near the Russian border is identified as the area of first Norwegian records.

4 Establishment and spread along the Murman and Finnmark coasts

4.1 Population growth in Russian waters

ICES (2005) describes a population that first concentrated near the release area and then expanded. The highest densities in Russian waters were observed off the Rybachi Peninsula in the late 1980s and early 1990s; crabs became abundant along the eastern Kola Peninsula in the late 1990s; and by 2002 the distribution reached Cape Kanin and the entrance to the White Sea, as well as offshore banks such as Kanin Bank and Goose Bank (ICES, 2005). By the early 1990s the species occupied most of the Kola coast from roughly 36°E to the Norwegian border (Sundet, 2014). Dvoretsky and Dvoretsky (2018) characterise the Barents Sea population as having become established by the mid-1990s, and note that crabs in the Barents Sea grow faster, reach larger sizes and mature earlier than those in the Sea of Okhotsk, which they relate to warmer conditions. Recent records from the White Sea and an expected further spread into the eastern and northern Barents Sea are noted by Dvoretsky and Dvoretsky (2022). In Russian waters the species has been recorded between 3 and 335 m depth and at temperatures from −0.8 to 8.5 °C (Dvoretsky & Dvoretsky, 2022).

4.2 Expansion in Norwegian waters

On the Norwegian side, the crab remained of little practical importance until the early 1990s. According to the Norwegian parliamentary committee, large catches in Norwegian waters began in 1992, mainly as bycatch in coastal gillnet and longline fisheries for cod, haddock and lumpsucker (Innst. S. nr. 143 (2007–2008), 2008). ICES (2005) reconstructs the subsequent expansion as follows: abundant in southern Varangerfjord in 1992; on the northern side of the fjord by 1994; first recorded in Tanafjord in 1995; range extensions to Laksefjord and Porsangerfjord in 2000; adults caught west of Sørøya and North Cape in 2001; and catches near Hammerfest, together with three crabs taken about 120 nautical miles off North Cape, in 2002.

Table 1 summarises this sequence.

Table 1: Milestones in the establishment and westward spread of the red king crab.

Year	Area	Source
1961–1969	Releases, Kola Fjord area	ICES (2005)
1974–1976	First catches and records	Orlov & Ivanov (1978)
1976/1977	First Norwegian record	OSPAR (2010); Sundet (2014)
1992	Abundant in Varangerfjord	ICES (2005)
1995	Tanafjord	ICES (2005)
2000	Laksefjord, Porsangerfjord	ICES (2005)
2001–2002	West of North Cape, Hammerfest	ICES (2005)
2020s	Coast to around Tromsø	Hvingel et al. (2023b)

The westward front has continued to advance, although at a slower pace in areas subject to intensive removal fishing. HI notes that crabs have been found successively further south along the coast to around Tromsø (Hvingel et al., 2023b), and Sundet (2014) assumed the western front to reach at least the Tromsø area and some 12–15 nautical miles offshore. A choice-experiment study notes reports of pockets of crabs as far west as Tromsø (Sandorf et al., 2025).

4.3 Mechanisms of spread

Two mechanisms have been examined: larval transport and adult migration. Dvoretsky and Dvoretsky (2022) review larval ecology in the Barents Sea and report that the first zoeae appear in late January–February, mass hatching starts in late March–early April, and larvae remain in coastal plankton until about mid-July, with development from zoea I to zoea IV taking about two months. Highest larval densities occur in semi-enclosed bays and inner fjords, and modelling indicates that most larvae released in sheltered bays are retained within the fjords; the general direction of larval dispersal is eastward with the coastal current (Dvoretsky & Dvoretsky, 2022).

Since larval drift is predominantly eastward, adult dispersal has been considered the more likely driver of westward spread. In a tag-recapture study based on more than 30,000 crabs tagged in Norwegian waters between 1994 and 2009, Windsland et al. (2014) found that nearly 90% of recaptured crabs had moved less than 30 km and about 2% more than 100 km, with a maximum recorded distance of 197 km. The authors estimated that the range had expanded about 430 km westwards since the first Norwegian observation, roughly 13 km per year, and attributed this to a combination of a few long-distance dispersers and slow, time-dependent movement of the majority. They also suggested that the complex fjord geography of northern Norway may reduce dispersal compared with native Pacific populations (Windsland et al., 2014). An earlier tagging programme in Varangerfjord similarly found that most adults moved only 2–15 nautical miles over three years, although some moved much further over short periods (ICES, 2005).

4.4 Why the introduction succeeded

Falk-Petersen et al. (2011) identify several features that explain the species' success as an invader: suitable physical habitat, the use of a wide range of habitats over the life cycle, high mobility, a generalist diet, low fishing pressure during the establishment phase and the absence of the parasites that affect the species in its native range. The species' life history supports this picture: juveniles live in shallow water until a carapace size of about 50 mm, adults migrate seasonally between shallow mating and moulting grounds and deeper feeding areas, and large females can carry well over one hundred thousand eggs (Havforskningsinstituttet, n.d.; OSPAR Commission, 2010).

5 From research fishery to commercial fishery

5.1 Bycatch problems and the research fishery (1994–2001/2002)

The Norwegian management response was triggered by bycatch. As crabs became abundant in Varangerfjord in the early 1990s, they entangled gillnets and removed bait from longlines, creating problems for coastal fishers (ICES, 2005; Sundet, 2014). ICES (2005) reports that bycatch increased steadily from 1997 to 1999 and declined in 2000–2002, attributing the decline mainly to reduced gillnetting for cod in the area.

The Joint Norwegian–Russian Fisheries Commission agreed in 1993 to an initial quota of 12,000 crabs per country, and a Norwegian experimental fishery began in 1994 with four licensed vessels (Sundet & Hoel, 2016). Stock surveys began at the same time (ICES, 2005). Only males above a minimum carapace length could be retained; ICES (2005) reports that the agreed minimum size was 132 mm, while Norway applied 137 mm. The total allowable catch (TAC) was shared equally between Norway and Russia during the research fishery (ICES, 2005). The Norwegian parliamentary committee dates the research catches to 1994–2001 and notes that commercial fishing was agreed in 2000 (Innst. S. nr. 143 (2007–2008), 2008). In the Russian zone, the research fishery continued until 2004 and was conducted from large vessels (ICES, 2005; Sundet, 2014).

5.2 The Norwegian commercial fishery from 2002

Norway opened an ordinary commercial fishery in autumn 2002 (Innst. S. nr. 143 (2007–2008), 2008). The initial quota was set in numbers of crabs rather than tonnes. Table 2 shows the quotas and participation reported in the parliamentary committee document.

Table 2: Norwegian quotas and participating vessels in the early commercial fishery (Innst. S. nr. 143 (2007–2008), 2008).

Year	Quota (crabs)	Vessels with access
2002	100,000	127
2003	200,000	193

Year	Quota (crabs)	Vessels with access
2004	280,000	260
2005	280,000	273
2006	300,000	264
2007	300,000	n/a

ICES (2005) gives a slightly different number of participating vessels for 2002 (124), and Sundet and Hoel (2016) state that more than 120 vessels took part in 2002 and more than 500 by 2015. The initial exploitation rate was set at 20% of males above the minimum size, rising to about 37% in 2006 and just under 30% in 2007 (Innst. S. nr. 143 (2007–2008), 2008). Fishing is restricted to pots, and the Norwegian fleet is dominated by small coastal vessels; Sundet and Hoel (2016) describe more than 500 vessels of 6–15 m in 2015. Access to the quota fishery has been reserved for fishers affected by crab bycatch in other fisheries (Sundet, 2014).

5.3 Russian commercial fishery

On the Russian side, commercial exploitation began in 2004 (Dvoretsky & Dvoretsky, 2018, 2022). Russian vessels are considerably larger than Norwegian ones and fish with many pots (Sundet, 2014). Dvoretsky and Dvoretsky (2022) report Russian Barents Sea landings of 9,836 t in 2019, 10,820 t in 2020 and 11,629 t in 2021, and the renewal of a small recreational fishery with an annual quota of 100 t. Dvoretsky and Dvoretsky (2018) identify high, mainly illegal, fishing pressure as the main cause of past population declines in both the North Pacific and the Barents Sea.

5.4 From joint to separate management

The two countries managed the crab jointly through the Commission until 2007 using a “3-S” regime (size, sex and season) supplemented by depth limits (Sundet, 2014). In 2007 the Commission agreed that each country would manage the stock within its own zone (Sundet, 2014; Jørgensen & Nilssen, 2011). Norway’s objectives were set out for the first time in a white paper to the Storting, St.meld. nr. 40 (2006–2007), and endorsed by the parliamentary committee (Innst. S. nr. 143 (2007–2008), 2008; Sundet & Hoel, 2016).

6 The Norwegian dual regime and stock development

6.1 Two zones, two objectives

The Norwegian policy rests on the premise that the crab cannot realistically be eradicated where it is established. ICES (2005) had already concluded that eradication was unrealistic after some forty years of presence, and the parliamentary committee

repeated the government's view that the crab was "here to stay" in its core area (Innst. S. nr. 143 (2007–2008), 2008). The overall objective became to limit further spread as far as possible and to keep the stock as low as possible outside a defined commercial area (Innst. S. nr. 143 (2007–2008), 2008).

The western boundary of the commercial area was drawn at 26°E at Magerøya, so that all of Porsangerfjord lay to the east (Innst. S. nr. 143 (2007–2008), 2008). The sources date this line differently: the parliamentary document states that it was agreed in 2003, with free fishing and a ban on discarding live crabs west of the line from August 2004; Jørgensen and Nilssen (2011) state that Norway was authorised in 2004 to use any necessary measures to limit spread west of 26°E; Sundet and Hoel (2016) describe 26°E as agreed in 2005 as the western limit of joint management. From 2008 the regime has comprised a quota-regulated area in eastern Finnmark and an open-access area elsewhere (Sundet & Hoel, 2016; OSPAR Commission, 2010). The northern boundary of the quota area was adjusted in 2010 and now runs along 71°30'N from 26°E to the Russian border (Sundet & Hoel, 2016).

Inside the quota area, the main instruments are a minimum legal size of 130 mm carapace length for both sexes, limits on the number of pots, vessel quotas and closed seasons (Sundet, 2014; Havforskningsinstituttet, n.d.). The minimum size was lowered from 137 mm to 130 mm around 2010 (Fiskerforum, 2016). Outside the quota area there is no minimum size and live crabs may not be released (Havforskningsinstituttet, n.d.; Sundet, 2014). The parliamentary committee also considered a subsidy of NOK 10 per kg for crabs removed outside the commercial area (Innst. S. nr. 143 (2007–2008), 2008).

6.2 Stock assessment approach

HI has conducted annual surveys in the quota-regulated area since 2000 and computes a stock index following a method described by Hvingel and colleagues (Hvingel et al., 2023a). The 2023 survey, for example, was carried out from 4 to 28 September with the research vessel *Kristine Bonnevie*, using trawl hauls, video sledge stations and pots, during a period in which commercial fishing was closed (Hjelset et al., 2024; Hvingel et al., 2023a). Since 2011, HI has also conducted trap surveys in the open-access area west of 26°E (Sundet & Hoel, 2016).

Early estimates were expressed in numbers. Before the 2007 season, about 1.1 million males above the minimum size were estimated in the commercial area, and in 2006 about 4.3 million crabs larger than 70 mm in the Varangerfjord, Østhavet, Tanafjord and Laksefjord areas; the stock west of 26°E was very roughly estimated at 500,000 crabs (Innst. S. nr. 143 (2007–2008), 2008). The full commercial area was first assessed as a whole in 2008 (Sundet, 2014). Current assessments use a model-based framework that expresses stock status relative to maximum sustainable yield (MSY) reference points. The harvest control rule has two priorities: a probability below 10% that the stock falls below $B_{lim} = 0.3 B_{MSY}$, and a probability of at most 35% that fishing mortality exceeds $F_{lim} = 1.7 F_{MSY}$ (Hvingel et al., 2023a).

6.3 Stock trends, advice and quotas

According to HI, the stock grew after establishment and has shown a generally declining trend since about 2003, with considerable variation; fishing mortality has increased since the fishery began, and the mean weight of legal males has decreased since 2000 (Hvingel et al., 2023a). Hjelset et al. (2012) linked reduced size composition and fecundity in the Norwegian stock to the fishery and invasion history, and Sundet (2014) reported a significant decline in egg production, probably caused by fishing on large males.

Table 3 summarises advice, quotas and male landings for selected years.

Table 3: Advice, male quota and male landings in the Norwegian quota-regulated area. Sources: Hvingel et al. (2023b) for 2009–2023; Hvingel et al. (2023a), Nærings- og fiskeridepartementet (2023, 2024) and Havforskningsinstituttet (2024) for 2024–2025.

Year	HI advice (t)	Quota (t)	Male landings (t)
2009	600	1,200	1,395
2012	<500	900	1,090
2016	<2,000	2,000	2,202
2018	<1,250	1,750	1,977
2020	<1,530	1,530	1,377
2022	<1,844	1,844	1,867
2023	<2,375	2,275	n/a
2024	966	966	n/a
2025	1,510	1,510	n/a

Over the period 2009–2023, quotas were in several years set above scientific advice, and landings sometimes exceeded quotas (Hvingel et al., 2023b). Female landings were small, ranging from 24 to 128 t per year in 2009–2022 (Hvingel et al., 2023b).

The 2023 assessment marked a turning point. The median biomass of legal males fell from 1.23 B_{MSY} in 2022 to 0.66 B_{MSY} in 2023, while the median fishing mortality ratio rose from 0.86 to 1.98 F_{MSY} ; the probability of exceeding F_{lim} was estimated at 63%, and the survey showed a clear drop in the number of legal males (Hvingel et al., 2023a). MSY was estimated at 1,779 t. HI advised a maximum catch of 966 t for 2024 (Hvingel et al., 2023a), which the ministry adopted for males, with an additional 60 t for females, describing the cut as a sharp reduction while stating that the stock remained within the management target (Nærings- og fiskeridepartementet, 2023).

The subsequent assessment showed an increase in the harvestable stock, which HI linked to lower fishing mortality following the 2024 cut, and the advice for 2025 was 1,510 t (Havforskningsinstituttet, 2024; We Are Aquaculture, 2024). The ministry set the 2025 quota at 1,510 t of males and 60 t of females, with 15% of the male quota reserved for damaged crabs and a closed season from 1 March to 30 April (Nærings-

og fiskeridepartementet, 2024). In November 2025, HI advised a maximum of 850 t of males for 2026, citing a decline in the harvestable stock; the assessment used a revised modelling framework, and updated survey indices indicated a somewhat more negative long-term trend (Bosworth, 2025). These swings illustrate how sensitive the stock is to fishing pressure: Fiskerforum (2016) quotes HI as noting that high fishing mortality also limits the potential for westward spread, which is consistent with the dual management objective.

Damaged crabs, with lost legs or claws, have made up 15–30% of the stock in recent years and about 22% on average since the mid-2000s (Hvingel et al., 2023a). HI has recommended extending the closed season and increasing the quota share for damaged crabs (Hvingel et al., 2023b), and in 2025 also recommended a ban on fishing in waters shallower than 100 m (Bosworth, 2025).

6.4 Divergent assessments across the border

Since 2007 the Norwegian and Russian parts of the stock have been assessed separately, by HI and by the Russian Polar Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (PINRO), respectively. FishSource notes that the two assessments diverge: the Norwegian assessment placed biomass below B_{MSY} in 2023, while the Russian assessment had estimated biomass well above its MSY-aligned target (FishSource, n.d.). Given that the population is shared and that Russian landings are several times larger than Norwegian ones (Dvoretzky & Dvoretzky, 2022; Hvingel et al., 2023b), this divergence is of practical as well as scientific interest.

7 A resource and an invasive species

7.1 Economic significance

The economic value of the crab has been a central argument for retaining a commercial fishery. In 2004–2006, the first-hand value of Norwegian catches was about NOK 60–80 million per year and exports about NOK 70–90 million, mainly to Japan and the European Union (Innst. S. nr. 143 (2007–2008), 2008). By 2015, landings from the quota area were worth NOK 141.6 million and exports about NOK 365 million (Sundet & Hoel, 2016). For Russia, Dvoretzky and Dvoretzky (2018) report export income from red king crab in the order of USD 200–250 million per year across its fisheries. Sundet (2014) notes that landed value varies greatly from year to year, mainly because of market prices. Falk-Petersen et al. (2011) summarise this duality: the crab is both an important source of income and a potential threat to the productive fisheries of the region.

7.2 Ecosystem effects

The ecological case against the crab rests mainly on its effects on benthic communities. Falk-Petersen et al. (2011) conclude that invaded areas show reduced benthic

diversity and biomass, that the crab preys on large epibenthic organisms which themselves provide habitat, and that effects on fish stocks, for example through egg predation or indirect interactions, are difficult to detect and predict. In Varangerfjord, Oug et al. (2011) compared soft-bottom fauna in 2007–2009 with baseline data from 1994 and found marked reductions in epifauna and infauna in crab-invaded areas, with declines in echinoderms, sedentary burrowing and tube-dwelling polychaetes and most bivalves, together with degraded sediment conditions at several sites. They suggested that the crab removes organisms responsible for bioirrigation and sediment reworking. A later study extended this analysis to structural and functional changes in several northern fjords (Oug et al., 2018), and HI reported observations from Porsangerfjord that large bivalves, sea stars and brittle stars disappeared over time at high crab densities (Fiskerforum, 2016).

HI summarises the potential effects as changes in benthic species composition, reduction of large individuals of species such as bivalves and sea stars, lower benthic biomass and possibly production, and altered sediment structure, while noting that the significance of these effects has not been adequately quantified (Hvingel et al., 2023b). The Norwegian Environment Agency has argued that existing environmental classification systems for coastal waters do not capture king crab effects on soft-bottom fauna, and published a proposed composite index, developed from data at 56 stations in Troms and Finnmark, to classify sites as affected or unaffected (Miljødirektoratet, 2022). Reviewing the economic literature, Sandorf et al. (2025) note that reported benthic losses due to crab predation range from 5% to 40% of benthic production and describe the overall evidence on ecosystem impact as inconclusive.

7.3 Management as a compromise

The dual regime has been described as a pragmatic response to a species that cannot be removed. Sundet and Hoel (2016) argue that the regime appears to work as intended and relate it to the obligation under the Convention on Biological Diversity to control alien species as far as possible and as appropriate. HI reported that crab density west of North Cape was less than 1% of that in the quota area, which it attributed largely to high fishing pressure in the open fishery, and that the stock was within the defined spread limits in 2023 (Hvingel et al., 2023b).

Economic analyses have raised questions about this compromise. Skonhøft and Kourantidou (2021) frame the crab as a natural asset that is simultaneously a value and a nuisance, and Kourantidou and Kaiser (2021) examine how research resources should be allocated for commercially valuable invasions. Xuan et al. (2026) develop a bioeconomic model that incorporates spatial management, enforcement, removal subsidies and illegal fishing, and conclude that the current separation into a quota area and a removal area may overestimate both stock and quotas when subsidy side-effects and non-compliance are not accounted for, and that spatially contrasting regimes can create incentives for non-compliance. Stated-preference work indicates that the Norwegian public places value on slowing spread and on benthic abundance (Sandorf et al., 2025).

8 Practitioner perspective

The author has worked in Norwegian fisheries since 2015, completing approximately eleven seasons on six vessels, including Barents Sea crab fisheries, in deck and processing roles, and has spent more than 1,500 days at sea above the Arctic Circle. This section does not present observations as data; it relates the literature reviewed above to the general operational context in which this experience was gained.

From a practitioner's standpoint, the literature underlines that the red king crab fishery is a fishery defined by regulation as much as by biology. The two-zone regime, the minimum legal size, the separate set-aside for damaged crabs and the closed season all translate directly into on-board routines of sorting, measuring and handling, and the high share of damaged crabs reported by HI (Hvingel et al., 2023a) points to the importance of careful handling at every stage of the catch process. The large year-to-year changes in quotas summarised in Table 3 also translate into variable working seasons and income for crews, which is relevant for people considering employment in the sector.

The author is also the founder of an educational platform on employment in the Norwegian fishing and crab industry. In that context, a review of this kind serves a practical purpose: the history of the crab as an introduced species and the ecological reasoning behind the management rules are documented mainly in specialist and Norwegian-language sources, and an accessible synthesis may help people entering the industry understand why the rules exist and why they change.

9 Knowledge gaps and research needs

Several gaps emerge from this review.

First, the ecosystem effects remain insufficiently quantified at the scale relevant for management. Studies such as Oug et al. (2011, 2018) document strong local effects, but HI notes that the overall significance has not been adequately quantified (Hvingel et al., 2023b), and economic analyses rely on a wide range of effect estimates (Sandorf et al., 2025). Standardised monitoring, such as the index proposed by Miljødirektoratet (2022), would help link crab density to measurable changes in benthic function.

Second, the Norwegian and Russian assessments of what is biologically a single population diverge (FishSource, n.d.). Comparable survey designs, data exchange and joint evaluation of stock status would reduce uncertainty, although this depends on the state of bilateral scientific cooperation.

Third, the recent methodological revision of the Norwegian assessment, which produced a more negative historical trend (Bosworth, 2025), and the strong year-to-year swings in advice indicate that the assessment model and its sensitivity to recruitment and survey indices deserve further documentation in the peer-reviewed literature.

Fourth, the long-term consequences of selective fishing on large males for reproductive potential, documented by Hjelset et al. (2012) and Sundet (2014), require continued

monitoring, especially in combination with the high proportion of damaged crabs.

Fifth, the effectiveness of the open fishery in containing spread south of Tromsø and the risk of larval transport towards Bjørnøya and Svalbard, which HI cannot rule out (Hvingel et al., 2023b), merit dedicated study. Finally, the incentives created by the dual regime for compliance and illegal fishing, highlighted by Xuan et al. (2026), call for empirical work on enforcement and fishers' behaviour.

10 Conclusions

The red king crab in the Barents Sea is the result of a deliberate Soviet introduction carried out between 1961 and 1969 with material from the Kamchatka region. Within about a decade the species was reproducing; by the 1990s it was abundant along the Kola coast and in Varangerfjord, and it has since spread westwards along the Finnmark coast to around Tromsø, mainly through slow adult dispersal. A joint Norwegian-Russian research fishery from 1994 gave way to commercial fisheries in Norway in 2002 and in Russia in 2004, and to separate national management from 2007.

Norway's dual regime, with a quota-regulated fishery east of 26°E and an open fishery to the west, reflects the crab's dual status. HI assessments describe a harvestable stock that has declined in general since the early 2000s and responds quickly to changes in fishing pressure, as shown by the sequence of advice from 966 t for 2024, to 1,510 t for 2025 and 850 t for 2026. At the same time, a growing body of research documents effects on benthic communities whose ecosystem-level significance is not yet adequately quantified. The case illustrates both the long-term consequences of species introductions and the difficulty of managing a species that is at once an economic asset and an ecological concern.

Declarations

Funding. None.

Competing interests. The author is the founder of BFISHERMAN, an educational platform on fisheries employment.

Use of AI tools. Literature search, drafting and translation were assisted by an AI tool (Claude, Anthropic); the author is responsible for the content.

References

Bosworth, A. (2025, November 24). Norwegian scientists recommend 44 per cent cut to 2026 king crab quota. *Baird Maritime*. <https://www.bairdmaritime.com/fishing/regulation-enforcement/norwegian-scientists-recommend-44-per-cent-cut-to-2026-king-crab-quota>

Dvoretsky, A. G., & Dvoretsky, V. G. (2018). Red king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*) fisheries in Russian waters: Historical review and present status. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*, 28(2), 331–353. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11160-017-9510-1>

Dvoretsky, V. G., & Dvoretsky, A. G. (2022). Ecology and distribution of red king crab larvae in the Barents Sea: A review. *Water*, 14(15), 2328. <https://doi.org/10.3390/w14152328>

Falk-Petersen, J., Renaud, P., & Anisimova, N. (2011). Establishment and ecosystem effects of the alien invasive red king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*) in the Barents Sea – a review. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 68(3), 479–488. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsq192>

FishSource. (n.d.). *Red king crab – Barents Sea* [Stock profile]. Sustainable Fisheries Partnership. Retrieved October 2026, from https://www.fishsource.org/stock_page/1115

Fiskerforum. (2016, November 5). IMR recommends 1500 tonne crab quota. <https://fiskerforum.com/imr-recommends-1500-tonne-crab-quota/>

Havforskningsinstituttet. (n.d.). *Kongekrabbe* [Species page]. Retrieved October 2026, from <https://www.hi.no/hi/temasider/arter/kongekrabbe>

Havforskningsinstituttet. (2024). *Kongekrabbe i norsk sone: Status og rådgivning for 2025*. <https://kudos.dfo.no/documents/201819/files/43098.pdf>

Hjelset, A. M., Jenssen, M., Schuster, E., Olsen, S. A., Larsen, M., Olsson, R., Fuhrmann, M. M., Johannesen, R., & Strømme, R. (2024). *Bestandskartlegging av kongekrabbe i kvoteregulert område – 2023: Toktrapport fra tokt med F/F Kristine Bonnevie 04.-28. september 2023* (Toktrapport 2024-13). Havforskningsinstituttet. <https://hdl.handle.net/11250/3133520>

Hjelset, A. M., Nilssen, E. M., & Sundet, J. H. (2012). Reduced size composition and fecundity related to fishery and invasion history in the introduced red king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*) in Norwegian waters. *Fisheries Research*, 121–122, 73–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2012.01.010>

Hvingel, C., Hjelset, A. M., Fuhrmann, M. M., Jenssen, M., & Zimmermann, F. (2023a). *Bestandsvurdering av kongekrabbe 2023 og råd for 2024* (Rapport fra havforskningen 2023-49). Havforskningsinstituttet. <https://www.hi.no/hi/nettrapporter/rapport-fra-havforskningen-2023-49>

Hvingel, C., Hjelset, A. M., Fuhrmann, M. M., Jenssen, M., & Zimmermann, F. (2023b). *Råd om fiske på kongekrabbe i 2024* (Rapport fra havforskningen 2023-50). Havforskningsinstituttet. <https://www.hi.no/hi/nettrapporter/rapport-fra-havforskningen-2023-50>

ICES. (2005). *The intentional introduction of the marine red king crab *Paralithodes camtschaticus* into the Southern Barents Sea* (L. L. Jørgensen, I. Manushin, J. H. Sundet, & S.-R. Birkely, Authors; ICES Cooperative Research Report No. 277). International Council for the Exploration of the Sea. https://ices-library.figshare.com/articles/report/The_intentiona

Innst. S. nr. 143 (2007–2008). (2008). *Innstilling fra næringskomiteen om forvaltning av kongekrabbe* [Recommendation on St.meld. nr. 40 (2006–2007)]. Stortinget. <https://www.stortinget.no/globalassets/pdf/innstillinger/stortinget/2007-2008/inns->

200708-143.pdf

Jørgensen, L. L., & Nilssen, E. M. (2011). The invasive history, impact and management of the red king crab *Paralithodes camtschaticus* off the coast of Norway. In B. S. Galil, P. F. Clark, & J. T. Carlton (Eds.), *In the wrong place – Alien marine crustaceans: Distribution, biology and impacts* (pp. 521–536). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0591-3_18

Kourantidou, M., & Kaiser, B. A. (2021). Allocation of research resources for commercially valuable invasions: Norway's red king crab fishery. *Fisheries Research*, 237, 105871. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2020.105871>

Miljødirektoratet. (2022). *Forslag til indeks for vurdering av kongekrabbens påvirkning på bunndyrsamfunn*. <https://www.miljodirektoratet.no/publikasjoner/2022/juni/forslag-til-indeks-for-vurdering-av-kongekrabbens-pavirkning-pa-bunndyrsamfunn>

Nærings- og fiskeridepartementet. (2023, December 20). *Fangst av kongekrabbe i 2024* [Press release]. Regjeringen.no. <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/aktuelt/fangst-av-kongekrabbe-i-2024/id3019722/>

Nærings- og fiskeridepartementet. (2024, December 17). *Fangst av kongekrabbe i 2025* [Press release]. Regjeringen.no. <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/aktuelt/fangst-av-kongekrabbe-i-2025/id3079702/>

Orlov, Y. I., & Ivanov, B. G. (1978). On the introduction of the Kamchatka king crab *Paralithodes camtschatica* (Decapoda: Anomura: Lithodidae) into the Barents Sea. *Marine Biology*, 48, 373–375. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00391642>

OSPAR Commission. (2010). *Quality Status Report 2010: ICES overview assessment of non-indigenous species in the OSPAR maritime area – Red king crab case study* (Supplement 2 to assessment 1.5.5.2). https://qsr2010.ospar.org/media/assessments/1.5.5.2_supplements/1.5.5.2_supplement_2.pdf

Oug, E., Cochrane, S. K. J., Sundet, J. H., Norling, K., & Nilsson, H. C. (2011). Effects of the invasive red king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*) on soft-bottom fauna in Varangerfjorden, northern Norway. *Marine Biodiversity*, 41(3), 467–479. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12526-010-0068-6>

Oug, E., Sundet, J. H., & Cochrane, S. K. J. (2018). Structural and functional changes of soft-bottom ecosystems in northern fjords invaded by the red king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*). *Journal of Marine Systems*, 180, 255–264. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2017.07.005>

Sandorf, E. D., Aanesen, M., Falk-Andersson, J., Furuseth, I. S., Hanley, N., Kaiser, B. A., Kourantidou, M., Navrud, S., Vondolia, G. K., & Xuan, B. B. (2025). Exploring information and embedding effects on willingness-to-pay to control the invasive red king crab in Norway. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 88(9), 2529–2556. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-025-01022-9>

Skonhoft, A., & Kourantidou, M. (2021). Managing a natural asset that is both a value and a nuisance: Competition versus cooperation for the Barents Sea red king crab. *Marine Resource Economics*, 36(3), 229–254. <https://doi.org/10.1086/714416>

- Sundet, J. H. (2014). The red king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*) in the Barents Sea. In L. Fernandez et al. (Eds.), *Marine invasive species in the Arctic* (TemaNord 547, pp. 71–82). Nordic Council of Ministers. <https://www.vliz.be/imisdocs/publications/272394.pdf>
- Sundet, J. H., & Hoel, A. H. (2016). The Norwegian management of an introduced species: The Arctic red king crab fishery. *Marine Policy*, 72, 278–284. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2016.04.041>
- We Are Aquaculture. (2024, November 4). More Norwegian king crab in 2025. <https://weareaquaculture.com/amp/story/news/fisheries/more-norwegian-king-crab-in-2025>
- Windsland, K., Hvingel, C., Nilssen, E. M., & Sundet, J. H. (2014). Dispersal of the introduced red king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*) in Norwegian waters: A tag-recapture study. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 71(7), 1966–1976. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fst241>
- Xuan, B. B., Armstrong, C. W., Kourantidou, M., Vondolia, G. K., Ngoc, Q. T. K., & Kaiser, B. A. (2026). Economic management of an invasion: The case of the red king crab in Norway. *Marine Resource Economics*, 41(3), 147–167. <https://doi.org/10.1086/740802>