



Submission by the
Royal New Zealand Society for the
Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Inc.

on the

Fisheries Amendment Bill

6th May 2026



Executive Summary

- SPCA opposes the Fisheries Amendment Bill and supports the Bill not proceeding from Select Committee.
- SPCA opposes the amendments that exempt on-board camera footage from OIA requests because this erodes transparency and accountability of what happens to animals at sea. It also shields the regulator from scrutiny – it is not clear to what extent MPI acts on animal welfare issues reported at sea, especially given that observer reports released under the OIA in 2022 have already demonstrated years of clearly documented cruelty to sharks.
- Wild animals face multiple anthropogenic threats that lead to heavily degraded ecosystems where meeting basic welfare needs become more difficult. SPCA supports an ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management that identifies the impacts of commercial fishing on ecosystems and the welfare of aquatic animals.
- SPCA recognises the value of reforming the Fisheries Act to improve decision-making about commercial fishing. We are sympathetic to efforts to reduce the time and resources needed for decision-making under the Fisheries Act.
- However, the proposed amendments do not reflect the limitations of the current system of information gathering that underpins the decision-making for the commercial fishing industry, nor do the proposals go far enough in advancing an ecosystems-based approach to fisheries management.
- SPCA advocates for more funding to support independent research and fisheries stock assessments. SPCA supports continued research on the interdependency of different fish stock and the environmental impacts of fisheries management.
- SPCA opposes the Bill because it does not take a precautionary approach to fisheries management that recognises the uncertainties of information used for stock assessments.
- SPCA does not support the Bill because we are concerned there are no incentives for fishers to reduce bycatch.
- SPCA is concerned that the rationale for amending the Bill to avoid the risk of judicial review of total allowable catch decisions risks sustainability and accountability.



Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	3
Submission	3
Recommendations	3
Sustainable fisheries management requires public transparency and an ecosystem-based approach, which considers the welfare of aquatic animals.....	4
Reforming the Fisheries Act to improve decision-making	5
Part 1: Amendments relating to total allowable catch and total allowable commercial catch....	5
SPCA opposes the amendments relating to total allowable catch and total allowable commercial catch, due to poor information on fish stocks managed in the QMS	5
Part 2: Other Amendments	7
Carrying forward the ACE risks environmental degradation and stock depletion.....	7
Amendments relating to returns and abandonment fail to introduce incentives to reduce bycatch and are overly optimistic about post-release survivability of animals.....	8
The monetary threshold for unpaid deemed value should be increased.....	9
Subpart 5: Exempting camera footage from the OIA removes an important mechanism to hold the regulator accountable.....	9
Subpart 6: Limiting the period for judicial review is not clearly evidenced.....	13
Conclusion	13
References.....	14



Introduction

The following submission is made on behalf of The Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (trading as SPCA).

SPCA is the preeminent animal welfare and advocacy organisation in New Zealand. The Society has been in existence for over 150 years with a supporter base representing more than 100,000 New Zealanders across the nation.

The organisation includes 28 Animal Welfare Centres across New Zealand and approximately 60 inspectors appointed under the Animal Welfare Act 1999.

Submission

SPCA advocates for all animals, including wild and aquatic animals. We regularly submit to the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) on fisheries policy because commercial fishing negatively impacts many animals including fish and crustaceans (Ellis et al., 2017; Waley et al., 2021), seabirds (Baker et al., 2024; Crawford et al., 2017; Dias et al., 2019; Whitehead et al., 2019), sea turtles (Dunn et al., 2023; Finucci & Dunn, 2024), and marine mammals such as sea lions, dolphins, and whales (Robertson & Chilvers, 2011; Wilson et al., 2014).

We welcome the opportunity to submit on the consultation for the Fisheries Amendment Bill.

Recommendations

- Fund and resource independent data collection on current stocks managed under the Quota Management System, interdependent stocks, and impacts of fishing on ecosystems.
- MPI is instructed to formalise internal processes for animal welfare investigations identified through on-board footage, and that these processes of reporting are documented in MPI observer logs.



- Robust observer data is collected on the condition of fish after capture, handling, and post-release monitoring that is aimed at understanding the survivability of any species captured in commercial fisheries.
- 100% of the commercial fishing fleet has on-board cameras in use.

Sustainable fisheries management requires public transparency and an ecosystem-based approach, which considers the welfare of aquatic animals

We are experiencing a devastating decline in biodiversity and the condition of marine habitats (Ministry for the Environment, 2019), which impacts all aquatic animals and renders our marine environments less resilient to climate change.

Aquatic animals face immediate threats from the cumulative impacts of commercial fishing, aquaculture, mining, chemical pollution, coastal nutrient and sediment input, invasive species, and harmful algal blooms (Gordon et al., 2010; Rae et al., 2023). Cumulative pressures from anthropogenic activities increase the vulnerability of marine animal populations to further threats of habitat loss, depleting prey stocks, water pollution, and the overarching longer-term threats of climate change such as rising air and water temperatures, heat waves, water acidification, and extreme weather events (Almiron & Faria, 2019; Cook et al., 2025; Fraser et al., 2012; Joseph et al., 2023; Shields, 2019).

Anthropogenic threats that lead to heavily degraded ecosystems make it increasingly difficult for wild aquatic animals to meet basic welfare needs (Aguirre, 2017; Groner et al., 2016; Joseph et al., 2023; Paquet & Darimont, 2010). SPCA advocates for all aquatic animals to have a good life and have places where they can thrive. Their welfare is intimately linked with their ability to find food, rear offspring, build nests, find roosts or habitats suitable for laying eggs, and engage in social interactions and normal behaviours.

SPCA supports an ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management that identifies the impacts of commercial fishing on ecosystems and the welfare of aquatic animals. Protecting animal welfare and the humane treatment of aquatic animals are important societal values and



impact the sustainability of the commercial fishing industry in New Zealand (Office of the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor, 2021).

Reforming the Fisheries Act to improve decision-making

SPCA recognises the value in reforming the Fisheries Act to improve decision-making about commercial fishing. However, we do not think the proposed amendments in the Fisheries Amendment Bill (the Bill) reflect the limitations of the current data that underpin the decision-making for the commercial fishing industry, nor do the amendments go far enough in advancing an ecosystems-based approach to fisheries management.

The amendments in the Bill erode public consultation and transparency and lack detail with safeguards to problems resulting from increased Ministerial power in setting catch limits. We are concerned that the Bill will lead to further uncertainty and risk for animals and people.

SPCA advocates for more funding to support independent research and fisheries stock assessments. SPCA supports continued research on the interdependency of different fish stock and the environmental impacts of fisheries management. SPCA supports research that aims to clarify the impacts of anthropogenic stressors on aquatic animal populations, including the impacts of climate change, land use, and fishery closures. SPCA advocates for continued transparency and public engagement in fisheries management.

Part 1: Amendments relating to total allowable catch and total allowable commercial catch

SPCA opposes the amendments relating to total allowable catch and total allowable commercial catch, due to poor information on fish stocks managed in the QMS

SPCA is sympathetic to efforts to reduce time and resources needed for decision-making under the Fisheries Act. We also see the value in greater flexibility in responding to new information that arises on the status of Quota Management System (QMS) stocks and the environmental impacts of catch decisions.



More information is needed to inform stock assessments including stocks that have never or not recently been assessed (see Peart, 2018). A large proportion of stock assessments rely on catch/effort data provided by the industry, rather than fisheries-independent surveys, which is problematic because of the widespread illegal dumping and misreporting that have distorted catch statistics for decades (Simmons et al., 2016; Slooten et al., 2017). Fisher-reported bycatch data is consistently underreported compared to observer data (Office of the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor, 2021). For some fisheries, annual estimates of bycatch and discards rely on data collected from the observed fraction of the industry and therefore are dependent on the level and spread of observer coverage and the quality of the collected data (Finucci et al., 2020). A lack of information, including information independent from those that benefit from fishing, is a serious risk for fisheries sustainability (Peart, 2018). The lack of independent up-to-date information on fish stocks managed in the QMS is a systemic problem that underpins our concern with the proposed amendments in Part 1 of the Bill.

Therefore, we oppose the Amendments in Part 1 of the Bill because it does not take a precautionary approach to fisheries management that recognises the uncertainties of information used for stock assessments, including:

- a lack of checks and balances on decision-making, specifically in new section 13G which allows the Minister to assess the reliability of information that they will then use to characterise stocks as low, medium, or high information.
- shifting of decision-making out of Ministerial hands with use of management procedures, specifically in new sections 14L-14T, which are risky to use with poor information and removes the ability for the public to engage in decision-making.
- too much weight placed on non-regulatory, voluntary measures, specifically in new sections 14I to 14K, which are better used as complementary tools when there is reliable information on stocks.
- placing greater emphasis on social and economic factors, specifically in new sections 13B-13C which undermines the greater need in assessing biological characteristics of the stock, environmental conditions affecting the stock, and interdependence of stock when setting catch limits.



We do not support new section 13F which provides that, in setting a total allowable catch for a QMS stock under new section 13A, the Minister must take into account the adverse effects of fishing for the stock on the aquatic environment and the environmental principles only to the extent that they are relevant to the standard factors. We are concerned that the rationale for amending the Fisheries Act in this manner is to avoid judicial review at the cost of environmental sustainability as detailed in the Cabinet Economic Policy Committee paper (Office of the Minister for Oceans and Fisheries, 06 August 2025):

Recent court cases relating to crayfish and orange roughy fisheries have challenged catch limit decisions via judicial review. The issue driving the review was not the catch limit, but rather whether fishing was having a wider environmental effect (such as the impact of bottom trawling or creation of kina barrens). Catch limit decisions in and of themselves may not be able to solve wider environmental effects, and usually other methods are more effective, such as gear restrictions or area closures.

and in MPI's advice to the Minister on amendments to the Fisheries Act to reduce judicial review risk (17 June of 2025):

there is an opportunity to mitigate the risk of legal challenge to fisheries management decisions through further operational improvements, the current Fisheries Act 1996 reform proposals, and additional legislative changes... recent court cases have seen a shift from viewing the Total Allowable Catch (TAC) as a mechanism to manage the abundance of a particular stock to a mechanism to also manage wider environmental issues...

SPCA is concerned that the focus is on changing the Fisheries Act to avoid judicial and public scrutiny. We advocate that decisions on setting catch limits be based on more genuine and robust consideration of the impact of commercial fishing on ecosystems, rather than amending Fisheries Act to avoid judicial review.

Part 2: Other Amendments

Carrying forward the ACE risks environmental degradation and stock depletion

SPCA does not support the proposals in this section to allow an increase in Annual Catch Entitlement (ACE) to be carried forward. We are concerned this would lead to environmental



degradation and stock depletion from overfishing in subsequent years. We are concerned that a natural disaster would be considered an exceptional circumstance for allowing ACE to be carried forward when the stocks themselves are often impacted by the natural disaster and that these impacts could be long term (Cook et al., 2025). For example, there is great uncertainty about the long-term impacts of the 2023 cyclones on rock lobster habitat in the CRA 3 fishery (MPI, Dec 2025). Carrying ACE forward in these instances may create a sustainability risk.

Amendments relating to returns and abandonment fail to introduce incentives to reduce bycatch and are overly optimistic about post-release survivability of animals

SPCA does not support the amendments in this section because we are concerned there are no incentives for fishers to reduce bycatch. Reducing bycatch is imperative for minimising welfare harms to wildlife and ensuring the sustainability of fisheries.

Current fisheries management has created disincentives for using good fishing practices to reduce the catch of unwanted fish; this contributes to fish wastage, illegal activity, and the unnecessary suffering of target and non-target species (Heron, 2016).

SPCA is concerned that the amendments in this section reflect an overly optimistic attitude about the post-release survivability of fish and other animals captured in commercial fisheries. The amendments specify no requirements for monitoring abandoned animals that are released under the presumption of survival. There are few studies that look at post-release survival for current species that are allowed to be released such as Southern Bluefin tuna, Pacific Bluefin tuna, and porbeagle. SPCA advocates that decisions to permit abandonment at sea should be supported by empirical data that indicates species caught by certain methods stand a chance to survive.

Should these amendments go through allowing abandonment of fish and other animals, SPCA advocates for the addition of conditions that affect survivability be included: how fish are hooked if caught on longlines (Moore & Finucci, 2024; Nunes et al., 2019; Skomal, 2007), injuries (Leroy et al., 2023), and handling stress (Leroy et al., 2023; Lines & Spence, 2014; Skomal, 2007; Southgate, 2008; Waley et al., 2021).



Current landing exceptions for some QMS fish require fishers to assess the condition of the fish before release to ensure they only release fish that are alive or likely to survive (Fisheries New Zealand, Dec 2023). It is not clear how fish released at depth will be assessed for survivability and we are concerned this will result in many animals being captured and returned or abandoned that will not survive. SPCA advocates for robust observer and camera data to be collected on the condition of fish after capture, handling, and post-release monitoring to understand the survivability of any species captured in commercial fisheries.

The monetary threshold for unpaid deemed value should be increased

SPCA agrees there should be disincentives for poor fishing behaviour and supports the option for a suspension of fishing permits. SPCA supports deemed value rates to be set so that they create a true disincentive for reducing bycatch and discard and improving accurate reporting of catch data. SPCA advocates for 100% of the commercial fishing fleet be required to have cameras or full-time observers to complement the potential role of deemed values decreasing the incentive to discard (see Townsend & Walker, 2022).

Subpart 5: Exempting camera footage from the OIA removes an important mechanism to hold the regulator accountable

SPCA rejects the amendments relating to camera recordings in Subpart 5 because they reduce the transparency and accountability of the impact of commercial fishing activities on animals at sea. We oppose an exemption of on-board camera footage to requests under the Official Information Act (OIA).

According to MPI (23 July 2025), cameras enable independent verification of the information provided by commercial fishers on fishing and related activities (e.g., protected species interactions, catch, and discards) (p.18). On-board cameras have shown that fisher-reported data underestimates what happens to wildlife at sea. MPI (2024) reported data before and after on-board cameras were operating on vessels indicating:



- 3.5 times increase in the number of albatross interactions.
- 6.8 times increase in dolphin captures.
- 46% increase in volume of discard.
- 34% increase in the number of fish species reported in catch.
- 2.1 times increase in the number of fish species reported in discards.

This shows that increased transparency has resulted in a change of behaviour. It is therefore unclear why the amendments to remove camera footage from OIA requests are included in the Bill given the focus is “*to make the fisheries system more responsive, certain, and efficient, to enhance value to fishers and better ensure sustainability*” (MPI, 2024, p.5).

SPCA is sympathetic to privacy concerns. However, we note there are already mechanisms in place to protect the privacy of commercial fishers:

- Cameras are not installed in areas of the deck or parts of a vessel unrelated to fishing such as the bridge, crew, quarters, messes, heads, or engine room (MPI, n.d.).
- MPI is required under the Privacy Act 2020 to take all reasonable security safeguards to ensure privacy, security, and confidentiality of the collected information (MPI, n.d.).
- MPI’s Guidelines for the Release of Fisheries Information detail processes for responding to requests for OIA footage and reasons for withholding (MPI, May 2023).

MPI’s own characterisation of their current system for managing OIA requests to protect privacy for camera footage indicates it is robust:

MPI’s current approach to assessing requests for footage under the OIA provides strong protections for footage. The OIA withholding grounds have allowed MPI to withhold footage when needed to protect privacy and confidentiality – to date no footage has been released to third parties (although this is currently being tested via a complaint to the Ombudsman. (MPI, 23 July 2025, p. 47).

MPI further indicates that the video footage “*...would never be made publicly available under the OIA*” (MPI, 23 July 2025, p. 7).



We fail to see where the problem is that would warrant further restrictions on camera footage to protect fisher privacy, especially when none has been released.

An exemption of on-board camera footage from OIA requests removes an important mechanism to hold the regulator, MPI, accountable for ensuring they are upholding their obligations to enforce the Animal Welfare Act for offences captured on cameras. MPI has the dual task of promoting the commercial fishing industry and enforcing the Animal Welfare Act 1999, which does apply to some captured wild animals, including aquatic animals. The option of having an OIA request for on-board camera footage ensures the public can hold MPI accountable in fulfilling its role for protecting the welfare of animals at sea.

MPI characterises the exemption of OIA footage as a minor concern in the Regulatory Impact Statement for this Bill: *“The preferred option is providing an exemption from the OIA for footage from cameras on-board commercial vessels. This will result in a small reduction in transparency of information as onboard camera footage would never be made publicly available under the OIA.”* (MPI, 23 July 2025, p. 7).

We respectfully disagree that an exemption of camera footage from OIA requests is a minor concern. SPCA has serious questions about what happens to video footage that captures animal welfare offenses committed during commercial fishing activities. On-board cameras may capture instances where bycatch animals remain alive after capture, and fishers may allow or cause them to suffer unreasonable or unnecessary pain, distress, or an inhumane death which may engage legal obligations under animal welfare laws.

It currently is not clear if and how these incidents are reported to the MPI animal welfare compliance team for investigation.

Rather than focus on reducing transparency and accountability for animal welfare offences committed at sea, SPCA requests that internal processes are developed for reporting offences captured on video to the MPI compliance team. This internal process should be available to the public, especially if the camera footage itself will not be.



We would also request these processes of reporting include offences documented in MPI observer logs. For example, MPI Observer logs covering a five-year period captured incidents where sharks were stabbed and had their jaws and gills cut to facilitate hook removal before returning to the sea (Forest & Bird, 2022). Best practices in the New Zealand [National Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks 2013](#) do not include stabbing sharks or cutting their jaws or gills as recommended methods of hook removal. We are concerned that the behaviour in the MPI Observer logs occurred over a five-year period, suggesting enforcement of the law that makes this an offence was not happening.

We are concerned the context in which these incidents were happening - that it was at sea and related to commercial fishing - explains the apparent lack of response from MPI. Where members of the public were filmed inhumanely killing a shark on a beach which drew large amounts of media coverage (Newstalk ZB, 3 Jan 2024), MPI clearly stated this was unacceptable behaviour:

... the Ministry for Primary Industries' animal welfare director for compliance and response, said Fisheries manages the effects of fishing on sharks with a range of rules restricting how and where they can be caught by commercial and recreational fishers. "There are guidelines covering how a shark can be killed to minimise suffering, which includes severing its spine across the back of its head," Burrell said in a statement. "While there appears to be some attempt to do this, we consider the shark was made to suffer unnecessary pain and distress due to the shark not being dispatched correctly in this instance. "We will be following up to ensure the people in the video are aware of their responsibilities under the Animal Welfare Act."

Low observer and camera coverage is a barrier to understanding the true impact that fishing activities have on animals (Crawford et al., 2017; Department of Conservation, n.d; Heron, 2016). Instead of focusing on removing OIA requests for on-board camera footage, SPCA would rather the Bill expand on-board camera requirements. SPCA advocates that 100% of commercial fishing vessels use on-board cameras to improve the level of monitoring, compliance, and verification of catch and thus quality of fishing data. Improved monitoring can also help mitigate the cascading effects of overfishing and over-harvesting of specific species. Improved monitoring is also necessary to better understand the true impacts of commercial fishing on non-target species that end up dead or released as bycatch (Emery et al., 2019).



SPCA encourages the development of technology that will better capture interactions between animals caught as bycatch to reduce the uncertainty of cryptic outcomes for animals that have escaped an interaction with a cable but may have been injured or died, e.g., seabirds and data transmission cables or New Zealand sea lions and Sea Lion Exclusion Devices.

SPCA rejects the framing that footage of bycatch and discard may unfairly negatively impact the reputation of the fishing industry. An important reason for having camera footage is to ensure transparency in the public domain so the impacts of commercial fishing are better understood by the public. We argue that creating barriers to transparency undermines the social license to operate more than perceived mischaracterisation of the industry.

Subpart 6: Limiting the period for judicial review is not clearly evidenced

SPCA opposes the amendments in this section of the Bill that limits the period for judicial review to 20 days. We are concerned that the rationale for this amendment is to avoid the risk of judicial review of total allowable catch decisions as a mechanism to increase certainty (see MPI, 19 June 2025), when it actually risks sustainability and accountability of the fishing industry.

Judicial review has been an important tool in ensuring the decisions for setting total allowable catch factor in the impacts on the environment and on the fish themselves. We have seen the ongoing issues with rock lobsters in the CRA 1 where catch limits were overturned by the court because the Minister did not fully consider the best available information about the interdependence of different species and the environment (Environmental Law Initiative v Minister for Oceans and Fisheries, [2025]). We think limiting judicial review to 20 days is too short a period to fully analyse decisions under the Fisheries Act and will perpetuate poor decision-making.

Conclusion

SPCA appreciates the opportunity to contribute to the consultation on the Fisheries Amendment Bill. Our organisation is happy to discuss this matter if further information is required.



References

- Aguirre, A. A. (2017). Changing patterns of emerging zoonotic diseases in wildlife, domestic animals, and humans linked to biodiversity loss and globalization. *Institute for Laboratory Animal Research Journal*, 58(3), 315-318.
<https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ilar/ilx035>
- Almiron, N., & Faria, C. (2019). Climate change impacts on free-living nonhuman animals. Challenges for media and communication ethics. *Studies in Media and Communication*, 7(1), 37-48. <https://doi.org/10.11114/smc.v7i1.4305>
- Baker, G. B., Komyakova, V., Wellbelove, A., Beynon, N., & Haward, M. (2024). The implementation of ACAP Best Practice Advice to mitigate seabird bycatch in fisheries: Issues and options. *Marine Policy*, 160, Article 105879.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2023.105879>
- Bull, L. S. (2007). Reducing seabird bycatch in longline, trawl, and gillnet fisheries. *Fish and Fisheries*, 8(1), 31-56. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-2979.2007.00234.x>
- Cook, K. M., Dunn, M. R., Behrens, E., Pinkerton, M. H., Law, C., & Cummings, V. J. (2025). *Marine heatwaves and fisheries in Aotearoa New Zealand: Review of potential effects on marine ecosystems and fishstocks*. New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 352. <https://fs.fish.govt.nz/Page.aspx?pk=113&dk=25867>
- Crawford, R., Ellenberg, U., Frere, E., Hagen, C., Baird, K., Brewin, P., Crofts, S., Glass, J., Mattern, T., Pompert, J., Ross, K., Kemper, J., Ludynia, K., Sherley, R. B., Steinfurth, A., Suazo, C., G., Yorio, P., Tamini, L., Mangel, J. C., ... Small, C. (2017). Tangled and drowned: A global review of penguin bycatch in fisheries. *Endangered Species Research*, 34, 373-396. <https://dx.doi.org/10.3354/esr00869>
- Department of Conservation (DOC). (n.d.). *Hector's & Māui dolphin incident database: 1 August 2018-30 April 2019*. <https://www.doc.govt.nz/our-work/hectors-and-maui-dolphin-incident-database/1-august-2018/>



Dias, M., Martin, R., Pearmain, E. J., Burfield, I. J., Small, C., Phillips, R. A., Yates, O., Lascelles, B., Garcia Borboroglu, P., & Croxall, J. P. (2019). Threats to seabirds: A global assessment. *Biological Conservation*, 237, 525-537.

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2019.06.033>

Dunn, M. R., Finucci, B., Pinkerton, M. H., Sutton, P., & Duffy, C. A. J. (2023). Increased captures of the critically endangered leatherback turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*) around New Zealand: The contribution of warming seas and fisher behavior. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2023.1170632>

Ellis, J. R., McCully Phillips, S. R., & Poisson, F. (2017). A review of capture and post-release mortality of elasmobranchs. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 90, 653-722.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/jfb.13197>

Emery, T.J., Noriega, R., Williams, A.J., Larcombe, J. (2019) Changes in logbook reporting by commercial fishers following the implementation of electronic monitoring in Australian Commonwealth fisheries. *Marine Policy*, 104, 135–145

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2019.01.018>

Environmental Law Initiative v Minister of Oceans and Fisheries [2025] NZHC 177.

<https://www.eli.org.nz/cases/crayfish-part2-win>

Finucci, B., Anderson, O. F., & Edwards, C.T.T. (2020). *Non-target fish and invertebrate catch and discards in New Zealand ling longline fisheries from 2002–03 to 2017–18*.

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Brit-Finucci/publication/341926303_Non-target_fish_and_invertebrate_catch_and_discards_in_New_Zealand_ling_longline_fisheries_from_2002-03_to_2017-18/links/5ed9adbe92851c9c5e816c8c/Non-target-fish-and-invertebrate-catch-and-discards-in-New-Zealand-ling-longline-fisheries-from-2002-03-to-2017-18.pdf

Finucci, B., & Dunn, M. R. (2024). Post-release survival for leatherback turtles caught in New Zealand surface longline fisheries. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 345*. 36 p. <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/dmsdocument/65802-AEBR-345-Post->



[release-survival-for-leatherback-turtles-caught-in-New-Zealand-surface-longline-fisheries](#)

Fisheries New Zealand. (December 2023). *Commercial landing exception reviews. Operational guidelines*. <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/dmsdocument/70775-Commercial-Landing-Exception-Review-Operational-guidelines>

Forest & Bird. (9 March 2022). *Sharks subject to “brutal” and needless killing, official reports reveal*. <https://www.forestandbird.org.nz/resources/sharks-subject-brutal-and-needless-killing-official-reports-reveal> Fraser, D. (2012). A “practical” ethic for animals. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 25, 721-746. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10806-011-9353-z>

Gordon, D. P., Beaumont, J., MacDiarmid, A., Robertson, D. A., & Ah Yong, S. T. (2010). Marine biodiversity of Aotearoa New Zealand. *PloS ONE*, 5(8), Article e10905. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0010905>

Groner, M. L., Maynard, J., Breyta, R., Carnegie, R. B., Dobson, A., Friedman, C. S., Froelich, B., Garren, M., Gulland, F. M. D., Heron, S. F., Noble, R. T., Revie, C. W., Shields, J. D., Vanderstichel, R., Weil, E., Wyllie-Echeverria, S., & Harvell, C. D. (2016). Managing marine disease emergencies in an era of rapid change. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 371, Article 20150364. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2015.0364>

Heron, M. (15 September 2016). *Independent review of MPI/MFish prosecution decisions Operations Achilles, Hippocamp and Overdue*. <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/dmsdocument/14029-Independent-Review-of-MPIMFish-Prosecution-Decisions-Operations-Achilles-Hippocamp-and-Overdue>

Joseph, J., Charalambous, R., Pahuja, H., Fox, D., Jeon, J., Ko, N., Rao, N., Wang, Z., Nerurkar, S. K., Sherekar, S. A., Yang, Y., Dutton-Regester, K., & Narayan, E. (2023). Impacts of climate change on animal welfare. *CABI Reviews*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.1079/cabireviews.2023.0020>



Leroy, B., Phillips, J. S., Potts, J., Brill, R. W., Evans, K., Forget, F., Holland, K., Itano, D., Muir, J., Pilling, G., & Nicol, S. (2023). Recommendations towards the establishment of best practice standards for handling and intracoelomic implantation of data-storage and telemetry tags in tropical tuna. *Animal Biotelemetry*, 11, Article 4.

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40317-023-00316-3>

Lines, J. A., & Spence, J. (2014). Humane harvesting and slaughter of farmed fish. *Revue scientifique et technique*, 33(1), 255-264. <https://dx.doi.org/10.20506/rst.33.1.2284>

Ministry for the Environment. (2019). *Our marine environment 2019*.

<https://environment.govt.nz/publications/our-marine-environment-2019/>

Ministry for Primary Industries. (n.d.) *FAQs On-board Camera Programme*.

<https://www.mpi.govt.nz/dmsdocument/58000-FAQs-On-board-Cameras-Programme>

Ministry for Primary Industries. (May 2023). *Guidelines for the Release of Fisheries Information*.

<https://www.mpi.govt.nz/dmsdocument/34803-Guidelines-for-Release-of-Fisheries-Information>

Ministry for Primary Industries. (2024). *Progress on the rollout of on-board cameras on commercial fishing vessels*.

<https://www.mpi.govt.nz/dmsdocument/61633-Update-at-1-April-2024-Progress-on-the-rollout-of-on-board-cameras-on-commercial-fishing-vessels>

Ministry for Primary Industries. (19 June 2025). *Advice on amendments to the Fisheries Act 1996 to reduce judicial review*.

<https://www.nzsportfishing.co.nz/fisheries/fisheries-management/fisheries-policy-and-reform-processes/fisheries-amendment-proposals-2025/#oia>

Ministry for Primary Industries. (23 July 2025). *Regulatory Impact Statement: Amendment to the Fisheries Act 1996*.

<https://www.regulation.govt.nz/our-work/regulatory-impact-statements/regulatory-impact-statement-amendments-to-the-fisheries-act-1996/>



Ministry for Primary Industries. (December 2025). *Review of sustainability measures for spiny rock lobster (CRA 3) for 2026/27*. Fisheries New Zealand Discussion Document Paper No: 2024/36. <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/dmsdocument/70975-Review-of-sustainability-measures-for-spiny-rock-lobster-CRA-3-for-202627-April-2026-round-Discussion-document>

Moore, B. R., & Finucci, B. (2024). *Estimation of release survival of pelagic sharks and fish in New Zealand commercial fisheries [New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/07]*. Fisheries New Zealand. <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/dmsdocument/61033/direct>

Newstalk ZB. (3 January 2024). *"Fish can't scream": Pregnant shark dragged to shore, cut open while still alive*. <https://www.newstalkzb.co.nz/news/national/pregnant-shark-in-christchurch-cut-open-alive-babies-put-back-in-the-ocean/>

Nunes, D. M., Hazin, F. H. V., Branco-Nunes, I. S. L., Hazin, H., Pacheco, J. C., Afonso, A. S., Mourato, B. L., & Carvalho, F. C. (2019). Survivorship of species caught in a longline tuna fishery in the western equatorial Atlantic Ocean. *Latin American Journal of Aquatic Research*, 47(5), 798-807. <https://doi.org/10.3856/vol47-issue5-fulltext-9>

Office of the Minister for Oceans and Fisheries. (06 August 2025). *Cabinet paper: Proposed changes to the Fisheries Act 1996*. <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/dmsdocument/70411-Cabinet-paper-Proposed-Changes-to-the-Fisheries-Act-1996>

Office of the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor. (2021). *The future of commercial fishing in Aotearoa New Zealand*. <https://bpb-ap-se2.wpmucdn.com/blogs.auckland.ac.nz/dist/f/688/files/2020/01/Fish-report-Full-report-11March21.pdf>

Paquet, P. C., & Darimont, C. T. (2010). Wildlife conservation and animal welfare: Two sides of the same coin. *Animal Welfare*, 19(2), 177-190. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0962728600001433>



- Peart, R. (2018). *Voices from the sea. Managing New Zealand's fisheries*.
<https://eds.org.nz/resources/documents/reports/voices-from-the-sea-managing-nzs-fisheries/>
- Rae, F., Nicol, C., & Simmonds, M. P. (2023). Expert assessment of the impact of ship-strikes on cetacean welfare using the Welfare Assessment Tool for Wild Cetaceans. *Animal Welfare*, 32(e18), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1017/awf/2023.7>
- Robertson, B. C., & Chilvers, B. L. (2011). The population decline of the New Zealand sea lion (*Phocartos hookeri*): A review of possible causes. *Mammal Review*, 41(4), 253-275.
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1365-2907.2011.00186.x>
- Shields, J. D. (2019). Climate change enhances disease processes in crustaceans: Case studies in lobsters, crabs, and shrimps. *Journal of Crustacean Biology*, 39(6), 1-11.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/jcbiol/ruz072>
- Simmons, G., Bremner, G., Whittaker, H., Clarke, P., Teh, L., Zyllich, K., Zeller, D., Pauly, D., Stringer, C., Torkington, B., & Haworth, N. (2016). *Reconstruction of marine fisheries catches for New Zealand (1950-2010)*. Institute for the Oceans and Fisheries. The University of British Columbia Working Paper Series.
<https://www.seararoundus.org/doc/PageContent/OtherWPContent/Simmons+et+al+2016+-+NZ+Catch+Reconstruction+-+May+11.pdf>
- Skomal, G. B. (2007). Evaluating the physiological and physical consequences of capture on post-release survivorship in large pelagic fishes. *Fisheries Management and Ecology*, 14(2), 81-89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2400.2007.00528.x>
- Slooten, E., Simmons, G., Dawson, S. M., Bremner, G., Thrush, S. F., Whittaker, H., McCormack, F., Robertson, B. C., Haworth, N., Clarke, P. J., Pauly, D., & Zeller, D. (2017). Evidence of bias in assessment of fisheries management impacts. *PNAS*, 114(25), E4901-E4902.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1706544114>



- Southgate, J. (2008). The welfare of fish during transport. In E. J. Branson (ed.), *Fish welfare* (pp. 185-194). Blackwell Publishing. <https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Fish+Welfare-p-9780470697610>
- Townsend, R. E., & Walker, S. (2022). The economics of deemed values. *Marine Policy*, 142, Article 105105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2022.105105>
- Waley, D., Harris, M., Goudling, I., & Correia, M. (2021). *Catching up: Fish welfare in wild capture fisheries*. Eurogroup for Animals. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(sici\)1098-2353\(1996\)9:1<53::aid-ca11>3.0.co;2-9](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1098-2353(1996)9:1<53::aid-ca11>3.0.co;2-9)
- Whitehead, E. A., Adams, N., Baird, K. A., Bell, E. A., Borrelle, S. B., Dunphy, B. J., Gaskin, C. P., Landers, T. J., Rayner, M. J., & Russell, J. C. (2019). *Threats to seabirds of Northern Aotearoa New Zealand*. Northern New Zealand Seabird Charitable Trust, Auckland, New Zealand. <https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/about-auckland-council/how-auckland-council-works/harbour-forums/Documents/threats-to-seabirds-northern-aotearoa.pdf>
- Wilson, S. M., Raby, G. D., Burnett, N. J., Hinch, S. G., & Cooke, S. J. (2014). Looking beyond the mortality of bycatch: Sublethal effects of incidental capture on marine animals. *Biological Conservation*, 171, 61-72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2014.01.020>