



Fisheries New Zealand

Tini a Tangaroa

Fisheries Assessment Plenary

May 2026

Stock Assessment and Stock Status
Volume 2: Horse mussel to Red crab





Fisheries New Zealand

Tini a Tangaroa

Fisheries Science and Information

Fisheries Assessment Plenary

May 2026

Stock Assessments and Stock Status
Volume 2: Horse mussel to Red crab

ISBN (online): 978-1-997337-11-9

© Crown Copyright May 2026 – Ministry for Primary Industries

The written material contained in this document is protected by Crown copyright. This document is published by Fisheries New Zealand, a branded business unit within the Ministry for Primary Industries. All references to Fisheries New Zealand in this document should, therefore, be taken to refer to the Ministry for Primary Industries.

The information in this publication is not governmental policy. While all reasonable measures have been made to ensure the information is accurate, the Ministry for Primary Industries does not accept any responsibility or liability for any error, inadequacy, deficiency, flaw in or omission from the information provided in this document or any interpretation or opinion that may be present, nor for the consequences of any actions taken or decisions made in reliance on this information. Any view or opinion expressed does not necessarily represent the view of the Ministry for Primary Industries.

Compiled and published by
Fisheries New Zealand
Fisheries Science and Information
Charles Fergusson Building, 34–38 Bowen House
PO Box 2526, Wellington 6140
New Zealand

Requests for further copies should be directed to:
Fisheries Science Editor
Fisheries New Zealand
Ministry for Primary Industries
PO Box 2526
Wellington 6140
NEW ZEALAND

Email: Fisheries-Science.Editor@mpi.govt.nz
Telephone: 0800 00 83 33

This publication is also available on the Ministry for Primary Industries websites at:
<http://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/publications>
<http://fs.fish.govt.nz> go to Document library/Research reports

Cover images credit: Rebekah Parsons-King, Stu Mackay, Richard O'Driscoll, Earth Sciences New Zealand.

Preferred citation

Fisheries New Zealand (2026). *Fisheries Assessment Plenary, May 2026: stock assessments and stock status*. Compiled by the Fisheries Science Team, Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand. 1990 p.



Fisheries New Zealand

Te Hiri Māori

MAY 2026 PLENARY VOLUME CONTENTS

Volume 1

Introductory sections and Alfonsino to Hoki

Alfonsino (BYX)
Anchovy (ANC)
Arrow squid (SQU)
Barracouta (BAR)
Black cardinalfish (CDL)
Bladder kelp attached (KBB G)
Blue cod (BCO)
Blue mackerel (EMA)
Blue moki (MOK)
Blue warehou (WAR)
Bluenose (BNS)
Butterfish (BUT)
Cockles (COC)
 COC Introduction
 COC 1A
 COC 3
 COC 7A
Deepwater (King) clam (PZL)
Elephant fish (ELE)
Flatfish (FLA)
Freshwater eels (SFE, LFE)
Frostfish (FRO)
Garfish (GAR)
Gemfish (SKI)
Ghost shark
 Dark ghost shark (GSH)
 Pale ghost shark (GSP)
Giant spider crab (GSC)
Green-lipped mussel (GLM)
Grey mullet (GMU)
Groper (HPB)
Hake (HAK)
Hoki (HOK)

Volume 2

Horse mussel to Red crab

Horse mussel (HOR)
Jack mackerels (JMA)
John dory (JDO)
Kahawai (KAH)
Kina (SUR)
King crab (KIC)
Kingfish (KIN)
Knobbed whelk (KWH)
Leatherjacket (LEA)
Ling (LIN)
Lookdown dory (LDO)
Orange roughy (ORH)
 ORH Introduction
 ORH 1
 ORH 2A/2B/3A
 ORH 3B
 ORH 7A
 ORH 7B
 ORH ET
Oreos (OEO)
 OEO Introduction
 OEO 3A
 OEO 4
 OEO 1 and 6
Paddle crabs (PAD)
Parore (PAR)
Pāua (PAU)
 PAU Introduction
 PAU 2
 PAU 3A
 PAU 3B
 PAU 4
 PAU 5A
 PAU 5B
 PAU 5D
 PAU 7
Pilchard (PIL)
Pipis (PPI)
 PPI
 PPI 1A
Porae (POR)
Prawn killer (PRK)
Queen scallops (QSC)
Redbait (RBT)
Red cod (RCO)
Red crab (CHC)

Volume 3

Red gurnard to Yellow-eyed mullet

Red gurnard (GUR)
Red snapper (RSN)
Ribaldo (RIB)
Rig (SPO)
Rubyfish (RBY)
Scampi (SCI)
School shark (SCH)
Sea cucumber (SCC)
Sea perch (SPE)
Silver warehou (SWA)
Skates
 Rough Skate (RSK)
 Smooth Skate (SSK)
Snapper (SNA)
 SNA Introduction
 SNA 1
 SNA 2
 SNA 7
 SNA 8
Southern blue whiting (SBW)
Spiny dogfish (SPD)
Sprat (SPR)
Stargazer (STA)
Surf Clams
 Surf Clams Introduction
 Deepwater tuatua (PDO)
 Fine (Silky) dosinia (DSU)
 Frimled venus shell (BYA)
 Large trough shell (MMI)
 Ringed dosinia (DAN)
 Triangle shell (SAE)
 Trough shell (MDI)
Tarakihi (TAR)
Toothfish (TOT)
Trevally (TRE)
Trumpeter (TRU)
Tuatua (TUA)
White warehou (WWA)
Yellow-eyed mullet (YEM)




CONTENTS

Volume 2: Horse mussel to Red crab

	Page
Horse mussel (HOR).....	697
Jack mackerels (JMA)	703
John dory (JDO).....	738
Kahawai (KAH)	765
Kina (SUR)	790
King crab (KIC)	806
Kingfish (KIN)	811
Knobbed whelk (KWH).....	839
Leatherjacket (LEA)	843
Ling (LIN)	853
Lookdown dory (LDO).....	900
Orange roughy (ORH)	
ORH Introduction.....	918
ORH 1.....	931
ORH 2A/2B/3A.....	938
ORH 3B.....	960
ORH 7A.....	1001
ORH 7B.....	1016
ORH ET.....	1025
Oreos (OEO)	
OEO Introduction.....	1031
OEO 3A.....	1046
OEO 4.....	1060
OEO 1 and 6.....	1074
Paddle crabs (PAD).....	1096
Parore (PAR).....	1104
Paua (PAU)	
Paua Introduction.....	1109
PAU 2.....	1132
PAU 3A.....	1142
PAU 3B.....	1167
PAU 4.....	1177
PAU 5A.....	1183
PAU 5B.....	1194
PAU 5D.....	1210
PAU 7.....	1226
Pilchard (PIL)	1247
Pipi (PPI).....	
PPI	1255
PPI 1A.....	1263
Porae (POR).....	1271
Prawn killer (PRK).....	1275
Queen scallops (QSC).....	1280
Redbait (RBT).....	1285
Red cod (RCO).....	1293
Red crab (CHC).....	1314

HORSE MUSSEL (HOR)*(Atrina zelandica)*

Kukuroroa, Kupa, Hururoa

**1. FISHERY SUMMARY**

Allowances, TACCs, and TACs are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs, and TACs (t) for horse mussel by Fishstock.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
HOR 1	1	1	8	4	14
HOR 2	1	1	4	2	8
HOR 3	1	1	4	2	8
HOR 4	1	1	2	1	5
HOR 5	1	1	2	1	5
HOR 6	1	1	2	1	5
HOR 7	1	1	32	16	50
HOR 8	1	1	2	1	5
HOR 9	1	1	1	1	5
HOR 10	0	0	0	0	0

1.1 Commercial fisheries

Horse mussels (*Atrina zelandica*) were introduced into the Quota Management System on 1 April 2004, with a combined TAC of 105 t and TACC of 29 t. Customary non-commercial and recreational allowances are 9 t each, and 58 t was allowed for other sources of mortality. The fishing year is from 1 April to 31 March and commercial catches are measured in greenweight. Most reported landings have been from HOR 1, and, apart from 1994–95 and 2002–03 when catches of about 5 t and 7 t respectively were reported, reported landings have all been small (Table 2). About 90% of the catch is taken as a bycatch during bottom trawling and the remainder is taken as a bycatch of dredge and Danish seine. It is likely that there is a reasonably high level of unreported discarded horse mussel catch.

HORSE MUSSEL (HOR) – May 2026

Table 2: TACCs and reported landings (t) of horse mussel by Fishstock from 1990–91 to present from CELR, CLR and ERS data. There have never been any reported landings in HOR 4, 5, 6, or 8. These fishstocks each have a TACC of 1 t and are not reported here.

	HOR 1		HOR 2		HOR 3		HOR 7	
	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC
1990–91	0.834	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1991–92	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1992–93	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1993–94	0.003	–	0	–	0.016	–	0	–
1994–95	5.525	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1995–96	0	–	0.019	–	0	–	0	–
1996–97	0.024	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1997–98	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1998–99	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1999–00	0	–	0	–	0	–	0.81	–
2000–01	0	–	0	–	0	–	0.128	–
2001–02	0	–	0.002	–	0	–	0	–
2002–03	7.153	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
2003–04	0.026	4	0	2	0	2	0	16
2004–05	0.217	4	0	2	0	2	1.017	16
2005–06	0.026	4	0	2	0	2	0	16
2006–07	0	4	0	2	0	2	0.06	16
2007–08	0	4	0	2	0	2	0.451	16
2008–09	0.068	4	0	2	0	2	0	16
2009–10	0.289	4	0	2	0	2	0.112	16
2010–11	0	4	0	2	0	2	0.857	16
2011–12	0	4	0	2	0	2	0.605	16
2012–13	0	4	0	2	0	2	0	16
2013–14	0	4	0	2	0	2	0.214	16
2014–15	0	4	0	2	0	2	0.117	16
2015–16	0	4	0	2	0.005	2	0.380	16
2016–17	0	4	0	2	0.018	2	0.630	16
2017–18	0	4	0	2	0.018	2	0.211	16
2018–19	0	4	0	2	0.090	2	0	16
2019–20	0	4	0	2	0.500	2	0	16
2020–21	0	4	0	2	0	2	0.03	16
2021–22	0	4	0	2	0.06	2	0	16
2022–23	0	4	0	2	0	2	0	16
2023–24	0	4	0	2	0.04	2	0.816	16
2024–25	0	4	0	2	0.259	2	7.286	16

	HOR 9		Total	
	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC
1990–91	0	–	0.834	–
1991–92	0	–	0	–
1992–93	0	–	0	–
1993–94	0	–	0.019	–
1994–95	0	–	5.525	–
1995–96	0	–	0.019	–
1996–97	0	–	0.024	–
1997–98	0	–	0.128	–
1998–99	0	–	0	–
1999–00	0	–	0.1	–
2000–01	0	–	0.128	–
2001–02	0	–	0	–
2002–03	0	–	7.155	–
2003–04	0	1	0.026	29
2004–05	0.065	1	1.299	29
2005–06	0.942	1	0.968	29
2006–07	0.261	1	0.321	29
2007–08	0	1	0.451	29
2008–09	0	1	0.068	29
2009–10	0	1	0.401	29
2010–11	0	1	1	29
2011–12	0	1	0.605	29
2012–13	0	1	0	29
2013–14	0	1	0.214	29
2014–15	0	1	0.117	29
2015–16	0	1	0.385	29
2016–17	0	1	0.0648	29
2017–18	0	1	0.329	29
2018–19	0	1	0.090	29
2019–20	0	1	0.500	29
2020–21	0	1	0.030	29
2021–22	0	1	0.06	29
2022–23	0	1	0	29
2023–24	0	1	0.864	29
2024–25	0	1	7.545	29

1.2 Recreational fisheries

A. zelandica do not appear in records from recreational fishing surveys (Bradford 1998) but are nevertheless taken from time to time by recreational fishers. There are no estimates of recreational take for this species.

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

A traditional food of Māori, this mussel is probably under-represented in midden shell counts because of the fragile and short-lived nature of the shell.

Māori customary fishers can utilise the provisions under both the recreational fishing regulations and the various customary regulations. Tangata whenua can harvest horse mussels under their recreational allowance and these are not included in records of customary catch. Customary reporting requirements vary around the country. Customary fishing authorisations issued in the South Island and Stewart Island would be under the Fisheries (South Island Customary Fishing) Regulations 1999. Many rohe moana / areas of the coastline in the North Island and Chatham Islands are gazetted under the Fisheries (Kaimoana Customary Fishing) Regulations 1998 which require reporting on authorisations. In the areas not gazetted, customary fishing permits would be issued under the Fisheries (Amateur Fishing) Regulations 2013, where there is no requirement to report catch.

The information on Māori customary harvest under the provisions made for customary fishing can be limited (Table 3). These numbers are likely to be an underestimate of customary harvest as only the catch approved and harvested in kilograms and numbers are reported in the table 3.

Table 3: Fisheries New Zealand records of customary harvest of horse mussel (approved and reported as weight (kg) and in numbers) between 2005–06 and 2017–18. No qualifying reports since 2021–19. – no data.

Stock	Fishing year	Weight (kg)		Numbers	
		Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
HOR 1	2005–06	–	–	2 000	150
	2006–07	160	160	150	150
	2007–08	260	210	–	–
	2008–09	110	50	90	90
	2009–10	40	20	–	–
	2010–11	–	–	100	0
	2011–12	–	–	50	0
	2012–13	–	–	–	–
	2013–14	–	–	–	–
	2014–15	–	–	–	–
	2015–16	–	–	–	–
	2016–17	–	–	80	0
	2017–18	140	90	–	–

1.4 Illegal catch

There is no known illegal catch of this mussel.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

There is no quantitative information on other sources of mortality, although widespread die-offs appear to be characteristic of this species. Storm scour, shell damage and subsequent predation, and exceeding carrying capacity have been suggested as possible reasons for this. In addition, fragile biogenic habitats such as horse mussels are vulnerable to removal, breakage and dislodgement by bottom contact fishing practices such as dredging and bottom trawling.

2. BIOLOGY

The horse (or fan) mussel, *Atrina zelandica*, is a widespread endemic bivalve that lives mainly on muddy-sand substrates in the lowest inter-tidal and sub-tidal shallows of mainly sheltered waters. Horse mussels are also found in deeper waters (to 50 m) off open coasts. The horse mussel is a flattened, emergent, filter-feeding mollusc, particularly conspicuous because of its size and abundance. Although more usually 260–300 mm long (110–120 mm wide) it can reach 400 mm in length and is New Zealand's largest bivalve. Horse mussels often live in groups, forming patches of up to 10 m² or more. The shell remains firmly embedded in the substrate by its pointed anterior end, the animal anchored to

particles in the sediment by its byssus. The crenellated posterior edge projects a few centimetres above the substrate, keeping the water intake clear of surface deposits and providing attachment for an array of algae and invertebrates such as sponges and sea squirts.

Horse mussels are dioecious broadcast spawners. Although spawning may take place throughout much of the year it is probably mainly during summer. There is no information on the size or age at which breeding begins. A pelagic larva is free swimming for several days or weeks but nothing is known of its primary settlement locations, which may not necessarily be within the adult beds (some bivalves including soft sediment ones such as pipi settle in one area but later migrate to another where adult beds develop). Recruitment events can be sporadic and short-lived.

There is little published information on age, growth, and mortality for horse mussels. It appears that *Atrina* grows rapidly for at least the first 2–4 years: shells about 120 mm long in a northern bed increased about 40 mm per year until 166 mm, after which growth slowed dramatically (Hay C. pers. comm. in Hayward et al.1999). Large shells are at least 5 y and possibly up to 15 y old. Widespread die-offs seem to be a feature of this species (Allan & Walshe 1984, Hayward et al.1999). For example, in the Rangitoto Channel, densities of 200–300 per m² reduced to 1–35 per m² over 2–3 y, with storm scour, shell damage and subsequent predation, and exceeding carrying capacity being possible reasons (Hayward et al.1999).

The Intrinsic Productivity Level is categorised as Medium for this species.

Horse mussels have widespread effects on ecosystem structure and function (Lohrer et al.2013) and are considered to be ecologically important in ecosystem health and function (Davidson et al.2011, MacDiarmid et al.2013). They can form biogenic habitat, acting as substrata for the settlement of epifauna such as sponges, reef forming bryozoans (Davidson et al.2010, Hay 1990, Anderson et al.2019) and soft corals. Horse mussels also provide shelter and refuge for invertebrates and small fish (Townsend et al.2015). Morrison et al.(2014) and Anderson et al.(2019) found that many fishery species were strongly associated with biogenic habitats such as horse mussels both for adult refuge but also as spawning grounds and nursery habitats e.g. blue cod Marlborough Sounds, and are thought to be important for juvenile snapper (Campbell 2023, unpublished PhD thesis). They also affect boundary layer dynamics and facilitate productivity and biodiversity by depositing pseudofaeces. Some sites that contain horse mussels, linked to nursery grounds for snapper and blue cod, have been identified as potential Habitats of Significance to Fisheries Management (HoPS) to be taken into account under s 9(c) of the Fisheries Act 1996.

Large scale losses of horse mussel beds across the outer Marlborough Sounds have been described by residents and long-time fishers (Handley 2015 and NIWA (now ESNZ) unpublished data). Density declines and a lack of recruitment have been noted in the last decade in Northern New Zealand, with potentially up to a 75% decrease of biogenic habitat coverage and ecosystem provision across New Zealand (Anderson et al.2019).

Habitat-forming species such as horse mussel are vulnerable to removal, breakage and dislodgement by bottom contact fishing practices such as dredging and bottom trawling. They are also impacted by combinations of coastal pressures such as increased sedimentation and resuspension of sediments (Handley 2015 and NIWA (now ESNZ) unpublished data). Loss of biogenic habitats and their services have been linked to rapid degradation of waterways, cascading impacts on marine biodiversity and significant loss of aesthetic, commercial and recreational values (Anderson et al.2019).

The horse mussel community in most northern harbours is almost entirely subtidal, in medium to fine muddy, but fairly stable, sand with moderate current velocities and no wave action. Similar communities have been observed in the Hauraki Gulf and Marlborough Sounds. Scallops, dredge oysters, and green lipped mussels are the main commercial shellfish species with beds that sometimes broadly overlap with the horse mussel distribution.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

For management purposes stock boundaries are based on FMAs; however, there is no biological information on stock structure, recruitment patterns, or other biological characteristics that might indicate stock boundaries.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

4.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

There are no estimates of fishery parameters or abundance for any horse mussel fishstock.

4.2 Biomass estimates

There are no biomass estimates for any horse mussel fishstock.

4.3 Yield estimates and projections

There are no estimates of *MCY* for any horse mussel fishstock.

There are no estimates of *CAY* for any horse mussel fishstock.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

For all Fishstocks there is insufficient information to estimate current stock status.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION


- Allan, L; Walshe, K (1984) Update on New Zealand horse mussel research. *Catch* '84 11(8): 14.
- Anderson, T J; Morrison, M; MacDiarmid, A; Clark, M; D'Archino, R., Nelson, W; Tracey, D; Gordon, D; Read, G; Kettles, H; Morrissey, D; Wood, A; Anderson, O; Smith, A M; Page, M; Paul-Burke, K; Schnabel, K; Wadhwa, S (2019) Review of New Zealand's Key Biogenic Habitats. NIWA Client Report 2018139WN. Prepared for the Ministry for the Environment: 184.
- Booth, J D (1983) Studies on twelve common bivalve larvae, with notes on bivalve spawning seasons in New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 17: 231–265.
- Bradford, E (1998) Harvest estimates from the 1996 national recreational fishing surveys. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document* 1998/16. 27 p.
- Campbell, J L (2003) The habitat use, diet and behaviour of juvenile snapper (*Chrysophrys auratus*). Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of PhD in Marine Science, the University of Auckland, 2023.
- Cummings, V J; Thrush, S F; Hewitt, J E; Turner, S J (1998) The influence of the pinnid bivalve *Atrina zelandica* Gray on benthic macroinvertebrate communities in soft-sediment habitats. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 228: 227–240.
- Davidson, R J, Duffy, C A J, Gaze, P, Baxter, A, du Fresne, S, Courtney, S, Hamill, P (2011) Ecologically significant marine sites in Marlborough, New Zealand. Report co-ordinated by Davidson Environmental Limited, for Marlborough District Council and Department of Conservation. Published by Marlborough District Council: 172.
- Davidson, R J; Richards, L A; Duffy, C A J; Kerr, V; Freeman, D; D'Archino, R; Read, G B; Abel, W (2010) Location and biological attributes of biogenic habitats located on soft substrata in the Marlborough Sounds. Prepared by Davidson Environmental Ltd. for Department of Conservation and Marlborough District Council. *Survey and monitoring report no. 575*.
- Estcourt, I N (1967) Distributions and associations of benthic invertebrates in a sheltered water soft-bottom environment (Marlborough Sounds, New Zealand). *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 1: 352–370.
- Handley, S (2015) The history of benthic change in Pelorus Sounds (Te Hoiere), Marlborough. NIWA Client Report No. NEL2015-001, prepared for the Marlborough District Council. 47 pp.
- Hay, C H (1990) The ecological importance of the horse mussel *Atrina zelandica* with special reference to the Marlborough Sounds. Department of Conservation Report.
- Hayward, B W; Morley, M S; Hayward, J J; Stephenson, A B; Blom, W M; Hayward, K A; Grenfell, H R (1999) Monitoring studies of the benthic ecology of Waitemata Harbour, New Zealand. *Records of the Auckland Museum* 36: 95–117.
- Lohrer, A M; Rodil, I F; Townsend, M; Chiaroni, L D; Hewitt, J E; Thrush, S F (2013) Biogenic habitat transitions influence facilitation in a marine soft-sediment ecosystem. *Ecology* 94(1): 136 – 145. [10.1890/11-1779.1](https://doi.org/10.1890/11-1779.1)
- MacDiarmid, A B; Bowden, D A; Cummings, V; Morrison, M; Jones, E; Kelly, M; Neil, H; Nelson, W; Rowden, A R (2013) Sensitive Marine Benthic Habitats Defined. NIWA Client Report WLG2013-18. Prepared for the Ministry for Environment: 72.
- McKnight, D G (1969) An outline distribution of the New Zealand shelf fauna. Benthos survey, station list, and distribution of the Echinoidea. *New Zealand Oceanographic Institute Memoir* No. 47.
- Morrison, M A; Jones, E; Consalvey, M; Berkenbusch, K (2014) Linking marine fisheries species to biogenic habitats in New Zealand: A review and synthesis of knowledge. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report. No. 130*.
- Paul, L J (1966) Observations on past and present distribution of mollusc beds in Ohiwa Harbour, Bay of Plenty. *New Zealand Journal of Science* 9: 30–40.
- Townsend, M; Lohrer, D (2015) ANZECC Guidance for Estuary Sedimentation. NIWA Client Report HAM2015-096. Prepared for the Ministry for the Environment.
- Townsend, N; Lohrer, A M; Rodil, I F; Chiaroni, L D (2015) The targeting of large-sized benthic macrofauna by an invasive portunid predator: evidence from a caging study. *Biological Invasions* 17(1): 231–244.

HORSE MUSSEL (HOR) – May 2026

Warwick, R M; McEvoy, A J; Thrush, S F (1997) The influence of *Atrina zelandica* Gray on meiobenthic nematode diversity and community structure. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 214: 231–247.

JACK MACKERELS (JMA)

(*Trachurus declivis*, *Trachurus novaezelandiae*, *Trachurus murphyi*)
Hauture



1. FISHERY SUMMARY

The jack mackerel fisheries catch three species: two endemic species, *Trachurus declivis* and *T. novaezelandiae*, and *T. murphyi* which appeared in New Zealand in the 1980s.

Jack mackerels were introduced to the Quota Management System (QMS) on 01 October 1987. The process was impacted by the Muriwhenua Fishing Claim (Jones 1988, Waitangi Tribunal 1988). The Territorial Sea north of 36°S was originally excluded from the JMA 1 and JMA 7 Quota Management Areas (QMAs), but included in these QMAs from 1 October 1996. In JMA 1 and JMA 3 the issuing of Individual Transferable Quota was delayed and individual quotas were allocated annually in these areas from the 1988 to 1996 fishing years. Allowances for customary non-commercial fishers, recreational fishers, and an allowance for other sources of mortality have only been set in JMA 3 and JMA 7 (Table 1).

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs, and TACs (t) for jack mackerels by Fishstock from 1 October 2025.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
JMA 1	32	10	80	8 000	8 122
JMA 3	20	20	180	8 780	9 000
JMA 7	10	5	355	35 537	35 907
JMA 10*	–	–	–	10	–

* allowances and TAC not set

1.1 Commercial fisheries

The three species are not individually identified in catch reporting. Historical estimated and recent reported jack mackerel landings and TACCs are shown in Tables 1 and 2, and Figure 1 shows the historical landings and TACC values for the main JMA stocks. Total annual landings have ranged between 21 059 t and 50 388 t since 1986–87 (Table 3).

In JMA 1, the jack mackerel catch is largely taken by the target purse seine fishery operating in the Bay of Plenty in Statistical Area 009 during June–December, with minor catches taken as a bycatch of kahawai and blue mackerel purse seine fisheries, and as a bycatch from trawl fisheries. In most years,

relatively small catches were taken from off the east Northland coast (Statistical Areas 002 and 003), although this area accounted for a substantial proportion of the total catch in 1993–94 and 1994–95.

Table 2: Reported landings (t) for the main QMAs from 1931 to 1982.

Year	JMA 1	JMA 3	JMA 7	Year	JMA 1	JMA 3	JMA 7
1931–32	0	0	0	1957	0	0	6
1932–33	0	0	0	1958	0	0	9
1933–34	0	0	0	1959	2	0	0
1934–35	0	0	0	1960	2	0	5
1935–36	0	0	0	1961	1	0	5
1936–37	0	0	0	1962	5	0	5
1937–38	0	0	0	1963	7	2	13
1938–39	0	0	0	1964	5	4	10
1939–40	1	0	0	1965	14	0	8
1940–41	1	1	2	1966	47	0	54
1941–42	0	0	2	1967	213	0	250
1942–43	3	0	2	1968	172	505	4 558
1943–44	0	0	0	1969	128	388	7 065
1944	9	0	0	1970	75	1 029	7 274
1945	7	0	0	1971	473	776	12 684
1946	3	0	6	1972	350	5 450	15 581
1947	14	0	4	1973	395	1 238	14 648
1948	3	0	6	1974	1 236	2 016	16 943
1949	5	0	22	1975	204	3 615	10 043
1950	7	6	3	1976	838	5 690	14 228
1951	4	4	1	1977	1 317	5 228	13 729
1952	1	4	7	1978	1 250	1 547	4 657
1953	0	3	9	1979	2 158	516	4 475
1954	3	0	1	1980	2 504	104	3 533
1955	3	0	12	1981	2 815	110	8 665
1956	1	0	2	1982	1 607	119	8 364

Notes:

1. The 1931–1943 years are April–March but from 1944 onwards are calendar years.
2. Data for the period 1931 to 1982 are based on reported landings by harbour and are likely to be underestimated as a result of under-reporting and discarding practices. Data include both foreign and domestic landings.

Since 1991–92, jack mackerel targeted landings in JMA 1 have usually represented more than 80% of total catch. The highest rates of bycatch are from kahawai and blue mackerel targeted operations.

In JMA 3 little targeting of jack mackerels by trawlers occurred before 1992–93, although purse seiners targeted both jack mackerels and kahawai in the early 1990s. During the 1990s there was an influx of *T. murphyi* into JMA 3; targeting of jack mackerels increased and accounted for around 80% of the catch in 1997–98 and 1998–99.

Targetting of jack mackerels by bottom trawlers in JMA 3 has been negligible since the early 2000s, with bycatch in a range of fisheries typically less than 500 tonnes per annum. The bulk of the jack mackerel catch is taken by midwater trawling, with 40–60% taken in jack mackerel target tows during 2014–15 to 2023–24 and the remainder primarily taken in tows targeting barracouta. Bycatch of jack mackerels in the squid trawl fishery was important during the 1990s.

The purse seine fishery operated between the Clarence River mouth and the Kaikōura Peninsula; catches peaked at 4400 t in 1992–93 and averaged more than 3000 t between 1989–90 and 1993–94. Purse seine catches declined from 1000 t in 1994–95, to 100 t in 2001–02 and 2002–03 and targeting of jack mackerel in JMA 3 by purse seining hasn't occurred since this time.

The increased availability of jack mackerels caused by the influx of *T. murphyi* resulted in increased TACCs in JMA 1 and JMA 3, to 8000 t and 9000 t, respectively, for the 1993–94 fishing year, and a further increase to 10 000 t and 18 000 t, respectively, for the 1994–95 year. The latter increases were made under the proviso that they be accounted for by increased catches of *T. murphyi* only with combined landings of *T. declivis* and *T. novaezelandiae* in JMA 1 and JMA 3 not exceeding the original quotas of 5970 t and 2700 t, respectively. Industry agreed to these limits and voluntarily introduced monitoring programmes to provide the information necessary for them to be met. Landings based sampling continued in JMA 1, but ceased in JMA 3 in the mid 2000s. Catch composition information for both JMA 3 and JMA 7 now relies on observer sampling.

Table 3: Reported landings (t) of jack mackerel by Fishstock from 1983–84 to present and actual TACCs (t) for 1986–87 to present. QMS data from 1986 to present. Quota Management Areas use the current definitions and catches from the Territorial Sea north of 36°S are included where these can be estimated from landings (CELR/CLR) data.

	JMA 1		JMA 3		JMA 7		JMA 10		Total	
	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings§	TACC
1983–84*	3 682	–	715	–	12 464	–	0	–	16 861	–
1984–85*	1 857	–	1 223	–	16 013	–	0	–	19 093	–
1985–86*	1 173	–	2 228	–	10 002	–	0	–	13 403	–
1986–87	4 056	5 970	1 638	2 700	19 815	20 000	0	10	25 509	28 680
1987–88	3 108	5 970	1 883	2 700	17 879	22 697	0	10	22 870	31 377
1988–89	2 986	5 970	1 919	2 700	17 403	26 008	0	10	22 308	34 688
1989–90	4 226	5 970	4 013	2 700	21 776	32 027	0	10	30 015	40 707
1990–91‡	7 311	5 970	6 403	2 700	17 786	32 069	0	10	31 500	40 749
1991–92‡	7 812	5 970	5 779	2 700	25 880	32 069	0	10	39 471	40 749
1992–93‡	8 551	5 970	15 399	2 700	24 659	32 537	0	10	48 609	41 216
1993–94‡	14 258	8 000	9 115	9 000	22 377	32 537	0	10	45 750	49 546
1994–95‡	10 348	10 000	11 519	18 000	18 912	32 537	0	10	40 779	60 547
1995–96	6 874	10 000	19 803	18 000	12 270	32 537	0	10	38 947	60 547
1996–97	6 912	10 000	15 687	18 000	12 056	32 537	0	10	34 655	60 547
1997–98	7 695	10 000	15 452	18 000	14 293	32 537	0	10	37 440	60 547
1998–99	5 641	10 000	15 111	18 000	13 629	32 537	0	10	34 381	60 547
1999–00	2 864	10 000	10 306	18 000	7 889	32 537	0	10	21 059	60 547
2000–01	8 360	10 000	2 744	18 000	15 703	32 537	0	10	26 806	60 547
2001–02	5 247	10 000	5 000	18 000	22 338	32 537	0	10	32 585	60 547
2002–03	6 172	10 000	2 225	18 000	26 084	32 537	0	10	34 481	60 547
2003–04	7 396	10 000	705	18 000	28 888	32 537	0	10	36 989	60 547
2004–05	9 418	10 000	716	18 000	36 507	32 537	0	10	46 641	60 547
2005–06	9 924	10 000	5 000	18 000	27 782	32 537	0	10	42 706	60 547
2006–07	5 293	10 000	1 857	18 000	32 039	32 537	0	10	39 189	60 547
2007–08	11 167	10 000	2 629	18 000	34 059	32 537	0	10	47 856	60 547
2008–09	9 791	10 000	1 964	18 000	28 828	32 537	0	10	40 583	60 547
2009–10	9 086	10 000	2 706	18 000	31 152	32 537	0	10	42 944	60 547
2010–11	8 262	10 000	3 592	18 000	28 177	32 537	0	10	40 030	60 547
2011–12	8 911	10 000	3 085	18 000	28 266	32 537	0	10	40 262	60 547
2012–13	8 054	10 000	3 830	18 000	31 776	32 537	0	10	43 660	60 547
2013–14	10 520	10 000	4 693	18 000	35 175	32 537	0	10	50 388	60 547
2014–15	10 177	10 000	4 115	18 000	33 970	32 537	0	10	48 261	60 547
2015–16	6 989	10 000	2 756	18 000	30 875	32 537	0	10	40 620	60 547
2016–17	8 890	10 000	4 665	8 780	33 802	32 537	0	10	47 356	51 327
2017–18	5 553	10 000	5 559	8 780	34 190	32 537	0	10	45 302	51 327
2018–19	4 332	10 000	4 651	8 780	31 752	32 537	0	10	40 734	51 327
2019–20	6 478	10 000	5 355	8 780	31 451	32 537	0	10	43 284	51 327
2020–21	6 777	10 000	5 601	8 780	31 810	32 537	0	10	44 188	51 327
2021–22	3 455	10 000	4 858	8 780	27 782	32 537	0	10	36 095	51 327
2022–23	3 328	10 000	5 300	8 780	34 549	32 537	0	10	43 178	51 327
2023–24	6 165	10 000	3 795	8 780	34 149	32 537	0	10	44 109	51 327
2024–25	7 640	10 000	5 147	8 780	35 496	35 537	0	10	48 283	54 327

* FSU data.

§ Includes landings from unknown areas before 1986–87.

‡ JMA 1 landings are totals from CLR and CELR data (Middleton et al 2016)

The TACC for JMA 3 was reduced to 8780 t from 1 October 2016, approximating the 1993–94 TACC level, on the basis that recent catches had been considerably lower than the TACC and that catches of *T. murphyi* were thought to be minimal, indicating low abundance of the species in New Zealand waters in recent years.

Landings in JMA 1 before 1989–90 were generally well below the quota of 5970 t (Table 3), with the maximum in 1986–87 only slightly above 4000 t. Landings increased to 7529 t in 1992–93, followed by a substantial increase to the highest recorded value of 14 256 t in 1993–94, which was more than twice the original quota and exceeded the quota of 8000 t set for that year. Over the period 1997–98 to 2004–05, annual catches from JMA 1 increased to near the level of the TACC (10 000 t) and, until 2014–15, annual catches fluctuated about 8000–10 000 t, with the exception of a considerably lower catch in 2006–07 and a peak catch of 11 200 t in 2007–08. JMA 1 landings since 2015–16 have been consistently less than the TACC (10 000 t), and since 2017–18 JMA 1 landings have fluctuated between 3000 and 7000 t. The TACC was reduced to 8000 t in October 2025.

Estimates of the species composition of the JMA 1 purse seine catches are available from 1989–90 to 2023–24 (Figure 2, Table 4). Estimates from 2013–14 to 2023–24 were updated by Middleton et al (2016) using the revised length-weight relationship for *T. novaezelandiae* from Hartill et al (2022).

During 1989–90 and 1990–91, annual catches were dominated by *T. novaezelandiae*, but included a small component of *T. declivis*. The proportion of *T. murphyi* in the catch increased considerably over the following years, accounting for 65% of the total catch in 1993–94 and continued to account for a considerable proportion of the JMA 1 catch during 1994–95 to 1998–99. Since 1999–00, annual catches of *T. murphyi* have generally been small, although they comprised 11% of the catch in 2003–04 and 26% in 2006–07. From 1999–00 to 2023–24, annual catches from JMA 1 were generally dominated by *T. novaezelandiae*. The annual catch of this species ranged from about 2000 t to 5000 t during the 1990s, and averaged 8135 t in 2007–08 to 2016–17. Correspondingly, cumulative catches of *T. declivis* and *T. murphyi* were low during this period (7% and 2%, respectively). Catches from the purse seine fishery in 2017–18 to 2022–23 were lower overall, following a reduction in fleet size and change from using brine to refrigerated sea water as the onboard storage medium, but increased to over 5800 t in 2023–24. The mean annual catch of *T. novaezelandiae* in this period was 3229 t, while the mean annual catch of *T. declivis* was 1368 t, and exceeded 2000 t in 2017–18 and 2019–20.




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the three main JMA stocks. From top: JMA 1 (Auckland East, Central East) and JMA 3 (South East coast, South East Chatham Rise. [Continued on next page]




Figure 1 [Continued]: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the three main JMA stocks. JMA 7 (Challenger, Central Egmont, Auckland West).




Figure 2: The time series of annual species catch estimates from the JMA 1 purse seine fishery in East Northland and the Bay of Plenty (JMN, *T. novaezelandiae*; JMD, *T. declivis*; JMM, *T. murphyi*).

Landings in JMA 3 over the period 1984–85 to 1988–89 were relatively constant, at a level below the quota of 2700 t. Landings increased over subsequent years to peak in 1992–93 at almost three times those of the preceding year and more than five times the quota. Under the first of two consecutive annual increases to the JMA 3 TACC in 1993–94 landings were slightly above the limit set, but were below the higher TACC level in 1994–95. The lower 1994–95 catch relative to that in 1992–93 has been attributed to the delayed implementation of the quota, less targeting of jack mackerel, and lower bycatch in the squid trawl fishery. Landings in JMA 3 increased markedly in 1995–96 (19 803 t), exceeding the TACC, with catches remaining stable around 15 500 t over three subsequent years. Landings have subsequently remained well below the TACC, with catches dropping below 1000 t in 2003–04 and 2004–05, but varying between 1800 t and 5600 t from 2005–06 to 2023–24. Declines in landings are attributed to declining abundance of *T. murphyi* which historically comprised the bulk of JMA 3 landings; however, whilst catch volumes have declined, model based estimates of catches suggest that *T. murphyi* still dominates the JMA 3 fishery (Figure 3).

The largest jack mackerel fishery is in JMA 7. In the early 1990s, JMA 7 landings were mainly taken by bottom trawlers but, following a fleet transition in the mid-1990s to early 2000s, are now mainly taken by midwater trawlers. Landings fluctuated between 17 403 t and 25 880 t from 1986–87 to 1994–95. From 1995–96 to 1998–99, landings were in the range of 12 056–14 293 t. Subsequently, landings increased steadily from 15 703 t in 2000–01, peaking at 36 507 t in 2004–05 (exceeding the TACC by 3971 t). From 2005–06 to 2023–24, catches have fluctuated around the TACC. Catches in the JMA 7 fishery are predominantly of *T. declivis* although catches of *T. novaezelandiae* show notable spikes in 2005 and 2023 (Figure 4).

Table 4: JMA 1 purse seine catches from East Northland and the Bay of Plenty and the time series of annual estimates of the species composition of the catch (JMN, *T. novaezelandiae*; JMD, *T. declivis*; JMM, *T. murphyi*) (information to 2012–13 compiled from various sources, see appendix 5 of Langley et al 2016; 2013–14 to 2023–24 from Middleton 2016).

Fishing year	Catch (t)	Species proportion		
		JMD	JMM	JMN
1989–90	1 433	0.15	0.04	0.81
1990–91	7 147	0.15	0.10	0.76
1991–92	6 921	0.11	0.32	0.58
1992–93	8 629	0.11	0.33	0.56
1993–94	13 710	0.17	0.65	0.18
1994–95	8 530	0.13	0.45	0.42
1995–96	5 643	0.03	0.13	0.84
1996–97	6 256	0.05	0.30	0.65
1997–98	7 009	0.05	0.42	0.53
1998–99	5 077	0.14	0.30	0.56
1999–00	2 416	0.01	0.01	0.98
2000–01	7 896	0.02	0.01	0.97
2001–02	5 146	0.17	0.01	0.82
2002–03	5 518	0.30	0.02	0.68
2003–04	6 838	0.46	0.11	0.43
2004–05	8 919	0.11	0.07	0.82
2005–06	9 568	0.11	0.00	0.89
2006–07	4 803	0.44	0.26	0.31
2007–08	11 270	0.23	0.01	0.76
2008–09	9 579	0.06	0.07	0.87
2009–10	8 714	0.00	0.00	1.00
2010–11	7 936	0.00	0.00	1.00
2011–12	8 765	0.13	0.00	0.86
2012–13	7 841	0.06	0.01	0.93
2013–14	10 543	0.08	0.01	0.91
2014–15	9 968	0.05	0.02	0.93
2015–16	6 722	0.01	0.00	0.99
2016–17	8 439	0.00	0.00	1.00
2017–18	5 140	0.46	0.02	0.52
2018–19	4 111	0.37	0.01	0.62
2019–20	6 208	0.36	0.00	0.64
2020–21	6 384	0.12	0.00	0.88
2021–22	3 301	0.39	0.00	0.61
2022–23	3 083	0.05	0.00	0.95
2023–24	5 857	0.28	0.00	0.72




Figure 3: The time series of annual species catch estimates from the JMA 3 fishery using species composition modelling (Middleton & Neubauer 2025). (JMD, *T. declivis*; JMM, *T. murphyi*).




Figure 4: The time series of annual species catch estimates from the JMA 7 fishery using stratified bootstrapping of observed tows with species composition data (Middleton 2026). (JMN, *T. novaezelandiae*; JMD, *T. declivis*; JMM, *T. murphyi murphyi*).

A number of factors have been identified that can influence landing volumes in the jack mackerel fisheries. In the purse seine fishery during the 1990s, jack mackerel was often mixed with kahawai. Fishing companies tend to avoid these mixed schools to conserve kahawai quota, particularly at the beginning of the fishing year. When mixing of the two species is prevalent, a low kahawai TACC can result in the targeting of jack mackerel being inhibited. Both skipjack tuna and blue mackerel have been fished in preference to jack mackerel in the purse seine fishery, with the jack mackerel season being influenced by the availability of these species. However, global increases in the market price for jack mackerel have increased its importance in the purse seine fishery to a level similar to that for blue mackerel, and, as a result, the catch season for jack mackerel has broadened in recent years..

In recent years, there has been a change in the operation of the JMA 1 purse-seine fleet. In response to market requirements, fish are no longer stored in brine on board the vessel. This has resulted in shorter trip durations and consequently a concentration of fishing effort in the Bay of Plenty (where *T. novaezelandiae* dominate) near the processing facilities in Tauranga. Market requirements for fish size also affect the jack mackerel species targeted, and consequently the areas fished.

In the trawl fisheries (JMA 3 and 7) the majority of Japanese vessels exited the fishery in the mid to late 1990s; this also impacted the destination markets for jack mackerels. Markets were also affected by the influx of *T. murphyi* because the New Zealand species had a higher market value (at least in Japan). Since 2000, the target trawl fishery has been dominated by BATM vessels (specifically Pulkovskiy Meridian/BATM-1288 vessels, a class of 104 m factory trawlers constructed in eastern Europe and designed for distant-water fisheries) which have high processing capacity focussed on whole (GRE) or Headed and Gutted (H&G) product. These vessels operate across a range of bulk fisheries, often seasonal (e.g., SQU, SBW, HOK), which means the apparent seasonality of JMA effort is primarily driven by the need to operate in the biologically seasonal (e.g., spawn) fisheries of various species as required, with JMA targeted in the temporal gaps between these events through the year.

Vessels over 46 m (i.e., all vessels in the JMA 7 midwater fleet) are excluded from nearshore areas throughout the JMA 7 QMA. These areas may represent a significant part of the habitat of jack mackerels. Vessels in this fishery have also worked to minimise bycatch of kingfish, snapper, and also common dolphins. Nevertheless, these restrictions do not appear to have constrained the fishery from taking the TACC in most years.

1.2 Recreational fisheries

Jack mackerels do not rate highly as a recreational target species although they are popular as bait.

Recreational catch in the northern region (JMA 1) was estimated at 333 000 fish (CV 0.13) by a diary survey in 1993–94 (Bradford 1996), 79 000 fish (CV 0.16) in a national recreational survey in 1996 (Bradford 1998), 349 000 fish (CV 39%) in the 2000 survey (Boyd & Reilly 2004) and 295 000 fish (CV 0.2%) in the 2001 survey (Boyd et al 2004). The surveys suggest a harvest of 80–110 t per year

for JMA 1, insignificant in the context of the commercial catch. Estimates from other areas are very low (between 500 and 47 000 fish) and are insignificant in the context of the commercial catch

The harvest estimates provided by telephone/diary surveys between 1993 and 2001 are no longer considered reliable for various reasons. A Recreational Technical Working Group concluded that these harvest estimates should be used only with the following qualifications: a) they may be very inaccurate; b) the 1996 and earlier surveys contain a methodological error; and c) the 2000 and 2001 estimates are implausibly high for many important fisheries. In response to these problems and the cost and scale challenges associated with onsite methods, a national panel survey was conducted for the first time throughout the 2011–12 fishing year (Wynne-Jones et al 2014). The panel survey used face-to-face interviews of a random sample of 30 390 New Zealand households to recruit a panel of fishers and non-fishers for a full year. The panel members were contacted regularly about their fishing activities and harvest information collected in standardised phone interviews. The national panel survey was repeated during the 2017–18 and 2022–23 fishing years using very similar methods to produce directly comparable results (Wynne-Jones et al 2019; Heinemann & Gray 2024). Recreational catch estimates from the three national panel surveys are given in Table 5. Note that national panel survey estimates do not include recreational harvest taken under s111 general approvals.

Table 5: Recreational harvest estimates for jack mackerel stocks (Wynne-Jones et al 2014, 2019, Heinemann & Gray 2024). Mean fish weights were obtained from boat ramp surveys (Hartill & Davey 2015, Davey et al 2019, 2024).

Stock	Year	Method	Number of fish	Total weight (t)	CV
JMA 1	2011–12	Panel survey	101 076	32.2	0.21
	2017–18	Panel survey	62 710	18.6	0.24
	2022–23	Panel survey	53 438	22.1	0.27
JMA 3	2011–12	Panel survey	50	<1	1.01
	2017–18	Panel survey	0	0	–
	2022–23	Panel survey	0	0	–
JMA 7	2011–12	Panel survey	19 991	10.2	0.58
	2017–18	Panel survey	20 026	6.2	0.51
	2022–23	Panel survey	5 503	2.6	0.44

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

Quantitative information on the current level of Māori customary non-commercial catch is not available.

1.4 Illegal catch

There is no information on illegal activity or catch but it is considered to be insignificant.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

There is no information on other sources of mortality.

2. BIOLOGY

The three species of jack mackerel in New Zealand have different geographical distributions, but their ranges partially overlap. *T. novaezelandiae* predominates in waters shallower than 150 m and warmer than 13° C; it is uncommon south of latitude 42° S. *Trachurus declivis* generally occurs in deeper (but less than 300 m) waters cooler than 16° C, north of latitude 45° S (Robertson 1978). *Trachurus murphyi* occurs to depths of least 500 m and has a wide latitudinal range (0° at the Galapagos Islands and coastal Ecuador, to south of 40° S off the Chilean coast) (Kawahara et al 1988).

Trachurus murphyi was first described from New Zealand waters in 1987 (Kawahara et al 1988). Its presence was recorded off the south and east coasts of the South Island. Its distribution expanded to off the west coast of the South Island and the North and South Taranaki bights by the late 1980s, reaching the Bay of Plenty in appreciable quantities by 1992, and becoming common off the east coast of Northland by June 1994. However, this distribution has decreased in more recent years; while

remaining an important part of the catch in JMA 3, since the late 1990s its presence north of Cook Strait has been sporadic with occasional landings in the JMA 1 purse seine fishery north of East Cape and from the JMA 1 inshore trawl fishery south of East Cape.

All species can be caught by bottom trawl, midwater trawl, or by purse seine nets targeting surface schools. The vertical and horizontal movement patterns are poorly understood. Jack mackerels are presumed to be generally off the bottom at night, and surface schools can be quite common during the day.

Jack mackerels have a protracted spring-summer spawning season. *T. novaezelandiae* probably matures at about 26–30 cm fork length (FL) at an age of 3–4 years, and *T. declivis* matures when about 26–30 cm FL at an age of 2–4 years. Spawning occurs in the North and South Taranaki bights, and probably in other areas as well.

The reproductive biology of *T. murphyi* in New Zealand waters is not well understood. Pre- and post-spawning fish have been recorded from the Chatham Rise, Stewart-Snares shelf, Northland east coast, and off Kaikoura in summer, but it is unknown whether there has been any resulting recruitment in New Zealand waters. A study by Taylor (2002a) showed that older size/age groups become increasingly dominant in catches westward from the South American coast, suggesting that an eastward migration of oceanic spawned larvae and juveniles occurs in the South Pacific Ocean.

Biological parameters relevant to the stock assessment are shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Estimates of biological parameters.

Fishstock		Estimate	Source
<u>1. Natural mortality (<i>M</i>)</u>			
All		0.18	
Considered best estimate for both endemic species from all areas.			Horn (1991a)
<u>2. Weight = $a(\text{length})^b$ (Weight in g, length in cm fork length)</u>			
		All	
	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	
<i>T. declivis</i>	0.023	2.84	Horn (1991a)
<i>T. novaezelandiae</i>	0.0093	3.10	Hartill et al (2022)
<i>T. murphyi</i>	0.016	2.85	Basten (1981)
<u>3. von Bertalanffy growth parameters</u>			
		All	
	L_{∞}	k	t_0
<i>T. declivis</i> (JMA 7)	46 cm	0.29	-1.06
<i>T. novaezelandiae</i> (JMA 1)	34.5 cm	0.34	0.1
<i>T. novaezelandiae</i> (JMA 7)	34.5 cm	0.30	-0.72
<i>T. murphyi</i> (JMA 7, females)	50.7 cm	0.231	-0.5 (fixed)
<i>T. murphyi</i> (JMA 7, males)	52.9 cm	0.216	-0.5 (fixed)

Horn (1993) fitted von Bertalanffy growth curves for *T. novaezelandiae* and *T. declivis* to samples collected from the central west coast and in the Bay of Plenty between 1974 and 1991. No significant sexual differences in growth were apparent for either species but geographical differences were indicated for *T. novaezelandiae*. Hartill et al (2022) have provided updated estimates of growth parameters for *T. novaezelandiae* in JMA 1. Updated estimates for *T. novaezelandiae* and *T. declivis* in have been provided by Neubauer & Middleton (2025) using a mixture modelling approach that simultaneously estimated growth parameters and the correct species for otoliths collected by observers in the JMA 7 fishery (see Section 5.1 below). *Trachurus novaezelandiae* and *T. declivis* have moderate initial growth rates that slow after about 6 years. Both species reach a maximum age of 25+ years.

Trachurus murphyi has proven difficult to age with markedly varying growth parameters estimated from fish sampled off South America (Horn & Ó Maolagáin 2021). Using otolith samples from JMA 7 in the period 2006–07 to 2018–19, Horn & Ó Maolagáin (2021) estimate that the mean asymptotic length of male *T. murphyi* in New Zealand is larger than that of females. Initial growth is rapid, slowing at 6–7 years, and *T. murphyi* is a moderately long-lived species with a maximum observed age of 38 years.

The best available estimate of M for *T. novaezelandiae* and *T. declivis* is 0.18 based on the age-frequency distributions of lightly exploited populations in the Bay of Plenty. Assuming $M = 0.18$, estimates of Z made in 1989 suggest that F is less than 0.05 for both endemic species off the central west coast (the main jack mackerel fishing ground).

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

Differences in growth rate of *T. novaezelandiae* and *T. declivis* between JMA 1 and JMA 7 may indicate stock separation.

Horn et al (2014) noted that *T. declivis* younger than 9 years old were rare in the JMA 3 catch in 2012–13, in contrast to JMA 7 where catches always included, and were sometimes dominated by, fish 5 years or younger. As a result, it was suggested that the adult *T. declivis* in JMA 3 may derive from other areas, and not be a distinct stock. Middleton & Neubauer (2025) found that *T. declivis* less than 40 cm fork length were uncommon in the midwater fishery JMA 3. Although some running ripe *T. declivis* have been found on the Chatham Rise, off the east coast South Island, and on the Stewart-Snares shelf, inshore survey data do not suggest that smaller *T. declivis* occur in areas inaccessible to the midwater trawl fishery. As a result, the working hypothesis for stock assessment purposes is that *T. declivis* in JMA 3 are part of the same biological stock as those in JMA 7.

There are two possible hypotheses on the stock structure of *T. murphyi* in New Zealand waters: it is either a separate stock established by fish migrating from South America, or part of a single, extensive trans-Pacific stock. Although successful recruitment in New Zealand waters would indicate the establishment of a separate stock, current evidence favours the latter hypothesis with an extensive stock between latitudes 35° and 50° S linking the coasts of Chile and New Zealand across what has been described as ‘the jack mackerel belt’. Few detailed data are available to document the process of range expansion by *T. murphyi* or indicate the relative abundance of the three species in particular areas. As a requirement of the increased TACCs introduced in 1994–95, improvements to jack mackerel catch monitoring were made to provide adequate data for quantifying species composition and relative abundance in JMA 1 and JMA 3.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECOSYSTEM CONSIDERATIONS

The figures and tables in this section were updated and additional text included for the May 2025 Fishery Assessment Plenary. This summary is from the perspective of the jack mackerel trawl fishery; a more detailed summary from an issue-by-issue perspective is available in the Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Annual Review where the consequences are also discussed ([Aquatic environment and biodiversity annual review \(AEBAR\) | NZ Government \(mpi.govt.nz\)](https://www.mpi.govt.nz/aquatic-environment-and-biodiversity-annual-review)).

4.1 Role in the ecosystem

A study of fish assemblages using research trawls suggested that *Trachurus novaezelandiae* is part of an inshore assemblage that prefers shallow northern waters (centred on about 60 m depth and latitude about 38.7° S). All three species overlap spatially, but *T. declivis* is part of a deeper assemblage around central New Zealand (centred on about 130 m and about 40.1° S), and *T. murphyi* occurs deeper still and further south (centred on about 220 m and about 44.7° S) (Francis et al 2002). *T. novaezelandiae* and *T. declivis* range through the water column from the surface to the sea floor. The behaviour of *T. murphyi* in New Zealand is less well known but studies off Chile suggest that this species tends to aggregate at night and that this could reflect nocturnal foraging (Bertrand et al 2004, 2006). The effect on the ecosystem of extracting, for example, between 5000 and 10 000 t of jack mackerels from JMA 1 and about 30 000 t from JMA 7 per year over the past two decades is unknown.

4.1.1 Trophic interactions

Stevens et al (2011) reported the diet of *T. novaezelandiae* and *T. declivis* from the Bay of Plenty, Northland, and off the west coast South Island to be predominantly euphausiids with fewer amphipods and fish (see also Hurst 1980). Crustaceans (several groups) were the dominant prey of *T.*

novaezealandiae in the Hauraki Gulf, with fewer fish and polychaetes (Godfriaux 1968, 1970). The diet of *T. murphyi* from research trawls on shelf areas around New Zealand, mainly down to 500 m depth, included: crustaceans (55%, mainly euphausiids 38%, amphipods 12%, and *Munida* 6%); salps (36%); and teleosts (11% frequency of occurrence in non-empty stomachs, Stevens et al 2011).

Predators of jack mackerels are likely to include many fishes, seabirds, and marine mammals given the relatively high abundance of jack mackerels. The diet of gemfish from research trawls in Southland included *Trachurus* spp. (6% of total, Stevens et al 2011). *T. declivis* and *T. murphyi* were identified from the stomachs of leafscale gulper shark and Plunket's shark and *T. declivis* from the stomachs of school shark (Dunn et al 2010). The diet of spiny dogfish included scavenged jack mackerel (Dunn et al 2013).

4.2 Non-target fish and invertebrate catch

Between 2009 and 2011, *T. novaezealandiae* dominated 97% of purse seine landings in JMA 1 (Walsh et al 2016). The estimated proportions by year were 1–17% for *T. declivis*, 0–3% for *T. murphyi*, and 81–99% for *T. novaezealandiae*. There was spatial and temporal heterogeneity in size and abundance; *T. novaezealandiae* dominated landings from the Bay of Plenty throughout the year and large *T. declivis* and *T. murphyi* were common in east Northland during winter (Walsh et al 2016).

Finucci et al (2022) used data from scientific observers and commercial catch-effort returns to estimate the rates and annual levels of fish and invertebrate bycatch and discards in the jack mackerel trawl fisheries, from 2002–03 to 2018–19. Jack mackerel species (*Trachurus* spp.) accounted for 77% of the total estimated catch in the target fishery since 2002–03. The other main catch species by weight were barracouta (11.0%), blue mackerel (3.1%), frostfish (3.0%), and redbait (2.4%). Smaller amounts of a range of other species including spiny dogfish, kingfish, porcupine fish, and sunfish were also reported. Arrow squid was the only invertebrate group in the top 30 non-target taxa, accounting for 0.3% of the catch, and nearly all catch was retained.

Total annual non-target catch was 7105–24 269 t between 2002–03 and 2018–19, varying over time approximately relative to total fishing effort throughout the period. Annual non-target catch comprised predominantly QMS species (7167–18 899 t), with the non-QMS species catch ranging from 87 t to 1360 t. Annual estimates of total non-target catch (predominately consisting of QMS species) have shown a significant declining trend over time. These trends are correlated with effort, which has also generally decreased over time.

Total discard estimates varied from 93 t to 359 t annually. Discards of jack mackerel were negligible. Discards of QMS species (largely spiny dogfish, *Squalus acanthias*, and kingfish, *Seriola lalandi*, which are both subject to an exception issued pursuant to section 72A of the Fisheries Act 1996) have increased since 2011–12, while non-QMS species and non-QMS invertebrate species have remained stable with no trend. Discards of invertebrates were low, and apart from in 2003–04 when 36 t were reported, discards did not exceed 2 t annually.

4.3 Incidental capture of protected species (mammals, seabirds, and protected fish)

For protected species, capture estimates presented here include all animals recovered to the deck (alive, injured, or dead) of fishing vessels but do not include any cryptic mortality, e.g., seabirds that are struck by a warp but not brought onboard the vessel (Middleton & Abraham 2007).

4.3.1 Marine mammal captures

Jack mackerel trawlers occasionally catch marine mammals, primarily common dolphin, long-finned pilot whale, and New Zealand fur seal (which are all classified as 'Not Threatened' under the New Zealand Threat Classification System in 2019 (Baker et al 2019)). Between 2002–03 and 2022–23, there were 199 observed captures of whales and dolphins in jack mackerel trawl fisheries: common dolphin (184), long-finned pilot whale (13), dusky dolphin (1), and long-beaked common dolphin (1). Estimated captures of common dolphin for 2002–03 to 2022–23 are shown in Table 7, and show a strong declining trend. Common dolphins were observed captured off the Taranaki coast or off the west coast of the North Island (Abraham et al 2016, 2021). The 2002–03 to 2022–23 average of the estimated capture rate for common dolphins is 1.5 captures per 100 tows (range 0 to 11.18) in the jack mackerel fishery.

Table 7: Number of tows by fishing year and observed and estimated common dolphin captures in jack mackerel trawl fisheries. No. obs, number of observed tows; % obs, percentage of tows observed; Rate, number of captures per 100 observed tows. Estimates are based on methods described by Abraham & Richard (2020).

Fishing year	Fishing effort			Observed captures		Estimated captures	
	Tows	Observed tows	% observed	Number	Rate	Mean	95% c.i.
2002–03	3 067	346	11.3	21	6.07	102	44–203
2003–04	2 383	152	6.4	17	11.18	81	34–158
2004–05	2 509	558	22.2	21	3.76	79	42–128
2005–06	2 808	709	25.2	2	0.28	10	2–27
2006–07	2 711	802	29.6	11	1.37	46	20–87
2007–08	2 651	818	30.9	20	2.44	38	22–61
2008–09	2 169	813	37.5	11	1.35	20	11–36
2009–10	2 406	786	32.7	4	0.51	15	4–39
2010–11	1 880	593	31.5	7	1.18	49	16–104
2011–12	2 034	1 551	76.3	5	0.32	6	5–13
2012–13	2 214	1 940	87.6	15	0.77	17	15–24
2013–14	2 450	2 190	89.4	28	1.28	29	28–35
2014–15	1 749	1 513	86.5	19	1.26	21	19–28
2015–16	1 545	1 384	89.6	2	0.14	3	2–7
2016–17	1 402	1 019	72.7	0	0.00	1	0–5
2017–18	1 688	1 474	87.3	0	0.00	0	0–4
2018–19	1 628	1 279	78.6	0	0.00	1	0–5
2019–20	1 748	1 353	77.4	0	0.00	1	0–7
2020–21	1 639	945	57.7	0	0.00	1	0–7
2021–22	1 642	1 204	73.3	0	0.00	1	0–6
2022–23	1 925	1 454	75.5	1	0.07	2	1–8

4.3.2 Seabird captures

Annual observed seabird capture rates ranged from 0 to 1.4 per 100 tows in jack mackerel fisheries between 2002–03 and 2019–20 (Abraham & Thompson 2009, Abraham & Thompson 2011, Thompson et al 2013, Abraham et al 2016). Capture rates have fluctuated without obvious trend at this low level (Table 8). Total estimated seabird captures in the jack mackerel trawl fishery varied from 3 to 27 between 2002–03 and 2019–20 (Table 8).

Table 8: Number of tows by fishing year and observed and estimated seabird captures in jack mackerel trawl fisheries. No. obs, number of observed tows; % obs, percentage of tows observed; Rate, number of captures per 100 observed tows. Estimates are based on methods described by Abraham & Richard (2020).

Fishing year	Fishing effort			Observed captures		Estimated captures	
	Tows	Observed tows	% observed	Number	Rate	Mean	95% c.i.
2002–03	3 067	346	11.3	4	1.16	21	10–39
2003–04	2 383	152	6.4	0	0.00	6	1–15
2004–05	2 509	558	22.2	8	1.43	14	9–23
2005–06	2 808	709	25.2	0	0.00	14	5–28
2006–07	2 711	802	29.6	1	0.12	7	2–16
2007–08	2 651	818	30.9	1	0.12	7	2–15
2008–09	2 169	813	37.5	6	0.74	12	7–20
2009–10	2 406	786	32.7	9	1.15	15	10–25
2010–11	1 880	593	31.5	7	1.18	14	8–24
2011–12	2 034	1 551	76.3	5	0.32	9	5–17
2012–13	2 214	1 940	87.6	24	1.24	25	24–27
2013–14	2 450	2 190	89.4	6	0.27	7	6–12
2014–15	1 749	1 513	86.5	11	0.73	13	11–18
2015–16	1 545	1 384	89.6	6	0.43	7	6–9
2016–17	1 402	1 019	72.7	4	0.39	6	4–11
2017–18	1 688	1 474	87.3	10	0.68	11	10–15
2018–19	1 628	1 279	78.6	3	0.23	4	3–8
2019–20	1 748	1 353	77.4	2	0.15	3	2–9
2020–21	1 639	945	57.7	10	1.06	16	11–25
2021–22	1 642	1 204	73.3	4	0.33	5	4–8
2022–23	1 925	1 454	75.5	2	0.14	4	2–10

Observed seabird captures since 2002–03 have been mostly prions, shearwaters, and petrels (83 of the 111 observed seabird captures), with 28 observed albatross captures (Table 9). Seabird captures in the jack mackerel fishery have been observed mostly on the Stewart-Snares shelf, off Taranaki, and off the east coast South Island. These numbers should be regarded as only a general guide on the distribution of captures because the numbers are small, and the observer coverage is not uniform across areas and may not be representative.

The jack mackerel target trawl fishery contributes to the total risk posed by New Zealand commercial fishing to seabirds (Table 10). The species to which the fishery poses the most risk is Southern

Buller's albatross; this target fishery posing 0.003 of risk (Table 10). Southern Buller's albatross was assessed at very high risk (Edwards et al 2023).

Mitigation methods such as streamer (tori) lines, Brady bird bafflers, warp deflectors, and offal management are used in the jack mackerel trawl fishery. Warp mitigation was voluntarily introduced from about 2004 and made mandatory in April 2006 (Department of Internal Affairs 2006). The 2006 Notice mandated that all trawlers over 28 m in length use a seabird scaring device while trawling ("paired streamer lines", "bird baffler" or "warp deflector" as defined in the Notice).

Table 9: Number of observed seabird captures in jack mackerel trawl fisheries, 2002–03 to 2022–23, by taxon and area. The risk category is an estimate of aggregate potential fatalities across trawl and longline fisheries relative to the Population Sustainability Threshold, PST (an analogue of PBR approach) (Edwards et al 2023). The current version of the risk assessment does not include a recovery factor.

Species	Risk category	Taranaki	WCNI	Chatham Rise	Stewart-Snares shelf	ECSI	WCSI	Total
Salvin's albatross	High	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
Southern Buller's albatross	Very high	0	0	0	4	2	0	6
Northern Buller's albatross	Medium	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
New Zealand white-capped albatross	High	4	0	0	11	4	0	19
Total albatrosses	–	4	0	1	15	9	0	29
Westland petrel	High	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
White-chinned petrel	Low	0	0	1	32	5	0	38
Sooty shearwater	Negligible	1	0	0	14	2	0	17
Common diving petrel	Negligible	1	0	0	5	0	1	7
White-faced storm petrels	Negligible	0	3	1	0	0	0	4
Australasian gannet	Negligible	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Fairy prion	Negligible	4	0	0	1	1	0	6
Cape petrels	NA	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
Buller's shearwater	Negligible	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Fulmar prion	NA	9	0	0	0	0	0	9
Grey-backed storm petrel	NA	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Northern giant petrel	Low	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Prions	NA	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Procellaria petrels	NA	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Storm petrels	NA	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Large seabird	NA	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total other birds	–	24	3	3	52	8	4	94

Table 10: Risk ratio of seabirds predicted by the SEFRA for the jack mackerel fishery and all fisheries included in the SEFRA, 2006–07 to 2019–20, with a risk posed by the domestic tuna and swordfish SLL fishery. The risk ratio is an estimate of aggregate potential fatalities across trawl and longline fisheries relative to the Population Sustainability Threshold, PST (an analogue of the PBR approach) (Edwards et al 2023). The current version of the risk assessment does not include a recovery factor. The New Zealand threat classifications are shown (Robertson et al 2021).

Species name	Risk ratio			Risk category	NZ Threat Classification
	Mackerel trawl	Total risk from NZ commercial fishing	% of total risk from NZ commercial fishing		
Southern Buller's albatross	<0.01	1.19	0.3	Very high	At Risk: Declining
New Zealand white-capped albatross	<0.01	0.5	0.4	High	At Risk: Declining

4.3.3 Protected fish species captures

Mobulid rays (spinetail devilrays, *Mobula mobular*, and manta rays, *Mobula birostris*, both protected since 2010 under the Wildlife Act 1953) occur mainly in north-eastern North Island waters during summer and could potentially be caught in purse seine nets along the north-east coast of North Island. However, observers monitoring mackerel purse seine fisheries (coverage 6–89% per year, 2002–03 to 2022–23) have not reported any captures of mobulid rays to date.

4.4 Benthic interactions

Jack mackerel are taken using trawls that are sometimes fished on or near the seabed. The spatial extent of seabed contact by trawl fishing gear in New Zealand's EEZ and Territorial Sea has been estimated and mapped in numerous studies for trawl fisheries targeting deepwater species (Baird et al 2011, Black et al 2013, Black & Tilney 2015, Black & Tilney 2017, Baird & Wood 2018, and Baird & Mules 2019, 2021a, 2021b), species in waters shallower than 250 m (Baird et al 2015, Baird & Mules 2021a, 2021b), and all trawl fisheries combined (Baird & Mules 2021a, 2021b, MacGibbon et al 2024). The most recent estimates of the deepwater trawl footprint was for the period 1989–90 to

2023–24 and was completed using a combination of fisher reported and Geospatial Position Reporting (GPR) data by MPI.

During 1989–90 to 2023–24, about 60 622 bottom-contacting jack mackerel trawls were reported on TCEPRs and ERS; this represents about 1200–3300 tows in most years up to 2013–14 and an average of 990 tows per year from 2014–15 to 2023–24. The total footprint generated from these tows was estimated at about 47 650 km². This footprint represented coverage of 1.2% of the seafloor of the combined EEZ and the Territorial Sea areas; 3.6% of the ‘fishable area’, that is, the seafloor area open to trawling, in depths of less than 1600 m. For the 2023–24 fishing year, 1065 jack mackerel bottom-contacting tows had an estimated footprint of 4712 km² which represented coverage of 0.1% of the EEZ and Territorial Sea and 0.2% of the fishable area.

The overall trawl footprint for jack mackerel (1989–90 to 2023–24) covered 16% of the seafloor in < 200 m, 6% of 200–400 m seafloor, and < 0.05% of the 400–600 m seafloor (Baird & Mules 2021b). The jack mackerel footprint contacted 1.7%, 0.1%, and < 0.01% of those depth ranges, respectively, in 2023–24.

Trawling for jack mackerel with some or all of the gear contacting the bottom, like trawling for other species, is likely to have effects on benthic community structure and function (e.g., Rice 2006) and there may be consequences for benthic productivity (e.g., Jennings et al 2001, Hermesen et al 2003, Hiddink et al 2006, Reiss et al 2009). These consequences are not considered in detail here but are discussed in the Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Annual Review 2021 (Fisheries New Zealand 2021).

4.5 Other considerations

4.5.1 Spawning disruption

Fishing may disrupt spawning activity or success. Canadian research carried out on Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) concluded that “Cod exposed to a chronic stressor are able to spawn successfully, but there appears to be a negative impact of this stress on their reproductive output, particularly through the production of abnormal larvae” (Morgan et al 1999). Morgan et al (1997) also reported disruption of a spawning shoal of Atlantic cod: “Following passage of the trawl, a 300-m-wide “hole” in the aggregation spanned the trawl track. Disturbance was detected for 77 min after passage of the trawl.” There have been no specific studies for jack mackerel in New Zealand waters, but information on the timing and location of spawning and fishing exists. *T. declivis* and *T. novaezelandiae* are serial spawners with a protracted spring-summer spawning season (Hurst et al 2000). *T. murphyi* appears to spawn from late winter through to summer (Horn 1991b, Hurst et al 2000). The JMA 7 trawl fishery has peaks of catch and effort in spring-summer (October–March) and in winter (April–September) (McKenzie 2008), the former overlapping with spawning. Most of the purse seine catch from the Bay of Plenty is taken in September–October, but an increasing proportion has been caught in November–December since 2005–06 (Walsh et al 2016), also overlapping the spring-summer spawning.

4.5.2 Habitat of particular significance to fisheries management

Fisheries New Zealand have developed guidelines on the identification of habitats of particular significance for fisheries management ([Habitats of particular significance for fisheries management | NZ Government](#)), and is in the process of reviewing available evidence for the development of an online register of habitats. Studies of potential relevance have identified areas of importance for spawning and juveniles (Hurst et al 2000). *T. declivis* spawning was found to be common on the southwest and northwest North Island outer shelf, and moderate to high abundance of juveniles was recorded from northwest North Island, Hauraki Gulf, and Bay of Plenty outer shelf. *T. novaezelandiae* spawning was found to be common on the southwest and northwest inner and outer shelf of the North Island, and moderate to high abundance of juveniles was recorded from Hauraki Gulf and Bay of Plenty inner and outer shelf, East Cape inner shelf, and Tasman Bay/Golden Bay. *T. murphyi* spawning was found to be common on the southwest outer shelf and only low abundance of juveniles was recorded from the outer Southland shelf and at 300–600 m on the Chatham Rise.

4.5.3 Genetic effects

Fishing and environmental changes, including those caused by climate change or pollution, could alter the genetic composition or diversity of a species. There are no known studies of the genetic diversity of jack mackerels in New Zealand.

4.5.4 Marine heatwave

The three species together are found across a broad temperature range of 8–17°C, but each species has a narrower range: *T. novaezealandiae* occurs commonly from 12–17 °C, *T. declivis* from 11–14°C, and *T. murphyi* from 8–14 °C. Marine heatwaves may therefore lead to shifts in distribution, and it has been speculated that the invasion of *T. murphyi* into New Zealand waters was related to strengthening El Niño events (Cummings et al. 2021).

5. STOCK ASSESSMENT

Stock assessments for jack mackerel are complicated by the reporting and management of three species under a single code.

5.0 Central East, and Auckland East (JMA 1)

The catch sampling programme used to estimate species composition in the JMA 1 purse seine fishery was extended during the 2019–20 and 2020–21 fishing years to collect catch-at-age data from sampled landings that included catches of *T. novaezealandiae* (Hartill et al 2022). The catch-at-age distributions for the two fishing years showed a consistent pattern in year class strength, with a progression of strong and weak year classes seen between the two years. Chapman-Robson total mortality estimates calculated from these two age distributions, for a range of assumed ages at recruitment, were similar between years (Table 11).

Table 11: Chapman-Robson total mortality estimates for alternative ages at full recruitment by fishing year. Bootstrap coefficients of variation are in parentheses (Hartill et al 2022).

Age at recruitment	2019–20	2020–21
3	0.206 (0.06)	0.232 (0.11)
4	0.247 (0.06)	0.290 (0.12)
5	0.302 (0.06)	0.290 (0.10)
6	0.356 (0.05)	0.331 (0.09)

Establishing B_{MSY} -compatible reference points

The Inshore Fisheries Assessment Working Group adopted $F = 0.87 \times M = 0.157$ as an F_{MSY} proxy target fishing mortality rate, based on the meta-analysis of Zhou et al (2012). This is based on M of 0.18.

5.1 South East coast, South East Chatham Rise, Sub-Antarctic, Southland (JMA 3)

The potential to carry out partial quantitative assessments for *T. declivis* and *T. novaezealandiae* in JMA 3 was investigated in 2025 (Middleton & Neubauer 2025), with the intention of replicating the approach employed in JMA 7 of carrying out CPUE analyses using observer data from tows where species composition sampling had been carried out (Middleton et al 2024).

Observer data indicated that catches of *T. novaezealandiae* were negligible in the key midwater trawl fishery in JMA 3, and the cessation of the purse seine fishery by the mid 2000s removed the potential for significant catches of *T. novaezealandiae* in the area.

Observer sampling of the JMA 3 catch was found to occur at a lower levels of coverage than in JMA 7 and, as a result, CPUE analyses for *T. declivis* and *T. murphyi* in JMA 3 were not possible using observer data alone. Instead, the observer data were used to develop models of the proportions of *T. declivis* and *T. murphyi* in catches at the fishing event level. At a broad scale, observer sampling demonstrated that *T. murphyi* dominated catches in JMA 3 in the 1990s and still remains an important part of the catch. However, *T. declivis* has become more prevalent since 2010, except around the Chatham Islands (Figure 5).




Figure 5: The relative proportions of *T. declivis* (JMD) and *T. murphyi* (JMM) from observer sampling in JMA 3. Data were aggregated in regions defined by DBSCAN clustering of the start locations of observed tows.

The species composition modelling indicated that observer trip was an important covariate, although it could not be determined whether this was attributable to small scale variation in species composition or variation in observer skill at differentiating the two species. The expected log posterior density was bimodal, indicating that the species composition model performed well for some events but less well for others. A mixture model was fitted to estimate the predictive ability of the species composition model using the same covariates (year, target, position, and trip) used in the composition model.

The two models were used to estimate catches of *T. declivis* and *T. murphyi* for midwater trawl events targeting jack mackerels, squid or barracouta in JMA 3, and separate CPUE analyses were carried out for the two species, and also for combined jack mackerels. In the base models, the mean of the posterior distribution was used to predict the species composition, and the estimated predictive ability from the mixture model was used to weight the positive catch observations in the CPUE analyses. Sensitivity analyses explored the influence of weighting, whether small predicted catches should be represented as zeros, and the use of individual draws from the posterior, rather than the mean, for estimating catch proportions.

The CPUE analyses suggested that abundance of *T. murphyi* peaked in JMA 3 in 1995–96 and 1996–97 before declining rapidly, presumably as *T. murphyi* spread to other parts of the EEZ (Figure 6). Abundance of *T. declivis* also showed a peak in 1995–96, and a further peak in 2000–01. Both species showed a period of lower abundance in the mid-2000s followed by a subsequent increase. For

T. declivis, there were peaks in abundance in 2016–17, and a large peak in 2022–23. The magnitude of these peaks suggested that the CPUE did not index a closed population, but either a subpopulation subject to movement (local or at stock level) and/or is an unreliable index due to the paucity of data.

Relative abundance of *T. declivis* in JMA 3 based on the CPUE index has been considerably more variable than in JMA 7 (Figure 6a) which, together with evidence that only older and larger *T. declivis* are present in JMA 3, led to the conclusion that *T. declivis* in JMA 3 was likely to be a part of a larger stock. For assessment purposes, the working hypothesis was that *T. declivis* in JMA 3 was part of the *T. declivis* stock that occurs in JMA 7, although an alternative hypothesis could be that it is part of the JMA 1 stock, which is spatially closer.




Figure 6: Combined (binomial/positive) catch per unit effort (CPUE) indices for predicted catches of *T. declivis* (JMA3 MW pred JMD event) and *T. murphyi* (JMA3 MW pred JMM event) in JMA 3, and total jack mackerel catches (JMA3 MW event), for midwater trawl events targeting jack mackerels, baracouta or squid in JMA 3, with individual species catches predicted from models using observer sampling data. The series are scaled to have a geometric mean of 1.




Figure 6a: Combined (binomial/positive) catch per unit effort (CPUE) for predicted catches of *T. declivis* (JMA3 MW pred JMD event) in JMA 3, and a positive index calculated from observer data using the subset of tows where length-frequency sampling permitted estimation of catch by species in JMA 7 (JMD7 MW observer). The series are scaled to have a geometric mean of 1.

5.2 Challenger, Central West, and Auckland West (JMA 7)

Preliminary stock assessments for *T. declivis* and *T. novaezealandiae* in JMA 7 were undertaken in 2007 (McKenzie 2009). These relied on CPUE indices (McKenzie, 2008) where an average species composition was applied to individual tows within a stratum. Webber & Starr (2022) noted that

applying average species proportions across relatively large strata to individual tows, instead of using the actual species proportions in the tow, will reduce the variability in a CPUE analysis and will likely lead to biased coefficient estimates because the model does not have access to the real variation by species relative to the covariate values. As a result, these previous CPUE analyses and the preliminary assessments are considered unreliable.

Webber & Starr (2022) also identified a range of concerns about the data from observer sampling in JMA 7. Consequently, a set of CPUE standardisations of all three species combined was carried out, for positive catches of JMA only.

Species proportion sampling

The key concern identified by Webber & Starr (2022) was that observer sampling for catch composition in the JMA 7 trawl fishery had not always been implemented as specified in the observer manual. There were reports which suggested that observers often took a single sample at the beginning of processing instead of several throughout the processing procedure. They suggested that if stratification of the catch within the trawl persisted through to when the catch was processed, then sampling at a single time would result in biased estimates of species composition.

The existing data collection procedures did not retain sub-sample information for jack mackerel length-frequency samples by species, so there was no way of using these data to assess whether the fish comprising a sample were collected at one time or as a series of sub-samples. To address concerns about potential stratification in the sampled catch, two observer trips were carried out where observers took up to four speciated length-frequency sub-samples of jack mackerel during the processing of catches and recorded the sub-sample data separately. Middleton (2022) found differences between some sub-sample and tow-level estimates of species proportions, but these were not related to the time during processing when sub-samples were taken. As a result, it was concluded by the WG that there was only a limited risk of bias in tow-level estimates of species composition arising from sampling at a single point during processing.

Misidentification of species

Misidentification of the three jack mackerel species in observer sampling of otoliths for ageing has been apparent in catch-at-age data from the JMA 7 fishery for some time. Based on the subset of fish aged, Saunders et al (2022) reported that the rate of misidentification by observers was at least 8% for *T. novaezelandiae* and at least 3% for *T. declivis*. While potential misidentification was sometimes apparent in length sampling data (e.g., a small number of suspiciously large *T. novaezelandiae*), instances of misidentification tended to stand out most obviously in plots of length at age, from age sampling. However, even in these data, misidentification was only clear for older fish (i.e., when the growth curves were obviously separated) whereas some level of misidentification would also be expected for smaller fish.

Moore et al (2024) demonstrated that analyses of otolith shape showed promise for confirming the species for fish selected for ageing. To address this issue using the existing data, Neubauer & Middleton (2025) developed a Bayesian mixture model of growth and fitted this model to age-length data for jack mackerels sampled in JMA 7 from 1995 to 2020. The 18 987 observations had a measured fork length, an age from otolith reading, and an observer-assigned species. The mixture model estimated the von Bertalanffy growth parameters for each species (combined sexes) and made predictions of the true species for each observation, accounting for potential ageing error (Figure 7).




Figure 7: Estimated growth curves for jack mackerels in JMA 7 (JMN, *T. novaezelandiae*; JMD, *T. declivis*; JMM, *T. murphyi*). Solid lines indicate the median and 95% interval for predicted size at age, in comparison to the growth curves based on parameters previously reported in the Plenary (dashed lines). The three panels group the data according to the observer assigned species, and points are coloured by the model predicted species (JMN = green, JMD = blue, JMM = red), and shaded by the estimated probability of that prediction.

The mixture model results have been used to provide updated estimates of growth parameters for *T. novaezelandiae* and *T. declivis* in JMA 7 (Table 6) but also provided information on the probability that the observer-assigned species was correct (Figure 8). The latter estimates allowed an investigation of the sensitivity of species-specific CPUE indices to species misidentification (see below). For each fish, the model provided an estimate of the probability that a particular fish should be assigned to a particular species. Because the growth curve for *T. declivis* lies between that of the other two species, the model tended to be less confident about species assignment for these fish. Using a threshold for likely misidentification of < 50% probability (that the observer-assigned species was correct, given the model) for *T. novaezelandiae* and *T. murphyi*, and < 25% for *T. declivis*, led to estimated misidentification rates of 8.3% for *T. declivis*, 5.9% for *T. novaezelandiae* and < 1% for *T. murphyi*.




Figure 8: Top: estimated growth curves for jack mackerel species in JMA 7 plotted as agreed age, from the otolith readings, at measured size and with panels grouping the data by observer-assigned species (JMN, *T. novaezelandiae*; JMD, *T. declivis*; JMM, *T. murphyi*). Solid lines indicate the median and 95% interval for predicted size at age, in comparison to the growth curves based on parameters previously reported in the Plenary (dashed lines), and points are coloured by the model predicted species (JMN = green, JMD = blue, JMM = red), and shaded by the estimated probability of that prediction. Bottom: median (points) and 95% interval (lines) for the probability that the observer assigned species label is correct, given the model predicted species, grouped by 1 cm length intervals.

CPUE

Species-specific CPUE indices for *T. declivis* and *T. novaezealandiae* in JMA 7 were revisited in 2022 (Middleton et al 2024), following the work to address concerns about the impacts of observer sampling on tow-level species composition estimates (Middleton 2022).

For observed tows with length-frequency sampling of jack mackerels, the observer sampling was used to estimate the proportion of each species in the tow, by weight after applying the standard length-weight relationships (Table 6) to estimate the weight of each sampled fish. These proportions were then applied to disaggregate the observer-recorded total weight of jack mackerels in the tow into a tow-by-tow catch by species (Figure 9). Where an observer had recorded catch weights using a species-specific code (i.e., JMD, JMM, or JMN), these weights were first recoded to the generic jack mackerel code (JMA) and aggregated at the tow level.




Figure 9: Annual boxplots of tow-level proportions of each jack mackerel species (JMN, *T. novaezealandiae*; JMD, *T. declivis*; JMM, *T. murphyi*) from observer sampling in JMA 7. Tows are plotted if the length frequency sample contained at least 30 fish.

Standardised CPUE indices were calculated using standard maximum-likelihood methods for each species individually. Data were restricted to tows where the observer recorded that jack mackerel was the target species. Two series were considered: (i) midwater tows only (MW series), which allowed annual indices to be estimated from 1999, and (ii) using both bottom and midwater tows (TR series), which allowed indices to be estimated from 1991.

For *T. novaezealandiae* tows were restricted to the Taranaki Bight and west coast of the North Island (Statistical Areas 037, 039, 040, 041, 042, and 045) while the datasets for *T. declivis* also included tows off the South Island west coast (Statistical Areas 034, 035, and 036). Core fleet selection required vessels to have at least one observed trip in a minimum of four fishing years for the midwater series, but—due to lower observer coverage in the early 1990s—this was reduced to a minimum of two years for the longer TR series in order to maximise the number of observations. Stepwise selection on the basis of AIC, retaining terms only if they explained an additional 1% of the deviance, was used to select covariates, with fishing year, vessel, month, and statistical area offered as

categorical terms (with method added for the TR series) and duration, start time, seabed depth, headline height, and fishing speed offered as continuous terms using natural spline smoothers.

Trachurus declivis occurred in a high proportion of tows, reaching 100% in some years and precluding estimation of an occurrence model. For *T. novaezealandiae* both an occurrence and positive catch models were fitted, and a combined index was calculated. For the MW series, vessel was not selected as an explanatory variable for catches of either species, an outcome which was likely to be attributable to the fact that the core fleets comprised only the very similar BATM-class vessels. The temporal trends evident in the indices for *T. declivis* and *T. novaezealandiae* were similar among the statistical areas included in the models for each species, indicating that it was unlikely that there was an area-year interaction in this analysis.

The following sensitivity analyses were considered:

- the impact of including or excluding tows where the length-frequency sample size was unusually small (less than 30 fish);
- the effect of excluding trips with apparent observer misidentifications of jack mackerel species;
- whether the subset of observer data with length-frequency sampling produced a biased index relative to the entire fleet data; and
- whether there was any evidence for ‘effort creep’ (i.e., increased catching efficiency over time) in the core fleet vessels.

None of these sensitivity analyses indicated significant problems with the standardised CPUE, and the MW series beginning in 1999 was accepted by the Deepwater Working Group as indices of abundance for *T. declivis* and *T. novaezealandiae* in JMA 7 (Figure 10). The longer TR (MW+BT) series, beginning in 1991, was not considered sufficiently reliable to provide a longer term series, primarily because the level of observer coverage was much lower in the early 1990s but also because of the fact that the vessels fishing in the early 1990s had largely exited the fishery by the end of that decade with almost no overlap with the post-1999 fishery.




Figure 10: Standardised catch per unit effort (CPUE) indices for *T. declivis* (JMD) and *T. novaezealandiae* (JMN) in JMA 7 calculated from observer data using the subset of tows where length-frequency sampling permitted estimation of catch by species. A positive catch index is presented for JMD and a combined index (binomial/positive) index for JMN. The series are scaled to have a geometric mean of 1.

The CPUE analyses for JMA 7 were updated to the 2023–24 year as part of the project to develop partial quantitative assessments for JMA 3 (Middleton & Neubauer 2025).

Establishing B_{MSY} -compatible reference points

In 2022, the Deepwater Working Group (DWWG) considered that there was little information available to allow equating a particular period with a specific stock status for either of the two native jack mackerel species. Commercial fisheries became established in JMA 7 in the 1970s, but catches were lower than in recent decades, and there was no indication that the stocks were depleted when jack mackerels entered the QMS. The DWWG noted that the Harvest Strategy Standard Operational Guidelines propose that, in cases where the relationship between CPUE and abundance can be assumed to be more or less proportional, it was reasonable to select an appropriate historical period when both CPUE and catches were relatively high and stable and to use this CPUE level as a target (conceptual B_{MSY}). Catches in JMA 7 were considered to have been stable since the early-mid 2000s, with the establishment of the BATM fleet. Periods of stable abundance were identified as 2004–2011 for *T. declivis* and 2006–2012 for *T. novaezealandiae*. Noting that both species had subsequently increased in abundance while combined species catches remained stable, the Plenary adopted the geometric mean CPUE in each of these periods as the target reference level for the appropriate species (equated to 35% B_0 for these medium-productivity species). The soft limit (20% B_0) was set at 4/7 of the mean value for each period and the hard limit (10% B_0) was set at 2/7 of the mean value by period.

Catch at Age

Catch-at-age distributions for all three jack mackerel species JMA 7 are available for 1989–90, 1990–91, 1995–96, 2004–05, and 2005–06 to 2020–21 (e.g., Saunders et al 2022). However, the DWWG noted that apparent strong year classes evident in the length -frequency distributions did not clearly translate to the age distributions, which were prepared using a standard method developed in 2011 with a stratification updated in 2016. The Working Group considered that the methodology for preparing age frequency distributions would require re-evaluation before these were used for stock assessment.

5.2 Biomass estimates

Estimates of current biomass are not available.

5.3 Other yield estimates and stock assessment results

For *T. declivis* and *T. novaezealandiae* catch-at-age proportions were used to estimate instantaneous total mortality Z for the years 2006–07 to 2008–09 in JMA 7 (Smith 2011). The methods used to produce species-specific catch-at-age distributions for JMA 7 are not currently considered sufficiently reliable to use these results.

5.4 Other factors

Trachurus murphyi has been known at times to comprise a substantial proportion of the purse seine catches in the area between Cook Strait and Kaikōura, in the Bay of Plenty, and off the east Northland coast, although the proportion of this component has declined considerably since the late 1990s. *Trachurus murphyi* has also been an important component of the west coast North Island jack mackerel trawl fishery but has declined in recent years. Thus, there has been a contraction in the range of this species in New Zealand waters, although it is unknown yet whether this represents a decrease in its overall abundance here. The effect of *T. murphyi* on the range and abundance of the other two species is unknown.

Aerial sightings data were used to produce a time series of relative abundance indices for jack mackerel. The time series covered the period from the beginning of the purse seine fishery in 1976 to 1993. It indicated an increase in abundance in JMA 1 from the early 1990s, and, although the result was not as clear, a similar trend in JMA 3 and JMA 7. These increases were attributed to the invasion of *T. murphyi*.

Efforts to produce aerial sightings based abundance indices for jack mackerel were discontinued as the species were not separated in the data (Taylor 2014).

The stipulation that catches in JMA 1 and JMA 3 above the original TACs (5970 t and 2700 t, respectively) be accounted for by increases in *T. murphyi* only, is a method of managing this species independently of the other two. This approach was introduced as a means of maintaining stocks of the

endemic species while allowing exploitation of increased stocks of *T. murphyi* resulting from its invasion.

The increase in *T. novaezelandiae* catch has predominantly occurred within the Bay of Plenty fishery area. There has been a small decrease in the length of fish caught from the fishery since 2006–07 to 2008–09, although it is unknown whether the decline in fish size is attributable to an increase in fishing mortality rates, changes in fishing operation, or variation in annual recruitment.

5.5 Future Research Considerations for all stocks

- The instruction that observers (for JMA 3 and JMA 7) routinely aim to spread the collection of length-frequency samples of jack mackerels throughout the processing period should be maintained; the observer database should be extended to capture information about the sub-sampling achieved from the processing of each tow.
- Consider the introduction of simpler species composition sampling (proportion by weight) for observed tows that are not selected for length-frequency sampling.
- Review of JMD and JMN stock structure and evaluation of the occurrence and extent of *T. murphyi* incursions into New Zealand waters, including a national scale characterisation of JMA. This should also review older documents describing the JMA fisheries and stocks.
- Investigate data on stock structure across all species.
- Support international (SPRFMO) work on stock structure for JMM.
- Explore potential for spatio-temporal modelling for all JMA stocks.
- Re-examine age data for all JMA stocks.
- Explore appropriate maturity staging scales for observers and trawl surveys.

JMA 1

- Explore the potential of ovary staging within the existing shed sampling undertaken in JMA 1.

JMA 3

- Collect jack mackerel species composition information from more observed tows; consider decoupling species composition sampling from length sampling; improve observer identification guides.
- Consider approaches, including comparisons of catch at age, catch at length, spawning patterns, otolith shape and parasites, to investigate the stock structure of *T. declivis*.
- Develop approaches to allow JMA 3 and JMA 7 data to be used in joint CPUE analyses at the species level.
- Explore observer only CPUE model (only predict species mix for observed trips).
- Test species composition model with JMA 7 data.
- Formulate and investigate alternative stock structure hypotheses.

JMA 7

- Extend the mixture modelling of length at age data to allow evaluation of whether significant sex or area specific differences in growth are present for any species.
- Explore using otolith shape analysis to validate the potential misidentification from the mixture modelling.
- Explore whether there are temporal trends in species misidentification.
- Evaluate the methodology and stratification, and provide time series of catch by species (e.g., bootstrapping vs model-based approaches) and consider whether the estimation of species composition and CPUE can be usefully integrated.
- Review the methodology used to create annual age frequency distributions, including the stratification used.
- Review available data on JMA 7 from west coast inshore trawl surveys to determine what additional information on trends in abundance and recruitment this can provide.
- Explore available information to investigate whether there are any temporal patterns in mean size for each species, and consider how these can inform our understanding of the stocks.

- Given the likely correlation between observer samples collected within the same trip, explore the representativeness of observer sampling at the trip level rather than event level.
- Estimate fishing mortality based on age structure for JMN and JMD.
- Estimate the relative exploitation rate for JMD 7 with and without the JMD 3 catch.
- Investigate environmental influences on availability using appropriate environmental covariates in the CPUE standardisation modelling.

6. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

Stock Structure Assumptions

Separate stocks of *T. declivis* (JMD) and *T. novaezealandiae* (JMN) are assumed to occur in JMA 1 and JMA 7. *T. declivis* in JMA 3 and JMA 7 are assumed to be part of the same biological stock, with the larger part of the stock residing in JMA 7. *T. murphyi* (JMM) in New Zealand waters is not considered to represent an independent biological stock.

- **JMA 1 - *T. novaezealandiae***

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2024	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Medium	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2020–21	Catch: 5581 t
Assessment runs presented	Estimates of fishing mortality for 2019–20 and 2020–21	
Reference Points	Target(s): $F_{MSY} \text{ proxy} = 0.87 \times M = 0.157$ Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: $F_{MSY} \text{ proxy} = 0.87 \times M = 0.157$	
Status in relation to Target	Likely (> 60%) to at or below the target	
Status in relation to Limits	Unknown	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Overfishing is Unlikely (< 40%) to be occurring	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status

-

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	An abundance index for JMN in JMA 1 is not available.
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	-
Trends in other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis

Stock Projections or Prognosis	It is not known whether catches at the level of the current TACCs or recent catch levels are sustainable in the long-term.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unlikely (< 40%) for current catch

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Chapman-Robson estimates of total mortality	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2024	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	Age composition from sampling of purse seine landings	1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	Aerial sightings index	3 – Low Quality: high-interannual variation
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	- No previously accepted assessment	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	The mortality rate estimates do not necessarily represent those experienced by the population of <i>Trachurus novaezelandiae</i> throughout JMA 1 because they were derived almost exclusively from purse seine landings taken from the Bay of Plenty.	

Qualifying Comments
-

Fishery Interactions
JMA 1 catches are primarily taken by targeted purse seine. Because jack mackerel often occur in mixed schools with kahawai, particularly towards the end of the fishing year, this can inhibit jack mackerel targeting in this fishery at this time.

- JMA 1 - *T. declivis*

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication	-	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Medium	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year:	Catch:
Reference Points	Target(s): Not established but B_{MSY} assumed Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: Not established	
Status in relation to Target	Unknown	
Status in relation to Limits	Unknown	
Status in relation to Overfishing	-	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status
-

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	An abundance index for JMD in JMA 1 is not available..
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	-
Trends in other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	It is not known whether catches at the level of the current TACCs or recent catch levels are sustainable in the long-

	term.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	-

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation

Assessment Type	Level 3 - Qualitative Evaluation: Fishery characterisation with evaluation of fishery trends (e.g., catch, effort and nominal CPUE, length frequency information) – there is no agreed index of abundance	
Assessment Method	-	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	-	
Main data inputs (rank)	Species proportions estimates	
Data not used (rank)	N/A	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	-	

Qualifying Comments

-

Fishery Interactions

JMA 1 catches are primarily taken by targeted purse seine. Because jack mackerel often occur in mixed schools with kahawai, particularly towards the end of the fishing year, this can inhibit jack mackerel targeting in this fishery at this time


- **JMA 3 - *T. declivis***

Provisionally considered to be a sub-stock of JMD 7, and so has the same stock status.

Stock Status


Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2025	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Medium	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2023–24	Catch: 1637 t (JMD 3 only), 28 686 t (JMD 3+7)
Assessment Runs Presented	Event resolution CPUE index from observer data from jack mackerel target midwater trawls with length frequency sampling (JMD 7 MW observer)	
Reference Points	Management Target: 35% B_0 ; the geometric mean CPUE for the period 2004–2011 (a conceptual proxy for B_{MSY}) Soft Limit: 20% B_0 ; scaled from management target Hard Limit: 10% B_0 ; scaled from management target Overfishing threshold: F_{MSY} compatible proxy based on the mean relative exploitation rate for the period 2004–2011	
Status in relation to Target	Likely (> 60%) to be at or above the target	
Status in relation to Limits	Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below both the soft and hard limits	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Overfishing is Unlikely (< 40%) to be occurring	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



(a) Total annual catches for JMD 3 and JMD 7; (b) positive catch standardised catch per unit effort (CPUE) index for *T. declivis* in JMA 7 (calculated from observer data using the subset of tows where length frequency sampling permits estimation of catch by species) relative to the agreed conceptual reference points. The green, orange, and red dashed lines represent the interim target, soft limit, and hard limit, respectively. (c) Annual relative exploitation rate (catch/CPUE).

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	CPUE in JMD 7 increased from 2010 to 2017, was stable to 2021, decreased in 2022 and 2023 to a level comparable with the mid-2010 period, but increased in 2024 to the level reached in 2017 to 2021.
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Relative fishing intensity for the combined JMD 3+7 stock has been below the overfishing threshold since 2011
Other Abundance Indices	A CPUE series for JMA 3 suggests abundance of total jack mackerels has been fluctuating without trend since 2010. The proportion of JMD in the catch has increased since 2020 which implies that the JMD CPUE is increasing.  Combined (binomial/positive) CPUE series for jack mackerels (all species) in JMA 3 using data from the midwater trawl fishery (top plot) and model-based estimated proportions of <i>T. declivis</i> (JMD) and <i>T. murphyi</i> (JMM) in the catch of jack mackerels from JMA 3 (bottom plot).

Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Current catch Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unknown

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 2 – Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	CPUE analysis	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2025	Next assessment: 2027
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Observer catch records and length frequency samples	1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	- Catch at age	2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: the methods used for producing scaled catch at age distributions require review
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	Species-specific CPUE has replaced a combined species analysis The JMA 7 series is assumed to index abundance of a stock that includes <i>T. declivis</i> in JMA 3 as well as JMA 7	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Whether the hypothesis that JMD 3 is the same stock as in JMD 7 is correct - The species composition (proportions of JMD vs JMM) in JMA 3 is uncertain, based on models fitted to limited observer data	

Qualifying Comments
-


Fishery Interactions
JMA 3 and 7 catches are primarily taken by midwater trawl. In JMA 7, availability of ACE for kingfish and snapper potentially influences targeting in some sub-areas. Incidental captures of protected species have been recorded for New Zealand fur seals and cetaceans.

- **JMA 7 - *T. declivis***

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2025	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Medium	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2023–24	Catch: 27 049 t (JMD 7 only), 28 686 t (JMD 3+7)
Assessment Runs Presented	Event resolution CPUE index from observer data from jack mackerel target midwater trawls with length frequency sampling (JMD 7 MW observer)	

Reference Points	Management Target: 35% B_0 ; the geometric mean CPUE for the period 2004–2011 (a conceptual proxy for B_{MSY}) Soft Limit: 20% B_0 ; scaled from management target Hard Limit: 10% B_0 ; scaled from management target Overfishing threshold: F_{MSY} compatible proxy based on the mean relative exploitation rate for the period 2004–2011
Status in relation to Target	Likely (> 60%) to be at or above the target
Status in relation to Limits	Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below both the soft and hard limits
Status in relation to Overfishing	Overfishing is Unlikely (< 40%) to be occurring

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



(a) Total annual catches for JMD 3 and JMD 7; (b) positive catch standardised catch per unit effort (CPUE) index for *T. declivis* in JMA 7 (calculated from observer data using the subset of tows where length frequency sampling permits estimation of catch by species) relative to the agreed conceptual reference points. The green, orange, and red dashed lines represent the interim target, soft limit, and hard limit, respectively. (c) Annual relative exploitation rate (catch/CPUE).

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	CPUE increased from 2010 to 2017, was stable to 2021, decreased in 2022 and 2023 to a level comparable with the mid-2010 period, but increased in 2024 to the level reached in 2017 to 2021
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Relative fishing intensity for the combined JMD 3+7 stock has been below the overfishing threshold since 2011
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or	Current catch

TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) in the short term Hard Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) in the short term
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unknown


Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 2 – Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	CPUE analysis	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2025	Next assessment: 2027
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Observer catch records and length frequency samples	1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	- Catch at age	2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: the methods used for producing scaled catch at age distributions require review
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	- Species-specific CPUE has replaced a combined species analysis -The JMA 7 series is assumed to index abundance of a stock that includes <i>T. declivis</i> in JMA 3 as well as JMA 7	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	-	

Qualifying Comments
-

Fishery Interactions
JMA 3 and 7 catches are primarily taken by midwater trawl. In JMA 7, availability of ACE for kingfish, blue mackerel and snapper potentially influences targeting in some sub-areas. Incidental captures of protected species have been recorded for New Zealand fur seals and cetaceans.

- JMA 7 - *T. novaezealandiae*

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2025	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Medium	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2023–24	Catch: 6842 t
Assessment Runs Presented	Event resolution CPUE index from observer data from jack mackerel target midwater trawls with length frequency sampling (JMN7 MW observer)	
Reference Points	Management Target: the geometric mean CPUE for the period 2006–2012 (a conceptual proxy for B_{MSY}) Soft Limit: 20% B_0 ; scaled from management target Hard Limit: 10% B_0 ; scaled from management target Overfishing threshold: F_{MSY} compatible proxy based on the mean relative exploitation rate for the period 2006–2012	
Status in relation to Target	Likely (> 60%) to be at or above the target	
Status in relation to Limits	Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below both the soft and hard limits	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Overfishing is Unlikely (< 40%) to be occurring	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status

(a) Annual catches for JMN 7; (b) combined (binomial/positive catch) standardised catch per unit effort (CPUE) index for *T. novaezealandiae* in JMA 7 (calculated from observer data using the subset of tows where length frequency sampling permits estimation of catch by species) relative to the agreed reference points. (c) Annual relative exploitation rate (catch/CPUE).

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	CPUE increased from 2010 to 2018 and has fluctuated without trend to 2024
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Relative fishing intensity declined from 2011 to 2018 and has been below the overfishing threshold since 2011
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis

Stock Projections or Prognosis	Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Current catch Soft Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) in the short term Hard Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) in the short term
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unknown

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation

Assessment Type	Level 2 – Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	CPUE analysis	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2025	Next assessment: 2027
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Observer catch records	

	and length frequency samples	1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	- Catch at age	2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: the methods used for producing scaled catch at age distributions require re-evaluation
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	- Species-specific CPUE has replaced a combined species analysis	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	-	

Qualifying Comments

Availability of JMN to the fleet is variable due to spatial restrictions that prevent the JMA fleet from operating inshore. As a result the recent drop in CPUE could be due to availability rather than abundance.

Fishery Interactions

JMA 7 catches are primarily taken by midwater trawl. Availability of ACE for kingfish and snapper potentially influences targeting in some sub-areas. Incidental captures of protected species have been recorded for New Zealand fur seals and cetaceans.

7. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Abraham, E R; Berkenbusch, K; Richard, Y; Thompson, F (2016) Summary of the capture of seabirds, mammals, and turtles in New Zealand commercial fisheries, 2002–03 to 2012–13. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 169*. 205 p.
- Abraham, E R; Richard, Y (2017) Summary of the capture of seabirds in New Zealand commercial fisheries, 2002–03 to 2013–14. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 184*. 88 p.
- Abraham, E R; Richard, Y (2018) Estimated capture of seabirds in New Zealand trawl and longline fisheries, 2002–03 to 2014–15. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 197*. 97 p.
- Abraham, E R; Richard, Y (2020) Estimated capture of seabirds in New Zealand trawl and longline fisheries, to 2017–18. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 249*. 86 p.
- Abraham, E R; Tremblay-Boyer, L; Berkenbusch, K (2021) Estimated captures of New Zealand fur seal, common dolphin, and turtles in New Zealand commercial fisheries, 2002–03 to 2012–13. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 258*. 98 p.
- Abraham, E R; Thompson, F N (2009) Capture of protected species in New Zealand trawl and longline fisheries, 1998–99 to 2006–07. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 32*. 197 p.
- Abraham, E R; Thompson, F N (2011) Summary of the capture of seabirds, marine mammals, and turtles in New Zealand commercial fisheries, 1998–99 to 2008–09. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 80*.
- Abraham, E R; Thompson, F N; Berkenbusch, K (2013) Estimated capture of seabirds in New Zealand trawl and longline fisheries, 2002–03 to 2010–11. (Unpublished Final Research Report for Ministry for Primary Industries project PRO2010-01 held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Abraham, E R; Thompson, F N; Oliver, M D (2010) Summary of the capture of seabirds, mammals, and turtles in New Zealand commercial fisheries, 1998–99 to 2007–08. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 45*. 149 p.
- Anderson, O F; Edwards, C T T; Roux, M-J (2017) Fish and invertebrate bycatch and discards in New Zealand jack mackerel trawl fisheries from 2002–03 until 2013–14. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 177*. 71 p.
- Baird, S J; Hewitt, J E; Wood, B A (2015) Benthic habitat classes and trawl fishing disturbance in New Zealand waters shallower than 250 m. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 144*. 184 p.
- Baird, S J; Mules, R (2019) Extent of bottom contact by New Zealand commercial trawl fishing for deepwater Tier 1 and Tier 2 target species determined using CatchMapper software, fishing years 2008–17. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 229*. 106 p.
- Baird, S J; Mules, R (2021a) Extent of bottom contact by commercial fishing activity in New Zealand waters, for 1989–90 to 2017–18. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 259*. 143 p.
- Baird, S J; Mules, R (2021b) Extent of bottom contact by commercial trawling and dredging in New Zealand waters, 1989–90 to 2018–19. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 260*. 157 p.
- Baird, S J; Wood, B A (2012) Extent of coverage of 15 environmental classes within the New Zealand EEZ by commercial trawling with sea-floor contact. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 89*. 43 p.
- Baird, S J; Wood, B A (2018) Extent of bottom contact by New Zealand commercial trawl fishing for deepwater Tier 1 and Tier 2 target fishstocks, 1989–90 to 2015–16. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 193*. 102 p.
- Baird, S J; Wood, B A; Bagley, N W (2011) Nature and extent of commercial fishing effort on or near the seafloor within the New Zealand 200 n. mile Exclusive Economic Zone, 1989–90 to 2004–05. *New Zealand Aquatic Environmental and Biodiversity Report No. 73*. 143 p.
- Baker, C S; Boren, L; Childerhouse, S; Constantine, R; van Helden, A; Lundquist, D; Rayment, W; Rolfe, J R (2019) Conservation status of New Zealand marine mammals, 2019. *New Zealand Threat Classification Series 29*. Department of Conservation, Wellington. 18 p.
- Baker, C S; Chilvers, B L; Childerhouse, S; Constantine, R; Currey, R; Mattlin, R; van Helden, A; Hitchmough, R; Rolfe, J (2016) Conservation status of New Zealand marine mammals, 2013. *New Zealand Threat Classification Series 14*. Department of Conservation, Wellington. 18 p.

- Baker, C S; Chilvers, B L; Constantine, R; DuFresne, S; Mattlin, R H; van Helden, A; Hitchmough, R (2010) Conservation status of New Zealand marine mammals (suborders Cetacea and Pinnipedia), 2009. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 44: 101–115.
- Ballara, S L; Anderson, O F (2009) Fish discards and non-target fish catch in the trawl fisheries for arrow squid and scampi in New Zealand waters. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 38*. 102 p.
- Basten, J C (1981) The fishery for jack mackerel (*Trachurus murphyi*) off Northern Chile. Theses, Dissertations and Student Research Papers (College of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences), School of Oceanography, Oregon State University, June 1981. 65 p.
- Bertrand, A; Barbieri, M A; Córdova, J; Hernández, C; Gómez, F; Leiva, F (2004) Diel vertical behaviour, predator-prey relationships, and occupation of space by jack mackerel (*Trachurus murphyi*) off Chile. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 61: 1105–1112.
- Bertrand, A; Barbieri, M A; Gerlotto, F; Leiva, F; Córdova, J (2006) Determinism and plasticity of fish schooling behaviour as exemplified by the South Pacific jack mackerel *Trachurus murphyi*. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 311: 145–156.
- Black, J; Tilney, R (2015) Monitoring New Zealand's trawl footprint for deepwater fisheries: 1989–1990 to 2010–2011. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 142*. 56 p.
- Black, J; Tilney, R (2017) Monitoring New Zealand's trawl footprint for deepwater fisheries: 1989–90 to 2012–13. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 176*. 65 p.
- Black, J; Wood, R; Berthelsen, T; Tilney, R (2013) Monitoring New Zealand's trawl footprint for deepwater fisheries: 1989–1990 to 2009–2010. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 110*. 57 p.
- Boyd, R O; Gowing, L; Reilly, J L (2004) 2000–2001 national marine recreational fishing survey: diary results and harvest estimates. (Unpublished New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Report for the Ministry of Fisheries Project REC2000-01 held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 92 p.
- Boyd, R O; Reilly, J L (2004) 1999/2000 National Marine Recreational Fishing Survey: harvest estimates. (Unpublished New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Report for the Ministry of Fisheries Project REC9803 held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 28 p.
- Bradford, E (1996) A comparison of the 1993-94 diary and boat ramp surveys of recreational fishing in the Ministry of Fisheries North region New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 96/5. 21 p. (Unpublished report held by NIWA library.)
- Bradford, E (1997) Estimated recreational catches from Ministry of Fisheries North region marine recreational fishing surveys, 1993–94. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1997/7. 16 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Bradford, E (1998) Harvest estimates from the 1996 national recreational fishing surveys. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document. 1998/16. 27 p. (Unpublished report held by NIWA library.)
- Bradford, E; Taylor P R (1995) Trends in pelagic fish abundance from aerial sightings data. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1995/8. 60 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Brothers, N; Duckworth, A R; Safina, C; Gilman, E L (2010) Seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries is grossly underestimated when using only haul data. *PloS One* 5: e12491. Doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0012491.
- Chapman, D G; Robson, D S (1960) The analysis of a catch curve. *Biometrics* 16: 354–368.
- Cummings, V J; Lundquist, C J; Dunn, M R; Francis, M; Horn, P; Law, C; Pinkerton, M H; Sutton, P; Tracey, D; Hansen, L; Mielbrecht, E (2021). Assessment of potential effects of climate-related changes in coastal and offshore waters on New Zealand's seafood sector. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 261*. 153 p.
- Davey, N; Hartill, B; Carter, M (2019) Mean weight estimates for recreational fisheries in 2017–18. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/25*. 32 p.
- Davey, N K; Johnson, K S; Maggs, J Q (2024) Mean weight estimates for recreational fisheries in 2022–23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/28*. 39 p.
- Department of Internal Affairs (2006) Seabird Scaring Devices – Circular Issued Under Authority of the Fisheries (Commercial Fishing) Amendment Regulations 2006 (No. F361). *New Zealand Gazette* 6 April 2006: 842–846.
- Dunn, M R; Stevens, D W; Forman, J S; Connell, A (2013) Trophic Interactions and Distribution of Some Squaliforme Sharks, Including New Diet Descriptions for *Deania calcea* and *Squalus acanthias*. *PloS ONE* 8(3): e59938. Doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0059938.
- Dunn, M R; Szabo, A; McVeagh, M S; Smith, P J (2010) The diet of deepwater sharks and the benefits of using DNA identification of prey. *Deep-Sea Research* 157: 923–930.
- Edwards, C T T; Peatman, T; Goad D; Webber, D N (2023) Update to the risk assessment for New Zealand seabirds. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 314*. 66 p.
- Elizarov, A A; Grechina, A S; Botenev, B N; Kuzetsov, A N (1993) Peruvian jack mackerel, *Trachurus symmetricus*, in the open waters of the South Pacific. *Journal of Ichthyology* 33(3): 86–104.
- Finucci, B; Anderson, O F; Edwards, C T T (2022) Non-target fish and invertebrate catch and discards in New Zealand jack mackerel trawl fisheries from 2002–03 to 2018–19. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 279*. 81 p.
- Francis, M P; Hurst, R J; McArdle, B; Bagley, N W; Anderson, O F (2002) New Zealand demersal fish assemblages. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 65: 215–234.
- Fisheries New Zealand (2021) Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Annual Review 2021. Compiled by the Aquatic Environment Team, Fisheries Science and Information, Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand. 779 p.
- Godfriaux, B L (1968) The food and feeding relationships of snapper (*Chrysophrys auratus*) and some other fish-species trawled in Hauraki Gulf. (Unpublished MSc (Hons) thesis, Victoria University of Wellington.)
- Godfriaux, B L (1970) Food of predatory demersal fish in Hauraki Gulf. II. Five fish species associated with snapper. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 4: 248–266.
- Hartill, B; Davey, N (2015) Mean weight estimates for recreational fisheries in 2011–12. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/25*. 37 p.
- Hartill, B; Middleton, D A J; Walsh, C; Spong, K; Ó Maolagáin, C (2022) Catch-at-age sampling of *Trachurus novaezelandiae* from JMA 1 in 2019–20 and 2020–21. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/37*. 16 p.
- Heinemann A; Gray, A (2024) National Panel Survey of Recreational Marine Fishers 2022–23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/51*. 116 p.
- Hermesen, J M; Collie, J S; Valentine, P C (2003) Mobile fishing gear reduces benthic megafaunal production on Georges Bank. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 260: 97–108.
- Hiddink, J G; Jennings, S; Kaiser, M J; Queiros, A M; Duplisea, D E; Piet, G J (2006) Cumulative impacts of seabed trawl disturbance on benthic biomass, production, and species richness in different habitats. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 63: 721–36.
- Horn, P L (1991a) Assessment of jack mackerel stocks off the central west coast, New Zealand, for the 1990–91 fishing year. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1991/6. 14 p. (Unpublished report held in NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Horn, P L (1991b) Trawl survey of jack mackerels (*Trachurus* spp.) off the central west coast, New Zealand, February-March 1990. *New Zealand Fisheries Technical Report No. 28*. 39 p.
- Horn, P L (1993) Growth, age structure, and productivity of jack mackerels (*Trachurus* spp.) in New Zealand waters. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 27: 145–155.

- Horn, P L; Hulston, D; Ó Maolagáin, C (2014) Commercial catch sampling for species proportion, sex, length, and age of jack mackerels in JMA 3 in the 2012–13 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/57*. 16 p.
- Horn, P L; Ó Maolagáin, C (2020) Age determination protocols for jack mackerels (*Trachurus* spp.) in New Zealand waters. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2020/07*. 22 p.
- Horn, P L; Ó Maolagáin, C (2021) The growth and age structure of Chilean jack mackerel (*Trachurus murphyi*) following its influx to New Zealand waters. *Journal of fish biology*, 98(4), 1144–1154. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfb.14647>
- Hurst, R J (1980) Studies on the life cycle of some New Zealand Anisakidae (Nematoda). Unpublished PhD thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand. 212 p.
- Hurst, R J; Stevenson, M L; Bagley, N W; Griggs, L H; Morrison, M A; Francis, M P (2000) Areas of importance for spawning, pupping or egg-laying, and juveniles of New Zealand coastal fish. (Unpublished Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project ENV1999/03 held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Jennings, S; Dinmore, T A; Duplisea, D E; Warr, K J; Lancaster, J E (2001) Trawling disturbance can modify benthic production processes. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 70: 459–475.
- Jones, J B (1988) Jack mackerels. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1988/19. 19 p. (Unpublished report held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Jones, J B (1990) Jack mackerels (*Trachurus* spp.) in New Zealand waters. *New Zealand Fisheries Technical Report No. 23*. 28 p.
- Kawahara, S; Uozumi, Y; Yamada, H (1988) First record of a carangid fish, *Trachurus murphyi* from New Zealand. *Japanese Journal of Ichthyology* 35(2): 212–214.
- Langley, A D; Middleton, D A J (2019) Determination of the species composition of the JMA 1 purse seine catch. NINSWG-2019-04. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Langley, A D; Middleton, D A J; Wilson, O L (2016) Species composition of the jack mackerel (genus *Trachurus*) catch from the JMA 1 purse seine fishery, 2005/06 to 2013/14. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2016/11*. 33 p.
- Leathwick, J R; Rowden, A; Nodder, S; Gorman, R; Bardsley, S; Pinkerton, M; Baird, S J; Hadfield, M; Currie, K; Goh, A (2012) A Benthic-optimised Marine Environment Classification (BOMEC) for New Zealand waters. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 88*. 54 p.
- MacGibbon, D J; Mules, R (2023) Extent and intensity of bottom contact by commercial trawling and shellfish dredging in New Zealand waters, 1990–2021. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 316*. 174 p
- McKenzie, A (2008) Standardised CPUE analyses for *Trachurus declivis* and *Trachurus novaezealandiae* in the JMA 7 jack mackerel fishery to 2004–05. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/46*. 36 p.
- McKenzie, A (2009) Preliminary stock assessments for *Trachurus declivis* and *T. novaezealandiae* in the JMA 7 jack mackerel fishery to 2005–06. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2009/28*. 39 p.
- MacKenzie, D; Fletcher, D (2006) Characterisation of seabird captures in commercial trawl and longline fisheries in New Zealand 1997/98 to 2003/04. Final Research Report for ENV2004/04, held by Ministry of Fisheries, New Zealand. 102 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Middleton, D A J (2022) An evaluation of species composition sampling in the JMA 7 trawl fishery. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/20*. 39 p.
- Middleton, D A J (2016) Species composition of the jack mackerel (genus *Trachurus*) catch from the JMA 1 purse seine fishery, 2005/06 to 2013/14. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2016/11*. 33 p.
- Middleton, D A J (2026) A rapid update of CPUE for jack mackerels in JMA 7 to 2024. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2026/08.63 p.
- Middleton, D A J; Abraham, E R (2007) The efficacy of warp strike mitigation devices: Trials in the 2006 squid fishery. (Unpublished Final Research Report for research project IPA2006/02 held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Middleton, D A J; Neubauer, P (2025) Characterisation and CPUE analyses for jack mackerels in the JMA 3 fishery up to 2024. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2025/50*. 431 p.
- Middleton, D A J; Neubauer, P; Wells, R H; Starr, P J (2024) Characterisation and CPUE analyses for jack mackerels in the JMA 7 fishery up to 2022. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/41*. 380 p.
- Moore, B R; Ó Maolagáin, C; Spong, K; Saunders, R J (2024) Commercial catch sampling for species proportion, sex, length, and age of jack mackerels in JMA 7 in the 2020–21 fishing year, with a summary of all available datasets. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/08*. 33 p.
- Morgan, M J; Deblois, E M; Rose, G A. (1997) An observation on the reaction of Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) in a spawning shoal to bottom trawling. Conference - Symposium on the Biology and Ecology of Northwest Atlantic Cod, St. John's, NF (Canada), 24–28 Oct 1994.
- Morgan, M J; Wilson, C E; Crim, L W (1999) The effect of stress on reproduction in Atlantic cod. *Journal of Fish Biology* 54(3): 477–488.
- Neubauer, P; Middleton, D A J (in prep) Bayesian mixture models for simultaneous estimation of growth parameters and species assignment for species that are frequently mis-identified.
- Reiss, H; Greenstreet, S P R; Seibe, K; Ehrich, S; Piet, G J; Quirijns, F; Robinson, L; Wolff, W K; Kronke, I (2009) Effects of fishing disturbance on benthic communities and secondary production within an intensively fished area. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 394: 201–213.
- Rice, J (2006) Impacts of Mobile Bottom Gears on Seafloor Habitats, Species, and Communities: A Review and Synthesis of Selected International Reviews. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Research Document 2006/057. 35 p. (Available from http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/CSAS/Csas/DocREC/2006/RES2006_057_e.pdf.)
- Richard, Y; Abraham, E R (2013) Risk of commercial fisheries to New Zealand seabird populations. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 109*. 58 p.
- Richard, Y; Abraham, E R (2015) Assessment of the risk of commercial fisheries to New Zealand seabirds, 2006–07 to 2012–13. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 162*. 85 p
- Richard, Y; Abraham, E R; Berkenbusch, K (2017) Assessment of the risk of commercial fisheries to New Zealand seabirds, 2006–07 to 2014–15. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 191*. 133 p.
- Richard, Y; Abraham, E R; Berkenbusch, K (2020) Estimated capture of seabirds in New Zealand trawl and longline fisheries, to 2017–18. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 249*. 90 p.
- Robertson, D A (1978) The New Zealand jack mackerel fishery. In Habib, G. and Roberts, P.E. (Eds.). Proceedings of the pelagic fisheries conference, July 1977. *FRD Occasional Publication No. 15*. pp. 43–47.
- Robertson, H A; Baird, K A; Elliott, G P; Hitchmough, R A; McArthur, N J; Makan, T D; Miskelly, C M; O'Donnell, C F J; Sagar, P M; Scofield, R P; Taylor, G A; Michel, P (2021) Conservation status of birds in Aotearoa New Zealand, 2021. *New Zealand Threat Classification Series* 36. Department of Conservation, Wellington. 43 p.
- Rohan, V M; Mittinty, M; Taylor, P R (2006) Aspects of estimating species proportions in the jack mackerel fishery: JMA 7 estimates using a Bayesian approach and examination of sampling bias in JMA 1 resulting from automated grading. Final Research Report for Specific Objective 7 of project JMA2004/01: Stock monitoring of jack mackerels. PELWG06/09. 26 p. (Unpublished report held by Ministry for Primary Industries, Wellington.)

- Saunders, R; Horn, P L; Ó Maolagáin, C; Hulston, D (2021) Commercial catch sampling for species proportion, sex, length, and age of jack mackerels in JMA 7 in the 2018–19 fishing year, with a summary of all available data sets. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2021/05*. 29 p.
- Saunders, R J; Ó Maolagáin, C; Hulston D; Spong K (2022) Commercial catch sampling for species proportion, sex, length, and age of jack mackerels in JMA 7 in the 2019–20 fishing year, with a summary of all available data sets. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/52*. 26 p.
- Smith, M H (2011) Catch curves for JMA species in JMA 7. DWWG-2011/27. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 6 p.
- Stevens, D W; Hurst, R J; Bagley, N W (2011) Feeding habits of New Zealand fishes: a literature review and summary of research trawl database records 1960 to 2000. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 85*. 218 p.
- Taylor, P R (2000) Species composition and seasonal variability in commercial catches and aerial sightings of jack mackerel, *Trachurus declivis*, *T. symmetricus murphyi*, and *T. novaezelandiae*, in JMA 1, JMA 3, and JMA 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/45*. 25 p.
- Taylor, P R (2002a) Stock structure and population biology of the Peruvian jack mackerel, *Trachurus symmetricus murphyi*. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2002/21*. 78 p.
- Taylor, P R (2002b) Species composition and seasonality of jack mackerel (*Trachurus declivis*, *T. symmetricus murphyi*, and *T. novaezelandiae*) in commercial catches from JMA 1, 3, and 7 during 1998–99 and 1999–2000, with a summary of biological information from 1990–91 to 1999–2000. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2002/51*. 72 p.
- Taylor, P R (2004) Species composition and seasonal variability in commercial catches of jack mackerel (*Trachurus declivis*, *T. symmetricus murphyi*, and *T. novaezelandiae*) in JMA 1, JMA 3, and JMA 7 during 2000–01. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2004/28*. 22 p.
- Taylor, P R (2008) Factors affecting fish size and landed volumes in the purse-seine and TCEPR charter-boat fisheries in 2004–05 and 2005–06. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/32*. 17 p.
- Taylor, P R (2014) Developing indices of relative abundance from observational aerial sightings of inshore pelagic finfish; Part 1, exploring the data. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/34*. 66 p.
- Taylor, P R; Horn, P L; O'Maolagáin, C (2012) Commercial catch sampling for species proportion, sex, length, and age of jack mackerels in JMA 1 in the 2006–07, 2007–08 and 2008–09 fishing years. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2012/48*. 36 p.
- Taylor, P R; Julian, K A (2008) Species composition and seasonal variability in commercial catches of jack mackerel (*Trachurus declivis*, *T. murphyi* and *T. novaezelandiae*) in JMA 1, 3, and 7 during 2004–05. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/25*. 24 p.
- Teirney, L D; Kilner, A R; Millar, R E; Bradford, E; Bell, J D (1997) Estimation of recreational catch from 1991/92 to 1993/94. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1997/15. 43 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Thompson, F N; Abraham, E R (2009) Dolphin bycatch in New Zealand trawl fisheries, 1995–96 to 2006–07. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No.36*. 24 p.
- Thompson, F N; Abraham, E R; Oliver, M D (2010) Estimation of fur seal bycatch in New Zealand trawl fisheries, 2002–03 to 2007–08. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 56*. 39 p.
- Thompson, F N; Berkenbusch, K; Abraham, E R (2013) Marine mammal bycatch in New Zealand trawl fisheries, 1995–96 to 2010–11. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 105*. 73 p.
- Tuck, I; Cole, R; Devine, J (2009) Ecosystem indicators for New Zealand fisheries. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 42*. 188 p.
- Waitangi Tribunal (1988) Muriwhenua Fishing Report. *Report of the Waitangi Tribunal on the Muriwhenua Fishing Claim (WAI 22)*. 371 p.
- Walsh, C; Bian, R; McKenzie, J M; Miller, A; Spong, K; Armiger, H (2012) Species composition and seasonal variability in commercial purse-seine catches of jack mackerel (*Trachurus declivis*, *T. murphyi*, and *T. novaezelandiae*) in JMA 1 between January 2009 and September 2011. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2012/46*. 41 p.
- Walsh, C; Bian, R; McKenzie, J; Spong, K; Armiger, H (2016) Species composition and seasonal variability in commercial purse-seine catches of jack mackerel (*Trachurus declivis*, *T. murphyi*, and *T. novaezelandiae*) in JMA 1 between January 2011 and September 2013. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2016/10*. 44 p.
- Webber, D N; Starr, P J (2022) Characterisation and CPUE from 1989–90 to 2018–19 of jack mackerel off the west coast of New Zealand (JMA 7). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/06*. 65p
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–2018. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/24*. 104 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Hill, L; Heinemann, A (2014) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2011–12: Harvest Estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/67*. 139 p.
- Zhou, S; Yin, S; Thorson, J T; Smith, A D; Fuller, M (2012) Linking fishing mortality reference points to life history traits: an empirical study. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 69: 1292–1301.

JOHN DORY (JDO)*(Zeus faber)*

Kuparu

**1. FISHERY SUMMARY**

John dory was introduced into the QMS on 1 October 1986; current allowances, TACCs, and TACs are summarised in Table 1. The TACCs for JDO 1, JDO 2, and JDO 3 were increased gradually during the late 1980s and early 1990s. The TACC for JDO 2 was reduced on 1 October 2024. The TACC for JDO 7 was increased from 131 to 150 t in October 2012, and to 190 t on 1 October 2016. The TACC for JDO 10 has remained unchanged since 1986.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs, and TACs (t) for John dory by Fishstock from 1 October 2024.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
JDO 1	36	15	18	354	423
JDO 2	2	1	14	135	152
JDO 3*				31.9	
JDO 7	4	2	11	230	247
JDO 10*				10	

* allowances and TAC not set

1.1 Commercial fisheries

John dory are taken mainly as a bycatch of the trawl and Danish seine fisheries. In recent years, around 50–65% of the total reported catch has been taken in JDO 1 and around 20% taken in JDO 2. Reported landings for the main QMAs from 1931 to 1982 are given in Table 2. Recent reported landings by Fishstock are given in Table 3, and the historical landings and TACC values for the three main JDO stocks are depicted in Figure 1.

The increase in JDO 1 landings after 1986–87 is largely attributed to increased targeting of John dory by trawl and Danish seine. Annual catches reached a peak during 1994–95 to 1996–97, at about the level of the TACC of 704 t. There was a general decline in annual landings over the subsequent years. During 2009–10 to 2017–18, landings were maintained at about 350 t per annum, but in 2018–19 (when the TACC was lowered to 354 t) landings dropped below 300 t for the first time since 1975. Landings declined to 193 t by 2023–24. Most of the decline in John dory catch occurred in the Hauraki Gulf-East Northland fishery. Annual catches from the west coast (FMA 9) were maintained at about 80–140 t over the 25 year period from 1990–91, predominantly as a bycatch of the snapper,

red gurnard, and trevally trawl fisheries. Annual catches from the Bay of Plenty fishery (trawl and Danish seine) were about 80–120 t during the same period.

Annual landings in JDO 2 have never exceeded the TACC and, in the mid-90s, were around 50% of the TACC in each year (Figure 1). From 1999–00 to 2002–03 landings were above 200 t, but, in recent years landings have decreased, being below 150 t since 2009–10. The TACC was reduced to 135 t in 2024–25. Landings from JDO 2 are considered to be approximately equally split between FMAs 2 and 8. Substantial proportions of John dory landings are taken as bycatch in target trawl fisheries for jack mackerels in FMA 8, and as tarakihi and red gurnard bycatch in FMA 2.

Table 2: Reported landings (t) for the main QMAs from 1931 to 1982.

Year	JDO 1	JDO 2	JDO 3	JDO 7	Year	JDO 1	JDO 2	JDO 3	JDO 7
1931–32	70	0	0	0	1957	110	37	0	20
1932–33	60	0	0	0	1958	132	54	0	40
1933–34	57	0	0	0	1959	157	64	0	50
1934–35	42	0	0	0	1960	158	81	0	53
1935–36	92	0	0	0	1961	156	76	0	52
1936–37	105	4	0	1	1962	150	87	0	38
1937–38	80	3	0	0	1963	114	96	0	44
1938–39	78	3	1	0	1964	112	85	1	30
1939–40	40	5	0	0	1965	111	101	0	32
1940–41	0	2	1	1	1966	148	110	0	37
1941–42	0	7	1	3	1967	162	102	0	41
1942–43	3	4	3	3	1968	203	83	0	36
1943–44	12	4	3	3	1969	189	96	0	19
1944	11	7	2	5	1970	259	137	0	24
1945	12	6	0	1	1971	234	141	1	38
1946	27	7	0	3	1972	213	122	0	34
1947	23	12	2	12	1973	259	99	0	30
1948	21	20	1	1	1974	340	101	0	28
1949	22	79	0	4	1975	261	92	0	22
1950	17	65	0	6	1976	362	135	0	55
1951	5	38	0	2	1977	315	141	0	73
1952	34	50	0	5	1978	392	119	0	24
1953	163	62	0	7	1979	503	121	0	29
1954	181	52	0	25	1980	563	173	0	26
1955	162	50	0	24	1981	646	186	0	38
1956	175	46	0	24	1982	577	162	0	28

Notes:

1. The 1931–1943 years are April–March but from 1944 onwards are calendar years.
2. Data up to 1985 are from fishing returns; data from 1986 to 1990 are from Quota Management Reports.
3. Data for the period 1931 to 1982 are based on reported landings by harbour and are likely to be underestimated as a result of under-reporting and discarding practices. Data includes both foreign and domestic landings. Data were aggregated to FMA using methods and assumptions described by Francis & Paul (2013).

Table 3: Reported landings (t) of John dory by Fishstock from 1983–84 to present and actual TACCs (t) for 1986–87 to present. QMS data from 1986–present. [Continued on next page]

Fishstock FMA (s)	JDO 1 1 & 9		JDO 2 2 & 8		JDO 3 3, 4, 5 & 6		JDO 7 7	
	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC
1983–84*	659	–	131	–	1	–	35	–
1984–85*	620	–	110	–	0	–	36	–
1985–86*	531	–	158	–	1	–	45	–
1986–87	409	510	168	240	3	30	57	70
1987–88	476	633	192	246	1	30	89	75
1988–89	480	662	151	253	6	30	47	82
1989–90	494	704	152	262	1	30	54	88
1990–91	505	704	171	269	1	31	53	88
1991–92	562	704	214	269	1	31	60	88
1992–93	578	704	217	269	8	31	50	91
1993–94	640	704	186	269	2	32	37	91
1994–95	721	704	140	270	3	32	30	91
1995–96	696	704	139	270	< 1	32	42	91
1996–97	689	704	140	270	< 1	32	35	91
1997–98	651	704	134	270	< 1	32	26	91
1998–99	672	704	182	270	< 1	32	34	91
1999–00	519	704	235	270	< 1	32	71	91

JOHN DORY (JDO) – May 2026

Table 3 [Continued]:

Fishstock FMA (s)	JDO 1		JDO 2		JDO 3		JDO 7	
	1 & 9		2 & 8		3, 4, 5 & 6		7	
	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC
2000–01	497	704	217	270	1	32	104	91
2001–02	453	704	240	270	4	32	124	91
2002–03	440	704	239	270	2	32	114	91
2003–04	492	704	184	270	< 1	32	155	91
2004–05	561	704	182	270	1	32	133	114
2005–06	549	704	159	270	1	32	124	114
2006–07	544	704	143	270	1	32	127	114
2007–08	482	704	133	270	< 1	32	110	114
2008–09	411	704	136	270	< 1	32	116	114
2009–10	359	704	152	270	< 1	32	109	125
2010–11	386	704	138	270	< 1	32	112	125
2011–12	351	704	131	270	< 1	32	126	125
2012–13	365	704	138	270	< 1	32	128	150
2013–14	349	704	142	270	< 1	32	151	150
2014–15	354	704	147	270	< 1	32	150	150
2015–16	342	704	129	270	< 1	32	151	190
2016–17	361	704	139	270	1	32	177	190
2017–18	322	704	135	270	1	32	203	190
2018–19	279	354	135	270	1	32	197	209
2019–20	255	354	124	270	1	32	178	230
2020–21	287	354	101	270	2	32	189	230
2021–22	271	354	98	270	2	32	179	230
2022–23	235	354	90	270	1	32	158	230
2023–24	193	354	112	270	1	32	150	230
2024–25	208	354	118	135	2	32	188	230

Fishstock FMA (s)	JDO 10		Total	
	10			
	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC
1983–84*	0	–	826	–
1984–85*	0	–	766	–
1985–86*	0	–	735	–
1986–87	< 1	10	638	860
1987–88	0	10	758	994
1988–89	0	10	684	1 037
1989–90	0	10	701	1 094
1990–91	0	10	730	1 102
1991–92	0	10	837	1 102
1992–93	0	10	853	1 105
1993–94	0	10	865	1 106
1994–95	0	10	894	1 107
1995–96	0	10	877	1 107
1996–97	0	10	864	1 107
1997–98	0	10	811	1 107
1998–99	0	10	889	1 107
1999–00	0	10	826	1 107
2000–01	0	10	819	1 107
2001–02	0	10	819	1 107
2002–03	0	10	795	1 107
2003–04	0	10	832	1 107
2004–05	0	10	877	1 129
2005–06	0	10	833	1 129
2006–07	0	10	815	1 129
2007–08	0	10	725	1 129
2008–09	0	10	663	1 129
2009–10	0	10	620	1 140
2010–11	0	10	637	1 140
2011–12	0	10	609	1 140
2012–13	0	10	633	1 165
2013–14	0	10	642	1 165
2014–15	0	10	652	1 165
2015–16	0	10	622	1 205
2016–17	0	10	678	1 205
2017–18	0	10	661	1 205
2018–19	0	10	612	874
2019–20	0	10	558	895
2020–21	0	10	579	895
2021–22	0	10	550	895
2022–23	0	10	484	895
2023–24	0	10	457	895
2024–25	0	10	516	761

* FSU data.

Landings from JDO 7 increased markedly after 1999–2000, as a result of increasing abundance. JDO 7 catch is taken largely as a bycatch of FMA 7 trawl fisheries. The JDO 7 TACC has been increased six times since 2003–04 and is currently 230 t (Table 3). Landings in 2017–18 exceeded the TACC by 13 t but have remained below the increased TACCs since then.

Overall, the majority of John dory catch is reported from the snapper bottom trawl fishery (16%), followed by the John dory bottom trawl (14%), and the tarakihi bottom trawl fisheries (14%). Danish seine accounts for the second largest John dory catch across fishing methods.




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the three main JDO stocks. JDO 1 (Auckland East), JDO 2 (Central East), and JDO 7 (Challenger).

Catches of John dory in JDO 1 are predominantly taken by bottom trawl in the snapper (23%), John dory (19%), and trevally (10%) target fisheries. Danish seine, bottom pair trawl, and bottom longline comprise the remaining John dory catch by fishing method. John dory in JDO 2 are taken predominantly by bottom trawl targeting tarakihi (30%) and gurnard (25%), with midwater and set net fishing methods comprising the remainder of the catch. John dory in JDO 7 is predominantly caught by bottom trawl targeting flatfish (25%), barracouta (23%), and tarakihi (18%). Throughout the North Island, the trawl and Danish seine fisheries targeting John dory take the majority of their catch when targeting snapper (33%) followed by the John dory target fishery (23%). No data were available for JDO set net fisheries in the South Island.

1.2 Recreational fisheries

John dory is an important recreational species in the north of New Zealand. They are caught using line fishing methods, predominantly by rod and reel with some longline catch.

1.2.1 Management controls

The main method used to manage recreational harvests of John dory is daily bag limits. Fishers can take up to 20 John dory as part of their combined daily bag limit in the Auckland and Kermadec, Central, and Challenger Fishery Management Areas.

1.2.2 Estimates of recreational harvest

There are two broad approaches to estimating recreational fisheries harvest: the use of onsite or access point methods where fishers are surveyed or counted at the point of fishing or access to their fishing activity; and offsite methods where some form of post-event interview and/or diary are used to collect data from fishers.

The first estimates of recreational harvest for John dory were calculated using an offsite approach, the offsite regional telephone and diary survey approach. Estimates for 1996 came from a national telephone and diary survey (Bradford 1998). Another national telephone and diary survey was carried out in 2000 (Boyd & Reilly 2004). The harvest estimates provided by these telephone diary surveys (Table 4) are no longer considered reliable.

In response to the cost and scale challenges associated with onsite methods, in particular the difficulties in sampling other than trailer boat fisheries, offsite approaches to estimating recreational fisheries harvest have been revisited. This led to the development and implementation of a national panel survey for the 2011–12 fishing year (Wynne-Jones et al. 2014). The panel survey used face-to-face interviews of a random sample of New Zealand households to recruit a panel of fishers and non-fishers for a full year. The panel members were contacted regularly about their fishing activities and catch information in standardised phone interviews. The national panel survey was repeated during the 2017–18 and 2022–23 fishing years using very similar methods to produce directly comparable results (Wynne-Jones et al. 2019; Heinemann & Gray 2024). Recreational catch estimates from the three national panel surveys are given in Table 4. Note that national panel survey estimates do not include recreational harvest taken on charter vessel trips or under s111 general approvals.

Table 4: Recreational harvest estimates for John dory stocks. National panel surveys ran throughout the October to September fishing year but are denoted by the January calendar year. Mean fish weights were obtained from boat ramp surveys (see Hartill & Davey 2015, Davey et al. 2019; 2024 for panel survey mean weights).

Stock	Year	Method	Number of fish	Total weight (t)	CV
JDO 1	2012	Panel survey	26 198	32.6	0.14
	2018	Panel survey	21 295	24.8	0.20
	2023	Panel survey	4 813	6.1	0.29
JDO 2	2012	Panel survey	2 000	2.5	0.33
	2018	Panel survey	2 587	3.1	0.34
	2023	Panel survey	1 060	1.4	0.54
JDO 3	2012	Panel survey	88	< 1	1.00
	2018	Panel survey	183	< 1	1.00
	2023	Panel survey	-	-	-
JDO 7	2012	Panel survey	1 351	1.8	0.52
	2018	Panel survey	699	0.8	0.47
	2023	Panel survey	215	0.3	0.72

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

No quantitative information is available on the current level of Māori customary non-commercial catch.

1.4 Illegal catch

No quantitative information is available.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

No quantitative information is available.

2. BIOLOGY

John dory are widespread, being found in the eastern Atlantic Ocean, the Mediterranean Sea, and around New Zealand, Australia, and Japan. They are common in the inshore coastal waters of northern New Zealand and, to a lesser extent in Tasman Bay, to depths of 50 m. In the Hauraki Gulf, adults move to deeper waters during summer and occasional feeding aggregations occur during winter.

John dory are serial spawners (spawning more than once in a season). There appears to be substantial variation in the time of spawning in New Zealand, with spawning occurring between December and April off the northeast coast. The eggs are large and pelagic, taking 12–14 days to hatch. Initially John dory grow rapidly with both males and females reaching 12 to 18 cm standard length (SL) after the first year. From the second year onwards females grow faster than males and reach a greater maximum length. Females mature at a size of 29 to 35 cm SL and in general, larger females mature earlier in the season and are more fecund. Males mature at 23 to 29 cm SL.

M was estimated using the equation $M = \log_e 100/\text{maximum age}$, where maximum age is the age to which 1% of the population survives in an unexploited stock. Using a maximum observed age of 12 years, M was estimated to equal 0.38. Biological parameters relevant to the stock assessment are given in Table 5.

Table 5: Estimates of biological parameters of John dory.

Fishstock	Estimate		Source
<u>1.Weight = a (length)^{b} (Weight in g, length in cm total length)</u>			
Combined sexes	a	b	
JDO 1	0.048	2.7	from <i>Ikatere</i> 2003
<u>2. von Bertalanffy growth parameters</u>			
	Females		
	K	t_0	L_∞
JDO 1	0.425	-0.223	41.13
	Males		
	K	t_0	L_∞
JDO 1	0.48	-0.251	36.4
			Hore (1982)

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

In 2012 the stock structure of John dory was reviewed (Dunn & Jones 2013). The approach evaluated patterns in the distribution of catch and CPUE, research survey biomass trends, location of spawning and nursery grounds, size and age compositions, and anecdotal information from the fishery.

John dory have been caught around most of the North Island and the northern South Island, indicating that the QMA boundaries are not biologically appropriate. The analysis suggested five stocks around New Zealand: (1) Hauraki Gulf and east Northland; (2) Bay of Plenty; (3) west coast North Island; (4) southeast North Island; and (5) northern South Island.

Spawning fish and nursery grounds are found in all five stocks. In addition, off the east coast North Island, CPUE analyses support the separation of the Hauraki Gulf, Bay of Plenty, and Hawke Bay

fisheries, and research trawl survey biomass estimates had different trends in Hauraki Gulf and the Bay of Plenty. Very few John dory are found south of Hawke's Bay on the southeast North Island, providing a gap between the east and west coast components of JDO 2. There is relatively strong evidence to separate the northeast and northwest coasts of JDO 1, including fishery CPUE analyses, length and age compositions, and research trawl survey biomass trends. The distribution of John dory off the west coast North Island is continuous between JDO 1 and the northern part of the west coast JDO 2, and the combination of these areas is also supported by CPUE analyses. There is evidence to separate the northern South Island from stocks to the north including the occurrence of unusually large fish off the northern South Island and CPUE analyses. John dory appear to reach the southern limit of their range off the north and northwest coasts of the South Island.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

4.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

An investigation into the stock structure of New Zealand John dory (Dunn & Jones 2013) supported five biological stocks: (1) Hauraki Gulf and east Northland, (2) Bay of Plenty, (3) west coast North Island, (4) southeast North Island, and (5) northern South Island. The first three stocks are found within JDO 1, the fourth consists of the east coast portion of JDO 2, and the fifth of JDO 7 and the portion of JDO 2 located off the south and east coast of the North Island.

JDO 1

Relative abundance indices have been obtained from trawl surveys of the Bay of Plenty, west coast North Island, and Hauraki Gulf within the JDO 1 Fishstock (Table 6, Figure 2). Six surveys were conducted in the Bay of Plenty starting in 1983 (Morrison et al. 2001a), and twelve in the Hauraki Gulf starting in 1984 (Morrison et al. 2001b) before being discontinued after 1999 and 2000 respectively. There was a change in the configuration of the trawl gear following the 1988 trawl survey which may have resulted in a change in the catchability of John dory part way through the time series. Therefore, surveys conducted between 1982 and 1988 and from 1989 onwards should be considered separately for comparisons of biomass indices to be valid.

Table 6: Estimates of John dory biomass (t) from *Kaharoa* trawl surveys. Estimates are recruited biomass (length ≥ 25 cm TL) for trawl surveys around the North Island, and total biomass for the west coast South Island survey. For the west coast North Island trawl survey, core strata are north of New Plymouth.

Year	Trip code	Biomass (t)	CV(%)	Year	Trip code	Biomass (t)	CV(%)
Bay of Plenty				West coast North Island (core strata)			
1983	KAH8303	105	25	1989	KAH8918	237	12
1985	KAH8506	91	15	1991	KAH9111	455	29
1990	KAH9004	123	18	1994	KAH9410	116	31
1992	KAH9202	213	12	1996	KAH9615	320	16
1996	KAH9601	172	49	1999	KAH9915	182	9
1999	KAH9902	148	15	2018	KAH1806	280	27
2020	KAH2001	81	24	2019	KAH1906	229	20
2021	KAH2101	92	22	2020	KAH2005	154	18
				2022	KAH2205	151	16
				2025	KAH2502	111	15
Hauraki Gulf				West coast South Island			
1984	KAH8421	136	16	1992	KAH9204	102	29
1985	KAH8517	131	13	1994	KAH9404	59	26
1986	KAH8613	100	19	1995	KAH9504	27	36
1988	KAH8810	385	39	1997	KAH9701	17	31
1989	KAH8917	206	20	2000	KAH0004	141	16
1990	KAH9016	192	18	2003	KAH0304	288	19
1992	KAH9212	166	37	2005	KAH0503	222	14
1993	KAH9311	320	27	2007	KAH0704	174	26
1994	KAH9411	221	13	2009	KAH0904	269	23
1997	KAH9720	287	20	2011	KAH1104	378	18
2000	KAH0012	188	29	2013	KAH1305	231	21
2019	KAH1907	187	15	2015	KAH1503	486	16
2020	KAH2006	156	31	2017	KAH1703	431	12
				2019	KAH1902	274	31
				2021	KAH2103	227	16
				2023	KAH2302	203	17
				2025	KAH2502	211	20

On the west coast of the North Island standardised trawl surveys were first carried out in 1986, with seven surveys completed before the series was discontinued in 1999 (Jones et al. 2022). The timing of these surveys was in spring or early summer between October and December. The survey was reinstated in 2018, with the survey area adjusted to remove trawl exclusion zones put in place to protect Māui dolphin, and a comparable time series constructed from 1989 onwards (Jones et al. 2023). In 2025, the time series ended as a new vessel (*Kaharoa II*), trawl net, towing speed and survey timing were introduced. The change to a summer timing was recommended by the Inshore Working Group in 2024 with the expectation that availability of snapper would be less variable (Jones et al. 2026).

In 2022, the CPUE indices for the three sub-areas within JDO 1 (Hauraki Gulf and east Northland, Bay of Plenty, and west coast North Island) were updated to 2020–21 (McKenzie 2023). The catch and effort data set included individual bottom trawl records from trawls targeting a range of inshore finfish species (BAR, TAR, TRE, GUR, SNA, and JDO). The landed catch of John dory from a trip was allocated to the individual trawl records in proportion to the estimated catch. The analyses used a delta-lognormal CPUE model incorporating positive catch (lognormal) and presence/absence (binomial) components. In a previous analysis (Langley 2018), different trends were apparent between the lognormal and binomial CPUE models. Further investigation indicated that the differences may have been attributable to changes in the recording of smaller John dory catches over the time period. Potential biases introduced by changes in catch reporting are likely to be adequately accounted for by applying the delta-lognormal approach.




Figure 2: Estimates of recruited (length ≥ 25 cm) John dory biomass (t) from *Kaharoa* trawl surveys with 95% confidence intervals. The 2025 estimate is not part of the time series, conducted from *Kaharoa II* with different trawl net at a different time of year. [Continued on the next page]




Figure 2[Continued]: Estimates of recruited (length ≥ 25 cm) John dory biomass (t) from *Kaharoa* trawl surveys with 95% confidence intervals. The 2025 estimate is not part of the time series, conducted from *Kaharoa II* with different trawl net at a different time of year.

Hauraki Gulf and east Northland (HG, part of JDO 1)

In Hauraki Gulf and east Northland, the standardised CPUE indices fluctuated during the 1990s and 2000s, then steadily declined from 2004–05 to 2012–13, and then increased relatively slowly during 2013–14 to 2020–21 (Figure 3).




Figure 3: CPUE indices of abundance for Hauraki Gulf and east Northland (part of JDO 1) (combined model of catch rates in mixed species bottom trawl tows). Error bars are $\pm$ two standard deviations.

Bay of Plenty (BoP, part of JDO 1)

The standardised CPUE series declined during the late 1990s, remained relatively stable during the 2000s, dropped in 2012–13 to 2013–14, then increased from 2015–16 to 2016–17 to be above or close to the series mean, and then declined to 2019–20 and increased in 2020–21 (Figure 4).




Figure 4: CPUE indices of abundance for the Bay of Plenty (part of JDO 1) (combined model of catch rates in mixed species bottom trawl tows). Error bars are $\pm$ two standard deviations.

West coast North Island (WCNI, western JDO 1 and western JDO 2)

The standardised CPUE series suggests that biomass has fluctuated over the study period. CPUE indices were at a high level in 2010–11 to 2012–13, declined over the subsequent four years (to 2016–17) to below the series mean, then slowly increased after this to be at the series mean in 2020–21 (Figure 5).




Figure 5: CPUE indices of abundance for the West coast North Island (western JDO 1 and western JDO 2) (combined model of catch rates in mixed species bottom trawl tows). Error bars are $\pm$ two standard deviations.

Establishing B_{MSY} -compatible reference points for JDO 1

In 2012, the Working Group accepted arithmetic mean standardised bottom trawl CPUE for the period 1995–96 to 2010–11 as B_{MSY} -compatible proxies for each of the three JDO 1 sub-stocks. All three series were based on combined positive catch and probability of capture models derived from event-scale fishing events (i.e., tow). JDO abundance tends to fluctuate in cycles, according to recruitment, and the period chosen included two periods of high abundance and high catch. The Working Group accepted the default Harvest Strategy Standard definitions that the Soft and Hard Limits would be one half and one quarter the target for each sub-stock, respectively.

Future Research Considerations:

- Consider constructing a pseudo-CELR series that goes back to 1989–90 to increase overlap of CPUE with WCNI, HG, and BoP trawl survey series.

Southeast North Island (eastern part of JDO 2)

In 2013, standardised CPUE indices were derived from inshore trawlers operating in the eastern portion of JDO 2 for 1989–90 to 2010–11.

In 2022, the CPUE analysis was updated and refined to include data to 2021–22 (Langley 2023). The CPUE data set included bottom trawl trips that predominantly targeted red gurnard or tarakihi within Statistical Areas 011–014. Prior to 2007–08, catch and effort data were primarily collected in daily aggregate format (CELR). John dory catches are typically small and were frequently not reported amongst the catch of the five main species associated with the daily fishing effort. The CPUE data set was configured as an aggregated trip record with the associated landed catch of John dory and the aggregated fishing effort data (number of days fished, total number of trawls and trawl duration) and the predominant target species and Statistical Area (trip ‘roll up’).

The final CPUE data set was limited to a selection of core fishing vessels conducting a minimum of 20 trawls in at least 5 years. A GLM approach was applied to model the occurrence of John dory in the (trip) catch (binomial model) and the magnitude of positive John dory catches (lognormal model) to derive a combined CPUE index (delta-lognormal). The resulting series was similar to the previous analysis for the corresponding period.

The CPUE indices showed a cyclical pattern during the 1990s and early 2000s with a substantial peak in abundance during 1998–99 to 2001–02. The CPUE indices declined to a low point in 2010–11 and 2011–12 and then steadily increased over the following years (Figure 6). A rapid update of the CPUE series with data to 2024–25 found a similar pattern to the previous series, (Figure 6).




Figure 6: CPUE indices for the Southeast North Island (part of JDO 2) as calculated by Langley (2023) and from a rapid update with data to 2024–25. The series are scaled to have a geometric mean of one for the years in common.

Establishing B_{MSY} -compatible reference points for east coast portion JDO 2 (FMA 2)

In 2013, the Working Group accepted the arithmetic mean standardised bottom trawl CPUE for the period 1989–90 to 2010–11 as a B_{MSY} -compatible proxy for the east coast JDO 2 stock. JDO abundance tends to fluctuate in cycles, according to recruitment, and the period chosen included two periods of high abundance and high catch and two periods of low abundance and catch, i.e., two cycles. The Working Group accepted the default Harvest Strategy Standard definitions that the Soft and Hard Limits would be one half and one quarter the target, respectively.


Future Research Considerations:

- Potential stock linkages between Bay of Plenty (JDO 1) and the eastern portion of JDO 2 (FMA2).

Northern South Island (JDO 7 and southern part of JDO 2)

In 2014, the CPUE indices for the northern South Island zone (JDO 7 and part of JDO 2) were revised and updated to include data to 2012–13 (Langley 2014). The CPUE index was based on JDO bycatch from the following bottom trawl targets: BAR, FLA, GUR, JDO, JMA, RCO, and TAR, in Statistical Areas 033–039.

The Southern Inshore Working Group agreed that the west coast South Island (WCSI) inshore trawl survey series appears to monitor trends in abundance of John dory, particularly recruited biomass (defined as fish of at least 25 cm TL) (Figure 7). The John dory biomass estimate of 211 t in 2025 had declined from the time series highs in 2015 and 2017 and was above the time series mean of 220 t (Figure 7). Biomass was low in the 1990s and increased from the 2000s, peaking in 2015. In most years, more biomass has been from the west coast, but sometimes more comes from Tasman Bay and Golden Bay (MacGibbon et al. 2026). In 2025, biomass decreased in Tasman Bay and Golden Bay but increased from the west coast, enough that the overall total biomass in 2025 was slightly higher than in the previous survey in 2023. The increases and decreases for each area were seen for both pre-recruit and recruited fish.



f

Figure 7: WCSI inshore trawl survey biomass estimates of recruited and pre-recruit John dory for the west coast South Island strata (top plot) and Tasman Bay/Golden Bay strata (bottom plot). Error bars are $\pm$ two standard deviations. John dory are assumed to recruit to the commercial fishery at 25 cm TL.

There were no clear modes in the length frequencies in the 1990s, although small but distinct 1+ cohorts could be seen in 1992 and 1994 (Figure 8). The large increase in biomass in the 2000s coincided with larger and more distinct modes seen in the length frequency distribution, particularly (though not exclusively) 1+ fish, which have been distinct in a number of years since 2000 (e.g., 2000, 2003, 2009, 2015, 2017, and 2021). The 2021 length frequency distribution showed the strongest 1+ mode in the time series from TBGB, at around 24–34 cm. These fish were not obvious as 3+ fish in 2023. This cohort might be the mode of 32–46 cm fish observed in TBGB, but the righthand shoulder of the 2023 1+ cohort, which was substantial and centred around 28 cm, overlapped the 3+ group. The mode from the west coast, centred around 38 cm, was likely to be the 3+ fish. Throughout the time series, where 1+ cohorts were visible, they were consistently stronger in TBGB (Figure 8). This was the case again in 2025, although the 1+ cohort was the weakest it has been since 2007. Overall numbers of fish were lower in 2025 despite the small increase in biomass. This was likely to be due to the fish that were present being larger; with west coast fish having a larger mode centred around 40–42 cm in 2025. These were likely to be 3+ fish, which were seen as a reasonable cohort of 1+ fish in 2023, mostly from Tasman Bay and Golden Bay.




Figure 8: Scaled population length frequency distributions for John dory in 30–400 m for west coast (white bars) and Tasman Bay/Golden Bay (blue bars), from WCSI inshore trawl surveys. n = number of fish measured, no. = scaled population number, CV = coefficient of variation (%). [Continued on next page]




Figure 8 [Continued]: Scaled population length frequency distributions for John dory in 30–400 m for west coast (white bars) and Tasman Bay/Golden Bay (blue bars), from WCSI inshore trawl surveys. n = number of fish measured, no. = scaled population number, CV = coefficient of variation (%).

The standardised CPUE series shows a similar trend to the trawl survey biomass index, with a large increase in biomass between the late 1990s and early 2000s, which persisted to 2013 (Figure 9).




Figure 9: CPUE indices of abundance for the northern South Island (JDO 7 and part of JDO 2), combined model of catch rates in mixed species bottom trawl tows (Langley 2014). Vertical lines show the 95% credible intervals.

Establishing B_{MSY} -compatible reference points for JDO 7

The Working Group initially accepted the arithmetic mean of total biomass from the West Coast South Island trawl survey (WCSI and TBGB) from 1992 to 2011 as the B_{msy} Proxy for JDO 7. Although no rationale was provided, these years included periods of low and high abundance, incorporating increasing abundance and catch. It was probably chosen assuming that abundance would fluctuate in cycles – with the period chosen including one low and one high cycle. Extension of the survey series over time has shown that biomass has remained much higher than during the 1990s – possibly suggesting an increase in productivity associated with warming oceans, as JDO 7 is as the southern extent of the species range. In 2026 the WG revised the B_{msy} proxy period, choosing 2003 to 2013, as abundance and catch were both high and stable during this period. The Working Group accepted the default Harvest Strategy Standard definitions that the Soft and Hard Limits would be one half and one quarter the target, respectively.

Future Research Considerations:

- Consider updating an appropriate CPUE series as a new survey vessel (*Kaharoa II*) with different catchability will be used for the WCSI trawl survey from 2027.
- Plot pre-recruit series on separate axes, so that the y-axis scale does not obscure trends.

4.2 Biomass estimates

Estimates of absolute reference and current biomass are not available.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

- JDO 1 (Hauraki Gulf and east Northland)


Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2022	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Medium	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2020–21	Catch: 86 t
Assessment Runs Presented	Standardised CPUE	
Reference Points	Interim Target: Arithmetic mean of the CPUE indices for John dory in Hauraki Gulf and east Northland from combined binomial and lognormal models from 1995–96 to 2010–11 Soft Limit: 50% of target Hard Limit: 25% of target Overfishing threshold: F_{MSY}	
Status in relation to Target	About as Likely as Not (40–60%) to be at or above the target	

Status in relation to Limits	Soft Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) to be below Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below
Status in relation to Overfishing	Very Unlikely (< 10%) that overfishing is occurring

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status

John dory: ENHG

Reference years: 1996-2011




Standardised CPUE indices for John dory in Hauraki Gulf and east Northland from combined binomial and lognormal models of catch rate in bottom trawl tows in a mixed target fishery (blue line). Solid horizontal lines indicate the target (green), soft limit (orange), and hard limit (red). The commercial catch from the area is also presented (dashed brown line), and trawl survey recruited biomass indices (purple with error bars $\pm$ two standard deviations).

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy

The CPUE indices steadily declined from the mid-2000s to slightly below the soft limit in 2012–13, then increased to be just below the target in 2019–20 and 2020–21.

Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy



Relative fishing mortality proxy derived from total area catch divided by CPUE indices from the recent CPUE analysis (black points). The dashed horizontal line represents the average fishing mortality in the period used to define the reference points (vertical green dotted lines).

The fishing mortality proxy indicates that fishing mortality has declined since 2006–07. Since 2011–12, total catch has remained stable or declined, while CPUE has increased, leading to a decrease in the fishing mortality proxy.

Other Abundance Indices

There is good correspondence between the Hauraki Gulf trawl survey and CPUE series.

Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	Annual catches and fishing mortality have been relatively low since 2011–12. There has been an approximate doubling of CPUE indices since 2011–12 and the 2020–21 CPUE index is just below target.
Probability of Current Catch or TAC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) at the current catch levels (which are the lowest of the time series) Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) over the next five years at current catch levels
Probability of Current Catch or TAC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Current catch is Very Unlikely (< 10%) to cause overfishing


Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Standardised CPUE	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2022	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	Catch and effort data	1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	N/A	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	-	

Qualifying Comments
-

Fishery Interactions
John dory is taken on the east coast by bottom trawl and Danish seine targeted at John dory and snapper.

- **JDO 1 (Bay of Plenty)**

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2022	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Medium	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2020–21	Catch: 75 t
Assessment Runs Presented	Standardised CPUE	
Reference Points	Interim Target: Arithmetic mean of the CPUE indices for John dory in Bay of Plenty from combined binomial and lognormal models from 1995–96 to 2010–11 Soft Limit: 50% of target Hard Limit: 25% of target Overfishing threshold F_{MSY}	
Status in relation to Target	About as Likely as Not (40–60 %) to be at or above the target	
Status in relation to Limits	Soft Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) to be below Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Unlikely (< 40%) that overfishing is occurring	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status


Standardised CPUE indices for John dory in Bay of Plenty from combined binomial and lognormal models of catch rate in bottom trawl tows in a mixed target fishery (blue line). Solid horizontal lines indicate the target (green), soft limit (orange), and hard limit (red). The commercial catch from the area is also presented (dashed brown line), and trawl survey recruited biomass indices (purple with error bars $\pm$ two standard deviations).

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy

The CPUE indices declined to minimum in 2018–19 and increased after that to be slightly below target in 2020–21.

Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy



Relative fishing mortality proxy derived from total area catch divided by CPUE indices from the recent CPUE analysis (black points). The dashed horizontal line represents the average fishing mortality in the period used to define the reference point (vertical green dotted lines).

The fishing mortality proxy was a minimum in 2011–12, increased to be above the threshold (F_{MSY} proxy) level from 2016–17 to 2018–19, then declined to be below the reference for the last two years.

Other Abundance Indices

There is good correspondence between the Bay of Plenty trawl survey and CPUE series.

Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables

-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	From 2018–19 annual catches have been relatively low, and the CPUE indices have increased. The current lower level of the fishing mortality may cause the stock to increase.
Probability of Current Catch or TAC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) at current catch levels Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) at current catch levels
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unlikely (< 40%) at the current level of catch


Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Fishery characterisation and standardised CPUE	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2022	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	2022 CPUE analysis	1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	N/A	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	-	

Qualifying Comments
-

Fishery Interactions
John dory is taken in the Bay of Plenty by bottom trawl targeted at John dory, snapper, trevally, tarakihi, and red gurnard and by Danish seine targeted at snapper and red gurnard.

- **JDO 1 (West Coast North Island)**

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2022	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Medium	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2020–21	Catch: 83 t
Assessment Runs Presented	Standardised CPUE	
Reference Points	Interim Target: Arithmetic mean of the CPUE indices for John dory on West Coast North Island from combined binomial and lognormal models from 1995–96 to 2010–11 Soft Limit: 50% of target Hard Limit: 25% of target Overfishing threshold: F_{MSY}	
Status in relation to Target	About as Likely as Not (40–60%) to be at or above the target	
Status in relation to Limits	Soft Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) to be below Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Unlikely (< 40%) to be occurring	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status


Standardised CPUE indices for John dory in west coast North Island from combined binomial and lognormal models of catch rate in bottom trawl tows in a mixed target fishery (blue line). Solid horizontal lines indicate the target (green), soft limit (orange), and hard limit (red). The commercial catch from the area is also presented (dashed brown line), and trawl survey recruited biomass indices (purple with error bars $\pm$ two standard deviations).

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy

From 2016–17 the CPUE indices have increased to be just above target in 2020–21.

Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy



Relative fishing mortality proxy derived from total area catch divided by CPUE indices from the recent CPUE analysis (black points). The dashed horizontal line represents the average fishing mortality in the period used to define the reference points (vertical green dotted lines).

Fishing mortality increased to the threshold during 2014–15 and then declined to be below the threshold in 2020–21.

Other Abundance Indices

There is good correspondence between the WCNI trawl survey and CPUE series

Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables

-

Projections and Prognosis

Stock Projections or Prognosis

Likely to fluctuate around the target

Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to

Soft Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) at current catch levels
Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) at current catch levels

remain below or to decline below Limits	
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unlikely (< 40%) at current catch levels


Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Fishery characterisation and standardised CPUE	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2022	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	2022 CPUE analysis	1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	N/A	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- The stock relationship between JDO 1 and JDO 2	

Qualifying Comments
-

Fishery Interactions
John dory is taken off the west coast by bottom trawl targeted at snapper trevally, gurnard, and tarakihi.

- JDO 2 (Southeast North Island – FMA2)

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2026	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Medium	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2024–25	Catch: 61 t
Assessment Runs Presented	Standardised CPUE (Trip-based BT targeting JDO, TAR, GUR)	
Reference Points	Interim target = B_{MSY} proxy: Mean of the CPUE indices for John dory off the southeast coast of the North Island from combined binomial and lognormal models from 1989–90 to 2010–11 Soft Limit: 50% of target Hard Limit: 25% of target Overfishing threshold = F_{MSY} proxy: Mean relative exploitation rate for period 1989–90 to 2010–11	
Status in relation to Target	Unlikely (< 40%) to be at or above the target	
Status in relation to Limits	Soft Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) to be below Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Unlikely (< 40%) to be occurring	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status

a) Annual removals for John dory in southeast North Island; (b) the standardised catch per unit effort (CPUE) index, relative to the agreed reference points, for John dory in southeast North Island from bottom trawling trips targeting gurnard, tarakihi, and John dory. The dashed vertical lines show the reference period; (c) annual relative exploitation rate (catch/CPUE) for John dory in Southeast North Island.

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	The CPUE indices have increased steadily from a low level in 2010–11 and 2011–12.

Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Fishing mortality declined over the last decade and is currently below the threshold.
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis

Stock Projections or Prognosis	Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Current catch: Soft Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) Current TACC: The TACC applies to both east and west coasts of JDO 2. About half of the catch for JDO 2 comes from the east coast stock. The total catch for JDO 2 is currently about one third of the TACC.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unlikely (< 40%) at current level of catch.

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation

Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment
Assessment Method	Fishery characterisation and standardised CPUE
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary Next assessment: 2027

	publication year: 2026	
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	Catch and effort data	1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	N/A	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	- The 2023 assessment update reduced the number of target species to TAR, GUR and JDO and only used Statistical Areas 011–014.	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	-	


Qualifying Comments
-

Fishery Interactions
John dory is taken off the east coast by bottom trawl primarily targeting tarakihi and red gurnard.


- **JDO 7 (Northern South Island)**

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2026	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Medium	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2024–25	Catch: 188 t
Assessment Runs Presented	Trawl survey biomass index (2025)	
Reference Points	Interim B_{MSY} proxy target: Arithmetic mean of total biomass from the West Coast South Island trawl survey (WCSI and TBGB) from 2003 to 2013 Soft Limit: 50% of target Hard Limit: 25% of target Overfishing threshold: F_{MSY}	
Status in relation to Target	About as Likely as Not (40–60%) to be at or above the target	
Status in relation to Limits	Soft Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) to be below Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Likely (> 60%) that overfishing is occurring	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



Biomass trends from the west coast South Island inshore trawl survey time series. Error bars are $\pm$ two standard deviations, assuming a lognormal distribution. The agreed B_{MSY} proxy (arithmetic average: 2003–2013 WCSI survey biomass estimates=260 t) is shown as a green dashed line; the calculated Soft Limit (=50% B_{MSY} proxy) is shown as a purple dashed line; the calculated Hard Limit (=25% B_{MSY} proxy) is shown as a grey dashed line. The grey vertical lines bound the reference period



Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	The series has been at or above the agreed B_{MSY} proxy since the 2003 survey, with considerable fluctuation. Biomass estimates for the last three surveys, although stable, were almost half the maximum value in the series (2015).
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Relative exploitation increased after 2019 and has been above the overfishing threshold since then.
Other Abundance Indices	The trend in BT CPUE (1989–90 to 2012–13) is comparable with that for the trawl survey series for the corresponding period.
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	- Recruitment appears to have been modest since 2019, and was low in 2025.

Projections and Prognosis

Stock Projections or Prognosis	Low recruitment in 2025 and high exploitation rates since 2019 suggest that abundance may decline in the short term under current catches.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) for current catch, unknown for TACC Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) for current catch, Unknown for TACC
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Likely (> 60%), for current catch and Very Likely (> 90%) for TACC

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Evaluation of survey biomass and length frequencies and standardised CPUE	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2026 (Survey); 2014 (CPUE)	Next assessment: 2028 (Survey 2027)
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- West Coast South Island trawl survey - Survey length frequency - CPUE	1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	N/A	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- The stock relationship between JDO 7 and the western part of JDO 2	

Qualifying Comments
-

Fishery Interactions
John dory are primarily taken in conjunction with the following QMS species: barracouta, red cod, stargazer, red gurnard, snapper, and tarakihi in the Northern South Island bottom trawl fishery.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Boyd, R O; Reilly, J L (2004) 1999–2000 National Marine Recreational Fishing Survey: harvest estimates. (Unpublished draft New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report for the Ministry of Fisheries Project REC9803 held by Fisheries New Zealand.) 28 p.
- Bradford, E (1998) Harvest estimates from the 1996 national recreational fishing surveys. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1998/16*. 27 p.
- Davey, N; Hartill, B; Carter, M (2019) Mean weight estimates for recreational fisheries in 2017–18. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/25*. 32 p.
- Davey, N K; Johnson, K S; Maggs, J Q (2024) Mean weight estimates for recreational fisheries in 2022–23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/28*. 39 p.
- Dunn, M R; Jones, E (2013) Stock structure and fishery characterisation for New Zealand John dory. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/40*. 99 p.
- Francis, M P; Paul, L J (2013) New Zealand inshore finfish and shellfish commercial landings, 1931–82. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/55*. 136 p.
- Fu, D; Gilbert, D J; Baird, S J; Manning, M J (2008) CPUE analysis of John dory (*Zeus faber*) in New Zealand's main fishery (JDO 1). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/14*. 42 p.
- Hanchet, S M; Francis, M P; Horn, P L (2001) Age and growth of John dory (*Zeus faber*). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/10*. 26 p.
- Hartill, B; Davey, N (2015) Mean weight estimates for recreational fisheries in 2011–12. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/25*.
- Heinemann A; Gray, A (2024) National Panel Survey of Recreational Marine Fishers 2022–23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/51*. 116 p.
- Hore, A J (1982) The age growth and reproduction of the John dory, *Zeus faber*. (Unpublished MSc thesis, University of Auckland.)
- Hore, A J (1985) John dory *In*: Colman, J A; McKoy, J L; Baird, G G (1985) Background papers for the 1985 Total Allowable Catch recommendations, pp. 117–122. (Unpublished report held by ESNZ library, Wellington.)
- Hore, A J (1988) John dory. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1988/39*. 8 p.
- Horn, P L; Hanchet, S M; Stevenson, M J; Kendrick, T H; Paul, L J (1999) Catch history, CPUE analysis, and stock assessment of John dory (*Zeus faber*) around the North Island (Fishstocks JDO1 and JDO2). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 99/33*. 58 p.
- Jones, E G.; Bian, R; MacGibbon, D J; McKenzie, J R; Escobar-Flores, P C; Stevens, D W; Walsh, C; O'Driscoll, R L (2022) Inshore trawl surveys of the west coast North Island, October–November 2018, 2019, and 2020. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/63*. 156 p.
- Jones, E G; Ballara, S; Bian, R; Langley, A; McKenzie, J R; O'Driscoll, R L (2023) Review of inshore trawl surveys of the west coast North Island. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2023/10*. 243 p.
- Jones, E G; Underwood, M J; Bian, R; Walsh, C; O'Driscoll, R L (2024) Inshore trawl survey of the west coast North Island, October 2022 (KAH2205). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/18*. 129 p.
- Kendrick, T H; Bentley, N (2011) Fishery characterisation and catch-per-unit-effort indices for three sub-stocks of John dory in JDO 1, 1989–90 to 2008–09. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2011/38*.
- Langley, A D (2014) Updated CPUE analyses for selected South Island inshore finfish stocks. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/40*. 116 p.
- Langley, A D (2018) Fishery characterisation and Catch-Per-Unit-Effort indices for John dory in JDO 1. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2018/36*. 84 p.

JOHN DORY (JDO) – May 2026

- Langley, A D (2023) Fishery characterisation and Catch-Per-Unit-Effort indices for John dory in eastern JDO 2, to 2021/22. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2023/08*. 28 p.
- MacGibbon, D J; Ballara, S L; Walsh, C; Buckthought, D; Bian, R (2026) Inshore trawl survey off the west coast South Island and in Tasman Bay and Golden Bay, March–April 2025 (KAH2502). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2026/10*. 84 p.
- MacGibbon, D J; Stevenson, M L (2013) Inshore trawl survey of the west coast South Island and Tasman and Golden Bays, March–April 2013 (KAH1305). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/66*. 115 p.
- MacGibbon, D J; Walsh, C; Buckthought, D; Bian, R (2022) Inshore trawl survey off the west coast South Island and in Tasman Bay and Golden Bay, March–April 2021 (KAH2103). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/11*. 97 p.
- McKenzie, A (2023) Fishery characterisation and catch per unit effort for John dory in JDO 1, to 2020/21. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2023/07*. 57 p.
- Morrison, M A; Stevenson, M; Hanchet, S (2001a) Review of Bay of Plenty trawl survey time series (1983–99). *NIWA Technical Report 107*. 55 p.
- Morrison, M A; Francis, M P; Parkinson, D (2001b) Trawl survey of snapper and associated species in the Hauraki Gulf, October 2000 (KAH0012). (Unpublished Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project INT2001/02 held by NIWA library, Wellington).
- Morrison, M A; Francis, M P; Parkinson, D M (2002) Trawl survey of them Hauraki Gulf, 2000 (KAH0012). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2002/46*. 49 p.
- Parsons, D M; Bian, R (2022) Trawl surveys of the Hauraki Gulf and Bay of Plenty in 2020 and 2021 to estimate the abundance of juvenile snapper. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/10*. 134 p.
- Stevenson, M L (2007) Inshore trawl surveys of the west coast of the South Island and Tasman and Golden Bays, March–April 2007 (KAH0704). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/41*. 64 p.
- Stevenson, M L (2010) Inshore trawl surveys of the west coast of the South Island and Tasman and Golden Bays, March–April 2009 (KAH0704). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2010/11*.
- Stevenson, M L (2012) Inshore trawl survey of the west coast of the South Island and Tasman and Golden Bays, March–April 2011. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2012/50*. 77 p.
- Stevenson, M L; MacGibbon, D J (2015) Inshore trawl survey of the west coast South Island and Tasman and Golden Bays, March–April 2015 (KAH1503). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/67*. 94 p.
- Teirney, L D; Kilner, A R; Millar, R E; Bradford, E; Bell, J D (1997) Estimation of recreational catch from 1991/92 to 1993/94. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1997/15*. 43 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–2018. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/24*. 104 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Hill, L; Heinemann, A (2014) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2011–12: Harvest Estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/67*. 139 p.

KAHAWAI (KAH)

(*Arripis trutta* and *Arripis xylabion*)
Kahawai



1. FISHERY SUMMARY

Kahawai (*Arripis trutta*) and Kermadec kahawai (*Arripis xylabion*) were introduced into the QMS on 1 October 2004 under a single species code, KAH. Within the QMS, kahawai management is based on six QMAs (KAH 1, KAH 2, KAH 3, KAH 4, KAH 8, and KAH 10).

These QMAs differ from the management areas used before kahawai were introduced into the QMS. The definitions of KAH 1, KAH 2, and KAH 10 remain unchanged, but KAH 4 was formerly part of KAH 3, as was the part of KAH 8 south of Tirua Point. The area of KAH 8 north of Tirua point was formerly called KAH 9.

TACs totalling 7612 t were set on introduction into the QMS. These TACs were based on a 15% reduction from both the level of commercial catch and assumed recreational use prior to introducing kahawai into the QMS. The Minister reviewed the TACs for kahawai for the 2005–06 fishing year. Subsequently, he decided to reduce TACs, TACCs, and allowances by a further 10% as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs, and TACs (t) for kahawai by Fishstock.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary Non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
KAH 1	900	200	45	1 075	2 200
KAH 2	610	185	30	705	1 530
KAH 3	390	115	20	410	935
KAH 4	4	1	0	9	14
KAH 8	385	115	20	520	1 040
KAH 10	4	1	0	9	14

1.1 Commercial fisheries

Commercial fishers take kahawai by a variety of methods. Purse seine vessels take most of the catch; however, substantial quantities are also taken seasonally in set net fisheries and as a bycatch in surface longline and trawl fisheries.

The kahawai purse seine fishery cannot be understood without taking into account the other species that the vessels target. The fleet, which is based in Tauranga, preferentially targets skipjack tuna (*Katsuwonus pelamis*) between December and May, with very little bycatch. When skipjack are not available, usually from June to November, the fleet fishes for a mix of species including kahawai, jack mackerels (*Trachurus* spp.), trevally (*Pseudocaranx dentex*), and blue mackerel (*Scomber australasicus*). These are caught 'on demand' as export orders are received (to reduce product storage costs). However, since the mackerels and kahawai school together there is often a bycatch of kahawai resulting from targeting of mackerels. Historical estimated kahawai landings are shown in Table 2, from 1931 to 1982. Reported landings, predominantly of *A. trutta*, are shown for 1962 up to and including 1982 in Table 3 by calendar year for all areas combined, and from 1983–84 onwards by fishing year and by historic management areas in Table 4 and by QMAs in Table 5. The historical landings and TACC for the main KAH stocks are depicted in Figure 1.

Table 2: Reported landings (t) for the main QMAs from 1931 to 1982.

Year	KAH 1	KAH 2	KAH 3	KAH 4	KAH 8	Year	KAH 1	KAH 2	KAH 3	KAH 4
1931–32	1	0	0	0	0	1957	25	6	0	0
1932–33	1	0	0	0	0	1958	33	13	0	0
1933–34	0	0	1	0	0	1959	31	2	0	0
1934–35	0	0	0	0	3	1960	40	1	0	0
1935–36	0	0	0	0	0	1961	40	0	0	0
1936–37	0	0	0	0	0	1962	54	7	0	0
1937–38	2	1	1	0	0	1963	60	11	0	0
1938–39	2	2	1	0	0	1964	75	4	1	0
1939–40	1	1	1	0	0	1965	85	13	0	0
1940–41	1	4	2	0	1	1966	143	106	0	0
1941–42	2	1	1	0	0	1967	147	303	0	0
1942–43	21	1	2	0	0	1968	107	159	29	0
1943–44	58	3	4	0	3	1969	163	29	12	0
1944	90	7	4	0	6	1970	141	59	22	0
1945	102	2	3	0	1	1971	185	258	10	0
1946	94	0	4	0	9	1972	168	151	22	0
1947	54	0	4	0	1	1973	295	132	13	0
1948	58	2	1	0	1	1974	357	206	17	0
1949	23	3	0	0	1	1975	140	28	18	0
1950	34	2	1	0	1	1976	401	108	30	0
1951	22	1	0	0	2	1977	631	385	218	0
1952	27	2	0	0	3	1978	1 237	487	279	0
1953	14	1	0	0	4	1979	1 642	552	608	0
1954	18	2	0	0	2	1980	1 213	885	810	0
1955	19	6	0	0	7	1981	659	625	1301	0
1956	16	3	0	0	7	1982	1 133	639	980	0

Notes:

The 1931–1943 years are April–March but from 1944 onwards are calendar years.

Data up to 1985 are from fishing returns; data from 1986 to 1990 are from Quota Management Reports. Data for the period 1931 to 1982 are based on reported landings by harbour and are likely to be underestimated as a result of under-reporting.

Table 3: Reported total landings (t) of kahawai from 1970 to 1982. Note that these data include estimates of kahawai from data where kahawai were reported within a general category of 'mixed fish' rather than separately as kahawai.

Year	Landings	Year	Landings	Year	Landings
1962	76	1969	234	1976	729
1963	81	1970	294	1977	1 461
1964	86	1971	572	1978	2 228
1965	102	1972	394	1979	3 782
1966	254	1973	586	1980	5 101
1967	457	1974	812	1981	3 794
1968	305	1975	345	1982	5 398

Source: 1962 to 1969, Watkinson & Smith (1972); 1970 to 1982, Sylvester (1989).

Before 1988 there were no restrictions in place for the purse seine fishery.

A total commercial catch limit for kahawai was set at 6500 t for the 1990–91 fishing year, with 4856 t set aside for those harvesting kahawai by purse seine (Table 6). Before the 2002–03 fishing year a high proportion of the purse seine catch was targeted, but in recent years approximately half of the landed catch has been reported as bycatch while targeting other species with purse seine gear.

Table 4: Reported landings (t) of kahawai by management areas as defined prior to 2004, from 1983–84 to 2003–04. Estimates of fish landed as bait or as ‘mixed fish’ are not included. Data for the distribution of catches among management areas and total catch are from the FSU database up to 1987–88 and from the CELR database after that date. Total LFRR or MHR values are the landings reported by Licensed Fish Receivers (to 2000–01) or on Monthly Harvest returns (to 2003–04).

Fishstock FMA(s)	KAH 1	KAH 2	KAH 3	KAH 8	KAH 10	Unknown Area	Total Catch	Total LFRR/MHR
	1	2	3–7	8, 9	10			
1983–84	1 941	919	813	547	0	46	4 266	–
1984–85	1 517	697	1 669	299	0	441	4 623	–
1985–86	1 597	280	1 589	329	0	621	4 416	–
1986–87	1 890	212	3 969	253	0	1 301	7 525	6 481
1987–88	4 292	1 655	2 947	135	0	581	9 610	9 218
1988–89	2 170	779	4 301	179	0	–	7 431	7 377
1989–90	2 049	534	5 711	156	0	16	8 466	8 696
1990–91	1 617	872	2 950	242	0	4	5 687	5 780
1991–92	2 190	807	1 900	199	< 1	7	5 104	5 071
1992–93	2 738	1 132	1 930	832	2	0	6 639	6 966
1993–94	2 054	1 136	1 861	98	15	0	5 164	4 964
1994–95	1 918	1 079	1 290	168	0	24	4 479	4 532
1995–96	1 904	760	1 548	237	7	46	4 502	4 648
1996–97	2 214	808	938	194	1	3	4 158	3 763
1997–98	1 601	291	525	264	0	19	2 700	2 823
1998–99	1 833	922	1 209	468	0	3	4 435	4 298
1999–00	1 616	1 138	718	440	0	< 1	3 912	3 941
2000–01	1 746	886	925	272	0	1	3 829	3 668
2001–02	1 354	816	377	271	0	< 1	2 819	2 796
2002–03	933	915	933	221	0	< 1	3 001	2 964
2003–04	1 624	807	109	205	0	0	2 745	2 754

In KAH 1, a voluntary moratorium was placed on targeting kahawai by purse seine in the Bay of Plenty from 1 December 1990 to 31 March 1991; this was extended from 1 December to the Tuesday after Easter in subsequent years. Although total landings decreased in 1991–92, landings in KAH 1 increased, and in 1993–94 the competitive catch limit for purse seining in KAH 1 was reduced from 1666 t to 1200 t. Purse seine catches reported for KAH 9 were also included in this reduced catch limit, although seining for kahawai off the west coast of the North Island ceased after the reduction in the KAH 1 purse seine limit. Purse seine catch limits were reached in KAH 1 between 1998–99 and 2000–01 and in 2003–04.

Prior to the introduction to the QMS, no change was made to the purse seine limit of 851 t for KAH 2. The KAH 2 purse seine fishery was closed early due to the catch limit being reached before the end of the season in each year between 1991–92 and 1995–96 and in 2000–01 and 2001–02.

Within KAH 3, the kahawai purse seine fleet has voluntarily agreed, since 1991–92, not to fish in a number of near-shore areas around Tasman Bay and Golden Bay, the Marlborough Sounds, Cloudy Bay, and Kaikoura. The main purpose of this agreement is to minimise local depletion of schools of kahawai found in areas where recreational fisheries occur, and to minimise catches of juveniles. The purse seine catch limit for KAH 3 was reduced from 2339 to 1500 tonnes from 1995–96. Purse seine catch limits have never been reached in KAH 3.

Since kahawai entered the Quota Management System on 1 October 2004, the purse seine catch limits no longer apply, and landings (regardless of fishing method) are now restricted by quota availability and fishing company policies. KAH 1 landings have ranged between 903 t and 1095 t since the introduction of the current TACC of 1075 t in 2005 (Figure 1). Landings in KAH 2 have been more variable, falling to just 128 t in 2019–20 and 152 t in 2023–24, but exceeding the TACC of 705 t in 2008–09, 2010–11, 2017–18 and 2024–25. KAH 3 landings have been well below the TACC since 2014–15, with just 41 t landed in 2018–19, but increasing to 266 t by 2024–25. KAH 8 landings exceeded the TACC of 520 t in 2007–08 and 2014–15, but have recently declined, ranging between 209 t and 361 t between 2016–17 to 2024–25.

Table 5: Prorated landings (t) of kahawai by the Fishstocks (and FMA) defined in 2004 for the fishing years from 1998–99 to the present. Distribution of data were derived by linking through the trip code, catch landing data (CLD), statistical areas, and landing points and prorating to CLD totals. Landings since 2004–05 are from QMS MHR data. The TACC is provided for those years since the introduction to the QMS.

Fishing year	KAH 1		KAH 2		KAH 3		KAH 4		KAH 8		KAH 10		Total	
	Catch	TACC	Catch	TACC	Catch	TACC	Catch	TACC	Catch	TACC	Catch	TACC	Catch	TACC
1998–99	1 652	–	975	–	697	–	0	–	1 120	–	0	–	4 444	–
1999–00	1 677	–	973	–	499	–	0	–	768	–	0	–	3 917	–
2000–01	1 678	–	922	–	425	–	0	–	581	–	0	–	3 606	–
2001–02	1 326	–	857	–	156	–	0	–	489	–	0	–	2 831	–
2002–03	869	–	855	–	650	–	0	–	542	–	0	–	2 916	–
2003–04	1 641	–	806	–	33	–	0	–	342	–	0	–	2 822	–
2004–05	1 147	1 195	708	785	129	455	< 1	10	544	580	0	10	2 529	3 025
2005–06	903	1 075	530	705	233	410	0	9	346	520	0	9	2 013	2 728
2006–07	1 046	1 075	672	705	382	410	< 1	9	407	520	0	9	2 507	2 728
2007–08	1 002	1 075	564	705	152	410	0	9	570	520	0	9	2 288	2 728
2008–09	945	1 075	823	705	157	410	0	9	381	520	0	9	2 306	2 728
2009–10	988	1 075	518	705	38	410	< 1	9	451	520	0	9	1 995	2 728
2010–11	1 002	1 075	719	705	46	410	0	9	454	520	0	9	2 221	2 728
2011–12	1 004	1 075	498	705	310	410	0	9	514	520	0	9	2 326	2 728
2012–13	1 095	1 075	502	705	195	410	0	9	468	520	0	9	2 260	2 728
2013–14	1 062	1 075	196	705	372	410	< 1	9	472	520	0	9	2 102	2 728
2014–15	992	1 075	523	705	59	410	0	9	607	520	0	9	2 181	2 728
2015–16	1 086	1 075	611	705	44	410	< 1	9	481	520	0	9	2 222	2 728
2016–17	1 021	1 075	399	705	58	410	0	9	316	520	0	9	1 794	2 728
2017–18	983	1 075	752	705	59	410	0	9	346	520	0	9	2 139	2 728
2018–19	1 045	1 075	635	705	41	410	0	9	321	520	0	9	2 042	2 728
2019–20	998	1 075	128	705	150	410	0	9	361	520	0	9	1 637	2 728
2020–21	1 017	1 075	670	705	202	410	< 1	9	300	520	0	9	2 188	2 728
2021–22	971	1 075	582	705	210	410	0	9	355	520	0	9	2 118	2 728
2022–23	1 004	1 075	648	705	233	410	0	9	274	520	0	9	2 158	2 728
2023–24	956	1 075	152	705	221	410	0	9	250	520	0	9	1 579	2 728
2024–25	1 090	1 075	727	705	266	410	< 1	9	209	520	0	9	2 293	2 728

Table 6: Reported catches (t) by purse seine method and competitive purse seine catch limit (t) from 1990–91 to 2003–04. All data are from weekly reports furnished by permit holders to the Ministry of Fisheries except those for 1993–94 which are from the CELR database. Fishstocks are as defined prior to 2004.

Year	KAH 1		KAH 2		KAH 3		KAH 8		KAH 10		Total	
	Catch	limit	Catch	limit	Catch	limit	Catch	limit	Catch	limit	Catch	limit
1990–91	1 422	1 666	493	851	n/a#	2 839*	0	none	0	none	n/a	5 356
1991–92	1 613	1 666	735*	851	1 714	2 339	0	none	0	none	4 080	4 856
1992–93	1 547	1 666	795*	851	1 808	2 339	140	none	0	none	4 290	4 856
1993–94	1 262	1 200	1 101*	851	1 714	2 339	15	§	0	none	4 092	4 390
1994–95	1 225	1 200	821*	851	1 644	2 339	0	§	0	none	3 690	4 390
1995–96	1 077	1 200	805*	851	1 146	1 500	0	§	0	none	3 028	3 551
1996–97	1 017	1 200	620	851	578	1 500	0	§	0	none	2 784	3 551
1997–98	969	1 200	175	851	153	1 500	0	§	0	none	1 297	3 551
1998–99	1 416*	1 200	134	851	463	1 500	2	§	0	none	2 015	3 551
1999–00	1 371*	1 200	553	851	520	1 500	0	§	0	none	2 444	3 551
2000–01	1 322*	1 200	954*	851	430	1 500	0	§	0	none	2 706	3 551
2001–02	838	1 200	747*	851	221	1 500	0	§	0	none	1 806	3 551
2002–03	514	1 200	819	851	816	1 500	0	§	0	none	2 149	3 551
2003–04	1 203*	1 200	714	851	1	1 500	0	§	0	none	1 918	3 551

By March 1991 when the catch limit was imposed, the purse seine catch had already exceeded 2339 t and the fishery was immediately closed. Because this occurred before the Minister's decision was announced, an extra 500 t was allocated to cover kahawai bycatch only.

* Purse seine fishery for kahawai closed.

§ Combined landings from KAH 9 and KAH 1 were limited to 1200 t.




Figure 1: Total commercial landings and TACC for the four main KAH stocks. From top: From top: KAH 1 (Auckland East), KAH 2 (Central East), KAH 3 (South East Coast, South East Chatham Rise, Sub-Antarctic, Southland, Challenger) [Continued on next page]




Figure 1 [Continued]: Total commercial landings and TACC for the four main KAH stocks. KAH 8 (Central Egmont, Auckland West).

1.2 Recreational fisheries

Kahawai is the second most important recreational species in FMA 1 (after snapper). Kahawai are highly prized by many recreational fishers, who employ a range of shore and boat-based fishing methods to target and/or catch the species. Kahawai is one of the fish species more frequently caught by recreational fishers, and recreational groups continue to express concern about the state of kahawai stocks in some areas. Historical kahawai recreational catches are poorly known. The current allowances within the TAC for each fishstock are shown in Table 1.

Information from the 2017–18 national panel survey (Wynne-Jones et al 2019) show that kahawai were mainly caught by rod or line (95.2%), with just over half of the landed catch taken from trailer boats (50.5%), and a third were taken off land, with very similar percentages seen previously in 2011–12 (Wynne-Jones et al 2014).

1.2.1 Management controls

The main method used to manage recreational harvests of kahawai is the daily bag limit. The current limits for kahawai are: up to 20 kahawai within a multi-species bag limit of 20 fish in the Auckland, Kermadec, Central, and Challenger management areas; up to 15 kahawai within a multi-species bag limit of 30 fish in the South-East, Southland, and Fiordland management areas; and up to 10 kahawai within a multi-species bag limit of 30 fish in the Kaikoura management area. There is no minimum legal size limit for any kahawai stock. A minimum net mesh size applies in all areas (the mesh sizes do vary by management area and net type).

1.2.2 Harvest estimates

There are two broad approaches to estimating recreational fisheries harvest: the use of onsite or access point methods, where fishers are surveyed or counted at their fishing location, or at an access point when they return to land after their fishing trip; and offsite methods, where some form of post-event interview and/or diary is used to collect data from fishers.

The first estimates of recreational harvest for kahawai were generated using an offsite regional telephone and diary survey approach in: MAF Fisheries South (1991–92), Central (1992–93), and North (1993–94) regions (Teirney et al 1997). Estimates for 1996 came from a national telephone and diary survey (Bradford 1998). Another national telephone and diary survey was carried out in 2000 (Boyd & Reilly 2002) and a rolling replacement of diarists in 2001 (Boyd et al 2004) provided estimates for a further year (mean weights were not re-estimated in 2001). Other than for the 1991–92 MAF Fisheries South survey, the diary method used mean weights of kahawai obtained from fish measured at boat ramps.

The harvest estimates provided by telephone-diary surveys between 1993 and 2001 are no longer considered reliable for various reasons. A Recreational Technical Working Group concluded that these

harvest estimates should be used only with the following qualifications: a) they may be very inaccurate; b) the 1996 and earlier surveys contain a methodological error; and c) the 2000 and 2001 estimates are implausibly high for many important fisheries. This led to the development of an alternative maximum count aerial-access onsite method that provides a more direct means of estimating recreational harvests for boat-based fisheries. The maximum count aerial-access approach combines data collected concurrently from two sources: a creel survey of recreational fishers returning to a subsample of ramps throughout the day; and an aerial survey count of vessels observed to be fishing at the approximate time of peak fishing effort on the same day. The ratio of the aerial count in a particular area relative to the number of interviewed parties who claimed to have fished in that area at the time of the overflight was used to scale up harvests observed at surveyed ramps, to estimate harvest taken by all fishers returning to all ramps (Hartill et al 2007b).

This aerial-access method was first used to estimate the recreational snapper harvest in the Hauraki Gulf in 2003–04 (Hartill et al 2007b), which was subsequently extended to survey the wider SNA 1 fishery in 2004–05 (Hartill et al 2007c). One benefit of this method is that it also provides harvest estimates for other key species, in particular kahawai (Table 7). The Marine Amateur Fisheries Working Group has concluded that this approach generally provides broadly reliable estimates of recreational harvest for KAH 1. It is not, however, possible to reliably quantify shore-based fishing from the air and it is necessary to derive scalars from recent offsite surveys to account for the shore-based kahawai catch. Aerial-access surveys, focusing on snapper, provided kahawai harvest estimates for the Hauraki Gulf in 2003–04 and for all of FMA 1 in 2004–05, 2011–12, and 2017–18. Aerial-access surveys in FMA 1 in 2011–12 and 2017–18 (Hartill et al 2013, 2019) provided independent harvest estimates for comparison with those generated from national panel surveys in those years.

In response to problems with previous telephone-diary surveys and the cost and scale challenges associated with onsite methods, a National Panel Survey was conducted for the first time throughout the 2011–12 fishing year. The panel survey used face-to-face interviews of a random sample of 30 390 New Zealand households to recruit a panel of fishers and non-fishers for a full year. The panel members were contacted regularly about their fishing activities and harvest information collected in standardised phone interviews. The two 2011–12 surveys appear to provide plausible results that corroborate each other for KAH 1 and are therefore considered to be broadly reliable (Hartill et al 2013). The panel survey and corroborating aerial-access survey were repeated over the 2017–18 fishing year. A national panel survey was also conducted in 2022–23 (Heinemann & Gray 2024).

Recreational harvest estimates from offsite surveys up to and including 2022–23 are given in Table 8 (from Wynne-Jones et al 2014, 2019, Hartill & Davey 2015, Hartill et al 2019 and Heinemann & Gray 2024), noting that the QMAs do not all match up with the strata used for the older harvest estimates (in particular for KAH 3 and 8).

Table 7: Summary of kahawai harvest estimates (t) derived from an aerial overflight survey of the Hauraki Gulf in 2003–04 (1 December 2003 to 30 November 2004, Hartill et al 2007b) and a similar KAH 1 wide survey conducted in 2004–05 (1 December 2004 to 30 November 2005, Hartill et al 2007c) and in 2011–12 and 2017–18 (1 October to 30 October, Hartill et al 2013, 2019). Values in brackets denote CVs associated with each estimate.

Year	East Northland	Hauraki Gulf	Bay of Plenty	KAH 1
2003–04	–	56 (0.15)	–	–
2004–05	129 (0.14)	98 (0.18)	303 (0.14)	530 (0.09)
2011–12	191 (0.16)	483 (0.13)	268 (0.12)	942 (0.08)
2017–18	312 (0.13)	517 (0.09)	390 (0.11)	1 219 (0.06)

1.2.3 Monitoring harvest

In addition to estimating absolute harvests, a system to provide relative estimates of harvest over time for key fishstocks has been designed and implemented for some key recreational fisheries. The system uses web cameras to continuously monitor trends in trailer boat traffic at key boat ramps complemented by creel surveys that provide estimates of the proportion of observed boats that were used for fishing and the average harvest of snapper and kahawai per boat trip (Hartill et al 2020). These data are combined to provide relative harvest estimates for KAH 1, that have been scaled by concurrent region wide aerial-

access harvest estimates, to estimate annual harvest tonnages landed by recreational fishers by substock (Table 9).

Table 8: Recreational catch estimates for kahawai stocks. The surveys ran from October or December to September or November but are denoted by the January calendar year. Mean fish weights were obtained from boat ramp surveys (for the telephone/diary and panel survey catch estimates). Totals are given in bold.

Stock	Year	Method	Number of fish (thousands)	Mean weight (g) (summer/winter)	Total weight (t)	CV
KAH 1	1994	Telephone/diary	727		978	–
	1996	Telephone/diary	666	1	960	0.06
	2000	Telephone/diary	1 860		2 195	0.13
	2001	Telephone/diary	1 905	2	2 248	0.13
Hauraki Gulf only	2004	Aerial-access			56	0.15
East Northland	2005	Aerial-access			129	0.14
Hauraki Gulf	2005	Aerial-access			98	0.18
Bay of Plenty	2005	Aerial-access			303	0.14
Total	2005	Aerial-access			530	0.09
East Northland	2012	Aerial-access		1 473/1 220 ³	191	0.16
Hauraki Gulf	2012	Aerial-access		1 565/1 475 ³	483	0.13
Bay of Plenty	2012	Aerial-access		1 477/1 628 ^{3,4}	268	0.12
Total	2012	Aerial-access		3,4,5	942	0.08
East Northland	2012	Panel survey	139	1 473/1 220 ³	198	0.14
Hauraki Gulf	2012	Panel survey	245	1 565/1 475 ³	377	0.09
Bay of Plenty	2012	Panel survey	238	1 477/1 628 ^{3,4}	360	0.11
Total	2012	Panel survey	621	3,4,5	935	0.07
East Northland	2018	Aerial-access			312	0.13
Hauraki Gulf	2018	Aerial-access			517	0.09
Bay of Plenty	2018	Aerial-access			390	0.11
Total	2018	Aerial-access			1 219	0.06
East Northland	2018	Panel survey	128	1 717	220	0.14
Hauraki Gulf	2018	Panel survey	207	1 702/1 794	357	0.1
Bay of Plenty	2018	Panel survey	211	1 693	357	0.11
Total	2018	Panel survey	546		934	0.07
East Northland	2023	Panel survey	61	1442	88	0.16
Hauraki Gulf	2023	Panel survey	60	1484	90	0.14
Bay of Plenty	2023	Panel survey	109	1705	186	0.12
Total	2023	Panel survey	231	1577	364	0.08
KAH 2	1993	Telephone/diary	195		298	–
	1996	Telephone/diary	142		217	0.09
	2000	Telephone/diary	1 808		2 937	0.74
	2001	Telephone/diary	492	2	799	0.20
	2012	Panel survey	145	1 583/1 449 ³	227	0.12
	2018	Panel survey	130	1 698	222	0.14
	2023	Panel survey	66		113	0.36
	1992	Telephone/diary	231		210	–
KAH 3	1994	Telephone/diary	6	6	8.4	–
	1996	Telephone/diary	226		137	0.07
	2000	Telephone/diary	413		667	0.16
	2001	Telephone/diary	353	2	570	0.18
	2012	Panel survey	104	1 279/2 340 ³	146	0.18
	2018	Panel survey	68	1 056	72	0.15
	2023	Panel survey	52		67	0.22
	1994	Telephone/diary	254	1	340	–
KAH 8	1996	Telephone/diary	199		204	0.09
	2000	Telephone/diary	337		441	0.20
	2001	Telephone/diary	466	2	609	0.24
	2012	Panel survey	259	1 664/1 318 ³	415	0.12
	2018	Panel survey	229	1 872/1 505	412	0.12
	2023	Panel survey	152		243	0.12

¹ Mean weight obtained from 1992–93 boat ramp sampling.

² The 2000 mean weights were used in the 2001 estimates.

³ Separate mean weight estimates were used for summer (1 October 2011 to 30 April 2012) and for winter (1 May to 30 September 2012).

⁴ Separate mean weight estimates were used for the eastern and western Bay of Plenty.

⁵ Temporally and spatially separate mean weight estimates used as per notes 3 and 4. [Continued on next page]

⁶ No harvest estimate available in the survey report, estimate presented is calculated as average fish weight for all years and areas by the number of fish estimated caught.

Trends inferred from this monitoring programme were initially very similar to that inferred from aerial-access harvest estimates in the Hauraki Gulf in 2004–05, 2006–07, and 2011–12, but the camera/creel kahawai harvest estimate for the Hauraki Gulf in 2017–18 is substantially lower than concurrent aerial-access and national panel surveys estimates for the same year (Table 9 c.f. Table 8). This difference appears to be due to a recent substantial increase in recreational fishing effort and catch around expanding mussel farms in the Firth of Thames, coinciding with a lesser increase in effort in the north-western gulf.

Additional creel survey monitoring has been initiated to monitor changes in the recreational fishery in these areas, which had not been adequately monitored from boat ramps in the Auckland metropolitan area up until 2019–20. There is, however, a good correspondence between trends inferred from camera/creel survey based indices and aerial-access survey and/or national panel survey harvest estimates, for recreational harvesting of kahawai for East Northland and the Bay of Plenty. In East Northland, the kahawai catch landed at the two monitored ramps has gone through similar fluctuations, with no apparent long-term trend evident. In the Bay of Plenty the recreational kahawai halved immediately after 2011–12 and remained at this level before spiking up to the highest estimated harvest tonnage in 2017–18, before declining back to the level seen in the years immediately after 2011–12. These estimates show the variability of recreational harvests between years and, in particular, that harvest levels can be driven not only by stock abundance but also by changes in localised availability.

Table 9: Recreational catch estimates (t) for kahawai in different parts of the KAH 1 stock area calculated from web camera and creel monitoring at key ramps combined with aerial-access estimates for each area in 2004–05 and 2006–07 (Hauraki Gulf only) and 2011–12 and 2017–18 (all areas within KAH 1) (from Hartill et al 2020). Recent estimates, especially for the Hauraki Gulf, are lower than expected but the reasons for this are still being investigated.

Year	East Northland	CV	Hauraki Gulf	CV	Bay of Plenty	CV	Total KAH 1	CV
2004–05	149	0.20	88	0.26	229	0.15	465	0.11
2006–07	–	–	69	0.30	–	–	–	–
2011–12	217	0.18	541	0.19	259	0.21	1017	0.12
2012–13	207	0.22	212	0.20	139	0.21	558	0.12
2013–14	175	0.19	229	0.18	167	0.24	571	0.12
2014–15	86	0.20	191	0.19	107	0.26	384	0.13
2015–16	241	0.17	298	0.18	184	0.17	723	0.10
2016–17	158	0.22	181	0.19	170	0.24	509	0.13
2017–18	275	0.15	260	0.16	404	0.15	938	0.09
2018–19	227	0.16	245	0.17	174	0.16	646	0.10

Web camera and creel monitoring has commenced in other kahawai QMAs but the results have not yet been used to infer trends in those fisheries, although levels of recreational harvesting from these stocks are relatively low.

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

Kahawai is an important traditional and customary food fish for Maori. The level of customary catch has not been quantified and an estimate of the current customary non-commercial catch is not available. Some Maori have expressed concern over the state of their traditional fisheries for kahawai, especially around the river mouths in the eastern Bay of Plenty (Maxwell, 2019).

1.4 Illegal catch

Estimates of illegal catch are not available, but are probably insignificant.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

There is no information on other sources of mortality. Juvenile kahawai may suffer from habitat degradation due to run-off, siltation and loss of shelter in estuarine areas.

2. BIOLOGY

Kahawai (*Arripis trutta*) are a schooling pelagic species belonging to the family Arripidae. Kahawai are found around the North Island, the South Island, the Kermadec Islands and Chatham Islands. They occur mainly in coastal seas, harbours, and estuaries and will enter the brackish water sections of rivers. A second species, *A. xylabion*, has been described (Paulin 1993). It is known to occur in the northern EEZ, at the Kermadec Islands and seasonally around Northland.

Kahawai feed mainly on fishes but also on pelagic crustaceans, especially krill (*Nyctiphanes australis*). Kahawai smaller than 100 mm mainly eat copepods. Although kahawai are principally pelagic feeders, they will take food from the seabed.

The spawning habitat of kahawai is unknown but is thought to be associated with the seabed offshore. Schools of females with running ripe ovaries have been caught by bottom trawl in 60–100 m in Hawke Bay (Jones et al 1992). Other females with running ripe ovaries have been observed in east coast purse seine landings sampled in March and April 1992, and between January and April in 1993 (McKenzie, NIWA, unpublished data). Length-maturation data collected from thousands of samples in the early 1990s suggest that the onset of sexual maturity in males occurs at around 39 cm (fork length) and in females at 40 cm (McKenzie, NIWA, unpublished data). This closely matches an estimate of 39 cm used for Australian *A. trutta* (Morton et al 2005). This length roughly corresponds to fish of four years of age in both countries. Eggs have been found in February in the outer Hauraki Gulf. Juvenile fish (0+ year class) can be found in shallow water over eelgrass meadows (*Zostera* spp.) and in estuaries.

Kahawai are usually aged using otoliths, following an ageing technique that has been validated (Stevens & Kalish 1998). Kahawai grow rapidly, attaining a length of around 15 cm at the end of their first year, and mature after 3–5 years at about 35–40 cm, after which their growth rate slows. The longest recorded *A. trutta* had a fork length of 79 cm and was caught by a recreational fisher in the Waitangi Estuary in Hawke Bay in August 1997 (Duffy & Petherick 1999). Northern kahawai, *Arripis xylabion*, grow considerably bigger than kahawai and attain a maximum length of at least 94 cm, but beyond this, little is known about the biology of *A. xylabion*. Male and female von Bertalanffy growth curves appear to be broadly similar, with females attaining a slightly higher value for L_{∞} , although statistical comparison of sex specific curves using a likelihood ratio test (Kimura 1980) suggests that they are statistically different (Hartill & Walsh 2005). Combined-sex growth curves are probably adequate for modelling purposes and are provided for some areas in Table 10. Sex specific growth parameters given for KAH 1 in previous plenary documents have higher estimates for L_{∞} (56.93 for males and 55.61 for females).

Table 10: Estimates of biological parameters.

Fishstock	Estimate		Source
<u>1. Natural mortality (<i>M</i>)</u>			
All		0.22	Hartill & Doonan (2022)
<u>2. Weight = a(length)^b (weight in g, length in cm fork length)</u>			
	a	b	
KAH 1 (resting)	0.0306	2.82	Hartill & Walsh (2005)
KAH 1 (mature)	0.0103	3.14	Hartill & Walsh (2005)
KAH 1 & 3 (all)	0.0236	2.89	Hartill & Walsh (2005)
<u>3. von Bertalanffy growth parameters</u>			
	<i>K</i>	<i>t</i> ₀	<i>L</i> _∞
KAH 1	0.35	0.13	54.6
KAH 2	0.34	0.60	53.5
KAH 3	0.30	0.25	54.2
KAH 9	0.23	-0.26	55.9

The maximum recorded age of kahawai is 26 years and this age has been previously used to estimate the instantaneous rate of natural mortality (M) using the equation $M = \log_e 100 / \text{maximum age}$ (Jones et al 1992). The resulting estimate of M of 0.18 assumes that this maximum observed age equates to that at which 1% of the population would survive in an unexploited stock, but a higher value for M is now considered more likely. This is because a re-analysis of purse seine catch-at-age data collected by Eggleston from KAH 2 & 3 between 1973 and 1975 suggested that 1% of the unexploited population would have lived for 20 years, which equates to an M of 0.23. A Chapman-Robson estimate of M of 0.22 was also derived from these catch-at-age data. Likelihood profiling of M undertaken during the 2021 stock assessment also suggested that values around 0.23 were most likely. Estimates of M ranging from 0.20 to 0.24 were therefore considered in the 2021 stock assessment and the assumed value used in the base case model was 0.22.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

Kahawai are presently defined as separate units for the purpose of fisheries management: KAH 1 (FMA 1); KAH 2 (FMA 2); KAH 3 (FMAs 3, 5, 6, & 7); KAH 4 (FMA 4); KAH 8 (FMAs 8 & 9), and KAH 10 (FMA 10).

Returns from tagging programmes do not provide definitive information on the level of potential mixing between KAH QMAs, but tagging returns suggest that most kahawai (*A. trutta*) remain in the same area for several years, but some move throughout the kahawai habitat. The pattern of kahawai movement around New Zealand is poorly understood and there are regional differences in age structure and abundance that are consistent with limited mixing between regions.

Smith et al (2008) compared otolith micro-chemistry (multi-element chemistry and stable isotopes) and meristics (e.g., fin counts) from 0-group kahawai from two regions (Okahu Bay, Waitematā Harbour and Hakahaka Bay, Port Underwood). Two distant sites were chosen to provide the best chance of successful discrimination. Neither meristics nor stable isotopes provided any discrimination, and magnesium and barium concentrations provided only weak discriminatory power.

On balance it seems possible that there are least two stocks of kahawai (*A. trutta*) within New Zealand waters with centres of concentration around the Bay of Plenty and the northern tip of the South Island. These two areas could be assumed to be separate for management purposes. Tagging data show that there is some limited mixing between these areas. Due to the shared QMA boundaries in the lower North Island and South Island, there is likely to be more mixing between the southern KAH QMAs than with the northern QMA (KAH 1).

There is no information about stock structure of *A. xylabion*.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

The first age-structured assessment of the KAH 1 stock was first undertaken in 2007 (Hartill 2009), which was updated and revised in 2015 (Hartill & Bian 2016) and then again in 2021 (Hartill & Doonan 2022). Both assessments were undertaken using CASAL (Bull et al 2012). The 2021 assessment is reported below.

There are no accepted assessments for kahawai stocks outside KAH 1, although there are some catch curve estimates of Z from these areas from the early 1990s, which are reported here.

4.1 KAH 1

4.1.1 Estimates of catch, selectivity, and abundance indices

(i) Commercial catch

The commercial catch history used in the assessment is provided in Table 11. Annual catch by method landings statistics up until 1981–82 were provided by Francis & Paul (2013), and Fisheries Statistics Unit data were used to generate landings statistics for 1982–83 to 1988–89. It is noted that catches during these early years are less certain due to reporting issues (e.g., see Table 4 legend).

(ii) Recreational catch

The recreational catch history in KAH 1 is poorly known. Aerial overflight estimates are available for the Hauraki Gulf in 2003–04 (Hartill et al 2007b) and for all three regions of KAH 1 in 2004–05 (Hartill et al 2007c), in 2011–12 (Hartill et al 2013) and in 2017–18 (Hartill et al 2019). Recreational harvest estimates for all three regions of KAH 1 are also available from National Panel Surveys undertaken in 2011–12 and 2017–18 (Wynne-Jones et al 2014, 2019), which were of a broadly similar magnitude to those provided by the aerial-access survey (see Table 8).

Table 11: Commercial catch (t) time series used in the 2021 stock assessment of KAH 1.

	Purse seine	Set net	Bottom trawl	Other	KAH 1		Purse seine	Set net	Bottom trawl	Other	KAH 1
1930–31	–	–	–	–	–	1975–76	140	148	65	48	401
1931–32	–	1	–	–	1	1976–77	271	163	123	74	631
1932–33	–	–	–	–	–	1977–78	432	461	200	145	1 238
1933–34	–	–	–	–	–	1978–79	875	228	380	159	1 642
1934–35	–	–	–	–	–	1979–80	561	270	250	132	1 213
1935–36	–	–	–	–	–	1980–81	292	159	131	76	658
1936–37	–	2	–	–	2	1981–82	440	356	202	135	1 133
1937–38	–	–	–	–	–	1982–83	169	527	105	181	982
1938–39	–	1	–	–	1	1983–84	1 445	321	65	111	1 942
1939–40	–	–	–	–	–	1984–85	882	410	82	141	1 515
1940–41	–	1	–	–	1	1985–86	1 191	263	53	91	1 598
1941–42	–	12	4	4	20	1986–87	1 544	224	45	77	1 890
1942–43	–	35	12	12	59	1987–88	3 964	212	43	72	4 291
1943–44	–	53	18	18	89	1988–89	1 644	340	69	117	2 170
1944–45	–	62	21	21	104	1989–90	1 699	351	70	121	2 241
1945–46	–	55	19	19	93	1990–91	1 563	333	82	62	2 040
1946–47	–	32	11	11	54	1991–92	1 726	322	49	75	2 172
1947–48	–	35	11	11	57	1992–93	2 473	628	176	162	3 439
1948–49	–	14	4	4	22	1993–94	1 162	596	80	137	1 975
1949–50	–	20	7	7	34	1994–95	1 053	436	65	157	1 711
1950–51	–	13	4	4	21	1995–96	1 098	350	127	135	1 710
1951–52	–	16	5	5	26	1996–97	921	691	113	105	1 830
1952–53	–	8	3	3	14	1997–98	712	351	116	72	1 251
1953–54	–	11	4	4	19	1998–99	1 374	217	149	85	1 825
1954–55	–	12	4	4	20	1999–00	1 222	243	106	43	1 614
1955–56	–	9	3	3	15	2000–01	1 393	217	79	57	1 746
1956–57	–	16	5	5	26	2001–02	957	292	59	45	1 353
1957–58	–	20	7	7	34	2002–03	608	236	49	37	930
1958–59	–	19	7	7	33	2003–04	1 361	200	51	25	1 637
1959–60	–	24	8	8	40	2004–05	834	178	48	38	1 098
1960–61	–	24	8	8	40	2005–06	535	216	72	82	905
1961–62	–	33	12	12	57	2006–07	696	267	40	43	1 046
1962–63	–	36	12	12	60	2007–08	668	261	57	36	1 022
1963–64	–	45	15	15	75	2008–09	602	274	31	48	955
1964–65	–	51	17	17	85	2009–10	555	329	60	47	991
1965–66	–	86	28	28	142	2010–11	541	306	58	61	966
1966–67	–	88	29	29	146	2011–12	707	185	68	85	1 045
1967–68	–	64	21	21	106	2012–13	707	232	115	54	1 108
1968–69	–	98	33	33	164	2013–14	645	220	132	66	1 063
1969–70	–	84	28	28	140	2014–15	490	212	106	198	1 006
1970–71	–	111	38	38	187	2015–16	717	184	72	121	1 094
1971–72	–	100	33	33	166	2016–17	667	182	87	86	1 022
1972–73	–	177	58	58	293	2017–18	661	161	59	100	981
1973–74	–	214	71	71	356	2018–19	640	200	111	101	1 052
1974–75	38	64	19	20	141	2019–20	682	161	80	81	1 004

Zero inflated negative binomial (ZINB) generalised linear modelling of observations of the number of kahawai landed per complete hour of interviewing at selected boat ramps surveyed since 1990 was used to reconstruct recreational catch histories for all three regions of KAH 1 from that time onward (Hartill & Doonan 2022). Environmental covariates (wind speed and tidal state) and temporal factors (fishing year, month, and day type) were offered to separate regional models which were used to predict the number of kahawai landed at each of the surveyed ramps since 1990. These predictions were used to calculate estimates of the annual number of kahawai landed across all of the boat ramps that were surveyed in each region, which were then combined with regional annual mean weight estimates. The resulting annual landed weight index was regarded as a relative index, because only a sample of boat ramps were surveyed in each region in each year. These regional relative harvest indices were therefore scaled to aerial-access harvest estimates for each region for 2004–05, 2011–12 and 2017–18, to provide estimates of the total recreational harvest of kahawai taken from each region of KAH 1 (Figure 2).

Estimates of recreational harvest were required back to 1930–31, however, and the harvest at that time was assumed to be 10% of that in 1974–75, which was then ramped up to that value over the intervening years.




Figure 2: Regional recreational catch histories for KAH 1 based on zero inflated negative binomial modelling of creel survey landings data (kahawai landed per complete creel survey hour). The relative harvest indices generated from regional model predictions were scaled up by regional harvest estimates provided by aerial-access surveys of KAH 1 in 2004–05, 2011–12 and 2017–18, to account for the catch landed by all recreational fishers, at all access points including those which had not been surveyed.

(iii) Catch composition data and selectivity estimates

The earliest catch-at-age data that are available were collected from single trawl and purse seine landings sampled in 1991, 1992, and 1993. Purse seine landings were also sampled in 2005, 2011, and 2012. Catch-at-age data were available from set net landings from the Hauraki Gulf in 2011 and 2012, which were sampled so that the selectivity for this method could be estimated.

Recreational landings sampled during each of 13 years between 2001 and 2018 provided the most consistently sampled source of catch-at-age data used in the assessment (Hartill et al 2007a, 2007d, 2008,

Armiger et al 2006, 2009, 2014, 2019). Boat ramp surveys were conducted in East Northland, the Hauraki Gulf, and the Bay of Plenty between January and April in each year, and regional age composition data were fitted in a fleets-as-areas model in 2021. The Hauraki Gulf catch-at-age data were separated out into two time series; an “early” period between 2001 and 2008 when landings were dominated by 3 and 4-year-olds, and a “late” period from 2009 to 2018, when recreational catches of kahawai were dominated by much older fish, which was thought to be due episodic immigration of larger fish from the Bay of Plenty

All age composition data were iteratively reweighted following the Francis method TA1.8 (Francis 2011), which resulted in effective sample sizes being down weighted by a range between 86 and 97% across regions and years for the recreational catch-at-age, 97% for the purse seine catch-at-age data and by 93% for the single trawl data. This process maintained CVs for the abundance indices at the level originally estimated outside of the model.

Logistic selectivity ogives were estimated for the purse seine, East Northland recreational, “late” Hauraki Gulf recreational and Bay of Plenty recreational fisheries, and double-normal selectivities were estimated for the “early” Hauraki Gulf recreational and single trawl fisheries. The single trawl selectivity ogive was also used when accounting for the relatively small tonnage landed by other methods such as bottom longlining and beach seine. A double normal selectivity was estimated from the set net catch-at-age data and subsequently fixed at MPD parameter values.

(iv) Indices of abundance

Four indices of abundance were available for the assessment; three regional recreational CPUE indices and an aerial Sightings per Unit Effort (SPUE) index. Set net CPUE indices used in the 2007 assessment are no longer considered reliable because ring net fishing is often reported as set net fishing.

Recreational CPUE indices

The recreational CPUE indices used in the 2021 model were based on creel survey data collected at boat ramps during surveys conducted intermittently since 1991. Separate standardised indices of the number of kahawai caught per angler trip (rod & line methods only) were calculated for the three regions of KAH 1 (Figure 3) (Hartill & Doonan 2022). Because the catch data used for these standardisations were counts of the number of fish landed per boat trip, and the majority of anglers did not catch kahawai during their trip in any given region or fishing year, negative binomial (NB) and zero inflated negative binomial (ZINB) CPUE generalised linear modelling methods were used to standardise catch rates and generate relative abundance indices.

With the ZINB standardisations the same terms were offered to both the left hand (negative binomial) and right hand (additional zero) components of the model. Rootogram diagnostic plots suggested that the ZINB models for East Northland and the Bay of Plenty provided better fits to the data than the NB models, but the ZINB model for the Hauraki Gulf fishery did not converge, and the NB index was used for this region. The Hauraki Gulf CPUE index was truncated at 2008 because CPUE at length analyses suggested that there was a sudden episodic influx of large kahawai into the Gulf sometime after 2008, which could not be explained by the subsequent growth of much smaller 3 and 4 year old fish that dominated recreational landings between 2001 and 2008.




Figure 3: Standardised recreational CPUE (number of fish/angler trip). Vertical lines are bootstrap 95% confidence intervals.

Aerial sightings index

In 2012, an index of abundance [sightings per unit effort (SPUE)] based on commercial aerial sightings data was accepted by the Northern Inshore Working Group. This index was calculated using data from the *aer_sight* database and applying a generalised additive model (GAM) to produce standardised annual relative abundance indices (Taylor 2014).

Flights were restricted to those that were exclusive to the Bay of Plenty (BoP) (i.e., those having flight paths that remained within an area defined as the BoP), only flown by pilot #2 and were the first flight of the day (apart from some defined exceptions, e.g., short refuelling flights at the start of the day).

Estimates of relative year effects were obtained using a forward stepwise GAM, where the data were fitted using two models: 1) the probability of a flight having a positive sighting modelled using a binomial regression; and 2) the tonnage sighted on positive flights modelled using a lognormal regression. These two models were combined into a single index. The data used for the SPUE analyses consisted of aerial sightings of kahawai, trevally, jack mackerel, blue mackerel, and skipjack tuna collected over the period 1986–87 to 2010–11, with missing years in 1988–89, from 1994–95 to 1996–97, and in 2006–07. Most of these missing years were the result of there being no available data. By

contrast, 2006–07 was dropped because the working group identified a bias in the annual index for that year because of the low number of available flights. The first year of the original series (1985–86) was dropped by the working group for the same reason.

The species with the maximum daily purse seine catch from the vessels that the pilot was working with in the BoP was used as a proxy for target species. Catch data before 1989 were from the *fsu-new* database and data from 1989 to 2013 were from the *warehou* database.

The working group accepted the combined model of SPUE for kahawai as an index of abundance in the BoP. The BoP combined SPUE index for kahawai shows substantial inter-annual variation with an overall gradual declining trend from 1986–87 to 2002–03; thereafter increasing sharply to a peak in 2007–08, and then declining to points above the long-term mean (Figure 4, Table 12).




Figure 4: Standardised sightings per unit effort (SPUE) indices for the Bay of Plenty KAH 1 stock, derived as a combination of year effect estimates from a lognormal and a binomial regression. Vertical lines are 95% confidence intervals.

Table 12: Standardised sightings per unit effort (SPUE) indices for the Bay of Plenty KAH 1 stock, derived as a combination of year effect estimates from a lognormal and a binomial regression for 1986–87 to 2012–13.

Fishing year	Combined	CV	Fishing year	Combined	CV
1986–87	1.14	0.31	2001–02	0.66	0.29
1987–88	0.86	0.27	2002–03	0.36	0.29
1988–89	No data	No data	2003–04	1.30	0.35
1989–90	0.58	0.27	2004–05	1.67	0.30
1990–91	0.78	0.27	2005–06	1.93	0.29
1991–92	0.66	0.28	2006–07	Insufficient data	Insufficient data
1992–93	1.19	0.27	2007–08	2.45	0.27
1993–94	1.17	0.30	2008–09	1.25	0.28
1994–95	No data	No data	2009–10	1.49	0.28
1995–96	No data	No data	2010–11	1.72	0.27
1996–97	No data	No data	2011–12	1.78	0.32
1997–98	0.81	0.28	2012–13	1.43	0.28
1998–99	0.45	0.28			
1999–00	0.47	0.54			
2000–01	0.70	0.29			

4.1.2 Model structure

The stock assessment was restricted to KAH 1 because this is the QMA where most of the observational data have been collected. Future assessments may consider a broader stock definition, but improved understanding of the movement dynamics of this species and further development of this model are required before this can be attempted. Even within KAH 1 there is little information on connectivity between the three main areas of the fishery: East Northland, Hauraki Gulf, and the Bay of Plenty. There are few tag data available that can be used to estimate these migration processes, because almost all of the kahawai that have been tagged have been released in the Bay of Plenty. This provides little

information about emigration from the Hauraki Gulf and East Northland. Recreational catch-at-age data collected since the 2007 assessment suggests that size-based migration between areas may vary more considerably and unpredictably than previously thought. A fleets-as-areas model structure was therefore used for the 2021 stock assessment for KAH 1, where separate selectivities and catch histories for the three regional recreational fisheries were used to account for the differing impact of these regional fisheries on the combined KAH 1 stock. A single selectivity and catch history was used for each of the commercial method fisheries, as they were either focused on a single region of KAH 1, or their catch histories were relatively small.

The stock assessment model assumes KAH 1 is a single biological stock exploited by several fisheries. Deviations from the spawner-recruitment curve were estimated for those years when there were three or more years of observational catch-at-age data and were constrained to a mean of 1.0 across all years from 1994 to 2020. Year-class strengths were estimated from the recreational landing composition data, because the Working Group concluded that year-class strengths could not be inferred from the limited purse seine, single trawl and set net catch composition data that were available. It is acknowledged that there is a potential mismatch between the recreational CPUE indices and the associated age structure of landed fish, because count data for unlanded catches were also used when generating these CPUE indices. The selectivity of the purse seine fishery appears to vary annually. The more recent purse seine and set net age compositional data that might have influenced the estimation of the 1994 to 2020 year classes were therefore heavily down-weighted so they had little influence on year class strength estimation.

A single annual time step was used, in which ageing was followed by recruitment, maturation, growth, and then mortality (natural and fishing). The relationships between length and age, and length and weight, were both assumed to be constant through time and were based on updated parameter values given in Table 10. Annual abundances of the age classes 1 to 20 were estimated in the model, with 20-year-olds representing all fish older than 19 years. The model was not sex specific. Maturation was knife-edged at four years of age. There is no information on the relationship between stock size and recruitment. The rate of natural mortality is uncertain, although there was evidence to suggest it was higher than previously assumed.

It was assumed that the population was at an unfished equilibrium state (B_0) in 1930, as reported commercial landings between 1930 and 1940 were only in the order of 1 to 2 tonnes per year. Key model outputs are probably robust to this assumption because commercial landings before the early 1970s were only of the order of a few hundred tonnes and recreational landings were assumed to be low relative to stock size prior to this time. Total fishing mortality was apportioned between fisheries according to observed catches and estimated selectivities. Method specific annual landings from seven fishing methods were considered: purse seine, single trawl, set net, other minor commercial fishing methods, and for the three regional recreational fisheries.

4.1.3 Evaluation of uncertainty

Evaluations of preliminary models focused on the assumed value for natural mortality (M). An M of 0.22 was assumed for the base case model. Two sensitivity models were also considered for two alternative values for M : 0.20 and 0.24.

MCMCs were run for all three of these models, with three concatenated chains of 1 million iterations that had been burnt in for half a million iterations. MCMC traces for some of the selectivity parameters for the $M = 0.20$ and 0.24 sensitivities fluctuated markedly, with the best diagnostics achieved by the base case ($M = 0.22$) model.

The base case model was projected for a five-year period (2021–22 to 2025–26), with future catches for these years and the recently completed 2020–21 fishing year all being set to the average annual catch by fishery for the three year period from 2017–18 to 2019–20. Year-class strengths were drawn from the 10-year period, 2005–2014.

4.1.4 Results

The trajectory of the spawning stock biomass estimated by the base case model broadly followed the abundance indices offered to the model, given the extent of interannual variability (Figure 5). All models suggest that the stock was gradually fished down until the late 1970s, followed by a steeper decline that coincided with the development of the purse seine fishery during the 1980s (Figure 6). These models suggest that the biomass of the KAH 1 stock started to rebuild during the early 2000s, followed by a decline in abundance in recent years due to lower levels of recruitment. Higher assumed values for M produced higher estimates of stock abundance and stock status.




Figure 5: Base case model fits to the three regional recreational CPUE abundance indices (number of fish caught per boat trip - see Figure 4) and a western Bay of Plenty aerial Sightings Per Unit Effort index (total school tonnage observed per flight - see Figure 5).




Figure 6: Comparison of spawning stock biomass (upper panel) and stock status trajectories (lower panel) for the base case (where M was assumed to be 0.22) and for two model sensitivities where higher and lower values for M were assumed. Two projections are shown for the base case; where most recent estimated year classes were resampled empirically, and where all of the estimated year classes were resampled. The vertical dashed line denotes first year of the projection period (2020–21). The spawning stock biomass estimates shown are MCMC medians.

The median MCMC estimate for $\%B_0$ in 2020 was estimated to be 56% for the base case, 50% when a lower M of 0.20 was assumed, and 60% when M was 0.24 (Table 13). In 2010 the Minister of Fisheries set a target reference point of 52% B_0 for this shared fishery, and although two of the sensitivity runs suggest that the KAH 1 stock biomass has fallen below this level at times, there is a high probability that the current biomass predicted by each model is close to or above this level (Tables 13 & 14).

Table 13: Biomass (t) and stock status estimates derived from MCMC runs for the base model (three chains combined) and two sensitivity models (medians with 95% credible intervals in parentheses).

Model	SSB0	SSB2020	SSB52%	SSB2020/SSB0	SSB2020/SSB52%
M = 0.22	37 549	20 880	19 524	0.556	1.069
(Base case)	(34 151–43 205)	(17 050–26 796)	(17 759–22 467)	(0.499–0.620)	(0.960–1.193)
M = 0.20	37 665	18 975	19 586	0.504	0.969
	(34 873–41 824)	(15 533–23 661)	(18 134–21 748)	(0.445–0.566)	(0.857–1.088)
M = 0.24	37 131	22 299	19 319	0.600	1.154
	(33 583–43 599)	(18 115–29 016)	(17 463–22 671)	(0.534–0.666)	(1.037–1.278)

Table 14: Probability of the KAH 1 stock in 2020 being below soft and hard limits and being at or above the target reference point. The target reference point of 52% B_0 was set by the Minister of Fisheries for this stock in 2010. Probabilities are calculated from the distribution of MCMC estimates calculated from each model.

Model	Pr ($SSB_{2020} < 10\% SSB_0$)	Pr ($SSB_{2020} < 20\% SSB_0$)	Pr ($SSB_{2020} > 52\% SSB_0$)
M = 0.22 (Base case)	0.000	0.000	0.854
M = 0.20	0.000	0.000	0.303
M = 0.24	0.000	0.000	0.985

4.1.5 Projections and yield estimates

The base and sensitivity models were projected forward five years, with empirical resampling from both the 10 most recently estimated year classes (2005–2014) and the full time series (1994–2014), using the average catch taken by each fishery annually over the three-year period from 2017–18 to 2019–20. These projections suggest that current stock status is likely to improve over the projected period (Table 15, Figure 7). The probability of the stock being at or above 52% B_0 in 2026 is 0.654 when the 10 most recently estimated year classes were resampled, and 0.839 when all 21 estimated year classes were resampled.

Table 15: Probability of the KAH 1 stock in 2026 falling below soft and hard limits and being at or above the target reference point. The target reference point of 52% B_0 was set by the Minister of Fisheries for this stock in 2010. Probabilities are calculated from the distribution of MCMC estimates calculated from each model (three chains combined for the base model).

Model	SSB2026/ SSB_0	Pr ($SSB_{2026} < 10\% SSB_0$)	Pr ($SSB_{2026} < 20\% SSB_0$)	Pr ($SSB_{2026} > 52\% SSB_0$)
M = 0.22 (21 YCSs resampled)	0.608 (0.460–0.728)	0.000	0.000	0.840
M = 0.22 (10 YCSs resampled)	0.556 (0.401–0.682)	0.000	0.987	0.646




Figure 7: Spawning stock biomass relative to B_0 for the base model ($M = 0.22$; three chains combined). The 52% B_0 target set by the Minister of Fisheries in 2010 is denoted by a black dashed line and the 20% B_0 soft limit is denoted by the grey dashed line. The grey shaded area denotes 95% credible intervals derived from the MCMC model run and the black line denotes the median estimate for each year. The projection shown here is based on empirical resampling of the 10 most recently estimated year class strengths. The vertical dashed line denotes the first year of the projection period (2021). These projections are based on resampling of the 10 most recent years for which year class strengths were estimated.

The deterministic yield corresponding to 52% B_0 from the base case model is 2785 t.

4.1.7 Future research considerations

- Examine the sensitivity of model outputs and perception of stock status to potential underestimation of historical catch data.
- Incorporate uncertainty in the recreational catch history (mean weight, estimated numbers caught per year, aerial access estimates).

- Further explore the standardisation of recreational fishery CPUE indices for inclusion within the stock assessment model.
- Investigate patterns in recreational selectivity and address the potential mismatch between recreational CPUE and the age composition of landed catch (e.g., sensitivity using only landed catch for the recreational CPUE series, consider fitting the model to age 4 and older, split discards as a separate fishery with its own selectivity). Gather a better understanding of the size of released kahawai, and those used for bait.
- A spatial model should be considered if there are data to inform it on movements of different age/size classes between sub-areas. This may reduce the patterns in residuals for model fits to recreational catch at age.
- Research is required to better understand movement and stock structure.


5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

KAH 1

Stock Structure Assumptions

Two stocks of kahawai (*A. trutta*) are assumed to exist within New Zealand waters with centres of concentration around the Bay of Plenty (KAH 1) and the northern tip of the South Island. Tagging data show that there is limited mixing between these areas.

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2021	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Medium	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2019–20	Catch: 998 t
Assessment Runs Presented	Base case model with $M=0.22$	
Reference Points	Target: 52% B_0 (set by Minister of Fisheries in 2010) Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: $U_{52\%B_0}$	
Status in relation to Target	About As Likely as Not (40–60%) to be at or above	
Status in relation to Limits	Soft Limit: Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%) to be below Hard Limit: Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%) to be below	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Overfishing is Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be occurring	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status

Trajectory of spawning stock biomass relative to B_0 for the base model ($M = 0.22$) and annual fishing intensity. The 52% B_0 target set by the Minister of Fisheries in 2010 is denoted by a black dashed line and the 20% B_0 soft limit and 10% B_0 hard limit are denoted by the grey dashed lines. Annual exploitation rates were calculated as the total tonnage of all fish four years and older divided by the biomass of all fish four years and older in each year.

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Little change in stock biomass since 2016
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	The exploitation rate has fluctuated without trend since 2009 and remains well below the overfishing threshold.
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis

Stock Projections or Prognosis	The KAH 1 stock is likely to increase slightly over the next five years at recent catch levels.
Probability of Current Catch or TAC causing biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%) Hard Limit: Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%)
Probability of current catch or TAC causing overfishing to continue or to commence	Very Unlikely (< 10%)

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation

Assessment Type	Level 1 - Full Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Statistical catch at age model implemented under CASAL	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2021	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	

Main data inputs (rank)	- Proportions-at-age from purse seine, single trawl, set net and recreational fisheries - Standardised recreational CPUE indices - Estimates of biological parameters (e.g. growth, age-at-maturity, length/weight) - Estimates of recreational harvest - Commercial catch - Aerial SPUE index	1 – High Quality 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: variable catchability and availability 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: only covers western Bay of Plenty
Data not used (rank)	- Set net CPUE indices	3 – Low Quality: confusion between set net and ring net fishing reporting
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	- Change to a fleets-as-areas model structure - Change to standardised recreational CPUE indices for each region of KAH 1 - Regional recreational catch histories were modelled for the period 1991 to 2020 based on creel survey data collected in most years and aerial-access harvest estimates provided by three aerial access surveys - Changed default M from 0.20 to 0.22 - Year class strengths only estimated 1994 to 2014, based solely on recreational catch at age data	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Recreational catch history, especially prior to 1990 - Recreational CPUE may be affected by availability because of limited spatial coverage by the recreational fishery - The degree of exchange between the KAH 1 and other stocks is essentially unknown - Spatial complexity in the movement of different sizes/ages of kahawai - Age composition data from the purse seine fishery might not reflect removals. - There is a conflict between age data and CPUE indices in the current model	

Qualifying Comments

- The assessment model has some structural inconsistencies, but none of the indices suggest a cause for concern. The relatively high target level also provides a buffer against poor stock status.

Fishery Interactions

Commercial catches of KAH 1 are primarily taken by purse-seine in association with jack mackerel, blue mackerel and trevally.

All other KAH regions

No accepted assessment is available that covers these regions. It is not known if the current catches, allowances or TACCs are sustainable. The status of KAH 2, 3 and 8 relative to B_{MSY} is unknown.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Armiger, H; Hartill, B; Rush, N; Buckthought, D; Smith, M (2014) Length and age compositions of recreational landings of kahawai in KAH 1 in January to April in 2011 and 2012. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/60*. 39 p.
- Armiger, H; Hartill, B; Rush, N; Vaughan, M; Smith, M; Buckthought, D (2009) Length and age compositions of recreational landings of kahawai in KAH 1 in January to April 2008 and KAH 8 in January to April 2007. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2009/36*. 40 p.
- Armiger, H; Hartill, B; Tasker, R; Smith, M (2006) Length and age compositions of recreational landings of kahawai in KAH 1 in January to April 2003–04 and 2004–05. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project KAH2003/01 Objectives 1 & 2. 33 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Boyd, R O; Gowing, L; Reilly, J L (2004) 2000–2001 National marine recreational fishing survey: diary results and harvest estimates. Draft New Zealand Fisheries Research Report. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Boyd, R O; Reilly, J L (2002) 1999/2000 National marine recreational fishing survey: harvest estimates. Draft New Zealand Fisheries Research Report. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Bradford, E (1997) Estimated recreational catches from Ministry of Fisheries North region marine recreational fishing surveys, 1993–94. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1997/7. 16 p. (Unpublished report held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Bradford, E (1998) Harvest estimates from the 1996 national recreational fishing surveys. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document. 1998/16. 27 p. (Unpublished report held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Bradford, E; Fisher, D; Bell, J (1998) National recreational fishing survey 1996: overview of catch and effort results. *NIWA Technical Report* 18. 55 p.
- Bull, B; Francis, R I C; Dunn, A; McKenzie, A; Gilbert, D J; Smith, M H; Bian, R; Fu, D (2012) CASAL (C++ algorithmic stock assessment laboratory): CASAL User Manual v2.30.2012/03/21. *NIWA Technical Report* 135. 280 p.
- Drummond, K L (1995) Report on investigations into the Central New Zealand kahawai purse seine fishery over the 1992/93 summer. Central Fisheries Region Internal Report 25. 33 p.
- Drummond, K L; Wilson, A L (1993) The biology and purse-seine fishery of kahawai (*Arripis trutta* Bloch and Schneider) from central New Zealand, during 1990/91–1991/92. Central Fisheries Region Internal Report 22. 42 p.
- Duffy, C A J; Petherick, C (1999) A new size record for kahawai (*Arripis trutta*) from New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 33: 565–569.
- Francis, M P; Paul, L J (2013) New Zealand inshore finfish and shellfish commercial landings, 1931–82. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/55*. 136 p.
- Francis, R.I.C.C (2011) Data weighting in statistical fisheries stock assessment models. *Canadian Journal of fisheries and Aquatic Science* 68: 1124–1138.
- Hartill, B (2009) Assessment of the KAH 1 fishery for 2006. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2009/24*. 43 p.
- Hartill, B; Armiger, H; Tasker, R; Middleton, C; Fisher, D (2007a) Monitoring the length and age composition of recreational landings of kahawai in KAH 1 in 2000–01, 2001–02 and 2002–03. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/6*. 38 p.
- Hartill, B; Armiger, H; Vaughan, M; Rush, N; Smith, M (2008) Length and age compositions of recreational landings of kahawai in KAH 1 from January to April 2007. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/63*. 40 p.
- Hartill, B; Bian, R (2016) Stock assessment of kahawai (*Arripis trutta*) in KAH 1. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2016/26*. 42 p.
- Hartill, B; Bian, R; Armiger, H; Vaughan, M; Rush, N (2007c) Recreational marine harvest estimates of snapper, kahawai, and kingfish in QMA 1 in 2004–05. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/26*. 44 p.
- Hartill, B; Bian, R; Rush, N; Armiger, H (2013) Aerial-access recreational harvest estimates for snapper, kahawai, red gurnard, tarakihi and trevally in FMA 1 in 2011–12. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/70*. 44 p.
- Hartill, B; Bian, R; Rush, N; Armiger, H (2019) Aerial-access recreational harvest estimates for snapper, kahawai, red gurnard, tarakihi and trevally in FMA 1 in 2017–18. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/23*. 39 p.
- Hartill, B; Davey, N (2015) Mean weight estimates for recreational fisheries in 2011–12. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/25*. 37 p.
- Hartill, B; Doonan, I (2022) Stock assessment for KAH 1, 1930–31 to 2019–20. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/54*. 66 p.
- Hartill, B; Rush, N; Payne, G; Davey, N; Bian, R; Millar, A; Armiger, H; Spong, K (2020) Camera and creel survey monitoring of trends in recreational effort and harvest from 2004–05 to 2018–19. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2020/18*. 54 p.
- Hartill, B; Smith, M; Rush, N; Vaughan, M; Armiger, H (2007d) Length and age composition of recreational landings of kahawai in KAH 1 from January to April 2005–06. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/28*. 30 p.
- Hartill, B; Walsh, C (2005) Characterisation of kahawai fisheries of New Zealand and a review of biological knowledge. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project KAH200401. 160 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Hartill, B; Watson, T; Cryer, M; Armiger, H (2007b) Recreational marine harvest estimates of snapper and kahawai in the Hauraki Gulf in 2003–04. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/25*. 55 p.
- Heinemann A; Gray, A. (2024) National Panel Survey of Recreational Marine Fishers 2022–23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/51*. 116 p.
- Jones, J B; Cresswell, P; Drummond, K; McKenzie, J (1992) Kahawai. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1992/2. 27 p. (Unpublished report held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Kimura, D K (1980) Likelihood methods for the von Bertalanffy growth curve. *Fishery Bulletin* 77: 765–776.
- Maxwell, K. (2019) Informing Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management from an Indigenous Perspective: The Mōtū Kahawai Fishery. PhD Thesis, Victoria University of Wellington. <https://researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/xmlui/handle/10063/8624>
- Morton, A; Lyle, J; Welsford, D (2005) Biology and status of key recreational finfish species in Tasmania. *Tasmanian Aquaculture and Fisheries Institute Technical Report Series* 25. 52 p.
- Paulin, C (1993) Review of Australasian fish family Arripidae (Percomorpha), with the description of a new species. *Australian Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 44: 459–471.
- Reilly, J L (2002) 1999/2000 National marine recreational fishing survey: weighting methodology for harvest estimates. Draft report by Statistical Insights Ltd. 25 p.
- Smith, P J; Hartill, B; Hamer, P; McKenzie, A (2008) Stock structure of kahawai, *Arripis trutta*. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/20*. 42 p.
- Stevens, D W; Kalish, J (1998) Validated age and growth of kahawai (*Arripis trutta*) in the Bay of Plenty and Tasman Bay. *NIWA Technical Report* 11. 33 p.
- Sylvester, C T A (1989) Kahawai fishery assessment 1989. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1989/10. 17 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Taylor, P R (2014) Developing indices of relative abundance from observational aerial sightings of inshore pelagic finfish; step 1, exploring the data. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/44*. 66 p.
- Teirney, L D; Kilner, A R; Millar, R E; Bradford, E; Bell, J D (1997) Estimation of recreational catch from 1991/92 to 1993/94. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1997/15. 43 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)

- Watkinson, J G; Smith, R (1972) *New Zealand Fisheries*. New Zealand Government Print. 91 p.
- Wright, P; McClary, D; Boyd, R O (2004) 2000/2001 National Marine Recreational Fishing Survey: direct questioning of fishers compared with reported diary data. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Project REC2000–01: Objective 2.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–2018. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/24*. 104 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Hill, L; Heinemann, A (2014) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2011–12: Harvest estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/67*. 139 p.

KINA (SUR)*(Evechinus chloroticus)*

Kina

**1. FISHERY SUMMARY**

South Island kina was introduced into the Quota Management System in October 2002. North Island kina was introduced into the Quota Management System from October 2003. Five Quota Management Areas based on the FMAs 3, 4, 5, 7A (Marlborough Sounds) and 7B (west coast) were created in the South Island and seven Quota Management Areas based on the FMAs 1A (Auckland-North), 1B (Auckland-South), 2A (Central (East-North)), 2B (Central (East-South)), 8, 9 and 10 were created in the North Island. Current allowances, TACCs and TACs are summarised in Table 1. The historical landings and TACC values for the main SUR stocks are depicted in Figure 1.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs, and TACs (t) for kina by Fishstock from 1 October 2024.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary Non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
SUR 1A	65	100	2	80	247
SUR 1B	90	135	4	280	509
SUR 2A	60	60	4	80	204
SUR 2B	35	35	2	30	102
SUR 3	20	20	2	42	84
SUR 4	7	20	3	225	255
SUR 5	10	10	5	455	480
SUR 7A	20	80	3	135	238
SUR 7B	5	10	1	10	26
SUR 8	12	12	1	1	26
SUR 9	11	11	1	10	33
SUR 10	0	0	0	0	0

1.1 Commercial fisheries

Most kina are found in waters less than 10 m deep and are harvested by breath-hold diving, although some was taken by target dredge in SUR 7A (Marlborough Sounds) until 2023. There is no minimum legal size for kina. Almost all roe harvested in this fishery is consumed on the domestic market. In 1988–89, competitive TACCs were established in the more important FMAs but not in east Northland (SUR 1) or at the Chatham Islands (SUR 4), both of which developed into productive fisheries in the 1990s (Table 2). On 1 October 1992 the Ministry of Fisheries placed a moratorium on the issue of permits to commercially harvest kina. The kina fishery has evolved considerably since the imposition of the moratorium. Where present, the competitive TACCs were either not caught or were exceeded, both by wide margins. Much of the increase in catch observed in SUR 5 in the early 1990s can be attributed to an experimental fishery developed in SUR 5, between Puysegur Point and Breaksea Island.

The short-lived Kina Development Programme harvested kina from Dusky Sound in 1993 under special permit.

Table 2: Total reported landings (t greenweight) of kina (SUR) by FMA and fishing year by all methods and target species. [Continued on next page]

Year	SUR 1		SUR 1A		SUR 1B		SUR 2		SUR 2A	
	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC
1983	66.2	–	–	–	–	–	33.0	–	–	–
1984	81.4	–	–	–	–	–	180.3	–	–	–
1985	64.5	–	–	–	–	–	83.8	–	–	–
1986	72.0	–	–	–	–	–	139.1	–	–	–
1987	52.1	–	–	–	–	–	142.6	–	–	–
1988	22.1	–	–	–	–	–	154.1	–	–	–
1989	35.5	–	–	–	–	–	92.8	–	–	–
1990	10.0	–	–	–	–	–	282.4	–	–	–
1991	71.5	–	–	–	–	–	87.2	–	–	–
1992	78.7	–	–	–	–	–	37.3	–	–	–
1993	89.7	–	–	–	–	–	170.4	–	–	–
1994	150.7	–	–	–	–	–	176.7	–	–	–
1995	155.9	–	–	–	–	–	129.7	–	–	–
1996	174.5	–	–	–	–	–	41.2	–	–	–
1997	161.6	–	–	–	–	–	49.9	–	–	–
1998	134.8	–	–	–	–	–	36.5	–	–	–
1999	201.4	–	–	–	–	–	20.2	–	–	–
2000	297.4	–	–	–	–	–	14.5	–	–	–
2001	184.5	–	–	–	–	–	11.4	–	–	–
2001–02	237.0	–	–	–	–	–	3.0	–	–	–
2002–03	211.2	–	–	–	–	–	30.4	–	–	–
2003–04	1.7	–	26.9	40	111.0	140	–	–	14.5	80
2004–05	–	–	20.9	40	131.1	140	–	–	6.5	80
2005–06	–	–	41.0	40	138.6	140	–	–	22.1	80
2006–07	–	–	37.1	40	147.3	140	–	–	13.8	80
2007–08	–	–	31.7	40	140.4	140	–	–	18.0	80
2008–09	–	–	30.5	40	130.6	140	–	–	19.8	80
2009–10	–	–	40.8	40	129.9	140	–	–	0.1	80
2010–11	–	–	31.7	40	122.1	140	–	–	4.1	80
2011–12	–	–	37.9	40	134.2	140	–	–	5.9	80
2012–13	–	–	38.7	40	145.4	140	–	–	10.6	80
2013–14	–	–	43.4	40	139.3	140	–	–	10.1	80
2014–15	–	–	39.7	40	147.5	140	–	–	18.8	80
2015–16	–	–	40.9	40	131.6	140	–	–	17.8	80
2016–17	–	–	39.6	40	142.7	140	–	–	9.3	80
2017–18	–	–	38.7	40	136.2	140	–	–	21.8	80
2018–19	–	–	36.5	40	133.3	140	–	–	9.0	80
2019–20	–	–	35.1	40	143.7	140	–	–	13.4	80
2020–21	–	–	41.9	40	150.6	140	–	–	7.0	80
2021–22	–	–	34.8	40	129.6	140	–	–	12.0	80
2022–23	–	–	35.6	40	136.8	140	–	–	1.3	80
2023–24	–	–	40.5	80	240.6	280	–	–	0.0	80
2024–25	–	–	31.8	80	234.2	280	–	–	0.0	80

Year	SUR 2B		SUR 3		SUR 4		SUR 5		SUR 7	
	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC
1983	–	–	4.8	–	11.3	–	0.5	–	26.3	–
1984	–	–	14.4	–	4.0	–	0.9	–	55.1	–
1985	–	–	4.0	–	7.4	–	4.6	–	99.6	–
1986	–	–	6.2	–	52.7	–	0.2	–	86.6	–
1987	–	–	2.4	–	28.4	–	4.3	–	52.6	–
1988	–	–	1.7	–	76.5	–	2.3	–	175.6	–
1989	–	–	0.8	–	216.6	–	19	–	6.2	–
1990	–	–	4.1	–	190.0	–	13.4	–	41.5	–
1991	–	–	21.3	–	35.3	–	166.9	–	56.3	–
1992	–	–	15.8	–	192.9	–	272.2	–	114.4	–
1993	–	–	9.9	–	21.8	–	*530.3	–	210.2	–
1994	–	–	8.8	–	55.3	–	327.2	–	98.2	–
1995	–	–	7.1	–	100.7	–	342.9	–	149	–
1996	–	–	6.0	–	99.5	–	446.4	–	142.2	–
1997	–	–	5.4	–	225.7	–	171.6	–	121.7	–
1998	–	–	3.8	–	303.1	–	91.2	–	144.7	–
1999	–	–	38.4	–	168.2	–	120.6	–	113.9	–
2000	–	–	50.4	–	396.5	–	106.3	–	87.9	–
2001	–	–	11.2	–	472.6	–	69.8	–	80.1	–
2001–02	–	–	5.2	–	368.0	–	184.9	–	31.7	–
2002–03	–	–	0.3	21	167.3	225	132.5	245	1.3	–

Table 2 [Continued]:

Year	SUR 2B		SUR 3		SUR 4		SUR 5		SUR 7	
	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC
2003–04	4.6	30	0.3	21	114.8	225	199.1	245	0	–
2004–05	1.4	30	0.5	21	91.7	225	350.4	455	–	–
2005–06	0.2	30	< 0.1	21	70.2	225	473	455	–	–
2006–07	< 0.1	30	3.2	21	108.3	225	423	455	–	–
2007–08	0.2	30	2.1	21	147.4	225	276.2	455	–	–
2008–09	< 0.1	30	4.2	21	135.6	225	294.9	455	–	–
2009–10	0.3	30	5.1	21	89.7	225	320.4	455	–	–
2010–11	< 0.1	30	5.2	21	134.9	225	339.2	455	–	–
2011–12	1.1	30	4.3	21	137.7	225	402	455	–	–
2012–13	0	30	4.8	21	76.2	225	474.8	455	–	–
2013–14	3.8	30	0.4	21	101.2	225	462.8	455	–	–
2014–15	2.3	30	0.2	21	75.2	225	458.4	455	–	–
2015–16	2.5	30	4.1	21	116.3	225	453.1	455	–	–
2016–17	13.4	30	8.6	21	220.0	225	460.1	455	–	–
2017–18	7.9	30	< 0.1	21	189.4	225	421.6	455	–	–
2018–19	13.2	30	2.3	21	94.8	225	466.7	455	–	–
2019–20	7.8	30	17.6	21	173.4	225	439.5	455	–	–
2020–21	25.4	30	16.1	21	141.8	225	464.1	455	–	–
2021–22	18.2	30	17.9	21	119.3	225	442.8	455	–	–
2022–23	14.8	30	13.9	21	163.7	225	398.5	455	–	–
2023–24	18.8	30	17.2	21	178.1	225	452.6	455	–	–
2024–25	13.7	30	41.9	42	164.2	225	470.0	455	–	–

Year	SUR 7A		SUR 7B		SUR 8&9		Total	
	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC
1983	–	–	–	–	3.6	–	157	–
1984	–	–	–	–	0.3	–	342	–
1985	–	–	–	–	0.9	–	275	–
1986	–	–	–	–	2	–	360	–
1987	–	–	–	–	0.1	–	283	–
1988	–	–	–	–	–	–	432	–
1989	–	–	–	–	1.5	–	372	–
1990	–	–	–	–	6.5	–	548	–
1991	–	–	–	–	4.4	–	443	–
1992	–	–	–	–	5	–	717	–
1993	–	–	–	–	–	–	1 032	–
1994	–	–	–	–	2.3	–	820	–
1995	–	–	–	–	89.5	–	975	–
1996	–	–	–	–	0.1	–	910	–
1997	–	–	–	–	0.2	–	736	–
1998	–	–	–	–	1.4	–	716	–
1999	–	–	–	–	0.5	–	663	–
2000	–	–	–	–	0.1	–	956	–
2001	–	–	–	–	3.1	–	832	–
2001–02	–	–	–	–	–	–	829.7	–
2002–03	63.2	135	0	10	0.9	–	607.4	636
2003–04	85.4	135	0	10	3.8	11	562.3	937
2004–05	101.3	135	–	10	0.9	11	704.7	1 147
2005–06	72.1	135	5.3	10	4.0	11	826.5	1 147
2006–07	117.3	135	9.2	10	8.6	11	868	1 147
2007–08	134.6	135	6.5	10	5.8	11	762.9	1 147
2008–09	128.7	135	6.1	10	3.4	11	753.8	1 147
2009–10	119.7	135	3.5	10	2.3	11	711.9	1 147
2010–11	97.4	135	7.2	10	2.5	11	741.9	1 147
2011–12	131.6	135	6	10	8.2	11	862.1	1 147
2012–13	115.5	135	5	10	4.0	11	875	1 147
2013–14	126.3	135	0	10	9.1	11	896	1 147
2014–15	142.8	135	0	10	7.9	11	885	1 147
2015–16	134.0	135	2.5	10	2.5	11	901	1 147
2016–17	138.6	135	0	10	10.3	11	952	1 147
2017–18	121.3	135	0	10	10.1	11	947	1 147
2018–19	131.0	135	0	10	4.8	11	891.5	1 147
2019–20	136.1	135	0	10	5.9	11	972.5	1 147
2020–21	141.6	135	0	10	1.2	11	989.9	1 147
2021–22	114.3	135	0	10	3.0	11	891.8	1 147
2022–23	138.6	135	0	10	0.1	11	903.3	1 147
2023–24	135.4	135	4.0	10	0.1	11	1 087.3	1 327
2024–25	117.5	135	4.0	10	0.8	11	1 078.1	1 348

Data from 1989 and 1990 are combined from the FSU and CELR databases. – indicates no recorded catch. Data for the period 1983 to 1999 are from Andrew (2001) and have been groomed. Catch estimates for 2000 and 2001 are taken directly from MFish. * includes 133 t caught in Dusky Sound experimental fishery. Catches from SUR 6, 8, and 9 have been pooled because too few permit holders recorded catches in these FMAs to report them singly.

In recent years landings have fluctuated around the TACCs for SUR 1A, 1B, 5 and 7A. The TACC was increased in SUR 1A and 1B in 2023–24. Landings have generally remained well below the TACCs in other FMAs but increased to 17 t (TACC 20 t) in SUR 3 in 2019–20, and have exceeded 170 t in 2016–17, 2017–18 and 2019–20 in SUR 4 (TACC 225 t). The SUR 3 TACC was increased to 42 t in 2024. Kina can be returned to the sea under the Fisheries (Landings and Discards) Notice if taken by hand and likely to survive on return.




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the nine main SUR stocks. From top: SUR 1A (Northland), SUR 1B (Hauraki Gulf, Bay of Plenty), and SUR 2A (East Coast). Note that these figures do not show data prior to entry into the QMS for SUR 1A to SURB 2A. [Continued on next two pages]




Figure 1 [Continued]: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the nine main SUR stocks. From top: SUR 2B (Wairarapa, Wellington), SUR 3 (South East Coast), and SUR 4 (South East Chatham Rise). Note that these figures do not show data prior to entry into the QMS for SUR 2B. [Continued next page]




Figure 1 [Continued]: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the nine main SUR stocks. From top: SUR 5 (Southland), SUR 7A (Challenger Nelson Marlborough) and SUR 7B (Challenger Westland). Note that these figures do not show data prior to entry into the QMS for SUR 7A and SUR 7B.

1.2 Recreational fisheries

Recreational catch was estimated using telephone-diary surveys in 1993–94, 1996 (Fisher & Bradford 1998, Bradford 1998) and 2000 (Boyd & Reilly 2004, Boyd et al. 2004) (Table 3). There are no estimates of recreational catch from the Chatham Islands. In many instances, insufficient kina were caught to provide reliable estimates of the error associated with the estimates of total harvest. The harvest estimates provided by these telephone-diary surveys are no longer considered reliable for various reasons. A Recreational Technical Working Group concluded that these harvest estimates should be used only with the following qualifications: a) they may be very inaccurate; b) the 1996 and

earlier surveys contain a methodological error; and c) the 2000 and 2001 estimates are implausibly high for many important fisheries.

Table 3: Estimates of recreational harvest of kina using telephone-diary surveys (1993–94, 1996, and 2000 surveys) and the national panel surveys (2011–12, 2017–18 and 2022–23).

Area	Number (thousands)	CV	Catch (t)
1993–94 (telephone-diary)			
East Northland	109	0.60	27.1
Hauraki Gulf	14	-	3.5
Bay of Plenty	648	0.49	160.9
SUR 1	801	0.41	198.9
SUR 9	30	0.72	7.4
1996 (telephone-diary)			
SUR 1	316	0.24	78.5
SUR 2	61	-	15.1
SUR 3	12	-	3.0
SUR 5	20	-	5.0
SUR 7	2	-	0.5
SUR 8	43	-	10.7
SUR 9	30	-	7.4
2000 (telephone-diary)			
SUR 1	1 793	0.35	445.2
SUR 2	1 026	0.57	254.7
SUR 3	8	0.58	2.0
SUR 5	70	1.01	17.4
SUR 7	2	1.01	0.5
SUR 8	85	0.85	21.1
SUR 9	82	0.67	20.4
2011–12 (national panel survey)			
SUR 1	1 997	0.87	-
SUR 2	107	0.32	-
SUR 3	12	0.59	-
SUR 5	10	0.73	-
SUR 7	12	0.67	-
SUR 8	60	0.43	-
SUR 9	58	0.62	-
SUR total	2 257	0.77	-
2017–18 (national panel survey)			
SUR 1	292	0.21	-
SUR 2	179	0.24	-
SUR 3	5	0.68	-
SUR 5	10	0.45	-
SUR 7	2	0.95	-
SUR 8	34	0.38	-
SUR 9	12	0.85	-
SUR total	534	0.15	-
2022–23 (national panel survey)			
SUR 1	130	0.45	-
SUR 2	233	0.59	-
SUR 3	24	0.47	-
SUR 5	16	0.72	-
SUR 7	9	0.81	-
SUR 8	69	0.55	-
SUR 9	74	0.93	-
SUR total	556	0.34	-

In response to these problems and the cost and scale challenges associated with onsite methods, a National Panel Survey was conducted for the first time throughout the 2011–12 fishing year. The panel survey used face-to-face interviews of a random sample of 30 390 New Zealand households to recruit a panel of fishers and non-fishers for a full year. The panel members were contacted regularly about their fishing activities and harvest information collected in standardised phone interviews. The national panel survey was repeated during the 2017–18 and 2022–23 fishing years using very similar methods to produce directly comparable results (Wynne-Jones et al. 2019; Heinemann & Gray 2024). Note that national panel survey estimates do not include recreational harvest taken on charter vessel trips or under s111 general approvals.

For the early telephone-diary surveys, catches in numbers were converted to catch in tonnes by assuming an average whole weight of 248.3 g per kina based on equal proportions across a size range 60–110 mm Test Diameter (TD) and a test diameter-weight relationship ($W = (6.27 \times 10^{-4})TD^{2.88}$) from Dusky Sound (unpublished data). These estimates of catch in tonnes should be considered as indicative only and may be very inaccurate. No estimates of mean weight were available to convert catches in numbers from the national panel survey to catch in tonnes.

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

There is an important customary non-commercial harvest of kina by Māori for food. Kina form an important fishery for customary non-commercial, but the total annual catch is not known.

Māori customary fishers utilise the provisions under both the recreational fishing regulations and the various customary regulations. Many tangata whenua harvest kina under their recreational allowance and these are not included in records of customary catch. Customary reporting requirements vary around the country. Customary fishing authorisations issued in the South Island and Stewart Island would be under the Fisheries (South Island Customary Fishing) Regulations 1999. Many rohe moana / areas of the coastline in the North Island and Chatham Islands are gazetted under the Fisheries (Kaimoana Customary Fishing) Regulations 1998 which require reporting on authorisations. In the areas not gazetted, customary fishing permits would be issued would be under the Fisheries (Amateur Fishing) Regulations 2013, where there is no requirement to report catch.

The information on Māori customary harvest under the provisions made for customary fishing can be limited (Table 4). These numbers are likely to be an underestimate of customary harvest as only the catch approved and harvested in kilograms and numbers are reported in the table.

Table 4: Fisheries New Zealand records of customary harvest of kina (approved and reported as weight (kg) and in numbers), for the year reported since 1998-99. – no data. [Continued on next two pages]

Fishing year	SUR 1A				SUR 1B			
	Weight (kg)		Numbers		Weight (kg)		Numbers	
	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
2003-04	–	–	–	–	–	–	1 200	750
2004-05	–	–	–	–	–	–	400	210
2005-06	–	–	–	–	1 790	1 040	–	–
2006-07	850	850	7 300	7 300	12 055	9 785	6 025	5 475
2007-08	2 890	2 890	6 900	6 900	11 225	9 285	12 230	10 130
2008-09	3 290	3 290	1 900	1 900	11 540	8 940	10 524	9 924
2009-10	1 760	1 760	1 400	1 400	11 615	8 995	9 500	7 750
2010-11	3 570	3 570	–	–	26 582	20 142	21 890	19 050
2011-12	9 575	8 775	900	600	4 990	2 900	1 450	1 400
2012-13	9 704	9 210	2 300	2 170	4 325	3 460	400	400
2013-14	610	610	3 900	3 900	480	360	–	–
2014-15	–	–	–	–	16 495	15 265	2 700	2 150
2015-16	–	–	–	–	5 550	3 950	1 260	383
2016-17	–	–	–	–	1 885	1 175	5 950	3 173
2017-18	–	–	–	–	410	130	8 875	5 700
2018-19	–	–	–	–	2 120	1 883	4 020	2 845
2019-20	–	–	–	–	640	560	380	355
2020-21	–	–	–	–	1 370	950	2000	1950
2021-22	–	–	–	–	240	180	–	–
2022-23	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2023-24	–	–	–	–	100	100	–	–

Fishing year	SUR 2A				SUR 2B			
	Weight (kg)		Numbers		Weight (kg)		Numbers	
	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
1998-99	–	–	200	200	–	–	–	–
1999-00	–	–	2 350	460	–	–	–	–
2000-01	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2001-02	–	–	100	80	–	–	–	–
2002-03	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2003-04	–	–	–	–	–	–	1 350	1 350
2004-05	–	–	600	440	–	–	900	900
2005-06	–	–	7 500	4 940	–	–	200	200

Table 4 [Continued]:

Fishing year	SUR 2A				SUR 2B			
	Weight (kg)		Numbers		Weight (kg)		Numbers	
	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
2006–07	–	–	55 806	41 546	–	–	–	–
2007–08	–	–	60 546	46 599	–	–	–	–
2008–09	–	–	54 050	46 427	–	–	18 055	14 940
2009–10	–	–	17 100	13 640	–	–	2 700	1 510
2010–11	1 300	1 000	71 950	66 222	–	–	–	–
2011–12	–	–	102 160	87 639	–	–	–	–
2012–13	–	–	127 090	101 162	–	–	–	–
2013–14	–	–	132 715	98 129	–	–	–	–
2014–15	–	–	63 410	52 181	–	–	200	130
2015–16	–	–	20 030	16 072	–	–	460	420
2016–17	300	300	50 400	33 483	–	–	–	–
2017–18	–	–	11 400	5 950	–	–	–	–
2018–19	–	–	32 870	12 785	–	–	–	–

Fishing year	SUR 3				SUR 4			
	Weight (kg)		Numbers		Weight (kg)		Numbers	
	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
2001–02	–	–	2 070	819	–	–	–	–
2002–03	–	–	650	150	–	–	–	–
2003–04	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2004–05	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2005–06	–	–	1 075	401	–	–	–	–
2006–07	–	–	2 020	1 417	–	–	–	–
2007–08	–	–	4 880	4 134	–	–	–	–
2008–09	–	–	3 099	968	–	–	–	–
2009–10	–	–	1 600	1 283	–	–	460	429
2010–11	–	–	17 170	16 092	–	–	–	–
2011–12	–	–	3 660	2 436	17	17	–	–
2012–13	–	–	5 600	4 629	–	–	–	–
2013–14	–	–	3 850	1 160	–	–	90	88
2014–15	–	–	1 910	1 382	–	–	40	40
2015–16	–	–	3 006	2 265	–	–	162	102
2016–17	–	–	1 805	1 570	–	–	310	310
2017–18	–	–	300	192	24	24	125	125
2018–19	–	–	–	–	50	50	–	–
2019–20	–	–	7 351	4 646	–	–	–	–
2020–21	–	–	6 650	6 089	–	–	–	–
2021–22	–	–	8 528	5 295	–	–	–	–
2022–23	–	–	630	160	–	–	–	–
2023–24	–	–	11 950	9 984	–	–	–	–
2024–25	–	–	110	51	–	–	–	–

Fishing year	SUR 5				SUR 7A			
	Weight (kg)		Numbers		Weight (kg)		Numbers	
	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
2000–01	–	–	730	520	–	–	–	–
2001–02	–	–	4 810	4 039	–	–	–	–
2002–03	–	–	3 440	2 255	–	–	–	–
2003–04	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2004–05	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2005–06	–	–	700	700	–	–	–	–
2006–07	–	–	260	260	50	10	–	–
2007–08	–	–	7 715	7 715	–	–	1 220	960
2008–09	–	–	7 450	7 125	–	–	1 570	1 198
2009–10	–	–	2 380	1 706	–	–	2 170	2 040
2010–11	–	–	300	300	–	–	–	–
2011–12	–	–	2 659	2 659	–	–	–	–
2012–13	–	–	5 680	5 680	–	–	–	–
2013–14	–	–	1 000	910	–	–	–	–
2014–15	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2015–16	–	–	3 840	3 170	–	–	–	–
2016–17	–	–	2 500	2 410	–	–	–	–
2017–18	–	–	2 150	2 150	–	–	–	–
2018–19	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2019–20	–	–	900	900	–	–	–	–
2020–21	–	–	3 070	2 851	–	–	–	–
2021–22	–	–	50	0	–	–	–	–
2022–23	–	–	2 000	2 000	–	–	–	–
2023–24	–	–	40	40	–	–	–	–
2024–25	–	–	500	500	–	–	–	–

Table 4 [Continued]:

Fishing year	SUR 7B				SUR 8			
	Weight (kg)		Numbers		Weight (kg)		Numbers	
	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
2006–07	–	–	250	250	–	–	–	–
2007–08	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2008–09	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2009–10	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2010–11	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2011–12	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2012–13	–	–	–	–	–	–	300	80
2013–14	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2014–15	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2015–16	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2016–17	–	–	70	70	–	–	–	–
2017–18	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2018–19	–	–	–	–	–	–	300	150

Fishing year	SUR 9			
	Weight (kg)		Numbers	
	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
2008–09	–	–	1 400	900
2009–10	100	80	–	–
2010–11	120	120	–	–
2011–12	350	320	–	–
2012–13	40	40	3 150	3 150
2013–14	400	280	500	380
2014–15	80	80	–	–

There are several types of customary management areas (locations listed in Table 5):

- mātaítai reserves – areas closed to commercial fishing, that may have bylaws affecting recreational and customary fishing
- taiāpure – local fisheries of special significance, that may have additional fishing rules
- temporary closures – issued under sections 186A or 186B of the Fisheries Act 1996

Table 5: Locations of the customary management areas relevant to kina. [Continued on next page]

	Mātaítai reserves	Taiāpure	Temporary closures s186A
SUR 1A	Te Puna	Waka-te-hāua Waikare Inlet	Marsden Bank and Mair Bank
SUR 1B	Te Maunga o Mauao Te Rae o Kohi Raukokere Te Kopa o Rongokānapa	Maketu	Ōmaha Bay, Kawau Bay, and Whangaparāoa Peninsula
SUR 2A	Te Kopa o Rongokānapa Hakihea Horokaka Toka Tāmure Te Hoe Moremore (a) Moremore (b)		Tangoiro/Waihirere Motuoroi Te Rāhui o Moremore
SUR 2B		Porangahau Palliser Bay (a) Palliser Bay (b)	
SUR 3	Te Waha o te Marangai Mangamaunu Kahutara Oaro (freshwater and marine) Tūtaeputa Lyttelton Harbour/Whakaraupō Rāpaki Bay Koukourārata Wairewa/Lake Forsyth Te Kaio Orari Ōpihi Waitarakao Te Ahi Tarakihi Tuhawaiki Waihao Moeraki Waikouaiti Otakou	Te Taumanu o Te Waka a Māui Oaro-Haumuri Akaroa Harbour East Otago	

Table 5 [Continued]:

	Mātaaitai reserves	Taiāpure	Temporary closures s186A
	Puna-wai-Toriki Tautuku Waikawa Harbour/Tumu Toka		
SUR 5	Ōtara Motupōhue (Bluff Hill) Ōmāui Oreti Waitutu Pikomamaku Te Whaka a Te Wera Kaihoka Horomamae		
SUR 7A	Te Tai Tapu (West Coast Kaihoka) Te Tai Tapu (West Coast – Anatori)	Whakapuaka (Delaware Bay)	
SUR 7B	Tauneke Ōkahu Okuru/Mussel Point Popotai Taumaka Tauparikaka Paringa Mahitahi/Bruce Bay Manakaiaua/Hunts Beach Okarito Lagoon Mikonui		
SUR 8			Western Taranaki
SUR 9	Marokopa Aotea Harbour Te Mātaaitai o Te Hikutū	Kawhia Aotea	

1.4 Illegal catch

There are qualitative data to suggest significant illegal, unreported, unregulated (IUU) activity in this fishery.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

Although there is no minimum legal size for kina, some incidental mortality is likely because roe quality (recovery rate and colour) is commonly assessed by opening ‘test’ kina underwater. These animals are not subsequently landed. There are no estimates of the magnitude to this incidental mortality.

2. BIOLOGY

The biology and ecology of kina has been extensively studied; this literature has most recently been reviewed by Barker (2001). *Evechinus chloroticus* is found throughout New Zealand and the sub-Antarctic Islands. Kina has an annual reproductive cycle which culminates in spawning between November and March (Dix 1970b, Walker 1984, McShane et al. 1994a, 1996, Lamare & Stewart 1998, Lamare 1998). Size at maturity appears to vary considerably and may be as small as 30 mm and as large as 75 mm TD (Dix 1970b, Barker et al. 1998). In Dusky Sound, kina are reproductively mature at 50–60 mm TD (McShane et al. 1996). Within these seemingly consistent patterns in the seasonality of the reproductive cycle there are many differences in the gonad size at small spatial scales.

Settlement is likely to vary between years and appears to differ among locations and habitats (Dix 1972, Walker 1984). Laboratory work has shown that kina larval mortality increased with increasing concentrations of suspended sediment at realistic concentrations (Phillips & Shima 2006). In the field, but not in the laboratory, development abnormalities were found associated with suspended sediment concentrations; this suggests the importance of other environmental factors associated with terrestrial runoff (Schwarz et al. 2006). Juvenile settlement and mortality have also been observed to increase with sediment at realistic concentrations in a size-specific manner in the laboratory; this agrees with juvenile patterns of distribution observed in the field (Walker 2007). Few small kina were observed in any of the surveys in Dusky Sound (McShane et al. 1993). These results suggest that the productivity of stocks in Fiordland may be low and that recruitment over-fishing is a real possibility.

The Intrinsic Productivity Level is categorised as Medium for this species.

There is relatively little information available on the interactions between kina and its predators and competitors. Although a wide range of fish and invertebrates eat kina, there is limited evidence that these species control or limit populations of kina in Fiordland. Work in a marine reserve, where large predators such as reef fishes and crayfish are abundant, indicates that predators can control numbers of kina surviving the transition from crevice-bound to open substratum grazing (Cole & Keuskamp 1998, Babcock et al. 1999). Babcock et al. (1999) have drawn a direct link between the increases in snapper and crayfish populations and the long-term decline in kina populations in the Leigh Marine Reserve. There is, however, no evidence that high kina densities limit rock lobster populations (Andrew & MacDiarmid 1991). It is likely, however, that changes in the abundance of kina, and the consequent changes in habitat representation, are part of a complex set of interacting processes, including but not exclusively, increased predation.

Awareness of kina barrens (areas dominated by kina and devoid of macroalgae after overgrazing of kelp forests) has increased in recent years. Many complex and interacting forces are in play in the formation and maintenance of these barrens. In some places (e.g. northern New Zealand, Shears & Babcock 2002, 2003) reduction due to fishing of kina predators such as rock lobster and snapper are thought to have caused an increase in kina densities and subsequent destruction of kelp forests. In other areas (e.g. Queen Charlotte Sound) other factors such as water quality, temperature and sedimentation are thought to have been a major contributor to the loss of kelp forests (Urlich & Handley 2020). In either case a new equilibrium is reached and the barrens can be maintained by relatively low densities of typically small, malnourished kina of no commercial value due to poor roe recovery.

A kina barrens workshop was convened by Fisheries New Zealand in March 2023, in which an research prioritisation exercise highlighted the following research needs: (1) a national assessment of kina populations and barrens, and complete review of current and past initiatives and research, (2) long-term programmes for monitoring coastal reef ecosystems, (3) research activities informed by engagement with tangata whenua and incorporation of mātauranga Māori, and (4) harvest strategy standards to set more appropriate catch limits for key kina predators (Doheny et al. 2023).

Kina compete with a range of invertebrate herbivores, including paua. There is no published evidence that high densities of kina limit paua populations in Fiordland. McShane (1997) reported that paua are abundant in Dusky Sound, and in Chalky and Preservation Inlets, but are rare in the fjords. Lamare & Mladenov (2000) estimate that kina grow 8–10 mm in their first year of life. Growth rates will vary considerably depending on local conditions, but kina may take 8–9 years to reach 100 mm TD, and very large individuals may reach ages of more than 20 years (Lamare & Mladenov 2000).

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

There appear to be few genetic differences in kina populations from Leigh (North Auckland) and Stewart Island (Mladenov et al. 1997), which suggests that there is some mixing among populations. There is no direct evidence that populations of kina at the Chatham Islands differ genetically from those on the mainland, nor is there evidence that “populations” of kina at the Chatham Islands are dependent on the dispersal of larvae from the mainland.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

Although there is a wealth of information on the biology and ecology of this species (see Barker 2001 for reviews), there is relatively little that can be used to assess the status of exploited stocks. There have been no assessments of sustainable yield nor are there estimates of biomass or trends in relative abundance for any Fishstock (Annala 1995).

4.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

Andrew (2001) reported catch rates from both dive and dredge fisheries but advised caution in the interpretation of catch rate information for sedentary invertebrates, like kina, gathered at broad spatial scales.

Miller & Abraham (2011) conducted a characterisation of the kina fishery around the country. In their report, the kina catch and effort data for dive and dredge fisheries are summarised for the 20 fishing years 1989–90 to 2008–09. In SUR 5, a voluntary logbook scheme to collect fine-scale data has been operating since the 2004–05 fishing year. As part of this scheme, one fishing company has recorded their catch in Paua Statistical Areas, using the same format as the Paua Catch Effort Landing Return (PCELR) forms. Kina harvest recorded in fine-scale Paua Statistical Areas accounted for 68% of all kina harvested in SUR 5 over that period, with the harvest from SUR 5 accounting for 46.6% of the national harvest between 2004–05 and 2008–09.

Indices of relative abundance using timed swims have been reported for Ariel Reef in SUR 2 (Anderson & Stewart 1993), Chatham Islands (Schiel et al. 1995, Naylor & Andrew 2002), and D'Urville Island and Arapawa Island in SUR 7 (McShane et al. 1994a). Numerous surveys of kina have been done over the last 30 years in fished areas, mostly by university-based researchers (e.g., Dix 1970a, Choat & Schiel 1982, Schiel et al. 1995, Cole & Keuskamp 1998, Babcock et al. 1999, Wing et al. 2001). Naylor & Andrew (2002) reported a range of densities for kina around Chatham Island from 0.17 m^{-2} (northwest Chatham Island) to 1.6 m^{-2} (south east Chatham Island). These were generally lower than estimates made in the mid-1990s by Schiel et al. (1995) (0.2 m^{-2} to 6 m^{-2}). By contrast, even lower kina densities of around 0.1 m^{-2} were reported by McShane et al. (1994a) for both Arapawa Island and D'Urville Island. Dix (1970a) reported much higher mean densities of kina ranging from 2.2 m^{-2} in Queen Charlotte Sound to 6 m^{-2} at Kaikōura.

Neubauer (unpublished) conducted an updated characterisation of the commercial kina fishery for SUR 1A and SUR 1B. The characterisation was focused on data for the fishing years 1989–99 to 2020–21. These data include catch estimates, effort data, and landings information. Overall, catch levels in SUR 1A and SUR 1B have remained relatively stable from 2003–04 to 2020–21, constrained by the 40 tonne TACC in SUR 1A and 140 tonne TACC in SUR 1B. In most recent years the TACC was caught in both SUR 1A and SUR 1B. Catch records prior to the QMS introduction in 2003 are considered to be less reliable, and available data suggest significant reporting issues prior to the QMS introduction. Effort, in terms of the number of records, has increased since the introduction of the QMS in 2003 in SUR 1A, peaking in the 2006–07 fishing year, before declining again to more consistent levels in recent years. In SUR 1B, the number of records declined significantly post QMS introduction, and has stabilised in recent years. For all years, effort was higher in SUR 1B than in SUR 1A.

4.2 Biomass estimates

McShane & Naylor (1993) reported biomass estimates of 2500 t and 500 t respectively for D'Urville Island and Arapaoa Island (SUR 7), presumably based on an expansion of density estimates reported in McShane et al. (1994a) by an area estimate; however, the methods are not detailed.

Anderson et al. (2023) estimated kina biomass in the Kura Te Au/Tory Channel portion of SUR 7A based on a stratified random sample survey using diver and camera transects, and incorporating mātauranga Māori at the design stage to identify the best location and timing for the survey. The survey was carried out in early summer, just prior to kina spawning, so as to assess roe quality at its annual peak. High-resolution bathymetry data ($2 \times 2 \text{ m}$) provided an accurate measure of the survey area for scaling up of sample density measurements. Within a total area of 4.5 km^2 and a depth range of 0–18 m, they reported estimates of 596 t greenweight with a CV of 19%, and 63 t of kina roe (in three condition categories) with a CV of 21%.

Biomass was estimated for Dusky Sound and Chalky Inlet (SUR 5) prior to Dusky Sound being opened as an experimental fishery in May 1993 (McShane & Naylor 1991, 1993). Productivity and biomass was to be estimated by depletion methods but this was unsuccessful because only 133 t of the projected 1000 t was caught (McShane et al. 1994b) and this catch was insufficient to cause a measurable change in the estimated biomass of kina.

A biomass survey was led by a major quota holder within SUR 3 in 2024 (McKenzie et al. 2024). The survey estimated a high overall biomass of kina across the surveyed area, with the observed population dominated by larger individuals and limited evidence of recruits. Some stakeholders noted that the survey density estimates did not match their own local observations, and concerns were raised about the representativeness of survey stations. These concerns have not yet been resolved.

A biomass survey was conducted by the University of Otago as part of an MBIE Smart Ideas “Development of a multidimensional, fine-scale mapping toolkit for adaptive fisheries management” (Desmond et al. 2026). The overall project focussed on measuring and modelling biodiversity of reef fauna at fine scales, but one component of that survey included estimating kina biomass (they also collected information on fish and macroalgae). Initial results show that both Fish Reef and East Otago Tāiapure show a high degree of patchiness. Variation, particularly within East Otago Tāiapure, suggests more sampling is required. There are discrepancies between the prior industry-led survey and the University-led survey results on both the estimated area of the reef/suitable urchin habitat and the biomass estimates. These populations are made up of large, probably very old individuals. University of Otago developed models to calculate biomass from model predictions. Model based predictions of density suggest kina are patchily distributed within habitat on both reefs and failure to account for this is likely to overestimate biomass.

4.3 Yield estimates and projections

MCY has not been estimated for any SUR fishstock. Within SUR 5, an MCY estimate of sustainable yield within Dusky Sound and Chalky Inlet was reported in Annala (1995). This estimate used Method 1 of Annala (1995) for new fisheries based on surveys done by McShane & Naylor (1991, 1993) and an estimate of a reference fishing mortality derived from McShane et al. (1994a). The estimated annual sustainable yield of 275 t for these two areas has never been harvested because they are closed to commercial fishing except under special permit.

CAY has not been estimated for any SUR fishstock.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

For all Fishstocks there is insufficient information to estimate current stock status.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION


- Anderson, O; Stewart, R (1993) Gisborne kina survey. (Unpublished report held in the ESNZ library, Wellington.) 2 p.
- Anderson, O F; Olsen, L; Marriott, P; Stead, J; Olmedo-Rojas, P (2023) Biomass survey and condition index for kina (*Evechinus chloroticus*) in SUR 7A. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2023/60*. 20 p.
- Andrew, N L (1986) The interaction between diet and density in influencing reproductive output in the echinoid *Evechinus chloroticus* (Val.). *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 97: 63–79.
- Andrew, N L (2001) Sea urchin fisheries: their status and management with special reference to the New Zealand kina fishery. (Unpublished report to the Ministry of Fisheries and Te Ohu Kai Moana, available at <http://www.doc.govt.nz/documents/science-and-technical/casn266.pdf>) 124 p.
- Andrew, N L; Choat, J H (1985) Habitat related differences in the survivorship and growth of juvenile sea urchins. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 27: 155–161.
- Andrew, N L; MacDiarmid, A B (1991) Interrelations among sea urchins (*Evechinus chloroticus*) and spiny lobsters (*Jasus edwardsii*) in northern New Zealand. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 70: 211–222.
- Annala, J H (1995) Report from the Fishery Assessment Plenary, May 1995. Stock assessments and yield estimates. 277 p.
- Babcock, R C; Kelly, S; Shears, N T; Walker, J W; Willis, T J (1999) Changes in community structure in temperate marine reserves. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 189: 125–134.
- Barker, M F (2001) The ecology of *Evechinus chloroticus*. In: Lawrence, J. (ed.). *Edible Sea Urchins: Biology and Ecology*. Elsevier Science, Amsterdam. 245–260 p.
- Barker, M F; Keogh, J A; Lawrence, J M; Lawrence, A L (1998) Feeding rate, absorption efficiencies, growth, and enhancement of gonad production in the New Zealand sea urchin *Evechinus chloroticus* Valenciennes (Echinoidea: Echinometridae) fed prepared and natural diets. *Journal of Shellfish Research* 17: 1583–1590.
- Boyd, R O; Gowing, L; Reilly, J L (2004) 2000–2001 national marine recreational fishing survey: diary results and harvest estimates. (Unpublished New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Report for the Ministry of Fisheries Project REC2000-01 held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 92 p.
- Boyd, R O; Reilly, J L (2004) 1999/2000 National Marine Recreational Fishing Survey: harvest estimates. (Unpublished New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Report for the Ministry of Fisheries Project REC9803 held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 28 p.

- Bradford, E (1998) Harvest estimated from the 1996 national marine recreational surveys. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1998/16*: 27p.
- Brewin, P E; Lamare, M D; Keogh, J A; Mladenov, P V (2000) Reproductive variability over a four-year period in the sea urchin *Evechinus chloroticus* (Echinoidea: Echinodermata) from differing habitats in New Zealand. *Marine Biology* 137: 543–557.
- Choat, J H; Schiel, D R (1982) Patterns of distribution and abundance of large brown algae and invertebrate herbivores in subtidal regions of northern New Zealand. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 60: 129–162.
- Cole, R G; Keuskamp, D (1998) Indirect effects of protection from exploitation: patterns from populations of *Evechinus chloroticus* (Echinoidea) in northeastern New Zealand. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 173: 215–226.
- Desmond, M; Brough, T (2026) Fishery Independent Kina Surveys in East Otago. Presentation to the Biodiversity Research Advisory Group on 21 April 2026. (Presentation held by Fisheries New Zealand). Research led by the University of Otago, Earth Sciences New Zealand and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu.
- Dix, T G (1970a) Biology of *evechinus chloroticus* (echinoidea: Echinometridae) from different localities, *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research*, 4:2, 91–116.
- Dix, T G (1970b) Biology of *Evechinus chloroticus* (Echinodermata: Echinometridae) from different localities. 3. Reproduction. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 4: 385–405.
- Dix, T G (1972) Biology of *Evechinus chloroticus* (Echinoidea: Echinometridae) from different localities. 4. Age, growth, and size. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 6: 48–68.
- Doheny, B; Davis J P; Miller, B (2023) Fishery-induced trophic cascades and sea urchin barrens in New Zealand: a review and discussion for management. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 324*. 110 p.
- Fisher, D; Bradford, E (1998) National marine recreational fishing survey 1996: catch and effort results by fishing zone. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project REC9701. 38 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington).
- Hartill, B; Davey, N (2015) Mean weight estimates for recreational fisheries in 2011–12. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/25*.
- Heinemann A; Gray, A. (2024) National Panel Survey of Recreational Marine Fishers 2022–23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/51*. 116 p.
- Lamare, M (1998) Origin and transport of larvae of the sea urchin *Evechinus chloroticus* (Echinodermata: Echinoidea) in a New Zealand fiord. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 174: 107–121.
- Lamare, M; Stewart, B (1998) Mass spawning by the sea urchin *Evechinus chloroticus* (Echinodermata: Echinoidea) in a New Zealand fiord. *Marine Biology* 132(1): 135–140.
- Lamare, M D; Mladenov, P V (2000) Modelling somatic growth in the sea urchin *Evechinus chloroticus* (Echinoidea: Echinometridae). *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 243: 17–43.
- MacDiarmid, A B; Breen, P A (1993) Spiny lobster population changes in a marine reserve. In: Battershill, C N; Schiel, D R; Jones, G P; Creese, R G; MacDiarmid, A B (eds.). Proceedings of the Second International Temperate Reef Symposium. 47–56. NIWA Marine, Wellington.
- McKenzie, A; Anderson, O; MacKay, K (2024) Kina abundance estimation for two sub-areas within SUR 3. NIWA client report prepared for Sustainable Fisheries Development Limited. (Unpublished report held by ESNZ, Wellington and Sustainable Fisheries Development Limited).
- McShane, P E (1992) Sea urchins in Dusky Sound-Prospects for a major kina industry in New Zealand. *New Zealand Professional Fisherman* December 92: 34–40.
- McShane, P E (1997) A summary of commercial catch data and biological information for kina (*Evechinus chloroticus*). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document. 1997/16*: 7 p.
- McShane, P E; Anderson, O F; Gerring, P K; Stewart, R A; Naylor, J R (1994a) Fisheries biology of kina (*Evechinus chloroticus*). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document. 1994/17*: 34 p.
- McShane, P; Gerring, P; Anderson, O; Stewart, R (1996) Population differences in the reproductive biology of *Evechinus chloroticus* (Echinoidea: Echinometridae). *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 30: 333–339.
- McShane, P E; Naylor, J R (1991) A survey of kina populations (*Evechinus chloroticus*) in Dusky Sound and Chalky Inlet, southwest New Zealand. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1991/17*. 34 p.
- McShane, P E; Naylor, J R (1993) SUR 7 – Prospects for development of a kina fishery. *Seafood New Zealand* 1: 33–34.
- McShane, P; Naylor, J; Anderson, O; Gerring, P; Stewart, R (1993) Pre-fishing surveys of kina (*Evechinus chloroticus*) in Dusky Sound, Southwest New Zealand. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 93/11*. 27 p.
- McShane, P E; Stewart, R; Anderson, O; Gerring, P K (1994b) Failure of kina fishery leaves bitter taste. *Seafood New Zealand* 2: 35–36.
- Mead, S (1996) Fertilization success, sustainable management and commercial development of the New Zealand sea urchin, *Evechinus chloroticus*. Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, University of Auckland.
- Miller, S L; Abraham, E R (2011) Characterisation of New Zealand kina fisheries. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2011/7*. 95 p.
- Mladenov, P V; Allibone, R M; Wallis, G P (1997) Genetic differentiation in the New Zealand sea urchin *Evechinus chloroticus* (Echinodermata: Echinoidea). *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 31: 261–269.
- Naylor, R; Andrew, N (2002) Relative abundance and size frequency of kina (*Evechinus chloroticus*) in the Chatham Islands in the 2001–02 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2002/35*. 8 p.
- Phillips, N E; Shima, J (2006) Differential effects of suspended sediments on larval survival and settlement of New Zealand urchins *Evechinus chloroticus* and abalone *Haliotis iris*. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 314: 149–158.
- Schiel, D R (1990) Macroalgal assemblages in New Zealand: structure, interactions and demography. *Hydrobiologia* 192: 59–76.
- Schiel, D R; Andrew, N L; Foster, M S (1995) The structure of subtidal algal and invertebrate assemblages at the Chatham Islands, New Zealand. *Marine Biology* 123: 355–367.
- Schwarz, A; Cole, R; Budd, R; Taylor, R; Hewitt, J; Hunt, L; Shima, J; Phillips, N (2006) Impacts of terrestrial runoff on the biodiversity of rocky reefs. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment Biodiversity Report* 7 109 p.
- Shears, N T; Babcock, R C (2002) Marine reserves demonstrate top-down control of community structure on temperate reefs. *Oecologia* 132: 131–142.
- Shears, N T; Babcock, R C (2003) Continuing trophic cascade effects after 25 years of no-take Marine reserve protection. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 246: 1–16.
- Urlich, S C; Handley, S J (2020) From ‘clean and green’ to ‘brown and down’: A synthesis of historical changes to biodiversity and marine ecosystems in the Marlborough Sounds, New Zealand. *Ocean & Coastal Management* 198.
- Walker, J (2007) Effects of fine sediments on settlement and survival of the sea urchin *Evechinus chloroticus* in northeastern New Zealand. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 331: 109–118.
- Walker, M (1984) Larval life span, larval settlement, and early growth of *Evechinus chloroticus* (Valenciennes). *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 18: 393–397.
- Wing, S R; Lamare, M D; Vasques, J (2001) Population structure of sea urchins (*Evechinus chloroticus*) along gradients in benthic productivity in the New Zealand fjords. In: Barker, M F (ed.). Proceedings of the 10th International Echinoderm Conference. University of Otago, Dunedin. A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam. Pp 569–576.

- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–2018. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/24*. 104 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Hill, L; Heinemann, A (2014) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2011–12: Harvest Estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/67*.

KING CRAB (KIC)

(*Lithodes aotearoa*, *Lithodes robertsoni*, *Neolithodes brodiei*)



Lithodes aotearoa



Lithodes robertsoni



Neolithodes brodiei

1. FISHERY SUMMARY

Allowances, TACCs, and TACs are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs, and TACs (t) for king crab by Fishstock.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
KIC 1	0	0	0	10	10
KIC 2	0	0	0	10	10
KIC 3	0	0	0	10	10
KIC 4	0	0	0	10	10
KIC 5	0	0	0	10	10
KIC 6	0	0	0	10	10
KIC 7	0	0	0	10	10
KIC 8	0	0	0	10	10
KIC 9	0	0	0	10	10
KIC 10	0	0	0	0	0

1.1 Commercial fisheries

King crabs (*Lithodes aotearoa*, *Lithodes robertsoni*, and *Neolithodes brodiei*) were originally introduced into the Quota Management System on 1 April 2004 as *Lithodes murrayi* and *N. brodiei*, with a combined TAC of 90 t and TACC of 90 t (Table 2). *Lithodes murrayi* have undergone taxonomic revision and are now known as the New Zealand king crab *Lithodes aotearoa* (Ahyong 2010). There are no allowances for customary, recreational, or other sources of mortality. The fishing year is from 1 April to 31 March and commercial catches are measured in greenweight. King crab are a minor bycatch in conjunction with orange roughy fishing off the Wairarapa Coast, queen scallop fishing off the Otago

coast, and both squid and hoki fishing off the east coast, South Island. The three crabs are relatively distinct and are found at different depths but may be confused with other species of *Lithodes*.

Table 2: TACCs and reported landings (t) of king crab by Fishstock from 1993–94 to present. The fishing year is from 1 April to 31 March. No landings have been reported from KIC 10.

Fishstock	KIC 1		KIC 2		KIC 3		KIC 4		KIC 5	
	Landing	TACC	Landing	TACC	Landing	TACC	Landing	TACC	Landing	TACC
1993–94	0	–	0.12	–	0.06	–	0	–	0	–
1994–95	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1995–96	0	–	0	–	0.06	–	0	–	0	–
1996–97	0	–	0.08	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1997–98	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1998–99	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1999–00	0	–	0	–	0.02	–	0	–	0	–
2000–01	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
2001–02	0.14	–	0.26	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
2002–03	0.01	–	0.01	–	0	–	0	–	0.03	–
2003–04	0	–	0	–	0.01	–	0.01	–	0	–
2004–05	0.01	10	0.08	10	0.12	10	0.02	10	0.03	10
2005–06	0	10	0.21	10	0.12	10	0.18	10	0.03	10
2006–07	0	10	0.04	10	0.24	10	0.9	10	0.13	10
2007–08	0.08	10	0.41	10	0.21	10	1.46	10	0.07	10
2008–09	0.01	10	0.19	10	0.24	10	1.57	10	0.07	10
2009–10	0	10	0.2	10	0.35	10	1.49	10	0.03	10
2010–11	0.02	10	0.18	10	0.25	10	1.9	10	0.14	10
2011–12	0	10	2.48	10	0.07	10	0.02	10	0.04	10
2012–13	0	10	3.76	10	0.13	10	0.02	10	0.11	10
2013–14	0	10	10.31	10	0.11	10	0.12	10	0.33	10
2014–15	0.01	10	8.09	10	0.12	10	0.02	10	0.09	10
2015–16	0	10	2.08	10	0.08	10	0.04	10	0.04	10
2016–17	0.02	10	0.03	10	0.05	10	0.29	10	0.02	10
2017–18	0.01	10	0.02	10	0.08	10	0.05	10	0.05	10
2018–19	0	10	0.02	10	0.45	10	0.05	10	0.41	10
2019–20	0.10	10	0.81	10	0.11	10	0.08	10	0.11	10
2020–21	0.01	10	0.05	10	0.44	10	0.05	10	0.01	10
2021–22	0.08	10	0.02	10	0.04	10	0.18	10	0.04	10
2022–23	0	10	1.13	10	5.53	10	0.13	10	0.03	10
2023–24	0.01	10	0.62	10	8.25	10	0.15	10	0.03	10
2024–25	< 0.01	10	0.39	10	6.73	10	0.10	10	0.06	10

Fishstock	KIC 6		KIC 7		KIC 8		KIC 9		Total	
	Landing	TACC	Landing	TACC	Landing	TACC	Landing	TACC	Landing	TACC
1993–94	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–	0.12	–
1994–95	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1995–96	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–	0.10	–
1996–97	4.00	–	0	–	0	–	0	–	4.10	–
1997–98	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1998–99	0.03	–	0	–	0	–	0	–	0.01	–
1999–00	0.04	–	0	–	0.07	–	0	–	0.12	–
2000–01	0.06	–	0	–	0	–	0	–	0.04	–
2001–02	0.03	–	0	–	0	–	0	–	0.45	–
2002–03	0.05	–	0	–	0	–	0	–	0.06	–
2003–04	0.46	–	0	–	0	–	0	–	0.48	–
2004–05	0.57	10	0	10	0	10	0	10	0.83	90
2005–06	0.51	10	0	10	0	10	0	10	1.05	90
2006–07	0.31	10	0	10	0	10	0.02	10	1.62	90
2007–08	0.49	10	0.08	10	0	10	0	10	2.82	90
2008–09	0.42	10	0.06	10	0	10	0.06	10	2.56	90
2009–10	0.34	10	0	10	0	10	0	10	2.47	90
2010–11	1.04	10	0	10	0.2	10	0.03	10	3.73	90
2011–12	0.34	10	0	10	0	10	0	10	2.98	90
2012–13	0.14	10	0	10	0	10	0.04	10	4.16	90
2013–14	0.70	10	0	10	0	10	0	10	11.61	90
2014–15	0.50	10	0.01	10	0	10	0	10	8.84	90
2015–16	0.27	10	0	10	0	10	0.01	10	2.51	90
2016–17	0.21	10	0	10	0	10	0	10	0.63	90
2017–18	0.85	10	0.01	10	0	10	0	10	1.07	90
2018–19	0.74	10	0	10	0	10	0.01	10	1.66	90
2019–20	0.54	10	0.01	10	0	10	0.01	10	1.76	90
2020–21	0.61	10	0.02	10	0	10	0	10	1.19	90
2021–22	0.68	10	0.05	10	0	10	0.04	10	1.13	90
2022–23	0.62	10	0.01	10	0	10	0.01	10	7.46	90
2023–24	1.20	10	0.23	10	0	10	0	10	10.47	90
2024–25	1.02	10	0.32	10	0	10	0	10	8.63	90

Note. In 1995–96 and 1998–99, 47 kg and 1 kg of LMU (*L. aotearoa*) were landed, respectively, but no FMA was assigned to the landings. In 1996–97, 24 kg of NEB (*N. brodiei*) were landed but no FMA was assigned to this landing. These reported landings are included in the total landings for KIC in those years.

Landings have been reported from all QMAs; however, these landings are small. Most of the landed catch has been reported under the aggregated code KIC, although there are a few records by species (i.e., *L. aotearoa* [LMU], *L. robertsoni* [LRO], and *N. brodiei* [NEB]) mainly by the fisheries observers.

Most of the reported landings have come from KIC 2 from 2011–12 to 2015–16, which was fished under a special permit during that time; catches of 2.15 tonnes in 2013–14 and 2.3 tonnes in 2014–15 were taken under special permit and are additional to the landing reported in Table 1. A special permit was also issued for KIC 6 in the 1996–97 fishing year. Landings in KIC 3 have increased since 2022–23. Target fishing is by potting, although small quantities of crabs are taken as bycatch in fisheries such as orange roughy and squid. Figure 1 shows the historical landings and TACC for KIC 2 and KIC 3. King crabs can be returned to the sea under the Fisheries (Landings and Discards) Notice if taken using potting and likely to survive on return.




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for KIC 2 and KIC 3. Note that this figure does not show data prior to entry into the QMS and does not include the catch taken under special permits.

1.2 Recreational fisheries

There are no records of recreational use of these crabs and, because of their depth range, recreational catch is unlikely.

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

There are no known records of customary use of these crabs and, because of their depth range, customary take is unlikely.

1.4 Illegal catch

There is no known illegal catch of these crabs.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

There is no quantitative information on other sources of mortality.

2. BIOLOGY

King crabs belong to the Anomura and differ from true crabs (Brachyura) in that the last pair of walking legs is very reduced and tucked into the gill chamber, and in females the abdomen is asymmetric.

Lithodes aotearoa is a large, pear-shaped, dark purplish-red or brick red crab that has been found at depths between 120 m and 700 m, from the east coast of Northland to southern parts of the Campbell Plateau. It is a circumpolar Southern Ocean species growing so large that the distance between the tips of the second legs can reach 1.25 m. The carapace width in males of this species may exceed 200 mm. Females are smaller with a carapace width up to 138 mm.

Lithodes robertsoni has been found at depths between 935–1259 m from as far north as the Challenger Plateau to as far south as the Snares Islands. The largest yet-examined specimen is its male holotype whose carapace measures 128.1 mm in postrostral length and 117.0 mm in width.

Neolithodes brodiei is also a very large crab, having a similar leg span to *Lithodes aotearoa* but a proportionately smaller carapace. It is also pear-shaped and typically a uniform brick to bright red colour. It is widely distributed from the Three Kings Islands to the Campbell Plateau, where it occurs on hard and soft substrates between about 800 m and 1100 m. Carapace width in this species is up to about 180 mm.

King crabs appear to be seasonal spawners, probably spawning in summer or autumn. King crabs are thought to aggregate for protection during breeding and moulting. Migrations between shallow and deep waters also probably occur in response to moulting and mating, at least in near-shore populations.

King crabs are associated with suspension-feeding fauna such as sponges, gorgonians, polychaetes, brachiopods, bryozoans, and ascidians. Garrick's masking crab, ling, black shark, red cod and hagfish, and other invertebrates, including unnamed holothurians and starfish, have all been reported from crab pots targeting king crab. Their principal predators are fish, New Zealand fur seals and New Zealand sea lions, however, king crabs are not known to be the exclusive diet of any other marine species.

They are probably omnivorous, although animal food (sessile, sedentary, and mobile invertebrates, and small fish), including dead material, is their predominant food.

The Intrinsic Productivity Level is categorised as Medium for this species. A comparison with similar species that are better known from other parts of the world may provide some insight into the king crab, although similarities are conjectural. The red king crab *Paralithodes camtschaticus* in the Alaskan fishery appears to have a lifespan of 15 to 20 years.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

For management purposes stock boundaries are based on FMAs; however, there is currently no biological or fishery information which could be used to identify stock boundaries.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

4.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

There are no estimates of fishery parameters or abundance for any king crab fishstock.

4.2 Biomass estimates

There are no biomass estimates for any king crab fishstock.

4.3 Yield estimates and projections

There are no estimates of *MCY* and *CAY* for any king crab fishstock.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

For all Fishstocks there is insufficient information to estimate current stock status.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Ahyong, S T (2010). King crabs of New Zealand, Australia, and the Ross Sea (Crustacea: Decapoda: Lithodidae). *NIWA Biodiversity Memoir* 123.
- Arnaud, P M; Do-Chi, T (1977) Donneés biologiques et biometriques sur les lithodes *Lithodes aotearoa* (Crustacea: Decapoda: Anomura) des Iles Crozet (SW Ocean Indien). *Marine Biology* 39: 147–159.
- Clark, M R; King, K J (1989) Deepwater fish resources off the North Island, New Zealand: results of a trawl survey, May 1985 to June 1986. *New Zealand Fisheries Technical Report No. 11*.
- Dawson, E W (1989) King crabs of the world (Crustacea: Lithodidae) and their fisheries. A comprehensive bibliography. *New Zealand Oceanographic Institute Miscellaneous Publication* 101.
- Food and Agriculture Organisation (1985) Southern Ocean CCAMLR Convention area, fishing areas 48, 58 and 88. pp. 89–92. FAO species identification sheets for fishery purposes. Vol. 1.
- McClay, C L (1988) Brachyura and crab-like Anomura of New Zealand. *Leigh Laboratory Bulletin No. 22*.
- Macpherson, E (2001) New species and new records of lithodid crabs (Crustacea, Decapoda) from the southwestern and central Pacific Ocean. *Zoosystema. Paris* 23: 797–805.
- Melville-Smith, R (1982) A brief exploitation of the stone crab *Lithodes aotearoa* (Henderson) off South West Africa, 1979/80. *Fisheries Bulletin of South Africa* 16: 45–55.
- Miquel, J C; Arnaud, P M (1987) Aspects de la biologie de *Lithodes aotearoa* (Crustacea : Decapoda) aux Iles Crozet, Ocean Indien Subantarctique. *CNFRA* 57: 81–89.
- Miquel, J C; Arnaud, P M; Do-Chi, T (1985) Population structure and migration of the stone crab *Lithodes aotearoa* in the Crozet Islands, Subantarctic Indian Ocean. *Marine Biology* 89: 263–269.
- Naylor, J R; Webber, W R; Booth, J D (2005) A guide to common offshore crabs in New Zealand waters. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 2*. 47 p.
- O’Driscoll, R L; Booth, J D; Bagley, N W; Anderson, O F; Griggs, L H; Stevenson, M L; Francis, M P (2001) Areas of importance for spawning, pupping or egg-laying, and juveniles of New Zealand deepwater fish, pelagic fish, and invertebrates. *NIWA Technical Report* 119. 377 p.
- Webb, B F (1972) Report on the investigations of the ‘Lloret Lopez II’ - 8 January to 2 April 1970. Section 3 Crab survey - 18 February to 27 February 1970. *Fisheries Technical Report No. 97*.
- Webber, R (1997) The royal family: king crabs at home and abroad. *Seafood New Zealand* May 1997: 81–84.

KINGFISH (KIN)

(*Seriola lalandi*)
Haku



1. FISHERY SUMMARY

Kingfish were introduced into the QMS on 1 October 2003. Current allowances, TACCs, and TACs are given in Table 1.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs, and TACs (t) for kingfish by Fishstock from 1 October 2024.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of fishing related mortality	TACC	TAC
KIN 1	459	76	47	91	673
KIN 2	79	18	19	69	185
KIN 3	10	4	3.5	20	37.5
KIN 4	1	1	0	1	3
KIN 7	40	6	10	60	116
KIN 8	55	19	16	100	190
KIN 10	1	0	0	1	2

1.1 Commercial fisheries

Historical estimated and recent reported kingfish landings and TACCs are shown in Tables 2 and 3, and Figure 1 shows the historical and recent landings and TACC values for the main kingfish stocks. Commercial landings of kingfish have been reported since the 1930s, with landings peaking at 144 t in 1940–41 before dropping to 11–41 t per annum between the mid-1940s and mid-1960s (Figure 1, Table 2). Landings increased from the late-1960s, exceeding 200 t per annum from the early 1970s, and reaching 532 t in 1992–93. Walsh et al (2003) note that landings for 1985 to 1988 are likely to be underestimated because of the change from the FSU to QMS reporting systems.

In the mid-1980s the commercial targeting of kingfish was restricted to certain methods and only fishers with ‘kingfish’ designated on their fishing permits could target the species (Walsh et al 2003). In the Auckland Fishery Management Area (FMAs 1 and 9), kingfish could be targeted by pole, troll, longline, and set net. After 1988, no new targeting permits were issued for kingfish. Although kingfish could be taken as bycatch, only fishers who had been granted targeting rights before 1988 could continue to

target kingfish. In 1992 a moratorium was imposed on the targeting of all non-QMS species. Fishers could only continue to target a non-QMS species if they held a target authorisation for that species as at September 1992 and they had taken the species at least once in the previous two years.

A minimum legal size (MLS) of 65 cm was established for kingfish in October 1993. This restriction applied to kingfish taken by all methods except trawling between 1993 and 2000. In December 2000, the Minister of Fisheries revoked the trawl MLS exemption (Walsh et al 2003).




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the five largest KIN fisheries. From top to bottom: KIN 1 (Auckland East), KIN 2 (Central East), and KIN 3 (East Coast South Island & Southland). [Continued on next page]




Figure 1 [Continued]: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the five largest KIN fisheries. KIN 7 (Challenger) and KIN 8 (Central Egmont and Auckland West).

The main fishing areas for kingfish have traditionally been the east (KIN 1 and KIN 2) and west coast (KIN 8) of the North Island of New Zealand (Table 2). Of the peak landings in 1992–93 of 532 t, 71% was from KIN 1. From 1993–94 to 2002–03 the reported landings of kingfish decreased substantially in both KIN 1 and KIN 2. Possible reasons for this decrease include: the effect of the October 1993 introduction of a MLS of 65 cm on all methods other than trawl, changes in fishing patterns in the snapper and trevally target set net, trawl, and bottom longline fisheries (that were responsible for most of the non-target catch of kingfish), decreased target fishing for kingfish, and set net area closures in FMA 1 from October 1993.

The TACs set for kingfish stocks from 1 October 2003 were based on a 20% reduction in average landings in KIN 1, KIN 2, and KIN 8. Commercial catches in KIN 1 were substantially below the TACC from 2003–04 to 2010–11 and have been around the TACC since then (Table 3). Except for 2005–06, landings in KIN 2 remained at or below the TACC until 2013–14 then fluctuated around the TACC until 2019–20, dropping to 36 t in 2021–22. In KIN 3 landings had generally been very low, but have increased since 2015–16, and exceeded the TACC (which was increased to 11 t from 2020–21) between 2018–19 and 2023–24. The TACC was increased again (to 20 t) in 2024–25. Landings in KIN 7 increased substantially from 2011–12, consistently exceeding the TACC until this was increased from 15 t to 44 t in 2020–21. This TACC was exceeded in 2022–23, and was increased to 60 t in 2024–25. In KIN 8 landings dropped to just above the TACC from 2005–06 to 2010–11 but were substantially above the TACC in the following years, reaching a peak of 115 t (TACC 45 t) in 2019–20. The TACC was increased from 45 t to 80 t in 2020–21 and to 100 t in 2024–25.

Set net, bottom trawl, and bottom longline accounted for 36%, 33%, and 15% respectively, of the kingfish commercial catch on average from 1983–84 to 1999–2000 (Walsh et al 2003). Targeting of kingfish has been largely restricted to the set net fishery. Set netting was responsible for most of the

commercial catch of kingfish in the 1990s, but set net catches decreased substantially from 2000. Bottom longline catches have been largely restricted to KIN 1, primarily as a bycatch of the snapper target fishery. Bycatch of kingfish in trawl fisheries targeting other species currently accounts for the majority of the commercial catch in all QMAs.

Table 2: Reported landings (t) for the main QMAs from 1931 to 1982.

Year	KIN 1	KIN 2	KIN 8	Year	KIN 1	KIN 2	KIN 8
1931–32	10	0	0	1957	18	2	2
1932–33	5	0	0	1958	13	2	2
1933–34	3	0	0	1959	10	4	2
1934–35	1	0	0	1960	11	5	0
1935–36	0	0	0	1961	18	7	0
1936–37	0	0	0	1962	20	10	1
1937–38	3	1	0	1963	18	9	1
1938–39	1	1	0	1964	18	6	1
1939–40	13	0	0	1965	21	13	0
1940–41	80	1	0	1966	32	20	1
1941–42	141	2	1	1967	40	17	3
1942–43	90	1	0	1968	58	23	4
1943–44	28	2	1	1969	75	29	6
1944	20	2	3	1970	93	34	7
1945	31	0	2	1971	111	40	8
1946	16	0	1	1972	129	46	9
1947	11	1	3	1973	189	48	10
1948	8	1	2	1974	214	63	12
1949	16	3	2	1975	66	46	9
1950	19	4	2	1976	114	51	11
1951	17	3	2	1977	109	38	14
1952	33	2	1	1978	299	43	26
1953	35	2	1	1979	242	46	63
1954	23	17	1	1980	161	37	35
1955	14	5	1	1981	195	25	54
1956	12	3	1	1982	247	25	45

Notes:

1. The 1931–1943 years are April–March but from 1944 onwards are calendar years.
2. Data up to 1985 are from fishing returns; data from 1986 to 1990 are from Quota Management Reports.
3. Data for the period 1931 to 1982 are based on reported landings by harbour and are likely to be underestimated as a result of under-reporting and discarding practices. Data include both foreign and domestic landings.

Kingfish were added to Schedule 6 of the Fisheries Act (1996) in October 2005 for all fishing methods except set net and in all areas. A special reporting code for Schedule 6 releases was introduced on 1 October 2006 to allow monitoring of releases. Kingfish that were released in accordance with Schedule 6 conditions and reported against this code were not counted against ACE. Schedule 6 was repealed as of 1 November 2022, but the Fisheries (Landing and Discard Exceptions) Notice allows the return to the sea of legal size kingfish until 30 September 2026, with identical requirements and restrictions to the previous Schedule 6 regime. There is draft legislation to extend this date to 30 September 2028, with decisions expected mid-2026.

Use of Schedule 6 provisions to release kingfish alive was adopted from 2008 in KIN 8 and has been used in KIN 7 since 2012 as catches increased; Schedule 6 returns in KIN 7 have equalled or exceeded the retained catch since 2016 (Figure 2, Table 4). Use of Schedule 6 provisions is more recent in KIN 1 and is associated with a decision in parts of the bottom longline fishery to only retain fish that exceed the recreational MLS of 75 cm. There was reduced use of the Schedule 6 provisions in KIN 1 and KIN 2 in 2020–21 and 2021–22.

When kingfish stocks were introduced into the QMS an annual deemed value rate of \$8.90 per kg was set for all stocks. Differential deemed value rates were also set, the maximum of which was double the annual rate (i.e., \$17.80). The rate of \$8.90 was chosen because this was the maximum port price of any kingfish stock reported by any licensed fish receiver prior to 2003. Deemed value rates were set high to discourage fishers from landing catch in excess of ACE holdings.

When landings began to increase and exceed available ACE, significant deemed values began to be incurred by fishers, particularly those who took kingfish in KIN 7 and KIN 8. Deemed values peaked in 2018–19 when around \$1.5m was incurred for KIN 7 and KIN 8 combined. The low value of kingfish packed and frozen at sea meant that catching kingfish that was unable to be balanced with ACE

represented a significant financial loss to industry. To reduce the quantity of deemed values incurred, fishers have been attempting to avoid catching kingfish in the first place, as well as implementing operational changes designed to ensure that any live kingfish can be returned to the sea.

Table 3: Reported landings (t) of kingfish by area (QMA) from 1983–84 to present. From 1986–87 to 2000–01, total landings are from LFRRs and landings by QMA are from CLRs prorated to the LFRR total. Totals include landings not attributed to the listed QMAs. MHR data from 2001-02 to present. [Continued on next page]

Year	KIN 1		KIN 2		KIN 3		KIN 4	
	Landing	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landing	TACC
1983–84*	326	–	58	–	11	–	0	–
1984–85*	239	–	52	–	8	–	0	–
1985–86*	262	–	43	–	4	–	0	–
1986–87	192	–	52	–	9	–	0	–
1987–88	202	–	56	–	9	–	0	–
1988–89	92	–	17	–	4	–	0	–
1989–90	221	–	62	–	2	–	0	–
1990–91	295	–	85	–	6	–	< 1	–
1991–92	362	–	93	–	4	–	< 1	–
1992–93	378	–	81	–	4	–	0	–
1993–94	184	–	67	–	2	–	< 1	–
1994–95	196	–	73	–	2	–	0	–
1995–96	214	–	120	–	2	–	< 1	–
1996–97	240	–	114	–	7	–	< 1	–
1997–98	155	–	106	–	2	–	< 1	–
1998–99	159	–	94	–	3	–	< 1	–
1999–00	111	–	93	–	4	–	< 1	–
2000–01	138	–	83	–	4	–	< 1	–
2001–02	95	–	60	–	2	–	< 1	–
2002–03	73	–	55	–	1	–	0	–
2003–04	49	91	50	63	1	1	< 1	1
2004–05	58	91	63	63	1	1	0	1
2005–06	48	91	73	63	< 1	1	0	1
2006–07	60	91	50	63	1	1	0	1
2007–08	66	91	40	63	< 1	1	< 1	1
2008–09	61	91	50	63	< 1	1	< 1	1
2009–10	66	91	56	63	< 1	1	< 1	1
2010–11	71	91	55	63	< 1	1	< 1	1
2011–12	87	91	60	63	< 1	1	0	1
2012–13	88	91	59	63	2	1	< 1	1
2013–14	100	91	67	63	1	1	< 1	1
2014–15	81	91	64	63	1	1	< 1	1
2015–16	95	91	67	63	2	1	< 1	1
2016–17	88	91	69	63	3	1	< 1	1
2017–18	85	91	55	63	4	1	< 1	1
2018–19	86	91	68	63	8	6	< 1	1
2019–20	78	91	60	63	10	6	< 1	1
2020–21	89	91	50	69	14	11	< 1	1
2021–22	66	91	36	69	11	11	< 1	1
2022–23	88	91	44	69	16	11	< 1	1
2023–24	78	91	47	69	19	11	< 1	1
2024–25	88	91	38	69	18	20	< 1	1

Year	KIN 7		KIN 8		KIN 10		Total	
	Landings	TACC	Landing	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC
1983–84*	3	–	50	–	0	–	448	–
1984–85*	< 1	–	46	–	0	–	345	–
1985–86*	1	–	70	–	0	–	380	–
1986–87	1	–	49	–	0	–	356	–
1987–88	1	–	49	–	0	–	373	–
1988–89	< 1	–	16	–	0	–	460	–
1989–90	3	–	\$26	–	< 1	–	428	–
1990–91	2	–	\$37	–	< 1	–	448	–
1991–92	2	–	\$32	–	9	–	512	–
1992–93	1	–	\$56	–	< 1	–	532	–
1993–94	4	–	29	–	< 1	–	288	–
1994–95	6	–	25	–	< 1	–	302	–
1995–96	7	–	45	–	< 1	–	380	–
1996–97	11	–	48	–	6	–	427	–
1997–98	7	–	42	–	1	–	326	–
1998–99	16	–	49	–	< 1	–	323	–
1999–00	10	–	51	–	0	–	270	–
2000–01	11	–	69	–	< 1	–	304	–
2001–02	22	–	52	–	0	–	231	–
2002–03	20	–	143	–	0	–	292	–
2003–04	3	7	57	36	0	1	160	200
2004–05	19	7	53	36	0	1	195	200
2005–06	7	7	40	36	< 1	1	169	200
2006–07	13	7	39	36	0	1	161	200
2007–08	5	7	45	36	0	1	157	200

KINGFISH (KIN) – May 2026

Year	KIN 7		KIN 8		KIN 10		Total	
	Landings	TACC	Landing	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC
2008–09	5	7	38	36	0	1	154	200
2009–10	7	7	43	36	0	1	172	200
2010–11	6	7	37	36	0	1	171	200
2011–12	15	7	72	45	0	1	235	209
2012–13	12	7	66	45	0	1	226	209
2013–14	26	15	89	45	0	1	283	217
2014–15	20	15	68	45	0	1	235	217
2015–16	21	15	63	45	0	1	248	217
2016–17	27	15	48	45	0	1	235	217
2017–18	47	15	63	45	0	1	255	217
2018–19	62	15	93	45	0	1	317	222
2019–20	46	15	115	45	0	1	309	222
2020–21	27	44	98	80	0	1	279	297
2021–22	25	44	83	80	0	1	222	297
2022–23	54	44	70	80	0	1	272	297
2023–24	21	44	75	80	0	1	240	297
2024–25	22	60	64	100	0	1	229	342

* FSU data (Area unknown data prorated in proportion to recorded catch).

§ Some data included in FMA 1.




Figure 2: Bars: reported commercial landings of kingfish, and returns under Schedule 6 provisions; line: TACC.

Table 4: Groomed landings (t) of kingfish by area (QMA) from 2006–07 to 2021–22 by destination code. Landing code ‘L’ represents normal landings to a licensed fish receiver, code ‘X’ indicates returns to the sea under Schedule 6, ‘Y’ indicates returns under the minimum landing size (only from electronic reporting, which was not fully implemented until early in 2019–20), and ‘Other’ includes all other non-intermediate landing codes of fish above the minimum landing size.

Fishing year	KIN 1				KIN 2				KIN 3				KIN 7				KIN 8			
	L	X	Y	Other	L	X	Y	Other	L	X	Y	Other	L	X	Y	Other	L	X	Y	Other
2006–07	61	0		1	49	0		0	1	0		0	10	0		1	35	0		3
2007–08	65	0		2	42	0		0	0	0		0	7	0		1	42	10		2
2008–09	60	0		2	50	0		0	0	0		0	4	0		1	34	1		3
2009–10	67	0		2	56	0		0	1	0		0	5	1		1	38	12		5
2010–11	70	0		2	55	0		0	1	0		0	5	1		1	33	8		4
2011–12	90	0		2	59	1		0	1	0		0	12	4		3	61	36		7
2012–13	86	0		2	56	0		0	1	0		0	8	4		4	60	44		8
2013–14	99	2		2	69	3		0	1	0		0	20	11		5	78	17		7
2014–15	80	1		2	64	7		0	1	1		1	14	12		5	61	9		6
2015–16	95	30		4	67	1		0	2	1		1	16	29		6	58	29		6
2016–17	87	49		4	69	6		0	3	1		2	21	21		4	42	36		7
2017–18	84	69	2	5	55	8		3	3	0	0	1	35	54	2	8	51	55	13	6
2018–19	81	34	6	5	66	6	1	3	6	2	0	2	41	48	0	3	85	82	17	6
2019–20	76	27	24	3	57	12	2	1	8	4	0	3	31	24	1	4	84	62	18	7
2020–21	82	15	32	5	47	3	2	0	11	5	0	6	22	33	0	2	87	49	16	6
2021–22	64	3	27	3	36	2	1	0	9	3	0	4	21	19	0	3	53	39	24	5

1.2 Recreational fisheries

Kingfish is highly regarded by recreational fishers in New Zealand for its sporting attributes and as a table fish. Kingfish are most often caught by recreational fishers from private boats and from charter boats but are also a prized catch for spearfishers and shore-based game fishers. Kingfish (defined as southern yellowtail kingfish) are recognised internationally as a sport fish, and kingfish caught in New Zealand waters hold 34 of the 36 International Gamefish Association World Records.

1.2.1 Management controls

The main methods used to manage recreational harvests of kingfish are minimum legal size limits, method restrictions, and daily bag limits. Fishers can retain and land up to three kingfish as part their daily bag limit. The MLS was increased to 75 cm (from 65 cm) for recreationally caught kingfish on 15 January 2004.

Many clubs, competitions, and charter boats have implemented a voluntary limit of one kingfish retained per person per day, and a number of gamefish clubs have also adopted a minimum size limit of 100 cm for kingfish. A high proportion of private and charter recreational catch is released (Holdsworth et al 2016b)

1.2.2 Tag and release

A voluntary tagging programme (the ‘Gamefish Tagging Programme’) with participation by some recreational fishers, and more recently some commercial fishers, has released 25 499 kingfish in New Zealand (1975 to 2022). Anglers feel they are contributing to research and conservation of stocks, while still getting recognition of their catch. Tagging of fish released by the JMA 7 trawl fishery was initiated in 2019 with over 465 tagged to date and five recaptured (three by recreational fishers and two by commercial trawl). The research objectives are to collect detailed information on released fish to help characterise the fishery and collect coarse growth, and movement information from recaptured fish. There have been 1682 tagged kingfish recaptured in New Zealand (1977 to 2022), with an average of 25 recaptures (and 569 releases) per year over the last 10 years (Table 5) (Holdsworth 2023).

Most kingfish are caught close to their release location, even after many years. Ninety four percent of recaptures for fish at liberty for 30 days or more were within 100 nautical miles of the release point (Figure 3). The proportion of recaptured kingfish at distances over 100 nautical miles increases after 3 years. Although kingfish are also capable of extensive movements, with four fish tagged in New Zealand recaptured in New South Wales, Australia, few recaptures are made outside the QMAs in which the fish were released.

Table 5: The number of kingfish tagged and recaptured by fishing year for the last 10 years.

	2012–13	2013–14	2014–15	2015–16	2016–17	2017–18	2018–19	2019–20	2020–21	2021–22
Releases	760	654	720	620	827	615	624	156	372	337
Recaptures	41	34	28	23	33	36	45	30	13	13




Figure 3: Kingfish straight line distance (nautical miles) from release location by days at liberty 1977 to 2022, truncated at 600 nm and 5000 days.

1.2.3 Estimates of recreational harvest

Recreational catch estimates are given in Table 6. There are two broad approaches to estimating recreational fisheries harvest: the use of onsite or access point methods where fishers are surveyed or counted at the point of fishing or access to their fishing activity; and offsite methods where some form of post-event interview and/or diary are used to collect data from fishers.

The first estimates of recreational harvest for kingfish were calculated using an offsite approach, the offsite regional telephone and diary survey approach. Estimates for 1996 came from a national telephone and diary survey (Bradford 1998). Another national telephone and diary survey was carried out in 2000 (Boyd & Reilly 2004) and a rolling replacement of diarists in 2001 (Boyd et al 2004) allowed estimates for a further year (population scaling ratios and mean weights from 2000 were not re-estimated in 2001).

The harvest estimates provided by these telephone/diary surveys are no longer considered reliable for various reasons. With the early telephone/diary method, fishers were recruited to fill in diaries by way of a telephone survey that also estimates the proportion of the population that is eligible (likely to fish). A ‘soft refusal’ bias in the eligibility proportion arises if interviewees who do not wish to co-operate falsely state that they never fish. The proportion of eligible fishers in the population (and, hence, the harvest) is thereby under-estimated. Pilot studies for the 2000 telephone/diary survey suggested that this effect could occur when recreational fishing was established as the subject of the interview at the outset. Another equally serious cause of bias in telephone/diary surveys was that diarists who did not immediately record their day’s catch after a trip sometimes overstated their catch or the number of trips made. There is some indirect evidence that this may have occurred in all the telephone/diary surveys (Wright et al 2004).

The recreational harvest estimates provided by the 2000 and 2001 telephone diary surveys are thought to be implausibly high for many species, which led to the development of an alternative maximum count aerial-access onsite method that provides a more direct means of estimating recreational harvests for suitable fisheries. The maximum count aerial-access approach combines data collected concurrently from two sources: a creel survey of recreational fishers returning to a subsample of boat ramps throughout the day; and an aerial survey count of vessels observed to be fishing at the approximate time of peak fishing effort on the same day. The ratio of the aerial count in a particular area to the number of interviewed parties who claimed to have fished in that area at the time of the overflight was used to scale up harvests observed at surveyed ramps, to estimate harvest taken by all fishers returning to all ramps. The methodology is further described by Hartill et al (2007).

This aerial-access method was first employed and optimised to estimate snapper harvests in the Hauraki Gulf in 2003–04. It was then extended to survey the wider SNA 1 fishery in 2004–05 and to provide

estimates for other species, including kingfish. The PELWG (Pelagic Working Group) indicated that the kingfish estimate should be considered with considerable caution due to the limited overlap between this method's sampling technique and the fisheries for kingfish, e.g., the target fisheries for kingfish are often in offshore areas from launches which were not sampled by the boat ramp survey. For this reason, the results from this survey have not been accepted or included in the working group report at this time.

In response to the cost and scale challenges associated with onsite methods, in particular the difficulties in sampling other than trailer boat fisheries, offsite approaches to estimating recreational fisheries harvest have been revisited. This led to the development and implementation of a national panel survey for the 2011–12 fishing year, repeated in 2017–18 and 2022–23 (Wynne-Jones et al 2014, 2019; Heinemann & Gray 2024). The panel surveys used face-to-face interviews of a random sample of New Zealand households to recruit a panel of fishers and non-fishers for a full year. The panel members were contacted regularly about their fishing activities and catch information collected in standardised phone interviews. Note that national panel survey estimates do not include recreational harvest taken on charter vessel trips or under s111 general approvals. The estimates of harvest from the 2011–12 panel survey were compared with direct estimates (using onsite surveys) for key stocks in FMA 1 (Edwards & Hartill 2015) and are considered reliable.

The increase in the minimum legal size to 75 cm in 2004 increased the average size of kingfish landed by recreational fishers. Average weights from boat ramp data collected during the survey year are not available for all QMAs and a national average weight is used to estimate total harvest weight. The point estimates of recreational harvest for KIN 1, KIN 7, and KIN 8 in 2012 and 2018 were above the allowances; recreational harvests in KIN 2 increased from 2012 to 2018 and exceeded the allowance in 2018.

Table 6: Recreational harvest estimates for kingfish stocks. The telephone/diary surveys ran from December to November but are denoted by the January calendar year. The national panel surveys ran throughout the October to September fishing year but are denoted by the January calendar year. Mean fish weights were obtained from boat ramp surveys (for the telephone/diary and panel survey harvest estimates). (Source: Tierney et al 1997, Bradford 1997, Bradford 1998, Boyd & Reilly 2004, Boyd et al 2004, Wynne-Jones et al 2014, 2019, Heinemann & Gray 2024). Harvest estimates from telephone/diary and panel surveys and not considered comparable.

Stock	Year	Method	Number of fish	Total weight (t)	CV
KIN 1	1992	Telephone/diary	186 000	260	–
	1994	Telephone/diary	180 000	228*	0.09
	1996	Telephone/diary	194 000	234	0.07
	2000	Telephone/diary	127 000	800	0.18
	2001	Telephone/diary	109 000	683	0.17
	2012	Panel survey	47 460	488	0.14
	2018	Panel survey	62 434	513	0.18
	2023	Panel survey	22 623	225	0.18
KIN 2	1992	Telephone/diary	68 000	92	–
	1994	Telephone/diary	62 000	78	0.18
	1996	Telephone/diary	67 000	70	0.11
	2000	Telephone/diary	25 000	138	0.38
	2001	Telephone/diary	21 000	113	0.33
	2012	Panel survey	3 682	37	0.25
	2018	Panel survey	9 373	77	0.28
	2023	Panel survey	4 495	50	0.39
KIN 7	1992	Telephone/diary	10 000	20	–
	1994	Telephone/diary	–	–	–
	1996	Telephone/diary	9 000	13	0.19
	2000	Telephone/diary	2 000	11	0.55
	2001	Telephone/diary	1 000	9	0.86
	2012	Panel survey	2 079	21	0.38
	2018	Panel survey	3 037	25	0.27
	2023	Panel survey	1 236	13	0.38
KIN 8	1992	Telephone/diary	6 000	#8	–
	1994	Telephone/diary	–	–	–
	1996	Telephone/diary	2 000	#3	–
	2000	Telephone/diary	9 000	65	0.45
	2001	Telephone/diary	14 000	108	0.46
	2012	Panel survey	5 259	53	0.26
	2018	Panel survey	5 175	43	0.24
	2023	Panel survey	4 445	46	0.42

* No harvest estimate available in the survey report; estimate presented is calculated as average fish weight for all years and areas by the number of fish estimated caught.

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

Kingfish is an important traditional food fish for Māori, but no quantitative information on the level of Māori customary non-commercial catch is available. The extent of the traditional fisheries for kingfish in the past is described by the Muriwhenua Fishing Report (Waitangi Tribunal 1988). Because of the coastal distribution of the species and its inclination to strike lures, it is likely that historically Māori caught considerable numbers of kingfish.

1.4 Illegal catch

There is no known illegal catch of kingfish.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

The extent of any other sources of mortality is unknown, however, handling mortality for sub-MLS size fish is likely to occur in both the recreational (sub 75 cm) and commercial (sub 65 cm) fisheries. Recreational fishers also release a large proportion of legal-size kingfish, and the use of Schedule 6 provisions to return legal-size kingfish to the sea if they are likely to survive increased in commercial fisheries after 2010.

2. BIOLOGY

In New Zealand, kingfish are predominantly found around the northern half of the North Island but also occur from 29° to 46° S, Kermadec Islands to Foveaux Strait (Francis 1988) and to depths of 200 m. Kingfish are large predatory fish with adults exceeding one and a half metres in length. They usually occur in schools ranging from a few fish to well over a hundred fish. Kingfish tend to occupy a semi-pelagic existence and occur mainly in open coastal waters, preferring areas of high current and or tidal flow adjacent to rocky outcrops, reefs, and pinnacles. However, kingfish are not restricted to these habitats and are sometimes caught or observed in open sandy bottom areas and within shallow enclosed bays. Juvenile kingfish are pelagic, often found in association with floating rafts of kelp and other debris. These can occur quite far offshore.

Estimates of age have been derived from opaque-zone counts in sagittal otolith thin sections. Estimates of von Bertalanffy growth parameters for kingfish were also derived from recreational tagging data and otoliths collected from the eastern Bay of Plenty. Estimates of K and L_{∞} were similar, being 0.128 and 130 cm from the otolith age data and 0.130 and 142 cm from the tagging increment data, respectively (Table 7). The hard-structure ageing techniques have yet to be validated for New Zealand kingfish, although the position of the first annulus has been validated using regular samples of 0+ year old fish from a fish aggregating device (Holdsworth et al 2013, Francis et al 2005).

A Bayesian analysis of length and maturity data suggests that the length of 50% maturity is 97 cm in females and 83 cm in males (McKenzie et al 2014).

Estimates of M ranged from 0.20 to 0.25, however, these estimates are thought to represent an upper bound because the samples were taken from an exploited population.

Available biological parameters relevant to stock assessment are given in Table 7.

Table 7: Estimates of biological parameters.

Fishstock							Estimate			Source
<u>1. Weight = $a(\text{length})^b$ (Weight in g, length in cm fork length).</u>							Both sexes			
							a	b		
KIN 1							0.03651	2.762	Walsh et al (2003)	
<u>2. von Bertalanffy growth parameters</u>										
Females				Males			Combined			
	L_{∞}	k	t_0	L_{∞}	k	t_0	L_{∞}	k	t_0	
Bay of Plenty (2002)	135.79	0.119	-0.976	123.81	0.137	-0.911	130.14	0.128	-0.919	McKenzie et al (2014)
East Northland (2015)	131.06	0.173	-1.257	116.44	0.247	-0.708				Holdsworth et al (2016)
Bay of Plenty (2015)	129.67	0.173	-1.074	120.27	0.184	-1.314				Holdsworth et al (2016)

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

Kingfish are widespread, occurring in temperate waters around South Australia, Japan, South Africa, and the western coast of the Americas (British Columbia to Chile) (Walsh et al 2003). Although previously considered a single species, Martinez-Takeshita et al (2015) suggest that southern hemisphere kingfish should be considered a separate species, and that “a combination of dynamics in the sub-tropical and temperate regions permits a low-level of connectivity among *S. lalandi* sampled in South Africa, New Zealand, and Chile”.

Within New Zealand, a study based on meristic characters and parasite loads suggests two stocks of kingfish off the west and east coasts (Smith et al 2004). These stocks are contained within the Tasman Current off the west coast and the East Auckland Current and East Cape Current off the east coast, with little mixing between them. The east coast stock may be further subdivided into northeast and Hawke’s Bay stocks based on limited exchange from tagging studies and parasite marker prevalence. Young juvenile kingfish are pelagic, often found in association with floating rafts of kelp and other debris.

Tagging results suggest that most adult kingfish do not move outside local areas, with many tag returns close to the release site (Figure 3). However, some tagged kingfish have been found to move very long distances; there are validated reports of New Zealand tagged kingfish being caught in Australian waters and Australian tagged kingfish being recaptured in New Zealand waters. Fish tagged off Taranaki were recaptured off North Cape and Coromandel (Holdsworth 2023).

In addition to the results from tagging studies, the age structure of recreational catches (Holdsworth et al 2016a) suggests that kingfish off the East Northland/Hauraki Gulf region and in the Bay of Plenty/East Cape region may comprise separate stocks.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

4.1 CPUE analyses

Standardised CPUE analyses were developed for KIN 1, 2, 7, and 8 during 2019 and 2020, and the key indices for KIN 7 and 8 were updated in 2021. Indices for all areas were updated in 2023, with the addition of a CPUE index for KIN 3, where landings have increased from previously low levels.

Statutory catch, effort, and landings data from the commercial fisheries were used to develop indices for the mixed-target inshore bottom trawl fisheries in the Bay of Plenty and East Northland sub-areas of KIN 1, and for KIN 2 and KIN 8. Indices were also developed for the snapper-target bottom longline fishery in East Northland, the mixed-target midwater and bottom trawl fisheries in KIN 3, and the offshore midwater gear trawl fishery that targets jack mackerels in KIN 7 and KIN 8 off the western North Island and north-western South Island.

Additional indices were developed for the recreational fisheries in the KIN 1 sub-areas using ramp survey data. Indices using data from kingfish catches reported from amateur charter vessels were also considered in 2020 but were rejected by the Working Group because (i) the recorded catches included fish returned to the sea without distinguishing returns of fish above and below the MLS, (ii) kingfish were targeted on features, where they aggregated, and CPUE was likely to be hyperstable, and (iii) charter boats targeting snapper mostly caught small kingfish.

In KIN 2, 7, and 8, and the bottom trawl gear fisheries in KIN 1, the proportion of the trip-level landed catches represented in event-level catch estimates can be low, especially when reporting used the CELR or TCEPR forms where estimated catches are limited to the top five species by weight per event. As a result, the CPUE analyses for the trawl fisheries used trip-level data where kingfish landings were modelled using covariates that were trip-level summaries of the effort data. These included number of tows, modal statistical area, mean hours per tow, mean bottom depth, and mean headline height. Delta-lognormal models were fitted to the trip-level catch and effort data from bottom trawl fishers operating

in East Northland, the Bay of Plenty, KIN 2, and KIN 8. Analyses were restricted to the period after kingfish was introduced to the QMS.

A trip level index for the midwater fishery in KIN 7 and 8 was also developed in 2020; this used data from trips where an observer was present on the vessel and offered the proportion of jack mackerel tows as a covariate. However, the preferred CPUE index for KIN 7 and 8 uses observer catch and effort data at the fishing event level in a combined (binomial/lognormal) index, starting in the 2005 fishing year when observer coverage increased in this fishery.

For the East Northland bottom longline fishery, the working group noted that kingfish was a valuable bycatch of the snapper longline fishery and appeared to have been consistently reported in estimated catches and landings since the QMS catch and effort data systems were introduced in the 1990 fishing year. In 2020, four indices were prepared for this fishery: (i) a daily-level index with the fine scale data available since 2008 aggregated to match the previous CELR-resolution data, and landings allocated to events using the approach of Starr (2007); (ii) a trip-level index using landings data and aggregated effort data; (iii) an event-level index using data from the LTCER form from 2008 onwards and landings allocated to events; and (iv) an index that was restricted to trips with a single set. The trip level index was adopted as the primary index for this substock.

Negative-binomial GLMMs were fitted to the number of fish caught during recreational bait-fishing trips recorded in the ramp survey data, separately for fishing locations in East Northland and the Bay of Plenty. These indices were updated in 2023, with data to 2021. Data were aggregated to location-month-target strata and the covariates offered to the models were: location, month, target species (KIN or SNA), number of events, mean number of fishers per event, and mean event duration. Location was included as a random effect. In 2020, separate trip-level models fitted to recreational fishing trips where the fishing method was reported as jigging and trolling were also presented to the working group. The indices derived from jigging and trolling models were more variable than the bait-fishing index because of lower numbers of surveyed events. Jigging and trolling are usually used to target kingfish aggregations on features, and there is believed to be a degree of learned hook avoidance associated with these catch methods.

4.1.1 Size composition

A key consideration in the working group's evaluation of the indices of relative abundance was the size composition of the kingfish catch in each fishery. Aggregated observer data (Figure 4) indicated that the bottom trawl fisheries primarily catch immature kingfish, whereas the midwater trawl fishery catches both juvenile and adult fish. The working group concluded that the bottom trawl indices were best regarded as indices of immature kingfish, whereas the midwater trawl and bottom longline indices included adult fish and were the better indices for the kingfish populations in the areas for which these indices are available.

No observer data were available from the bottom longline fishery, but packing data were used to examine the weight composition of kingfish landed from this fishery (Figure 5). These indicated that the bottom longline fishery also catches adult fish (based on the length-weight relationship in Table 7, and the sizes at 50% maturity reported by McKenzie et al 2014, the weight at 50% maturity is approximately 7.3 kg for males and 11.2 kg for females).

Cumulative weight distributions from the annual Bay of Islands Yellowtail Tournament suggests this catches fewer small fish than the bottom longline fishery, but similar proportions of larger fish (e.g., greater than 15kg; Figure 5). Between year variation in catch at weight distributions is evident in both fisheries. Comparisons between cumulative length distributions from recreational catch at age sampling in 2015 (Holdsworth et al 2016) and other recreational fishing length frequency information indicates that the fish sampled from bait-fishing in ramp surveys typically resemble the “inshore” fishery while fish encountered in the Bay of Islands Yellowtail Tournament are generally larger (Figure 6a). However, the “offshore” fishery has a much higher proportion of large fish.

By way of comparison, the cumulative length frequency distributions from the KIN 7 and 8 midwater trawl fisheries most closely resemble those of the East Northland inshore fisheries (including the Bay of Islands Tournament) (Figure 6b).




Figure 4: Unscaled length frequency distributions for kingfish by area and method, aggregated over all available samples, using observer data collected from 2000–01 onwards. (E: number of events sampled, n: number of fish sampled, MW: midwater, BT: bottom trawl). Area codes are Observer Fisheries Management Areas: AKE = Auckland East (FMA 1); AKW = Auckland West (FMA 9); CEE = Central East (FMA 2) ; CEW = Central Egmont (FMA 8); ; CHA = Challenger (FMA 7).




Figure 5: Annual cumulative weight frequency of (a) single kingfish packed from the East Northland bottom longline fishery by Leigh Fisheries Limited between 2010 and 2016, and (b) kingfish caught in the Bay of Islands Yellowtail Tournament which takes place in June each year. The weights included from the packing data are restricted to fish greater than 4.6 kg, the minimum weight recorded in the Yellowtail Tournament data which were restricted to fish greater than 75 cm.




Figure 6: Cumulative length distributions of fish ≥ 75 cm from the inshore and offshore East Northland (ENLD) recreational length frequency data in 2015 (Holdsworth et al 2016) and other recreational fishery length frequency information: the Bay of Islands Yellowtail Tournament in 2015 (BoI.2015), plotted with (a) recreational bait-fishing samples from ramp surveys in 2015 (ENLD.rampBA.2015) and overall from 1991 to 2021 (ENLD.rampBA.all yrs), noting that Yellowtail Tournament fish were included in the wider East Northland samples collected in 2015; (b) length frequency information from the KIN 7 and 8 midwater trawl fishery.

4.1.2 Trends in CPUE indices

All three East Northland fisheries CPUE indices increased between 2010 and 2018 (Figure 7) with high inter-annual variability in the longline index in this period. Since 2018, the longline index has declined to levels about the long-term average, and a similar decline is evident in the recreational bait-fishing index. In contrast, the bottom trawl index continued to increase until 2021, with a drop in 2022.

The bottom longline index in the Bay of Plenty shows a similar pattern to East Northland, increasing to a peak in 2018 and then declining. The bottom trawl index increased consistently from 2004 to 2021 before declining in the most recent year (Figure 8). The recreational bait-fishing index for the Bay of Plenty showed an increasing trend over this period, but with considerable year to year variation.

The main index from observer data in the KIN 7 and 8 midwater trawl fishery showed a gradual increase from 2008 to 2014, before increasing rapidly. The index has fluctuated at this increased level from 2016 to 2022 (Figure 9). The index from the KIN 8 bottom trawl fishery demonstrated a more cyclic pattern around a steadily increasing trend from 2009 to 2021, and a decline in the final year that is common between both the KIN 7 and 8 observer trip index and the bottom trawl index in KIN 8.

Series from the bottom trawl fisheries (and the bottom/midwater fishery in KIN 3) are based on catches of primarily juvenile kingfish. The index for KIN 3 shows a substantial increase from 2018 to 2021 (Figure 10, left plot), coincident with the increase of catch in this area. The bottom trawl indices all showed a similar increase from 2004 to 2017, but recent trends have differed. In KIN 1, both the ENLD and BPLE series had an increasing trend to 2021, but dropped towards the series mean in 2022. In KIN 2 and KIN 8 the series have fluctuated without trend since 2017.




Figure 7: CPUE indices for the different fisheries (BT: bottom trawl, BLL bottom longline) in KIN 1 (ENLD: East Northland) scaled to a geometric mean of one for the years in common.




Figure 8: CPUE indices for the different fisheries (BT: bottom trawl, BLL: bottom long line) in KIN 1 (BPLE: Bay of Plenty) scaled to a geometric mean of one for the years in common.




Figure 9: CPUE indices for the west coast North Island fisheries (MW: midwater trawl, BT: Bottom trawl) scaled to a geometric mean of one for the years in common.




Figure 10: CPUE indices for bottom trawl fisheries (combined bottom and midwater fishing in KIN 3) scaled to a geometric mean of one for the years in common. Left: all series; Right: excluding the KIN 3 series.

4.1.3 Catch at length information

Length frequency distributions for kingfish caught at the annual Bay of Islands Yellowtail Tournament (Figure 11) show progression of length modes associated with fish estimated to be 4 to 6 years of age with some evidence that the 2009 and 2013 year classes (i.e. fish around 93 cm and aged 5 in 2014 and 2018) were above average.

Observer sampling in the JMA midwater trawl fishery in KIN 7 and 8 allows the progression of year classes entering the west coast North Island fishery to be followed (Figure 12). For example, based on the size at age estimated from the East Northland von Bertalanffy curve (Table 7), the small mode of fish observed in the Challenger (CHA) FMA around 50 cm in 2015 is likely to be age 1 fish, that are subsequently evident as a 60 cm mode in 2016. There was no sampling in 2017, but a 70 cm mode in 2018, and an 85 cm mode in 2019, dominate the fishery potentially indicating a large cohort with

slower-than-expected growth. Sampling is more limited in the Central West (CEW) and Auckland West (AKW) FMAs, but the same modes are evident in 2015 and 2016 sampling in these areas.




Figure 11: Length frequency distributions for kingfish measured from the Bay of Islands Yellowtail Tournament by Bluewater Marine Research, with estimated mean length at age for male and female kingfish in East Northland (Table 7). Note that the Tournament was not held in 2020 and 2021 due to Covid pandemic restrictions.




Figure 12: Length-frequency distributions for kingfish caught in the midwater trawl fishery, by area, fishing year, and target species. Annotations indicate the number of unique sampling events (E) and sampled number of fish (n) for each area, target and year. Sampled numbers are scaled to the catch weight in each sampled event. Column headers refer to Observer Fisheries Management Area codes: AKW – Auckland West (FMA 9), CEW – Central Egmont (FMA 8), CHA – Challenger (FMA 7). All midwater trawl.

Establishing B_{MSY} -compatible reference points

The working group accepted the trip-level bottom longline index as the primary index of abundance for KIN 1 (East Northland) and the observer data based tow-level model for KIN 7 and KIN 8. Most of the available CPUE series start in the early 2000s and show steeply increasing trends in abundance for all areas. With the lack of stable periods of high catch and abundance, the working group concluded that the most reasonable approach to determining reference points was to choose stable periods of low abundance early in the series as representing soft limits. The KIN 1 longline series monitors the portion of the population vulnerable to longline gear used to target snapper. Because the selectivity of this gear

excludes larger adults found on offshore features, the offshore populations are monitored separately for EN and BoP using Z estimates derived from the age composition of recreational and charterboat catches from these features. The target mortality rate is $F_{SB40\%} = 0.1$.

4.2 Catch at age sampling (KIN 1)

The age composition of the KIN 1 target recreational charter boat fleet catch was sampled in 2010–11 and in 2014–15 for the purpose of estimating total mortality (Z). Sampling was stratified into two regions, East Northland and Bay of Plenty, and two strata based on distance from the shore: inshore on the North Island continental shelf (shallower than 200 m) and around four offshore islands and pinnacles. Representative samples of kingfish over the MLS were obtained from the offshore Bay of Plenty and inshore East Northland with 831 and 863 kingfish measured over 75 cm in these two strata in 2014–15 (Table 8). Sampling was less successful in the inshore Bay of Plenty and the offshore East Northland but deemed usable by the Inshore Working Group.

Table 8: Number of kingfish lengths and otolith sets collected in 2014–15 from the recreational fishery.

	KIN measured > 75 cm	Otoliths collected	Otoliths used in the age-length key
Inshore Bay of Plenty	211	57	212
Offshore Bay of Plenty	831	156	
Inshore EN/HGU	863	217	271
Offshore East Northland	318	55	

All kingfish were measured and recorded per trip on participating vessels. Age-length keys were developed using otoliths from retained fish. Bay of Plenty offshore samples in 2010–11 included more old fish than those from inshore (Holdsworth et al 2013). The Bay of Plenty offshore age distribution in 2014–15 was similar to that observed from the Bay of Plenty in 2010–11, although more older fish were evident in the 2014–15 sample. In 2014–15 there was a mode at age 5 in East Northland and age 6 in Bay of Plenty (Figure 13).




Figure 13: Kingfish age composition by region for inshore and offshore samples in 2014–15.

The Inshore Working Group agreed there was no valid method for combining inshore and offshore age frequencies by region for the purpose of estimating regional total mortality (Z), recommending instead that total mortality estimates be derived solely from the offshore age frequencies.

Total mortality estimates for offshore areas ranged from 0.19 to 0.25 for 2014–15 (Table 9). The $F_{SB40\%}$ target reference point for kingfish is 0.1, as derived by SSB/R methods (Holdsworth et al 2013). Assuming an instantaneous natural mortality rate (M) of 0.2, the target total mortality (Z) rate for kingfish is 0.3. None of the 2014–15 derived Z estimates given in Table 9 are higher than 0.3, suggesting that overfishing of kingfish in offshore areas of the Bay of Plenty and East Northland was unlikely. Although movement has been recorded between inshore and offshore areas, the relationship between these areas is unknown.

Table 9: Total mortality (Z) estimates for KIN 1 sub-regions as derived from catch-curve analysis (Chapman & Robson) of recreational charter boat catch-at-age data by fishing year, assuming 6 years is the age at full recruitment. The offshore estimate for the Bay of Plenty in 2009–10 was for the White Island area only and the offshore estimate for Northland in 2014–15 was for the Three Kings area only. Bootstrap CVs are shown in parentheses. EN/HG is East Northland/Hauraki Gulf, BoP is Bay of Plenty.

Sub-Region	EN/HG		BoP	
	2009–10	2014–15	2009–10	2014–15
Inshore	0.87 (0.12)	0.49 (0.08)	0.50 (0.14)	0.29 (0.09)
Offshore	–	0.19 (0.08)	0.30 (0.14)	0.25 (0.07)

4.3 Biomass estimates

Few kingfish are encountered in trawl surveys likely because their swimming speed and endurance makes them capable of escaping during the tow or while hauling (this exacerbated by the relatively low tow speed and duration of survey tows, suggesting that trawl surveys are not a suitable method for monitoring changes in kingfish abundance). Kingfish are amenable to mark-recapture studies. However, up to now, tagging studies have been conducted solely to describe kingfish movement patterns and to estimate growth. Data from these programmes are inadequate to estimate stock biomass because tag releases and recoveries are voluntary, not systematic.

4.4 Other factors

It was recognised that if the increases in abundance represented a regime shift, or a significant change in productivity levels, with an associated increase in B_0 , then the use of historical levels of relative abundance to establish a soft limit may not be appropriate.

4.5 Future research considerations

CPUE analyses

- Further investigate the implications of modelling catch and effort data aggregated to trip levels vs. finer scale data, with consideration of the range of descriptors that can be constructed for trip models (including weighting by catch). Consideration should also be given to the choice of modal values for area and month, and investigation of alternatives such as where fisheries spend the most time vs. where the influence is greatest.

Catch curve analysis

- Improve data collection to better understand inshore–offshore movements.
- Continue to monitor age structure in the offshore population

General

- Revisit estimates of biological parameters (maturity, natural mortality, growth rates, and length-weight).
- Develop full catch (removals) histories, including those for recreational fisheries. This is required to estimate the relative exploitation rate in partial quantitative assessments.
- Improve data collection from the charter boat catch and effort by requiring that released kingfish less than the MLS are reported separately from larger released kingfish.
- For KIN 7&8, there are observer length frequency and maturity data, and some otoliths have been collected, in addition to an accepted CPUE index. The length frequency, maturity and ageing data should be fully analysed with a view toward evaluating the feasibility of conducting a fully quantitative stock assessment in the future. Investigate how representative observer

sampling is of the full catch, given they only sample retained fish, and explore the potential of using observer data to generate a mature biomass index.

- Undertake an investigation of stock structure for kingfish.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS


Stock Structure Assumptions

Meristic characteristics and parasite loads suggest that there are two stocks of kingfish off the west and east coasts. Opportunistic mark-recapture programmes indicate that most kingfish are recaptured close to the site of release, regardless of time at liberty. However, there some movement between the east and west coasts of the North Island, and more widely including trans-Tasman. The age structure of recreational catches suggests that kingfish off East Northland/Hauraki Gulf and in the Bay of Plenty/East Cape regions may comprise separate stocks.

For assessment purposes it is assumed that New Zealand kingfish comprise several biological stocks: East Northland, Bay of Plenty & KIN 2; KIN 3; KIN 7 & KIN 8. KIN 4 is not considered here.

- **KIN 1 – East Northland/Hauraki Gulf**

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	Inshore 2023; Offshore 2016	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Medium	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2021–22	Catch: 29 t (commercial)
Assessment Runs Presented	Standardised CPUE from the East Northland bottom longline fishery (trip index) (considered an index of inshore fish) Total mortality estimates from catch curve analysis for Offshore ENLD	
Reference Points	Inshore interim target: B_{MSY} proxy, interpreted as twice the mean CPUE for the period 2003–2007; Offshore interim target: $F_{SB40\%}$ (current estimate is $F_{SB40\%} = 0.1$) Inshore Soft Limit: Mean CPUE from 2003–2007 Inshore Hard Limit: 50% of the soft limit Offshore Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Offshore Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Inshore overfishing threshold: Twice the relative exploitation rate from 2003–2007 Offshore overfishing threshold: $F_{SB40\%}$	
Status in relation to Target	Inshore: About as Likely as Not (40–60%) to be at or above the target Offshore: F_{2015} was Likely (> 60%) to be at or below the overfishing threshold	
Status in relation to Limits	<u>Inshore</u> Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the soft limit Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below the hard limit <u>Offshore</u> Unknown for both the soft and hard limits	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Inshore: Unknown Offshore: Overfishing is Unlikely (< 40%) to be occurring	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status-

Standardised catch per unit effort (CPUE) index for KIN 1 ENLD from bottom longlining targeting snapper, relative to the agreed reference points, the values from which were used to define the reference period.

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	The inshore index has shown a strong decline since 2018.
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	In 2016, total mortality estimates from catch curve analyses indicated that F was likely to be at or below $F_{SB40\%}$ in offshore areas.
Other Abundance Indices	The recreational bait fishing index shows similar trends to the bottom longline inshore index. The BLL and inshore recreational bait fishery catch similar sized fish.
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis

Stock Projections or Prognosis	Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or commence	Unknown

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation

Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Inshore: Standardised CPUE based on a delta-lognormal index from bottom longline Offshore: Estimates of total mortality using Chapman-Robson estimator	
Assessment dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2023 (CPUE); 2016 (Chapman-Robson)	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	Commercial catch and effort data	1 – High Quality

	Ramp survey data used to generate a secondary index of abundance Recreational length frequency data used to interpret indices of abundance Packing data used to interpret indices of abundance Age structure of recreational catch in 2014–15 Instantaneous rate of natural mortality (M) of 0.20 based on a maximum age of 23 years. Age at 50% maturity (6 yr) Age at MLS (4 yr) Growth rate	2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: spatial coverage is an issue 1 – High Quality 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: a detailed analysis of these data has not been completed 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	N/A	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	The smoother fitted to the CPUE index was removed	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Uncertainty in the estimate of M - Uncertain relationship between inshore and offshore areas	

Qualifying Comments

Selectivity of the bottom longline fishery (and recreational bait fishery) is considered to be domed and the full adult population is unlikely to be indexed.
The CPUE series does not apply to the offshore population that is fished on features by amateur charter vessels.
Offshore fisheries occur on features (pinnacles or islands) found beyond the mainland 200 m depth contour.

Fishery Interactions


Commercial kingfish catch is almost all bycatch in fisheries for other species.

- KIN 1 – Bay of Plenty and KIN 2**

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	Inshore 2023; Offshore 2016	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Medium	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2021–22	Catch: 73 t (commercial)
Assessment Runs Presented	Standardised CPUE from the Bay of Plenty bottom longline fishery (trip index) (considered an index of inshore fish) Total mortality estimates from catch curve analysis for Offshore Bay of Plenty	
Reference Points	Inshore interim target: B_{MSY} proxy, interpreted as twice the mean CPUE for the period 2003–2006; Offshore interim target: $F_{SB40\%}$ (current estimate is $F_{SB40\%} = 0.1$) Inshore Soft Limit: Mean CPUE from 2003–2007 Inshore Hard Limit: 50% of the soft limit Offshore Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Offshore Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Inshore overfishing threshold: $F_{SB40\%}$	

	Offshore overfishing threshold: $F_{SB40\%}$
Status in relation to Target	Inshore: Unlikely (< 40%) to be at or above the target Offshore: F_{2015} was Likely (> 60%) to be at or below the overfishing threshold
Status in relation to Limits	<u>Inshore</u> Soft Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) to be below Hard Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) to be below <u>Offshore</u> Unknown for both the soft and hard limits
Status in relation to Overfishing	Inshore: Unknown Offshore: Overfishing is Unlikely (< 40%) to be occurring

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status-



Standardised catch per unit effort (CPUE) index for KIN 1 BPLE from bottom longlining targeting snapper, relative to the agreed reference points, the values from which were used to define the reference period.

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	The inshore biomass has declined since 2018
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	F appeared to have declined between 2010 and 2016 for Offshore BPLE (although White Island was the only BPLE area assessed in 2010); likely to have been low for the decade to 2016 in all BPLE areas
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown for both inshore and offshore areas Hard Limit: Unknown for both inshore and offshore areas
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unknown for both the inshore and offshore areas

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Standardised CPUE based on a delta-lognormal index from bottom longline (inshore) Estimates of total mortality using Chapman-Robson estimator (offshore)	
Assessment dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2023 (CPUE); 2016 (Chapman-Robson)	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	Commercial catch and effort data Age structure of recreational catch in 2014–15 Instantaneous rate of natural mortality (M) of 0.20 based on a maximum age of 23 years. Age at 50% maturity (6 yr) Age at MLS (4 yr) Growth rate	1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	N/A	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Uncertainty in the estimate of M - Uncertain relationship between inshore and offshore areas	

Qualifying Comments

Selectivity of the bottom longline fishery (and the recreational bait fishery) is considered to be domed and the full adult population is unlikely to be indexed
The CPUE series does not apply to the offshore population that is fished on features by amateur charter vessels
Offshore fisheries occur on features (pinnacles or islands) found beyond the mainland 200 m depth contour.

Fishery Interactions

Commercial kingfish catch is almost all bycatch in fisheries for other species.

- KIN 3**


There is insufficient information to estimate current stock status. However, recent increases in catches are considered to be driven by increases in abundance.

- KIN 7 and KIN 8**

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2023	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Medium	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2021–22	Catch: 108 t (commercial)
Assessment Runs Presented	Standardised CPUE from observer tow data in the jack mackerel target midwater trawl fishery	

Reference Points	Interim Target: B_{MSY} proxy, interpreted as twice the mean CPUE in the period 2005–2009 Soft Limit: Mean CPUE from 2005 to 2009 Hard Limit: 50% of the soft limit Overfishing threshold: Twice the relative exploitation rate in 2005–2009
Status in relation to Target	Very Likely (> 90%) to be at or above the target
Status in relation to Limits	Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below both the soft and hard limits
Status in relation to Overfishing	Unknown

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status-



Standardised catch per unit effort (CPUE) index for KIN 7 and KIN 8 from midwater trawling targeting jack mackerel (observer tow-level index), relative to the agreed reference points, defined by the period indicated between dashed blue vertical lines.

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	CPUE increased considerably from 2006–07 to 2016 and has fluctuated without trend since then, remaining well above the interim target
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	-
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis

Stock Projections or Prognosis	Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) for current retained catch Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) for current retained catch
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or commence	Unknown

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation

Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment


Assessment Method	Standardised CPUE based on a lognormal index from observed midwater trawl tows targeting jack mackerel	
Assessment dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2023	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	Observer catch and effort data Observer length frequency data	1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	N/A	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Avoidance of kingfish by the JMA fleet may impact this index	
Qualifying Comments		
The vulnerable biomass index for the BATM fleet is largely sub-adults, and we are not monitoring adults well.		
Length observations are from the retained fish, and it is unclear how representative these are of total catch due to no measurements of fish released alive.		
The CPUE series may not be long enough to encompass the natural fluctuations in stock productivity.		
Fishery Interactions		
Commercial kingfish catch is almost all bycatch in fisheries for other species.		

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Boyd, R O; Gowing, L; Reilly, J L (2004) 2000–2001 national marine recreational fishing survey: diary results and harvest estimates. (Unpublished New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Report for the Ministry of Fisheries Project REC2000-01 held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 92 p.
- Boyd, R O; Reilly, J L (2004) 1999/2000 National Marine Recreational Fishing Survey: harvest estimates. (Unpublished New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Report for the Ministry of Fisheries Project REC9803 held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 28 p.
- Bradford, E (1997) Estimated recreational catches from Ministry of Fisheries North region marine recreational fishing surveys, 1993–94. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1997/7. 16 p. (Unpublished report held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Bradford, E (1998) Harvest estimates from the 1996 national recreational fishing surveys. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document. 1998/16. 27 p. (Unpublished report held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Edwards, C T T; Hartill, B H (2015) Calibrating between offsite and onsite amateur harvest estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/49*. 23 p.
- Francis, M; McKenzie, J; Ó Maolagáin, C (2005) Attempted validation of the first annual growth zone in kingfish (*Seriola lalandi*) otoliths. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries research project SAP2004-04, Objective 1. 22 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Francis, R I C C (1988) Maximum likelihood estimation of growth and growth variability from tagging data. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 22: 42–51.
- Hartill, B; Bian, R; Armiger, H; Vaughan, M; Rush, N (2007) Recreational marine harvest estimates of snapper, kahawai, and kingfish in QMA 1 in 2004–05. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/26*. 44 p.
- Hartill, B; Davies, N M (1999) New Zealand billfish and gamefish tagging, 1997–98. *NIWA Technical Report 57*. 39 p.
- Heinemann A; Gray, A. (2024) National Panel Survey of Recreational Marine Fishers 2022–23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/51*. 116 p.
- Holdsworth, J C (2023) New Zealand billfish and gamefish tagging, 2019–20 to 2021–22. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2023/02*. 31 p.
- Holdsworth, J C; McKenzie, J R; Walsh, C; Bian, R; Ó Maolagáin, C (2016a) Catch-at-age of yellowtail kingfish (*Seriola lalandi*) caught by recreational fishers 2014–15. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2016/45*. 35 p.
- Holdsworth, J C; McKenzie, J R; Walsh, C; van der Straten, K M; Ó Maolagáin, C (2013) Catch-at-age of yellowtail kingfish (*Seriola lalandi*) caught by recreational fishers in KIN 1, New Zealand. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/3*. 31 p.
- Holdsworth, J C; Saul, P J; Boyle, T; Sippel, T (2016b) Synthesis of New Zealand gamefish tagging data, 1975 to 2014. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2016/24*. 63 p.
- McKenzie, J; Smith, M; Watson, T; Francis, M; Ó Maolagáin, C; Poortenaar, C; Holdsworth, J (2014) Age, growth, maturity and natural mortality of New Zealand kingfish (*Seriola lalandi lalandi*). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/03*. 36 p.
- McKenzie, J R (2014) Review of productivity parameters and stock assessment options for kingfish (*Seriola lalandi lalandi*) *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/04*. 17 p.
- Martinez-Takeshita, N; Purcell, C M; Chabot, C L; Craig, M T; Paterson, C N; Hyde, J R; Allen, L G (2015) A tale of three tails: cryptic speciation in a globally distributed marine fish of the genus *Seriola*. *Copeia* 103: 357–368.
- Smith, P J; Diggles, B; McKenzie, J; Kim, S; Ó Maolagáin, C; Notman, P; Griggs, L H (2004) Kingfish stock structure. (Unpublished Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Project KIN2002/01 Objective 1 held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 29 p.

KINGFISH (KIN) – May 2026

- Starr, P J (2007) Procedure for merging MFish landing and effort data, V2.0. Document AMPWG/07/04. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Teirney, L D; Kilner, A R; Millar, R E; Bradford, E; Bell, J D (1997) Estimation of recreational catch from 1991/92 to 1993/94. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1997/15. 43 p. (Unpublished report held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Waitangi Tribunal (1988) Muriwhenua fishing report. Department of Justice, Wellington.
- Walsh, C; McKenzie, J; McGregor, G; Poortenaar, C; Hartill, B; Smith, M (2003) Information available for the management of New Zealand kingfish (*Seriola lalandi lalandi*) stocks. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/25*. 57 p.
- Wright, P; Gowing, L; McClary, D; Boyd, R O (2004) 2000–2001 National Marine recreational fishing survey: direct questioning of fishers compared with reported diary data. (Unpublished Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project REC2000-01: Objective 2 held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 28 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–18. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/24*. 104 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Hill, L; Heinemann, A (2014) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2011–12: Harvest Estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/67*. 139 p.

KNOBBED WHELK (KWH)*(Austrofusus glans)***1. FISHERY SUMMARY**

Knobbed whelks (*Austrofusus glans*) were introduced into the Quota Management System on 1 October 2006. The fishing year is from 1 October to 30 September and commercial catches are measured in greenweight. TACs have been allocated in 10 QMAs (Table 1). Commercial fishers may return knobbed whelk to the waters from which they were taken if the return takes place as soon as practical and they are likely to survive, as provided for in the Fisheries (Landing and Discard Exceptions) Notice.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs, and TACs (t) for knobbed whelk (*Austrofusus glans*) by Fishstock.

Fishstock	Description	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
KWH1	Auckland	1	1	0	1	3
KWH 2	Central (East)	1	1	0	1	3
KWH 3	South East (Coast)	1	1	0	3	5
KWH 4	South East (Chatham Rise)	1	1	0	6	8
KWH 5	Southland	1	1	0	1	3
KWH 6	Sub Antarctic	1	1	0	2	4
KWH 7A	Nelson / Marlborough	1	1	1	50	53
KWH 7B	West coast	1	1	0	1	3
KWH 8	Central (West)	1	1	0	1	3
KWH 9	Auckland (West)	1	1	0	1	3

1.1 Commercial fisheries

Target fishing for knobbed whelks is by baited pots. Because economic returns for whelk fishing are poor, most of the historical catch is bycatch from oyster and scallop dredging and from bottom trawling. Due to the low value of this species it is likely that there is a high level of unreported discarded catch. Knobbed whelks can be returned to the sea under the Fisheries (Landings and Discards) Notice if likely to survive on return.

Landings shown in Table 2 for the period 1990–91 to 2005–06 were recorded under the generic code for whelks (WHE); however, the Ministry considers that in FMA 1, 2, 7, and 8 most reported landings were of the knobbed whelk *Austrofusus glans*. In FMA 3, 4, 5, and 6, the Ministry considers that about a third of reported landings were of the knobbed whelk, whereas the remainder were the large ostrich foot shell *Struthiolaria papulosa*. Landings have been recorded for KWH since 2006–07 (Table 3).

Table 2: Reported landings (t) of whelks (WHE) by FMA from 1990–91 to 2005–06 from landing returns. See section 1.1 for an explanation of the proportion of WHE that are considered to be knobbed whelks.

Fishing year	WHE 1	WHE 2	WHE 3	WHE 4	WHE 5	WHE 6	WHE 7	WHE 8	WHE 9	Total
1990–91	0	0	0	0	0	0	44.976	0	0	44.976
1991–92	0	0	0	0	0	0	26.935	0	0	26.935
1992–93	0.021	0	0.018	0	0	0	1.762	0	0	1.801
1993–94	0	0.135	0	0	0	0	49.278	0	0	49.413
1994–95	0	0.707	0.545	0	0	0	21.458	0.593	0	23.303
1995–96	0	0.089	0.178	0	0	0	27.596	0	0	27.863
1996–97	0.002	0.174	0.144	0	0.003	0	8.959	0	0	9.282
1997–98	0	0	0.102	0.150	0	0	0.884	0	0	1.136
1998–99	0	0	0.223	2.205	2.470	0.150	0.570	0	0	5.618
1999–00	0	0	2.286	7.953	3.250	0.790	0.080	0	0	14.359
2000–01	0	0	10.467	17.497	3.538	4.765	0.141	0	0	36.408
2001–02	0	0	1.474	3.995	0.515	1.755	0.002	0	0	7.741
2002–03	0	0	0.212	0.020	0.004	0.780	0.077	0	0	1.093
2003–04	0.035	0	0.491	0	0	0.335	4.217	0	0	5.078
2004–05	0.008	0	0.021	0	0	0.335	0.234	0	0.047	0.639
2005–06	0	0	0.163	0	0	0	0.032	0	0	0.195

Table 3: Landings of Knobbed whelk (KWH) by QMA from 2006–07 to present from monthly harvest returns (MHR).

QMA	KWH 1		KWH 2		KWH 3		KWH 4		KWH 5	
	Landing	TACC	Landing	TACC	Landing	TACC	Landing	TACC	Landing	TACC
2006–07	0.080	1	0	1	0.010	3	0	6	0	1
2007–08	0.077	1	0	1	0.006	3	0	6	0	1
2008–09	0.103	1	0	1	0.121	3	0	6	0	1
2009–10	0.088	1	0	1	0.053	3	0	6	0	1
2010–11	0.473	1	0.036	1	0	3	0	6	0	1
2011–12	0.721	1	0.070	1	0.088	3	0	6	0	1
2012–13	0.551	1	0	1	0.003	3	0	6	0.001	1
2013–14	0.116	1	0	1	0.159	3	0	6	0.002	1
2014–15	0.039	1	0	1	0.020	3	0	6	0	1
2015–16	0.011	1	0	1	0.031	3	0	6	0	1
2016–17	0	1	0	1	0.210	3	0	6	0	1
2017–18	0	1	0	1	0.140	3	0.020	6	0	1
2018–19	0	1	0	1	0.375	3	0.001	6	0.001	1
2019–20	0	1	0	1	0.871	3	0	6	0	1
2020–21	0	1	0	1	0.255	3	1.443	6	0.082	1
2021–22	0	1	0	1	1.775	3	1.05	6	0.006	1
2022–23	0	1	0	1	3.415	3	1.99	6	0.001	1
2023–24	0	1	0	1	1.678	3	1.98	6	0.001	1
2024–25	0	1	0	1	0.477	3	0	6	0	1

QMA	KWH 6		KWH 7A		KWH 7B		KWH 8		Total	
	Landing	TACC	Landing	TACC	Landing	TACC	Landing	TACC	Landing	TACC
2006–07	0	2	0.046	50	0	1	0	1	0.136	67
2007–08	0	2	9.174	50	0.104	1	0	1	9.361	67
2008–09	0.001	2	0.226	50	0.008	1	0	1	0.459	67
2009–10	0	2	18.500	50	0	1	0	1	18.614	67
2010–11	0	2	16.033	50	0	1	0	1	16.542	67
2011–12	0	2	0	50	0.008	1	0	1	0.887	67
2012–13	0	2	0	50	0.014	1	0	1	0.569	67
2013–14	0	2	0	50	0	1	0	1	0.277	67
2014–15	0	2	0	50	0	1	0.108	1	0.167	67
2015–16	0	2	0	50	0	1	0	1	0.032	67
2016–17	0	2	0	50	0	1	0	1	0.210	67
2017–18	0	2	0	50	0	1	0.010	1	0.170	67
2018–19	0	2	0	50	0	1	0	1	0.377	67
2019–20	0	2	0	50	0	1	0	1	0.871	67
2020–21	0	2	0.002	50	0	1	0	1	1.782	67
2021–22	0	2	0	50	0	1	0	1	2.831	67
2022–23	0	2	0	50	0	1	0	1	5.402	67
2023–24	0	2	0	50	0.078	1	0	1	3.739	67
2024–25	0	2	0	50	0.025	1	0	1	0.502	67

Reported landings of knobbed whelk in FMA 1, FMA 2, and FMA 8 have been relatively low and variable since the 1990s and have been (largely or all) accounted for as bycatch. In FMA 7 in the early 1990s higher catches were reported as part of experimental fisheries in Golden Bay and Tasman Bay to provide stock assessment information in these areas (Tables 2 and 3). In the period 2011–12 to 2019–20 total reported landings averaged just 0.39 t, although landings have increased since 2020–21 with increasing landings in KWH 3 and 4. Landings are split into two tables (before and after the 2006 fishing year) because reporting requirements changed when knobbed whelks entered the QMS.

1.2 Recreational fisheries

There are no estimates of recreational catch.

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

There are no estimates of current customary catch.

1.4 Illegal catch

There is no known illegal catch of this whelk.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

There is no information on other sources of mortality for this whelk.

2. BIOLOGY

The knobbed whelk, *A. glans*, is a widely distributed gastropod found from low tide to about 600 m (Powell 1979). This carnivorous whelk grows up to 5 cm long and occurs throughout New Zealand where it is found on sandy/silt/mud substrate. There is very little published about the biology of this species; most references are identification notes or records of occurrence. It is a scavenger that buries in the substrate when not feeding. A wide variety of invertebrates including polychaetes, gastropods, and bivalves occur within the wide depth range of the knobbed whelk, but no interdependent relationships are documented with *A. glans*.

The Intrinsic Productivity Level is categorised as Low for this species. A comparison with similar species that are better known from other parts of the world may provide some insight into the knobbed whelk, although similarities are conjectural. The Knobbed Whelk *Busycon carica* in the South Carolina Subtidal Waters appears to have a lifespan of at least 30 years.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

For management purposes stock boundaries are based on FMAs. There is no biological information on stock structure, recruitment patterns, or other biological characteristics which might indicate alternative stock boundaries.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

4.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

There are no estimates of fishery parameters or abundance for any knobbed whelk fishstock.

4.2 Biomass estimates

There are no biomass estimates for any knobbed whelk fishstock.

4.3 Yield estimates and projections

There are no estimates of *MCY* for any knobbed whelk fishstock.

There are no estimates of *CAY* for any knobbed whelk fishstock.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

For all KWH fishstocks there is insufficient information to estimate current stock status.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Morton, J; Miller, M (1968) *The New Zealand sea shore*. Collins, Auckland. 638 p.

Powell, A W B (1979) *New Zealand Mollusca*. Marine, land and freshwater shells. Collins, Auckland. 500 p.

LEATHERJACKET (LEA)

(*Meuschenia scaber*)
Kokiri, Hiriri

**1. FISHERY SUMMARY**

Leatherjacket was introduced into the QMS on 1 October 2003. Current allowances, TACCs, and TACs are given in Table 1.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs, and TACs (t) for leatherjacket by Fishstock from 1 October 2025.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary Non-Commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
LEA 1	5	1	9	137	152
LEA 2	2	1	57	1 136	1 196
LEA 3	2	1	21	200	224
LEA 4	1	1	1	7	10
LEA 10	0	0	0	0	0

1.1 Commercial fisheries

Nationally, very small landings were first reported in 1948. Most of the current leatherjacket catch is taken as a bycatch, and it is very likely that leatherjacket has always been primarily a bycatch species. From less than 2 t in the early 1960s, reported landings increased to 200–400 t in the mid-1970s, 1980s, and early 1990s (Table 2). It is possible actual catches were higher than reported prior to the 1970s, but that some catches were discarded without being reported due to low market demand in this period. Landings increased further in the late 1990s, to around 1000 to 1300 t, but have decreased to less than 500 t since 2012–13 (Table 3), and average less than 300 t between 2017–18 and 2024–25.

Figure 1 shows the historical landings and TACC values for the main leatherjacket stocks. LEA 1 landings fluctuated around the TACC from the fishing year 2003–04 to 2012–13, but have since declined, with 31 t landed in 2024–25. The LEA 1 TACC was reduced to 137 t in October 2025. LEA 2 landings have been much lower than the TACC of 1136 t, with landings averaging 72 t from 2014–15 to 2020–21 and averaging 32 t from 2021–22 to 2024–25. LEA 3 landings exceeded the 100 t TACC between 2008–09 and 2012–13 and fluctuated at or above the 130 t TACC between 2013–14 and 2019–20. The LEA 3 TACC was increased to 140 t in 2020–21, continued to be exceeded, and was increased to 200 t in 2024–25, which was again exceeded.

Table 2: Reported landings (t) for the main QMAs from 1931 to 1982.

Year	LEA 1	LEA 2	LEA 3	Year	LEA 1	LEA 2	LEA 3	Year	LEA 1	LEA 2	LEA 3
1931–32	0	0	0	1951	1	0	0	1971	49	11	0
1932–33	0	0	0	1952	7	0	0	1972	34	32	0
1933–34	0	0	0	1953	7	0	0	1973	31	46	0
1934–35	0	0	0	1954	7	0	0	1974	51	46	0
1935–36	0	0	0	1955	4	0	0	1975	39	29	0
1936–37	0	0	0	1956	0	0	0	1976	59	155	0
1937–38	0	0	0	1957	0	0	0	1977	49	163	0
1938–39	0	0	0	1958	0	0	0	1978	85	85	0
1939–40	0	0	0	1959	0	0	0	1979	81	179	0
1940–41	0	0	0	1960	0	0	0	1980	81	232	173
1941–42	0	0	0	1961	1	0	0	1981	93	199	68
1942–43	0	0	0	1962	1	0	0	1982	111	111	5
1943–44	0	0	0	1963	3	0	0	1983	150	88	19
1944	0	0	0	1964	3	0	0	1984	261	103	11
1945	0	0	0	1965	16	0	0	1985	238	154	28
1946	0	0	0	1966	17	0	0	1986	167	117	133
1947	0	0	0	1967	4	0	0	1987	95	162	157
1948	14	0	0	1968	26	4	0	1988	40	66	20
1949	14	0	0	1969	26	13	0				
1950	8	0	0	1970	34	11	0				

Notes:

1. The 1931–1943 years are April–March but from 1944 onwards are calendar years.
2. Data up to 1985 are from fishing returns; data from 1986 to 1990 are from Quota Management Reports.
3. Data for the period 1931 to 1982 are based on reported landings by harbour and are likely to be underestimated as a result of under-reporting and discarding practices. Data includes both foreign and domestic landings. Data were aggregated to FMA using methods and assumptions described by Francis & Paul (2013).

Table 3: Reported commercial landings (tonnes) of leatherjacket by Fishstock for the fishing years from 1989–90 to present. Landings for LEA 10 have not been shown as these were negligible and were rounded to zero.

Fishstock FMA (s)	LEA 1 1&9		LEA 2 2&8		LEA 3 3, 5 & 6		LEA 4 4		Total	
	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC
1989–90	114	-	169	-	42	-	-	-	325	-
1990–91	143	-	178	-	61	-	-	-	382	-
1991–92	160	-	85	-	100	-	-	-	345	-
1992–93	154	-	98	-	41	-	-	-	293	-
1993–94	188	-	62	-	37	-	-	-	287	-
1994–95	186	-	148	-	50	-	-	-	384	-
1995–96	152	-	296	-	38	-	-	-	486	-
1996–97	128	-	908	-	70	-	-	-	1 106	-
1997–98	151	-	165	-	66	-	-	-	382	-
1998–99	110	-	413	-	30	-	-	-	553	-
1999–00	115	-	1 136	-	35	-	-	-	1 286	-
2000–01	131	-	880	-	41	-	-	-	1 052	-
2001–02	185	-	953	-	43	-	-	-	1 181	-
2002–03	162	-	568	-	67	-	0	-	797	-
2003–04	189	188	396	1 136	28	100	0	7	613	1 431
2004–05	223	188	221	1 136	56	100	< 1	7	500	1 431
2005–06	173	188	172	1 136	60	100	0	7	405	1 431
2006–07	191	188	215	1 136	49	100	0	7	454	1 431
2007–08	135	188	258	1 136	73	100	0	7	466	1 431
2008–09	178	188	282	1 136	122	100	0	7	582	1 431
2009–10	181	188	455	1 136	117	100	0	7	754	1 431
2010–11	185	188	276	1 136	112	100	< 1	7	573	1 431
2011–12	167	188	277	1 136	127	100	< 1	7	571	1 431
2012–13	178	188	150	1 136	114	100	0	7	442	1 431
2013–14	147	188	105	1 136	132	130	0	7	384	1 461
2014–15	140	188	91	1 136	143	130	0	7	374	1 461
2015–16	151	188	75	1 136	133	130	4	7	363	1 461
2016–17	141	188	80	1 136	122	130	0	7	343	1 461
2017–18	92	188	67	1 136	135	130	0	7	294	1 461
2018–19	97	188	70	1 136	154	130	0	7	320	1 461
2019–20	79	188	59	1 136	131	130	0	7	269	1 461
2020–21	64	188	64	1 136	124	140	0	7	252	1 471
2021–22	55	188	37	1 136	159	140	0	7	251	1 471
2022–23	40	188	23	1 136	200	140	0	7	263	1 471
2023–24	30	188	28	1 136	246	140	0	7	304	1 471
2024–25	31	188	41	1 136	345	200	0	7	417	1 531




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACCs for the main LEA stocks. From top to bottom: LEA 1 (Auckland), LEA 2 (Central), and LEA 3 (South East).

1.2 Recreational fisheries

Leatherjackets are seldom caught by hook and line but recreational fishers, especially in the northern region, take some leatherjacket by spear fishing, in rock lobster pots, and in set nets. No estimates of recreational harvest of leatherjacket were generated from the telephone/diary surveys conducted in 1994, 1996, and 2000 because so few were reported. A national panel survey was conducted for the first time throughout the 2011–12 fishing year. The panel survey used face-to-face interviews of a random sample of 30 390 New Zealand households to recruit a panel of fishers and non-fishers for a full year (from Wynne-Jones et al 2014). The panel members were contacted regularly about their

fishing activities and harvest information collected in standardised phone interviews. The national panel survey was repeated during the 2017–18 and 2022–23 fishing years using very similar methods to produce directly comparable results (Wynne-Jones et al 2019; Heinemann & Gray 2024). Recreational catch estimates from the three national panel surveys are given in Table 4. Note that national panel survey estimates do not include recreational harvest taken on charter vessel trips or under s111 general approvals.

Table 4: Recreational harvest estimates (in numbers of fish) for leatherjacket stocks (Wynne-Jones et al 2014, 2019, Heinemann & Gray 2024).

Stock	Year	Method	Number of fish	Total weight (t)	CV
LEA 1	2011–12	Panel survey	1532	–	0.70
	2017–18	Panel survey	2398	–	0.44
	2022–23	Panel survey	132	–	1.01
LEA 2	2011–12	Panel survey	831	–	0.58
	2017–18	Panel survey	178	–	0.81
	2022–23	Panel survey	–	–	–
LEA 3	2011–12	Panel survey	506	–	0.65
	2017–18	Panel survey	133	–	1.00
	2022–23	Panel survey	137	–	1.01

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

There is no quantitative information available to allow the estimation of the amount of leatherjacket taken by customary non-commercial fishers.

2. BIOLOGY

The New Zealand leatherjacket (*Meuschenia scaber*) is present around much of New Zealand, but is most common in the north. Trawl survey records show it to be widespread over the inner shelf north of East Cape and Cape Egmont, in the South Taranaki Bight, in Tasman Bay and Golden Bay, Pegasus Bay, and the South Canterbury Bight, extending to depths below 100 m, but with greatest abundance at 10–60 m (Anderson et al 1998). It was less commonly caught along the east coast of the North Island south of East Cape, off the northeast South Island (Cook Strait to Pegasus Bay), northwest South Island (Cape Farewell to Cape Foulwind), and around the South Otago and Southland coast. It has not been taken by trawl off the west coast south of Cape Foulwind.

The New Zealand leatherjacket also occurs in Australia, from New South Wales to the southern coast of West Australia. In the Australian southeast trawl fishery, *Meuschenia scaber* is the main leatherjacket species caught (Yearsley et al 1999). It was once believed that two similar species of leatherjacket occurred in New Zealand – ‘rough’ and ‘smooth’ – but these are now considered to be a single species with variable colouring. Kokiri is the Maori name, but is not in common usage. ‘Creamfish’ is a New Zealand trade name for the processed (headed/gutted/skinned) product, rather than a name for the fish itself.

Leatherjacket usually occur near reefs and over rough seafloor, but may be found over sand or some distance above the bottom. Although not a schooling species, it does occur in small groups.

A recent study showed that fifty percent sexual maturity was attained at 19 cm and 1.5 y in the Hauraki Gulf, and there were not significant differences between sexes (Visconti et al 2017, 2018). Maximum age was 9.8 y for males and 18.1 y for females. Males defend territories and eggs are laid within nests on the seafloor from late winter to early summer (Ayling & Cox 1982, Milicich 1986, Visconti et al 2017, 2018).

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

3.1 Biomass estimates

There have been no biological studies directly relevant to the recognition of separate stocks.

The west coast South Island (WCSI) trawl survey probably monitors adult biomass and most of the survey catch comes from Tasman Bay and Golden Bay. The total biomass estimates are shown in Figure 2. Biomass estimates have been relatively stable throughout the time series but increased substantially in 2019 and again in 2021 to the time series high. These higher estimates in 2019 and 2021 are however associated with higher CVs of 44 and 46%, respectively. CVs have been less than 35% in most other surveys. Biomass decreased substantially in 2023 to a time series low of 127 t, below the time series mean (231 t).




Figure 2: Leatherjacket biomass estimates from the WCSI inshore trawl survey time series. Error bars are $\pm$ two standard deviations.




Figure 3: Leatherjacket total biomass for the ECSI winter surveys in core strata (30–400 m), and core plus shallow strata (10–400 m) in 2007, 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018, 2021, 2022, and 2024. Error bars are 2 standard deviations.

East coast South Island (ECSI) winter trawl survey biomass estimates in the core strata (30–400 m) probably do not track abundance because so few fish are caught, and coefficients of variations are generally high ranging from 36 to 76% (mean = 55%, up to 2012). There was nevertheless an increase in abundance from 2009 (Figure 3). Most of the biomass is captured in the 10–30 m depth indicating that the core plus shallow strata (10–400 m) is the only valid depth range within which to monitor leatherjacket biomass; although it is doubtful that these surveys index leatherjacket abundance well because they are also found over foul ground and hence not fully available to trawl gear (Beentjes & MacGibbon 2013). There was no trend in biomass in the 10–400 m depth range.

3.2 Length distributions

Leatherjacket were not caught in significant numbers in the ECSI winter surveys until 2007 when the shallow strata were included in the surveys. The length distributions in the core plus shallow strata (10–400 m) show three clear modes at about 8 cm, 15 cm, and 25 cm, (nominally 0+, 1+, and 2+) and these vary in strength and appearance among surveys (combined males, females, and unsexed) (Beentjes & MacGibbon 2013); only the 2+ mode was present in the 2021 survey, whereas the 1+ and 2+ modes were present in 2022 (Beentjes et al 2023). The core plus shallow strata survey is monitoring both pre-recruited cohorts, and fish in the recruited size range.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

There has been no scientific assessment of the maximum sustainable yield, reference, or current biomass of any of the leatherjacket stocks.

A characterisation and CPUE analysis for the LEA 3 fishery was undertaken by Langley (2013). Leatherjacket in LEA 3 are landed throughout the year, taken almost exclusively by bottom trawl gear in Statistical Areas 021–025 and 030 (Figure 4). Almost all of the LEA catch is taken in the 10–50 m depth range. The characterisation revealed that most of the increase in LEA 3 catch since 2005–06 is attributable to increased landings of leatherjacket catch from bottom trawls targeting spiny dogfish in Foveaux Strait (025).




Figure 4: Distribution of reported catch for bottom trawl by Statistical Area in LEA 3 and fishing year from trips which landed leatherjacket in LEA 3 (Langley 2013).

A CPUE standardisation was undertaken using catch and effort data that included all trips that landed or targeted leatherjacket in LEA 3, but did not include trips that did not catch the species in LEA 3. Landed catch was assigned to effort records proportional to estimated catch, following the Starr (2007) methodology, with some refinements where the data were aggregated to CELR equivalent format (vessel/day/method/statistical area/target species) and then the records were defined as CELR equivalent. This method was somewhat problematic due to differences in the reliability of reporting of fishing location and target species between the CELR and TCER form types. The Foveaux Strait and Canterbury Bight fisheries were analysed separately. The Foveaux Strait analysis was rejected by the Working Group and is therefore not reported further.

The Canterbury Bight analysis was limited to the bottom trawl (BT) fishery in Statistical Areas 020 and 022, targeting a range of target species (RCO, BAR, FLA, ELE, TAR, WAR, and GUR). The dataset included trips where 1 kg or more of LEA 3 leatherjacket was landed. The analysis had large numbers of very small catches. Eight vessels accounted for 80% of the catch. The Working Group requested that the Canterbury Bight delta lognormal model targeting FLA, ELE, GUR from 2002 (Target FLA, GUR, ELE post QMS) be used because these are the years when the reporting is likely to be more reliable. There was an indication that CPUE from the Canterbury Bight fishery has increased since the early 2000s, and these indices were robust to some key assumptions. The index (Figure 5) showed that the CPUE remained low at the start of the series and then began to increase from 2007–08 to 2011–12. However, some concerns were raised about the low number of vessels in the analysis and the development of new markets for this species that may have increased targeting or retention of this species in towards the end of the series, suggesting that the index may not be reliable as an index of abundance.

The Working Group concluded that this analysis only pertains to the stock unit for the east coast of the South Island; is the best available information on the stock abundance at this stage, but trawl survey data may provide better information in the medium and long term; and that this is a Level 2 assessment and should be given a medium or mixed (2) overall assessment quality rank.




Figure 5: A comparison of three standardised CPUE indices for leatherjacket off the east coast South Island (from Langley 2013).

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS


Stock Structure Assumptions

Stock structure is unknown but for management purposes the QMA boundaries are assumed to represent the stock boundaries for this species. There are two distinct areas of catch distribution within LEA 3 (Foveaux Strait and east coast South Island) and these may represent distinct biological stocks.

- **LEA 3 (East coast South Island only)**

Stock Status	
Year of Most Recent Assessment	CPUE: 2013 – now considered out of date; Trawl Survey 2025
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Medium

Assessment Runs Presented	CPUE: Target FLA, GUR, ELE post QMS ECSI winter inshore survey
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: F_{MSY}
Status in relation to Target	Unknown
Status in relation to Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unlikely (< 40%)
Status in relation to Overfishing	Unknown



Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	CPUE remained low at the start of the series (2002) and then began to increase from 2007–08 to 2011–12. The biomass index from the east coast South Island trawl survey 30–400 m strata has increased since 2008, but there was no consistent trend in biomass in the valid 10–400 m strata.
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Unknown because new markets for this species may have increased targeting or retention in recent years.
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unknown

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Standardised CPUE	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2013	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	2 - Medium or Mixed Quality: CPUE may be compromised by the low number of vessels in the analysis and trends in targeting or retention of leatherjacket; the trawl survey has only covered the entire habitat since 2007.	
Main data inputs (rank)	- catch and effort data from bottom trawl sets targeting FLA, GUR, and ELE - trawl survey biomass index	2 - Medium or Mixed Quality: few vessels in analysis 1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	- Foveaux Strait CPUE index - Trawl survey biomass estimates from the 10–400 m strata	3 – Low Quality: based on only a single vessel that has recently started targeting LEA 3 – Low Quality: confidence intervals large and only eight data points
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	New model	
Major sources of Uncertainty	The low number of vessels in the analysis and new markets for this species may have increased targeting or retention in later years of the time series. Trends in CPUE may therefore be a result of changes in reporting and retention rather than abundance. Total trawl survey biomass estimates for the entire survey area (10–400 m) have large confidence intervals for most surveys.	

Qualifying Comments
-

Fishery Interactions

Leatherjacket are landed in fisheries targeting RCO, BAR, FLA, ELE, TAR, WAR, and GUR, but are most commonly caught in FLA, GUR, and ELE target bottom trawl tows. Some concerns have been raised about catch being taken in “hay paddocks”; these are polychaete worm beds that are biologically sensitive, habitat forming areas, which appear to be diminishing in areal extent as a consequence of disturbance from bottom trawling.

Research Needs

Fishery characterisations that include interviews with fishers and processors are required to assess the degree to which changes in fishing practices and economic drivers may have influenced CPUE trends. Trawl surveys need to continue to include the shallow strata in order to monitor the abundance of leatherjacket off the east coast of the South Island.

6. FURTHER INFORMATION

- Anderson, O F; Bagley, N W; Hurst, R J; Francis, M P; Clark, M R; McMillan, P J (1998) Atlas of New Zealand fish and squid distributions from research bottom trawls. *NIWA Technical Report* 24. 303 p.
- Ayling, A M; Cox, G J (1982) *Collins guide to the sea fishes of New Zealand*. Collins, Auckland. 343 p.
- Beentjes, M P; MacGibbon, D J (2013) Review of QMS species for inclusion in the east coast South Island winter trawl survey reports. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2013/35. 102 p.
- Beentjes, M P; MacGibbon, D J; Escobar-Flores, P (2023) Inshore trawl survey of Canterbury Bight and Pegasus Bay, May–June 2022 (KAH2204). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2023/35. 147 p.
- Beentjes, M P; MacGibbon, D J; Lacroix, Y (2022) Inshore trawl survey of Canterbury Bight and Pegasus Bay, April–June 2021 (KAH2104). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2022/23. 147 p.
- Beentjes, M P; MacGibbon, D; Lyon, W S (2015) Inshore trawl survey of Canterbury Bight and Pegasus Bay, April–June 2014 (KAH1402). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2015/14. 136 p.
- Davey, N.K.; Johnson, K.S; Maggs, J.Q. (2024). Mean weight estimates for recreational fisheries in 2022–23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2024/28. 39 p.
- Francis, M (2012) *Coastal Fishes of New Zealand*. Fourth edition. Craig Potton Publishing, Nelson. 268 p.
- Francis, M P (1996) *Coastal fishes of New Zealand. An identification guide*. Revised edition. Reed books, Auckland.
- Francis, M P; Paul, L J (2013) New Zealand inshore finfish and shellfish commercial landings, 1931–82. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2013/55. 136 p.
- Hartill, B; Davey, N (2015) Mean weight estimates for recreational fisheries in 2011–12. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2015/25.
- Heinemann A; Gray, A. (2024) National Panel Survey of Recreational Marine Fishers 2022–23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2024/51. 116 p.
- Langley, A (2013) Characterisation and CPUE analysis for the LEA 3 fishery. SINS-WG-2013-27. 37 p. (Unpublished Working Group document held by Fisheries New Zealand.)
- MacGibbon, D J; Stevenson, M L (2013) Inshore trawl survey of the west coast South Island and Tasman and Golden Bays, March–April 2013 (KAH1305) *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2013/66. 115 p.
- MacGibbon, D J; Beentjes, M P; Lyon, W L; Lacroix, Y (2019) Inshore trawl survey of Canterbury Bight and Pegasus Bay, April–June 2018 (KAH1803). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2019/03. 136 p.
- MacGibbon, D J; Beentjes, M P; Escobar-Flores, P (2024) Inshore trawl survey of Canterbury Bight and Pegasus Bay, April–June 2024 (KAH2402). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2024/87. 150 p.
- Milicich, M J (1986) Aspects of the early life history of *Paricka scaber* (Pisces: Monacanthidae). (M.Sc. thesis, University of Auckland.)
- Starr, P J (2007) Procedure for merging MFish Landing and Effort data. V2.0. Adaptive Management Programme Working Group paper 07/04. 17 p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Visconti, V; Trip, E D L; Griffiths, M H; Clements, K (2017) Reproductive biology of the leatherjacket, *Meuschenia scaber* (Monacanthidae) (Forster 1801) in the Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 52: 82–99.
- Visconti, V; Trip, E D L; Griffiths, M H; Clements, K (2018) Life-history traits of the leatherjacket *Meuschenia scaber*, a long-lived monacanthid. *Journal of Fish Biology* 92: 470–486.
- Yearsley, G K; Last, P R; Ward, R D (Eds) (1999) Australian seafood handbook. An identification guide to domestic species. CSIRO Marine Research, Australia. 461 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–2018. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2019/24. 104 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Hill, L; Heinemann, A (2014) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2011–12: Harvest Estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2014/67. 139 p.

LING

(*Genypterus blacodes*)
Hoka



1. FISHERY SUMMARY

Ling was introduced into the Quota Management System on 1 October 1986. TACs, TACCs, and allowances as of 1 October 2024 are given in Table 1.

Table 1: TACs (t), TACCs (t), and allowances (t) for ling.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
LIN 1	40	20	3	400	463
LIN 2*	–	–	–	982	–
LIN 3	0	0	0	2 060	2 060
LIN 4	0	0	0	4 200	4 200
LIN 5	1	1	104	5 208	5 314
LIN 6	0	0	85	8 505	8 590
LIN 7	1	2	68	3 387	3 458
LIN 10*	–	–	–	10	–

* allowances and TAC not set

1.1 Commercial fisheries

Ling was introduced into the Quota Management System (QMS) on 1 October 1986. Ling are widely distributed throughout the middle depths (200–800 m) of the New Zealand EEZ, particularly south of latitude 40° S. From 1975 to 1980 there was a substantial longline fishery on the Chatham Rise (and to a lesser extent in other areas) carried out by Japanese and Korean longliners. Since 1980 ling have been caught by large trawlers, both domestic and foreign owned, and by small domestic longliners and trawlers. In the early 1990s the domestic fleet was increased by the addition of several larger longliners with autoline equipment, resulting in a large increase in the catches of ling off the east and south of the South Island (LIN 3, 4, 5, and 6). Following the 2000–01 fishing year there was a declining trend in catches taken by longline vessels in most areas, offset, to some extent, by increased trawl landings. Potting for ling represented less than 1% of the catch up until 2013; since then, the use of this method has increased; potting represented 24 – 42% of the catch in the different ling stocks in 2025. The only areas where potting has not been increasing are the Cook Strait (LIN 7CK) and the Bounty Plateau (LIN 6B).

The principal grounds for smaller domestic vessels are off the west coast of South Island (WCSI) and the east coast of both main islands south of East Cape. For the large trawlers the main sources of ling are Puysegur Bank and the slope of the Stewart-Snares shelf and waters in the Auckland Islands area, and the Chatham Rise, primarily as bycatch of target fisheries for hoki. Longliners fish mainly in LIN 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Under the Adaptive Management Programme (AMP), the LIN 1 TACC was increased to 400 t from 1 October 2002; it remained at this level when LIN 1 was removed from the AMP on 30 September 2009. In a proposal for the 1994–95 fishing year, LIN 3 and 4 TACCs were increased to 2810 t and 5720 t, respectively. These stocks were removed from the AMP from 1 October 1998, with TACCs maintained at the increased level. However, from 1 October 2000, the LIN 3 and 4 TACCs were reduced to 2060 t and 4200 t, respectively. From 1 October 2004, LIN 5 and LIN 6 TACCs were increased by about 20% to 3595 t and 8505 t, respectively, and the LIN 5 TACC was increased again by 10% (to 3955 t) from 1 October 2013. From 1 October 2009, the LIN 7 TACC was increased from 2225 t to 2474 t, and to 3080 t from 1 October 2013. From 1 October 2018, the LIN 5 TACC was increased to 4735 t, and further increased to 5208 t from 1 October 2021. From 1 October 2019 a TACC of 3387 t applies for LIN 7. Since 2019–20, landings from Fishstocks LIN 1, LIN 2, LIN 4, and LIN 6 have been substantially lower than their TACCs while the LIN 3, LIN 5 and LIN 7 catches were near or slightly above the TACCs. Reported landings for the main QMAs from 1931 to 1982 are given in Table 2.

Table 2: Reported landings (t) for the main QMAs from 1931 to 1982.

Year	LIN 1	LIN 2	LIN 3	LIN 4	LIN 5	LIN 6	LIN 7
1931–32	0	0	11	0	1	0	0
1932–33	0	63	14	0	2	0	35
1933–34	0	146	59	0	1	0	67
1934–35	0	217	70	0	1	0	94
1935–36	0	146	124	0	1	0	66
1936–37	0	133	103	0	1	0	61
1937–38	0	91	320	0	1	0	57
1938–39	0	66	280	0	24	0	37
1939–40	0	40	320	0	16	0	26
1940–41	1	85	286	0	21	0	46
1941–42	0	64	308	0	22	0	40
1942–43	0	54	254	0	24	0	29
1943–44	0	83	264	0	19	0	40
1944	0	103	224	0	13	0	46
1945	1	122	199	0	13	0	80
1946	0	153	348	0	9	0	78
1947	0	203	474	0	24	0	96
1948	0	120	403	0	24	0	66
1949	0	108	402	0	20	0	67
1950	0	84	352	0	29	0	61
1951	0	60	230	0	16	0	34
1952	0	69	235	0	16	0	36
1953	0	62	212	0	19	0	34
1954	0	75	208	0	7	0	44
1955	0	48	160	0	6	0	27
1956	0	27	155	0	4	0	15
1957	0	34	175	0	8	0	19
1958	0	43	178	0	15	0	28
1959	0	39	157	0	13	0	27
1960	0	26	196	0	21	0	19
1961	0	25	230	0	20	0	19
1962	1	27	211	0	13	0	16
1963	1	17	213	0	14	0	11
1964	1	20	223	0	16	0	13
1965	1	21	195	0	24	0	13
1966	5	52	141	0	16	0	17
1967	7	40	106	0	14	0	36
1968	7	55	88	0	11	0	42
1969	5	52	154	0	10	0	23
1970	6	67	167	0	14	0	51
1971	4	49	203	0	20	1	37
1972	6	37	522	6	22	0	33
1973	18	73	1 425	0	23	0	41
1974	9	102	575	42	335	44	82
1975	3	70	1 770	15	1 513	344	224
1976	2	60	1 567	14	2 630	0	1 739
1977	9	100	1 149	466	1 683	0	2 810
1978	24	144	487	0	2 515	391	240
1979	82	228	799	246	4 400	1 431	454
1980	114	205	265	182	4 064	933	928
1981	208	429	427	444	3 576	636	1 020
1982	320	625	924	435	2 109	317	1 208

Reported landings by nation from 1975 to 1987–88 are given in Table 3, and reported landings and TACCs by Fishstock from 1983–84 onwards are given in Table 4. Figure 1 shows the historical landings and TACC values for the main LIN stocks.

Table 3: Reported landings (t) from 1975 to 1987–88. Data from 1975 to 1983 from MAF; data from 1983–84 to 1985–86 from FSU; data from 1986–87 to 1987–88 from QMS. –, no data available.

Fishing year	New Zealand			Longline		Foreign Licensed Trawl			Grand total
	Domestic	Chartered	Total	(Japan + Korea)	Japan	Korea	USSR	Total	
1975*	486	0	486	9 269	2 180	0	0	11 499	11 935
1976*	447	0	447	19 381	5 108	0	1 300	25 789	26 236
1977*	549	0	549	28 633	5 014	200	700	34 547	35 096
1978–79#	657	24	681	8 904	3 151	133	452	12 640	13 321
1979–80#	915	2 598	3 513	3 501	3 856	226	245	7 828	11 341
1980–81#	1 028	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1981–82#	1 581	2 423	4 004	0	2 087	56	247	2 391	6 395
1982–83#	2 135	2 501	4 636	0	1 256	27	40	1 322	5 958
1983†	2 695	1 523	4 218	0	982	33	48	1 063	5 281
1983–84§	2 705	2 500	5 205	0	2 145	173	174	2 491	7 696
1984–85§	2 646	2 166	4 812	0	1 934	77	130	2 141	6 953
1985–86§	2 126	2 948	5 074	0	2 050	48	33	2 131	7 205
1986–87§	2 469	3 177	5 646	0	1 261	13	21	1 294	6 940
1987–88§	2 212	5 030	7 242	0	624	27	8	659	7 901

* Reported by calendar year, # Reported April 1 to March 31(except domestic vessels, which reported by calendar year).
† Reported April 1 to September 30 (except domestic vessels, which reported by calendar year).
§ Reported October 1 to September 30.

Table 4: Reported landings (t) of ling by Fishstock from 1983–84 to present and actual TACCs (t) from 1986–87 to present. Estimated landings for LIN 7 from 1987–88 to 1992–93 include an adjustment for ling bycatch of hoki trawlers, based on records from vessels carrying observers. QMS data from 1986-present. [Continued on next page]

Fishstock FMA (s)	LIN 1		LIN 2		LIN 3		LIN 4		LIN 5	
	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC
1983–84*	141	–	594	–	1 306	–	352	–	2 605	–
1984–85*	94	–	391	–	1 067	–	356	–	1 824	–
1985–86*	88	–	316	–	1 243	–	280	–	2 089	–
1986–87	77	200	254	910	1 311	1 850	465	4 300	1 859	2 500
1987–88	68	237	124	918	1 562	1 909	280	4 400	2 213	2 506
1988–89	216	237	570	955	1 665	1 917	232	4 400	2 375	2 506
1989–90	121	265	736	977	1 876	2 137	587	4 401	2 277	2 706
1990–91	210	265	951	977	2 419	2 160	2 372	4 401	2 285	2 706
1991–92	241	265	818	977	2 430	2 160	4 716	4 401	3 863	2 706
1992–93	253	265	944	980	2 246	2 162	4 100	4 401	2 546	2 706
1993–94	241	265	779	980	2 171	2 167	3 920	4 401	2 460	2 706
1994–95	261	265	848	980	2 679	2 810	5 072	5 720	2 557	3 001
1995–96	245	265	1 042	980	2 956	2 810	4 632	5 720	3 137	3 001
1996–97	313	265	1 187	982	2 963	2 810	4 087	5 720	3 438	3 001
1997–98	303	265	1 032	982	2 916	2 810	5 215	5 720	3 321	3 001
1998–99	208	265	1 070	982	2 706	2 810	4 642	5 720	2 937	3 001
1999–00	313	265	983	982	2 799	2 810	4 402	5 720	3 136	3 001
2000–01	296	265	1 105	982	2 330	2 060	3 861	4 200	3 430	3 001
2001–02	303	265	1 034	982	2 164	2 060	3 602	4 200	3 295	3 001
2002–03	246	400	996	982	2 529	2 060	2 997	4 200	2 939	3 001
2003–04	249	400	1 044	982	1 990	2 060	2 618	4 200	2 899	3 001
2004–05	283	400	936	982	1 597	2 060	2 758	4 200	3 584	3 595
2005–06	364	400	780	982	1 711	2 060	1 769	4 200	3 522	3 595
2006–07	301	400	874	982	2 089	2 060	2 113	4 200	3 731	3 595
2007–08	381	400	792	982	1 778	2 060	2 383	4 200	4 145	3 595
2008–09	320	400	634	982	1 751	2 060	2 000	4 200	3 232	3 595
2009–10	386	400	584	982	1 718	2 060	2 026	4 200	3 034	3 595
2010–11	438	400	670	982	1 665	2 060	1 572	4 200	3 856	3 595
2011–12	384	400	504	982	1 292	2 060	2 305	4 200	3 649	3 595
2012–13	383	400	579	982	1 475	2 060	2 181	4 200	3 610	3 595
2013–14	380	400	673	982	1 442	2 060	2 373	4 200	3 935	3 955
2014–15	374	400	673	982	1 325	2 060	2 246	4 200	3 924	3 955
2015–16	422	400	702	982	1 440	2 060	2 659	4 200	3 868	3 955
2016–17	404	400	1 022	982	1 808	2 060	2 565	4 200	3 356	3 955
2017–18	415	400	1 106	982	2 171	2 060	2 636	4 200	4 034	3 955
2018–19	383	400	939	982	2 016	2 060	2 044	4 200	4 596	4 735
2019–20	371	400	756	982	1 685	2 060	1 778	4 200	4 678	4 735
2020–21	319	400	645	982	1 489	2 060	2 129	4 200	4 949	4 735
2021–22	353	400	532	982	1 175	2 060	2 604	4 200	5 044	5 208
2022–23	270	400	456	982	1 366	2 060	1 892	4 200	4 906	5 208
2023–24	296	400	439	982	1 965	2 060	2 359	4 200	4 763	5 208
2024–25	213	400	588	982	1 734	2 060	2 182	4 200	5 302	5 208

Table 4 [Continued]:

Fishstock FMA (s)	LIN 6		LIN 7 7 & 8			LIN 10		Total	
	Landings	TACC	Reported Landings	Estimate Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings§	TACC
1983–84*	869	–	1 552	–	–	0	–	7 696	–
1984–85*	1 283	–	1 705	–	–	0	–	6 953	–
1985–86*	1 489	–	1 458	–	–	0	–	7 205	–
1986–87	956	7 000	1 851	–	1 960	0	10	6 940	18 730
1987–88	1 710	7 000	1 853	1 777	2 008	0	10	7 901	18 988
1988–89	340	7 000	2 956	2 844	2 150	0	10	8 404	19 175
1989–90	935	7 000	2 452	3 171	2 176	0	10	9 028	19 672
1990–91	2 738	7 000	2 531	3 149	2 192	< 1	10	13 506	19 711
1991–92	3 459	7 000	2 251	2 728	2 192	0	10	17 778	19 711
1992–93	6 501	7 000	2 475	2 817	2 212	< 1	10	19 065	19 737
1993–94	4 249	7 000	2 142	–	2 213	0	10	15 961	19 741
1994–95	5 477	7 100	2 946	–	2 225	0	10	19 841	22 111
1995–96	6 314	7 100	3 102	–	2 225	0	10	21 428	22 111
1996–97	7 510	7 100	3 024	–	2 225	0	10	22 522	22 113
1997–98	7 331	7 100	3 027	–	2 225	0	10	23 145	22 113
1998–99	6 112	7 100	3 345	–	2 225	0	10	21 034	22 113
1999–00	6 707	7 100	3 274	–	2 225	0	10	21 615	22 113
2000–01	6 177	7 100	3 352	–	2 225	0	10	20 552	19 843
2001–02	5 945	7 100	3 219	–	2 225	0	10	19 561	19 843
2002–03	6 283	7 100	2 918	–	2 225	0	10	18 903	19 978
2003–04	7 032	7 100	2 926	–	2 225	0	10	18 760	19 978
2004–05	5 506	8 505	2 522	–	2 225	0	10	17 189	21 977
2005–06	3 553	8 505	2 479	–	2 225	0	10	14 184	21 977
2006–07	4 696	8 505	2 295	–	2 225	0	10	16 102	21 977
2007–08	4 502	8 505	2 282	–	2 225	0	10	16 264	21 977
2008–09	2 977	8 505	2 223	–	2 225	0	10	13 137	21 977
2009–10	2 414	8 505	2 446	–	2 474	0	10	12 609	22 226
2010–11	1 335	8 505	2 800	–	2 474	0	10	12 337	22 226
2011–12	2 047	8 505	2 771	–	2 474	0	10	12 953	22 226
2012–13	3 102	8 505	3 010	–	2 474	0	10	14 339	22 226
2013–14	3 221	8 505	3 200	–	3 080	0	10	15 224	23 192
2014–15	3 115	8 505	3 343	–	3 080	0	10	15 002	23 192
2015–16	2 222	8 505	3 340	–	3 080	0	10	14 654	23 192
2016–17	2 473	8 505	3 428	–	3 080	0	10	15 056	23 192
2017–18	4 846	8 505	3 487	–	3 080	0	10	18 694	23 192
2018–19	3 706	8 505	3 059	–	3 080	0	10	16 743	23 972
2019–20	3 972	8 505	3 216	–	3 387	< 1	10	16 456	24 279
2020–21	3 916	8 505	3 308	–	3 387	0	10	16 754	24 279
2021–22	3 881	8 505	3 325	–	3 387	0	10	16 920	24 752
2022–23	4 780	8 505	3 540	–	3 387	0	10	17 211	24 752
2023–24	4 414	8 505	3 216	–	3 387	0	10	17 451	24 752
2024–25	5 137	8 505	2 990	–	3 387	0	10	18 147	24 752

* FSU data.

§ Includes landings from unknown areas before 1986–87, and areas outside the EEZ since 1995–96.




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the seven main LIN stocks. LIN 1 (Auckland East). [Continued on next two pages]




Figure 1 [Continued]: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the seven main LIN stocks. From top to bottom: LIN 2 (Central East), LIN 3 (South East Coast), and LIN 4 (South East Chatham Rise). [Continued on next page]




Figure 1 [Continued]: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the seven main LIN stocks. From top to bottom: LIN 5 (Southland), LIN 6 (Sub-Antarctic), and LIN 7 (Challenger).

1.2 Recreational fisheries

Recreational harvest estimates were provided by telephone/diary surveys between 1993 and 2001 but are no longer considered reliable for various reasons. A Recreational Technical Working Group concluded that these harvest estimates should be used only with the following qualifications: a) they may be very inaccurate; b) the 1996 and earlier surveys contain a methodological error; and c) the 2000 and 2001 estimates are implausibly high for many important fisheries. In response to these problems and the cost and scale challenges associated with onsite methods, a national panel survey was conducted for the first time throughout the 2011–12 fishing year. The panel survey used face-to-face interviews of a random sample of 30 390 New Zealand households to recruit a panel of fishers and non-fishers for a

full year (Wynne-Jones et al. 2014). The panel members were contacted regularly about their fishing activities and harvest information collected in standardised phone interviews. The national panel survey was repeated during the 2017–18 and 2022–23 fishing years using very similar methods to produce directly comparable results (Wynne-Jones et al. 2019; Heinemann & Gray 2024). In 2011–12, only three fishers reported catching ling in LIN 1 (4 trips) and only two fishers reported catching ling in LIN 7 (3 trips). In 2017–18, one fisher reported catching ling in LIN 3 (1 trip), and four fishers reported catching ling in LIN 7 (4 trips). In 2022–23, one fisher reported catching ling in LIN 1 (1 trip). Estimates of total nationwide catch were 990, 224 and 84 fish in 2011–12, 2017–18 and 2022–23, respectively, all with wide CVs. Note that national panel survey estimates do not include recreational harvest taken on charter vessel trips or under s111 general approvals.

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

Quantitative information on the level of Māori customary non-commercial take is not available. Ling bones have been recovered from archaic middens throughout the South Island and southern North Island, and on Chatham Island (Leach & Boocock 1993). In the South Island and Chatham Island, ling comprised about 4% (by number) of recovered fish remains.

1.4 Illegal catch

It is believed that up to the mid-1990s some ling bycatch from the west coast hoki fishery was not reported. Estimates of total catch including non-reported catch are given in Table 4 for LIN 7. It is believed that in the early 1990s, some catch from LIN 7 was reported against other ling stocks (probably LIN 3, 5, and 6). The likely levels of historical misreporting are moderate, being about 250–400 t in each year from 1989–90 to 1991–92 (Dunn 2003).

1.5 Other sources of mortality

There is likely to be some mortality associated with escapement from trawl nets, mostly from small fish that can escape through the trawl mesh. The mortality of ling associated with escapement is not known. In the Sub-Antarctic, the catch and effort records for ling suggest that small ling are uncommon in areas where the hoki/hake/ling fishery occurs with only very low proportions of small ling recorded by observers (Mormede et al. 2021a). Hence the level of mortality of ling associated with escapement is likely to be low over the history of the fishery and is assumed to be negligible. The other sources of mortality from the longline fishery are likely to be insignificant.

2. BIOLOGY

The maximum age recorded for New Zealand ling is 46 years, although only 0.5% of successfully aged ling have been older than 30 years. A growth study of ling from five areas (west coast South Island, Chatham Rise, Bounty Platform, Campbell Plateau, and Cook Strait) showed that females grew significantly faster and reached a greater size than males in all areas, and that growth rates were significantly different between areas. Ling growth is fastest in Cook Strait and slowest on the Campbell Plateau (Horn 2005).

M was initially estimated from the equation $M = \log_e 100 / \text{maximum age}$, where maximum age is the age to which 1% of the population survives in an unexploited stock. The mean M calculated from five samples of age data was 0.18 (range = 0.17–0.20) (Horn 1993). However, a review of M and results of modelling conducted in 2007 suggested that this parameter may vary between stocks (Horn 2008). The M for Chatham Rise ling was estimated to be lower than 0.18, whereas for Cook Strait and west coast South Island the value was potentially higher than 0.18. M was evaluated again in 2017 (Edwards 2017). In the new study all available life-history data were re-analysed and sex-specific M values derived. For a variety of reasons female M values were estimated with much greater confidence than those for males, the results for females being: west coast South Island 0.15, Cook Strait 0.12, Chatham Rise 0.13, and Sub-Antarctic 0.16. However, all credibility intervals overlapped such that assuming a common value of 0.14 in all areas was also credible. Due to the methodology employed, these values have been treated as a potential minimum value in sensitivity runs rather than the most plausible value for those stocks. M has been estimated in assessment model runs for some stocks (see Section 4).

Ling in spawning condition have been reported in a number of localities throughout the EEZ (Horn 2005, 2015). Time of spawning appears to vary between areas: August to October on the Chatham Rise, September to December on Campbell Plateau and Puysegur Bank, September to February on the Bounty Platform, and July to September off west coast South Island and in Cook Strait. Little is known about the distribution of juveniles until they are about 40 cm total length, when they begin to appear in trawl samples over most of the adult range.

Ling appear to be mainly bottom dwellers, feeding on crustaceans such as *Munida* and scampi and also on fish, with commercial fishing discards being a significant dietary component (Dunn et al. 2010). However, they may at times be caught well above the bottom, for example when feeding on hoki during the hoki spawning season.

Biological parameters relevant to the stock assessment are shown in Table 5. The growth model was updated in 2025 for LIN 7WC (Mormede et al. in prep a), in 2024 for LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B (Mormede et al. 2024a), and in 2022 for LIN 3&4 (Mormede et al. 2022a), and showed no indication of change in the length-weight or growth parameters over time. The maturation ogive was re-estimated for LIN 5&6 (Mormede et al. 2024a and see Table 6); it showed no indication of change over time. An alternative maturity ogive was evaluated in the stock assessment of LIN 3&4 in 2025, where maturity was derived from otolith growth zone measurements (Holmes et al. 2025). This method assumed that a reduction in growth zone width was a result of transition from relatively fast somatic growth, to slow somatic growth plus gamete production. The resulting age at maturity was estimated to be age 7 for both sexes.

Table 5: Estimates of biological parameters. See Section 3 for definitions of Fishstocks.

1. Natural mortality (*M*)
Both

FMA	
All stocks	0.18

2. Weight = a (length)^{*b*} (Weight in g, length in cm total length)

	Female		Male		Area
	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	
FMA					
LIN 3&4	0.00138	3.271	0.00128	3.294	Chatham Rise
LIN 5&6	0.00132	3.293	0.00213	3.179	Southern Plateau
LIN 6B	0.00114	3.318	0.001	3.354	Bounty Platform
LIN 7WC	0.00098	3.362	0.00131	3.292	West coast S.I.
LIN 7CK	0.000934	3.368	0.001146	3.318	Cook Strait

3. von Bertalanffy growth parameters

	Female				Male				Area
	<i>K</i>	<i>t</i> ₀	<i>L</i> _∞	CV	<i>K</i>	<i>t</i> ₀	<i>L</i> _∞	CV	
FMA									
LIN 3&4	0.090	-0.71	153.3	0.09	0.130	-0.65	112.2	0.09	Chatham Rise
LIN 5&6	0.13	-1.53	110.6	0.08	0.19	-1.16	91.2	0.07	Southern Plateau
LIN 6B	0.12	-0.1	138.9	0.08	0.15	-0.1	117.1	0.07	Bounty Platform
LIN 7WC	0.11	-0.1	178.9	0.09	0.13	-0.1	126.1	0.09	West coast S.I.
LIN 7CK	0.097	-0.54	163.6		0.08	-1.94	158.9		Cook Strait

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

A review of ling stock structure (Horn 2005) examined diverse information from studies of morphometrics, genetics, growth, population age structures, and reproductive biology and behaviour, and indicated that there are at least five ling stocks, i.e., west coast South Island, Chatham Rise, Cook Strait, Bounty Platform, and the Southern Plateau (including the Stewart-Snares shelf and Puysegur Bank). Stock affinities of ling north of Cook Strait are unknown, but spawning is known to occur off Northland, Cape Kidnappers, and in the Bay of Plenty.

In 2023, Statistical Area 032 was reassigned from the LIN 5&6 stock to the LIN 7WC stock based on the continuity of catch locations (Mormede et al. 2024a). Before 2024, Sub-Antarctic ling were assessed as two independent stocks (LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B). A spatial analysis of the length and sex structure of ling in 2021 suggested some evidence that LIN 6B could be considered a part of the LIN 5&6 stock (Mormede et al. 2021a). Further analyses carried out in 2026 suggested that ling in Statistical Area 023 might exhibit a different growth from those in the rest of LIN 7WC, although it was unclear if this

apparent difference was due to deeper waters fished in Statistical Area 032 or an actual difference in growth due to a different stock (Mormede et al, in prep a).

A characterisation of all ling stocks by Horn (2022) suggested that ling in the Sub-Antarctic (LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B) were a single stock, with some between area seasonal movement of adult fish. The stock structure of Sub-Antarctic ling was further investigated in 2024 (Mormede et al. 2024b), with differences in growth suggesting that LIN 3&4, LIN 5&6, and LIN 7WC were likely to be different stocks, and that the current boundaries between those stocks were likely to be adequate. Based on available catch rate, age structure, and growth information, LIN 6B was considered unlikely to be part of LIN 3&4, with only weak evidence that it was not part of LIN 5&6. Because of the paucity of data available to assess LIN 6B as a separate stock, and the similarities in the information between LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B, the working group decided to include LIN 6B with LIN 5&6 as a single Sub-Antarctic ling stock (LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B).

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

LIN 1 was previously managed and assessed under the AMP, and the stocks off the east and west coasts (LIN 1E and LIN 1W) have been assessed separately. An updated CPUE analysis for the eastern part of the stock (LIN 1E) was attempted in 2020 but was not accepted as an index of abundance due to sparse data, the influence of vessels with particularly low catch rates in the early part of the series, and inconsistent trends in different statistical areas. A CPUE analysis for the ling target bottom longline fishery in LIN 2 was conducted in 2014. The characterisation and stock assessments of LIN 3&4 (Chatham Rise) was updated in 2025, LIN 7WC (west coast South Island) in 2026, and that for Sub-Antarctic ling (LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B) was last updated in 2024. Assessments for other stocks were updated in 2007 (LIN 6B when assumed to be a stand-alone stock, Bounty Platform, with a CPUE update in 2014), 2010 (LIN 7CK, Cook Strait, with an assessment in 2013 rejected). LIN 1 and LIN 2 are assessed using CPUE analysis. All other ling stock assessments have been conducted using a Bayesian age structured model. The 2025 LIN 3&4 assessment used Casal2 (Doonan et al. 2016). The stock assessment of ling in LIN 5&6 was run in CASAL and Stan (Webber et al. 2021). Other age-structured assessments have used CASAL (Bull et al. 2012).

Model input parameters are provided in Table 6, with catch histories by stock and fishery presented in Table 7. Estimates of relative abundance from standardised CPUE analyses (Table 8) and trawl surveys (Table 9) are also presented below. In 2022, the Deepwater Working Group recommended that the model year start for all current and future ling assessments be set at 1st January, matching the calendar year. This matches the biology and fisheries better and allows uniformity in the assessments rather than a different model year for each stock.

Table 6: Input parameters for the assessed stocks.

Parameter	LIN 3&4	LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B	LIN 6B	LIN 7WC	LIN 7CK
Stock-recruitment steepness	0.84	0.84	0.9	0.84	0.9
Recruitment variability CV	0.7	0.7	1.0	0.7	0.7
Ageing error CV	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.07
Proportion male at birth	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Proportion of mature that spawn	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Maximum exploitation rate (U_{max})	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6

Maturity ogives (from Horn 2005, and from Mormede et al. 2024a for LIN 5&6)

Age	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
LIN 3&4 (and assumed for LIN 6B)													
Male	0.0	0.03	0.063	0.14	0.28	0.48	0.69	0.85	0.93	0.97	0.99	1.00	1.0
Female	0.0	0.00	0.003	0.01	0.014	0.033	0.08	0.16	0.31	0.54	0.76	0.93	1.0
LIN 5&6													
Male	0.0	0.04	0.16	0.41	0.72	0.91	0.98	0.99	1.00	1.00			
Female	0.0	0.01	0.01	0.12	0.28	0.55	0.78	0.91	0.97	0.99	1.00		
LIN 7WC (and assumed for LIN 7CK)													
Male	0.0	0.015	0.095	0.39	0.77	0.94	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00			
Female	0.0	0.004	0.017	0.06	0.18	0.39	0.65	0.85	0.94	1.00			
Combined	0.0	0.010	0.056	0.23	0.48	0.67	0.83	0.93	0.97	1.00			

Table 7: Estimated catch histories (t) for LIN 2 (ECNI), LIN 3&4 (Chatham Rise), LIN 5&6 (Campbell Plateau), LIN 6B (Bounty Platform), LIN 7WC (WCSI section of LIN 7), and LIN 7CK (Cook Strait). Landings have been separated by fishing method (trawl or longline or, where relevant, potting). The catch histories for LIN 2 and LIN 7CK are expressed in fishing years, whereby 1990 is the model year from 1st October 1989 to 31st September 1990. The catch histories for LIN 3&4, LIN 5&6 & LIN 6B and LIN 7WC are expressed in calendar year. ‘-’ denotes no update to the stock assessment and therefore catch histories.

Year	LIN 2		LIN 3&4			LIN 5&6		LIN 6B	LIN 7WC			LIN 7CK	
	trawl	line	trawl	line	pot	trawl	line	line	trawl	line	pot	trawl	line
1972	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1973	-	-	250	0	0	500	0	0	85	20	0	45	45
1974	-	-	382	0	0	1 120	0	0	144	40	0	45	45
1975	-	-	953	8 439	0	900	118	0	401	800	0	48	48
1976	-	-	2 100	17 436	0	3 402	190	0	565	2 100	0	58	58
1977	-	-	2 055	23 994	0	3 100	301	0	715	4 300	0	68	68
1978	-	-	1 400	7 577	0	1 945	494	10	300	323	0	78	78
1979	-	-	2 380	821	0	3 707	1 022	0	539	360	0	83	83
1980	-	-	1 340	360	0	5 200	0	0	540	305	0	88	88
1981	-	-	673	160	0	4 427	0	10	492	300	0	98	98
1982	-	-	1 183	339	0	2 402	0	0	675	400	0	103	103
1983	-	-	1 210	326	0	2 778	5	10	1 040	710	0	97	97
1984	-	-	1 366	406	0	3 203	2	6	924	595	0	119	119
1985	-	-	1 351	401	0	4 480	25	2	1 156	302	0	116	116
1986	-	-	1 494	375	0	3 182	2	0	1 082	362	0	126	126
1987	-	-	1 313	306	0	3 962	0	0	1 105	370	0	97	97
1988	-	-	1 636	290	0	2 065	6	0	1 428	291	0	107	107
1989	-	-	1 397	488	0	2 923	10	9	1 959	370	0	255	85
1990	85	134	3 170	243	2	5 004	0	14	2 173	229	0	362	121
1991	162	185	3 979	1 786	16	3 537	407	139	2 025	425	0	488	163
1992	110	299	3 851	3 388	37	7 663	1 026	1 244	1 572	873	0	498	85
1993	97	381	2 836	3 963	13	6 202	1 166	1 260	1 590	699	0	307	114
1994	96	397	2 374	4 241	11	6 782	1 423	652	1 312	1 003	0	269	84
1995	97	398	2 680	5 391	7	5 064	2 032	534	1 759	994	0	344	70
1996	149	350	3 375	4 699	1	6 872	2 101	614	2 019	994	0	392	35
1997	168	269	3 901	4 182	38	7 468	3 588	312	2 034	1 323	0	417	89
1998	148	387	5 140	3 299	40	5 771	3 267	493	1 995	1 065	0	366	88
1999	169	257	4 306	2 994	41	6 013	2 952	707	2 389	916	0	316	216
2000	166	286	3 826	3 228	23	7 506	2 328	1 175	2 479	947	0	317	131
2001	216	344	2 941	3 082	2	5 701	1 819	1 061	2 400	1 007	1	258	80
2002	212	366	3 637	2 330	1	7 720	1 264	859	2 475	762	0	230	171
2003	124	344	3 563	2 150	1	8 423	668	988	2 094	926	0	280	180
2004	82	420	2 714	1 731	4	8 016	1 509	422	2 092	764	0	241	227
2005	54	335	2 250	2 259	10	7 295	892	48	1 595	845	0	200	282
2006	45	365	1 890	1 489	54	7 118	781	110	1 773	781	0	129	220
2007	87	425	2 841	1 571	55	8 083	890	218	1 323	1 161	0	107	189
2008	37	457	2 432	2 034	15	5 345	659	446	1 150	1 021	0	115	110
2009	49	394	1 459	1 897	12	4 425	550	232	1 216	992	0	108	39
2010	37	409	1 530	1 973	39	4 391	1 064	2	1 386	1 199	0	74	14
2011	51	426	1 030	1 658	33	4 445	842	55	1 606	1 143	0	115	67
2012	57	288	1 470	2 087	11	6 608	1 168	4	1 697	1 285	0	96	47
2013	44	317	1 125	2 394	24	5 535	259	219	1 959	1 089	0	104	106
2014	78	337	1 349	2 443	58	6 075	925	75	1 914	1 444	0	71	71
2015	68	385	1 513	1 685	46	5 735	759	38	2 092	1 349	2	68	63
2016	69	386	1 551	2 695	164	4 482	618	214	2 159	1 471	15	52	81
2017	-	-	1 811	2 432	201	7 309	761	970	2 451	1 470	0	-	-
2018	-	-	1 330	2 870	543	7 355	768	149	2 440	1 225	15	-	-
2019	-	-	1 347	1 877	674	7 264	1 286	171	1 834	1 400	8	-	-
2020	-	-	1 060	1 627	402	6 168	2 033	255	1 687	1 752	0	-	-
2021	-	-	1 050	1 932	369	7 338	1 205	636	1 406	1 847	210	-	-
2022	-	-	1 090	1 852	479	7 198	1 378	249	1 482	1 590	213	-	-
2023	-	-	1 343	964	1 186	6 325	3 318	303	1 488	1 184	739	-	-
2024	-	-	1 310	1 262	1 208	-	-	-	1 244	1 215	765	-	-
2025	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	920	876	745	-	-

Table 8: Standardised CPUE indices (with CVs) for the ling longline and trawl fisheries. Year refers to calendar year. ‘–’ denotes no update to the stock assessment and therefore catch histories. Note that the LIN 5&6 CPUE was not standardised to 1 to avoid the minimisation bound constraint in CASAL & Casal2 (Mormede et al. 2021b, Webber et al. 2021) but instead expressed in standardised catch in kilograms. A 1% learning rate (due to technology or efficiency increase) was applied to the LIN7WC series provided in this table prior to their input into the model.

Year	LIN 2 line		LIN 5&6 line		LIN 6B line		LIN 7WC line		LIN 7WC trawl	
	CPUE	CV	CPUE	CV	CPUE	CV	CPUE	CV	CPUE	CV
1991	–	–	6 310	0.07	–	–	1.11	0.06		
1992	1.64	0.09	9 030	0.04	1.74	0.15	1.26	0.05		
1993	1.40	0.08	8 610	0.04	1.41	0.13	0.97	0.05		
1994	1.55	0.09	7 620	0.05	0.95	0.16	0.93	0.05		
1995	1.54	0.07	8 870	0.04	1.24	0.13	1.00	0.05		
1996	1.34	0.07	7 150	0.05	1.15	0.12	0.62	0.05		
1997	1.29	0.07	7 950	0.04	0.92	0.14	0.75	0.05	1.52	0.14
1998	1.27	0.07	6 970	0.04	1.06	0.12	0.84	0.04	1.23	0.14
1999	1.13	0.07	5 330	0.04	1.07	0.11	0.90	0.05	1.51	0.14
2000	0.80	0.07	6 380	0.04	0.95	0.10	0.92	0.04	1.20	0.14
2001	0.60	0.08	7 320	0.04	0.76	0.11	1.10	0.04	1.17	0.14
2002	0.97	0.08	7 160	0.04	0.69	0.11	1.02	0.05	1.02	0.14
2003	0.88	0.07	5 030	0.07	0.78	0.10	1.14	0.04	0.82	0.14
2004	1.07	0.07	4 710	0.07	0.74	0.16	1.18	0.05	0.92	0.14
2005	1.00	0.08	8 510	0.06	–	–	0.82	0.04	0.87	0.14
2006	0.88	0.07	5 810	0.06	–	–	0.79	0.04	0.92	0.14
2007	0.95	0.07	8 260	0.05	–	–	1.15	0.04	0.95	0.14
2008	0.85	0.07	6 310	0.06	–	–	1.09	0.05	0.89	0.14
2009	0.89	0.08	7 400	0.05	–	–	1.08	0.04	1.19	0.14
2010	0.90	0.07	5 840	0.05	–	–	1.31	0.04	0.98	0.14
2011	0.82	0.06	4 570	0.06	–	–	1.15	0.04	1.07	0.14
2012	0.56	0.07	5 570	0.04	–	–	1.20	0.04	0.95	0.14
2013	0.65	0.08	3 080	0.14	–	–	1.28	0.04	1.13	0.14
2014	–	–	4 940	0.06	–	–	1.31	0.04	1.04	0.14
2015	–	–	4 810	0.06	–	–	1.12	0.04	1.10	0.14
2016	–	–	3 880	0.08	–	–	1.13	0.04	1.11	0.14
2017	–	–	4 170	0.07	–	–	1.23	0.04	1.13	0.14
2018	–	–	5 920	0.05	–	–	1.18	0.04	0.93	0.14
2019	–	–	5 180	0.05	–	–	1.24	0.04	0.93	0.14
2020	–	–	5 520	0.04	–	–	1.18	0.04	0.96	0.14
2021	–	–	3 960	0.06	–	–	0.99	0.04	0.85	0.14
2022	–	–	4 140	0.06	–	–	0.84	0.04	0.80	0.14
2023	–	–	4 450	0.06	–	–	0.83	0.05	0.93	0.14
2024	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.66	0.05	0.77	0.14
2025							0.53	0.06	0.63	0.14

Year	LIN 7CK line		LIN 7CK trawl	
	CPUE	CV	CPUE	CV
1990	1.29	0.15	–	–
1991	1.44	0.13	–	–
1992	1.43	0.11	–	–
1993	1.11	0.11	–	–
1994	0.90	0.11	1.25	0.05
1995	0.83	0.12	1.16	0.04
1996	0.97	0.13	1.12	0.04
1997	1.32	0.18	1.00	0.04
1998	0.83	0.15	1.01	0.04
1999	1.54	0.18	1.02	0.03
2000	1.45	0.19	1.27	0.04
2001	1.27	0.18	1.46	0.04
2002	2.04	0.11	1.27	0.05
2003	1.66	0.10	1.27	0.04
2004	1.45	0.09	1.13	0.04
2005	1.16	0.10	1.18	0.04
2006	0.97	0.15	1.10	0.05
2007	0.70	0.12	0.73	0.06
2008	0.82	0.22	0.90	0.06
2009	0.60	0.28	0.44	0.07
2010	0.35	0.30	0.44	0.07
2011	0.22	0.30	0.23	0.09
2012	–	–	–	–

Not updated more recently

Table 9: Trawl survey biomass indices (t) and estimated coefficients of variation (CV). [Continued on next page]

Fishstock	Area	Vessel	Trip code	Date	Biomass	CV (%)
LIN 3	ECSI (winter)	<i>Kaharoa</i>	KAH9105*	May–Jun 1991	1 009	35
			KAH9205*	May–Jun 1992	525	17
			KAH9306*	May–Jun 1993	651	27
			KAH9406*	May–Jun 1994	488	19
			KAH9606*	May–Jun 1996	488	21
			KAH0705*	May–Jun 2007	283	17
			KAH0806*	May–Jun 2008	351	22
			KAH0905*	May–Jun 2009	262	19
			KAH1207*	May–Jun 2012	265	21
LIN 3 & 4	Chatham Rise	<i>Tangaroa</i>	TAN9106	Jan–Feb 1992	8 930	5.8
			TAN9212	Jan–Feb 1993	9 360	7.9
			TAN9401	Jan 1994	10 130	6.5
			TAN9501	Jan 1995	7 360	7.9
			TAN9601	Jan 1996	8 420	8.2
			TAN9701	Jan 1997	8 540	9.8
			TAN9801	Jan 1998	7 310	8.0
			TAN9901	Jan 1999	10 310	16.1
			TAN0001	Jan 2000	8 350	7.8
			TAN0101	Jan 2001	9 350	7.5
			TAN0201	Jan 2002	9 440	7.8
			TAN0301	Jan 2003	7 260	9.9
			TAN0401	Jan 2004	8 250	6.0
			TAN0501	Jan 2005	8 930	9.4
			TAN0601	Jan 2006	9 300	7.4
			TAN0701	Jan 2007	7 800	7.2
			TAN0801	Jan 2008	7 500	6.8
			TAN0901	Jan 2009	10 620	11.5
			TAN1001	Jan 2010	8 850	10.0
			TAN1101	Jan 2011	7 030	13.8
			TAN1201	Jan 2012	8 098	7.4
			TAN1301	Jan 2013	8 714	10.1
			TAN1401	Jan 2014	7 489	7.2
			TAN1601	Jan 2016	10 201	7.2
			TAN1801	Jan 2018	8 758	11.5
			TAN2001	Jan 2020	7 577	7.9
			TAN2201	Jan 2022	7 293	10.7
			TAN2401	Jan 2024	7 311	8.3
LIN 5 & 6	Southern Plateau	<i>Amatal Explorer</i>	AEX8902*	Oct–Nov 1989	17 490	14.2
			AEX9002*	Nov–Dec 1990	15 850	7.5
LIN 5 & 6	Southern Plateau (summer)	<i>Tangaroa</i>	TAN9105	Nov–Dec 1992	24 090	6.8
			TAN9211	Nov–Dec 1992	21 370	6.2
			TAN9310	Nov–Dec 1993	29 750	11.5
			TAN0012	Dec 2000	33 020	6.9
			TAN0118	Dec 2001	25 060	6.5
			TAN0219	Dec 2002	25 630	10.0
			TAN0317	Nov–Dec 2003	22 170	9.7
			TAN0414	Nov–Dec 2004	23 770	12.2
			TAN0515	Nov–Dec 2005	19 700	9.0
			TAN0617	Nov–Dec 2006	19 640	12.0
			TAN0714	Nov–Dec 2007	26 492	8.0
			TAN0813	Nov–Dec 2008	22 840	9.5
			TAN0911	Nov–Dec 2009	22 710	9.6
			TAN1117	Nov–Dec 2011	23 178	11.8
			TAN1215	Nov–Dec 2012	27 010	11.3
			TAN1412	Nov–Dec 2014	30 010	7.7
			TAN1614†	Nov–Dec 2016	26 656	16.0
			TAN1811	Nov–Dec 2018	21 276	10.4
LIN 5 & 6	Southern Plateau (autumn)	<i>Tangaroa</i>	TAN2014	Nov–Dec 2020	22 343	12.4
			TAN2215	Nov–Dec 2022	24 660	9.2
			TAN2413	Nov–Dec 2024	24 936	8.1
			TAN9204	Mar–Apr 1992	42 330	5.8
			TAN9304	Apr–May 1993	37 550	5.4
LIN 7WC	WCSI	<i>Tangaroa</i>	TAN9605	Mar–Apr 1996	32 130	7.8
			TAN9805	Apr–May 1998	30 780	8.8
LIN 7WC	WCSI	<i>Tangaroa</i>	TAN0007	Aug 2000	1 861	17.3
			TAN1210	Aug 2012	2 169	14.8
			TAN1308	Aug 2013	2 000	18.4
			TAN1608	Aug 2016	1 635	12.7
			TAN1807	Jul–Aug 2018	1 682	18.3
			TAN2107	Jul–Aug 2021	1 231	17.7
			TAN2407	Jul–Aug 2024	612	16.4

Table 9 [Continued]:

Fishstock	Area	Vessel	Trip code	Date	Biomass	CV (%)
LIN 7WC	WCSI	<i>Kaharoa</i>	KAH9204*	Mar–Apr 1992	286	19
			KAH9404*	Mar–Apr 1994	260	20
			KAH9504*	Mar–Apr 1995	361	16
			KAH9701*	Mar–Apr 1997	146	31
			KAH0004*	Mar–Apr 2000	94	47
			KAH0304*	Mar–Apr 2003	150	33
			KAH0503*	Mar–Apr 2005	270	37
			KAH0704*	Mar–Apr 2007	172	28
			KAH0904*	Mar–Apr 2009	285	38
			KAH1104*	Mar–Apr 2011	233	43
			KAH1305*	Mar–Apr 2013	403	45
			KAH1503*	Mar–Apr 2015	470	53
			KAH1703*	Mar–Apr 2017	150	18
			KAH1902*	Mar–Apr 2019	316	26
			KAH2101*	Mar–Apr 2021	165	45
			KAH2302	Mar–Apr 2023	70	33
			KAH2502	Mar–Apr 2025	65	42

* Not used in the reported assessment.

† The core survey strata were unable to be completed and biomass estimates were scaled up using factors based on the proportion of biomass of each species in ‘missing strata’ in previous surveys from 2000–14 (O’Driscoll et al. 2018).

4.1 LIN 1

In October 2002, the TACC for LIN 1 was increased from 265 t to 400 t within an AMP. Reviews of the LIN 1 AMP were carried out in 2007 and 2009. The AMP was discontinued by the Minister of Fisheries in 2009–10. Updates of LIN 1 CPUE analyses were carried out in 2013, 2017, and 2020. The early CPUE analyses were given a reduced data quality ranking; in 2020 the Inshore Working Group concluded that the CPUE analyses did not provide a reliable index of abundance.

4.1.1 Fishery characterisation

- Around two thirds of LIN 1 landings come from the LIN target bottom longline fishery with most of the remainder from a mixed target bottom trawl fishery. The proportion of the catch taken by longline increased in 2005.
- The ling longline fishery has operated consistently in the Bay of Plenty (primarily Statistical Areas 009 and 010). Longline catches increased in East Northland from the mid-1990s, then off the west coast of the North Island from 2008.
- The majority of bottom trawl catches are taken in Statistical Areas 008 to 010, although there have been significant bottom trawl catches of ling off the west coast of the North Island in Statistical Areas 045 to 047. There were substantial ling bycatches made by trawl off the North Island west coast from 1996–97 to 2000–01 in the gemfish fishery (which has since ceased).
- Target bottom trawl catches of LIN 1 have increased since 2005 and represent about a third of trawl catches. Bycatch in the gemfish trawl fishery was important from the mid-1990s to early 2000s. Prior to 1995, bycatch of ling in the scampi fishery represented the majority of ling trawl catches, and, although the volume has reduced, the scampi fishery remains a consistent part of the LIN 1 trawl fishery. Ling catches in the hoki target trawl fishery have increased since 2010.
- The bottom longline landings of LIN 1 are taken mainly in the final two months of the fishing year, probably due to the economics of the vessels switching from tuna longlining to cleaning up available ling quota at the end of the fishing year. Bottom trawl catches of ling tend to be more evenly distributed across the year and reflect the fishing patterns of the diverse trawl targets, such as scampi which is also a consistent fishery over the entire year. Both the major fishing methods which take ling have sporadic seasonal patterns, reflecting the small landings in most years and the bycatch nature of many of the fisheries, although the ling target longline fishery has operated more consistently since 2005.
- The depth distribution of ling catches in the trawl fisheries show two main depths associated with the target species. Most ling are caught in the scampi/hoki/ling fisheries at about 400 m depth, but some are taken in the tarakihi/snapper/barracouta/trevally fisheries around 100 m depth. Bottom longline depth records indicate that target ling fishing (as well as target bluenose fishing) takes place at even deeper depths, with most of the records at between 500 and 600 m.

4.1.2 Abundance indices

A variety of different CPUE analyses have been carried out for LIN 1 (see Starr & Kendrick 2017) but no indices are currently accepted.

4.2 East Coast North Island, (LIN 2, Statistical Areas 011–015)

In 2014 a catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) analysis was conducted on data from the LIN 2 fishery (Roux 2015). Estimated catch data and effort data from bottom longliners that targeted ling in FMA 2 Statistical Areas 011–015 (ECNI) where there was a positive catch, were used. The estimated catch and effort data were rolled up by vessel/day/statistical area after a filter was applied to individual fishing events to retain estimated catch from the top five species together with all effort.

A GLM model (model 1) was fitted using a core vessel fleet where individual vessels had to have fished for four or more years in the fishery and fished a minimum of 10 days per year. One auto-longlining vessel was excluded because it was an outlier in terms of numbers of hooks set and created patterns in the residuals.

The sensitivity of the CPUE time series was tested for a range of alternative sets of input data: vessels using very large numbers of hooks per day (over 10 000) were either included or excluded; changes in fishing power and fleet were minimised by fitting only the most recent time series (2000–2013); data from Statistical Area 016 (Cook Strait) were either included or excluded; and fitting was carried out with or without the use of interaction terms. An all-target model using bottom longline data that targeted or caught ling was also developed with ‘target species’ included as an explanatory variable. The GLM trend was robust to all sensitivity runs investigated.

The standardised CPUE index for ling from the ECNI demonstrates an initial decline consistent with the previous assessment (Horn 2004a), followed by a period of stability (2002–2010) with lower CPUE in 2011–12 and 2012–13 (Figure 2). This pattern was consistent across all GLM scenarios examined.




Figure 2: Estimated ling catch (bars) and standardised CPUE indices for LIN 2. Blue line and triangles from Horn (2004a). Red line and circles for ECNI Statistical Areas 011–015 for core bottom longline vessels targeting ling, from Roux (2015). The two CPUE series were normalised to the overlapping fishing years (1992–2001).

4.3 Chatham Rise, LIN 3 & LIN 4

4.3.1 Model structure and inputs

The stock assessment for LIN 3&4 (Chatham Rise) was updated in 2025 (Holmes & Dunn 2025). For final model runs, the full posterior distribution was sampled using Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods. Bounded estimates of spawning stock virgin (B_0) and current (B_{2025}) biomass were obtained. Year class strengths and fishing selectivity ogives were estimated in the model. All selectivities were fitted as logistic ogives. Trawl fishery and research survey selectivity ogives used to be fitted as double normal curves (Holmes 2019), but the right-hand limb was highly uncertain and estimated towards logistic, hence the change. Due to the low numbers of young fish aged in the fishery, the age frequency was truncated at age 5 for both commercial fisheries and age 3 for the trawl survey. Because only one potting trip was observed and no age data were available, the potting fishery was assumed to have the same selectivity as the longline fishery based on the trip length frequency (Mormede et al. 2022a).

Selectivities were assumed constant over all years in each fishery/survey. Instantaneous natural mortality rate (M) was estimated as sex-specific and constant at age in the model, parameterised as the average mortality value (M_{avg}) and the male-female difference (M_{diff}).

For LIN 3&4, model input data included catch histories for trawl, longline, and pot fisheries separately, biomass and sexed catch-at-age data from a summer trawl survey series, and sexed catch-at-age from the trawl and longline fisheries (Table 10). The longline CPUE series has previously been used in a sensitivity run but was rejected in 2025 because it was not considered a reliable index of the stock abundance. In addition, the longline effort was reducing with vessels transitioning to potting. A scampi target CPUE series was also explored but not accepted. The catch history, biological input parameters, and estimates of relative abundance used in the model are given in Tables 5–9. The stock assessment model partitioned the population into two sexes, and age groups 3 to 25 with age 25 being a plus group. The longline age frequency for the data series started in 2002. Earlier data was not used due to low sample sizes and lack of representativeness of the fishery. The 2019 age frequency was also not included due to low sample size and large uncertainty. To align more closely with the spawning season and seasons of the fishery of the various ling stocks, the model year was set as January to December. The model’s annual cycle is described in Table 11.

Table 10: LIN 3&4: Summary of the relative abundance series applied in the models, including source years (Years). Data used in the base case model are shown in bold.

Data series	Years
Trawl survey biomass (<i>Tangaroa</i> , Jan)	1992–2014, 2016, 2018, 2020, 2022, 2024
Trawl survey proportion at age (<i>Tangaroa</i> , Jan), sexed	1992–2014, 2016, 2018, 2020, 2022, 2024
Commercial longline proportion-at-age (Jun–Oct), sexed	2002–09, 2013–2018, 2020–2022
Commercial trawl proportion-at-age (Oct–May), sexed	1992, 1994–2023

Table 11: LIN 3&4: Annual cycle of the stock model, showing the processes taking place at each time step, their sequence within each time step, and the available observations. Fishing and natural mortality that occur within a time step occur after all other processes, with half of the natural mortality for that time step occurring before and half after the fishing mortality.

Step	Period	Processes	M^*	Age†	Observations	
					Description	%Z‡
1	Jan-Jun	Recruitment	0.9	0.5	Trawl survey (summer)	0.2
2	Jul-Dec	Spawning	0.1	0	–	
		fisheries			Longline CPUE	0.5
		(longline & trawl)			Longline catch-at-age/length	
					Trawl catch-at-age	
		Increment in ages		0.5		

* M is the proportion of natural mortality that was assumed to have occurred in that time step.

† Age is the age fraction, used for determining length-at-age, that was assumed to occur by the start of that time step.

‡ %Z is the percentage of the total mortality in the step that was assumed to have taken place at the time each observation was made.

The error distributions assumed were multinomial for the age data, and lognormal for the abundance data. The weight assigned to each data set was controlled by the error coefficient of variation (CV). The multinomial observation error CVs for the at-age data were adjusted using the reweighting procedure of Francis (2011). Additional process errors for the trawl survey biomass index were estimated within the model at MPD level only (fixed at MCMC level) after the age frequency datasets were reweighted.

Most priors were intended to be uninformative and were specified with wide bounds. One exception was an informative prior for the trawl survey q . The prior on q for all the *Tangaroa* trawl surveys was estimated assuming that the catchability constant was a product of areal availability (0.5–1.0), vertical availability (0.5–1.0), and vulnerability between the trawl doors (0.03–0.40). The resulting (approximately lognormal) distribution had mean 0.13 and CV 0.70, with bounds assumed to be 0.02 to 0.30. Penalty functions were used to constrain the model so that any combination of parameters that did not allow the historical catch to be taken was strongly penalised. A penalty was applied to the estimates of year class strengths to encourage estimates that averaged to 1. In all model runs, the catchability coefficients (qs) were estimated as free parameters.

4.3.2 Model estimates

The base model used the biomass index and sexed age frequencies from the summer trawl survey but, because of concerns over data quality, used combined sex age frequency information from the commercial trawl and commercial longline fleets. Commercial CPUE series were not used.

The fits to the catch-at-age data and survey biomass series were good. Estimated year class strengths were not widely variable, although were poorly estimated prior to 1980 (Figure 3). Previous analyses fixing year class strengths to 1 prior to 1980 showed that the model results were not sensitive to the different recruitment assumption for this early period (see Mormede et al. 2023b). All year class strengths estimated from 2000 have been lower than average, apart from for the 2007 year.

Ling are first caught by the trawl survey (age at full selectivity 5–6 years), then the trawl fishery (age 6–8 years), and then the longline fishery (age 12–15 years).

Base case estimates indicated that it was unlikely that B_0 was lower than 100 000 t for this stock, or that biomass in 2025 was less than 48% of B_0 (Table 12, Figure 4). Annual fishing pressure (catch over vulnerable biomass) was estimated to be lower than 0.15 (often much lower) since 1979 (Figure 5).




Figure 3: LIN 3&4. Estimated posterior distributions of year class strength from the base case run, with median (line and individual points) and 95% credible interval (grey band). The horizontal line indicates a year class strength of one.

Table 12: LIN 3&4: Bayesian median and 95% credible intervals (in parentheses) of B_0 and B_{2025} (in tonnes, and as a percentage of B_0) for the Base model run and two sensitivities, and the probability that B_{2025} is above 40% of B_0 or below 20% of B_0 .

Model run	B_0		B_{2025}		B_{2025} (% B_0)	$P(>40\% B_0)$	$P(<20\% B_0)$
Base model	114 384	(103 473–138 315)	66 638	(50 671–94 693)	58.3 (48.8–68.9)	1.000	0.000

The model indicated a relatively flat biomass trajectory from about 2009 (Figure 4). Annual landings from the LIN 3&4 stock have been less than 4600 t since 2004, markedly lower than the 6000–8000 t taken annually between 1992 and 2003. Biomass projections derived from this assessment are shown below (Section 4.3.3).




Figure 4: LIN 3&4 base model. Estimated median trajectories (with 95% credible intervals shown as grey band) for absolute biomass and biomass as a percentage of B_0 . The red horizontal line at 10% B_0 represents the hard limit, the orange line at 20% B_0 is the soft limit, and the green line is the % B_0 target (40% B_0).




Figure 5: LIN 3&4 base model: Exploitation rates (catch over vulnerable biomass) with 95% credible intervals shown in grey.

Model sensitivity runs included an alternative assumption for maturity at age, derived from otolith zone widths following Morrongiello et al. (2021). This indicated an earlier age at 50% maturity of 7 for both sexes. This raised estimated B_0 by approximately 20% and stock status (B_{2025}/B_0) by about 9% compared to the base model. The WG expressed concern about the reliability of the catch-at-age data from the longline fishery. The sex ratio in 2021 and 2022 was reversed compared to most previous years and a large proportion of the females were in the plus group. Sensitivity runs were conducted where i) the 2021–22 years of longline age frequency were removed, ii) selectivity was made double normal for the trawl fleet and survey, iii) selectivity was made double normal only for the survey, iv) sex specific age frequencies were trialled for longline and trawl fisheries. Results from all sensitivities were similar in terms of stock status and, where comparable, in terms of fit to catch-at-age data and survey data.

4.3.3 Projections

Four scenarios were carried out, all using the base case model. Recent catches have been much lower than the TACC so the future catches were assumed to be either the average of the 2022–2024 catches or the TACC, keeping the ratio of catches between the fisheries to that of the 2022–2024 fisheries (38% longline, 35% trawl, and 27% pot). Furthermore, year class strengths have been mostly low since 2000 so the year class strengths for the projections were either resampled from the full 1975–2016 range, or from the 2007–2016 range.

For LIN 3&4, using the base case model and assuming future catches equal recent catch levels, stock size in 2030 is projected to be 55% of B_0 and 95% of biomass in 2025 if year class strengths are consistent with all year class strengths. This reduces to 53% of B_0 and 92% of biomass in 2025 if year class strengths are consistent with recent (2007–2016) year class strengths. If catches reach the TACC, with the same year class strength assumptions biomass in 2030 reduces to 45% and 42% of B_0 and 81% and 77% of B_{2025} respectively (Table 13).

The probability of biomass in 2030 being above 40% B_0 is 0.65–1.0 and the probability of being below 20% B_0 is zero for all projection scenarios.

Table 13: LIN 3&4. Bayesian median and 95% credible intervals (in parentheses) of projected B_{2030} , B_{2030} as a percentage of B_0 , and as a percentage of B_{2025} for the base case run and various assumptions of future catches and year class strengths (YCS). The probability of B_{2030} being above 40% B_0 (p_{40}) and of B_{2030} being below 20% B_0 (p_{20}) are also reported.

YCS range	Catch range	Future catch (t)			B_{2030} (t)	B_{2030} (% B_0)	B_{2030} (% B_{2025})	p_{40}	p_{20}
		Trawl	Line	Pot					
All	2022–2024	1 248	1 359	958	63 477 (46 612– 91 951)	55 (44–69)	95 (86–110)	1.00	0
2007–2016	2022–2024	1 248	1 359	958	60 292 (43 818– 87 496)	53 (42–65)	92 (83–101)	0.99	0
All	TACC	2 191	2 387	1 682	51 895 (34 749–80 784)	45 (33–60)	81 (69–96)	0.79	0
2007–2016	TACC	2 191	2 387	1 682	48 663 (31 954– 76 220)	42 (30–56)	77 (65–88)	0.65	0

4.4 Sub-Antarctic, LIN 5 & 6 & LIN 6B

4.4.1 Model structure and inputs

An age-based stock assessment model assuming a Beverton-Holt stock-recruit relationship for LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B (Sub-Antarctic) was carried out in 2024 (Mormede et al. 2024c). This was the first time LIN 6B was incorporated in the Sub-Antarctic stock model, and the first time the Sub-Antarctic ling stock was assessed using Casal2 (Casal2 Development Team 2024). LIN 6B was included as a separate fishery in the model, sharing the LIN 5&6 bottom longline selectivity and the LIN 5&6 biological parameters and recruitment. The age composition data and fisheries CPUE from LIN 6B were deemed too poorly determined to be useful in the stock assessment and were omitted. Although potting is becoming an important part of this fishery, there are no age data available for potting in LIN 5&6 and potting was assumed to have the same selectivity as bottom longline, as assumed in the other ling stocks that include potting catches.

For final runs, the posterior distribution was sampled using Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC), based on the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. Estimates of spawning stock virgin (B_0) and current (B_{2024}) biomass were obtained. Year class strengths and fishing selectivity ogives were also estimated in the model. Trawl fishery selectivity ogives were fitted as double normal curves with the right-hand limb fixed at 100 (i.e., a flat-topped selectivity); longline fishery and research survey ogives were fitted as logistic curves. Selectivities were assumed constant over all years in each fishery/survey.

MCMC chains with a total length of 6×10^6 iterations were constructed. A burn-in length of 1×10^6 iterations was used, with every 1000th sample taken from the final 5×10^6 iterations (i.e., a final sample of length 5000 was sampled from the Bayesian posterior). Three individual chains were carried out. Model input data include catch histories for both LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B, biomass and catch-at-age data from summer and autumn trawl survey series (of LIN 5&6), LIN 5&6 longline fishery CPUE series (only as a sensitivity), catch-at-age data from the longline and trawl LIN 5&6 fisheries, and estimates of biological parameters for LIN 5&6. The stock assessment model partitioned the population into two sexes and age groups 3 to 28 with a plus group. The base model's annual cycle is described in Table 14. To align with other ling assessments, the model year was updated to be the calendar year rather than September to August.

A summary of the observations used in this assessment and the associated time series is given in Table 15. Lognormal errors, with known CVs, were assumed for all relative biomass observations. The CVs available for those observations of relative abundance allow for sampling error only. However, additional variance, assumed to arise from differences between model simplifications and real-world variation, was added to the sampling variance. The additional variance, termed process error, was estimated in the models at MPD-level only. Multinomial errors were assumed for all age composition

observations. The effective sample sizes for the composition samples were estimated following method TA1.8 as described in appendix A of Francis (2011). Given that making adjustments to correct the *Tangaroa* Sub-Antarctic trawl survey biomass estimate for 2016 would introduce some undefinable uncertainty, the Deepwater Working Group recommended in 2021 that this survey be excluded in all ling stock assessments. This survey was excluded from the 2024 stock assessment of ling.

Table 14: LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B. Annual cycle of the stock model, showing the processes taking place at each time step, their sequence within each time step, and the available observations. Fishing and natural mortality that occur within a time step occur after all other processes, with half of the natural mortality for that time step occurring before and half after the fishing mortality.

Step	Period	Processes	M^*	Age †	Observations	
					Description	%Z ‡
1	Jan–Aug		0.67	0.5	Trawl survey (autumn)	0.5
2	Sep–Dec	Recruitment	0.33	0.0	Longline CPUE	0.5
		Trawl and longline fisheries			Longline catch-at-age	0.5
		Increment ages			Trawl catch-at-age	0.5
					Trawl survey (summer)	0.9

* M is the proportion of natural mortality that was assumed to have occurred in that time step.

† Age is the age fraction, used for determining length-at-age, that was assumed to occur in that time step.

‡ %Z is the percentage of the total mortality in the step that was assumed to have taken place at the time each observation was made.

Table 15: LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B. Summary of the relative abundance series applied in the models, including source years (Model years). Note that the 2016 trawl survey index and proportions at age were removed based on working group recommendation.

Data series	Model years
Trawl survey biomass (<i>Tangaroa</i> , Nov–Dec)	1991–93, 2000–09, 2011–12, 2014, 2018, 2020, 2022
Trawl survey proportion at age (<i>Tangaroa</i> , Nov–Dec)	1991–93, 2000–09, 2011–12, 2014, 2018, 2020, 2022
Trawl survey biomass (<i>Tangaroa</i> , Mar–May)	1992–93, 1996, 1998
Trawl survey proportion at age (<i>Tangaroa</i> , Mar–May)	1992–93, 1996, 1998
LIN 5&6 CPUE (longline) —sensitivity	1991–2023
LIN 5&6 commercial longline proportion-at-age	1996, 1998–2012, 2014, 2016–2020, 2022
LIN 5&6 commercial trawl proportion-at-age	1993, 1996, 1998–2022

The assumed prior distributions used in the assessment are given in Table 16. Most priors were intended to be relatively uninformative and were specified with wide bounds.

Table 16: LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B. Assumed prior distributions and bounds for estimated parameters in the assessments. The parameters for lognormal priors are mean (in log space) and CV.

Parameter	Shape/ transformation	Starting values		Prior distribution	Parameters	Bounds	
B_0	Log transform	200	000	Uniform		10	13
Year class strengths	Simplex transform	1		Lognormal	1 0.7	-10	10
Survey selectivity	Logistic	5	3	Uniform		0.001–1	5–200*
	Double normal						
Trawl selectivity	Right-hand fixed at 100	10	3	Uniform		1	5–200*
Lines selectivity	Logistic	11	3	Uniform		1	5–200*
Survey q (free)		0.12		Uniform		0.02	4.0
CPUE q (free)		0.01		Uniform		0.0001	10
Survey process error $^{\sim}$		0.1		Uniform-log		0.001	2
CPUE process error $^{\sim}$		0.2		Uniform-log		0.001	2

* A range of maximum values were used for the upper bound.

Penalty functions were used to constrain the model so that any combination of parameters that did not allow the historical catch to be taken was strongly penalised. A small penalty was applied to the estimates of year class strengths to encourage estimates that averaged to 1. The catch history, biological input parameters, and estimates of relative abundance used in the model are given in Tables 5–9.

The base model for 2024 was quite similar to that of the previous assessment in 2021 (Mormede et al. 2021b). The main changes were:

- the addition of LIN 6B as an additional fishery of the Sub-Antarctic stock;
- the removal of the longline CPUE index in the base case model (it was added in 2021);
- the estimation of catchability parameters (q) as free parameters; and
- the move from a model year starting in September to starting in January.

4.4.2 Model estimates

Description of the base model run reported is as follows. The base case is considered to be a reference model because it was the most stable model obtained and uses all of the trusted information available. Other model runs which led to this base case are reported elsewhere (Mormede et al. 2024c). The incremental addition of the LIN 6B catches to the model increased the initial biomass by about 12 400 t, which is close to the estimated LIN 6B initial biomass when it was assessed as an independent stock (13 570 t, Horn 2007b). The base case model comprised three fisheries (and associated updated annual cycle), a fixed natural mortality of 0.18 y^{-1} , free survey q parameters, and fixed right-hand limb trawl selectivity parameters.

A number of sensitivity runs were reported. Further details are below and are also available in Mormede et al. (2024c).

- Sensitivity runs on natural mortality with M fixed at 0.16 (based on Edwards 2017), at 0.20 (MPD estimated value in 2021) or length-based with $a = 0.98$, $b = -1$ and $M = 0.18$. The length-based natural mortality model was based on Lorenzen (2022) with parameters reported here optimised from a suite of investigations (see Mormede et al. 2024c for details).
- A sensitivity run on the effect of CPUE, adding the LIN 5&6 longline CPUE series to the base case model. This resulted in a lower initial biomass estimate and lower status.
- A sensitivity run on the effect of the bottom longline age composition data, whereby the longline selectivity was fixed at the median MCMC value and the model rerun, resulting in little difference compared with the base case.
- A sensitivity run where catches were increased by 5% prior to 1986 and 2% thereafter, resulting in almost identical outcome to the base case.

Stock status estimates for 2024 from three reported models were 52–69% of B_0 (Figure 6, Table 17), with the lowest stock status linked to the lowest value of M , followed by the model with the longline CPUE index. Annual exploitation rates (catch divided by vulnerable biomass) were low (less than 0.1) in all years as a consequence of the high estimated stock size relative to the level of catches (Figure 7). Steepness was assumed to be 0.84 (Table 6); sensitivities to this were not done due to the consistently high stock status.

The effect of using a length-based natural mortality was small: the data did not support length-based differential mortality of fish selected in the fishery, and therefore mortality was assumed constant at length by the time fish were selected in the fishery. Length-based mortality did result in slightly different natural mortality rates between males and females because of their different size at age, which resulted in slightly different selectivities but no change in the estimated biomass trajectory.

The inclusion of the LIN 5&6 longline standardised CPUE resulted in both lower initial biomass and lower status compared with the base case model. This change was driven by the trend in this time-series. However, it is unlikely that the fisheries catchability has remained constant over the 1991–2023 period, or that improvements in catchability over time were adequately captured in the CPUE standardisation. Adding an arbitrary 1% annual learning rate to the standardised longline CPUE resulted in model estimates that were close to the base case model.

Posterior distributions of year class strength estimates from the base case model run are shown in Figure 8; the distribution from the base case model differed little from the sensitivity models. Year classes show a trend of alternating periods of strong and weak recruitment. Overall, estimated year class strengths were not widely variable, with all medians being between 0.5 and 1.7. Biomass estimates for the stock declined through the 1990s, were stable between the early 2000s and 2016, and have been declining again since (Figure 6). The biomass trajectory from the sensitivity runs was different for those sensitivity runs with either high or low natural mortality only (see Table 17).




Figure 6: LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B. Estimated posterior distribution of year class strength from the base case run, with median (line and individual points), interquartile range (dark grey band) and 95% credible interval (light grey band). The horizontal line indicates a year class strength of one.




Figure 7: LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B base model. Estimated median trajectories (with interquartile range shown as dark grey bands and 95% credible intervals as light grey bands) for absolute biomass and biomass as a percentage of B_0 . The red horizontal line at 10% B_0 represents the hard limit, the orange line at 20% B_0 is the soft limit, and the green line is the % B_0 target (40% B_0).

Table 17: LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B. Bayesian median and 95% credible intervals (in parentheses) of B_0 (in tonnes), and B_{2024} as a percentage of B_0 , and the probability that B_{2024} is above 40% and below 20% of B_0 from the Base model and sensitivity runs.

Model run	B_0		B_{2024} (% B_0)		$P(>40\% B_0)$	$P(<20\% B_0)$
Base model	204 628	171 734 – 258 458	66.3	55.3 – 78.3	1.000	0.000
M=0.16	158 380	142 888 – 179 277	52.1	42.3 – 62.3	0.993	0.000
M=0.20	304 797	226 047 – 419 980	76.7	65.1 – 88.3	1.000	0.000
length-based M	205 664	174 120 – 255 506	64.5	53.9 – 75.7	1.000	0.000
Additional catch	208 772	175 345 – 262 784	66.3	55.3 – 78.4	1.000	0.000
Base + CPUE	180 575	157 476 – 215 386	54.3	45.5 – 64.0	0.999	0.000
Base - BLL AF	212 692	175 995 – 275 733	69.3	57.6 – 82.1	1.000	0.000




Figure 8: LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B base model exploitation rate (catch divided by vulnerable biomass) by fishery with interquartile range shown in dark grey and 95% credible intervals in light grey.

Research survey and fishery selectivity ogives were relatively tightly defined. The survey ogive suggested that ling were fully selected by the research gear at about age 7–9 years. Estimated fishing selectivities indicated that ling were fully selected by the trawl fishery at about age 9 years, and by the longline fisheries at about age 12–16.

The effect of possible incidental mortality associated with escapement from trawl nets and potential unreported catch from before the introduction of the stock to the QMS was evaluated in a sensitivity model. Discards from the hoki/hake/ling target fishery were likely to be very low (< 0.3%, Anderson et al. 2019).

Incidental mortality of small fish associated with escapement is also assumed to be low because the ling fishery occurs in areas away from locations where small ling are found. Unreported catch prior to the introduction of ling into the QMS is not known but assumed to be low due to the high commercial value of ling at that time. A sensitivity model was run that assumed 5% additional fishery mortality for years before the introduction of the QMS (1986) and 2% thereafter. The inclusion of estimates of incidental mortality and pre-QMS unreported catch resulted in a very similar status, and similar estimates of current biomass.

4.4.3 Projections

For LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B, the probability of B_{2029} being below 40% of B_0 is very small when assuming either one of two future annual catch scenarios (the average catch from 2020–2023, or the TACC apportioned to the 2020–2023 catches between the fisheries) and long term (1973 – 2017) or recent (2008 – 2017) recruitment (Table 18).

Table 18: LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B. Bayesian median and 95% credible intervals (range) of projected B_{2029} , B_{2029} as a percentage of B_0 , B_{2029}/B_{2024} (%) and probability of B_{2029} being over 40% B_0 in 2029 (pab40) for the base case run and different recruitment and future catch split options. YCS range is range of years where recruitment is resampled for the projections and catch range the basis of future catches (2020–23 or TACC). Future catches are also reported for the LIN 5&6 trawl fishery (trawl), LIN 5&6 longline fishery (line) and LIN 6B fishery (6B).

YCS range	Catch range	Future catch (t)			B_{2029} (t)	B_{2029} (t) range	B_{2029} (% B_{2024})	B_{2029} (% B_{2024}) Range	B_{2029} (% B_0)	B_{2029} (% B_0) Range	pab40
		trawl	line	6B							
1973–2017	2020–23	6 954	1 967	396	133 874	95 594–194 403	98.4	91.9–106.4	65.3	54.3–77.4	1.000
2008–2017	2020–23	6 954	1 967	396	132 208	93 368–194 186	97.2	91.4–104.1	64.5	53.2–77.3	1.000
1973–2017	TACC	10 235	2 895	583	119 754	81 531–180 217	88.0	80.5–96.1	58.4	46.5–71.4	0.999
2008–2017	TACC	10 235	2 895	583	118 044	79 315–179 991	86.8	79.4–94.5	57.6	45.3–71.5	0.998

4.5 Bounty Platform, LIN 6B (Bounty Platform only)

The stock assessment for the Bounty Platform stock (part of LIN 6) was last updated in 2007 (Horn 2007b). In 2024, the working group decided to include LIN 6B with LIN 5&6 as a single Sub-Antarctic

ling stock based on the similarities in information between LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B and the paucity of data available to assess LIN 6B as a separate stock (Mormede et al. 2024b).

4.6 West coast South Island, LIN 7WC

4.6.1 Model structure and inputs

The stock assessment for LIN 7WC (west coast South Island) was updated in 2026 (Mormede et al. in prep b). The assessment model partitioned the population into age groups 1 to 28 with a plus group, and sex in the partition. The model's annual cycle is described in Table 19. The catch history was updated to include potting as a separate fishing method, although there are no fishery specific data available from this fishery to inform selectivity (Mormede et al. in prep a). The age frequency distributions were recalculated using a single annual age length key for all fishing methods combined and provided to the model by sex (Mormede et al. in prep a). The trawl and longline CPUE indices were input in the model with an assumption of an annual learning (technology or efficiency increase) rate of 1% (added to the indices in Table 8).

The reported model runs were developed following the investigation of numerous previous model runs. These evaluated the sensitivity of the model fit to assumptions about indices of abundance, estimating an additional two year class strength values, estimation or fixing of the process errors of the indices of abundance, providing age frequencies observations scaled by stratum (as carried out previously) or cohort, alternative values of the natural mortality rate, and weights assigned to different observational data sets.

Year class strengths and fishing selectivity ogives were estimated in the model. All selectivity ogives were assumed to be logistic, and, in the absence of age frequency data from this fishery, the potting selectivity ogives were assumed to be identical to that of longline.

Table 19: LIN 7WC. Annual cycle of the stock model, showing the processes taking place at each time step, their sequence within each time step, and the available observations. Fishing and natural mortality that occur within a time step occur after all other processes, with half of the natural mortality for that time step occurring before and half after the fishing mortality.

Step	Period	Processes	M*	Age†	Observations	
					Description	%Z‡
1	Jan-Dec	Recruitment	1.0	0.0		
		Spawning				
		fishery (longline)			Longline catch-at-age	0.5
					Longline CPUE	
		fishery (trawl)			Trawl catch-at-age	0.5
1	End of Dec	Increment ages	0.0	1.0	Trawl CPUE	
					Trawl survey biomass and catch-at-age	

* M is the proportion of natural mortality that was assumed to have occurred in that time step.

† Age is the age fraction, used for determining length-at-age, that was assumed to occur in that time step.

‡ %Z is the percentage of the total mortality in the step that was assumed to have taken place at the time each observation was made.

Table 20: LIN 7WC. Settings of the models exploring the sensitivity of the base case stock assessment to the index of abundance (columns) and the value of natural mortalities (rows).

Natural mortality (per year)	Model name
0.16	Model 2
0.18	Base case
0.20	Model 3

The base case model included both trawl and longline CPUE with a 1% annual learning rate, age frequency distributions scaled by stratum, default reweighting of datasets and biomass indices process errors estimated at MPD level.

Two additional analyses were carried out to test the sensitivity of the results of the LIN 7WC stock assessment (base case) to the assumed natural mortality (Table 20): model 2 was used to investigate the effect of using a lower assumed value of natural mortality, and model 3 was used to investigate the effect of using a higher assumed natural mortality.

The full posterior distributions of the parameters of the final model runs were sampled using Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods, based on the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. Bounded estimates of spawning stock virgin (B_0) and current (B_{2026}) biomass were obtained. Three MCMC chains were constructed using a burn-in length of 1×10^6 iterations, with every 1000th sample taken from the next 3×10^6 iterations (i.e., three final samples of length 2000 each were taken from the Bayesian posterior totalling 6000 samples to describe the posterior distributions of the model parameters). Visual inspections of the chains were used to determine the acceptability of the MCMC procedure. The final model runs (Section 4.6.2) were considered acceptable for providing management advice.

For LIN 7WC, available data to model the fishery included catch histories, trawl and bottom longline fishery CPUE series, extensive catch-at-age data from the trawl fishery, sparse catch-at-age data from the longline fishery, biomass estimates and catch-at-age data from *Tangaroa* surveys in 2000, 2012, 2013, 2016, 2018, 2021, and 2024 and estimates of constant biological parameters (Table 21, Figure 9, and Table 5). Catch-at-age data were used as sexed, with separate selectivities for males and females. As no biological sample data were available from the potting fishery, due to very limited observer coverage, catch-at-age data were not available for this fishery.

The trawl CPUE consisted of the standardised commercial tow-by-tow data which targeted hoki, hake, or ling. The longline CPUE consisted of the standardised commercial data aggregated at the vessel, statistical area, and month level. Further investigations highlighted a change in the reporting of longline catch and effort from the TCEPR to ERS forms whereby sets were mostly aggregated daily in the former (because they were within 2 nautical miles of each other) and not the latter, forcing the aggregation of catch and effort data for CPUE analyses (Mormede et al. in prep a). Sensitivity runs using only ERS longline data and standardising for space provided a similar trend to the full series and therefore was not used in the model at this stage. The ERS series might be useful once more data are available. The *Kaharoa* inshore trawl survey biomass estimates and proportion-at-length estimates were not considered to be useful for this species (Stevenson 2007).

The error distributions assumed were multinomial for the proportions-at-age and lognormal for all other data. Biomass indices had assumed CVs set equal to the sampling CV plus an additional process error estimated at MPD level for each index series. The multinomial observation error effective sample sizes for the proportions-at-age data were adjusted using the reweighting procedure of Francis (2011).

The assumed prior distributions used in the assessment are given in Table 22. Most priors were intended to be relatively uninformative and were specified with wide bounds. The previous prior for the survey q was lognormal with μ of 0.07 and CV of 0.7 but deemed to have an undue influence on the estimation and therefore was changed to a uniform prior. The prior distributions for the selectivity parameters were assumed to be uniform.

Penalty functions were used to constrain the model so that any combination of parameters that did not allow the historical catch to be taken was strongly penalised. A small penalty was applied to the estimates of year class strengths to encourage estimates that averaged to 1. This penalty was never triggered in any of the model runs.

The catch history, biological input parameters, and estimates of relative abundance used in the model are given in Tables 5–9.

Table 21: LIN 7WC. Summary of the relative abundance and stock composition series applied in the models, including source years (Years).

Data series	Years
Commercial trawl CPUE	1997–2025
Commercial trawl proportion-at-age (Jun–Sep)	1994–2008, 2012–2018, 2020–2025
Commercial longline CPUE (aggregated)	1990–2025
Commercial longline proportion-at-age	2012, 2015–2018, 2020, 2021, 2024
Trawl survey biomass (core strata) (<i>Tangaroa</i> , Jul)	2000, 2012–13, 2016, 2018, 2021, 2024
Trawl survey age data	2000, 2012–13, 2016, 2018, 2021, 2024




Figure 9: LIN 7WC. Input biomass indices: commercial trawl CPUE (BT – with 1% annual learning rate), commercial longline CPUE (BLL (daily) – with 1% annual learning rate) and trawl survey biomass from the core strata (survey) with their associated confidence intervals (prior to the addition of process error).

Table 22: LIN 7WC. Assumed prior distributions and bounds for parameters estimated in the models. For lognormal distributions the figures are the log-space mean and the CV, and for normal distributions the figures are the mean and standard deviation.

Parameter	Shape/ transformation	Starting values			Prior distribution	Parameters	Bounds	
B_0	Log transform	80	000		Uniform		10	13.5
Year class strengths	Simplex transform	1			Lognormal	1 0.6	-10	10
Survey selectivity	Logistic	13	7	1	Uniform		0.001–1	5–200*
Trawl selectivity	Logistic	10	4	1	Uniform		1	5–200*
Lines selectivity	Logistic	13	4	1	Uniform		1	5–200*
Survey q (free)		0.1			Uniform		0.0001	1
CPUE q (free)		0.1			Uniform		0.0001	2
Survey process error $\sim$		0.01			Uniform		0.001	2
CPUE process error $\sim$		0.01			Uniform		0.001	2

* A range of maximum values were used for the upper bound.

4.6.2 Model estimates

There was no evidence of lack of convergence of the MCMCs (Mormede et al. in prep b). The fits to the catch-at-age data were acceptable considering the variability in the observations from year-to-year, and the fits were almost indistinguishable between model runs. The fits to the survey biomass series and the CPUE series were acceptable, including capturing the recent reduction in all three indices. Recruitment multipliers were estimated with wide confidence intervals throughout the series (estimated to 2020) and indicated an extended period of low recent recruitment (Figure 10).

The ling selectivities in LIN 7WC were unusual in that the trawl survey selected older fish than the commercial trawl. The commercial longline selected older fish than both commercial and survey trawl. Fits to the observed data were adequate (Mormede et al. in prep b). This resulted in the commercial trawl and longline fisheries selectivities being to the right of the maturity ogive, leading to a small proportion of the spawning stock biomass being not vulnerable to fishing (about 10% at B_0 for the base case). Maturity was investigated, it was similar to the ogive used (from Horn 2005) for most years, but more variable in recent years.




Figure 10: LIN 7WC. Estimated posterior distributions for standardised recruitment multipliers from the base case run, with median (line), the interquartile range (dark grey), and 95% credible interval (light grey). The horizontal line indicates a recruitment multiplier value of one.

The base case median estimate for B_0 was 54 144 t for this stock, and that the median biomass for 2026 was 34% of B_0 (Table 23, Figure 11). Annual exploitation rates (catch over spawning stock biomass) were estimated to have been increasing since 2010 and were above 0.15 in 2026 (Figure 12). The long-term median annual exploitation rate (catch over spawning stock biomass) that would maintain the stock at its target (50% probability of being at or above 40% of initial spawning stock biomass) under long-term average recruitment is 0.148, and 0.026 under the 2016–2020 recruitment.

The model outcomes were sensitive to alternative values of natural mortality, with a lower value of natural mortality leading to lower estimates for initial biomass and stock status in 2026, and conversely a higher value of natural mortality leading to higher initial biomass and stock status estimates for 2026 (Table 23). All estimated parameters were largely unchanged for these runs.

Table 23: LIN 7WC Bayesian median and 95% credible intervals (in parentheses) of B_0 and B_{2026} (in tonnes and as a percentage of B_0), and the probability that B_{2026} is above 40% of B_0 or below 20% of B_0 .

Model run	B_0		$B_{2026} (\%B_0)$		$P(>40\% B_0)$	$P(<20\% B_0)$
Base case	54 144	(50 096 – 59 413)	34.0	(28.9 - 40.1)	0.027	0
$M = 0.16$	51 917	(48 928 – 55 904)	29.9	(25.1 - 35.5)	0.000	0
$M = 0.20$	58 180	(52 266 – 66 996)	38.4	(32.3 - 45.1)	0.313	0




Figure 11: LIN 7WC base case. Estimated posterior distribution of the spawning stock biomass (SSB in tonnes, left) and of the proportion of initial spawning biomass (%SSB₀, right) trajectory and estimated virgin spawning stock biomass reference points (40%, 20%, and 10% B_0) for the base case model. The solid black line represents the median values and the dark grey shading interquartile range and light shading 95% credible interval.




Figure 12: LIN 7WC base model: Exploitation rate (defined as total catch divided by spawning stock biomass) with the interquartile range (dark grey) and 95% credible interval (light grey).

4.6.3 Projections

Projections were carried out to 2031 for LIN 7WC using the base case model. A range of assumptions for future recruitment and future constant catch were investigated (Figure 14). Because recruitment has been decreasing since 2008, two assumptions were investigated: that future recruitment will resemble the most recent years of recruitment (arbitrarily chosen as the last five years estimated: 2016–2020), or that future recruitment will continue to follow the recent declining trend. This trend was determined by developing an Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average (ARIMA) model using all the MCMC estimates of recruitment from the base case model (Figure 13). Developed by Box & Jenkins (1970), ARIMA models are designed to understand past data or predict future values by analysing trends, and the autocorrelation inherent in the data.

Because recruitment has been below average since 2007 and declining since 2003, projections indicated that the spawning stock biomass would continue to decline even with a 30% reduction in recent catches and would likely breach the soft limit reference point in 2031 at that level of catch (Table 24). Although both recent recruitment and continued decline in recruitment provided similar projections over five years on average, the projected recruitment using ARIMA predictions were more uncertain, leading to higher probability of breaching the soft limit.

Table 24: LIN 7WC. Bayesian median and 95% credible intervals (in parentheses) of projected B_{2031} as a percentage of B_0 , and B_{2031}/B_{2026} (%) for the base case model run. The probability of B_{2031} being above 40% B_0 (p_{40}) and of B_{2031} being below 20% B_0 (p_{20}) are also reported. Two assumptions of future recruitment are presented: as per the 2016–2020 YCS (top) or continuing trend as estimated using ARIMA models (bottom).

Catch range	Future catch (t)									
	Trawl	Line/Pot	B_{2031}		$B_{2031} (\%B_0)$		$B_{2031} (\%B_{2026})$		p_{40}	p_{20}
Future YCS resampled from the 2016–2020 estimates										
2024–2025	1 009	1 875	11 165	(6 923 – 18 188)	21	(13–32)	61	(44–83)	0.001	0.45
80%	807	1 500	13 205	(8 112 – 20 252)	24	(16–36)	72	(52–93)	0.004	0.18
70%	707	1 312	14 224	(9 083 – 21 280)	26	(18–38)	77	(59–98)	0.010	0.09
No catch	0	0	21 388	(1 6262 – 28 443)	39	(31–50)	117	(100–136)	0.454	0.00
Future YCS continued trend estimated using ARIMA model										
2024–2025	1 009	1 875	10 136	(4 830 – 22 010)	19	(9–40)	55	(30–113)	0.02	0.57
80%	807	1 500	12 146	(5 958 – 24 061)	22	(11–43)	66	(38–123)	0.04	0.36
70%	707	1 312	13 158	(6 955 – 25 086)	24	(13–45)	71	(43–128)	0.05	0.25
No catch	0	0	20 330	(14 152 – 32 254)	38	(27–58)	110	(86–167)	0.37	0.00

Future YCS resampled from 2016–2020 estimates

Future YCS estimated using ARIMA model




Figure 13: LIN 7WC base model projections: Future recruitment multipliers under the assumption of recent recruitment (left) or continued trend in recruitment (right) with the interquartile range (dark grey) and 95% credible interval (light grey). The blue line represents when recruitment multipliers start being assumed.




Figure 14: LIN 7WC base model projections: Median and 95% credible interval of spawning stock biomass in 2031 as a percentage of initial biomass (y axis) as a function of future recruitment assumptions (panels) and future constant catch (x axis). The purple line and shading represent the median spawning stock biomass in 2026 and 95% credible interval. The green line represents 40% B_0 . The blue lines are a smoother between the estimated point to aid interpretation.

Monitoring of changes that may be due to climate change and environmental variability

A qualitative evaluation of potential effects of environmental or climate change on the stock assessment where productivity may have changed due to environmental fluctuations or climate change is given in Table 25.

Table 25: Summary of the changes that may be due to climate change and environmental variability for west coast South Island ling [Continued on next page]

Parameter	Summary
Recruitment	There is evidence of an extended period of low recent recruitment with a downwards trend from 2003 to 2017
Age-at-maturity	The survey and observer data indicate a possible increase in the age at maturity of ling in LIN 7WC in the 2021–2025 period, and / or a change in the timing of maturation
Stock recruitment steepness and variability	It is not known if there have been changes in the stock-recruit steepness parameter (h). Variability in recruitment has remained relatively constant
Natural mortality	There was no information available to determine if there have been changes in natural mortality over time
Growth	Growth model (von Bertalanffy) residuals by year of observation and year indicates some annual variability in growth, but there was no clear trend over time
Length-weight	There was no evidence of change in length-weight relationship over time
Spatial distribution	Based on the trawl survey distributions, there was no evidence of spatial distribution changes over time
Stock structure	The stock structure does not seem to have changed (Horn 2022 and Mormede et al. 2024b vs Horn 2005)
Locations of spawning and site fidelity	Unknown, as there were few data from which to draw conclusions

4.7 Cook Strait, LIN 7CK

4.7.1 Model structure and inputs

A stock assessment of ling in Cook Strait (LIN 7CK) was completed in 2013 (Dunn et al. 2013). Because it is believed that the true M for the Cook Strait stock is higher than the ‘default’ value of 0.18, it was considered desirable to estimate M in the model and so incorporate the effect of this uncertainty in M in the assessment. However, the simultaneous estimation of B_0 and M was not successful owing to the adoption of a multinomial likelihood (rather than lognormal) for proportions-at-age. Consequently, models with fixed M values were run, and, although the age data were reasonably well fitted, the model failed to accurately represent declines in resource abundance that appear evident from CPUE values, which have been declining since 2001. The model was considered unsuitable for the provision of management advice.

The last stock assessment for LIN 7CK (Cook Strait) accepted by the Working Group was completed in 2010 (Horn & Francis 2013), and it is reported here. The stock assessment model partitions the population into two sexes and age groups 3 to 25 with a plus group. The model’s annual cycle is described in Table 26. Year class strengths and fishing selectivity ogives were also estimated in the model. Commercial trawl selectivity was fitted as double normal curves; longline fishery ogives were fitted as logistic curves.

Table 26: LIN 7CK. Annual cycle of the stock model, showing the processes taking place at each time step, their sequence within each time step, and the available observations. Fishing and natural mortality that occur within a time step occur after all other processes, with half of the natural mortality for that time step occurring before and half after the fishing mortality.

Step	Period	Processes	M^*	Age†	Observations	
					Description	%Z‡
1	Oct–May	Recruitment fishery (line)	0.67	0.5	Longline CPUE Longline catch-at-age	0.5
2	Jun–Sep	increment ages fishery (trawl)	0.33	0	Trawl CPUE Trawl catch-at-age	0.5

* M is the proportion of natural mortality that was assumed to have occurred in that time step.

† Age is the age fraction, used for determining length-at-age, that was assumed to occur in that time step.

‡ %Z is the percentage of the total mortality in the step that was assumed to have taken place at the time each observation was made.

For final runs, the full posterior distribution was sampled using Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods, based on the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. Bounded estimates of spawning stock virgin (B_0) and current (B_{2008}) biomass were obtained. MCMC chains were constructed using a burn-in length of 4×10^6 iterations, with every 2000th sample taken from the next 20×10^6 iterations (i.e., a final sample of length 1000 was taken from the Bayesian posterior).

For LIN 7CK, model input data include catch histories, trawl and longline fishery CPUE, extensive catch-at-age data from the trawl fishery, sparse catch-at-age data from the longline fishery and estimates of biological parameters. Initial modelling investigations found that the longline CPUE produced implausible results; this series was rejected as a useful index. The base case used all catch-at-age data from the fisheries, and the trawl CPUE series. Instantaneous natural mortality was estimated in the model.

Lognormal errors, with observation-error CVs, were assumed for all CPUE and proportions-at-age observations. Additional process error, assumed to arise from differences between model simplifications and real-world variation, was added to the sampling variance (Table 27).

Table 27: LIN 7CK. Summary of the available data including source years (Years), and the estimated process error (CV) added to the observation error.

Data series	Years	Process error CV
CPUE (hoki trawl, Jun–Sep)	1994–2009	0.2
Commercial trawl proportion-at-age (Jun–Sep)	1999–2009	1.1
Commercial longline proportion-at-age	2006–07	1.1

The assumed prior distributions used in the assessment are given in Table 28. Most priors were intended to be relatively uninformative and were specified with wide bounds.

Table 28: LIN 7CK: Assumed prior distributions and bounds for estimated parameters in the assessments. The parameters are mean (in log space) and CV for lognormal, and mean and standard deviation for normal.

Parameter description	Distribution	Parameters		Bounds	
B_0	uniform-log	–	–	2 000	60 000
Year class strengths	lognormal	1.0	0.9	0.01	100
CPUE q	uniform-log	–	–	1e-8	1e-2
Selectivities	uniform	–	–	0	20–200*
M	lognormal	0.18	0.16	0.1	0.3

* A range of maximum values was used for the upper bound.

Penalty functions were used to constrain the model so that any combination of parameters that did not allow the historical catch to be taken was strongly penalised. A small penalty was applied to the estimates of year class strengths to encourage estimates that averaged to 1.

The catch history, biological input parameters, and estimates of relative abundance used in the model are shown in Tables 5–8.

4.7.2 Model estimates

A single model was presented incorporating a catch history, trawl and longline fishery catch-at-age, trawl CPUE series, with double-normal ogives for the trawl fishery and logistic ogives for the longline fishery, and M estimated in the model.

Posterior distributions of LIN 7CK year class strength estimates from the base case model run are shown in Figure 15.




Figure 15: LIN 7CK. Estimated posterior distributions of year class strength. The horizontal line indicates a year class strength of one. Individual distributions show the marginal posterior distribution, with horizontal lines indicating the median.

The assessment is driven by the trawl fishery catch-at-age data and tuned by the trawl CPUE. Both input series contain information indicative of an overall stock decline. The confidence bounds around biomass estimates are wide (Table 29, Figure 16). Probabilities that current and projected biomass will drop below selected management reference points are given in Table 30. Median M was estimated to be 0.24 (95% confidence interval 0.16–0.30). Estimates of biomass are very sensitive to small changes in M , but clearly there is information in the model encouraging an M higher than the ‘default’ value of 0.18. The model indicated a slight overall biomass decline to about 2000, followed by a much steeper decline from 2000 to 2010. Exploitation rates (catch over vulnerable biomass) were very low up to the late 1980s and have been low to moderate (up to about 0.12 y^{-1}) since then. Since the early 1990s, trawl fishing pressure has generally declined, whereas longline pressure has generally increased.

Table 29: LIN 7CK. Bayesian median and 95% credible intervals (in parentheses) of B_0 and B_{2010} (in tonnes), and B_{2010} as a percentage of B_0 for all model runs.

Model run	B_0		B_{2010}		$B_{2010} (\%B_0)$	
Base case	8 070	(5 290–53 080)	4 370	(1 250–40 490)	54	(23–80)




Figure 16: LIN 7CK. Estimated median trajectories (with 95% credible intervals shown as dashed lines) for absolute biomass and biomass as a percentage of B_0 .

Table 30: LIN 7CK. Probabilities that current (B_{2010}) and projected (B_{2015}) biomass will be less than 40%, 20%, or 10% of B_0 . Projected biomass probabilities are presented for two scenarios of future annual catch (i.e., 220 t and 420 t).

Biomass	Management reference points		
	40% B_0	20% B_0	10% B_0
B_{2010}	0.248	0.006	0.000
B_{2015} , 220 t catch	0.179	0.010	0.000
B_{2015} , 420 t catch	0.328	0.094	0.019

4.7.3 Projections

Projections out to 2015 for LIN 7CK indicated that biomass was likely to increase with future catches equal to recent previous catch levels or decline slightly if catches were equal to the mean since 1990 (Table 31).

Table 31: LIN 7CK. Bayesian median and 95% credible intervals (in parentheses) of projected B_{2015} , B_{2015} as a percentage of B_0 , and B_{2015}/B_{2010} (%) for the base case.

Stock and model run	Future catch (t)	B_{2015}		$B_{2015} (\%B_0)$		$B_{2015}/B_{2010} (\%)$	
		Median	95% CI	Median	95% CI	Median	95% CI
LIN 7CK Base	220	5 030	(1 310–43 340)	59	(24–97)	110	(82–158)
	420	4 320	(590–42 910)	52	(11–92)	95	(45–136)

5. FUTURE RESEARCH CONSIDERATIONS

All stocks

- For all stocks, the potential change in growth or spawning over time should be investigated to keep track of potential climate change signals.
- Updates in fishery definitions and fishing seasons need to be applied to the ageing project.
- Potential recruitment issues should be investigated for all LIN stocks given extended low recent recruitment for LIN 7WC and some other LIN stocks.
- The LIN potting fishery has been increasing since 2021. Observer collected length and age compositions are required to develop an age-frequency and associated selectivity for this fishery.
- Develop a methodology to obtain biological data from small vessels (<34 m) that lack of observer coverage to provide data representative of the fleet.

LIN 2

- A review of the ling stock structure for LIN 2 should be completed before further assessments are conducted for this stock.

LIN 3&4

- The potting fishery has been developing since 2018. One trip was observed in 2020 and length data collected. Additional observer collected length data and age readings are required to develop an age frequency and associated selectivity for this fishery.
- Spatio-temporal standardisation of commercial and Chatham Rise survey data provided different indices worthy of further investigation.
- Improve understanding of spatio-temporal spawning cycle.
- Reconsider the most appropriate way to manage the periodic inadequacy in the bottom longline sampling for age and its lack of consistent representativeness.

LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B

- Further work on the most appropriate implementation of *M* should be considered.
- Collect more data to further explore the links between LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B.
- Additional representative longline and potting length frequency and age data are required for all areas.
- Ageing otoliths that were collected in Statistical Area 025 would help delineate the LIN 3&4 and LIN 5&6 stocks.
- The Plenary recommends that the *Tangaroa* Sub-Antarctic trawl survey biomass estimate (but not age compositions) for 2016 be included in future stock assessments.
- Investigate ways to monitor LIN 5 and LIN 6 separately to help inform management, including trawl survey data or spatial CPUE analysis.

LIN 7WC

- The development of cohort-based, age-frequency distributions should continue.
- A full characterisation of the potting fishery will be needed once the time series is sufficient.
- Age-at-maturity survey observations were unusual in 2021 and 2024 and should be further investigated.
- As the stock status is declining and recent recruitment has been low, this stock could benefit from an increased frequency of monitoring and assessment.
- Consider removing the 1% learning assumption from the trawl fishery CPUE as ling are mostly taken as a bycatch of hoki in this fishery.
- Check for evidence of changes in stock distribution (due to environmental or other changes).
- Compare selectivities from survey and commercial trawl vessels in different areas and run sensitivities based on these differences.

6. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

Stock Structure Assumptions


Ling are assessed as five independent biological stocks, based on the presence of spawning areas and some differences in biological parameters between areas (Horn 2005, Horn 2022). Ling in LIN 6B was considered to be part of the Sub-Antarctic stock in 2024 (Mormede et al. 2024b). Statistical Area 032 was reassigned from the LIN 5&6 stock to the LIN 7WC stock in 2023 initially based on the continuity of catches, and confirmed based on differences in growth (Mormede et al. 2024b).

The Chatham Rise biological stock comprises all Fishstock LIN 3 and LIN 4 north of the Otago Peninsula. The Sub-Antarctic biological stock comprises all Fishstock LIN 5 and all Fishstock LIN 6 including the Bounty Platform (LIN 6B starting in 2024), and LIN 3 south of the Otago Peninsula. The WCSI biological stock occurs in Fishstock LIN 7 west of Cape Farewell. The Cook Strait biological stock includes those parts of Fishstocks LIN 7 and LIN 2 between the northern Marlborough Sounds and Cape Palliser. Ling around the northern North Island (Fishstock LIN 1) are assumed to comprise another biological stock, but there is no information to support this assumption. The stock affinity of ling in LIN 2 between Cape Palliser and East Cape is unknown.

East and west coast LIN 1 are regarded as separate stocks, but no assessments are available for either stock.

- **East coast North Island (part of LIN 2, Statistical Areas 011–015)**

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2014 - now considered out of date	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2012–13	Catch: 304 t
Assessment Runs Presented	CPUE time series based on bottom longline ling target fishing	
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: F corresponding to 40% B_0	
Status in relation to Target	Unknown. CPUE has declined by between about 50–60% since the start of the time series in 1992.	
Status in relation to Limits	B_{2014} is Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the Soft Limit and Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below the Hard Limit	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Unknown	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status

Standardised CPUE index ($\pm$ 95% CI) for bottom longline vessels targeting ling from the ECNI Statistical Areas 011–015 (1992–2013). The dashed horizontal line is the time series mean.

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Biomass is estimated to have declined from 1992 by 50–60%.
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Unknown
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis (2014)

Stock Projections or Prognosis	Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	CPUE has declined while catches have been below the TACC. There is some probability that fishing at the TACC or current catch may lead to overfishing.

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation

Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Evaluation of a CPUE time series from 1992–2013 for bottom longliners targeting ling in Statistical Areas 011–015.	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2014	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Bottom longline effort& estimated catch	1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	N/A	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- It is assumed that the longline CPUE time series tracks the entire biomass of ling in this stock. - The boundaries of this biological stock, particularly towards Cook Strait, are uncertain.	

Qualifying Comments

-

Fishery Interactions


Ling are often taken as bycatch in hoki target trawl fisheries in this region. The main bycatch species of hoki-hake-ling-silver warehou-white warehou target fisheries are rattails, javelinfish, and spiny dogfish. Additional information on trawl bycatch can be found in the Environmental and Ecosystem Considerations section of the hoki chapter of the plenary report.

Model-based analysis of observer and effort data shows that, in the target longline fisheries for ling across all stocks, the main bycatch species (those constituting over 1% of the observed catch) are: spiny dogfish, ribaldo, skates (smooth and rough), black cod, sea perch, pale ghost shark, red cod, and shovelnose dogfish.


Incidental captures are reported for protected seabirds associated with the longline fishery and seabirds and fur seals associated with the hoki trawl fishery.

- Chatham Rise (LIN 3 & 4)**

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2025	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2024 (model year is calendar year)	Catch: 3780 t
Assessment Runs Presented	Base case	
Reference Points	Management Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: $U_{40\%}$	
Status in relation to Target	B_{2025} was estimated to be 58% B_0 ; Very Likely (> 90%) to be at or above the target	
Status in relation to Limits	B_{2025} is Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%) to be below the Soft Limit and Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%) to be below the Hard Limit	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Overfishing is Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be occurring	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status

Trajectory over time of relative spawning biomass (with 95% credible intervals in grey or blue) for the base case model for the Chatham Rise ling stock from the start of the assessment period in 1972 to the most recent assessment in 2025 (vertical grey line) and projected to 2030 with future catches as either the average of the catch from 2022–2024 (solid) or TACC (dashed). Biomass estimates are based on MCMC results. The red horizontal line at 10% B_0 represents the hard limit, the orange line at 20% B_0 is the soft limit, and the green line is the % B_0 target (40% B_0). Projections were undertaken by resampling all year class strengths (left) or from the 2007 to 2016 year class strengths (right).



Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Biomass is estimated to have been increasing or stable since 2003.
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	Fishing pressure is estimated to have been stable since about 2008.
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	Recruitment since about 2000 is estimated to have been lower than the long-term average for this stock.

Projections and Prognosis (2025)

Stock Projections or Prognosis	Current catch is Very Unlikely ($< 10\%$) and catch at the TACC is Unlikely ($< 40\%$) to cause the stock to decline below the target by 2030.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Very Unlikely ($< 10\%$) at current catch Hard Limit: Exceptionally Unlikely ($< 1\%$) at current catch Soft Limit: Very Unlikely ($< 10\%$) at TACC Hard Limit: Exceptionally Unlikely ($< 1\%$) at TACC
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Very Unlikely ($< 10\%$)

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation

Assessment Type	Level 1 - Full Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Age-structured Casal2 model with Bayesian estimation of posterior distributions	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2025	Next assessment: 2028
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	

Main data inputs (rank)	- Summer research trawl survey series, 1992–2014, 2016, 2018, 2020, 2022, 2024 - Proportions-at-age data from the commercial fisheries and trawl survey - Estimates of biological parameters (note that <i>M</i> was estimated in the models)	1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	- Longline fishery CPUE series (annual indices since 1991): series not used in the base assessment model - Scampi target trawl CPUE series (ling bycatch) -<i>Kaharoa</i> ECSI trawl survey abundance index -Pot fishery length and age frequency data	2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: likely unreliable in the early 1990s. 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: series runs from 1992-2003 only. 3 – Low Quality: inadequate spatial coverage of the stock distribution 3 – Low Quality: only one fishing trip has been observed
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	- Change from CASAL to Casal2 model platform - Combined sexes from longline and trawl	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Lack of contrast in survey indices - Reliability of the age frequency data from the longline fishery - Spatial spawning cycle	

Qualifying Comments

-

Fishery Interactions

Ling are often taken as bycatch in hoki target trawl fisheries in this region. The main bycatch species of hoki-hake-ling-silver warehou-white warehou target fisheries are rattails, javelinfish, and spiny dogfish. Additional information can be found in the Environmental and Ecosystem Considerations section of the hoki chapter of the plenary report.

Model-based analysis of observer and effort data shows that, in the target longline fisheries for ling across all stocks, the main bycatch species (those making up over 1% of the observed catch) are: spiny dogfish, ribaldo, skates (smooth and rough), black cod, sea perch, pale ghost shark, red cod, and shovelnose dogfish. All these species are a significant part of the longline fishery bycatch on the Chatham Rise. Spiny dogfish is particularly represented in the longline bycatch (14.8% of catch across all LIN QMAs), with an estimated average annual catch of 1238 t (minimum 281 t, maximum 2405 t) between 2002–03 and 2017–18 in LIN 3 & 4.

Incidental captures are reported for protected seabirds associated with the longline fishery and seabirds and fur seals associated with the hoki trawl fishery. In the 2019–20 fishing year, protected species captures for the longline fishery consisted of 4 seabirds and no marine mammals.


- **Sub-Antarctic (LIN 5 & 6 and LIN 6B)**

Stock Status


Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2024

Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2023 (model year is calendar year)	Catch: 9946 t
Assessment Runs Presented	Age based Casal2 assessment	
Reference Points	Management Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: $U_{40\%B_0}$	
Status in relation to Target	B_{2024} was estimated to be 66% B_0 ; Virtually Certain (> 99%) to be at or above the target	
Status in relation to Limits	B_{2024} is Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%) to be below the Soft Limit and Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%) to be below the Hard Limit	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Overfishing is Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%) to be occurring	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status




Trajectory over time of relative spawning biomass (with interquartile range in dark grey and 95% credible intervals in light grey) for the LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B base model from the start of the assessment period in 1973 to the most recent assessment in 2024 (vertical blue line) and projected to 2029 with future catches as either the average of the catch from 2020–2023 (9317 t) (top row) or TACC (13 713 t) (bottom row). Years on the x-axis are calendar year. Biomass estimates are based on MCMC results. The red horizontal line at 10% B_0 represents the hard limit, the orange line at 20% B_0 is the soft limit, and green line is the % B_0 target (40% B_0). Projections were undertaken by resampling recent year class strengths (2008–2017).



Trajectory over time of exploitation rate ($catch / SSB$) and spawning biomass ($\% B_0$), for the LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B base model from the start of the assessment period in 1973 to 2024. The red vertical line at 10% B_0 represents the hard limit, the orange line at 20% B_0 is the soft limit, and green lines are the $\% B_0$ target (40% B_0) and the corresponding exploitation rate (catch divided by $SSB U_{40} = 0.176$ under average recruitment assumptions). Biomass and exploitation rate estimates are medians from MCMC results. The blue cross represents the limits of the 95% credible intervals of the estimated ratio of the SSB to B_0 and exploitation rate in 2024.

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Biomass has declined in recent years but remains high.
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	Exploitation rate is estimated to have been low, but increasing in recent years and remains below the overfishing threshold.



LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B base model: Exploitation rate ($Catch / SSB$) with interquartile range shown as dark grey and 95% credible interval as light grey. The green horizontal line is the exploitation rate U_{40} (catch divided by $SSB U_{40} = 0.176$ under average recruitment assumptions)

Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	Stock status is unlikely to change over the next 5 years at recent catch levels (9317 t) and reduce at the level of the TACC (13 713 t), but remain well above the target.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%) at current catch or catches at the level of the TACC Hard Limit: Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%) at current catch or TACC
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%) at current catch or TACC

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 1 - Full Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Age-structured Casal2 model with Bayesian estimation of posterior distributions	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2024	Next assessment: 2027
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Summer and autumn <i>Tangaroa</i> trawl survey series - Proportions-at-age data from the commercial fisheries and trawl surveys - Estimates of biological parameters	1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	- LIN 6B proportions-at-age from the commercial longline fishery - LIN 6B longline fishery CPUE series - LIN 5&6 longline fishery CPUE series (annual indices since 1991)	3 – Low Quality: sparse data 3 – Low Quality: sparse data 2 – Medium or mixed Quality: does not have a constant q
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	- LIN 6B catch was included in the stock assessment - Data from Statistical Area 032 were removed - Free survey q_s were used instead of nuisance q_s , and some changes to catchability priors were made - The longline CPUE series was not used in the base case - Model year started 1 January rather than 1 September	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- B_0 is uncertain due to a lack of contrast in abundance indices. - The degree of mixing between LIN 6B and LIN 5&6.	
Qualifying Comments		
The current assessment assumes that LIN 5 and LIN 6 (including the Bounty Platform LIN 6B) are a single biological stock.		


Fishery Interactions
Ling are often taken as bycatch in hoki target trawl fisheries in this region. The main bycatch species of hoki-hake-ling-silver warehou-white warehou target trawl fisheries are rattails, javelin fish, and spiny dogfish. Additional information can be found in the Environmental and Ecosystem Considerations section of the hoki chapter of the plenary report. Model-based analysis of observer and effort data shows that, in the target longline fisheries for ling across all stocks, the main bycatch species (those comprising over 1% of the observed catch) are: spiny dogfish, ribaldo, skates (smooth and rough), black cod, sea perch, pale ghost shark, red cod, and shovelnose dogfish.

Incidental captures are reported for protected seabirds associated with the longline fishery and seabirds and fur seals associated with the hoki trawl fishery. A single basking shark capture was reported for LIN 5 in 2019–20.


- **West coast South Island (LIN 7WC)**

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2026	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2026 (model year is calendar year)	Catch: 2526 t
Assessment Runs Presented	Base case	
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: $U_{40\%B_0}$	
Status in relation to Target	Median B_{2026} was estimated to be 34% B_0 . Unlikely (< 40%) to be at or above the target	
Status in relation to Limits	B_{2026} is Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the Soft Limit and Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below the Hard Limit	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Overfishing is Likely (> 60%) to be occurring	


Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



Trajectory over time of relative spawning biomass (with interquartile range in dark grey and 95% credible intervals in light grey) for the base case model for the WCSI ling stock from the start of the assessment period in 1972 to the most recent assessment in 2026 (vertical blue line) and projected to 2031 with future catches and catch split as the average of the catch from 2025–2025 (2884 t) and continued trend in year class strengths (using ARIMA projections). Years on the x-axis are calendar year. Biomass estimates are based on MCMC results. The red horizontal line at 10% B_0 represents the hard limit, the orange line at 20% B_0 is the soft limit, and green line is the % B_0 target (40% B_0).



Trajectory over time of relative spawning biomass (with interquartile range in dark grey and 95% credible intervals in light grey) for the base case model for the WCSI ling stock from the start of the assessment period in 1972 to the most recent assessment in 2026 (vertical blue line) and projected to 2031 with future catches and catch split as the average of the catch from 2025–2025 (2884 t) and future year class strengths resampled from the 2016–2020 estimates year class strengths. Years on the x-axis are calendar year. Biomass estimates are based on MCMC results. The red horizontal line at 10% B_0 represents the hard limit, the orange line at 20% B_0 is the soft limit, and green line is the % B_0 target (40% B_0).



Trajectory over time of exploitation rate (U) and spawning biomass (% B_0), for the LIN 7WC base model from the start of the assessment period in 1972 to 2026 (in blue). The red vertical line at 10% B_0 represents the hard limit, the orange line at 20% B_0 is the soft limit, and the green line is the % B_0 target (40% B_0). Biomass and exploitation rate estimates are medians from MCMC results. The blue cross represents the limits of the 95% confidence intervals of estimated the ratio of the SSB to B_0 and exploitation rate in 2026. The horizontal green line corresponds to the long-term exploitation rate at long term recruitment that would achieve a 50% probability of being at or above 40% B_0 (U_{40}).

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Biomass is estimated to have continually declined since 2012.
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Exploitation rates have increased since 2009
Other Abundance Indices	- Provisional potting CPUE for 2019–2025 supports recent trend - <i>Kaharoa</i> WCSI survey is consistent with recent decline
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	Stock status is Very Likely (> 90%) to remain below the target and to continue to decline over the next 5 years at the current catch levels.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	At current catch levels: Soft Limit: About as Likely as Not (40–60%) Hard Limit: Unlikely (< 40%)
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	At current catch levels: Very Likely (> 90%)

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 1 - Full Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Age-structured model with Bayesian estimation of posterior distributions using CASAL 2	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2026	Next assessment: 2029
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Catch history - Abundance index from WCSI trawl surveys - Proportions at age data from the commercial fisheries and trawl surveys - Commercial trawl hoki-hake-ling target fishery CPUE - Commercial longline fishery CPUE - Estimates of fixed biological parameters	1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	- <i>Kaharoa</i> trawl survey abundance index - Potting CPUE series	3 – Low Quality: inadequate spatial coverage of the stock distribution 3 – Low Quality: time series too short
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	- CPUE now applied with a 1% annual learning rate - Recruitment assumptions for projections	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Lack of potting and longline fisheries biological data, including length and age compositions - How changes in the fishery could be affecting selectivity and therefore estimation of recruitment - Bimodal age compositions in the trawl fishery and survey index - Impact of a changing environment on future recruitment, productivity and distribution	

Qualifying Comments
-

Fishery Interactions
Ling are often taken as a bycatch in hoki target trawl fisheries in this region. The main bycatch species of hoki-hake-ling-silver warehou-white warehou target trawl fisheries are rattails, javelinfish, and spiny dogfish. Additional information can be found in the Environmental and Ecosystem Considerations section of the hoki chapter of the plenary report.


Model-based analysis of observer and effort data shows that, in the target longline fisheries for ling across all stocks, the main bycatch species (those making up over 1% of the observed catch) are: spiny dogfish, ribaldo, skates (smooth and rough), black cod, sea perch, pale ghost shark, red cod, and shovelnose dogfish.

Incidental captures are reported for protected seabirds associated with the longline fishery and seabirds and fur seals associated with the hoki trawl fishery.

- **Cook Strait (LIN 7CK) (LIN 2 [Statistical Area 016] & part of LIN 7)**

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2010 (an assessment in 2013 was rejected) - now considered out of date	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2008–09	Catch: 147 t
Assessment Runs Presented	Base case	
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: F corresponding to 40% B_0	
Status in relation to Target	B_{2010} was estimated to be 54% B_0 ; Likely (> 60%) to be at or above the target	
Status in relation to Limits	B_{2010} is Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%) to be below the Soft Limit and Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%) to be below the Hard Limit	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Overfishing is Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be occurring	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



Trajectory over time of spawning biomass (absolute, and % B_0 , with 95% credible intervals shown as broken lines) for the Cook Strait ling stock from the start of the assessment period in 1972 to the most recent assessment in 2010. Years on the x-axis are fishing year with '1990' representing the 1989–90 fishing year. Biomass estimates are based on MCMC results.

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Biomass is estimated to have been declining since 1999, but is unlikely to have dropped below 30% B_0 .
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Overall fishing pressure is estimated to have been relatively constant since the mid-1990s, but has trended down for trawl and up for longline.
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	Recruitment from 1995 to 2006 was low relative to the long-term average for this stock. There are no estimates for the more recent year classes.

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	Stock status is predicted to improve slightly over the next 5 years at a catch level equivalent to that since 2006 (i.e., 220 t per year), or remain relatively constant at a catch equivalent to the mean since 1990 (i.e., 420 t per year).
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Note that there is no specific TACC for the Cook Strait stock. Soft Limit: Catch 220 t, Very Unlikely (< 10%); Catch 420 t, Very Unlikely (< 10%) Hard Limit: Catch 220 t, Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%); Catch 420 t, Very Unlikely (< 10%)
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Very Unlikely (< 10%)

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 1 - Full Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Age-structured CASAL model with Bayesian estimation of posterior distributions	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2010	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	3 – Low Quality: The only accepted relative abundance series (trawl fishery CPUE) was not well fitted. A subsequent assessment in 2013 was rejected by the Working Group.	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Proportions-at-age data from the commercial trawl fishery - Proportions-at-age data from the commercial longline fishery - Trawl fishery CPUE series (annual indices since 1994) - Estimates of biological parameters	1 – High Quality 3 – Low Quality: not representative of entire fishery 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: not well-fitted by model 1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	- Longline fishery CPUE	3 – Low quality: does not track stock biomass
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	- No significant changes since the previous assessment	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- There are no fishery-independent indices of relative abundance. It is not known if the trawl CPUE series is a reliable abundance index. - The stock structure of Cook Strait ling is uncertain. While ling in this area are almost certainly biologically distinct from the WCSI and Chatham Rise stocks, their association with ling off the lower east coast of the North Island is unknown. - It is possible that trawl selectivity has varied over time, resulting in poor fits to some age classes in some years. - Longline fishery selectivity is based on only two years of catch-at-age data from the auto longline fishery. No information is available from the 'hand-baiting' longline fishery. - The model is moderately sensitive to small changes in M, and M is poorly estimated.	

Qualifying Comments
There is no separate TACC for this stock; it comprises parts of Fishstocks LIN 7 and LIN 2.

Fishery Interactions

Ling are often taken as a bycatch in hoki target trawl fisheries in this region. The main bycatch species of hoki-hake-ling-silver warehou-white warehou target trawl fisheries are rattails, javelinfish, and spiny dogfish. Additional information can be found in the Environmental and Ecosystem Considerations section of the hoki chapter of the plenary report.

Model-based analysis of observer and effort data shows that, in the target longline fisheries for ling across all stocks, the main bycatch species (those comprising over 1% of the observed catch) are: spiny dogfish, ribaldo, skates (smooth and rough), black cod, sea perch, pale ghost shark, red cod, and shovelnose dogfish.

Incidental captures are reported for protected seabirds associated with the longline fishery and seabirds and fur seals associated with the hoki trawl fishery.

7. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Anderson, O F; Edwards, C T T; Ballara, S (2019) Non-target fish and invertebrate catch and discards in New Zealand hoki, hake, ling, silver warehou, and white warehou trawl fisheries from 1990–91 to 2016–17. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 220*. 117 p.
- Ballara, S L (2019) A descriptive analysis of all ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) fisheries, and CPUE for ling longline fisheries for LIN 5&6, from 1990 to 2017. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/49*. 92 p.
- Ballara, S L; Horn, P L (2015) A descriptive analysis of all ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) fisheries, and CPUE for ling longline fisheries for LIN 3&4 and LIN 5&6, from 1990 to 2013. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/11*. 55 p.
- Box, G E P; Jenkins, G (1970) *Time series analysis: forecasting and control*. 2nd Edition. San Francisco: Holden-Day. 240 p.
- Bradford, E (1996) Marine recreational fishery survey in the Ministry of Fisheries North region, 1993–94. *New Zealand Fisheries Data Report No. 80*. 83 p.
- Bull, B; Francis, R I C C; Dunn, A; McKenzie, A; Gilbert, D J; Smith, M H; Bian, R (2012) CASAL (C++ algorithmic stock assessment laboratory): CASAL user manual v2.30-2012/03/21. *NIWA Technical Report 135*. 280 p.
- Casal2 Development Team (2024) Casal2 user manual for age-based models, v24.02 (2024-02-21). National Institute of Water & Atmospheric Research Ltd. NIWA Technical Report 139. 295 p. (Using source code from <https://github.com/alistairdunn1/CASAL2:Development>)
- Doonan, I; Large, K; Dunn, A; Rasmussen, S; Marsh, C; Mormede, S (2016) Casal2: New Zealand's integrated population modelling tool. *Fisheries Research* 183: 498–505.
- Dunn, A (2003) Investigation of evidence of area misreporting of landings of ling in LIN 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 from TCEPR records in the fishing years 1989–90 to 2000–01. Final Research Report. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Dunn, M R; Ballara, S L (2018) Fishery description and stock assessment for ling off the West Coast South Island (LIN 7) to the 2015–16 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/40*. 112 p.
- Dunn, M R; Connell, A; Forman, J; Stevens, D W; Horn, P L (2010) Diet of two large sympatric teleosts, the ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) and hake (*Merluccius australis*). *PLoS ONE* 5(10): e13647. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0013647
- Dunn, M R; Edwards, C T T; Ballara, S L; Horn, P L (2013) Stock assessment of ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) in Cook Strait and off the West Coast South Island (LIN 7), and a descriptive analysis of all ling fisheries, for the 2012–13 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/63*. 102 p.
- Edwards, C T T (2017) Development of natural mortality priors for ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) stock assessments in New Zealand. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2017/55*. 32 p.
- Francis, R I C C (2011) Data weighting in statistical fisheries stock assessment models. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 68: 1124–1138.
- Francis, R I C C; Hurst, R J; Renwick, J A (2001) An evaluation of catchability assumptions in New Zealand stock assessments. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/1*. 37 p.
- Heinemann A; Gray, A. (2024) National Panel Survey of Recreational Marine Fishers 2022-23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/51*. 116 p.
- Holmes, S J (2019) Stock assessment of ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) on the Chatham Rise (LIN 3&4) for the 2018–19 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/70*. 45 p.
- Holmes, S J; Dunn, M R (2025) Stock assessment of Chatham Rise ling in 2025. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2025/48*. 58 p.
- Holmes, S J; Dunn, M R; Ballara, S (2025) Descriptive analysis of ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) on Chatham Rise (LIN 3&4) up to 2023–24 and inputs for the 2025 stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2025/47*. 57 p.
- Horn, P L (1993) Growth, age structure, and productivity of ling, *Genypterus blacodes* (Ophidiidae), in New Zealand waters. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 27: 385–397.
- Horn, P L (2003) CPUE from commercial fisheries for ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) around the North Island, New Zealand: an evaluation of series for LIN 1, LIN2, and Cook Strait. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/13*. 49 p.
- Horn, P L (2004a) CPUE from commercial fisheries for ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) in Fishstocks LIN 3,4,5,6, and 7 from 1990 to 2003. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2004/62*. 40 p.
- Horn, P L (2004b) A review of the auto-longline fishery for ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) based on data collected by observers from 1993 to 2003. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2004/47*. 28 p.
- Horn, P L (2005) A review of the stock structure of ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) in New Zealand waters. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2005/59*. 41 p.
- Horn, P L (2007a) A descriptive analysis of commercial catch and effort data for ling from New Zealand waters in Fishstocks LIN 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/22*. 71 p.
- Horn, P L (2007b) Stock assessment of ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) on the Bounty Plateau and in Cook Strait for the 2006–07 fishing year. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project LIN2005-01, Objective 3. 51 p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)

- Horn, P L (2008) Stock assessment of ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) on the Chatham Rise, Campbell Plateau, and in Cook Strait for the 2007–08 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/24*. 76 p.
- Horn, P L (2009) Stock assessment of ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) off the west coast of South Island for the 2008–09 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2009/16*. 42 p.
- Horn, P L (2010) CPUE from commercial fisheries for ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) in Fishstocks LIN 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 from 1990 to 2008, and a descriptive analysis update. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2010/25*. 54 p.
- Horn, P L (2015) Spatial and temporal changes in ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) population structure on the Chatham Rise and off West Coast South Island. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/3*. 23 p.
- Horn, P L (2022) A synopsis of the biology of ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) and a history of its fishery and assessment in New Zealand. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/27*. 82 p.
- Horn, P L; Dunn, M R; Ballara, S L (2013) Stock assessment of ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) on the Chatham Rise (LIN 3&4) and in the Sub-Antarctic (LIN 5&6) for the 2011–12 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/6*. 87 p.
- Horn, P L; Francis, R I C C (2013) Stock assessment of ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) in Cook Strait for the 2010–11 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/7*. 35 p.
- Kienzle, M (2021) Stock assessment for ling off the west coast South Island (LIN 7WC) to the 2018–19 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2021/18*. 22 p.
- Leach, B F; Boocock, A S (1993) Prehistoric fish catches in New Zealand. *British Archaeological Reports International Series 584*. 38 p.
- Lorenzen, K (2022) Size- and age-dependent natural mortality in fish populations: Biology, models, implications, and a generalized length-inverse mortality paradigm. *Fisheries Research* 255: 106454.
- McGregor, V (2015) Stock assessment of ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) on the Chatham Rise (LIN 3&4) for the 2014–15 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/82*. 50 p.
- Mormede, S; Dunn, A; Webber, D N (2021a) Descriptive analysis and stock assessment model inputs of ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) in the Sub-Antarctic (LIN 5&6) for the 2020–21 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2021/60*. 113 p.
- Mormede, S; Dunn, A; Webber, D N (2021b) Stock assessment of ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) in the Sub-Antarctic (LIN5&6) for the 2020–21 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2021/61*. 40 p.
- Mormede, S; Dunn, A; Webber, D N (2022a) Descriptive analysis of ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) on the Chatham Rise (LIN 3&4) up to 2020–21 and inputs for the 2022 stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/64*. 85p.
- Mormede, S; Dunn, A; Webber, D N (2022b) Spatial-temporal standardisation of commercial longline and trawl survey catches of ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) on the Chatham Rise (LIN 3&4). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/13*. 10 p.
- Mormede, S; Dunn, A; Webber, D N (2023a) Descriptive analysis of ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) off the west coast South Island (LIN 7WC) up to 2021–22 and inputs for the 2023 stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2023/51*. 91p.
- Mormede, S; Dunn, A; Webber, D N (2023b) Stock assessment of ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) on the Chatham Rise (LIN 3&4) for the 2021–22 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2023/14*. 39p.
- Mormede, S; Dunn, A; Webber, D N (2024a) Descriptive analysis of ling in the Sub-Antarctic (LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B) up to 2023 and inputs for the 2024 stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/82*. 94 p.
- Mormede, S; Dunn, A; Webber, D N (2024b) Stock hypotheses for ling in the Sub-Antarctic (LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/83*. 13 p.
- Mormede, S; Dunn, A; Webber, D N (2024c) The 2024 stock assessment of ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) in the Sub-Antarctic (LIN 5&6 and LIN 6B). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report*. 2024/84. 28 p.
- Mormede, S; Dunn, A; Webber, D N (2024d) The 2023 stock assessment of ling off the west coast South Island (LIN 7WC). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/02*. 23p.
- Mormede, S; Dunn, A; Webber, D N (in prep a) Descriptive analysis of ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) off the west coast South Island (LIN 7WC) up to 2024–25 and inputs for the 2026 stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report*
- Mormede, S; Dunn, A; Webber, D N (in prep b) The 2026 stock assessment of ling off the west coast South Island (LIN 7WC). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report*.
- Morrongiello J R; Horn P L; Ó Maolagáin C; Sutton P J H (2021) Synergistic effects of harvest and climate drive synchronous somatic growth within key New Zealand fisheries. *Global Change Biology* 27(7): 1470–1484. doi: 10.1111/gcb.15490. Epub 2021 Jan 27. PMID: 33502819.
- O'Driscoll, R L; Ballara, S L; MacGibbon, D J; Schimel, A C G (2018) Trawl survey of hoki and middle depth species in the Southland and Sub-Antarctic, November–December 2016 (TAN1614). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2018/39*. 84 p.
- Pinkerton, M H; Holmes, S J; Sutton, P J H; Behrens, E; Dunn, M R (2026) Environmental variability and change in the LIN 3&4 stock region. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2026/14*. 40 p.
- Roberts, J (2016) Stock assessment of ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) in the Sub-Antarctic (LIN 5&6) for the 2014–15 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2016/05*. 35 p.
- Roux, M-J (2015) Review of the longline fishery for ling (*Genypterus blacodes*) in LIN 2, and an update of the CPUE index. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/6*. 26 p.
- Starr, P J; Kendrick, T H (2017) Fishery Characterisation and CPUE Analysis of LIN 1. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2017/48*. 81 p.
- Starr, P J; Kendrick, T H; Lydon, G J; Bentley, N (2007) Full term review of the LIN 1 adaptive management programme. Report to the Adaptive Management Fishery Assessment Working Group. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Stevenson, M L (2007) Inshore trawl survey of the west coast of the South Island and Tasman and Golden Bays, March–April 2007 KAH0704. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/41*.
- Webber, D N; Dunn, A; Mormede, S (2021) Stan-ASD: A new age-structured stock assessment model, with an application to sub-Antarctic hake (*Merluccius australis*) and ling (*Genypterus blacodes*). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2021/59*. 43 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–2018. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/24*. 104 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Hill, L; Heinemann, A (2014) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2011–12: Harvest Estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/67*. 139 p.

LOOKDOWN DORY (LDO)*(Cyttus traversi)***1. FISHERY SUMMARY**

Lookdown dory was introduced into the Quota Management System (QMS) on 1 October 2004 with the allowances, TACs and TACCs in Table 1. It is currently managed as three stocks: LDO 1 which comprises FMAs 1–2 and 7–9; LDO 3 which comprises FMAs 3–6; and LDO 10 (Kermadec region).

Table 1: Recreational and customary non-commercial allowances, TACCs and TACs, by Fishstock, for lockdown dory.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
LDO 1	0	0	0	168	168
LDO 3	0	0	0	614	614
LDO 10	0	0	0	1	1

1.1 Commercial fisheries

Reliable landings data are available from 1989–90 onwards, after the introduction of Catch Landing Returns (CLRs) in the previous year (Table 2). Annual landings are also available from Licensed Fish Receiver Returns (LFRRs), and these agree well with CLR figures in most years (within 10%), but differ by 20–27% in 4 of the 12 years with comparable data (Table 2). Total landings (CLR) increased steadily from 127 t in 1989–90 to 760 t in 2001–02. Estimated catch as a percentage of recorded landings were moderate in the early 1990s at 60–70%, but subsequently declined to around 30%. Lookdown dory will often not be included within the top five species in a trawl haul, but the reason for the declining percentage of landings recorded as catch is unknown.

Since entering the QMS, landings in LDO 1 slightly exceeded the TACC in 2005–06 and 2007–08; by an average of 30 t in 2012–13 to 2014–15; by 76 t in 2017–18 and by 7 t in 2022–23 (Table 3, Figure 1). The TACC in LDO 3 has never been caught, with landings fluctuating around 300 t until 2022–23, increasing to 453 t in 2023–24. This probably reflects the reduction in the size of the trawl fishery on the Chatham Rise where the greatest proportion of lockdown dory has been taken as bycatch. No landings have been reported from LDO 10.

There is a seasonal pattern of catch of lockdown dory on the west coast South Island in relation to target fishing for spawning hoki and hake in winter. Catches elsewhere are also dependent on fishing activity in target fisheries but, other than a slight decline in winter months in relation to the shift in area of operation of the hoki fleet, they tend to be less seasonal.

Table 2: Reported landings and estimated catch (t) of lockdown dory by fishing year from 1989–90 to 2001–02. Also, percentage of landings recorded as catch in the catch effort databases.

Year	Landings (CLR)	Landings (LFRR)	Estimated catch (t)	% of CLR landings recorded as estimated catch
1989–90	127	161	80	63
1990–91	164	182	105	64
1991–92	249	216	177	71
1992–93	275	264	159	58
1993–94	188	226	117	62
1994–95	283	277	125	44
1995–96	260	276	107	41
1996–97	354	426	173	49
1997–98	564	557	265	47
1998–99	625	640	228	36
1999–00	637	605	215	34
2000–01	694	504	157	23
2001–02	760	-	254	33

Table 3: Reported domestic landings (t) of lockdown dory by Fishstock and TACC from 2004–05 to present.

Fishstock FMA	LDO 1 1,2,7,8&9		LDO 3 3,4,5&6		LDO 10 10		Total	
	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC
2004–05	110	168	272	614	0	1	382	783
2005–06	180	168	290	614	0	1	470	783
2006–07	147	168	284	614	0	1	431	783
2007–08	174	168	256	614	0	1	430	783
2008–09	144	168	315	614	0	1	459	783
2009–10	161	168	274	614	0	1	435	783
2010–11	165	168	216	614	0	1	380	783
2011–12	153	168	229	614	0	1	382	783
2012–13	185	168	309	614	0	1	494	783
2013–14	204	168	256	614	0	1	460	783
2014–15	207	168	357	614	0	1	564	783
2015–16	166	168	342	614	0	1	507	783
2016–17	160	168	339	614	0	1	499	783
2017–18	244	168	320	614	0	1	564	783
2018–19	133	168	288	614	0	1	421	783
2019–20	122	168	277	614	0	1	399	783
2020–21	141	168	316	614	0	1	457	783
2021–22	133	168	344	614	0	1	477	783
2022–23	175	168	312	614	0	1	487	783
2023–24	112	168	453	614	0	1	566	783
2024–25	150	168	425	614	0	1	575	783

Lookdown dory is generally caught by bottom trawling in depths of 200 to 800 m mainly as bycatch in the hoki fishery, but also in a variety of other target fisheries such as barracouta, hake, ling, scampi, squid and jack mackerel. A small amount of target fishing is reported from FMA 7. Most of the landings have historically come from FMA 3 (east coast South Island), FMA 4 (Chatham Rise), and FMA 7 (west coast South Island) (Table 4). Landings from around the North Island have been restricted mostly to a few tonnes each year from FMAs 1, 2, 8 and 9. In FMA 5 (Southland) and FMA 6 (Sub-Antarctic) landings averaged 28 t and 25 t respectively in 1999–00 to 2003–04. 123 kg of lockdown dory were reported to have been caught from outside the New Zealand EEZ in the 2012–13 fishing year.

Table 4: Reported historic landings (rounded to nearest tonne) of lockdown dory by FMA and fishing year 1989–90 to 2003–04.

Year	FMA 1	FMA 2	FMA 3	FMA 4	FMA 5	FMA 6	FMA 7	FMA 8	FMA 9	FMA 10
1989–90	2	1	40	20	12	2	51	-	-	-
1990–91	3	4	46	59	10	11	33	< 1	-	-
1991–92	1	2	96	75	17	3	55	-	-	-
1992–93	1	4	63	112	10	2	83	-	-	-
1993–94	< 1	2	62	50	4	3	67	-	< 1	-
1994–95	1	6	73	108	7	3	85	-	< 1	-
1995–96	2	4	99	78	11	3	62	-	< 1	-
1996–97	7	10	108	110	11	7	100	< 1	< 1	-
1997–98	5	8	159	272	11	25	82	-	< 1	-
1998–99	3	3	161	295	21	17	124	< 1	10	-
1999–00	3	5	161	295	21	17	124	< 1	10	-
2000–01	2	6	203	318	24	25	111	< 1	4	-
2001–02	10	10	181	331	26	28	170	3	2	-
2002–03	8	8	261	365	48	32	167	1	2	-
2003–04	13	8	135	210	22	24	113	3	1	-




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the two main LDO stocks. Top to bottom: LDO 1 (Challenger, Central, Auckland), and LDO 3 (South East Chatham Rise, South East Coast, Sub Antarctic, Southland). Note that this figure does not show data prior to entry into the QMS.

1.2 Recreational fisheries

There is no quantitative information on recreational harvest levels of lockdown dory. Due to the offshore location and depth distribution of lockdown dory recreational catch is thought to be negligible.

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

An estimate of current catch is not available but given the offshore location and depth distribution of lockdown dory customary non-commercial catch is thought to be negligible.

1.4 Illegal catch

Estimates of illegal catch are not available.

2.5 Other sources of mortality

There is no quantitative information on the level of other sources of mortality.

2. BIOLOGY

Lookdown dory (*Cyttus traversi*) belongs to the family Zeidae. This family includes 13 species in seven genera distributed among the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and the Mediterranean Sea. Lookdown dory also occurs in Australian waters, mostly east and south of Tasmania (where it is known as king dory), and also in South Africa. It is widely distributed throughout New Zealand waters with most records from the Chatham Rise.

It is one of the less abundant members of a loosely associated group of about 23 common species, which together form the upper slope fish assemblage of New Zealand's continental shelf (Francis et al 2002). The main species in this group are hoki, javelin fish, ling, pale ghostshark, sea perch, hake, and longnose spookfish (chimaerid). It was identified as a key species characterising the demersal fish community 350–550 m on the Chatham Rise (Bull et al 2001).

Juveniles are found in surface waters up to a length of approximately 12 cm (May & Maxwell 1986), at which stage a metamorphosis occurs associated with the transition from a pelagic to a demersal habitat (James 1976). Adults are most common between 400 to 600 m, but have a wide depth range, from 50 to 1200 m (Anderson et al 1998). The main prey of lockdown dory are natant decapod crustaceans, followed by 903uphausiid, mysid, galatheid, and nephropsid crustaceans, and fish (Clark & King 1989, Forman & Dunn, 2010). Lookdown dory is likely to be prey of larger fish and have occasionally been recorded in the stomachs of large ling.

Trawl survey catch distribution across the Chatham Rise is fairly even, with females ranging from 10 to 55 cm total length, and males ranging from 10 to 45 cm. Lookdown dory show early signs of ripening to spawn in the January surveys (Livingston et al 2002). Catch distribution across the Sub-Antarctic is patchier than across the Chatham Rise, particularly during autumn surveys (O'Driscoll & Bagley 2001). Lookdown dory appear to grow larger in the Sub-Antarctic than on the Chatham Rise with females ranging from 12 to 60 cm total length, and males ranging from 12 to 45 cm.

There are no known aggregations or migrations associated with spawning lockdown dory. Around the North Island, female lockdown dory were reported to mature at about 35 cm (May & Maxwell 1986). Tracey et al (2007) estimated mean length at first maturity to be 18.3 cm and 5.2 years for males and 21.6 cm and 6.3 years for females, based on macroscopic maturity estimates of fish caught in Chatham Rise surveys. Ripe specimens are usually seen in autumn and winter but have also been observed in summer (Clark & King 1989). Livingston et al (2002) reported early signs of ripening in January Chatham Rise trawl surveys. Observer records from the east coast South Island and Chatham Rise show that ripe females are more common in summer months and spent females are more common in winter (MacGibbon et al 2012). Females on the west coast South Island are mostly resting, immature or spent in winter. Although most spawning takes place in autumn and winter it is likely that it is not a discrete event but occurs over much of the year. Research data from other areas are sparse, but show the presence of fish in spawning condition in most months of the year.

Although there are no published studies of validated age and growth of lockdown dory, preliminary work in Australia suggests that this species may live to over 30 years (Stewart & Smith 1992). Tracey et al (2007) attempted to use lead-radium techniques to validate ageing by zone counts of otoliths but were unsuccessful. Based on unvalidated zone counts, they observed maximum ages of 38 and 35 years for males and females respectively for New Zealand lockdown dory from the Chatham Rise. Initial fish growth was rapid for both sexes, and females approached a substantially larger mean asymptotic maximum size than males. Length at maximum observed age for females was approximately 50 cm. Tracey et al (2007) estimated total mortality Z using three methods; 1) age reached by 5% of the population (after Hoenig 1983), 2) mean age above recruitment (after Chapman and Robson 1960) and 3) slope of the right hand limb of the relationship between age and the natural logarithm of the frequency of fish in that age class (after Ricker 1975). Results ranged from 0.12 to 0.17 and could be considered an upper limit for natural mortality M . Von Bertalanffy growth parameters and natural mortality M values are given in Table 5 and length-weight parameters are given in Table 6.

Table 5 : Summary of von Bertalanffy growth parameters and natural mortality M values for Chatham Rise lockdown dory. Source : Tracey et al 2007. NB : Ageing in this study used unvalidated methods.

1. von Bertalanffy growth parameters

Sex	N	L_{∞}	SE	95% CI	K	SE	95% CI	t_0	SE	95% CI
All	382	50.72	2.53	(45.75, 55.68)	0.058	0.007	(0.044, 0.073)	-3.53	0.67	(-4.84, -2.21)
Males	191	38.78	1.68	(35.49, 42.06)	0.074	0.011	(0.053, 0.095)	-4.28	0.87	(-5.97, -2.57)
Females	191	69.94	5.71	(58.75, 81.13)	0.039	0.006	(0.027, 0.051)	-3.90	0.72	(-5.31, -2.49)

2. natural mortality M

Sex	M
Combined	0.10 to 0.15

Table 6: Length-weight parameters for Chatham Rise and Sub-Antarctic lockdown dory.

Fishstock	Estimate				Source
1.Weight = a(length)^b (Weight in g, length in cm total length)					
FMA 3 & 4	Females		Males		Tracey et al (2007)
	a	b	a	b	
	0.022	2.98	0.025	2.96	
FMA 5 & 6	Sexes combined				Bagley et al (unpublished data)
	a	b			
	0.022	3.02			

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

A catch-effort characterisation carried out in 2010 (MacGibbon et al 2012) identified three main fishing areas where lockdown dory are caught. These are the east coast South Island (FMA 3), Chatham Rise (FMA 4), and west coast South Island (FMA 7). It was found that these are still the main relevant fishing areas when this work was updated in 2012 (Ballara 2014).

There is little information on stock structure, recruitment patterns, or other biological characteristics on which to base any biological fishstock boundaries. MacGibbon et al (2012) found that both sexes grow to a larger size in the Sub-Antarctic compared with the Chatham Rise suggesting the possibility of different stocks. There is also a difference in abundance between males and females in both areas with females nearly always outnumbering males (Figure 2).




Figure 2: Doorspread biomass estimates of lockdown dory by sex from the Chatham Rise 1991 to 2014 (upper) and Sub-Antarctic 1991 to 1993 and 2000 to 2012 (lower), from Tangaroa surveys.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

In December 2013 the Middle Depths Working Group agreed that for the west coast South Island (FMA 7, which accounts for the vast majority of the LDO 1 catch), acceptable methods of monitoring abundance are relative biomass estimates from the west coast South Island winter trawl survey carried out by R.V. *Tangaroa*. Catch-per-unit-effort indices from daily processed commercial catches and from the scientific observer programme were also accepted as indices of abundance for the west coast of the South Island.

The Middle Depths Working Group agreed in February 2011 that relative biomass estimates of lookdown dory from middle depth trawl surveys on the Chatham Rise and the Sub-Antarctic were suitable for monitoring major changes in lookdown dory abundance for LDO 3. Standardised CPUE indices from a mixed target species trawl fishery on the ECSI and Chatham Rise area were not accepted by the Working Group.

4.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

West coast South Island, west and east coast North Island (LDO 1)

Biomass indices from the west coast South Island *Tangaroa* surveys are considerably lower than those for the Chatham Rise and Sub-Antarctic but are still thought to be potentially reliable measures of abundance (Table 7). In 2021 new strata were added to the west of existing WCSI *Tangaroa* survey strata. The estimated biomass including the new strata was 18% higher than if they were excluded, 463 t as opposed to 391 t. Further surveys are needed to confirm which strata are needed to track abundance in the FMA 7 region. There are only 6 years of length frequency data available. The distributions suggest distinct modes can be identified (Figure 3) but they are not tracking cohorts if growth of lookdown dory west of the South Island is as estimated by Tracey et al, (2007) for Chatham Rise lookdown dory.

CPUE indices for lookdown dory on the WCSI were developed using the daily processed catch data and a smaller subset of observed vessels in the hoki and hake target fisheries (Ballara 2014). Both series showed a similar trend, flat since 1995 (Figures 4 and 5).

Chatham Rise & Sub-Antarctic (LDO 3)

Lookdown dory biomass is usually in the top 10 species on Chatham Rise and CVs are relatively precise (usually less than 15%) (Table 7). Females have consistently comprised more of the biomass than males (Figure 2). Biomass indices on the Sub-Antarctic have higher but still acceptable CVs (generally less than 30%). Catches of lookdown dory are very low in the east coast South Island inshore *Kaharoa* survey with often high CVs and lookdown dory are only caught occasionally in the west coast South Island inshore *Kaharoa* survey (Table 7). These surveys can not provide reliable measures of abundance.

Length frequency distributions of Chatham Rise lookdown dory suggest that recruitment is variable (MacGibbon et al, 2012, Ballara, 2014). Generally, when a strongly recruiting year class is present, the male length frequencies are often bimodal and females show two or three modes (Figure 6). Length frequency plots show that females are usually more numerous than males with a mean ratio for the time series (to 2014) of 1.15 females to every male (range 0.98–1.52). Males don't grow as large as females, with few males growing larger than 40 cm. Females have been measured at 50 cm and above in all years.

Length frequency distributions from the summer Sub-Antarctic series are less informative and no tracking of cohorts is possible. Overall, scaled population numbers are much lower for both sexes here than on Chatham Rise but, again, females are more numerous than males with a mean ratio for the time series (to 2014) of 1.8 females for every male (range 0.55–3.9). Females also grow to a larger size than males and both sexes grow to a larger size on the Sub-Antarctic than on Chatham Rise, which suggests that it may be a separate biological stock. This could also potentially be due to differences in fishing pressure.

Table 7: Biomass indices (t) and coefficients of variation (CV) for lockdown dory from trawl surveys (Assumptions: areal availability, vertical availability and vulnerability = 1). Trip codes starting 'KAH': *Kaharoa* surveys; trip codes starting 'TAN': *Tangaroa* surveys. [Continued on next page]

Trip code	Depth range (m)	Date	Biomass (t)	% CV
QMA 1				
WCSI (inshore)				
KAH9204	20–400	Mar–Apr 1992	2	64.1
KAH9404	20–400	Mar–Apr 1994	1	87.2
KAH9504	20–400	Mar–Apr 1995	18	94.4
KAH9701	20–400	Mar–Apr 1997	5	57.4
KAH0004	20–400	Mar–Apr 2000	16	87.4
KAH0304	20–400	Mar–Apr 2003	3	78.3
KAH0503	20–400	Mar–Apr 2005	6	61.8
KAH0704	20–400	Mar–Apr 2007	0	100
KAH0904	20–400	Mar–Apr 2009	-	-
KAH1104	20–400	Mar–Apr 2011	-	-
KAH1305	20–400	Mar–Apr 2013	-	-
KAH1503	20–400	Mar–Apr 2015	-	-
KAH1703	10–400	Mar–Apr 2017	-	-
KAH1902	10–400	Mar–Apr 2019	6	100
KAH2103	10–400	Mar–Apr 2021	0	100
WCSI (offshore) core				
TAN0007	300–650	Jul–Aug 2000	169	14.4
TAN1210	300–650	Jul–Aug 2012	155	11.9
TAN1308	300–650	Aug 2013	205	11.1
TAN1609	300–650	Aug 2016	210	12.2
TAN1807	300–650	Jul–Aug 2018	271	21.7
TAN2107	300–650	Aug 2021	374	15.6
WCSI all				
TAN1210	200–800	Jul–Aug 2012	181	10.6
TAN1308	200–800	Aug 2013	236	11.6
TAN1609	200–1000	Aug 2016	230	11.4
TAN1807	200–1000	Jul–Aug 2018	292	20.2
TAN2107	200–1000	Aug 2021	391	15.0
WCSI deep + EX				
TAN2107	200–1050	Aug 2021	463	16.2
QMA 3				
ECSI				
KAH9205	30–400	May–Jun 1992	6	60.7
KAH9306	30–400	May–Jun 1993	5	54.0
KAH9406	30–400	May–Jun 1994	16	49.5
KAH9606	30–400	May–Jun 1996	11	100
KAH0705	30–400	May–Jun 2007	23	65.2
KAH0806	30–400	May–Jun 2008	30	29.9
KAH0905	30–400	May–Jun 2009	31	37.1
KAH1207	30–400	Apr–Jun 2012	27	61.4
KAH1402	30–400	Apr–Jun 2014	19	33.0
KAH1605	30–400	Apr–Jun 2016	46	73.9
KAH1803	30–400	Apr–Jun 2018	37	94.3
KAH2104	30–400	Apr–Jun 2021	9	56.3
Chatham Rise				
TAN9106	200–800	Dec 1991–Feb 1992	4 819	5.6
TAN9212	200–800	Dec 1992–Feb 1993	6 401	5.2
TAN9401	200–800	Jan 1994	7 703	7.2
TAN9501	200–800	Jan–Feb 1995	5 284	6.6
TAN9601	200–800	Dec 1995–Jan 1996	7 540	8.0
TAN9701	200–800	Jan 1997	6 568	7.6
TAN9801	200–800	Jan 1998	7 019	6.0
TAN9901	200–800	Jan 1999	7 417	8.2
TAN0001	200–800	Dec 1999–Jan 2000	7 651	7.0
TAN0101	200–800	Dec 2000–Jan 2001	7 713	6.5
TAN0201	200–800	Dec 2001–Jan 2002	8 821	11.1
TAN0301	200–800	Dec 2002–Jan 2003	5 904	7.0

Table 7 [Continued]:

Trip code	Depth range (m)	Date	Biomass (t)	% CV
TAN0401	200–800	Dec 2003–Jan 2004	6 746	7.7
TAN0501	200–800	Dec 2004–Jan 2005	6 351	9.3
TAN0601	200–800	Dec 2005–Jan 2006	7 818	8.5
TAN0701	200–800	Dec 2006–Jan 2007	5 710	7.7
TAN0801	200–800	Dec 2007–Jan 2008	5 225	9.3
TAN0901	200–800	Dec 2008–Jan 2009	7 789	8.7
TAN1001	200–800	Jan 2010	4 896	9.7
TAN1101	200–800	Jan 2011	3 257	21.4
TAN1201	200–800	Jan 2012	5 913	13.2
TAN1301	200–800	Jan 2013	7 141	11.0
TAN1401	200–800	Jan 2014	5 560	6.9
TAN1601	200–800	Jan 2016	6 494	8.8
TAN1801	200–800	Jan 2018	9 535	27.2
TAN2001	200–800	Jan 2020	6 352	9.1
TAN2201	200–800	Jan 2022	6 354	11.0
Sub-Antarctic				
TAN9105	300–1000	Nov–Dec 1991	1 095	12.8
TAN9211	300–1000	Nov–Dec 1992	1 048	11.1
TAN9310	300–1000	Nov–Dec 1993	821	13.2
TAN0012	300–1000	Nov–Dec 2000	921	15.2
TAN0118	300–1000	Nov–Dec 2001	566	19.7
TAN0219	300–1000	Nov–Dec 2002	446	22.1
TAN0317	300–1000	Nov–Dec 2003	636	23.7
TAN0414	300–1000	Nov–Dec 2004	614	27.9
TAN0515	300–1000	Nov–Dec 2005	703	19.1
TAN0617	300–1000	Nov–Dec 2006	513	35.1
TAN0714	300–1000	Nov–Dec 2007	725	20.0
TAN0813	300–1000	Nov–Dec 2008	811	24.7
TAN0911	300–1000	Nov–Dec 2009	820	25.1
TAN1117	300–1000	Nov–Dec 2011	349	33.0
TAN1215	300–1000	Nov–Dec 2012	436	29.1
TAN1412	300–1000	Nov–Dec 2014	352	28.3
TAN16	300–1000	Nov–Dec 2016	675	24.0
TAN1811	300–1000	Nov–Dec 2018	358	28.2
TAN2014	300–1000	Nov–Dec 2020	753	18.3

4.4 Other yield estimates and stock assessment results

No information is available.

4.5 Future research considerations

Catch-per-unit-effort indices from daily processed commercial catches and from the scientific observer programme were accepted as indices of abundance for the west coast of the South Island, but the indices were last updated for data up to the 2011–2012 fishing year.

Ageing by reading possible annual zones on otoliths has yet to be validated (an initial attempt using radiometric techniques was unsuccessful). Otolith sampling and development of catch-at-age for Chatham Rise would increase its usefulness for monitoring and aid in interpretation of trends. Tracey *et al.* (2007) suggested that the use of whole otoliths in radiometric testing could provide a validation method. Validation would provide the opportunity to develop catch-at-age and length-at-age series.




Figure 3: Lookdown dory length frequencies from west coast Soth Island *Tangaroa* surveys. Blue shaded bars in the year 2021 show additional numbers at length caught in the new strata introduced in the 2021 survey.




Figure 4: Log normal CPUE indices for WCSI daily processed catch, bottom trawl target hoki or hake, showing catches (scaled to same mean as indices), and lognormal standardised and un-standardised indices. Bars indicate 95% confidence intervals. Year defined as June–September.




Figure 5: CPUE lognormal indices for WCSI observer programme data, target hoki or hake, bottom and midwater trawl, showing catches (scaled to same mean as indices), and lognormal standardised and un-standardised indices. Bars indicate 95% confidence intervals. Year defined as June–September.




Figure 6: Lookdown dory length frequencies from Chatham Rise *Tangaroa* surveys. Length frequencies are shown from 1993, to show bi-modal length distributions found in some years, then from 1998, 2003, 2008, 2013, 2018 and 2022. Vertical line is at 18.3 cm for males and 21.6 cm for females (length at 50% maturity given by Tracey et al 2007).


5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

There are no known sustainability concerns in the lockdown dory fishery. For LDO 1, the area which accounts for the vast majority of the lockdown dory, catch is thought to be well monitored by trawl surveys which are currently too short to suggest any pattern, but CPUE indices (conducted on data to 2012) suggested that abundance had been stable since the mid-1990s. For LDO 3, trawl surveys on the Chatham Rise and Sub-Antarctic indicate abundance has fluctuated without long term trend in both areas. Although LDO 3 includes both Chatham Rise and the Sub-Antarctic, separate status of the stock tables are presented on the basis these areas may contain sub-stocks.

- LDO 1 (west coast South Island, west and east coast North Island)**

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2023	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2021–22	Catch: 133 t
Assessment runs presented	-	
Reference Points	Target: Not established but 40% B_0 assumed Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: -	
Status in relation to Target	Unknown	
Status in relation to Limits	Unknown for Soft limit Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the Hard Limit	
Status in relation to Overfishing	-	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



Doorspread biomass estimates for lockdown dory (error bars are $\pm$ two standard deviations) from the winter WCSI *Tangaroa* surveys 2000, and 2012, 2013, 2016, 2018, and 2021.

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Within LDO 1, FMA 7 biomass indices from the trawl survey time series are similar for 2000 and 2012 (core strata), with an

LOOKDOWN DORY (LDO) – May 2026

	increase from 2012 to 2021. This time series is thought to cover an appropriate depth and geographical range for lookdown dory.
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	Unknown
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis

Stock Projections or Prognosis	Stock size is Unlikely (< 40%) to change much at current catch levels in FMA 7.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unlikely (< 40%)
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	-

Assessment Methodology

Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Evaluation of agreed CPUE indices and trawl survey indices thought to index abundance within FMA 7 of LDO 1. The vast majority of the LDO 1 catch is taken in FMA 7, catches in other areas of LDO 1 are minor.	
Assessment dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2023	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	-	
Main data inputs (rank)	-	
Data not used (rank)	-	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	-	

Qualifying Comments

-

Fishery Interactions


In LDO 1, lookdown dory are taken primarily as bycatch in the bottom trawl west coast South Island hoki and hake target fisheries. Smaller catches are reported by midwater trawl. Interactions are the same as those for the hoki fishery. The east coast North Island scampi fishery also catches lookdown dory. A variety of other target fisheries also report catching lookdown dory but in very small amounts. A small amount of lookdown dory is targeted on the west coast of the South Island by smaller trawlers.

LDO 3 (Chatham Rise)
Stock Status


Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2023	
Intrinsic productivity level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2021–21	Catch: Unknown
Reference Points	Target: Not established but 40% B_0 assumed Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: -	

Status in relation to Target	Unknown
Status in relation to Limits	Unknown for Soft limit Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the Hard Limit
Status in relation to Overfishing	-

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



Doorspread biomass estimates of lockdown dory (error bars are $\pm$ two standard deviations) from the Chatham Rise, from *Tangaroa* surveys from 1991 to 2014 and 2016, 2018, 2020, 2022.



Relative biomass from Chatham Rise *Tangaroa* trawl survey: blue line plus vertical lines showing $\pm$ 2 s.d. (left axis); dashed line, reported QMR/MHR landings (right axis); red dotted line, TACC for LDO 3 (right axis). Horizontal green line marks the target (calculated as arithmetic mean over reference period), horizontal orange line the soft limit, and horizontal red line the hard limit. Vertical broken green lines bound the reference period.

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Within LDO 3, FMAs 3 & 4 biomass indices have been fairly flat throughout the time series of Chatham Rise trawl surveys with the exception of 2010 and 2011 which show a decline.

Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Unknown
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	Stock size is Unlikely (< 40%) to change much at current catch levels in FMAs 3 & 4.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unlikely (< 40%)
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	-

Assessment Methodology		
Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial quantitative stock assessment	
Assessment Method	Evaluation of agreed trawl survey indices thought to index FMA 3 & 4 abundance	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2023	Next assessment: unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	-	
Main data inputs (rank)	-	
Data not used (rank)	-	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	-	


Qualifying Comments
There is some indication that lockdown dory on the Chatham Rise may be a different stock to the Sub-Antarctic (i.e. different maximum sizes, evidence of some spawning activity in the Sub-Antarctic, as well as more extensively on the Chatham Rise)

Fishery Interactions
In LDO 3 lockdown dory are mainly caught as bycatch in the hoki target bottom trawl fishery but also in many other middle depth fisheries. Interactions are the same as those for the hoki fishery.

LDO 3 (Sub-Antarctic)

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2023	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2021–22	Catch: Unknown
Reference Points	Target: Not established but 40% B_0 assumed Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: -	
Status in relation to Target	Unknown	
Status in relation to Limits	Unknown for Soft limit Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the Hard Limit	
Status in relation to Overfishing	-	


Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



Doorspread biomass estimates of lookdown dory (error bars are $\pm$ two standard deviations) from the Sub-Antarctic, from *Tangaroa* surveys from 1991 to 1993, 2000 to 2009, 2011–12, 2014, 2016, 2018 and 2020.

LDO3: Sub-Antarctic (*Tangaroa*) survey

Reference years: 2005-2009



Relative biomass from Sub-Antarctic *Tangaroa* trawl survey: blue line plus vertical lines showing $\pm$ 2 s.d. (left axis); dashed line, reported QMR/MHR landings (right axis); red dotted line, TACC for LDO 3 (right axis). Horizontal green line marks the target (calculated as arithmetic mean over reference period), horizontal orange line the soft limit, and horizontal red line the hard limit. Vertical broken green lines bound the reference period.

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy

Within LDO 3, FMAs 5 & 6 biomass indices from the Sub-Antarctic series declined to 2002, then increased again until 2009. The four lowest biomass estimates of the series have come from surveys since 2011 but the estimate in 2020 is in the range seen between 2000 and 2009.

Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Unknown
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	Stock size is Unlikely (< 40%) to change much at current catch levels in FMAs 5 & 6.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unlikely (< 40%)
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	-

Assessment Methodology		
Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial quantitative stock assessment	
Assessment Method	Evaluation of agreed trawl survey indices thought to index FMA 5 & 6 abundance	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2023	Next assessment: unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	-	
Main data inputs (rank)	-	
Data not used (rank)	-	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	-	

Qualifying Comments
There is some indication that lockdown dory on the Chatham Rise may be a different stock to the Sub-Antarctic (i.e. different maximum sizes, evidence of some spawning activity in the Sub-Antarctic, as well as more extensively on the Chatham Rise).

Fishery Interactions
In LDO 3 lockdown dory are mainly caught as bycatch in the hoki target bottom trawl fishery but also in many other middle depth fisheries. Interactions are the same as those for the hoki fishery.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Anderson, O F; Bagley, N W; Hurst, R J; Francis, M P; Clark, M R; McMillan, P J (1998) Atlas of New Zealand fish and squid distribution from research bottom trawls. *NIWA Technical Report* 42. 303 p.
- Anderson, O F; Gilbert, D J; Clark, M R (2001) Fish discards and non-target catch in the trawl fisheries for orange roughy and hoki in New Zealand waters for the fishing years 1990–91 to 1998–99. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2001/16. 57 p.
- Bagley, N W; O'Driscoll, R L (2012) Trawl survey of middle depth species in the Southland and Sub-Antarctic areas, November–December 2009 (TAN0911). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2012/05. 70 p.
- Ballara, S L (2014) Fishery characterisation and standardised CPUE analyses for lockdown dory, *Cyttus traversi* (Hutton, 1872) (Zeidae), 1989–90 to 2011–12. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2014/62.
- Bull, B; Livingston, M E; Hurst, R J; Bagley, N (2001) Upper-slope fish communities on the Chatham Rise, New Zealand, 1992–99. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 35 (3): 795–815.
- Clark, M R; King, K J (1989) Deepwater fish resources off the North Island, New Zealand: results of a trawl survey, May 1985 to June 1986. *New Zealand Fisheries Technical Report* 11. 56 p.
- Forman, J S; Dunn, M R (2010) The influence of ontogeny and environment on the diet of lockdown dory, *Cyttus traversi*. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research*. 44: 329–42.
- Francis, M P; Hurst, R J; McArdle, B; Bagley, N W; Anderson, O F (2002) New Zealand demersal fish assemblages. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 62(2): 215–234.
- Hurst, R J; Bagley, N W; Anderson, O F; Francis, M P; Griggs, L H; Clark, M R; Paul, L J; Taylor, P R (2000) Atlas of juvenile and adult fish and squid distributions from bottom and midwater trawls and tuna longlines in New Zealand waters. *NIWA Technical Report* 84. 162 p.
- James, G D (1976) *Cyttus traversi* Hutton: Juvenile form of *C. ventralis* Barnard and Davies (Pisces: Zeidae). *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 6(4): 493–498.

- Livingston, M E; Bull, B; Stevens, D W; Bagley, N W (2002) A review of hoki and middle depth trawl surveys of the Chatham Rise, January 1992–2001. *NIWA Technical Report 113*. 146 p.
- Livingston, M E; Clark, M; Baird, S J (2003) Trends in incidental catch of major fisheries on the Chatham Rise for fishing years 1989–90 to 1998–99. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/52*. 74 p.
- Livingston, M E; Stevens, D W (2005) Trawl survey of hoki and middle depth species on the Chatham Rise, January 2004 (TAN0401). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2005/21*. 62 p.
- MacGibbon, D J; McGregor, V; Hurst, R J (2012) Fishery characterisation and standardised CPUE analyses for lookdown dory, *Cyttus traversi* (Hutton, 1872) (Zeidae), 1989–90 to 2008–09. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2012/07*. 143 p.
- May, J L; Maxwell, J G H (1986) Trawl fish from temperate waters of Australia. CSIRO Division of Fisheries Research, Tasmania. 492 p.
- Nelson, J S (1994) *Fishes of the world*. Third edition. J. Wiley, New York. 600 p.
- O'Driscoll, R L; Bagley, N W (2001) Review of summer and autumn trawl survey time series from the Southland and Sub-Antarctic area 1991–98. *NIWA Technical Report 102*. 115 p.
- O'Driscoll, R L; Booth, J D; Bagley, N W; Anderson, O F; Griggs, L H; Stevenson, M L; Francis, M P (2003) Areas of importance for spawning, pupping or egg-laying, and juveniles of New Zealand deepwater fish, pelagic fish, and invertebrates. *NIWA Technical Report 119*. 377 p.
- Stevens, D W; O'Driscoll, R L; Ladroit, Y; Ballara, S L; MacGibbon, D J; Horn, P L (2015) Trawl survey of hoki and middle depth species on the Chatham Rise, January 2014 (TAN1401). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/19*. 119 p.
- Stewart, B D; Smith, D (1992) Development of methods to age commercially important dories and oreos. *Newsletter of the Australian Society for Fish Biology* 22 (2): 53–54.
- Tracey, D M; Horn, P L; Andrews, A H; Marriott, P M; Dunn, M R (2007) Age and growth, and an investigation of age validation of lookdown dory (*Cyttus traversi*). Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Project LDO2004-01 Objective 1. 36 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)F

INTRODUCTION – ORANGE ROUGHY (ORH)

(Hoplostethus atlanticus)



1

1. INTRODUCTION

Orange roughy was introduced into the Quota Management System (QMS) on 1 October 1986. The main orange roughy fisheries have been treated separately for assessment and management purposes, and individual reports have been produced for each of six areas consisting of one or more stocks as follows.

1. Northern North Island (ORH 1)
 - Mercury-Colville stock
 - Other stocks
2. Cape Runaway to Banks Peninsula (ORH 2A, 2B, & 3A)
 - East Cape stock
 - Mid-East Coast stock
3. Chatham Rise and Puysegur (ORH 3B)
 - Northwest Chatham Rise stock
 - East and South Chatham Rise stock
 - Puysegur stock
 - Other stocks or subareas
4. Challenger Plateau (ORH 7A)
5. West coast South Island (ORH 7B)
6. Outside the EEZ
 - Lord Howe
 - Northwest Challenger
 - North, Central, and Southern Louisville stocks
 - West Norfolk
 - South Tasman

Recent orange roughy stock assessments have been conducted for the Mid-East Coast (2022), East and South Chatham Rise (2025), Northwest Chatham Rise (2025) and Puysegur (2017), Challenger Plateau (2024), and West coast South Island (a preliminary assessment in 2020). These assessments used a generally similar approach, with the preferred method for monitoring stock biomass being acoustic surveys of spawning plumes. The methods common to these assessments are described later in this introduction.

¹ Image: Terry Hann

2. BIOLOGY

Orange roughy inhabit depths between about 700 m and 1500 m within the New Zealand EEZ. They are most abundant between about 800 m and 1200 m. Their maximum depth range is less well known. Knowledge of orange roughy biology and fisheries was most recently reviewed by Tingley & Dunn (2018).

Orange roughy are slow-growing, long-lived fish. On the basis of otolith ring counts and radiometric isotope studies, orange roughy can live to at least 100 years. Age determination from otolith rings has been validated by length-mode analysis for juveniles up to four years of age (Mace et al. 1990), and adult ages have been validated using radiometric techniques in several studies, most recently by Andrews et al. (2009).

Orange roughy otoliths have a marked transition zone in banding which is believed to be associated with the onset of maturity (Francis & Horn 1997). The estimates of transition-zone maturity range from 23 to 31.5 years for fish from various New Zealand fishing grounds (Horn et al. 1998). However, some stock assessment models fitted to age frequency data collected from spawning aggregations have estimated the age of spawning to be older than transition zone maturity. Orange roughy in New Zealand waters reach a maximum size of about 50 cm standard length (SL), and 3.6 kg in weight, but the maximum size varies among assumed stocks. Average size is around 35 cm SL, although there is variation between areas.

Spawning occurs between June and early August in several areas within the New Zealand EEZ, from the northwest coast of the North Island and Bay of Plenty in the north, to the Auckland Islands in the south. Spawning occurs in dense aggregations at depths of 700–1000 m and may be associated with both flat seabeds, and also bottom features such as pinnacles and canyons. Spawning fish are also found outside the EEZ on the Challenger Plateau, Lord Howe Rise, and Norfolk Ridge to the west, and the Louisville Ridge to the east. It is known that not all fish spawn in every year, but understanding of skipped spawning is lacking.

Fecundity is relatively low, with females carrying on average about 40 000–60 000 eggs. The eggs are large (2–3 mm in diameter), are fertilised in the water column, and then drift upwards towards the surface and remain planktonic until they hatch close to the bottom after about 10 days. Details of larval biology are poorly known.

Orange roughy juveniles are first available to bottom trawls at age about 6 months, when they exhibit a mean length of about 2 cm. Early juveniles have been found in relatively large numbers in only one area to date, at a depth of 800–900 m about 150 km east of the main spawning ground on the north Chatham Rise. Larger juveniles are widespread and have been caught by bottom trawls around most of New Zealand (Dunn et al. 2009).

Orange roughy also form aggregations outside the spawning period, presumably for feeding. Their main prey species include mesopelagic and benthopelagic prawns, fish, and squid, with other organisms such as mysids, amphipods, and euphausiids occasionally being important.

Intrinsic productivity is categorised as very low for this species. The default value of natural mortality (M) is assumed to be 0.045 yr^{-1} . This was based on otolith age data from a 1984 research survey of the Chatham Rise that used an estimation technique based on mean age. An estimate of 0.037 yr^{-1} was obtained from a lightly fished population in the Bay of Plenty in 1996.

Biological parameters used in the following assessments (Tables 1 and 2) were estimated by Doonan (1994) with modifications of A_r , A_m , S_r , and S_m for the 1998 stock assessment meetings by Francis & Horn (1997), Horn et al. (1998), and Doonan et al. (1998), and further modifications by Hicks (2006), and for the Mid-East Coast 2022 assessment (Dunn et al. 2022).

Biases in reading ages from otoliths were identified, leading to a recommendation by reviewers of orange roughy workshops in October 2005 and February 2006 that no age data should be used in

assessments until the biases were quantified and corrected. Stemming from this recommendation, a new ageing methodology was developed for orange roughy in 2007, associated with an international ageing workshop for this species (Tracey et al. 2007, Horn et al. 2016). In stock assessments since 2014, age-frequency data were only used if the otoliths had been read using the new ageing protocol. Despite improvements in ageing methodology, substantial unexplained between-sample variability remains in orange roughy age frequencies (Dunn 2024).

The single-sex growth curve, the length-weight parameters, and the maturity ogive based on transition zones, which are all based on ageing using the old-protocol data, are still believed to be valid. The estimates of these biological parameters (Table 1) were used for both the East Chatham Rise and the Northwest Chatham Rise stock assessments, although the otoliths used were collected from the East Chatham Rise only (of which most were from the Spawning Box).

Table 1: Biological parameters used for orange roughy assessments. -, not estimated. Fish length is standard length.

Parameter	Symbol	Male	Female	Both sexes
Natural mortality	M	–	–	0.045 yr ⁻¹
Age of recruitment	$A_r(a_{50})$	–	–	= A_m
Gradual recruitment	$S_r(a_{0.95})$	–	–	= S_m
Age at maturity	$A_m(a_{50})$	–	–	Table 2
Gradual maturity	$S_m(a_{0.95})$	–	–	Table 2
von Bertalanffy parameters				
- Chatham Rise (default)	L_∞	36.4 cm	38.0 cm	–
- Northwest Chatham Rise	L_∞	–	–	37.78 cm
- East Chatham Rise	L_∞	–	–	37.78 cm
- Mid-East Coast	L_∞	36.8 cm	39.0 cm	37.63 cm
- Challenger Plateau	L_∞	33.4 cm	35.0 cm	–
- All areas (default)	k	0.070 yr ⁻¹	0.061 yr ⁻¹	–
- Northwest Chatham Rise	k	–	–	0.059 yr ⁻¹
- East Chatham Rise	k	–	–	0.059 yr ⁻¹
- Mid-East Coast	k	0.059	0.053	0.065 yr ⁻¹
- All areas (default)	t_0	–0.4 yr	–0.6 yr	–
- East Chatham Rise	t_0	–	–	–0.491 yr
- Northwest Chatham Rise	t_0	–	–	–0.491 yr
- Mid-East Coast	t_0	–0.5 yr	–0.5 yr	–0.5 yr
Length-weight parameters				
- default	a	–	–	0.0921
- East and Northwest Chatham Rise	a	–	–	0.0800
- Mid-East Coast	a	0.064	0.049	–
- default	b	–	–	2.71
- East and Northwest Chatham Rise	b	–	–	2.75
- Mid-East Coast	b	2.81	2.89	–
Recruitment steepness	h	–	–	0.75

Table 2: Estimates of A_m and S_m by area for New Zealand orange roughy from transition zone observations.

Area	A_m			S_m		
	M	F	Both sexes	M	F	Both sexes
Chatham Rise (default)	–	–	29	–	–	3
Northwest Chatham Rise	–	–	28.51	–	–	4.56
East Chatham Rise	–	–	28.51	–	–	4.56
Ritchie Bank	–	–	31.5	–	–	7.11
Challenger Plateau	–	–	23	–	–	3
Puysegur Bank	–	–	27	–	–	3
Bay of Plenty	26	27	–	4	5	–

3. ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECOSYSTEM CONSIDERATIONS

The figures and tables in this section were updated and additional text included for the May 2025 Fishery Assessment Plenary. This summary is from the perspective of the orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish trawl fishery; a more detailed summary from an issue-by-issue perspective is available in the Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Annual Review where the consequences are also discussed ([Aquatic environment and biodiversity annual review \(AEBAR\) | NZ Government \(mpi.govt.nz\)](#)).

3.1 Role in the ecosystem

Orange roughy are the dominant bottom trawl-caught demersal fish at depths of 750–1100 m on the north and east Chatham Rise, off the east coast of the North Island south of about East Cape, and the Challenger Plateau (Clark et al. 2000, Doonan & Dunn 2011, Tracey et al. 1990). An analysis of New

Zealand demersal fish assemblages using research trawl data showed that orange roughy was the most frequently occurring species (found in more than 40% of tows) in the mid-slope assemblage (Francis et al. 2002). Fishing has reduced the abundance of orange roughy since the 1980s, and the effects of removing, for example, an average of about 18 000 t per year from ORH 3B between 1979–80 and 2009–10 are largely unknown. There are likely to have been ecosystem implications (Tracey et al. 2012).

3.1.1 Trophic interactions

The main prey species of orange roughy include mesopelagic and benthopelagic prawns, fish, and squid, with other organisms such as mysids, amphipods, and euphausiids occasionally being important (Rosecchi et al. 1988). Koslow (1997) showed that orange roughy have a faster metabolism than deepwater fishes that are typically dispersed over the flat seafloor, and their food consumption is higher. Ontogenetic shifts occur in their feeding preferences with the smaller fish (up to 20 cm) feeding on crustaceans, and larger fish (31 cm and above) feeding on teleosts and cephalopods (Stevens et al. 2011). Relative proportions of the three prey groups were similar between areas. Bulman & Koslow (1992) found that teleosts were more important than crustaceans by weight in the prey of Australian orange roughy, and that this dominance increased in adult-sized fish. Dunn & Forman (2011) inferred from diet analysis that juveniles feed more on the benthos compared with the benthopelagic foraging of adults. Where they co-occur, orange roughy and black oreo may compete for teleost and crustacean prey.

Predators of orange roughy are likely to change with fish size. Larger smooth oreo, black oreo, and orange roughy were observed with healed soft flesh wounds, typically in the dorso-posterior region. Wound shape and size suggest they may be caused by one of the deepwater dogfishes (Dunn et al. 2010). Giant squid and sperm whales are also thought to prey on orange roughy but evidence is scarce, e.g., a summary of diet in *Architeuthis sanctipauli* lists *Hoplostethus atlanticus* as a prey item but the data source is unclear (Jereb & Roper 2010); and four individual *Hoplostethus* sp. were reported in the stomach of one of ten sperm whales (about 1% of the prey; Gaskin & Cawthorn 1967).

3.1.2 Ecosystem indicators

Tuck et al. (2009, 2014) used data from the Sub-Antarctic and Chatham Rise middle-depth trawl surveys to derive indicators of fish diversity, size, and trophic level. However, fishing for orange roughy occurs mostly deeper than the depth range of these surveys and is only a small component of fishing in the areas considered by Tuck et al. (2009, 2014).

3.2 Non-target fish and invertebrate catch

Anderson & Finucci (2022) summarised the bycatch of orange roughy and oreo trawl fisheries from 2002–03 to 2019–20. Total non-target catch in the orange roughy fishery ranged from a low of 535 t in 2012–13 to a high of 4834 t in 2003–04. Levels dropped sharply for a few years after 2009–10, then increased thereafter, but with a declining trend overall. Total non-target catch was strongly correlated with effort, with effort also having generally decreased over time. During the period 2015–16 to 2019–20, orange roughy accounted for approximately 80% of the total observed catch and the remainder comprised mainly smooth oreo (4.8%), rattails (1.7%), shovelnose dogfish (1.3%), and ribaldo (1.0%). More than 700 species or species groups were recorded by observers, including various deepwater dogfishes (2%), morid cods (1%), rattails (<1%), and slickheads (0.5%). Total estimated annual discards of non-target QMS species were very low, ranging from only 1 t in 2007–08 to 46 t in 2015–16, while discards of non-QMS species ranged from 108 t in 2013–14 to 1504 t in 2017–18; both showed no obvious trend over time.

Invertebrate species are caught in low numbers in the orange roughy fishery (Anderson & Finucci 2022) with squid (0.3%; mostly warty squid, *Onykia* spp., 0.22%) being the largest component of invertebrate catch followed by various echinoderms (0.3%) and cnidarians (0.2%). Tracey et al. (2011) analysed the distribution of nine groups of protected corals based on bycatch records from observed trawl effort from 2007–08 to 2009–10, primarily from 800–1000 m depth. For the orange roughy target fishery, about 10% of observed tows in FMAs 4 and 6 included coral bycatch, but a higher proportion of tows in northern waters included coral (28% in FMA 1, 53% in FMA 9; Tracey et al. 2011).

Finucci et al. (2019) analysed bycatch trends in deepwater fisheries, including orange roughy trawl, from 1990–91 until 2016–17. They found that the most common bycatch species by weight (t) were smooth oreo (*Pseudocyttus maculatus*, SSO), black oreo (*Allocyttus niger*, BOE), and unspecified sharks (SHA). Moreover, among the 557 bycatch species examined, 94 showed a decrease in catch over time (29 were statistically significant) and 62 showed an increase (14 were significant). The species showing the greatest decline were dark ghost shark (*Hydrolagus novaezealandiae*, GSH), black oreo (BOE), and lanternshark (*Etmopterus* sp., ETM), while the greatest increases were found for longnose velvet dogfish (*Centroscyrnus crepidater*, CYP), Portuguese dogfish (*Centroscyrnus coelolepis*, CYL), and Owston’s dogfish (*Centroscyrnus owstonii*, CYO).

3.3 Incidental capture of protected species (seabirds, mammals, and protected fish)

For protected species, capture estimates presented here include all animals recovered to the deck (alive, injured or dead) of fishing vessels but do not include any cryptic mortality (e.g., seabirds struck by a warp but not brought on board the vessel, Middleton & Abraham 2007, Brothers et al. 2010).

3.3.1 Marine mammal captures

Trawlers targeting orange roughy, oreo, and black cardinalfish occasionally catch New Zealand fur seal (which were classified as “Not Threatened” under the New Zealand Threat Classification System in 2010, Baker et al. 2016; Baker et al. 2019). Between 2002–03 and 2007–08, there were 15 observed captures of New Zealand fur seal in orange roughy, oreo, and black cardinalfish trawl fisheries. There have been two observed captures in the period between 2008–09 and 2019–20, during which time the average level of annual observer coverage was 26.2% (Table 3). Corresponding mean annual estimated captures in this period ranged 0–3 (mean 1.25) based on statistical capture models (Thompson et al. 2013; Abraham et al. 2016). All observed fur seal captures occurred in the Sub-Antarctic region.

Table 3: Number of tows by fishing year and observed and estimated New Zealand fur seal captures in orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish trawl fisheries. No. obs, number of observed tows; % obs, percentage of tows observed; Rate, number of captures per 100 observed tows. Estimates are based on methods described by Abraham & Richard (2020) and are available online at <https://protectedspeciescaptures.nz/PSCv9/released/>.

Fishing year	Fishing effort			Observed captures		Estimated captures	
	Tows	Observed tows	% observed	Number	Rate	Mean	95% c.i.
2002–03	8 870	1 380	15.6	0	0.00	6	1–13
2003–04	8 008	1 262	15.8	2	0.16	8	3–17
2004–05	8 424	1 618	19.2	4	0.25	10	5–18
2005–06	8 291	1 357	16.4	2	0.15	8	3–16
2006–07	7 369	2 322	31.5	2	0.09	4	2–9
2007–08	6 730	2 811	41.8	5	0.18	7	5–11
2008–09	6 133	2 372	38.7	0	0.00	4	0–9
2009–10	6 013	2 136	35.5	0	0.00	4	0–9
2010–11	4 177	1 205	28.8	0	0.00	2	0–7
2011–12	3 655	922	25.2	0	0.00	1	0–4
2012–13	3 099	346	11.2	0	0.00	1	0–3
2013–14	3 606	434	12.0	0	0.00	1	0–3
2014–15	3 812	978	25.7	1	0.10	1	1–3
2015–16	4 083	1 421	34.8	0	0.00	1	0–3
2016–17	3 971	1 226	30.9	0	0.00	0	0–2
2017–18	3 752	903	24.1	0	0.00	0	0–2
2018–19	3 906	1 189	30.4	1	0.08	1	1–3
2019–20	3 944	1 171	29.7	0	0.00	0	0–3
2020–21	4 072	1 322	32.5	0	0.00	0	0–2
2021–22	3 527	1 273	36.1	0	0.00	0	0–2
2022–23	3 316	1 326	40.0	0	0.00	0	0–2

3.3.2 Seabird captures

Annual observed seabird capture rates in the orange roughy, oreo and cardinalfish trawl fisheries have ranged from 0 to 1.02 per 100 tows between 2002–03 and 2022–23 (Table 4). The average observed capture rate in deepwater trawl fisheries (including orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish) for the period from 2002–03 to 2022–23 is about 0.41 birds per 100 tows, a very low rate relative to other New Zealand trawl fisheries, e.g., for scampi (3.8 birds per 100 tows) and squid (12 birds per 100 tows) over the same years.

Table 4: Number of tows by fishing year and observed and estimated seabird captures in orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish trawl fisheries. No. obs, number of observed tows; % obs, percentage of tows observed; Rate, number of captures per 100 observed tows. Estimates are based on methods described by Abraham & Richard (2020) and are available online at <https://protectedspeciescaptures.nz/PSCv9/released/>.

Fishing year	Fishing effort			Observed captures		Estimated captures	
	Tows	Observed tows	% observed	Number	Rate	Mean	95% c.i.
2002–03	8 870	1 380	15.6	0	0.00	38	22–57
2003–04	8 008	1 262	15.8	3	0.24	37	22–54
2004–05	8 424	1 618	19.2	7	0.43	39	25–56
2005–06	8 291	1 357	16.4	8	0.59	40	26–56
2006–07	7 369	2 322	31.5	1	0.04	24	13–38
2007–08	6 730	2 811	41.8	7	0.25	28	17–42
2008–09	6 133	2 372	38.7	7	0.30	25	15–38
2009–10	6 013	2 136	35.5	19	0.89	37	27–51
2010–11	4 177	1 205	28.8	1	0.08	16	7–28
2011–12	3 655	922	25.2	2	0.22	17	8–29
2012–13	3 099	346	11.2	2	0.58	16	7–28
2013–14	3 606	434	12.0	2	0.46	20	10–34
2014–15	3 812	978	25.7	0	0.00	16	7–29
2015–16	4 083	1 421	34.8	4	0.28	17	9–29
2016–17	3 971	1 226	30.9	2	0.16	16	8–28
2017–18	3 752	903	24.1	4	0.44	18	9–29
2018–19	3 906	1 189	30.4	11	0.93	24	16–35
2019–20	3 944	1 171	29.7	5	0.43	18	10–28
2020–21	4 072	1 322	32.5	10	0.76	23	15–34
2021–22	3 527	1 273	36.1	13	1.02	23	17–33
2022–23	3 316	1 326	40.0	6	0.45	15	9–24

Salvin's albatross was the most frequently captured albatross (38% of observed albatross captures), but eight different albatross species have been observed captured since 2002–03. Cape petrels were the most frequently captured other taxon (29% of observed captures of taxa other than albatross, Table 5). Seabird captures in the orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish fisheries have been observed mostly around the Chatham Rise and off the east coast South Island. These numbers should be regarded as only a general guide on the distribution of captures because the observer coverage is not uniform across areas and may not be representative.

Table 5: Number of tows by fishing year and observed and estimated New Zealand seabird captures in orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish trawl fisheries. No. obs, number of observed tows; % obs, percentage of tows observed; Rate, number of captures per 100 observed tows. Estimates are based on methods described by Abraham & Richard (2020) and are available online at <https://protectedspeciescaptures.nz/PSCv9/released/>.

Species	Risk Category	Chatham Rise	East coast South Island	Fiordland	Sub-Antarctic	Stewart-Snares shelf	West coast South Island	West coast North Island	Total
Salvin's albatross	High	17	6	0	3	0	0	0	26
Southern Buller's albatross	Very high	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	5
Chatham Island albatross	Medium	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	12
New Zealand white-capped albatross	High	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	8
Gibson's albatross	Medium	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Antipodean albatross	Medium	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Northern royal albatross	Low	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Southern royal albatross	Low	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3
Black-browed albatross	NA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Albatrosses	NA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total albatrosses	NA	43	7	2	5	0	3	0	60
Northern giant petrel	Low	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	4
White-chinned petrel	Low	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
Grey petrel	Negligible	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3
Sooty shearwater	Negligible	5	3	0	0	0	1	0	9
Common diving petrel	Negligible	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	9
White-faced storm petrels	Negligible	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Cape petrel	NA	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	7
Petrels, prions, and shearwaters	NA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Double-banded plover	NA	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Fairy prion	Negligible	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Grey-backed storm petrel	NA	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Short-tailed shearwater	NA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Snares Cape petrel	Low	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Southern giant petrel	NA	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Total other birds	NA	32	7	6	3	1	4	1	54

The deepwater trawl fisheries (including the orange roughy target fishery) contribute to the total risk posed by New Zealand commercial fishing to seabirds (see Table 6). The two species to which the

fishery poses the most risk are Chatham Island albatross and Southern royal albatross, with this suite of fisheries posing 0.09 and 0.01 of risk (Table 6). Chatham Island albatross is assessed as at medium risk and Southern royal albatross as at low risk (Edwards et al. 2023).

Mitigation methods such as streamer (tori) lines, Brady bird bafflers, warp deflectors, and offal management are used in the orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish trawl fisheries. Warp mitigation was voluntarily introduced from about 2004 and made mandatory in April 2006 (Department of Internal Affairs 2006). The 2006 notice mandated that all trawlers over 28 m in length use a seabird scaring device while trawling (being “paired streamer lines”, “bird baffler”, or “warp deflector” as defined in the notice).

Table 6: Risk ratio of seabirds predicted by the SEFRA for the deepwater trawl fishery and all fisheries included in the SEFRA, 2006–07 to 2019–20, with a risk posed by the domestic tuna and swordfish SLL fishery. The risk ratio is an estimate of aggregate potential fatalities across trawl and longline fisheries relative to the Population Sustainability Threshold, PST (an analogue of the PBR approach) (Edwards et al. 2023). The current version of the risk assessment does not include a recovery factor. The New Zealand threat classifications are shown (Robertson et al. 2021).

Species name	Risk ratio			Risk category	NZ Threat Classification
	Deepwater trawl	Total risk from NZ commercial fishing	% of total risk from NZ commercial fishing		
Salvin's albatross	0.01	0.69	1.3	High	Threatened: Nationally Critical
Chatham Island albatross	0.09	0.27	34.0	Medium	At Risk: Naturally Uncommon
Northern Buller's albatross	<0.01	0.19	1.3	Medium	At Risk: Naturally Uncommon
Southern royal albatross	0.01	0.08	9.1	Low	Threatened: Nationally Vulnerable

3.3.3 Protected fish species captures

Deepwater trawling for orange roughy and oreo typically exceeds the depth at which protected fish species are usually found. Fisheries-reported records include the capture of a basking shark (*Cetorhinus maximus*) in 2019, a species classified as “Endangered” by IUCN in 2013 and as “Threatened – Nationally Vulnerable” in 2016, under the New Zealand Threat Classification System (Duffy et al. 2018). Basking shark has been a protected species in New Zealand since 2010, under the Wildlife Act 1953, and is also listed in Appendix II of the CITES convention. However, basking sharks have been occasionally confused with bluntnose sixgill shark (*Hexanchus griseus*), a “Not Threatened” species according to the DOC latest assessment (Duffy et al. 2018).

An observer-reported capture includes the smalltooth sandtiger shark (deepwater nurse shark) *Odontaspis ferox* in 2012, classified as “Critically Endangered” by the IUCN Red List and “At Risk–Naturally Uncommon” under the New Zealand Threat Classification System (Duffy et al. 2018).

Protected coral species are reported caught in orange roughy fisheries (McGovern & Hewettson 2025). The main coral taxa reported are stony corals including *Goniocorella dumosa* (Anderson & Finnuci 2022) with 8831 kg observed caught between 2015 and 2022.

3.4 Benthic interactions

The spatial extent of seabed contact by trawl fishing gear in New Zealand’s EEZ and Territorial Sea has been estimated and mapped in numerous studies for trawl fisheries targeting deepwater species (Baird et al. 2011, Black et al. 2013, Black & Tilney 2015, Black & Tilney 2017, Baird & Wood 2018, and Baird & Mules 2019, 2021a, 2021b), species in waters shallower than 250 m (Baird et al. 2015, Baird & Mules 2020a), and all trawl fisheries combined (Baird & Mules 2021a, 2021b, MacGibbon et al. 2024). The most recent estimates of the deepwater trawl footprint was for the period 1989–90 to 2023–24 and was completed using a combination of fisher reported and Geospatial Position Reporting (GPR) data by MPI.

Orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish are taken using bottom trawls and accounted for about 18% of all tows reported that fished on or close to the bottom between 1989–90 and 2023–24. From 1989–90 to 2023–24, about 148 000 orange roughy bottom trawls were reported on TCEPRs and ERS: with between 5000 and at least 8000 tows reported most years up to 1999–2000; 3000–4500 annual tows between 2000–01 and 2009–10; and 1300–3100 tows a year during 2010–11 to 2023–24. The total footprint generated from these tows was estimated at about 46 825 km². This footprint represented

coverage of 1% of the seafloor of the combined EEZ and the Territorial Sea areas and 3% of the ‘fishable area’, that is, the seafloor area open to trawling, in depths of less than 1600 m. For the 2023–24 fishing year, 1351 orange roughy bottom tows had an estimated footprint of 2468 km² which represented coverage of < 0.1% of the EEZ and Territorial Sea and 0.2% of the fishable area.

The overall trawl footprint for orange roughy (1989–90 to 2020–21) covered 12% of the seafloor in 800–1000 m, 9% of 1000–1200 m seafloor, and 3% of the 1200–1600 m seafloor (MacGibbon & Mules 2023). In 2023–24, the orange roughy footprint contacted 0.9%, 0.6%, and < 0.1% of those depth ranges, respectively. Deepsea corals in the New Zealand region are diverse and, because of their fragility, are at risk from anthropogenic activities such as bottom trawling (Clark & O’Driscoll 2003, Clark & Rowden 2009, Williams et al. 2010). All deepwater hard corals are protected under Schedule 7A of the Wildlife Act 1953. Baird et al. (2013) mapped the likely coral distributions using predictive models and concluded that the fisheries that pose the most risk to protected corals are these deepwater trawl fisheries.

Trawling for orange roughy, like trawling for other species, is likely to have effects on benthic community structure and function (e.g., Rice 2006) and there may be consequences for benthic productivity (e.g., Jennings et al. 2001, Hermesen et al. 2003, Hiddink et al. 2006, Reiss et al. 2009). These consequences are not considered in detail here but are discussed in the Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Annual Review 2021 (Fisheries New Zealand 2021).

The New Zealand EEZ contains Benthic Protection Areas (BPAs) and seamount closures that are closed to bottom trawl fishing for the protection of benthic biodiversity. These combined areas include 28% of underwater topographic features (including seamounts), 52% of all seamounts over 1000 m elevation, and 88% of identified hydrothermal vents. A significant proportion of BPAs is deeper than 1500m.

3.5 Other considerations

Fishing during spawning may disrupt spawning activity or success. There is no research on the disruption of spawning orange roughy by fishing in New Zealand.

Some orange roughy spawning aggregations were historically abundant but depleted by fishing, predominantly during the 1980s and 1990s, and no longer seem to occur. This includes the large aggregations on Strawberry Mountain in the Mid-East Coast stock, and on Central Flats in the Challenger stock. On Chatham Rise, the main spawning aggregation no longer occurs at the Old Spawning Plume but at Rekohu, and spawning aggregations occur on the Morgue Hill but no longer the Graveyard Hill. The relationship between different spawning aggregations within the same assumed stock, and the implications of the loss of spawning aggregations for orange roughy and the wider ecosystem, is unknown.

3.5.2 Genetic effects

Fishing, environmental changes, including those caused by climate change or pollution, could alter the genetic composition or diversity of a species. There are no known studies of the genetic diversity of orange roughy from New Zealand. Genetic studies for stock discrimination are reported under “stocks and areas”.

3.5.3 Habitat of particular significance to fisheries management

Fisheries New Zealand have developed guidelines on the identification of habitats of particular significance for fisheries management ([Habitats of particular significance for fisheries management | NZ Government](#)), and is in the process of reviewing available evidence for the development of an online register of habitats. Mace et al. (1990) identified only one area of high abundance for juvenile orange roughy at 800–900 m depth about 150 km east of the main spawning ground on the north Chatham Rise. Orange roughy from 9 cm SL have also been located on the Challenger Plateau and O’Driscoll et al. (2003) show other areas where immature fish are relatively common. Dunn et al. (2009) showed that orange roughy juveniles are generally found close to the seabed, and in shallower water than the adults, starting off at depths of around 850–900 m and spreading deeper, and over a wider depth range, as they grow. Dunn & Forman (2011) also suggested that juveniles start on flat grounds shallower than the adults, that they shift deeper as they grow, and that seamounts and other features tend to be dominated

by the largest orange roughy. It is not known if there are any direct linkages between the congregation of orange roughy around features and the corals found on those features. Bottom trawling for orange roughy has the potential to affect features of the habitat that could qualify as habitat of particular significance to fisheries management.

4. RECENT STOCK ASSESSMENTS

In this section, methods and assumptions common to stock assessments since 2014 are described.

4.1 Data quality and model structure

A high-quality threshold imposed on data before they were used in an assessment resulted in the exclusion of biomass estimates that had previously been used. In particular, CPUE indices were not used in any of the assessments because, despite often pronounced trends, they were considered unlikely to be monitoring stock-wide abundance although they may provide information on local abundance trends. Estimates of biomass from egg surveys were not used as assumptions of the survey design were not met, and/or there were major difficulties in analysing the survey data. Acoustic-survey estimates of biomass were only used when mainly single-species aggregations were surveyed with suitable equipment. Estimates of spawning orange roughy biomass were accepted for plumes on the flat surveyed using hull-mounted transducers or towed systems. On underwater features, estimates were accepted when the shadow zone estimate was no more than about 10% of the total estimate. For hull-mounted transducers, this requires that the plumes are high in the water column or near the top of the feature (and not on the side of the feature where shadow zone corrections are often large).

Models either estimate maturity within the model from age frequencies of spawning fish, or assume a maturity ogive estimated from otolith transition zones. The ogive used to define Spawning Stock Biomass (*SSB*) is explicitly a *spawning* ogive, and the *SSB* is not necessarily the same as mature biomass (see Dunn et al. 2008 for a review of the non-spawning proportion).

The recent assessment models now include more age data using a more reliable ageing methodology (Tracey et al. 2007, Horn et al. 2016).

4.2 Acoustic q priors

The major sources of recent abundance information in the models are from acoustic surveys of spawning biomass. For each survey, the spawning biomass estimate was included in the appropriate assessment as an estimate of *relative* spawning biomass rather than *absolute* spawning biomass. The reason that the estimates are not used as absolute estimates of biomass (i.e., $q = 1$) is because there are two major potential sources of bias: (i) the estimates may be biased low or high because the estimate of orange roughy target strength is incorrect, and (ii) the survey is unlikely to have covered all of the spawning stock biomass. The unknown proportionality constant, or q , for each survey was estimated in the model using an informed prior for each q . Each prior was constructed from two components: orange roughy target strength and availability to the survey.

The target strength (TS) prior was derived from the estimates of Macaulay et al. (2013) and Kloser et al. (2013) who both obtained TS estimates (at 38 kHz) from visually verified orange roughy as they were herded by a trawl net (the “AOS” was mounted on the head of the net and acoustic echoes and stereo photos were obtained simultaneously). Macaulay et al. (2013) estimated a TS (for 33.9 cm fish) of -52.0 dB with a 95% CI of -53.3 to -50.9 dB; Kloser et al. (2013) gave a point estimate of -51.1 dB and gave a range, that allowed for the artificial tilt angles of the herded fish, from -52.2 to -50.7 dB. The prior was taken to be normal with a mean of -52.0 dB with 99% of the distribution covered by ± 1.5 dB (which covers both ranges). This results in a tight distribution for informed acoustic q priors, reflecting a high confidence in the target strength estimates.

For surveys that covered ‘most’ of the spawning stock biomass (e.g., ESCR where in some years surveys covered the Old plume², the Rekohu plume, and the “Crack”), availability was modelled with a

²For clarity, what was previously described as the ‘Spawning plume’ located in the Spawning Box has been renamed the ‘Old-plume’ so as to differentiate it from the Rekohu plume, which is also a spawning plume in the Spawning Box.

Beta(8,2) distribution (this has a mean of 0.8 – i.e., it is assumed *a priori* that 80% of the spawning stock biomass is being indexed; this was based upon acoustic biomass estimates available from the northeast Chatham Rise in the early 2000s; see table 15 in the East & South Chatham Rise assessment chapter, Ministry of Fisheries 2008). The acoustic q prior is the combination of the availability and TS priors (assuming they are independent), and was approximately normal with a mean of 0.8 and a CV of 19%.

5. FUTURE RESEARCH CONSIDERATIONS

The research considerations below are generic to all or most of the orange roughy assessments.

- Continue to improve methods to reduce contamination by swim-bladder species when using current AOS technology to estimate orange roughy acoustic biomass, and determine the potential magnitude of possible errors.
- Greater detail is needed on the performance of tows or transects from surveys, especially when there are issues with them. Such detail should be included in the comment field and will enable analysts to determine how or whether to include them in models.
- Provide a more detailed protocol for otolith collections in surveys to ensure sufficient otoliths are collected. For example, it may be useful to oversample in case insufficient samples are collected subsequently.
- Re-examine the $M=0.045$ and $h=0.75$ assumptions for each orange roughy assessment.
- Review the appropriateness of assuming a 5% catch overrun for current and recent years.
- Adequate age information is needed for all stocks from both surveys and from commercial fisheries. Review available data and explore the potential for improvement in sampling through both observer sampling and industry based sampling.
- Locate data on Enterprise Allocation (the system used to award quota for deepwater species in the 3 years prior to the full introduction of the QMS – a precursor to the QMS) catches and limits for 1983–86 and include these in Plenary catch tables and graphs, as well as in stock assessments.
- Review the Management Strategy Evaluation and the resulting Harvest Control Rule, along with their application, in a technical Working Group to ensure that the approach still represents best practice.
- Re-evaluate stock structure assumptions as new data become available, potentially making use of relevant novel techniques (genetics, tagging, otolith microchemistry).
- Further investigate the relationship between maturity and spawning, and the potential for age-dependent skipped spawning.
- Review the appropriateness of the allowance for spawning in other locations made in the interpretation of acoustic survey data (i.e., $q = 0.8$) for all stocks.
- Review available data to explore the disturbance effects on spawning plumes, and the impact this may have on acoustic surveys.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Abraham, E R; Richard, Y (2017) Summary of the capture of seabirds in New Zealand commercial fisheries, 2002–03 to 2013–14. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 184*. 88 p.
- Abraham, E R; Richard, Y (2018) Estimated capture of seabirds in New Zealand trawl and longline fisheries, 2002–03 to 2014–15. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 197*. 97 p.
- Abraham, E R; Richard, Y (2020) Estimated capture of seabirds in New Zealand trawl and longline fisheries, to 2017–18. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 249*. 86 p.
- Abraham, E R; Richard, Y; Berkenbusch, K; Thompson, F (2016) Summary of the capture of seabirds, marine mammals, and turtles in New Zealand commercial fisheries, 2002–03 to 2012–13. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 169*. 205 p.
- Abraham, E R; Thompson, F N (2011) Summary of the capture of seabirds, marine mammals, and turtles in New Zealand commercial fisheries, 1998–99 to 2008–09. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 80*.
- Abraham, E R; Thompson, F N; Berkenbusch, K (2013) Estimated capture of seabirds in New Zealand trawl and longline fisheries, 2002–03 to 2010–11. (Unpublished Final Research Report for Ministry for Primary Industries project PRO2010-01, held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Abraham, E R; Thompson, F N; Oliver, M D (2010) Summary of the capture of seabirds, mammals, and turtles in New Zealand commercial fisheries, 1998–99 to 2007–08. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 45*. 149 p.
- Abraham, E R; Tremblay-Boyer, L; Berkenbusch, K (2021) Estimated captures of New Zealand fur seal, common dolphin, and turtles in New

- Zealand commercial fisheries, to 2017–18. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 258*. 94 p.
- Anderson, O F; Dunn, M R (2007) Descriptive analysis of catch and effort data from New Zealand orange roughy fisheries in ORH 1, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B and 7B to the end of the 2004–05 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/29*. 71 p.
- Anderson, O F; Finucci, B (2022) Non-target fish and invertebrate catch and discards in New Zealand orange roughy and oreo trawl fisheries from 2002–03 to 2019–20. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 282*. 117 p.
- Anderson, O F; Gilbert, D J; Clark, M R (2001) Fish discards and non-target catch in the trawl fisheries for orange roughy and hoki in New Zealand waters for the fishing years 1990–91 to 1998–99. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/16*. 57 p.
- Andrews, A H; Tracey, D M (2003) Age validation of orange roughy, oreos, and black cardinalfish. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project DEE2000/02. 25 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Andrews, A H; Tracey, D M; Dunn, M R (2009) Lead-radium dating of orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*): validation of a centenarian lifespan. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science* 66: 1130–1140.
- Baird, S J (2004a) Estimation of the incidental capture of seabird and marine mammal species in commercial fisheries in New Zealand waters, 1999–2000. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2004/41*. 56 p.
- Baird, S J (2004b) Incidental capture of seabird species in commercial fisheries in New Zealand waters, 2000–01. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2004/58*. 63 p.
- Baird, S J (2004c) Incidental capture of seabird species in commercial fisheries in New Zealand waters, 2001–02. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2004/60*. 51 p.
- Baird, S J (2005) Incidental capture of seabird species in commercial fisheries in New Zealand waters, 2002–03. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2005/2*. 50 p.
- Baird, S J; Hewitt, J E; Wood, B A (2015) Benthic habitat classes and trawl fishing disturbance in New Zealand waters shallower than 250 m. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 144*. 184 p.
- Baird, S J; Mules, R (2019) Extent of bottom contact by New Zealand commercial trawl fishing for deepwater Tier 1 and Tier 2 target species determined using CatchMapper software, fishing years 2008–17. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 229*. 106 p.
- Baird, S J; Mules, R (2021a) Extent of bottom contact by commercial fishing activity in New Zealand waters, for 1989–90 to 2017–18. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 259*. 143 p.
- Baird, S J; Mules, R (2021b) Extent of bottom contact by commercial trawling and dredging in New Zealand waters, 1989–90 to 2018–19. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 260*. 157 p.
- Baird, S J; Smith, M H (2007) Incidental capture of New Zealand fur seals (*Arctocephalus forsteri*) in commercial fisheries in New Zealand waters, 2003–04 to 2004–05. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 14*. 98 p.
- Baird, S J; Tracey, D; Mormede, S; Clark, M (2013) The distribution of protected corals in New Zealand waters DOC12303/POP2011-06. NIWA Client Report No: WLG2012-43. Prepared for Marine Conservation Services, Department of Conservation and Te Papa Atawhai 93 p. <https://www.doc.govt.nz/globalassets/documents/conservation/marine-and-coastal/marine-conservation-services/reports/pre-2019-annual-plans/pop-2011-06-coral-distribution.pdf>
- Baird, S J; Wood, B A (2012) Extent of coverage of 15 environmental classes within the New Zealand EEZ by commercial trawling with seafloor contact. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 89*. 43 p.
- Baird, S J; Wood, B A (2018) Extent of bottom contact by New Zealand commercial trawl fishing for deepwater Tier 1 and Tier 2 target fishstocks, 1989–90 to 2015–16. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 193*. 102 p.
- Baird, S J; Wood, B A; Bagley, N W (2011) Nature and extent of commercial fishing effort on or near the seafloor within the New Zealand 200 n. mile Exclusive Economic Zone, 1989–90 to 2004–05. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 73*. 143 p.
- Baker, C S; Boren, L; Childerhouse, S; Constantine, R; van Helden, A; Lundquist, D; Rayment, W; Rolfe, J R (2019) Conservation status of New Zealand marine mammals, 2019. *New Zealand Threat Classification Series 29*. Department of Conservation, Wellington. 18 p.
- Baker, C S; Chilvers, B L; Constantine, R; DuFresne, S; Mattlin, R H; van Helden, A; Hitchmough, R (2010) Conservation status of New Zealand marine mammals (suborders Cetacea and Pinnipedia), 2009. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 44: 101–115.
- Baker, C S; Chilvers, B L; Childerhouse, S; Constantine, R; Currey, R; Mattlin, R; van Helden, A; Hitchmough, R; Rolfe, J (2016) Conservation status of New Zealand marine mammals 2013. *New Zealand Threat Classification Series 14*. Department of Conservation. 22 p.
- Ballara, S L; Anderson, O F (2009) Fish discards and non-target fish catch in the trawl fisheries for arrow squid and scampi in New Zealand waters. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 38*. 102 p.
- Black, J; Tilney, R (2015) Monitoring New Zealand's trawl footprint for deepwater fisheries: 1989–1990 to 2010–2011. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 142*. 56 p.
- Black, J; Tilney, R (2017) Monitoring New Zealand's trawl footprint for deepwater fisheries: 1989–90 to 2012–13. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 176*. 65 p.
- Black, J; Wood, R; Berthelsen, T; Tilney, R (2013) Monitoring New Zealand's trawl footprint for deepwater fisheries: 1989–1990 to 2009–2010. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 110*. 57 p.
- Brothers, N; Duckworth, A R; Safina, C; Gilman, E L (2010) Seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries is grossly underestimated when using only haul data. *PloS One* 5: e12491. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.001249
- Bull, B; Francis, R I C C; Dunn, A; Gilbert, D J; Bian, R; Fu, D (2012) CASAL (C++ algorithmic stock assessment laboratory): CASAL User Manual v2.30-2012/03/21. *NIWA Technical Report 135*. 280 p.
- Bulman, C M; Koslow, J A (1992) Diet and food consumption of a deep-sea fish, orange roughy *Hoplostethus atlanticus* (Pisces: Percichthyidae) of southeastern Australia. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 82: 115–129.
- Clark, M R (1999) Fisheries for orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) on seamounts in New Zealand. *Oceanologica Acta* 22(6): 593–602.
- Clark, M R (2006) Descriptive analysis of orange roughy fisheries in the New Zealand region outside the EEZ: Lord Howe Rise, Northwest Challenger Plateau, West Norfolk Ridge, South Tasman Rise, and Louisville Ridge to the end of the 2004–05 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2006/56*. 38 p.
- Clark, M R (2008) Descriptive analysis of orange roughy fisheries in the New Zealand region outside the EEZ: Lord Howe Rise, northwest Challenger Plateau, west Norfolk Ridge, south Tasman Rise and Louisville Ridge to the end of the 2005–06 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/12*. 45 p.
- Clark, M R; Anderson, O F; Francis, R I C C; Tracey, D M (2000) The effects of commercial exploitation on orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) from the continental slope of the Chatham Rise, New Zealand, from 1979 to 1997. *Fisheries Research* 45(3): 217–238.
- Clark, M R; Fincham, D J; Tracey, D M (1994) Fecundity of orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) in New Zealand waters. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 28: 193–200.
- Clark, M; O'Driscoll, R (2003) Deepwater fisheries and aspects of their impact on seamount habitat in New Zealand. *Journal of Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Science* 31: 441–458.
- Clark, M R; Rowden, A A (2009) Effect of deepwater trawling on the macro-invertebrate assemblages of seamounts on the Chatham Rise, New Zealand. *Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers*, 56(9): 1540–1554.

- Cordue, P L (2014a) The 2014 orange roughy stock assessments. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/50*. 135 p.
- Cordue, P L (2014b) A Management Strategy Evaluation for orange roughy. ISL Client Report for Deepwater Group. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Department of Internal Affairs (2006) Seabird Scaring Devices – Circular Issued Under Authority of the Fisheries (Commercial Fishing) Amendment Regulations 2006 (No. F361). *New Zealand Gazette 6 April 2006* : 842–846.
- Doonan, I J (1994) Life history parameters of orange roughy; estimates for 1994. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document: 1994/19*. 14 p.
- Doonan, I J; Dunn, M R (2011) Trawl survey of Mid-East Coast orange roughy, March–April 2010. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2011/20*. 62 p.
- Doonan, I J; Francis, R I C C; Horn, P; Tracey, D M (1998) Update of biological parameters for orange roughy. Report to Deepwater Stock Assessment Working Group, 98/16. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Doonan, I J; Tracey, D M (1997) Natural mortality estimates for orange roughy in ORH 1 (Bay of Plenty). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1997/26*. 9 p.
- Duffy, C; Francis, M; Dunn, M; Finucci, B; Ford, R; Hitchmough, R; Rolfe, J (2018) Conservation status of New Zealand chondrichthyans (chimaeras, sharks and rays), 2016. *New Zealand Threat Classification Series 23*. Department of Conservation, Wellington. 13 p.
- Dunn, M R; Forman, J S (2011) Hypotheses of spatial stock structure in orange roughy *Hoplostethus atlanticus* inferred from diet, feeding, condition, and reproductive activity. *PLoS ONE 6(11)*: e26704.
- Dunn, M R; Rickard, G J; Sutton, P J H; Doonan, I J (2009) Nursery grounds of the orange roughy around New Zealand. *ICES Journal of Marine Science 66*: 871–885.
- Dunn, M R; Stevens, D W; Forman, J S; Connell, A (2013) Trophic Interactions and Distribution of Some Squaliforme Sharks, Including New Diet Descriptions for *Deania calcea* and *Squalus acanthias*. *PLoS ONE 8(3)*: e59938. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0059938
- Dunn, M R; Szabo, A; McVeagh, M S; Smith, P J (2010) The diet of deepwater sharks and the benefits of using DNA identification of prey. *Deep-Sea Research I 57*: 923–930.
- Dunn, M R; A' mar, T; Doonan, I J (2022) Assessment of the Mid-East Coast orange roughy stock for 2022. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/38*. 77 p.
- Dunn, M R (2024) Stock assessment research for Chatham Rise orange roughy in 2023. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/46*. 36 p.
- Edwards, C T T; Peatman, T; Goad D; Webber, D N (2023) Update to the risk assessment for New Zealand seabirds. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 314*. 66 p.
- Finucci, B; Edwards, C T T; Anderson, O F; Ballara, S L (2019) Fish and invertebrate bycatch in New Zealand deepwater fisheries from 1990–91 until 2016–17. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 210*. 77 p.
- Fisheries New Zealand (2021) Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Annual Review 2021. Compiled by the Aquatic Environment Team, Fisheries Science and Information, Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand. 779 p.
- Francis, M P; Hurst, R J; McArdle, B H; Bagley, N W; Anderson, O F (2002) New Zealand demersal fish assemblages. *Environmental Biology of Fishes 65(2)*: 215–234.
- Francis, R I C C (1992) Recommendations concerning the calculation of maximum constant yield (MCY) and current annual yield (CAY). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1992/8*. 27 p.
- Francis, R I C C; Horn, P L (1997) The transitions zone in otoliths of orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) and its relationship to the onset of maturity. *Marine Biology 129*: 681–687.
- Francis, R I C C; Robertson, D A; Clark, M R; Doonan, I J; Coburn, R P; Zeldis, J R (1993) Assessment of the ORH 3B orange roughy fishery for the 1993/94 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1993/7*. 44 p.
- Gaskin, D E; Cawthorn, M W (1967) Diet and feeding habits of the sperm whale (*Physeter catodon* L.) in the Cook Strait region of New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research 1*: 156–179.
- Hallet, C S; Daley, R K (2011) Feeding ecology of the southern lanternshark (*Etmopterus baxteri*) and the brown lanternshark (*E. unicolor*) off southeastern Australia. *ICES Journal of Marine Science 68*: 157–165.
- Hermesen, J M; Collie, J S; Valentine, P C (2003) Mobile fishing gear reduces benthic megafaunal production on Georges Bank. *Marine Ecology Progress Series 260*: 97–108.
- Hicks, A C (2006) Growth, length-weight, and maturity estimates for the Northeast Chatham Rise. WG-Deepwater-06/13. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Hiddink, J G; Jennings, S; Kaiser, M J; Queiros, A M; Duplisea, D E; Piet, G J (2006) Cumulative impacts of seabed trawl disturbance on benthic biomass, production, and species richness in different habitats. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 63*: 721–36.
- Hilborn, R; Walters, C J (1992) *Quantitative fisheries stock assessment: choice, dynamics, and uncertainty*. Chapman and Hall, New York, 570 p.
- Horn, P L; Tracey, D M; Clark, M R (1998) Between-area differences in age and length at first maturity of orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*). *Marine Biology 132 (2)*: 187–194.
- Horn, P L; Tracey, D M; Doonan, I J; Krusic-Golub, K (2016) Age determination protocol for orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2016/03*. 30 p.
- Jennings, S; Dinmore, T A; Duplisea, D E; Warr, K J; Lancaster, J E (2001) Trawling disturbance can modify benthic production processes. *Journal of Animal Ecology 70*: 459–475.
- Jereb, P; Roper, C F E (2010) (eds) Cephalopods of the world. An annotated and illustrated catalogue of cephalopod species known to date. Volume 2. Myopsid and Oegopsid Squids. *FAO Species Catalogue for Fishery Purposes. No. 4, Vol. 2*. Rome, FAO. 2010. 605 p.
- Kloser, R J; Macaulay, G J; Ryan, T E; Lewis, M (2013) Identification and target strength of orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) measured in situ. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 134*: 97–108.
- Koslow, J A (1997) Seamounts and the Ecology of Deep-sea Fishes. *American Scientist Vol. 85*. 168–176.
- Leathwick, J R; Rowden, A; Nodder, S; Gorman, R; Bardsley, S; Pinkerton, M; Baird, S J; Hadfield, M; Currie, K; Goh, A (2012) Benthic-optimised marine environment classification for New Zealand waters. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 88*. 54 p.
- Macaulay, G J; Kloser, R J; Ryan, T E (2013) *In situ* target strength estimates of visually verified orange roughy. *ICES Journal of Marine Science 70*: 215–222.
- Mace, P M; Fenaughty, J F; Coburn, R P; Doonan, I J (1990) Growth and productivity of orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) on the north Chatham Rise. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research 24*: 105–119.
- MacGibbon, D J; Mules, R (2023) Extent and intensity of bottom contact by commercial trawling and shellfish dredging in New Zealand waters, 1990–2021. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 316*. 174 p.
- MacKenzie, D; Fletcher, D (2006) Characterisation of seabird captures in commercial trawl and longline fisheries in New Zealand 1997/98 to 2003/04. (Unpublished Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries project ENV2004/04, held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 102 p.
- McGovern, H; Hewetson (2025) Conservation Services Programme Annual Research Summary 2022–23. February 2025. Department of Conservation, Wellington, 110 p.

- Middleton, D A J; Abraham, E R (2007) The efficacy of warp strike mitigation devices: Trials in the 2006 squid fishery. (Unpublished Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries project IPA2006/02, held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Ministry of Fisheries (2008) Report from the Fisheries Assessment Plenary, May 2008: stock assessments and yield estimates. Ministry of Fisheries, Wellington, New Zealand. 990p.
- Morgan, M J; Wilson, C E; Crim, L W (1999) The effect of stress on reproduction in Atlantic cod. *Journal of Fish Biology* 54(3): 477–488.
- MPI (2013) Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Annual Review 2013. Compiled by the Fisheries Management Science Team, Ministry for Primary Industries, Wellington, New Zealand. 538 p.
- O'Driscoll, R L; Booth, J D; Bagley, N W; Anderson, O F; Griggs, L H; Stevenson, M L; Francis, M P (2003) Areas of importance for spawning, pupping or egg-laying, and juveniles of New Zealand deepwater fish, pelagic fish, and invertebrates. *NIWA Technical Report* 119. 377 p.
- O'Driscoll, R L; MacGibbon, D; Fu, D; Lyon, W; Stevens, D W (2011) A review of hoki and middle depth trawl surveys of the Chatham Rise, January 1992–2010. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2011/47. 814 p.
- Pankhurst, N W (1988) Spawning dynamics of orange roughy, *Hoplostethus atlanticus*, in mid-slope waters of New Zealand. *Environmental biology of fishes* 21: 101–116.
- Paul, L J; Tracey, D M; Francis, R I C C (2002) Age validation of deepwater fish species, with particular reference to New Zealand orange roughy and oreos: a literature review. (Unpublished Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project DEE200002, held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 33 p.
- Ramm, K (2012) Conservation Services Programme Observer Report: 1 July 2010 to 30 June 2011. FINAL REPORT. Conservation Services Programme, Department of Conservation, November 2012. (Unpublished report held by Department of Conservation, Wellington.)
- Reiss, H; Greenstreet, S P R; Siebe, K; Ehrich, S; Piet, G J; Quirijns, F; Robinson, L; Wolff, W J; Kronke, I (2009) Effects of fishing disturbance on benthic communities and secondary production within an intensely fished area. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 394:201–213.
- Rice, J (2006) Impacts of Mobile Bottom Gears on Seafloor Habitats, Species, and Communities: A Review and Synthesis of Selected International Reviews. *Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Research Document* 2006/057. 35 p. (available from http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/CSAS/Csas/DocREC/2006/RES2006_057_e.pdf).
- Richard, Y; Abraham, E R (2013) Risk of commercial fisheries to New Zealand seabird populations. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 109*. 58 p.
- Richard, Y; Abraham, E R (2015) Assessment of the risk of commercial fisheries to New Zealand seabirds, 2006–07 to 2012–13. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 162*. 85 p.
- Richard, Y; Abraham, E R; Berkenbusch, K (2017) Assessment of the risk of commercial fisheries to New Zealand seabirds, 2006–07 to 2014–15. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 191*. 133 p.
- Richard, Y; Abraham, E R; Berkenbusch, K (2020) Assessment of the risk of commercial fisheries to New Zealand seabirds, 2006–07 to 2016–17. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 237*. 57 p.
- Robertson, H A; Baird, K A; Elliott, G P; Hitchmough, R A; McArthur, N J; Makan, T D; Miskelly, C M; O'Donnell, C F J; Sagar, P M; Scofield, R P; Taylor, G A; Michel, P (2021) Conservation status of birds in Aotearoa New Zealand, 2021. *New Zealand Threat Classification Series* 36. Department of Conservation, Wellington. 43 p.
- Rossechi, E; Tracey, D M; Weber, W R (1988) Diet of orange roughy, *Hoplostethus atlanticus* (Pisces: Trachichthyidae), on the Challenger Plateau, New Zealand. *Marine Biology* 99: 293–306.
- Stevens, D W; Hurst, R J; Bagley, N W (2011) Feeding habits of New Zealand fishes: a literature review and summary of research trawl database records 1960 to 2000. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 85*.
- Thompson, F N; Abraham, E R; Oliver, M D (2010) Estimation of fur seal bycatch in New Zealand sea lions trawl fisheries, 2002–03 to 2007–08. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 56*. 29 p.
- Thompson, F N; Berkenbusch, K; Abraham, E R (2013) Marine mammal bycatch in New Zealand trawl fisheries, 1995–96 to 2010–11. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 105*. 73 p.
- Tingley, G; Dunn, M (Eds) (2018) Global review of orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*), their fisheries, biology and management. *FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Technical Paper No. 622*. Rome. 128. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.
- Tracey, D M; McMillan, P J; Armstrong, J M; Banks, D A (1990) Orange roughy trawl survey: Challenger Plateau and west coast South Island, 1983. *New Zealand Fisheries Technical Report No. 22*. 34 p.
- Tracey, D; Baird, S J; Sanders, B M; Smith, M H (2011) Distribution of protected corals in relation to fishing effort and assessment of accuracy of observer identification. NIWA Client Report No: WLG2011-33 prepared for Department of Conservation, Wellington. 74 p.
- Tracey, D; Clark, M; Bull, B; Mackay, K (2004) Fish species composition on seamounts and adjacent slope in New Zealand waters. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 38: 163–182.
- Tracey, D M; Clark, M R; Anderson, O F; Kim, S W (2012) Deep-Sea Fish Distribution Varies between Seamounts: Results from a Seamount Complex off New Zealand. *PLoS ONE* 7(6): e36897. oi:10.1371/journal.pone.0036897
- Tracey, D M; Horn, P L (1999) Background and review of ageing orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*, Trachichthyidae) from New Zealand and elsewhere. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 33: 67–86.
- Tracey, D; Horn, P; Marriott, P; Krusic-Golub, K; Gren, C; Gili, R; Mieres L C (2007) Orange Roughy Ageing Workshop: otolith preparation and interpretation. Draft report to DWFAWG.
- Tuck, I; Cole, R; Devine, J (2009) Ecosystem indicators for New Zealand fisheries. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 42*. 188 p.
- Tuck, I D; Pinkerton, M H; Tracey, D M; Anderson, O A; Chiswell, S M (2014) Ecosystem and environmental indicators for deepwater fisheries. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 127*. 143 p.
- Williams, A; Schlacher, T A; Rowden, A A; Althaus, F; Clark, M R; Bowden, D A; Stewart, R; Bax, N J; Consalvey, M; Kloser, R J (2010) Seamount megabenthic assemblages fail to recover from trawling impacts. *Marine Ecology* 31: 183–199.
- Zeldis, J R; Grimes, P J; Ingerson, J K V (1994) Ascent rates, vertical distribution, and a thermal history model of development of orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) eggs in the water column. *Fishery Bulletin (United States)* 93: 373–385.

ORANGE ROUGHY NORTHERN NORTH ISLAND (ORH 1)

1. FISHERY SUMMARY

Allowances, TACCs, and TACs are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs, and TACs (t) for ORH 1.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
ORH 1	0	0	70	1 400	1 470

1.1 Commercial fisheries

The ORH 1 region extends northwards from west of Wellington around to Cape Runaway. Prior to 1993–94 there was no established fishery, and reported landings were generally small (Table 2). A new fishery developed in winter 1994, when aggregations were fished on two hill complexes in the western Bay of Plenty. In 1996 catches were also taken off the west coast of Northland. Figure 1 shows the historical landings and TACC values for ORH 1.

A TACC of 190 t was set from 1989–90. Prior to that there had been a 10 t TAC and various levels of exploratory quota. From 1995–96, ORH 1 became subject to a five year adaptive management programme, and the TACC was increased to 1190 t. A catch limit of 1000 t was applied to an area in the western Bay of Plenty (Mercury-Colville ‘box’), with the former 190 t TACC applicable to the remainder of ORH 1. In 1994 and 1995, research fishing was also carried out under Special Permit (not included in the TACC). For the period June 1996–June 1997, a Special Permit was approved for exploratory fishing. This allowed an additional 800 t (not included in the TACC) to be taken in designated areas, although catches were limited from individual features (hills and seamounts etc).

Table 2: Reported landings (t) and TACCs (t) from 1982–83 to present. - no TACC. The reported landings do not include catches taken under an exploratory special permit of 699 t in 1998–99 and 704 t in 1999–2000. QMS data from 1986-present.

Fishing year	Reported landings			TACC	Fishing year	Reported landings			TACC
	West coast	North-east coast	Total			West coast	North-east coast	Total	
1982–83*	< 0.1	0	< 0.1	-	2006–07	+	+	1 036	1 400
1983–84*	0.1	0	0.1	-	2007–08	+	+	1 104	1 400
1984–85*	< 0.1	96	96	-	2008–09	+	+	905	1 400
1985–86*	< 1	2	2	-	2009–10	+	+	825	1 400
1986–87*	0	< 0.1	< 0.1	10	2010–11	+	+	772	1 400
1987–88	0	0	0	10	2011–12	+	+	1 114	1 400
1988–89	0	19	19	10	2012–13	+	+	1 171	1 400
1989–90	37	49	86	190	2013–14	+	+	1 055	1 400
1990–91	0	200	200	190	2014–15	+	+	1 181	1 400
1991–92	+	+	112	190	2015–16	+	+	1 004	1 400
1992–93	+	+	49	190	2016–17	+	+	775	1 400
1993–94	0	189	189	190	2017–18	+	+	881	1 400
1994–95	0	244	244	190	2018–19	+	+	592	1 400
1995–96	55	910	965	1 190	2019–20	+	+	679	1 400
1996–97	+	+	1 021	1 190	2020–21	+	+	680	1 400
1997–98	+	+	511	1 190	2021–22	+	+	598	1 400
1998–99	+	+	845	1 190	2022–23	+	+	332	1 400
1999–00	+	+	771	1 190	2023–24	+	+	339	1 400
2000–01	+	+	858	800	2024–25			334	1 400
2001–02	+	+	1 294	1 400					
2002–03	+	+	1 123	1 400					
2003–04	+	+	986	1 400					
2004–05	+	+	1 151	1 400					
2005–06	+	+	1 207	1 400					

* FSU data. + Unknown distribution of catch.




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for ORH 1 (Auckland).

1.2 Recreational fisheries

There is no known non-commercial fishery for orange roughy in this area.

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

No customary non-commercial fishing for orange roughy is known in this area.

1.4 Illegal catch

No quantitative information is available on the level of illegal catch in this area.

1.5 Other sources mortality

There may be some overrun of reported catch because of fish loss with trawl gear damage and ripped nets. In other orange roughy fisheries, a level of 5% has been estimated.

2. STOCKS AND AREAS

Orange roughy are distributed throughout the area. Spawning is known from several hills in the western Bay of Plenty as well as from features in the western regions of ORH 1. Stock status/affinities within the QMA are unknown. The Mercury-Colville grounds in the Bay of Plenty are about 120 n. miles from fishing grounds at East Cape (ORH 2A North), and spawning occurs at a similar time. Hence, it is likely that these are separate stocks. The Mercury and Colville Knolls in the Bay of Plenty are about 25 miles apart and may form a single stock. Stock affinities with other fishing hills in the southern and central Bay of Plenty are unknown. The Tauroa Knoll and outer Colville Ridge seamounts are distant from other commercial grounds, and these fish may also represent separate stocks.

3. STOCK ASSESSMENT

An assessment for the Mercury-Colville box was carried out in 2001 and is repeated here. A deterministic stock reduction technique (*after* Francis 1990) was used to estimate virgin biomass (B_0) and current biomass ($B_{current}$) for the Mercury-Colville orange roughy stock. The model was fitted to the biomass indices using maximum likelihood and assuming normal errors. In common with other orange roughy assessments, the maximum exploitation rate was set at 0.67. The model treats sexes separately, and assumes a Beverton-Holt stock-recruit relationship. Confidence intervals of the biomass estimates were derived from bootstrap analysis (Cordue & Francis 1994).

3.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

A series of trawl surveys of the Mercury-Colville box to estimate relative abundance were agreed under an Adaptive Management Programme. The first survey was carried out in June 1995 with a second survey in winter 1998 (Table 3). The biomass index of the latter survey was much lower than 1995, and

because of warmer water temperatures it was uncertain whether the 1998 results were directly comparable to the 1995 results. They were not incorporated in the decision rule for the adaptive management programme. A third survey was carried out in June 2000, with the results suggesting that the abundance of orange roughy in the box had decreased considerably and was at low levels. However, these estimates are uncertain because of the suggestion that environmental factors may have influenced the distribution of orange roughy. The abundance indices from trawl survey and commercial catch-effort data used in the assessment are given in Table 3. The trawl survey indices had CVs of 0.27, 0.39 and 0.29 for 1995, 1998, and 2000 respectively.

Table 3: Biomass indices and reported catch used in estimation of B_0 . Values in square brackets are included for completeness; they are not used in the assessment.

Year	1993–94	1994–95	1995–96	1996–97	1997–98	1998–99	1999–00
Trawl survey	-	76 200	-	-	[2 500]	-	3 800
CPUE	8.3	9.1	5.4	4.2	[0.5]	1.5	(2.0)
Catch (t)	230	440	915	895	295	140	250

The CPUE series is mean catch per tow (sum of catches divided by number of tows, target ORH) from Mercury Knoll in the month of June. This is the only month when adequate data exist from the fishery to compare over time. A CV of 0.30 was assigned to the CPUE data.

Catch history information is derived from TCEPR records, scaled to the reported total catch for ORH 1. Overrun of reported catch (e.g., burst bags, inappropriate conversion factors) was assumed to be zero, as even if there was some, it is likely that it was similar between years. The catch in 1999–00 was assumed to be 250 t.

Assessments were carried out for three alternative sets of biomass indices (Table 4).

Table 4: Three alternative sets of biomass indices used in the stock assessment.

Alternative	Trawl survey indices	CPUE indices
1	1995, 2000	All except 1998
2	1995, 2000	None
3	1995, 2000	All except 1998 and 2000

Biological parameters used are those for the Chatham Rise stock, except for specific Bay of Plenty values for the maturity and recruitment ogives (Annala et al 2000).

3.2 Biomass estimates

The estimated virgin biomass (B_0) is very similar for all three alternative assessments (Table 5). With alternative 1 the estimated B_0 is 3200 t, with a current biomass of 15% B_0 . For both alternatives 2 and 3, the estimated B_0 is 3000 t, which is B_{min} , the minimum stock size which enables the catch history to be taken given a maximum exploitation rate of 0.67.

Table 5: Biomass estimates (with 95% confidence intervals in parentheses) for stock assessments with the three alternatives of Table 4. B_0 is virgin biomass; B_{MSY} is interpreted as B_{MAY} , which is 30% B_0 ; $B_{current}$ is mid-season 1999–00; and B_{beg} is the biomass at the beginning of the 2000–01 fishing year. Estimates are rounded to the nearest 100 t (for B_0), 10 t (for other biomasses), or 1%.

Biomass	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
B_0 (t)	3 200	(3 000, 3 600)	3 000	(3 000, 3 500)	3 000	(3 000, 3 300)
B_{MSY} (t)	960	(900, 1 080)	900	(900, 1 050)	900	(900, 990)
$B_{current}$ (t)	490	(290, 890)	290	(290, 790)	290	(290, 590)
$B_{current}$ (% B_0)	15	(10, 25)	10	(10, 23)	10	(10, 18)
B_{beg} (t)	480	(270, 900)	270	(270, 800)	270	(270, 590)

The model fits the CPUE data reasonably well but estimates a smaller decline than is implied by the two trawl survey indices.

3.3 Yield estimates and projections

Yield estimates were determined using the simulation method described by Francis (1992) and the relative estimates of MCY , E_{CAY} and MAY , as given by Annala et al (2000).

Yield estimates are all much lower than recent catches (Table 6). Estimates of current yields (MCY_{current} and CAY) lie between 16 t and 35 t; long-term yields ($MCY_{\text{long-term}}$ and MAY) lie between 44 t and 67 t.

Table 6: Yield estimates (t) for stock assessments with the three alternatives of Table 4.

Yield	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
MCY_{current}	35	(22, 53)	22	(22, 51)	22	(22, 44)
$MCY_{\text{long-term}}$	47	(44, 53)	44	(44, 51)	44	(44, 49)
CAY	29	(16, 54)	16	(16, 48)	16	(16, 36)
MAY	67	(58, 70)	58	(58, 68)	58	(58, 64)

CSP for this stock is just under 100 t for any B_0 between 3000 t and 3600 t.

4. ANALYSIS OF ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

The ORH 1 TACC was increased from 800 to 1400 t in October 2001/02 under the Adaptive Management Programme. The objectives of this AMP were to determine stock size, geographical extent, and long-term sustainable yield of the ORH 1 stock. This is a complex AMP, with ORH 1 divided into four sub-areas (see Figure 2), each with total catch and “feature” catch limits (Table 7) (a “feature” was defined as being within a 10 n. mile radius of the shallowest point).

Table 7: Description of control rules implemented in the ORH 1 AMP.

ORH 1 Subarea	Proposed Catch Limit	Feature Limit (t/fishing year)
Area A	200 t	100 t
Area B	500 t	150 t
Area C	500 t	150 t
Area D	200 t	75 t

Feature limits also serve as limits to the total catch in any area due to the limited number of available productive features. The Mercury-Colville “Box” (located within Area D) has been given a specific limit of 30 t per year to allow for the bycatch of orange roughy when fishing for black cardinalfish. The catch of orange roughy in the Mercury-Colville “Box” is included in the overall limit for Area D.




Figure 2: Four sub-management areas for the ORH 1 AMP (labelled A-D). Dotted lines enclose the exploratory fishing areas defined in the special permit issued on 6 July 1998. Solid lines enclose seamount closures and the Mercury-Colville Ohena ‘box’ (labelled at their top). Trawls (dots) where orange roughy were reported as the target species and caught during 1997–98 and 1998–99 are shown. Note that the lines separating Areas A and D from Areas B and C are incorrectly drawn at 36° S latitude rather than 35°30’ S latitude.

From 1 October 2007 the stock is no longer part of the Adaptive Management Programme but stakeholders have agreed to continue with the sub-area and feature limits within the overall ORH 1 TACC.

Review of ORH 1 AMP in 2007

In 2007 the AMP Assessment Working Group reviewed the performance of the AMP after the full 5-year term.

Fishery Characterisation

- In most years, the total catch has been less than the TACC (Table 8).
- The area splits into A, B, C and D only occurred in 2001.
- Main fishery is in area B; the fishery in area A only began in 2002.
- Two main goals of the AMP:
 - Reduce fishing in area D, in particular the Mercury-Colville “box”.
 - Look for new fishing areas, distributing effort across the QMA, with feature limits to reduce the possibility of localised overfishing.

Table 8: Estimated target catches by sub-area, scaled to landings, reported landings, and TACC for ORH 1. The scaling factor is calculated as reported catch/estimated (all target) catch (source: Anderson 2007b)

	Sub-area target catch (t)				Total target catch(t)	Reported landings (t)	TACC (t)	Scaling factor
	A	B	C	D				
1998	0.5	5.6	0.0	491.0	497	511	1 190	0.99
1999	5.2	575.2	165.0	724.5	1 470	1 543	1 190	0.99
2000	0.8	644.6	164.8	597.5	1 408	1 476	1 190	1.03
2001	8.5	166.3	99.4	164.6	439	858	800	1.11
2002	122.7	440.5	265.8	227.1	1 056	1 294	1 400	1.06
2003	196.7	508.1	237.9	72.2	1 015	1 123	1 400	0.98
2004	223.2	421.7	117.0	110.1	872	986	1 400	1.01
2005	277.0	389.8	173.4	174.1	1 014	1 151	1 400	1.13
2006	151.0	473.2	372.6	186.0	1 183	1 201	1 400	1.13

CPUE Analysis

- Unstandardised CPUE is in kg/tow. The short time series, the nature of the fishery (fishing aggregations spread over a wide area in different seasons) and the impact of catch limits on features and sub-areas prevent any useful relative abundance indices from being developed at this point for ORH 1.
- Where features are less than 10 n. mile apart, catch is apportioned according to the distance to the feature. Industry in-season reporting is based on the feature closest to the start of the tow.
- Possible problems with the area A observations in 2005–06, as there seem to be more reported tows than expected given the number of vessels operating in the area.

Observer Programme

- 50% observer coverage prior to 1 October 2006 (a high level relative to that for other deepwater stocks, with a large number of samples taken relative to the size of the fishery). From 1 October 2006, 100% coverage was requested by the Minister, but this has not been fully achieved, as some ORH 1 is taken as bycatch on trips that do not predominantly target ORH.
- The size frequency data show high levels of stock variability between fisheries on features or feature groups. Size variation does not seem to be linked to exploitation rate.

Environmental Effects

- Observer data from 2000 to 2003 indicated that incidental captures of seabirds did not occur in the ORH 1 target fishery (Baird 2005). Marine mammal interactions are also not a problem.
- Only three non-fish bycatch records have been reported from observed trips (in 1994 and 1995). All were shearwaters that landed on deck and were released alive. It was verified that observers were briefed in the same way as for other MFish trips including recording non-fish bycatch i.e. seabirds and marine mammals. Note that this does not include benthic organisms.

- The overall impact of bottom trawling on seamounts in ORH 1 is not known. A number of seamounts have been closed to fishing and the Norfolk Deep BPA is included in the industry accord relating to benthic protection areas within New Zealand's EEZ.

Sub-area D Directed Adaptive Exploratory Fishing Programme

- The purpose of this exercise was to establish whether fish populations shift between features in different years in sub-area D.
- Based on the results from the exploratory fishing from 2002 to 2005 it is evident that catches from all features contained a high proportion of ripe or ripe running females and that synchronised spawning occurs on a range of hills during winter.
- In 2006 the AMP Working Group recommended some changes to the design of the exploratory survey; however, this was not achieved during the 2006 survey.

The abbreviated checklist questions for full- and mid-term reviews are:

1. Is stock abundance adequately monitored?
The working group concluded that CPUE does not seem to be a proportional measure of abundance for this stock. However, CPUE is used in ORH 1 as a management tool. When CPUE drops on a feature, fishers are meant to move to another feature.
2. Is logbook coverage sufficient?
As there are Ministry fisheries observers on these vessels, fishers are not required to complete detailed logbooks for the AMP. This is the highest level of monitoring of any ORH fishery in New Zealand.
3. Are additional analyses of current data necessary?
No. The Working Group concluded that no other information can currently be extracted from the existing data that will provide insight into the status of the ORH 1 stocks. However, a potential problem with the 2005–06 catch records from Area A still needs to be checked.
4. Based on the biomass index, is current harvest sustainable?
Unknown. The purpose of the AMP was to spread effort in an attempt to reduce fishing pressure on any one sub-area or feature (and Area D in particular). ORH 1 is a large area, with orange roughly aggregations spread across a number of areas and features. The amount of fishing in some areas appears to be low, but without any indication of current abundance, there is no way to determine if this level of fishing is in fact sustainable, or if current feature limits will avoid overexploitation of localised areas.
5. Where is stock, based on weight of evidence, in relation to B_{MSY} ?
Unknown. In 2001, when the AMP was initiated, the Working Group stated that the stock was likely to be above B_{MSY} ; while the information collected since that time has not improved the understanding about the status of the stock, the intent of the AMP design for ORH 1 was to spread effort to reduce the likelihood of the biomass declining below B_{MSY} .
ORH 1 is unlikely to be a single biological stock, and probably includes a number of constituent stocks. The Working Group concluded that it is not possible to estimate B_{MSY} for any of the individual stocks, let alone aggregate up to an estimate for ORH 1 as a whole. Moreover, a better understanding is not possible in the near future. B_{MSY} is difficult to estimate in situations involving an unknown number of constituent stocks.
6. Are the effects of fishing adequately monitored?
Yes, there is good observer coverage. The Working Group noted that one consequence of deliberately spreading effort was to increase the possible benthic impact.
7. Are rates of non-fish bycatch acceptable?
Yes.
8. Should the AMP be reviewed by the Plenary?
This AMP does not need to be reviewed by the Plenary.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

From 1 October 2001, the TACC for ORH 1 was increased to 1400 t within the AMP, with sub-area and feature limits. From 1 October 2007 the stock is no longer part of the Adaptive Management Programme but stakeholders have agreed to continue with the sub-area and feature limits within the overall ORH 1 TACC.

In most years the total catch has been less than the TACC. However, it is not known if recent catch levels or current TACCs are sustainable in the long term. Except for the small area of the Mercury-Colville box no assessment of stock status is currently available. The assessment of the Mercury-Colville box is now also considered out of date.

An assessment of the Mercury-Colville box in 2001 indicated that biomass had been reduced to 10–15% B_0 (compared to an assumed B_{MSY} of 30% B_0). As the stock was considered to be well below B_{MSY} , a catch limit of 30 t was set for the box. The assessment indicated that a catch level of about 100 t would probably maintain the stock at the 2000 stock size (assuming deterministic recruitment) and catch levels from 16 to 35 t (consistent with CAY or MCY strategies) might allow the stock to rebuild slowly.

In other areas of ORH 1 the status of the constituent stocks is unknown. The amount of fishing in some areas appears to be low, but without any indication of current abundance, there is no way to determine if this level of fishing is in fact sustainable or if current feature limits will avoid overexploitation of localised areas.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Anderson, O F (2007a) Descriptive analysis of catch and effort data from New Zealand orange roughy fisheries in ORH 1 to the end of the 2005–06 fishing year.. Deepwater-WG-07/39. 11 p. (Unpublished paper held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Anderson, O F (2007b) Report to SeaFIC on the orange roughy Adaptive Management Programme in ORH 1. (Unpublished document held at NZ Seafood Industry Council Library, Wellington.)
- Anderson, O F; Dunn, M R (2006) Descriptive analysis of catch and effort data from New Zealand orange roughy fisheries in ORH 1, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, and 7B to the end of the 2003–04 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2006/20*. 59 p.
- Annala, J H; Sullivan, K J; O'Brien, C J (2000) Report from the Fishery Assessment Plenary, May 2000: stock assessments and yield estimates. (Unpublished report held in NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Baird, S J (2005) Incidental capture of seabird species in commercial fisheries in New Zealand waters, 2002–03. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2005/2*. 50 p.
- Clark, M R (1999) Fisheries for orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) on seamounts in New Zealand. *Oceanologica Acta* 22(6): 593–602.
- Clark, M R (2001) A description of the orange roughy fishery in northern North Island waters (ORH 1) for 1997–98 to 1999–2000: an update of commercial catch and effort information. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/76*. 23 p.
- Clark, M R; Field, K D (1998) Distribution, abundance and biology of orange roughy in the western Bay of Plenty: results of a trawl survey, June 1995 (SMT9501). *NIWA Technical Report* 14. 29 p.
- Clark, M R; King, K J (1989) Deepwater fish resources off the North Island, New Zealand: results of a trawl survey, May 1985 to June 1986. *New Zealand Fisheries Technical Report* No. 11. 56 p.
- Clark, M R; Tracey, D M (1988) Assessment of the west coast South Island and northern North Island orange roughy fisheries. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1988/20. 11 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Cordue, P L; Francis, R I C C (1994) Accuracy and choice in risk estimation for fisheries assessment. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 51: 817–829.
- Francis, R I C C (1990) A maximum likelihood stock reduction method. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1990/4. 8 p. (Unpublished document held in NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Francis, R I C C (1992) Recommendations concerning the calculation of maximum constant yield (MCY) and current annual yield (CAY). New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1992/8. 27 p. (Unpublished document held in NIWA library, Wellington.)
- SeaFIC (2006) Report to the Adaptive Management Programme Fishery Assessment Working Group: Full Term Review of the ORH1 Adaptive Assessment Programme. AMP-WG-06 (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand.)
- Starr, P; Clark, M R; Francis, R I C C (1996) ORH 1: blueprint for controlled development of an orange roughy fishery? *Seafood New Zealand* 4(2): 29–31.

ORANGE ROUGHY, CAPE RUNAWAY TO BANKS PENINSULA (ORH 2A, 2B, 3A)

1. FISHERY SUMMARY

Allowances, TACCs, and TACs are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs, and TACs (t) for Cape Runaway to Banks Peninsula orange roughy by Fishstock.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
ORH 2A	0	0	24	488	512
ORH 2B	0	0	3	60	63
ORH 3A	–	–	9	177	186

1.1 Commercial fisheries

The first reported landings of orange roughy between Cape Runaway and Banks Peninsula were in 1981–82 occurring with the development of the Wairarapa fishery. Total reported landings and TACCs grouped into the three orange roughy Fishstocks since 1981–82 are shown in Figure 1 and Table 2.




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACCs for ORH 2A (Central (Gisborne)) and ORH 2B (Central (Wairarapa)) [continued on the next page].




Figure 1[continued]: Reported commercial landings and TACCs for ORH 3A (Central/Challenger/South-East (Cook Strait/Kaikōura)).

Table 2: Reported landings (t) and TACCs (t) from 1981–82 to present. QMS data from 1986–present.

Fishing Year	QMA 2A (Ritchie + E.Cape)		QMA 2B (Wairarapa)		QMA 3A (Kaikōura)		All areas combined TACC or catch limit	
(1 Oct–30 Sep)	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC or catch limit
1981–82	—	—	554	—	—	—	554	—
1982–83	—	—	3 510	—	253	—	3 763	—
1983–84†	162	—	6 685	—	554	—	7 401	—
1984–85†	1 862	—	3 310	3 500	3 266	§	8 438	—
1985–86†	2 819	4 576	867	1 053	4 326	2 689	8 012	8 318
1986–87	5 187	5 500	963	1 053	2 555	2 689	8 705	9 242
1987–88	6 239	5 500	982	1 053	2 510	2 689	9 731	9 242
1988–89	5 853	6 060	1 236	1 367	2 431	2 839	9 520	10 266
1989–90	6 259	6 106	1 400	1 367	2 878	2 879	10 537	10 352
1990–91	6 064	6 106	1 384	1 367	2 553	2 879	10 001	10 352
1991–92	6 347	6 286	1 327	1 367	2 443	2 879	10 117	10 532
1992–93	5 837	6 386	1 080	1 367	2 135	2 879	9 052	10 632
1993–94	6 610	6 666	1 259	1 367	2 131	2 300	10 000	10 333
1994–95	6 202	7 000	754	820	1 686	1 840	8 642	9 660
1995–96	4 268	4 261	245	259	612	580	5 125	5 100
1996–97	3 761	4 261	272	259	580	580	4 613	5 100
1997–98	3 827	4 261	254	259	570	580	4 651	5 100
1998–99	3 335	3 761	257	259	582	580	4 174	4 600
1999–00	3 120	3 761	234	259	617	580	3 971	4 600
2000–01	1 385	1 100	190	185	479	415	2 054	1 700
2001–02	1 087	1 100	180	185	400	415	1 667	1 700
2002–03	782	680	105	99	235	221	1 122	1 000
2003–04	703	680	103	99	250	221	1 056	1 000
2004–05	1 120	1 100	206	185	416	415	1 742	1 700
2005–06	1 076	1 100	172	185	415	415	1 663	1 700
2006–07	1 131	1 100	203	185	401	415	1 736	1 700
2007–08	1 068	1 100	209	185	432	415	1 709	1 700
2008–09	1 114	1 100	173	185	414	415	1 701	1 700
2009–10	1 117	1 100	213	185	390	415	1 720	1 700
2010–11	1 113	1 100	158	185	420	415	1 690	1 700
2011–12	876	875	140	140	428	415	1 445	1 430
2012–13	727	#875	102	#140	296	#415	1 124	#1 430
2013–14	732	875	108	140	331	415	1 171	1 430
2014–15	483	488	54	60	156	177	693	725
2015–16	474	488	59	60	178	177	710	725
2016–17	505	488	57	60	174	177	736	725
2017–18	485	488	46	60	117	177	647	725
2018–19	491	488	60	60	129	177	680	725
2019–20	377	488	61	60	138	177	576	725
2020–21	503	488	59	60	182	177	744	725
2021–22	511	488	61	60	131	177	703	725
2022–23	495	488	61	60	85	177	641	725
2023–24	460	488	60	60	56	177	577	725
2024–25	494	488	46	60	89	177	629	725

† FSU data. § Included in QMA 3B TAC. # In 2012–13, shelving occurred (ORH 2A 165 t, ORH 2B 34 t, and ORH 3A 101 t).

There was a major change in the ORH 2A fishery in 1993–94 with a shift of effort from the main spawning

hill on Ritchie Bank to hills off East Cape. Although these hills had apparently only been lightly fished in the past, during 1993–94 52% of the total catch from ORH 2A was taken from the East Cape area (Table 3). This led to an agreement between industry and the Minister responsible for fisheries that, from 1994–95, the traditionally fished areas within ORH 2A (south of 38° 23' S, hereafter referred to as “2A South”) would be managed separately from the new East Cape fishery (north of 38° 23' S, “2A North”). ORH 2A South was combined with ORH 2B and ORH 3A to form the Mid-East Coast (MEC) stock for management purposes.

Table 3: North Mid-East Coast + East Cape (ORH 2A) catches by area, in tonnes and by percentage of the total ORH 2A catch. (Percentages up to 1993–94 and from 2007–08 calculated from Ministry data; 1994–95 to 1996–97 from NZFIB data, 1997–98 to 2020–21 from Orange Roughy Management Co, and 2021–22 from FNZ. Mid-East Coast (MEC) stock (ORH 2A South, ORH 2B, and ORH 3A combined) catches in tonnes.

Fishing year	2A North		2A South		MEC (t)
	t	%	t	%	
1983–84	0	0	162	100	7 401
1984–85	4	< 1	1 858	99	8 434
1985–86	41	1	2 778	99	7 971
1986–87	253	5	4 934	95	8 452
1987–88	36	< 1	6 203	99	9 695
1988–89	143	2	5 710	98	9 377
1989–90	20	< 1	6 239	99	10 517
1990–91	13	< 1	6 051	99	9 988
1991–92	18	< 1	6 329	99	10 099
1992–93	30	< 1	5 807	99	9 022
1993–94	3 437	52	3 173	48	6 563
1994–95	2 921	47	3 281	53	5 721
1995–96	3 235	76	1 033	24	1 890
1996–97	2 491	66	1 270	34	2 122
1997–98	2 411	63	1 416	37	2 240
1998–99	1 901	57	1 434	43	2 273
1999–00	1 456	47	1 666	53	2 517
2000–01	302	22	1 083	78	1 752
2001–02	186	17	901	83	1 480
2002–03	173	24	546	76	886
2003–04	170	24	533	76	886
2004–05	271	24	849	76	1 471
2005–06	216	20	859	80	1 445
2006–07	229	20	902	80	1 506
2007–08	200	24	868	76	1 509
2008–09	230	21	884	79	1 471
2009–10	267	24	850	76	1 453
2010–11	207	19	906	81	1 484
2011–12	184	21	692	79	1 260
2012–13	190	26	537	74	935
2013–14	176	25	530	75	5 315
2014–15	179	42	248	58	458
2015–16	186	40	280	60	466
2016–17	188	37	317	63	626
2017–18	196	41	280	59	444
2018–19	197	39	304	61	493
2019–20	173	41	204	59	423
2020–21	217	41	285	59	524
2021–22	179	38	292	62	484

The catch limits for these two areas changed several times in the following years, including a subdivision of 2A North (Table 4). Catches in the exploratory sub-area of 2A North never approached the catch limit, with only 37 t being caught in 1996–97 and less in subsequent years.

For the 2000–01 fishing year, the TACC for ORH 2A was reduced to 1100 t, that for ORH 2B to 185 t, and that for ORH 3A to 415 t. Within the TACC for ORH 2A, the catch limit for all of 2A North was reduced to 200 t, without specifying separate catch limits for the East Cape Hills and the exploratory area, while the catch limit for 2A South was reduced to 900 t. This gave a catch limit for the MEC stock of 1500 t. The catch limit for MEC was reduced to 800 t (and ORH 2A South to 480 t) for the 2002–03 and 2003–04 fishing years. From 1 October 2004 there was an increase in the TACC to 1100 t, 185 t, and 415 t in 2A, 2B, and 3A, respectively. Furthermore, an allowance of 58 t, 9 t, and 21 t, for other mortality was allocated to 2A, 2B, and 3A in 2004 as well.

In 2012–13 the fishing industry voluntarily shelved (an agreement that transfers ACE to a third party to effectively reduce the catch without adjusting the TACC) approximately 25% of the MEC quota, resulting in effective catch limits of 510 t, 106 t, and 314 t for 2A South, 2B, and 3A, respectively. In 2014–15 TACCs were lowered further, to 488 t, 60 t, and 177 t in 2A, 2B, and 3A, respectively. Reported commercial landings have closely followed the decreasing TACCs in all three orange roughy stocks and totalled 576 t in 2019–20 and 744 t in 2020–21, slightly over the TACC of 725 t.

Table 4: Catch limits (t) by sub-area within ORH 2A, as agreed between the industry and the Minister responsible for fisheries since 1994–95 and the catch limit for the Mid-East Coast (MEC) stock (ORH 2A South, ORH 2B, ORH 3A combined). (Note that 2A North was split, for the years 1996–97 to 1999–2000, into the area round the East Cape Hills and the remaining area, which is called the exploratory area). [Continued on next page]

Fishing year	2A North	2A South	MEC
1994–95	3 000	4 000	6 660
1995–96	3 000	1 261	2 100
1996–97	3 000*	1 261	2 100
1997–98	3 000*	1 261	2 100
1998–99	2 500*	1 261	2 100
1999–00	2 500*	1 261	2 100
2000–01	200	900	1 500
2001–02	200	900	1 500
2002–03	200	480	800
2003–04	200	480	800
2004–05	200	900	1 500
2005–06	200	900	1 500
2006–07	200	900	1 500
2007–08	200	900	1 500
2008–09	200	900	1 500
2009–10	200	900	1 500
2010–11	200	900	1 500
2011–12	200	675	1 230
2012–13	200	510	930
2013–14	200	510	930
2014–15	200	288	525
2015–16	200	288	525
2016–17	200	288	525
2017–18	200	288	525
2018–19	200	288	525
2019–20	200	288	525
2020–21	200	288	525
2021–22	200	288	525

*Catch limit for East Cape Hills including 500 t for the exploratory area.

1.2 Recreational fisheries

Recreational fishing for orange roughy is not known in this area.

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

No information on customary non-commercial fishing for orange roughy is available for this area.

1.4 Illegal catch

No information is available about illegal catch in this area.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

There has been a history of catch overruns in this area because of lost fish and discards, particularly in the early years of the fishery. In the assessments presented here total removals were assumed to exceed reported catches by the overrun percentages in Table 5.

All yield estimates and forward projections presented make an allowance for the current estimated level of overrun of 5%.

Table 5: Catch overruns (%) by QMA and year. -, no catches reported.

Year	2A (North and South)	2B	3A	Year	2A (North and South)	2B	3A
1981–82	–	30	–	1989–90	20	20	20
1982–83	–	30	30	1990–91	15	15	15
1983–84	50	30	30	1991–92	10	10	10
1984–85	50	30	30	1992–93	10	10	10
1985–86	50	30	30	1993–94	10	10	10
1986–87	40	30	30	1994–95	5	5	5
1987–88	30	30	30	Subsequent years as per 1994–95			
1988–89	25	25	25				

2. BIOLOGY

Biological parameters used in this assessment are presented in the Biology section at the beginning of the Introduction – Orange roughy chapter.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

Two major spawning locations have been identified in ORH 2A, one at the East Cape Hills in “2A North” and the other on the Ritchie Bank in “2A South”. Spawning orange roughy were located in Wairarapa (ORH 2B) in winter 2001, but no large concentrations were found, and the significance of this spawning event is not known. Spawning orange roughy have not been located in Kaikōura (ORH 3A). The major spawning area in ORH 2A South, ORH 2B, and ORH 3A was historically on the Ritchie Bank, but spawning aggregations were not seen there in the 2013, 2017, or 2021 acoustic biomass surveys, and persistent and large catch rates consistent with a spawning aggregation have rarely been seen there in the commercial fishery since the early 2000s. The main spawning aggregations now seem to be to the south at Rockgarden, and to the west at Sea Valley.

Results from allozyme studies showed that orange roughy from the three areas, “2A South”, Wairarapa, and Kaikōura could not be separated, but were distinct from fish on the eastern Chatham Rise. Earlier analyses that suggested there was a genetic stock boundary between East Cape and Ritchie Bank were not supported by a more recent replicate sample from East Cape. For these reasons, orange roughy in this region are currently treated as two stocks: the Mid-East Coast (MEC) stock (2A South, Wairarapa, and Kaikōura) and the East Cape (EC) stock (2A North). The relationship between these areas and the location of the main fishing grounds is shown in Figure 2.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

Stock assessments are reported below for East Cape (EC) from 2003 and for Mid-East Coast (MEC) from 2022.

4.1 East Cape stock (2A North)

The stock assessment for the East Cape was last updated in 2003 and is summarised here (Anderson 2003b). An attempt to update the assessment with a new set of CPUE indices was made in 2006 but was rejected by the Working Group because of changes in the fishery which invalidated the utility of the CPUE series as an index of abundance. With no other abundance estimates available, an updated stock assessment was not possible.

4.1.1 Assessment Inputs

A CPUE analysis was performed in 2006 but was considered unreliable because of a change in fishing patterns and fleet size corresponding to the reduction of the catch limit to 200 t in 2000–01. The CPUE analysis was updated in 2011 and was considered more reliable by the Working Group due to the increase in the number of trawls per year since 2006. The 2011 analysis showed that standardised CPUE

decreased after a peak in 2003–04 and has subsequently remained at a level similar to that in the late 1990s to early 2000s (Table 6).




Figure 2: Catch (t) per tow of orange roughy in ORH 2A, ORH 2B, and ORH 3A for the five fishing years from 2006–07 to 2010–11 (circles, with area proportional to catch size), location of the fisheries assumed during stock assessment, and the location of the main spawning, feeding, and nursery grounds. Perimeters of Benthic Protection Areas (BPAs) closed to bottom trawling are marked with dashed grey lines, and seamounts closed to trawling are marked as shaded rectangles.

Previous concerns by the Working Group that the fishery was dominated by a single vessel were alleviated somewhat by the return or entry of three other vessels to the fishery since 2003–04, but the utility of CPUE analyses in fisheries where substantial catch limit reductions have caused major changes in fishing patterns remains an issue for this stock.

The model inputs for the 2003 stock assessment were catches, an egg survey, and CPUE indices (Table 6). The biological parameters used are presented in the Biology section at the beginning of the Introduction – Orange roughy chapter.

4.1.2 Stock assessment

A stock assessment analysis for the East Cape stock was performed in 2003 using the stock assessment program, CASAL (Bull et al 2002) to estimate virgin and current biomass.

- The model was fitted using Bayesian estimation and partitioned the EC stock population by sex, maturity (the fishery was assumed to act on mature fish only) and age (age-groups used were 1–70, with a plus group).
- The model estimated virgin biomass, B_0 , and the process error for the CPUE indices. Catchability,

- q , was treated as a nuisance parameter by the model.
- The stock was considered to reside in a single area, and to have a single maturation episode modelled by a logistic-producing ogive where 50% of fish of both sexes were mature at age 26 and 95% at age 29.
 - The catch equation used was the instantaneous mortality equation from Bull et al (2002) whereby half the natural mortality was applied, followed by the fishing mortality, then the remaining natural mortality.
 - The size at age model used was the von Bertalanffy.
 - No stock recruitment relationship was assumed.
 - A Bayesian estimation procedure was used with a penalty function included to discourage the model from allowing the stock biomass to drop below a level at which the historical catch could not have been taken.
 - Lognormal errors, with known (sampling error) CVs were assumed for the CPUE and egg survey indices. Additionally, process error variance was estimated by the model and added to the CVs from the CPUE indices.
 - Confidence intervals were calculated from the posterior profile distribution of B_0 estimates, where the process error parameter was fixed at the value previously estimated.

Table 6: Standardised CPUE and egg survey indices, and CVs for the East Cape stock, as used in the 2003 assessment, and an updated standardised CPUE index derived in 2011. -, no data.

	CPUE index 2003	CV (%)	Egg survey	CV (%)	CPUE index 2011	CV (%)
1993–94	1.00	12	–	–	0.95	23
1994–95	0.69	8	29 000	69	0.76	22
1995–96	0.60	8	–	–	0.61	23
1996–97	0.41	8	–	–	0.47	22
1997–98	0.25	7	–	–	0.27	23
1998–99	0.25	7	–	–	0.28	23
1999–00	0.22	9	–	–	0.23	23
2000–01	0.21	15	–	–	0.28	26
2001–02	0.22	16	–	–	0.23	27
2002–03	–	–	–	–	0.51	32
2003–04	–	–	–	–	0.50	30
2004–05	–	–	–	–	0.29	27
2005–06	–	–	–	–	0.37	28
2006–07	–	–	–	–	0.36	29
2007–08	–	–	–	–	0.27	28
2008–09	–	–	–	–	0.24	28
2009–10	–	–	–	–	0.20	27

4.1.3 Biomass estimates

Biomass estimates for this stock are given in The base case estimate of $B_{CURRENT}$ (the mid-year biomass in 2002–03) is 5100 t (24% B_0) with a 95% confidence interval of 3800 to 7550 t. This is almost twice the value of B_{2003} estimated for mid-year 1999–2000 in the previous assessment (Anderson 2000). The alternative assessment gives a very similar estimate of B_{2003} .

Table 7 and the biomass trajectories, plotted against the scaled indices, are shown in Figure 3. The base case assessment of the EC stock included only the CPUE indices. An alternative assessment was carried out including the point estimate of biomass from the 1995 egg survey along with the CPUE indices. The CPUE indices agree well with the biomass estimates, with only the 1993–94 and 1997–98 indices departing from the biomass 95% confidence intervals. The egg survey biomass estimate, with the large associated CV, has little effect on the biomass trajectory.

The base case estimate of $B_{CURRENT}$ (the mid-year biomass in 2002–03) is 5100 t (24% B_0) with a 95% confidence interval of 3800 to 7550 t. This is almost twice the value of B_{2003} estimated for mid-year 1999–2000 in the previous assessment (Anderson 2000). The alternative assessment gives a very similar estimate of B_{2003} .

Table 7: Estimates of virgin biomass (B_0), B_{MSY} (calculated as B_{MAY} , the mean biomass under a CAY policy), and B_{2003} , for the EC stock (with 95% confidence intervals in parentheses).

Assessment	Index	B_0 (t)		B_{MSY} (t)	B_{2003}	
		(t)			(t)	% B_0
Base case	CPUE	21 100	(19 650–23 350)	6 300	5 100	24 (20–32)

Alternative CPUE + Egg survey 21 200 (19 700–23 550) 6 380 5 200 25 (20–33)




Figure 3: Estimated biomass trajectories for the base case and alternative model runs for the EC stock. Annual biomass estimates are mean posterior density (MPD) values and 95% confidence intervals (grey dashed lines) are calculated from the posterior profile distribution of B_0 estimates. The CPUE index CVs (sampling error plus process error) are shown, as is the CV calculated for the egg survey biomass estimate.

4.1.4 Yield estimates and projections

Estimates of *MCY* and *CAY* for the EC stock were calculated from large numbers of simulation runs using posterior profile sampling of B_0 and a series of trial harvest levels. These estimates, together with *MAY* (the mean catch with a *CAY* harvesting strategy) and *CSP* (current surplus production) are given in Table 8. *CSP* is driven by recruitment of fish spawned before the fishery began.

Table 8: Estimates of *MCY*, *CAY*, *MAY*, and *CSP* for the EC stock, with 95% confidence intervals in parentheses (all corrected for an assumed overrun of 5%).

Assessment	<i>MCY</i> (t)	<i>CAY</i> (t)	<i>MAY</i> (t)	<i>CSP</i> (t)
Base case	350	370	410	550
Alternative	350	370	410	550

4.2 Mid-East Coast stock (2A South, 2B, 3A)

A new stock assessment was conducted in 2022. The previous assessment was 2014 (Cordue 2014c). There was no new information available that would change the accepted stock definition of the MEC orange roughy stock as comprising ORH 2A South, ORH 2B, and ORH 3A.

4.2.1 Model structure

The model was sex and age-structured (1–120 years with a plus group) with sex and maturity in the partition (i.e., fish were classified by age, sex, and as mature or immature). A single area and a single time step were used with four year-round fisheries defined by different selectivities (a “south” fishery catching young fish (double-normal selectivity), a “north” fishery catching older fish (logistic selectivity), a “Pegasus” fishery at the Pegasus Canyon since 1999 (logistic selectivity), and a “Spawn” fishery focused on spawning aggregations (logistic selectivity). The spawning season was assumed to occur after 75% of the mortality and 100% of spawning fish were assumed to spawn each year. The spawning ogive (which defines *SSB* and may be different from the maturity ogive in orange roughy) was assumed to be the same as the selectivity for the Spawn fishery, and therefore described the age composition of the spawning fish (Spawning Stock Biomass).

The catch history was constructed by scaling the catches in Table 2 by the catch overrun percentages in


Table 5

Table 5 and partitioning using estimated catch and effort data (

Table 9). Catches for 2021–22 were assumed to be same as 2020–21. Natural mortality was assumed to be fixed at 0.045 and the stock-recruitment relationship was assumed to follow a Beverton-Holt function with steepness of 0.75. Growth was modelled by sex and used empirical length-at-age (Figure 4). An ageing error of 0.1 was assumed. All fitted observations were unsexed.

Table 9: Mid-East Coast orange roughy catch (t) history by fishery, including catch overruns, as used in the 2022 stock assessment model.

Fishing year	Spawn	North	South	Pegasus	Fishing year	Spawn	North	South	Pegasus
1981–82	0	153	567	0	2002–03	201	446	181	101
1982–83	38	1 000	3 854	0	2003–04	250	370	223	86
1983–84	214	2 025	7 414	0	2004–05	356	677	371	141
1984–85	2 000	2 599	6 738	0	2005–06	518	497	346	157
1985–86	2 907	2 689	5 323	0	2006–07	409	661	368	144
1986–87	4 132	3 744	3 605	0	2007–08	459	586	411	128
1987–88	4 753	4 272	3 578	0	2008–09	460	597	329	158
1988–89	4 224	3 883	3 613	0	2009–10	512	563	289	163
1989–90	4 871	3 484	4 266	0	2010–11	533	549	238	238
1990–91	3 424	4 500	3 562	0	2011–12	591	240	339	154
1991–92	4 371	3 681	3 057	0	2012–13	374	290	195	124
1992–93	4 570	2 749	2 606	0	2013–14	499	138	217	163
1993–94	2 493	2 095	2 632	0	2014–15	229	69	143	39
1994–95	3 097	1 221	1 688	0	2015–16	275	73	120	75
1995–96	925	419	640	0	2016–17	157	197	143	79
1996–97	1 126	477	626	0	2017–18	128	199	117	21
1997–98	859	835	658	0	2018–19	269	105	120	23
1998–99	638	1 108	492	149	2019–20	132	132	118	41
1999–00	1 154	809	488	192	2020–21	225	120	89	118
2000–01	592	723	366	158	2021–22	225	120	89	118
2001–02	637	452	383	83					

**Figure 4: Mid-East Coast orange roughy median length-at-age by sex estimated using a smoother and the length-weight relationship used in the assessment model. The parameters are of the length (L) to weight (W) relationship $W = aL^b$. The red line represents females and the dashed blue line represents males.**

4.2.2 Input data and statistical assumptions

There were four main data sources for observations fitted in the assessment: spawning biomass estimate from acoustic surveys (2013, 2017, and 2021); a trawl survey time series of relative biomass indices (1992–1994, 2010) with associated age frequencies (1993 and 2010) and length frequencies (1992, 1994), age frequencies from the Spawn fishery (commercial 1989, 1990, 1991 and 2010; research 2017 and 2021), and length frequencies (LFs) collected from the commercial fisheries. Estimates of proportions mature-at-age were used in the previous assessment (2014) but excluded in 2022 because they were inconsistent with the spawning age frequencies.

Research surveys

The MEC area has been surveyed using acoustic and trawl methods, and egg surveys have also been conducted. Not all survey data were used in the 2022 assessment. The egg survey estimates have some quality issues associated with them; the 1993 survey data were post-stratified and “corrected” for

turnover of fish (Zeldis et al 1997). The 1993 egg survey estimate was used in the 2013 assessment but was not considered to be reliable enough for assessments since 2014 (which had a higher “quality threshold”). Similarly, the wide-area acoustic survey estimates from 2001 and 2003 (Doonan et al 2003, 2004a) have been rejected since 2014 as being not sufficiently reliable (in particular, the biomass estimates primarily came from mixed species marks and “orange roughy” marks identified subjectively; rather than being from easily identified spawning plumes).

Trawl survey data

A time series of pre-spawning season, random, stratified trawl surveys were conducted in March–April on RV *Tangaroa* in 1992–94 and 2010 (Grimes et al 1994, 1996a, 1996b; Doonan & Dunn 2011). The 2010 survey was specifically designed to be comparable with the earlier surveys and to produce an abundance index for the MEC home grounds (Doonan & Dunn 2011). In addition to the relative biomass indices (Table 10), the survey data were analysed to produce length frequencies from all years and age frequencies from 1993 and 2010 (Doonan et al 2011).

Table 10: Mid-East Coast orange roughy biomass indices and CVs used in the 2022 stock assessment.

Year	Trawl index (t)	CV (%)	Acoustic index (t)	CV (%)
1992	20 838	29		
1993	15 102	27		
1994	12 780	14		
2010	7 074	19		
2013			4 225	20
2017			6 969	14
2021			6 326	20

The biomass indices were fitted as relative biomass with a double-normal selectivity on the immature fish, and a constant selectivity on the mature fish, with an uninformed prior on the proportionality constant (q). A process error of 20% was added to the CVs. The length frequencies from 1992 and 1994 were fitted as multinomial, as were the age frequencies from 1993 and 2010 (length frequencies from 1993 and 2010 had been used in the production of the age frequencies).

Acoustic survey estimate

The only reliable acoustic estimates of spawning biomass for MEC came from multi-frequency “AOS” surveys (acoustic and optical gear mounted on the trawl headline, e.g., see Kloser et al 2011). Four areas were visited in 2013, but the only substantial spawning plume was seen in the “Sea Valley”. A similar search for spawning aggregations was completed in 2017 and 2021, when spawning plumes were found at both Sea Valley and Rockgarden. All valid snapshot estimates from 38 kHz were averaged to produce the biomass index (see Table 10). No process error was added to the CVs.

A base assumption used for all orange roughy acoustic spawning biomass estimates was that they collectively covered “most” of the spawning biomass, where “most” was taken to be 80%. The previous (2014) assessment for the Mid-East Coast stock reduced this to 60%. Because 2017 and 2021 surveys searched all known substantial spawning grounds for Mid-East Coast orange roughy, in 2022 “most” was revised back to 80%, and sensitivities were conducted for 60% and 100%. The acoustic estimates were therefore fitted as relative biomass with an informed prior: lognormal (mean = 0.8, CV = 19%) for the base model.

Commercial age and length frequencies

Twelve length frequencies between 1991 and 2018 were available for the North fishery, four between 1994 and 2016 for the South fishery, seven between 1990 and 2017 for the Spawn fishery, and two samples, in 2000 and 2016, for the Pegasus fishery. For the Spawn fishery, the length frequency (seven LFs between 1990 and 2017) and age frequency (AF) samples (five AFs from 1989–91, 2010, and 2017) were assumed to represent spawning fish, with selectivity set equal to estimated logistic maturity. The spawning age frequency from 2021 contained a greater proportion of younger fish and was inconsistent with the earlier samples, and so was fitted with its own logistic selectivity. The composition data were all assumed to be multinomial, with effective sample sizes initially based upon Cordue (2014a)

for age frequencies, and the number of tows for LFs, but then down-weighted to ensure primacy of the biomass data and more balanced patterns of residuals. Final effective samples sizes for the Spawn AFs were between 13 and 25 (mean 20), the trawl survey AFs were 20, and the LFs were between 1 and 10 (mean 3.2).

4.2.3 Model runs and results

In the base model, natural mortality (M) was fixed at 0.045 yr^{-1} . There were numerous MPD sensitivity runs and three main sensitivities are presented in this chapter: $M = 0.035 \text{ yr}^{-1}$; mean acoustics q prior = 0.6; and mean acoustics q prior = 1.0. The latter assumed all the spawning biomass was observed by the acoustic surveys.

In the base model, the main parameters estimated were virgin spawning stock biomass (SSB_0), the spawning ogive, three fishery selectivities (North, South, Pegasus), the trawl survey selectivities (immature and mature), the 2021 age frequency selectivity, and year class strengths (YCS) from 1881 to 1996 (with the Haist parameterisation and lognormal priors with $CV=0.8$). Additional estimated parameters were the CV of the length-at-age parameters and the proportionality constants (qs) for the trawl survey time series and the acoustic biomass estimates.

Model fits

The MPD fits to data were similar to the MCMC implied fits. The fits to the biomass indices were acceptable, although the decline in the trawl surveys could not be fitted well (Figure 5).




Figure 5: Mid-East Coast orange roughy MPD fit to biomass indices for the base model run: left: acoustic spawning biomass indices (estimated q of 0.68); right: *Tangaroa* trawl survey indices. Vertical broken lines are 95% CIs.

The spawning season age frequencies were noisy, but the general shape was fitted well (Figure 6). The fit to the trawl survey age frequencies was good (Figure 6). The MPD fits to the commercial length frequencies were adequate considering the length frequencies showed substantial year-to-year variability (Figure 7). The spawning ogive (which was different from the maturity ogive) was estimated with an A_{50} of 55.2 years and A_{1095} of 18.1 years. The spawning season age frequency for 2021 had a greater proportion of younger fish, with an A_{50} of 35.6 years and A_{1095} of 11.0 years. The age of 50% maturity of orange roughy has been estimated from transition zones on otoliths to be at around 30 years, but assessments have shown that the age of 50% spawning is typically greater. One hypothesis to explain this difference is skipped spawning, where younger mature fish spawn less often. The relatively high proportion of young mature fish observed for 2021 could have been sample bias, or a due to a temporal change in the prevalence of skipped spawning. A separate selectivity was used for this age frequency.




Figure 6: Mid-East Coast orange roughy MPD fits of the base model run to age frequencies (N is the assumed effective sample size). Observations are grey points; model predictions are the black lines.




Figure 7: Mid-East Coast orange roughy base model example MPD fits to length frequencies (N is the assumed effective sample size). Observations are grey points; model predictions are the black lines.

MPD model runs showed that the results were relatively insensitive to changes in the growth model, alternative CVs on the year class strength priors, changes to the weight given to the length frequencies, and alternative selectivity models for the trawl survey data. Simplifying the model to have two fisheries, following the previous assessment (2014), estimated a larger stock at a similar level of depletion, but incurred catch penalties with a poorer fit to data and less plausible YCS and biomass trends. Assuming a higher M of 0.06 year^{-1} estimated a smaller and less depleted stock but fitted the data less well, with several implausible selectivity parameters. Using the 2021 spawn age frequency and proportion mature data (as used in 2014) to estimate spawning selectivity, with a separate selectivity then used for the base model “spawn” fishery, estimated a larger and more depleted stock, with a markedly poorer fit to data. MPD runs across a range of M and stock-recruitment steepness values indicated the base assumption of M was supported by data, and could plausibly be a little lower, and that the model had no information to determine steepness. A sensitivity run estimating M was not completed because of the noisy age data with substantial uncertainties in the spawning and fishery selectivity ogives.

MCMC results

MCMC convergence diagnostics were acceptable for the base model and sensitivities. In all model runs, the spawning stock biomass was reduced through the 1980s to below 10% SSB_0 in the 1990s, and then slowly rebuilt. Virgin spawning biomass (SSB_0) was estimated to be about 53 000 t for the base case, and the current stock status 22% SSB_0 (Table 11). When the mean of the acoustic q was reduced ($q = 0.6$), the spawning stock was estimated to be slightly larger and currently less depleted, and vice versa when the higher q was assumed ($q = 1.0$). The base and acoustic q sensitivity runs all estimated the current stock status to be at or above the soft limit (20% SSB_0). Assuming a lower M estimated a larger SSB_0 and stock status just below the soft limit.

Table 11: Mid-East Coast orange roughy MCMC estimates of virgin spawning biomass (SSB_0) and stock status (SSB_{2022} as % SSB_0), and overall vulnerable biomass (VB_0) and status (VB_{2022} as % VB_0) calculated assuming a logistic selectivity with parameters averaged from base model run MPD selectivity estimates, for the base model and the three sensitivity runs: a) reducing the mean acoustic catchability coefficient, q , from 0.8 to 0.6; b) increasing the mean acoustic q from 0.8 to 1.0; c) decreasing M to 0.035 year^{-1} .

Spawning biomass				
Assessment	SSB_0 (000 t)	95% CI	SSB_{2022} (% SSB_0)	95% CI
Base model	53 350	46 550 – 63 670	22.4	16.7 – 29.2
Acoustic $q = 0.6$	57 590	49 070 – 69 120	26.3	20.2 – 33.5
Acoustic $q = 1.0$	51 280	45 480 – 60 010	19.8	14.7 – 26.4
$M = 0.035$	69 060	60 340 – 79 860	16.7	12.2 – 22.1
Vulnerable biomass				
Assessment	VB_0 (000 t)	95% CI	VB_{2022} (% VB_0)	95% CI
Base model	144 720	121 180 – 171 900	47.0	31.8 – 66.6
Acoustic $q = 0.6$	149 390	122 160 – 178 370	52.8	37.4 – 72.6
Acoustic $q = 1.0$	143 170	118 310 – 171 430	44.0	30.2 – 62.1
$M = 0.035$	136 130	114 500 – 156 910	36.3	23.3 – 51.7

The estimates of stock size and status were relatively precise given that some selectivities were relatively poorly estimated, particularly for the South fishery, the mature fish in the trawl survey, and the Spawn 2021 age frequency. A sensitivity run was completed with normal priors placed on the parameters of the South fishery selectivity, with mean values taken from the MPD estimates and assumed CVs, and while this prevented the improbable capture of very young fish it made almost no difference to the estimates of stock size and status. The use of model estimates to construct priors for use in the same model is statistically incorrect, so the base run was preferred. Orange roughy were estimated to first recruit to the South fishery, then the Pegasus and North fisheries, and then the Spawn fishery (Figure 8). The spawning ogive was relatively precisely estimated, indicating spawning started at about age 40 and all fish spawned by about age 80.

Assuming a logistic selectivity with parameters averaged from base model run MPD estimates, the overall vulnerable biomass (VB_0) did not decline as much as the spawning biomass, reaching just below 40% VB_0 in the late 1990s and then slowly rebuilding (Table 11, Figure 9). The biomass vulnerable to the southern fisheries, where recruitment was at a younger age, declined to about 50% and then remained steady from the early 2000s until the last five years, when it slowly declined. The recent decline in vulnerable biomass for the South fishery (VB_s) was because recruitment was estimated to be

approaching an historical low, caused by the reduction of the spawning biomass in the 1980s (Figure 10). The estimated YCS showed a slight decrease from about 1940, a peak around 1970, and then lowest levels of YCS between 1980 and 1993 with a minimum in 1989 (Figure 10).

Estimated exploitation rate peaked in 1991–92 and 1992–93 and was above the target range ($U_{30\%B0}$ – $U_{50\%B0}$) from 1982–83 to 2002–03, and 2004–05 to 2011–12 (Figure 11). Exploitation rate has been well below the target since 2014–15.




Figure 8: Mid-East Coast orange roughy base case MCMC estimates of selectivities and the spawning ogive. The estimated selectivity model parameters (and 95% credible intervals) are shown on each panel. The light shaded area covers the 95% credible intervals, the darker shaded area the 50% credible intervals, and the solid line the median.

Projections

Projections were conducted with resampling of YCS estimated from the base model (1881–1996), for catch at the 2021 level of 524 t (plus a 5% catch overrun assumed). SSB was predicted to increase slowly (Figure 12, Table 12). The SSB was estimated to be greater than the lower bound of the target zone ($30\% SSB_0$) with at least 70% probability by 2037.




Figure 9: Mid-East Coast orange roughy base case MCMC estimates of upper panels: the Spawning Stock Biomass (SSB), and vulnerable biomass trends estimated using logistic selectivity parameters averaged across all fisheries (average vulnerable biomass, VB_0 ; $A_{50} = 34$, $A_{1095} = 8$), and in the southern fisheries (South and Pegasus, VB_s ; $A_{50} = 24$, $A_{1095} = 2$). Lower panels, biomass in each year as a proportion of initial biomass. The light shaded area covers the 95% credible intervals, the darker shaded area the 50% credible intervals, and the solid line the median. The horizontal broken lines indicate the hard limit (10% of virgin biomass), soft limit (20% of virgin biomass), and 40% of virgin biomass.




Figure 10: Mid-East Coast orange roughy base case MCMC estimates “true” YCS (R_t/R_0). Upper panel: The light shaded area covers the 95% credible intervals, the darker shaded area the 50% credible intervals, the solid black line the median, and the solid red line the mean. The vertical blue line (to the right) indicates the year class estimated to be 50% recruited to the Pegasus fishery in 2022 (the second largest fishery, after the spawn fishery, in 2022). The vertical red line (to the left) indicates the year class 50% recruited to the spawning stock in 2022. Lower panel: mean “true” YCS.




Figure 11: Mid-East Coast orange roughy base case MCMC estimates of exploitation rate (catch/vulnerable biomass). The box in each year covers 50% of the distribution and the whiskers extend to 95% of the distribution. The exploitation rate associated with a biomass target of 30–50% SSB_0 is marked by shaded box.




Figure 12: Mid-East Coast orange roughy base case MCMC projections of spawning stock biomass with constant future catch. The box in each year covers 50% of the distribution and the whiskers extend to 95% of the distribution. The lower bound of the target range (30% SSB_0) is indicated by the black horizontal broken line, with the soft limit (20% SSB_0) in blue.

Table 12: Mid-East Coast orange roughy MCMC estimates of projected spawning stock biomass (SSB) for the base model, and the probability of above the hard limit (10% SSB_0), soft limit (20% SSB_0), and lower bound of the target range (30% SSB_0).

Fishing year	$p(SSB < X\% SSB_0)$		$p(SSB > 30\% B_0)$
	$X=10\%$	$X=20\%$	
2021–22	0.00	0.21	0.01
2022–23	0.00	0.16	0.03
2023–24	0.00	0.10	0.05
2024–25	0.00	0.06	0.09
2025–26	0.00	0.04	0.15
2026–27	0.00	0.03	0.23

5. FUTURE RESEARCH CONSIDERATIONS

Relationship between maturity and spawning and prevalence of skipped spawning

- The estimated age of 50% spawning was unexpectedly high (about 55 years) given that orange roughy have generally been estimated to have an age of 50% maturity of about 30–35 years. To be plausible, the later age of 50% spawning relative to maturity requires an assumption of skipped spawning that is more prevalent in younger fish. There is theoretical support for this assumption

and evidence from Mid-East Coast trawl survey gonad samples that not all female Mid-East Coast orange roughy were spawning by age 50.

- o The theoretical expectations for skipped spawning, and the availability of existing data to inform skipped spawning estimates, need to be investigated.
- o A simulation model to investigate the skipped spawning hypothesis should be constructed.

Collection of biological data including aged otoliths

- Additional biological samples should be collected, including maturity evaluations and aged otoliths, to better inform assumptions about maturity and spawning. Because variability in biological characteristics seems to be greater between than within catches, sample collection should focus on collecting adequate samples from many catches (including surveys). Sampling across years is also required to allow temporal variability in the age structure of spawning aggregations, and potential skipped spawning, to be investigated.
- Obtain more data on macroscopic versus histological staging for a range of known ages including those beyond 50. Ensure historical data are fully utilised.
- Obtain further samples from research or commercial trawls to investigate maturity outside the main spawning areas. Review the overall approach to collecting age frequencies, length frequencies, and maturity data both from spawning and non-spawning fisheries, and research surveys and commercial fisheries to improve coverage and representativeness.
- Collect age data from both acoustic and commercial catches in the same year.

Stock structure

- Review the existing information with respect to stock structure, including genetic, morphometric, and other information, including from adjacent stock areas. This review could then be used to guide the development of stock structure assumptions in assessment models.

Age frequencies for commercial fisheries

- The estimates of selectivity for three of the four fisheries in the 2022 assessment model were informed only by length frequency samples, and estimated selectivity parameters were particularly uncertain. Aged otolith samples from the non-spawning fisheries are needed to improve these estimates of fishery selectivity.
- Re-age the 2002 otolith samples using the new protocol.

Loss of some historical spawning aggregations

- Some historical spawning aggregations have been depleted, and no longer seem to occur. For the Mid-East Coast, this includes the aggregation on Strawberry Mountain. The relationship between different spawning aggregations within the same assumed stock, and the implications of the loss of spawning aggregations for orange roughy and the wider ecosystem, should be investigated.

Catch history

- Investigate whether alternative assumptions about historical catches could result in better model fits, posteriors, and other outputs, specifically with reference to uncertainty in catch overruns relating to discarding and lost fish.

CPUE

- The existing fisheries catch and -effort data are not considered to be useful for generating a relative abundance index for this stock. However, given the sparsity of relative abundance information from formal surveys, an exploration of existing fisheries catch rate information, standardising for the effects of vessel, month, and location, etc., may yield longer time series of abundance information for specific locations that can be used to compare with model outputs.

Fishing intensity

- Reconsider how a consistent, combined U or F is best calculated.

East Cape stock assessment

- Options for updating the assessment of ORH 2A North (East Cape) should be investigated.

6. STATUS OF THE STOCKS


Stock Structure Assumptions

Orange roughy in ORH 2A, 2B, and 3A are treated as two biological stocks based on the location of spawning grounds. These stocks are managed and assessed separately, however some genetic mixing has been shown to occur. The 2A North stock spawns around the East Cape hills off of the North Island. The 2A South, 2B, and 3A stock is assumed to spawn on Ritchie Bank and surrounding areas (Rockgarden, Sea Valley).

• ORH East Cape Stock (2A North)

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2003	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Very Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2001–02	Catch: 186 t
Assessment Runs Presented	A base case with one alternative	
Reference Points	Management Target: 30–50% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold:-	
Status in relation to Target	B_{2003} was 24% B_0 , which was Unlikely (< 40%) to be at or above the target.	
Status in relation to Limits	B_{2003} was Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the Soft Limit, and Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below the Hard Limit	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



Estimated biomass trajectory for the base model run for the EC stock. Annual biomass estimates are mean posterior density (MPD) values and 95% confidence intervals (grey dashed lines) are calculated from the posterior profile distribution of B_0 estimates. The CPUE index CVs (sampling error plus process error) are shown.

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Biomass declined in the early 1990s but appeared to stabilise at around 5000 t.
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	F has declined along with the agreed catch limit and remains stable at the current catch level of 200 t.
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-
Projections and Prognosis (2003)	

Stock Projections or Prognosis	The estimated CAY (370 t) and MAY (410 t) were both greater than the catch limit of 200 t, and this suggested the stock would start to rebuild.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%)
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	-

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation

Assessment Type	Level 1 – Full Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Statistical catch-at-age model implemented in CASAL with Bayesian estimation of posterior distributions	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2003	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	-	
Main data inputs	- Catch - Standardised CPUE - 1994–95 egg survey	
Data not used (rank)	-	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	-	

Qualifying Comments

The most recent assessment (2003) is now 11 years out-of-date. In recent years, the ability of stock assessment models that assume deterministic recruitment for orange roughy stocks to reflect current or projected stock status has been called into question.

Fishery Interactions


The main bycatch species are cardinalfish and alfonsino. Low productivity bycatch species include deepwater sharks, deepsea skates, and corals. Protected species bycatch includes seabirds and corals.

- **ORH Mid-East Coast Stock (2A South, 2B, 3A)**

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2022	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Very Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2020–21	Catch: 552 t
Assessment Runs Presented	Base model	
Reference Points	Management Target: Biomass range 30–50% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: Fishing intensity range $U_{30\%B_0}$ – $U_{50\%B_0}$	
Status in relation to Target	B_{2022} was estimated to be 22% B_0 Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be at or above the lower end of the management target range	
Status in relation to Limits	B_{2022} is About as Likely as Not (40–60%) to be below the Soft Limit B_{2022} is Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the Hard Limit	

Status in relation to Overfishing	Fishing intensity in 2022 was estimated to be 0.8% (37% of $U_{30\%B_0}$) Overfishing is Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be occurring

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



Historical trajectory over time of exploitation rate (U) and spawning biomass (% B₀), for the Mid-East Coast orange roughy base model, from the start of the fishery (represented by a red point), to 2022. The red vertical line at 10% B₀ represents the hard limit, the orange line at 20% B₀ is the soft limit, and green shaded areas are the % B₀ target (30–50% B₀) and the corresponding exploitation rate (U₃₀– U₅₀). Biomass and exploitation rate estimates are medians from MCMC results.

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Estimated spawning biomass has been slowly increasing since about 2000. Average vulnerable biomass has also been increasing over the same period.
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Estimated fishing intensity has been low and stable since 2014–15.
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis

Stock Projections or Prognosis	At the current catch limit, the stock is projected to increase slowly over the next five years and to be above the soft limit but below the lower bound of the target in 2027.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	For the current catch and catch limit (over the next 5 years): Soft Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%)
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	For the current catch and catch limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%)

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation

Assessment Type	Level 1 - Full Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Age-structured CASAL model with Bayesian estimation of posterior distributions	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2022	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	

Main data inputs (rank)	- Acoustic biomass estimates (2013, 2017, 2021) - Trawl survey biomass indices (1992–94, 2010), age frequencies (1993, 2010), length frequencies (1992, 1994), proportion spawning at age (1993, 2010) - Spawning season age frequencies (1989–91, 2010, 2017, 2021) - Commercial length frequencies (1989–90 to 2017–18)	1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	- CPUE indices - 2002 spawning season age frequency - Wide-area acoustic estimates - Egg survey estimates	3 – Low Quality: unlikely to be indexing stock-wide abundance 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: needs to be re-aged with new protocol 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: too much potential bias due to target identification and mixed species issues 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: too much potential bias due to survey design assumptions not being met
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	- Four fisheries instead of two, including a spawning fishery - Spawning ogive set equal to the spawning fishery selectivity (with an assumption of mature fish skipping spawning) - CV of YCS prior set at 0.8, rather than “nearly uniform” - Acoustic q mean set in the base case at 0.8 rather than 0.6 - Growth parameters have been updated - Sex is now included in the partition, but only for estimating growth - Trawl survey fitted with double-normal (immature) and constant (mature) selectivity	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- The proportion of the spawning stock biomass that was indexed by the acoustic surveys - Recent recruitment, where a lack of observational data meant year class strengths were assumed to be average since 1997 - The age-specific proportion of mature fish that spawn - Spatial population structure - Historical catches uncertain	

Qualifying Comments

-

Fishery Interactions

Fish bycatch is estimated to make up about 20% of the total catch in this fishery. The main bycatch species are alfonsino, smooth oreo, and hoki. Low productivity bycatch species include deepwater sharks, deepsea skates, and corals. Observed incidental captures of protected species include corals, low numbers of seabirds, and a New Zealand fur seal. Orange roughy are caught using bottom trawl gear. Bottom trawling interacts with benthic habitats.

7. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Anderson, O F (2000) Assessment of the East Cape hills (ORH 2A North) orange roughy fishery for the 2000–01 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/19*. 29 p.

Anderson, O F (2003a) A summary of biological information on the New Zealand fisheries for orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) for the 2001–02 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/21*. 25 p.

- Anderson, O F (2003b) CPUE analysis and stock assessment of the East Cape hills (ORH 2A North) orange roughy fishery for 2003. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/24*. 20 p.
- Anderson, O F (2005) CPUE analysis and stock assessment of the South Chatham Rise orange roughy fishery for 2003–04. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report*. 2005/07.
- Anderson, O F; Dunn, M R (2007a) Descriptive analysis of catch and effort data from New Zealand orange roughy fisheries in ORH 1, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, and 7B to the end of the 2003–04 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report*. 2006/20.
- Anderson, O F; Dunn, M R (2007b) Descriptive analysis of catch and effort data from New Zealand orange roughy fisheries in ORH 1, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, and 7B to the end of the 2004–05 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report*. 2007/29.
- Anderson, O F; Francis, R I C C; Hicks, A C (2002) CPUE analysis and assessment of Mid-East Coast orange roughy stock (ORH 2A South, 2B, 3A). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2002/56*. 23 p.
- Bull, B; Francis, R I C C; Dunn, A; Gilbert, D J (2002) CASAL (C++ algorithmic stock assessment laboratory): CASAL user manual v1.02.2002/10/21. *NIWA Technical Report 117*. 199 p.
- Bull, B; Francis, R I C C; Dunn, A; Gilbert, D J; Bian, R; Fu, D (2012) CASAL (C++ algorithmic stock assessment laboratory): CASAL User Manual v2.30-2012/03/21. *NIWA Technical Report 135*. 280 p.
- Clark, M; Anderson, O; Dunn, M (2003) Descriptive analysis of catch and effort data from New Zealand orange roughy fisheries in ORH 1, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, and 7B to the end of the 2001–02 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/60*. 51 p.
- Clark, M R; Taylor, P; Anderson, O F; O'Driscoll, R (2002) Descriptive analysis of catch and effort data from New Zealand orange roughy fisheries in ORH 1, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, and 7B to the end of the 2000–01 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report*. 2002/62.
- Cordue, P L (2012) Fishing intensity metrics for use in overfishing determination. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 69: 615–623
- Cordue, P L (2014a) A 2013 stock assessment of Mid-East Coast orange roughy. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/32*.
- Cordue, P L (2014b) A Management Strategy Evaluation for orange roughy. ISL Client Report for Deepwater Group. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Cordue, P L (2014c) The 2014 orange roughy stock assessments. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/50*. 135 p.
- Cordue, P L (2017) A stock assessment update to the end of the 2017–18 fishing year for the Mid-East Coast orange roughy stock. ISL Client Report for Deepwater Group. 45 p.
- Doonan, I J (1994) Life history parameters of orange roughy: estimates for 1994. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1994/19*. 13 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Doonan, I J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (2004a) Acoustic estimates of the abundance of orange roughy for the Mid-East Coast fishery, June 2003. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2004/54*. 21 p.
- Doonan, I J; Dunn, M R (2011) Trawl survey of Mid-East Coast orange roughy, March–April 2010. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2011/20*.
- Doonan, I J; Hicks, A C; Coombs, R F; Hart, A C; Tracey, D (2003) Acoustic estimates of the abundance of orange roughy in the Mid-East Coast fishery, June–July 2001. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/4*. 22 p.
- Doonan, I J; Horn, P L; Krusic-Golub, K (2013) Comparison of age between 1993 and 2010 for mid-east coast orange roughy (ORH 2Asouth, 2B & 3A). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/44*.
- Doonan, I J; Tracey, D M; Grimes, P J (2004b) Relationships between macroscopic staging and microscopic observations of oocyte progression in orange roughy during and after the mid-winter spawning period, Northwest Hills, Chatham Rise, July 2002. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2004/6*. 28 p.
- Dunn, M R (2005) CPUE analysis and assessment of the Mid-East Coast orange roughy stock (ORH 2A South, 2B, 3A) to the end of the 2002–03 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2005/18*. 35 p.
- Dunn, M R; Anderson, O F; McKenzie, A (2005) Descriptive analysis of catch and effort data from New Zealand orange roughy fisheries in ORH 1, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, and 7B to the end of the 2002–03 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2005/19*. 60 p.
- Field, K D; Francis, R I C C; Zeldis, J R; Annala, J H (1994) Assessment of the Cape Runaway to Banks Peninsula (ORH 2A, 2B, and 3A) orange roughy fishery for the 1994–1995 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1994/20*. 24 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Francis, R I C C (1992) Recommendations concerning the calculation of maximum constant yield (MCY) and current annual yield (CAY). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1992/8*. 27 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Francis, R I C C (2011) Data weighting in statistical fisheries stock assessment models. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 68: 1124–1138.
- Francis, R I C C; Clark, M R; Coburn, R P; Field, K D; Grimes, P J (1995) Assessment of the ORH 3B orange roughy fishery for the 1994–95 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1995/4*. 43 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Francis, R I C C; Field, K D (2000) CPUE analysis and assessment of the Mid-East Coast orange roughy stock (ORH 2A South, 2B, 3A). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/29*. 20 p.
- Francis, R I C C; Horn, P L (1997) Transition zone in otoliths of orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) and its relationship to the onset of maturity. *Marine Biology* 129: 681–687.
- Francis, R I C C; Hurst, R J; Renwick, J A (2001) An evaluation of catchability assumptions in New Zealand stock assessments. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/1*. 37 p.
- Grimes, P (1994) Trawl survey of orange roughy between Cape Runaway and Banks Peninsula, March–April 1992 (TAN9203). *New Zealand Fisheries Data Report No. 42*. 36 p.
- Grimes, P (1996a) Trawl survey of orange roughy between Cape Runaway and Banks Peninsula, March–April 1993 (TAN9303). *New Zealand Fisheries Data Report No. 76*. 31 p.
- Grimes, P (1996b) Trawl survey of orange roughy between Cape Runaway and Banks Peninsula, March–April 1994 (TAN9403). *New Zealand Fisheries Data Report No. 82*. 31 p.
- Hart, A; Doonan, I J; Coombs, R F (2003) Classification of acoustic fish marks for the 2001 Mid-East Coast orange roughy fishery, June–July 2001. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report*. 2003/18.
- Kloser, R J; Macaulay, G; Ryan, T; Lewis, M (2011) Improving acoustic species identification and target strength using frequency difference and visual verification: example for a deep-sea fish orange roughy. DWWG 2011-52. (Unpublished report held by the Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Tracey, D; Ayers, D (2005) Biological data from the orange roughy abundance surveys in the Mid-East Coast fishery. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report*. 2005/10.
- Tracey, D; Horn, P; Marriott, P; Krusic-Golub, K; Gren, C; Gili, R; Mieres, L C (2007) Orange Roughy Ageing Workshop: otolith preparation and interpretation. Draft report to DWWG. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Zeldis, J R; Francis, R I C C; Field, K D; Clark, M R; Grimes, P J (1997) Description and analyses of the 1995 orange roughy egg surveys at East Cape and Ritchie Bank (TAN9507), and reanalyses of the 1993 Ritchie Bank egg survey. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1997/28*. 34 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)

ORANGE ROUGHY, CHATHAM RISE AND SOUTHERN NEW ZEALAND (ORH 3B)

1. FISHERY SUMMARY

Allowances, TACCs, and TACs are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs, and TACs (t) for ORH 3B from 1 October 2025.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
ORH 3B	0	5	23	2 321	2 349

1.1 Commercial fisheries

Orange roughy are found in waters deeper than 750 m throughout Quota Management Area 3B. Historically, the main fishery has been concentrated on the Chatham Rise. Annual reported orange roughy catches in ORH 3B ranged between 24 000 and 33 000 t in the 1980s, progressively decreased from 1989–90 to 1995–96 because of a series of TACC reductions, were stable over the mid-1990s to mid-2000s, decreased further after 2005–06 as TACCs were further reduced, increased after 2012–13 as TACCs were increased, and then decreased in 2023–24 as the TACC was reduced (Table 2 and Figure 1). The TACC was further reduced in October 2025. In June 2026 the Minister of Oceans and Fisheries decided to close the North-west part of the Spawning Box (includes the three main spawning areas within ESCR -Rekohu, the Old Spawning Plume and Mt Muck) to orange roughy fishing from 1 June to 16 July in an effort to assist with improving spawning success. This spawning closure will remain in place until the fishery reaches 40% B0. There has been no analysis of the ORH for orange roughy in 2026 and as a result not all tables have been updated with 2024-25 data. An independent review of orange roughy stock assessment science will take place in June 2026 and work on stock assessments will resume once this is completed.

Table 2: Reported landings (t), TACCs (t) and Agreed catch limits (t) from 1979–80 to present. QMS data from 1986 to present.

Fishing year	Reported catch (t)	TACC (t)	Agreed catch limit (t) §	Fishing year	Reported catch (t)	TACC (t)	Agreed catch limit (t) §
1979–80†	11 800	–	–	2010–11	3 486	4 610	3 860
1980–81†	31 100	–	–	2011–12	2 765	3 600	2 850
1981–82†	28 200	23 000	–	2012–13	2 515	3 600	2 850
1982–83*	32 605	23 000	–	2013–14	4 492	4 500	–
1983–84*	32 535	30 000	–	2014–15	4 747	5 000	–
1984–85	29 340	30 000	–	2015–16	4 529	5 000	–
1985–86	30 075	29 865	–	2016–17	4 486	5 197	–
1986–87	30 689	38 065	–	2017–18	4 942	5 197	–
1987–88	24 214	38 065	–	2018–19	5 157	6 091	–
1988–89	32 785	38 300	–	2019–20	5 624	6 772	–
1989–90	31 669	32 787	–	2020–21	6 524	7 967	–
1990–91	21 521	23 787	–	2021–22	6 781	7 967	–
1991–92	23 269	23 787	–	2022–23	6 764	7 967	–
1992–93	20 048	21 300	–	2023–24	2 691	4 752	–
1993–94	16 960	21 300	–	2024–25	3 566	4 752	–
1994–95	11 891	14 000	–				
1995–96	12 501	12 700	–				
1996–97	9 278	12 700	–				
1997–98	9 638	12 700	–				
1998–99	9 372	12 700	–				
1999–00	8 663	12 700	–				
2000–01	9 274	12 700	–				
2001–02	11 325	12 700	–				
2002–03	12 333	12 700	–				
2003–04	11 254	12 700	–				
2004–05	12 370	12 700	–				
2005–06	12 554	12 700	–				
2006–07	11 271	11 500	–				
2007–08	10 291	10 500	–				
2008–09	8 758	9 420	–				
2009–10	6 662	7 950	–				

† Catches for 1979–80 to 1981–82 are for an April–March fishing year.

* Catches for 1982–83 and 1983–84 are 15 month totals to accommodate the change from an April–March fishing year to an October–September fishing year. The TACC for the interim season, March to September 1983, was 16 125 t.

‡ Catches from 1984–85 onwards are for a 1 October–30 September fishing year.

§ Agreed, non-regulatory catch limits between industry and MPI, which includes ‘shelving’ (an agreement that transfers ACE to a third party to effectively reduce the catch without adjusting the TACC).

ORANGE ROUGHY (ORH 3B) – May 2026

There have been major changes in the distribution of catch and effort over the history of this fishery (Table 3). Initially, it was confined to the Chatham Rise and, until 1982, most of the catch was taken from areas of relatively flat bottom on the northern slopes of the Rise (in the Spawning Box), between mid-June and mid-August, when the fish form large aggregations for spawning (Figure 2).

From 1983 to 1989 about one third of the catch was taken from the south and east Chatham Rise, where new fishing grounds developed on and around knolls and hill features. Much of the catch from these areas was taken outside the spawning season as the fishery extended to most months of the year.




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACCs for ORH 3B.

Table 3: ORH 3B catches by area, to the nearest 10 t or 100 t, and by percentage (to the nearest percent) of the total ORH 3B reported catch. Catches are equivalent to those shown in Table 2 but are allocated to an area using the ratio of estimated catches, and revised such that all years are from 1 October–30 September. Note that catches for the East Rise are given by the sum of Spawning Box and Rest of East Rise [Continued on next page].

Year	Northwest Rise		South Rise		Spawning box		Rest of East Rise		Non-Chatham	
	t	%	t	%	t	%	t	%	t	%
1978–79	0	0	0	0	11 500	98	300	2	0	0
1979–80	1 200	4	800	3	27 900	90	1 200	4	0	0
1980–81	8 400	30	3 700	13	16 000	57	100	0	0	0
1981–82	7 000	28	500	2	16 600	67	800	3	0	0
1982–83	5 400	35	4 800	31	4 600	30	600	4	0	0
1983–84	3 300	13	5 100	21	15 000	61	1 500	6	0	0
1984–85	1 800	6	7 900	27	18 400	63	1 100	4	0	0
1985–86	3 700	12	5 300	18	17 000	56	4 100	13	0	0
1986–87	3 200	10	4 900	16	20 200	66	2 400	8	0	0
1987–88	1 600	7	6 800	28	13 500	56	2 300	10	0	0
1988–89	3 800	12	9 200	28	16 700	51	3 100	9	0	0
1989–90	3 300	10	11 000	35	16 200	51	1 100	3	200	1
1990–91	1 500	7	6 900	32	6 100	28	6 100	29	900	4
1991–92	300	1	2 200	9	1 000	4	12 000	51	7 800	34
1992–93	3 800	19	5 400	27	100	0	4 700	23	6 100	30
1993–94	3 500	21	5 100	30	0	0	4 900	29	3 500	20
1994–95	2 400	20	1 600	13	500	5	3 500	30	3 800	32
1995–96	2 400	19	1 300	10	1 600	13	2 200	17	5 000	40
1996–97	2 200	24	1 400	15	1 700	19	1 900	21	1 900	21
1997–98	2 300	23	1 700	17	2 400	24	2 200	22	1 600	16
1998–99	2 700	28	1 200	13	1 100	11	2 500	27	1 900	21
1999–00	2 100	24	1 100	13	1 500	17	3 100	36	800	9
2000–01	2 600	27	1 700	18	1 200	13	2 300	24	1 500	17
2001–02	2 200	19	1 100	10	3 100	28	3 600	31	1 300	12
2002–03	2 200	19	1 500	13	3 200	27	3 900	33	1 500	7
2003–04	2 000	18	1 400	12	4 300	38	2 600	23	1 000	9
2004–05	1 600	13	1 700	14	4 100	33	3 000	24	2 000	16
2005–06	1 400	11	1 300	10	3 900	31	3 900	31	2 100	16
2006–07	700	7	1 200	11	4 200	37	3 700	32	1 500	16
2007–08	800	8	1 300	13	3 800	37	2 700	26	1 600	16
2008–09	750	8	1 170	14	3 400	39	2 150	25	1 290	15
2009–10	720	11	940	14	3 120	47	1 260	19	620	9
2010–11	40	1	460	13	1 860	53	740	21	380	11
2011–12	70	3	300	11	1 520	55	770	28	100	3
2012–13	110	4	290	12	1 450	58	590	24	70	3
2013–14	800	18	500	12	1 420	33	1 240	29	540	12
2014–15	800	17	370	8	1 990	43	700	15	630	14
2015–16	700	16	360	8	1 220	28	1 800	42	460	11
2016–17	730	16	530	12	1 310	29	1 150	26	590	13
2017–18	840	17	445	9	1 285	26	1 532	31	840	17

Table 3 [Continued]:

Year	Northwest Rise		South Rise		Spawning box		Rest of East Rise		Non-Chatham	
2018–19	304	7	455	10	2 556	55	651	14	684	15
2019–20	342	5	307	6	3 233	59	1 144	21	596	11
2020–21	391	6	235	4	4 241	65	1 311	20	346	5
2021–22	203	3	316	5	5 099	75	709	10	454	7
2022–23	185	3	365	5	5 227	77	543	8	445	7
2023–24	212	8	51	2	1 445	54	702	26	280	10

In the early 1990s, effort within Chatham Rise shifted further from the Spawning Box to eastern and northwestern parts of the rise. The Spawning Box was closed to fishing from 1992–93 to 1994–95. It was then reopened and since the annual catch has mostly come from the Spawning Box and the Rest of the East Rise (Table 3). In 2026, the Minister decided to close the North-west part of the Spawning box (Rekohu, the Old Spawning Plume and Mt Muck) to orange roughy fishing from 1 June to 16 June in an effort to assist with spawning success.

The early 1990s also saw the Puysegur fishery develop, followed by other fishing grounds near the Auckland Islands and on the Pukaki Rise, which was also a focus for the fishery south of the Chatham Rise. Since 2020–21, more than half of the ORH 3B catch was taken from the Spawning Box, with at most 20% of the catch coming from the Northwest Chatham Rise, South Chatham Rise, and Subantarctic combined (Table 3).

Since 1992–93, the distribution of the catch within ORH 3B has been managed by a series of catch limit agreements between the fishing industry and the Minister responsible for fisheries. Initially, the agreement was that at least 5000 t be caught south of 46° S. Subsequently, the catch limits, and the designated sub-areas to which they apply, have changed from year to year. The TACC was reduced to 3600 t in 2011–12 but has since been increased (Table 2). The agreed catch limit for the East and South Chatham Rise increased each year between 2017–18 and 2020–21, remained at 5970 t until 2022–23, and was then reduced to 2755 t (Table 4).

The catch limits by sub-area are given in Table 4. On five occasions, 250 t of the ORH 3B TACC has been set aside for industry research surveys (Table 4), although this has sometimes been used in areas outside the East and South Chatham Rise.




Figure 2: ORH 3B fishery sub-areas and the approximate position of other named fisheries. The recognised stocks are indicated by bold text. The rectangles mark the main fishing grounds, with those on Chatham Rise shaded: A, Graveyard (180) hills; B, Spawning Box; C, Smith's City NE hills; D, Andes; E, Chiefs; F, South Rise (Mt. Kiso & Hegerville). The Old Spawning Plume, Rehoku, and Mt Muck are all within the Spawning Box (B).

ORANGE ROUGHY (ORH 3B) – May 2026

Outside the Spawning Box, catches increased in the 1990s and catch rates have been highly variable, sustained largely by the discovery of new fishing areas. Flat areas on the Northwest Rise and several major hills on the South Rise were important in the late 1980s, but no longer produce their previous levels of catch (Table 5). High catch rates can still occur, but these are less frequent than observed in the early years of the fishery. Catches from the Northwest Rise fell to near zero in 2010–11 as a result of an agreement among quota owners to avoid fishing in this area (Table 3). This agreement was extended to the 2011–12 and 2012–13 fishing years. Quota owners then agreed to shelve 207 tonnes of Northwest Chatham Rise ACE for 2014–15 to 2017–18. The catch limit was set at 1150 t from 1 October 2018.

Table 4: Commercial catch limits (t) by designated sub-area within ORH 3B, as agreed between the industry and the Ministers responsible for fisheries since 1992–93. Note that East Rise includes the Spawning Box, closed between 1992–93 and 1994–95. Sub-area boundaries have varied somewhat between years. * South Rise included in East Rise catch limit. ** Arrow Plateau included in Sub-Antarctic.

Year	Northwest Chatham Rise	East Chatham Rise	South Chatham Rise	Puysegur	Arrow Plateau	Sub-Antarctic
1992–93	3 500	4 500	6 300	5 000	–	2 000
1993–94	3 500	4 500	6 300	5 000	–	2 000
1994–95	2 500	3 500	2 000	2 000	3 000	1 000
1995–96	2 250	4 950	*	1 000	**	4 500
1996–97	2 250	4 950	*	500	**	5 000
1997–98	2 250	4 950	*	0	1 500	4 000
1998–99	2 250	4 950	*	0	1 500	4 000
1999–00	2 250	4 950	*	0	1 500	4 000
2000–01	2 250	4 950	*	0	1 500	4 000
2001–02	2 000	7 000	1 400	0	1 000	1 300
2002–03	2 000	7 000	1 400	0	1 000	1 300
2003–04	2 000	7 000	1 400	0	1 000	1 300
2004–05†	1 500	7 250	1 400	0	1 000	1 300
2005–06†	1 500	7 250	1 400	0†	1 000	1 300
2006–07	750	8 650‡	*	0	0	1 850
2007–08†	750	7 650#	*	0	0	1 850
2008–09†	750	6 570§	*	0	0	1 850
2009–10†	750	5 100	*	0	0	1 850
2010–11	750β	2 960†	*	150	0	500
2011–12	750β	1 950†	*	150	0	500
2012–13	750β	1 950†	*	150	0	500
2013–14	750	3 100	*	150	0	500
2014–15	1 250δ	3 100	*	150	0	500
2015–16	1 250δ	3 100	*	150	0	500
2016–17	1 250δ	3 100	*	347	0	500
2017–18	1 250δ	3 100	*	347	0	500
2018–19	1 150	4 095	*	347	0	500
2019–20	1 150	4 775	*	347	0	500
2020–21	1 150	5 970	*	347	0	500
2021–22	1 150	5 970	*	347	0	500
2022–23	1 150	5 970	*	347	0	500
2023–24	1 150	2 755	*	347	0	500
2024–25	1 150	2 755	*	347	0	500

† An additional 250 t set aside for industry research surveys.

‡ 8650 t allocated to the East and South Chatham Rise combined, with no more than 2000 t from the South Rise, and no more than 7250 t from the East Rise.

Combined East and South Rise catch not to exceed 7650 t; East Rise not to exceed 6500 t; South Rise catch not to exceed 1750 t.

§ In 2008–09, the catch from the spawning plume was not to exceed 3285 t.

β From 2010–11 to 2012–13, quota owners agreed to avoid fishing the Northwest Rise.

δ Quota owners agreed to shelve 207 tonnes of Northwest Chatham Rise ACE for 2014–15 to 2017–18. This left 1043 tonnes available to catch.

Between 1991–92 and 2000–01, more than half of the Chatham Rise catch came from four hill complexes: the Andes, Smith City and neighbours, Graveyard, and Big Chief and neighbours (Table 5). All of these have shown a decline in unstandardised catch rate since the early years of the fishery, and, in recent years, catch rates in these hill complexes have remained relatively low. After 2000–01, the proportion of the catch from these hill complexes decreased, as a greater proportion of the catch came from the Spawning Box. Catches from the Old Spawning Plume during the spawning season (which peaks in July) decreased to < 100 t between 2015–16 and 2019–20 as fishing was focused on Rekohu but then increased from 2020–21 (Table 5).

ORANGE ROUGHY (ORH 3B) – May 2026

Table 5: Orange roughy estimated catches (to nearest 10 t), effort as number of tows, and unstandardised catch rates (total catch divided by total number of tows; to nearest 0.1 t/tow) for orange roughy target fishing on Chatham Rise. Spawning Box In season is spawning plume area May-August), and Out season is September-April. Letters in parentheses indicate sub-areas, as in Table 4. Approximate positions are: Big Chief, 44.7° S, 175.2° W; Smiths City and neighbours, 43.1° S, 174.2° W; Andes, 44.2° S, 174.6° W; Graveyard, 42.8° S, 180°). NA is shown when there were fewer than three vessels in the fishery within the last five years reported. →, zero targeted catch and effort. NA - fewer than three vessels in the fishery (last five years). [Continued on next page]

Year	Andes (E)			Smith's City NE Hills (E)			Spawning Box In (E)			Spawning Box Out (E)		
	Catch	Tows	t/tow	Catch	Tows	t/tow	Catch	Tows	t/tow	Catch	Tows	t/tow
1978–79	–	–	–	–	–	–	7 100	446	15.9	2 240	172	13.0
1979–80	–	–	–	110	36	3.1	9 800	967	10.1	7 400	791	9.4
1980–81	–	–	–	2	2	1.0	11 100	889	12.5	6 240	461	13.5
1981–82	–	–	–	40	11	3.6	4 750	470	10.1	4 450	604	7.4
1982–83	–	–	–	40	2	20.0	3 980	227	17.5	3 840	386	9.9
1983–84	–	–	–	60	7	8.6	6 590	378	17.4	8 630	836	10.3
1984–85	–	–	–	10	3	3.3	9 320	676	13.8	7 460	537	13.9
1985–86	–	–	–	670	52	12.9	8 521	659	12.9	7 650	859	8.9
1986–87	–	–	–	210	34	6.2	8 090	597	13.6	12 010	1 035	11.6
1987–88	–	–	–	160	33	4.8	7 870	622	12.7	5 820	701	8.3
1988–89	30	18	1.7	310	48	6.5	6 970	595	11.7	6 730	817	8.2
1989–90	90	13	6.9	40	9	4.4	6 830	403	16.9	5 020	609	8.2
1990–91	80	12	6.7	4 890	633	7.7	2 820	238	11.8	2 900	212	13.7
1991–92	7 080	724	9.8	1 270	222	5.7	650	85	7.6	380	59	6.4
1992–93	2 940	345	8.5	600	84	7.1	50	2	25.0	60	11	5.5
1993–94	3 320	605	5.5	560	109	5.1	–	–	–	20	3	6.7
1994–95	1 650	573	2.9	1 140	345	3.3	490	86	5.7	20	31	0.6
1995–96	1 120	418	2.7	410	145	2.8	1 360	127	10.7	150	42	3.6
1996–97	730	260	2.8	720	164	4.4	930	101	9.2	610	107	5.7
1997–98	1 140	476	2.4	400	146	2.7	1 580	118	13.4	660	154	4.3
1998–99	1 260	448	2.8	810	272	3.0	510	73	7.0	530	151	3.5
1999–00	1 990	529	3.8	680	210	3.2	910	34	26.8	520	112	4.6
2000–01	980	354	2.8	650	191	3.4	810	59	13.7	440	124	3.5
2001–02	2 040	546	3.7	490	167	2.9	2 120	159	13.3	960	219	4.4
2002–03	2 230	872	2.6	400	124	3.2	2 150	166	13.0	1 000	216	4.6
2003–04	1 170	677	1.7	360	160	2.3	1 880	163	11.5	1 030	276	3.7
2004–05	1 090	518	2.1	310	127	2.4	1 910	214	8.9	860	230	3.7
2005–06	1 340	727	1.8	370	119	3.1	1 630	117	13.9	1 730	256	6.8
2006–07	1 160	583	2.0	570	201	2.8	1 980	121	16.4	1 720	355	4.8
2007–08	900	418	2.2	286	77	3.7	2 550	200	12.8	780	195	4.0
2008–09	350	327	1.1	473	174	2.7	2 020	121	16.7	1 030	214	4.8
2009–10	440	243	1.8	160	84	1.9	1 980	136	14.6	850	246	3.5
2010–11	460	151	3.0	90	27	3.3	1 230	75	16.4	70	28	2.5
2011–12	450	164	2.7	130	26	5.0	660	39	16.9	80	24	3.3
2012–13	450	163	2.8	10	7	1.4	580	30	19.3	70	18	3.9
2013–14	790	218	3.6	140	39	3.6	390	40	9.8	30	18	1.7
2014–15	460	162	2.8	42	16	2.6	210	27	7.8	50	9	5.6
2015–16	1 180	438	2.7	130	75	1.7	43	5	8.6	390	96	4.1
2016–17	700	438	1.6	70	37	1.9	–	–	–	320	104	3.1
2017–18	760	505	1.5	200	76	2.6	10	1	10.0	400	114	3.5
2018–19	470	423	1.1	190	81	2.3	40	10	4.0	260	95	2.7
2019–20	440	345	1.3	220	106	2.1	20	21	1.0	550	152	3.6
2020–21	180	281	0.6	140	85	1.6	1 220	167	7.3	1 530	303	5.0
2021–22	90	92	1.0	290	89	3.3	2 170	210	10.3	960	205	4.7
2022–23	60	55	1.1	133	47	2.8	2 539	171	14.8	797	165	4.8
2023–24	60	48	1.3	42	34	1.2	513	74	6.9	498	113	4.4

Year	Rest of East (E)			Graveyard (NW)			Rest of Northwest (NW)			Hegerville (S)		
	Catch	Tows	t/tow	Catch	Tows	t/tow	Catch	Tows	t/tow	Catch	Tows	t/tow
1980–81	30	10	3.0	80	8	10.0	7 960	2 072	3.8	980	235	4.2
1981–82	360	77	4.7	90	12	7.5	3 830	613	6.2	40	9	4.4
1982–83	1 030	63	16.3	90	11	8.2	8 500	1 482	5.7	7 440	856	8.7
1983–84	1 190	139	8.6	–	–	–	2 780	657	4.2	3 370	493	6.8
1984–85	990	80	12.4	–	–	–	1 640	314	5.2	5 660	824	6.9
1985–86	3 030	306	9.9	60	15	4.0	3 400	560	6.1	3 660	840	4.4
1986–87	1 950	296	6.6	30	12	2.5	2 920	659	4.4	2 470	601	4.1
1987–88	2 100	324	6.5	130	19	6.8	1 360	387	3.5	2 020	673	3.0
1988–89	2 090	299	7.0	130	28	4.6	3 280	846	3.9	1 160	563	2.1
1989–90	360	86	4.2	180	33	5.5	2 100	599	3.5	480	237	2.0
1990–91	540	92	5.9	10	4	2.5	1 230	268	4.6	230	80	2.9
1991–92	3 020	362	8.3	60	23	2.6	190	65	2.9	50	57	0.9
1992–93	610	85	7.2	3 240	298	10.9	210	80	2.6	400	91	4.4
1993–94	530	124	4.3	2 150	362	5.9	1 110	227	4.9	250	135	1.9
1994–95	500	199	2.5	1 590	362	4.4	800	293	2.7	120	107	1.1
1995–96	520	132	3.9	1 790	347	5.2	370	179	2.1	80	102	0.8
1996–97	310	102	3.0	840	205	4.1	1 070	345	3.1	120	92	1.3
1997–98	470	259	1.8	810	306	2.6	1 300	498	2.6	60	56	1.1
1998–99	350	210	1.7	930	187	5.0	1 520	553	2.7	120	23	5.2

ORANGE ROUGHY (ORH 3B) – May 2026

Table 5 [Continued]:

Year	Rest of East (E)			Graveyard (NW)			Rest of Northwest (NW)			Hegerville (S)		
	Catch	Tows	t/tow	Catch	Tows	t/tow	Catch	Tows	t/tow	Catch	Tows	t/tow
1999–00	390	157	2.5	620	236	2.6	1 360	369	3.7	10	9	1.1
2000–01	380	139	2.7	1 010	299	3.4	1 310	614	2.1	110	22	5.0
2001–02	800	215	3.7	730	206	3.5	1 270	652	1.9	30	20	1.5
2002–03	980	339	2.9	1 080	254	4.3	1 060	596	1.8	180	45	4.0
2003–04	440	267	1.6	750	127	5.9	1 090	595	1.8	100	48	2.1
2004–05	410	200	2.1	920	176	5.2	570	332	1.7	100	23	4.3
2005–06	1 210	404	3.0	960	191	5.0	440	253	1.7	110	59	1.9
2006–07	970	431	2.3	590	76	7.8	140	42	3.3	160	38	4.2
2008–09	970	372	2.6	390	75	5.2	300	113	2.7	530	184	2.9
2009–10	510	195	2.6	290	89	3.3	360	193	1.9	470	131	3.6
2010–11	120	39	3.1	10	5	2.0	30	5	6.0	130	32	4.1
2011–12	120	56	2.1	30	6	5.0	30	4	7.5	60	25	2.4
2012–13	60	38	1.6	70	9	7.8	20	5	4.0	30	10	3.0
2013–14	190	64	3.0	570	102	5.6	220	121	1.8	10	8	1.3
2014–15	160	36	4.4	550	164	3.4	200	120	1.7	10	8	1.3
2015–16	250	189	1.3	400	166	2.4	210	245	0.9	10	11	0.9
2016–17	180	131	1.4	190	143	1.3	430	323	1.3	21	30	0.7
2017–18	330	144	2.3	400	183	2.2	340	218	1.6	4	6	0.7
2018–19	330	170	1.9	140	81	1.7	180	147	1.2	18	8	2.3
2019–20	420	216	1.9	130	69	1.9	140	114	1.2	NA	NA	NA
2020–21	820	204	4.0	120	69	1.7	240	141	1.7	NA	NA	NA
2021–22	510	164	3.1	100	63	1.6	90	94	1.0	NA	NA	NA
2022–23	543	150	3.6	49	29	1.7	120	96	1.2	NA	NA	NA
2023–24	636	117	5.4	87	28	3.1	137	73	1.9	7	5	1.4

Year	Big Chief (S)			Rest of South (S)			Rekohu		
	Catch	Tows	t/tow	Catch	Tows	t/tow	Catch	Tows	t/tow
1978–79	–	–	–	–	–	–	140	9	15.6
1979–80	–	–	–	20	12	1.7	30	7	4.3
1980–81	–	–	–	110	25	4.4	60	4	15.0
1981–82	–	–	–	30	28	1.1	20	3	6.7
1982–83	–	–	–	180	31	5.8	30	4	7.5
1983–84	–	–	–	120	86	1.4	1	1	1.0
1984–85	–	–	–	870	289	3.0	0	0	–
1985–86	–	–	–	530	198	2.7	10	2	5.0
1986–87	–	–	–	1 440	433	3.3	40	4	10.0
1987–88	–	–	–	3 180	923	3.4	10	5	2.0
1988–89	1 010	198	5.1	4 810	1 810	2.7	40	5	8.0
1989–90	2 860	529	5.4	4 240	1 114	3.8	60	7	15.0
1990–91	3 150	457	6.9	1 710	508	3.4	–	–	–
1991–92	820	136	6.0	1 230	425	2.9	10	2	5.0
1992–93	3 300	690	4.8	1 260	476	2.6	–	–	–
1993–94	2 370	695	3.4	2 240	1 181	1.9	–	–	–
1994–95	530	262	2.0	930	960	1.0	1	4	0.3
1995–96	580	142	4.1	410	411	1.0	20	1	20.0
1996–97	420	138	3.0	360	209	1.7	2	3	0.7
1997–98	950	294	3.2	460	541	0.9	1	3	0.3
1998–99	560	212	2.6	420	265	1.6	–	–	–
1999–00	380	123	3.1	510	193	2.6	–	–	–
2000–01	1 020	213	4.8	440	222	2.0	–	–	–
2001–02	660	233	2.8	340	211	1.6	10	2	5.0
2002–03	650	275	2.4	480	205	2.3	–	–	–
2003–04	570	299	1.9	470	276	1.7	1 030	151	6.8
2004–05	790	308	2.6	520	240	2.2	1 030	200	5.2
2005–06	500	302	1.7	410	283	1.4	160	65	2.5
2006–07	510	282	1.8	200	191	1.0	80	43	1.9
2007–08	690	335	2.1	170	189	0.9	180	55	3.3
2008–09	330	308	1.1	100	155	0.6	100	39	2.6
2009–10	180	125	1.4	40	63	0.6	60	28	2.1
2010–11	210	59	3.6	30	35	0.9	400	31	12.9
2011–12	180	72	2.5	10	18	0.6	670	36	18.6
2012–13	100	36	2.8	20	17	1.2	710	39	18.2
2013–14	350	77	4.5	140	85	1.6	950	40	23.8
2014–15	250	57	4.4	150	109	1.4	1 780	89	20.0
2015–16	190	159	1.2	110	66	1.7	700	54	13.0
2016–17	390	160	2.4	80	60	1.3	870	115	7.6
2017–18	340	180	1.9	50	57	0.9	800	83	9.6
2018–19	310	219	1.4	40	74	0.5	2 010	162	12.4
2019–20	160	156	1.0	60	71	0.8	2 560	269	9.5
2020–21	90	103	0.9	NA	NA	NA	1 200	202	5.9
2021–22	40	31	1.3	10	12	0.5	1 600	192	8.3
2022–23	58	39	1.5	NA	NA	NA	1 431	122	11.7
2023–24	32	21	1.5	3	9	0.3	516	72	7.2

The first fishery to be developed south of the Chatham Rise was on Puysegur Bank, where spawning aggregations of orange roughy were found during a joint industry-Ministry exploratory fishing survey in 1990–91. The fishery developed rapidly, but from 1993–94 catch limits were substantially under-caught. Catch limits were subsequently reduced from the initial level of 5000 t, and the industry implemented a catch limit of 0 t beginning in the 1997–98 fishing year (reported catches in 2004–05 and 2005–06 were taken during industry surveys). A catch limit of 150 t was provided for research purposes at Puysegur from 2010–11 (Table 4). Following a stock assessment of Puysegur in 2017, a commercial catch limit was set at 347 t from 1 October 2017.

Exploratory fishing on the Macquarie Ridge south of Puysegur in 1993 led to the development of a fishery off the Auckland Islands. Total catch rose to around 900 t in 1994–95, but then dropped to less than 200 t by 1999–2000.

In 1993–94, catches were taken on the ‘Arrow Plateau’, which became the first major fishery to develop on the easternmost section of the Chatham Rise. A catch limit of 3000 t was put in place for 1994–95, with an additional limit of 500 t for each hill. Only a few hills in this area have been fished successfully, and the catch has never reached the catch limit, which was reduced to 1000 t by the early 2000s (Table 4). The Arrow Plateau was closed to orange roughy fishing when it was designated a Benthic Protection Area in 2007 (Table 6). In 1995–96, large catches were reported on the southeast Pukaki Rise, with a catch total of over 3000 t. However, the catches dropped rapidly and the fishery effectively ceased within a few years.

From 2001–02, a fishery developed on the northeast Pukaki Rise, including the area known as Priceless, where catches were mostly taken at the start of the fishing year. Catches at Priceless reached the feature limit of 500 t for each of the six years up to 2006–07, but catches and catch rates declined substantially from 2007–08 and have remained low since. Areas of the northeast Pukaki Rise outside Priceless were developed in 2004–05 and also showed a rapid decline in catches and catch rates. By 2007–08, the fishery in the sub-Antarctic was limited to the Auckland Islands and northeast Pukaki Rise areas. After 2008–09, the fishery extended over a relatively wide area, but catches and catch rates were low, and the fishery was effectively reduced to the Auckland Islands between 2011–12 and 2017–18 (Table 6).

Table 6: Orange roughy estimated catches (to nearest 10 t, or for smaller catches 5 t or < 1 t), number of tows, and unstandardised catch rates (total catch divided by total number of tows; to nearest 0.1 t/tow) for orange roughy target fishing in areas outside Chatham Rise. For this table, the areas were defined by the following rectangles: Arrow, 42.17° to 46° S, east of 173° W; Auckland, 49° to 52° S, 165° to 167° E; Bounty, 46° to 47.5° S, 177.5° E to 180°; Priceless, 48° to 48.44° S, 174.7° to 175.2° E; Other Pukaki, 47° to 50.4° S, 174° to 176.4° E (and not in Priceless); Puysegur, 46° to 47.5° S, 165° to 166.5° E. The area described as Antipodes in previous reports is now included in Other Pukaki. All years are for 1 October–30 September. NA is shown when there were fewer than three vessels in the fishery within the last five years reported. –, zero targeted catch and effort. [Continued on next page]

Year	Arrow			Auckland			Bounty			Priceless		
	Catch	Tows	t/tow	Catch	Tows	t/tow	Catch	Tows	t/tow	Catch	Tows	t/tow
1985–86	120	9	13.8	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1986–87	110	10	10.8	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1987–88	5	3	1.6	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1988–89	10	3	3.3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1989–90	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	5	2	1.0
1990–91	200	16	11.1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1991–92	110	8	8.7	–	–	–	< 1	8	< 0.1	–	–	–
1992–93	20	3	2.8	30	30	1.5	–	–	–	5	6	0.3
1993–94	460	113	7.7	180	168	1.2	< 1	2	< 0.1	< 1	1	0.2
1994–95	760	249	3.0	840	206	4.7	< 1	5	< 0.1	–	–	–
1995–96	170	50	3.4	370	213	1.6	< 1	35	< 0.1	–	–	–
1996–97	250	152	1.7	120	92	1.1	20	13	1.5	< 1	3	< 0.1
1997–98	330	183	1.8	360	186	1.9	160	113	1.4	10	12	1.1
1998–99	760	273	2.7	440	219	2.0	130	167	0.8	10	2	3.0
1999–00	290	155	1.8	150	132	1.1	170	71	2.4	5	2	2.0
2000–01	190	83	2.3	60	68	0.9	150	55	2.7	< 1	1	< 0.1
2001–02	70	48	1.5	130	58	2.3	40	26	1.4	550	18	30.5
2002–03	220	80	2.7	10	30	0.3	220	53	4.1	480	36	13.2
2003–04	140	79	1.8	5	25	0.2	90	53	1.8	450	98	4.6
2004–05	60	86	0.7	5	6	0.8	100	38	2.6	540	175	3.1
2005–06	100	69	1.3	–	–	–	40	34	1.0	540	62	8.7
2006–07	–	–	–	–	–	–	5	14	< 0.1	470	92	5.1
2007–08	–	–	–	150	29	5.1	1	2	0.5	540	101	5.3
2008–09	–	–	–	110	17	6.3	< 1	1	< 0.1	180	42	4.3

ORANGE ROUGHY (ORH 3B) – May 2026

Table 6 [Continued]:

Year	Arrow			Auckland			Bounty			Priceless		
	Catch	Tows	t/tow	Catch	Tows	t/tow	Catch	Tows	t/tow	Catch	Tows	t/tow
2009–10	–	–	–	20	26	0.7	10	9	0.7	5	28	0.1
2010–11	–	–	–	40	26	1.5	100	28	3.5	5	8	0.3
2011–12	–	–	–	20	6	3.0	< 1	3	< 0.1	< 1	3	0.3
2012–13	–	–	–	40	12	3.1	–	–	–	–	–	–
2013–14	–	–	–	300	45	6.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
2014–15	–	–	–	350	88	3.9	–	–	–	–	–	–
2015–16	–	–	–	380	54	7.0	–	–	–	–	–	–
2016–17	–	–	–	150	58	2.6	50	6	7.7	<1	1	<0.1
2017–18	–	–	–	105	31	3.4	48	9	5.3	<1	9	<0.1
2018–19	–	–	–	98	31	3.1	1	6	0.2	<1	6	<0.1
2019–20	–	–	–	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2020–21	–	–	–	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2021–22	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2022–23	–	–	–	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2023–24	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Year	Other Pukaki			Puysegur			Other		
	Catch	Tows	t/tow	Catch	Tows	t/tow	Catch	Tows	t/tow
1985–86	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1986–87	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1987–88	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1988–89	–	–	–	–	–	–	30	10	3.3
1989–90	10	6	1.8	110	75	1.5	50	8	10.2
1990–91	10	1	6.0	600	124	4.8	20	36	0.6
1991–92	< 1	2	< 0.1	6 380	671	9.5	220	51	5.7
1992–93	5	13	0.3	4 190	630	6.6	360	226	1.9
1993–94	20	9	2.2	2 430	1 312	1.8	100	427	0.3
1994–95	50	20	2.2	1 250	156	8.0	90	80	1.5
1995–96	3 010	306	5.0	580	241	2.4	550	229	2.9
1996–97	670	595	< 0.1	430	160	2.7	400	152	2.8
1997–98	130	194	< 0.1	–	–	–	1 100	512	2.3
1998–99	130	82	< 0.1	10	6	1.9	1 780	492	3.8
1999–00	< 1	46	< 0.1	–	–	–	110	309	0.4
2000–01	40	25	1.6	–	–	–	190	556	1.9
2001–02	< 1	1	< 0.1	10	10	0.9	180	199	2.3
2002–03	10	3	3.2	–	–	–	310	120	6.6
2003–04	< 1	9	< 0.1	10	3	4.1	280	221	1.8
2004–05	520	43	11.7	100	17	5.6	460	153	3.7
2005–06	740	91	8.1	220	80	2.7	230	115	2.2
2006–07	730	119	6.2	–	–	–	1	6	< 1
2007–08	700	160	4.4	–	–	–	< 1	14	< 0.1
2008–09	630	127	4.9	–	–	–	< 1	10	< 0.1
2009–10	320	114	2.8	–	–	–	1	29	0.1
2010–11	90	50	1.7	–	–	–	40	41	1.1
2011–12	40	10	3.5	–	–	–	50	41	2.0
2012–13	–	–	–	–	–	–	200	45	4.7
2013–14	–	–	–	–	–	–	50	57	2.0
2014–15	–	–	–	140	29	5.0	110	44	4.2
2015–16	–	–	–	–	–	–	< 1	2	< 0.1
2016–17	<1	2	0.3	–	–	–	90	67	3.4
2017–18	276	68	4.1	197	37	5.3	<1	1	<0.1
2018–19	210	28	7.5	215	49	4.4	22	14	1.6
2019–20	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2020–21	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2021–22	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	–	–	–
2022–23	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2023–24	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	–	–	–

Catches of orange roughy have also been taken: off the Bounty Islands (around 100–200 t per year from 1997–98 to 2004–05, but infrequently since then, and none since 2011–12) (Table 6); off the Snares Islands (up to around 500 t per year); from areas of the Macquarie Ridge (100–500 t per year from 2000–01 to 2004–05, and in 2008–09); and off Fiordland (around 500 t in 2000–01, but catches rapidly decreased). Since 2021–22, there has been little fishing outside of Puysegur and parts of Pukaki Rise (Table 6).

1.2 Recreational fisheries

No recreational fishing for orange roughy is known in this quota management area.

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

No customary non-commercial fishing for orange roughy is known in this quota management area.

1.4 Illegal catch

No information is available on illegal catch in this quota management area.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

There has been a history of catch over-runs on the Chatham Rise because of lost fish and discards, and discrepancies in tray weights and conversion factors. In assessments, total removals from each part of the Chatham Rise were assumed to exceed reported catches by the over-run percentages given in Table 7. For Puysegur and other southern fisheries there is no reason to believe that, if there was an over-run in catches, this shows any trend over time. For this reason, it was assumed that there was no over-run for this area.

Table 7: Chatham Rise catch over-runs (%) by fishing year.

Year	1978–79	1979–80	1980–81	1981–82	1982–83	1983–84	1984–85	1985–86	1986–87	1987–88
Over-run	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	28	26	24
Year	1988–89	1989–90	1990–91	1991–92	1992–93	1993–94	1994–95 and subsequently			
Over-run	22	20	15	10	10	10	5			

Within the TAC, an allowance of 5% of the TACC is allocated for other sources of mortality (currently 238 t).

2. BIOLOGY

Biological parameters used in this assessment are presented in the Biology section in the Introduction – Orange Roughy chapter.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

For the purposes of this report the term ‘stock’ refers to a biological unit with a single major spawning ground, in contrast to a ‘Fishstock’ which refers to a management unit.

Genetically two main stocks are recognised within ORH 3B (Chatham Rise and Puysegur; Smith & Benson 1997) and these are considered to be distinct from stocks in adjacent areas (Cook Canyon and Ritchie Bank). However, it is likely, because of their geographical separation and discontinuities in the distribution of orange roughy, that concentrations of spawning fish on the Arrow Plateau, near the Auckland Islands, and northwest of the Antipodes Islands also form separate stocks.

Genetic data have been applied to define stock boundaries, both within ORH 3B, and between it and adjacent areas. Mitochondrial DNA shows that there are considerable differences between Puysegur fish and fish from the geographically adjacent areas Cook Canyon and Chatham Rise. Allozyme frequency studies suggest that Chatham Rise fish are distinct from those on the Ritchie Bank (ORH 2A). These data also suggest multiple stocks within the Chatham Rise, but do not indicate clear stock boundaries. Although there is significant heterogeneity amongst allozyme frequencies from different areas of the rise, these frequencies varied as much in time (samples from the same location at different times) as in space (samples from different locations at the same time).

Chatham Rise

The stock structure of orange roughy on the Chatham Rise was reviewed in 2008 (Dunn & Devine 2010). This review evaluated all available data because no single dataset seemed to provide definitive information about likely stock boundaries. The analysed data included: catch distribution and CPUE patterns; location of spawning and nursery grounds; inferred migrations; size, maturity, and condition data; genetic studies; and habitat and natural boundaries.

There is evidence that a separate stock exists on the Northwest Rise. The Northwest Rise contains a large spawning ground on the Graveyard Hills and also nursery grounds around, and primarily to the west of, the Graveyard Hills. There is a gap in the distribution of early juveniles (under 15 cm standard length) between the Graveyard area and the Spawning Box at approximately 178° W. A research trawl

survey found post-spawning adult fish to the west, but not to the east, of the Graveyard Hills, and a westerly post-spawning migration was inferred. Analyses of median length from commercial and research trawls found that orange roughy on the Northwest Chatham Rise and Graveyard Hills were smaller than those on the East Rise. A substantial decline in the size of 50% maturity after 1992 was found for both the Graveyard Hills and the Northwest Rise, but not for other areas. The only information that does not support the Northwest Rise being a separate stock is an indication from patterns in commercial catch rates that some fish arriving to spawn in the Spawning Box may come from the west (Coburn & Doonan 1994, 1997). Catch data and genetic studies do not shed any further light on stock structure. Oceanographic models suggest that a gyre to the east of the Graveyard may provide a mechanism for a separation between the Northwest Chatham Rise and the East Rise.

The separation of the Northeast Hills and Andes as separate stocks from the Spawning Box and Eastern Flats was based on observations of simultaneous spawning aggregations occurring on these hills, and because stock assessment models indicated a mismatch between the standardised CPUE trends. However, the following suggest that all these areas are a single stock: the occurrence of a continuous nursery ground throughout the area, similar trends in size of 50% maturity in each area, the essentially continuous habitat with similar environmental conditions, and inferred post-spawning migrations from the Spawning Box towards the East Rise. Analyses of median lengths from commercial catches showed no obvious differences between areas. In addition, the spawning aggregations found on the Northeast Hills and Andes appear to have been minor compared with those in the Spawning Box. The spawning aggregation on the Northeast Hills has also exhibited an increase in mean length and catch rates, suggesting that fish spawning on these hills are not resident, and thus are not separate from the surrounding area. Based on the available data the Northeast Hills and Andes are therefore considered to be from the same stock as the Spawning Box and Eastern Flats.

The only evidence to separate the eastern area of the South Rise (Big Chief and surrounds) from the East Rise is the lack of spawning migrations inferred from an absence of a seasonal effect in standardised CPUE analyses. The evidence that the Big Chief area is the same stock as the East Rise includes: the fact that the nursery grounds and habitat are continuous, there were no splits between the areas identified from analyses of median length, and the fisheries are similar. The reports of spawning fish around Big Chief have been infrequent, and so are considered equivocal on stock structure. The Big Chief area is therefore considered part of the East Rise stock.

There is weak evidence that the area of the South Rise west of, and including, Hegerville is a separate stock. The evidence includes median length analyses which indicated a split in this area and an oceanographic front at around 177° W. However, very few catches of spawning orange roughy have been reported in this area, and there appears to be no substantial nursery ground. Both of these factors support the idea that this area does not have a separate stock. In the area to the west of the suggested split, the fish are relatively small during spawning and relatively large during non-spawning. Combined with a standardised CPUE which shows a decline in abundance around July (peak spawning), and a somatic condition factor which declines during September–November (post-spawning), this supports an hypothesis of adult fish leaving the area to spawn elsewhere.

The South Rise could provide feeding habitat for the stock, which is estimated to have had an initial biomass of over 300 000 t, an amount that was probably too large to inhabit only the East Rise. There is more evidence to support the idea of orange roughy in this area being part of the East Rise stock than there is to the contrary. The current hypothesis is that the area to the west of the current convergence zone may be relatively marginal habitat, where larger juvenile, maturing, and adult orange roughy were once predominant, and there is little spawning and few juveniles because the water is relatively cold.

Based on these analyses, the Chatham Rise has been divided into two areas: the Northwest, and the East and South Rise combined (Figure 2). The focal area of the Northwest stock is the Graveyard Hills. The focal area of the East and South Rise stock is the Spawning Box during spawning, and the southeast corner of the rise during non-spawning.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

No model-based stock assessments were conducted for ORH 3B stocks from 2007 to 2013. This was primarily because the 2006 stock assessment, which assumed deterministic recruitment, showed an increasing trend in biomass which was not supported by recent biomass indices. Deterministic recruitment was assumed because ageing data were considered to be unreliable. The assessment of the MEC stock in 2013 used age data from the new ageing methodology (Tracey et al 2007, Horn et al 2016) and estimated recruitment. A similar assessment approach has been used for Northwest Chatham Rise and East and South Chatham Rise stocks since 2014, and Puysegur stock since 2017 (Cordue 2014a).

Research in 2023 raised some concerns about the results of the most recent stock assessment models of the Northwest Chatham Rise (2018) and East & South Chatham Rise (2020) which estimated both stocks to be in the target zone of 30–50% B_0 . For the Northwest Chatham Rise stock, the predicted spawning biomass size and rebuild was consistent with the acoustic biomass estimates, and the most recent assessment (2018) was therefore accepted although considered more uncertain than originally thought; however, a research focus on the East & South Chatham Rise stock meant the assessment was not updated. The reduced size of the recent Northwest Chatham Rise fishery, which was catching less than 20% of the TACC, was attributed to most fish being on the closed Morgue hill and therefore unavailable to the fishery. For the East & South Chatham Rise stock, the predicted spawning biomass size and rebuild was inconsistent with the estimates and flat or declining trend from the acoustic biomass surveys. Although the agreed catch limit was taken, the CPUE was at or close to historically low levels for the main non-spawning fisheries. The East & South Chatham Rise assessment was therefore rejected in 2023.

The Northwest Chatham Rise fishery took 18% of the agreed catch limit in 2023–24. About 20% of the recent catch was taken during the spawning season, compared with 60–85% historically (Anderson & Dunn 2012). This may be because the main spawning aggregation now occurs on the Morgue hill which was closed to bottom fishing in 2001, rather than the Graveyard hill which remains open to fishing. However, fish are believed to move off Morgue on some occasions, out of the area closed to fishing. The recent fishery used more long tows on flat ground, rather than short tows on features; about 50% catch was taken in tows > 4 hours duration after 2015–16, compared historically with about 50–90% from tows < 1 hour (Figure 3).




Figure 3: Northwest Chatham Rise (left panel) and East and South Chatham Rise (right panel) percentage of orange roughy target tows by duration (hours) and fishing year.

Operators suggest this change in fishing behaviour has been partly in response to the demand for better quality whole fish (rather than fish being processed into fillets) obtained from smaller catches of non-spawning fish to supply the Chinese export market, although this market has declined in recent years. Unstandardised CPUE has been flat or declining and was at historical lows in 2016–17 and 2021–22 (Table 5, Figure 4).

The East and South Chatham Rise fishery took 80% of the agreed catch limit of 2755 t in 2023–24,

ORANGE ROUGHY (ORH 3B) – May 2026

which was reduced from 5970 t in 2022–23. Since about 2015–16, the fishery changed from 65–90% caught in short tows of < 1 hour duration on features and outside the spawning season (June and July), to 50–60% caught in long tows of > 2 hours duration (Figure 3), and about 90% taken during the spawning season. Three vessels have dominated the catch since about 2000–01, with four more vessels contributing since 2019–20. Unstandardised CPUE has generally been flat or slowly declining since 2010–11 and were at historical lows within the last five years for fisheries at Andes complex, Smith City & neighbours, Big Chief & neighbours, Rekohu, and Spawning Box in season (during spawning), but with an increase since then at Andes complex and Big Chief & neighbours (Table 5, Figure 4).




Figure 4: ORH 3B fishery sub-areas and annual unstandardised CPUE for the periods 2009–10 to 2015–16 (period of lower catches and TAC); 2016–17 to 2023–24 (recent years within which fishery characteristics have changed: see text). Black lines and points, t/tow (left y-axis); Grey lines and points, t/hour (right y-axis). Graveyard Hills and Other NWCR are within the NWCR stock, the other sub-areas being within the ECSR. Years only plotted when 20 or more tows were completed. Allocation to area takes account of the positional offset between vessel and trawl (see Dunn et al 2025.).

Stock assessment research for 2023–25

Emerging issues in the assessment of the East & South Chatham Rise stock were detailed in Fisheries New Zealand (2023). The main issues, and insights from subsequent research, are described here.

Length frequencies from the commercial fishery and research trawl surveys were found to have an excessive influence on model biomass estimates. Because of the slow growth of orange roughy, length frequencies are not expected to provide reliable information on stock status. For 2025, length frequency data were excluded if age data were available, or a plausible simplifying assumption was possible (such as that fishery selectivity is equal to maturity).

After review and revision of orange roughy ageing protocols (Horn et al 2016), stock assessments were successfully fitted using the small number of age frequencies (in 2014: two for the East & South Chatham Rise; one for the Northwest Chatham Rise). The subsequent addition of new age frequency data found variability similar to that encountered in the early 2000s (which had originally led to the

ageing review). Research in 2024 found the age frequencies might be explained by recruitment patterns (Dunn et al 2025), but the addition of new age frequency data during 2025 suggested unrepresentative age sampling was most likely. For 2025, stock assessments therefore included model runs that excluded the age frequency data, and set fishery and acoustic survey selectivity equal to the maturity ogive estimated from otolith transition zones (see orange roughy Introduction).

The longevity and extended age structure of orange roughy populations means that recruitment estimation has to cover a wide range of year classes. Orange roughy age frequency data are sparse, noisy, and do not allow individual strong or weak cohorts to be followed through time. Simulation studies have shown that estimating year class strengths can cause model over-parameterization and lead to inaccurate estimates of stock size and status (Stephenson et al 2022). For 2025, model runs estimating year class strengths used more restrictive priors on the YCS deviates, effectively smoothing YCS trends.

The decline in historical CPUE series was too steep to be explained by the catch removals and cannot be representative of total SSB. Standardised CPUE has been rejected for use in stock assessments (see orange roughy Introduction). For 2025, the Spawning Box trawl survey series (1984–94) was also rejected because it had a declining trend too steep to be fitted by the model, and this lack of fit was found to influence estimates of biomass, selectivity, and maturity.

Fishing vessel disturbance as a factor influencing orange roughy biomass estimates and CPUE through fish behaviour (i.e., scaring fish away; fish redistribution) was considered plausible based upon fish biology, fisher experience, survey experience and results, CPUE analyses, and population model investigations (Dunn et al 2025).

The longevity of orange roughy, and potential for extended gaps in recruitment, makes estimation of B_0 problematic. This is because the fishery, and scientific monitoring, may not have existed long enough to have encountered average productivity. For 2025, options for estimating productivity included estimating M (with deterministic YCS), estimating year class strengths (with fixed M), and estimating time-varying recruitment (i.e., a model having two R_0 s; with fixed M). The latter assumed a change point in 1980, which was supported by likelihood profiles of the change year, and by the investigations of potential influence of fishing disturbance on spawning (Dunn et al 2025).

Acoustic biomass estimates from the vessel and AOS 38 kHz, and AOS 120 kHz, were found to have diverged after 2016 (Figure 5). Various hypotheses to explain this change were considered, but the cause is not yet resolved. For 2025, the acoustic biomass estimates from the different frequencies were therefore treated as alternative series, being the vessel and AOS 38 kHz, and the AOS 120 kHz. Although the acoustic biomass estimates were calculated for all three echosounders separately, ultimately the vessel and AOS 38 kHz were combined to ensure consistency with the previously agreed 38 kHz biomass estimates.

Model runs treating the acoustic biomass estimates as relative with uninformed (uniform) priors on the catchability (q) were found to produce implausibly high SSB estimates. All final model runs therefore included an informed prior on the q for the most recent acoustic biomass series. The prior was the same as used in previous assessments being lognormal with $\mu=0.8$ and $cv=0.19$ (i.e., the acoustic estimated biomass was 80% of the total SSB).

Because of issues described above, assessment model runs in 2025 investigated permutations of observational data and productivity assumptions. For the East & South Chatham Rise, the acoustic series options were (a) the 2011–24 vessel 38 kHz (with informed q prior); (b) the 2011–24 AOS 120 kHz (with informed q prior); (c) the 2011–24 AOS 38 kHz (with informed q prior); plus options (a), (b) and (c) also including the 2002–10 vessel 38 kHz Old Spawning Plume series (with uniform q prior). For the Northwest Chatham Rise, the acoustic options were (a) the 2012–22 AOS 38 kHz (with informed q prior); or (b) the 2012–22 AOS 120 kHz (with informed q prior). For runs using only the acoustic series (with selectivity and maturity assumed) productivity options were to estimate M , or time-varying recruitment (i.e., two R_0 s). For runs using acoustic series and age frequencies (with selectivity and maturity estimated), productivity options were to estimate year class strengths, or time-varying recruitment. The rationale for selection of final model runs is described for each stock in the sections

ORANGE ROUGHY (ORH 3B) – May 2026

below.




Figure 5: Acoustic biomass estimates for Chatham Rise orange roughy. Combined areas is the Old Spawning plume, Mt. Muck, and Rekohu (all East & South Chatham Rise). Black circles, vessel 38 kHz; red squares, AOS 38 kHz; blue triangles, AOS 120 kHz. In combined areas panel: black cross, vessel 38 kHz; blue triangle, AOS 120 kHz.

4.1 East and South Chatham Rise

A Bayesian stock assessment was conducted for the East and South Chatham Rise (ESCR) stock in 2025, using data up to 2023–24. This used an age-structured population model fitted to two series of acoustic survey estimates of spawning biomass (covering 2002–10 and 2011–24), and proportions-at-age from targeted trawling of spawning aggregations across a range of years and three locations.

4.1.1 Model structure

The model was single-sex and age-structured (1–100 years with a plus group). A single time step was used, with spawning taken to occur after 75% of the mortality and 100% of mature fish were assumed to spawn each year. Four fisheries were assumed (Old Spawning Plume, Mt. Muck, Rekohu, with the remainder being allocated to a “Non-spawn” fishery), with a catch history constructed from the East & South Chatham Rise catches in Table 3 using the catch over-run percentages in Table 7.

When only acoustic data were used, selectivity was assumed equal to the otolith transition zone maturity estimate (logistic with $a_{50} = 28.51$, $a_{95} = 4.56$). When age frequencies were included, maturity was set equal to the selectivity for Rekohu and Old Spawning Plume and assumed to be the same as maturity. Mt. Muck had its own selectivity, estimated as logistic ogives.

Natural mortality rate was assumed to be fixed at 0.045 yr^{-1} . A single step change in productivity was allowed by estimating one R_0 for the period 1911 to 1979, and a second R_0 for the period 1980 to 2025. A stock-recruitment relationship was not assumed (i.e., steepness = 1). Process error was added manually to the acoustic series to ensure the MPD passed through the 95% CI. The remaining fixed biological parameters are given in tables 1 and 2 of the Orange Roughy Introduction section.

4.1.2 Input data and statistical assumptions

There were two main data sources for observations available to the assessment: acoustic-survey spawning biomass estimates from the three spawning locations Old Spawning Plume, Mt. Muck, and Rekohu, and age frequencies from target fishing of each of these spawning areas.

Final model runs used (a) only the two acoustic biomass series, and estimated time-varying recruitment; or (b) the two acoustic series and age frequencies, and estimated time-varying recruitment. Model runs using only the acoustic series and estimating M were excluded because of poor MCMC diagnostics. Model runs including the age and length frequency data and estimating year class strengths were excluded because the data were considered insufficiently informative for year class strength estimation. Model runs fitting only to the recent acoustic data (2011–2024) were evaluated but excluded in favour of using as much of the higher quality data as possible (i.e., always including the acoustic Old Spawning Plume 2002–10 series).

Acoustic estimates

Biomass estimates were the vessel 38 kHz series for the Old Spawning Plume for 2002 to 2010, and either the 2011–24 vessel and AOS 38 kHz series, or the 2011–24 AOS 120 kHz series (Table 8). The biomass estimates from 2011–24 were assumed to represent ‘most’ of the spawning biomass each year. This was modelled by treating the acoustic estimates as relative biomass and estimating the proportionality constant (q) with an informed prior. The prior was normally distributed with a mean of 0.8 (i.e., ‘most’ = 80%) and a CV of 19% (see Orange Roughy Introduction). The CV of 19% was derived from the acoustic target strength uncertainty using the 38 kHz echosounder. The Old Spawning Plume series for 2002–10 was fitted with an uninformative (uniform) prior.

4.1.3 Model runs and results

The model parameters estimated were the virgin (unfished, equilibrium) recruitment (R_0), recruitment for the period 1980–2025 (R_t), and the acoustic survey catchability scalars (q_s) for the 2002–10 and 2011–24 series. When age frequencies were included, logistic selectivity parameters were also estimated for Mt. Muck ($A_{50} = 34.9$; $A_{95} = 9.0$).

Table 8: Acoustic survey estimates of spawning biomass used in the ESCR assessment model. The CVs do not include any process error. From 2011 only years when all three plumes were surveyed are included, and biomass estimates are shown for each echosounder.

Year	Location	Frequency	Estimate (t)	CV
2002	Old Spawning Plume	Vessel 38 kHz	63 950	0.06
2003	Old Spawning Plume	Vessel 38 kHz	44 316	0.06
2004	Old Spawning Plume	Vessel 38 kHz	44 968	0.08
2005	Old Spawning Plume	Vessel 38 kHz	43 923	0.04
2006	Old Spawning Plume	Vessel 38 kHz	47 450	0.10
2007	Old Spawning Plume	Vessel 38 kHz	34 427	0.05
2008	Old Spawning Plume	Vessel 38 kHz	31 668	0.08
2009	Old Spawning Plume	Vessel 38 kHz	28 199	0.05
2010	Old Spawning Plume	Vessel 38 kHz	21 205	0.07
2011	Old Spawning Plume + Rekohu + Mt.Muck	Vessel & AOS 38 kHz	51 329	0.13
2013	Old Spawning Plume + Rekohu + Mt.Muck	Vessel & AOS 38 kHz	54 363	0.08
	Old Spawning Plume + Rekohu + Mt.Muck	AOS 120 kHz	54 542	0.08
2016	Old Spawning Plume + Rekohu + Mt.Muck	Vessel & AOS 38 kHz	43 560	0.10
	Old Spawning Plume + Rekohu + Mt.Muck	AOS 120 kHz	36 716	0.11
2022	Old Spawning Plume + Rekohu + Mt.Muck	Vessel & AOS kHz	48 981	0.07
	Old Spawning Plume + Rekohu + Mt.Muck	AOS 120 kHz	29 939	0.10
2024	Old Spawning Plume + Rekohu + Mt.Muck	Vessel & AOS kHz	41 375	0.06
	Old Spawning Plume + Rekohu + Mt.Muck	AOS 120 kHz	22 723	0.13

The model provided acceptable fits to the acoustic series, but the 2002–10 acoustic series declined faster than could be fitted by the model (Figure 6). When only the acoustic series were included, the posterior estimates for the acoustic q s were not very different from the priors (Figure 7). When the age frequencies were included, the q s were estimated to be lower than the prior, meaning the estimated acoustic series biomass (2011–24) was greater (by about 20–40%) than observed. The overall fit to the age frequencies was accepted, but some individual age frequencies were not well fitted (Figure 8). All age frequencies could not be fitted by a model assuming constant selectivity because they implied a change in age structure not possible in an orange roughy population; for example, the substantial proportion of old fish present in the Old Spawning Plume in 1984 were absent in 2003, but then returned in 2012; at Rekohu, the fish aged less than about 30 years were present in 2016, greatly reduced in 2022, but returned in 2024; at Mt. Muck, a large proportion in the plus group was only present in 2016.

All model runs estimated a productivity decline between 1911–1979 and 1980–2025 of between 14% and 40% of the initial value (Table 9). The decline was greater in model runs using the 120 kHz acoustic series. The decline in recruitment occurs because the model is attempting to fit the absolute level of recent acoustic biomass estimates, and also a shift to the right of the age frequencies (most obviously seen in 2022).

Sensitivity runs showed that the estimated stock size and status was sensitive to the mean of the assumed q prior when only acoustic data were used, giving smaller and more depleted stock with higher q , larger and less depleted stock with lower q . The model was also sensitive to assumptions and estimation of selectivity and maturity, for example, if maturity was assumed equal to estimated selectivity for Rekohu and estimated separately for the Old Spawning Plume then the stock was more depleted. Selectivity could vary substantially with similar fits to data; for example, in investigative model runs the Old Spawning Plume a_{50} varied from around 25 to 45 years. The rate of decline in the 2002–10 acoustic series could only be fitted by estimating year class strengths and a very low M ($<0.02 \text{ yr}^{-1}$), which were not considered acceptable assumptions; these runs also incurred a catch penalty, indicating that the SSB was at the smallest size possible that could explain the historical catches ($B_{\min}$).




Figure 6: ESCR assessment model runs using the acoustic (vessel) 38 kHz from 2002–10, and either the vessel 38 kHz (2011–24) or AOS 120 kHz (2013–24) acoustic biomass series, MCMC implied fits of SSB (solid line, median; shaded region, 95% credible intervals) to the acoustic biomass indices (points with vertical lines indicating the 95% CI).




Figure 7: ESCR assessment model prior (broken line) and MCMC posterior (solid line) for the acoustic q (series from 2011) with text giving the median and 95% credible intervals.

ORANGE ROUGHY (ORH 3B) – May 2026




Figure 8: ECCR assessment model MPD fits (“best fits”) to the age frequencies from REK, Rekohu; OSP, Old Spawning Plume; and MMU, Mt. Muck. Solid line, Acoustic 38 and AF; broken red line, Acoustic 120 and AF.

Table 9: ESCR, estimates of recruitment at age one (with 95% credible intervals) for the period 1911–1979 (R_0) and 1980–2025 (R_1).

Data sets	R_0 (millions)	R_1 (millions)	R_1 (median) / R_0 (median)
Acoustic 38	39.5 (36.9–44.4)	15.8 (11.7–20.7)	0.40
Acoustic 120	41.7 (38.1–48.0)	7.9 (2.4–11.5)	0.19
Acoustic 38 and AF	49.9 (46.5–54.6)	11.1 (6.7–17.1)	0.22
Acoustic 120 and AF	48.0 (45.0–52.1)	6.5 (3.7–11.1)	0.14

Biomass estimates

Virgin biomass, B_0 , was estimated to be similar for the acoustic-only runs at 349 200 or 368 600 t, and higher and similar for the acoustic and age frequencies runs at 441 800 or 423 900 t (Table 10). The runs using the vessel 38 kHz series from 2011–24 estimated a higher stock status, at 16 or 18% B_0 , than those using the AOS 120 kHz series from 2013–24, at 8 and 13% B_0 .

Table 10: ESCR, MCMC median estimates and 95% credible intervals) of virgin spawning stock biomass (B_0), spawning stock biomass in 2025, stock status (B_{2025} as % B_0), and probability of being below the soft (20% B_0) and hard (10% B_0) limits. All model runs include the Old Spawning Plume acoustic series (2002–10) and one recent (2011–24) acoustic series, and assume time-varying recruitment (TV), at two levels (Table 9).

Model run	B_0 (000 t)	B_{2025} (000 t)	B_{2025} (% B_0)	$p(B_{2025} < 20\% B_0)$	$p(B_{2025} < 10\% B_0)$
Acoustic 38	349.2 (326.5–392.3)	52.0 (36.1–81.9)	16 (11–22)	94	1
Acoustic 120	368.6 (336.7–424.2)	29.3 (19.4–45.5)	8 (6–11)	100	91
Acoustic 38 and AF	441.8 (411.6–483.0)	81.5 (56.2–117.5)	18 (13–25)	72	<1
Acoustic 120 and AF	423.9 (398.0–460.6)	53.7 (32.7–84.0)	13 (8–19)	99	14

The probability that the stock was below the soft limit (20% B_0) in 2025 was 72–100%. The probability that the stock was below the hard limit (10% B_0) in 2025 was 1% or less for the runs using the acoustic 38 kHz series (runs Acoustic 38, and Acoustic 38 and AF), and higher at 14% or 91% for the runs using the acoustic 120 kHz series (runs Acoustic 120, and Acoustic 120 and AF) (Table 10).

The estimated spawning stock biomass (SSB) trajectory showed a declining trend from 1980 (when the fishery started) through to 1994 when the biomass was between the soft and hard limit (acoustic only runs) or at the lower bound of the target zone (acoustics and age frequency runs) (Figure 9). The SSB then rebuilt until 2005, after which it declined, with the rate of decline least in the Acoustic 38 run, and greatest in the Acoustic 120 and AF run.

Use of the 38 kHz throughout (runs Acoustic 38, Acoustic 38 and AF) has the advantage that it maintains the use of the same instrument (38 kHz echosounder) from 2002 through to 2024. The 38 kHz has greater penetration through the water column than 120 kHz. The use of the 120 kHz series after 2010 (runs Acoustic 120, Acoustic 120 and AF) has the advantage that the 120 kHz should be more accurate for orange roughy (because it has a better signal to noise ratio for orange roughy) and it avoids the use of a substantial correction factor for the 2024 survey (one of four transmitters in the 38 kHz transducer failed in 2024, resulting in the transducer reading low and biomass estimates being multiplied by 1.86).

The estimated exploitation rate (as catch/SSB) peaked in 1990–91, then declined to the upper bound of the target zone estimated from all YCS (Acoustic 38, and Acoustic 38 and AF), within the all-YCS target zone (Acoustic 120), or remained above the all-YCS target zone (Acoustic 120 and AF) (Figure 10). Exploitation rate was high from 2002–03 to 2009–10, then dropped into the all-YCS target zone after about 2009–10 for all runs except Acoustic 120 and AF, and then increased from 2019–20 as catches were increased, until a substantial drop following the TACC reduction in 2023–24, after which exploitation rate was in the all-YCS target zone for all runs except Acoustic 120 and AF. The exploitation rate target zone for recent YCS was substantially lower than for all YCS, and so low (<1%) for the Acoustic 38 and Acoustic 38 and AF runs that it appeared as a narrow band in Figure 10.




Figure 9: ESCR, MCMC estimated spawning-stock status trajectory for the four assessment model runs (solid line, median; shaded region, 95% credible intervals) Dotted lines indicate the hard limit (10% B_0) and soft limit (20% B_0), and dashed lines the management target range (30–50% B_0).

ORANGE ROUGHY (ORH 3B) – May 2026




Figure 10: ESCR, MCMC estimated exploitation rate trajectory for the four assessment model runs (boxplot where solid line, median; outer box, interquartile range; whiskers 95% SI) Green (upper) shaded area indicates the exploitation rate corresponding to the target zone (U_{30} to U_{50}) after sampling from all year class strengths (1911–2025); Grey (lower) shaded area indicates the exploitation rate corresponding to the target zone (U_{30} to U_{50}) after sampling from recent year class strengths (1980–2025).

Projections

Five-year biomass projections were made assuming future catches to be the current agreed catch limit (2755 t), or the 2023–24 catch (2198 t; plus 5% over-run).

Assuming recent (1980–2025) recruitment, or sampling from all years (1911–2025), made no difference to projections (Table 11). This was because the extended age structure of orange roughy stocks meant that changing the size of a few (five) incoming cohorts make little difference. There was little difference in projections at the TACC or recent catch (80% of the TACC).

Projections using only acoustic data (Acoustic 38, Acoustic 120) showed a slow SSB increase, and projections for the models which included age frequencies (Acoustic 38 and AF, Acoustic 120 and AF) showed a slow SSB decrease (Table 11). Runs using the 120 kHz acoustic series were slightly more pessimistic. After five years, all projections were Likely (> 60%) to remain below the soft limit, the Acoustic 120 run was still Very Likely (> 90%) to be below the hard limit, the Acoustic 120 and AF run Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the hard limit, and the Acoustic 38 and Acoustic 38 and AF runs Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below the hard limit.

A large part of the short-term SSB rebuilds for Acoustic 38 and Acoustic 120 can be attributed to the somatic growth of survivors. While the Acoustic 38 projection showed a long-term (>30 years) increase and then plateau in SSB at current catch or TACC, the Acoustic 120 projection showed a decline in SSB from about 2055, once the lower recruitment levels (see Table 9) had permeated through the age structure. Longer-term recruitment trends are highly uncertain.

Table 11: ORH 3B ESCR Bayesian median and 95% credible intervals (in parentheses) of projected B_{2030} , B_{2030} as a percentage of B_0 , B_{2030}/B_{2025} (%), and probability of SSB being above the lower bound of the target zone ($0.3 B_0$) in 2030, 2082 (2025 plus two orange roughy generations), and 2025, and below the soft limit ($0.2 B_0$) and hard limit ($0.1 B_0$) in 2030. Projections made for current catch (2198 t) and TACC (2755 t), to which a 5% assumed catch over-run is added. Future productivity either assumes the recent (post-1980) level of recruitment, or empirical re-sampling of YCS over the entire assessment period (1911–2025).

Model run	YCS	Catch (t)	B_{2030} ('000 t)	B_{2030} (% B_0)	B_{2030}/B_{2025} (%)	$p(B_{2030} > 0.3 B_0)$	$p(B_{2030} < 0.2 B_0)$	$p(B_{2030} < 0.1 B_0)$
(1) Acoustic 38	Recent	2 198	61.1 (45.2–93.5)	17.4 (13.0–24.8)	118 (105–130)	<1	78	0
Acoustic 38	All	2 198	61.1 (45.2–93.5)	17.4 (13.0–24.8)	118 (105–130)	<1	78	0
Acoustic 38	Recent	2 755	59.8 (43.9–92.2)	17.1 (12.6–24.4)	116 (103–127)	<1	81	<1
Acoustic 38	All	2 755	59.8 (43.9–92.2)	17.1 (12.6–24.4)	116 (103–127)	<1	81	<1
(2) Acoustic 120	Recent	2 198	32.3 (22.6–46.0)	8.7 (5.8–12.1)	109 (84–136)	0	100	80
Acoustic 120	All	2 198	32.3 (22.6–46.0)	8.7 (5.8–12.1)	109 (84–136)	0	100	80
Acoustic 120	Recent	2 755	31.0 (21.3–44.7)	8.4 (5.5–11.7)	105 (80–130)	0	100	85
Acoustic 120	All	2 755	31.0 (21.3–44.7)	8.4 (5.5–11.7)	105 (80–130)	0	100	85
(3) Acoustic 38 and AF	Recent	2 198	76.7 (50.5–114.0)	17.3 (12.0–24.3)	94 (87–100)	0	81	<1
Acoustic 38 and AF	All	2 198	76.7 (50.5–114.0)	17.3 (12.0–24.3)	94 (87–100)	0	81	<1
Acoustic 38 and AF	Recent	2 755	75.4 (49.3–112.7)	17.0 (11.7–24.0)	92 (86–98)	0	83	<1
Acoustic 38 and AF	All	2 755	75.4 (49.3–112.7)	17.0 (11.7–24.0)	92 (86–98)	0	83	>1
(4) Acoustic 120 and AF	Recent	2 198	47.3 (26.6–77.3)	11.1 (6.6–17.1)	88 (80–95)	0	100	32
Acoustic 120 and AF	All	2 198	47.3 (26.6–77.3)	11.1 (6.6–17.1)	88 (80–95)	0	100	32
Acoustic 120 and AF	Recent	2 755	46.0 (25.4–76.0)	10.9 (6.3–16.8)	86 (76–93)	0	100	38
Acoustic 120 and AF	All	2 755	46.0 (25.4–76.0)	10.9 (6.3–16.8)	86 (76–93)	0	100	38

Biological reference points, management targets and yield

Orange roughy stocks have had a target management range of 30–50% B_0 since 2014. A new Management Procedure is currently under development. Yield estimates are not reported for this stock.

4.2 Northwest Chatham Rise

A Bayesian stock assessment was conducted for the Northwest Chatham Rise (NWCR) stock in 2025, using data up to 2023–24. This used an age-structured population model fitted to four acoustic survey estimates of spawning biomass, one proportion-at-age from a trawl survey, three proportion-at-age from targeted trawling on a spawning aggregation, and two length frequencies from the commercial fishery.

4.2.1 Model structure

The model was single-sex and age-structured (1–100 years with a plus group), with maturity assumed equal to the otolith transition zone estimate (logistic with $a_{50} = 28.51$, $a_{105} = 4.56$). A single time step was used, with spawning taken to occur after 75% of the mortality and 100% of mature fish were assumed to spawn each year. A single fishery was assumed with a catch history constructed from the Northwest catches in Table 2 using the catch over-run percentages in Table 7. Natural mortality rate was estimated with a normal prior ($\mu = 0.045$, $cv = 0.33$). The stock-recruitment relationship was Beverton-Holt with steepness 0.75. A process error of 0.2 was added to the acoustic series. The remaining fixed biological parameters are given in tables 1 and 2 of the Orange Roughy Introduction section.

4.2.2 Input data and statistical assumptions

There were three main data sources for observations available to the assessment: acoustic-survey spawning biomass estimates from the main spawning hills (Graveyard and Morgue, 2012, 2016, 2021, 2022); an age frequency and an estimate of proportion-spawning-at-age taken from a 1994 wide-area trawl survey;

ORANGE ROUGHY (ORH 3B) – May 2026

an age frequency taken from targeted trawls above Morgue (2016, 2021, 2022), and length frequencies collected from the commercial fishery covering 1989–2005.

Final model runs used only the acoustic biomass estimates, and estimated M . Model runs including the age and length frequency data were excluded because the data were considered insufficiently informative for year class strength estimation. A time varying change in productivity, as assumed for the East and South Chatham Rise assessment, was tested but rejected because it estimated an implausibly large increase in recruitment after 1980 in order to fit the increasing Morgue acoustic biomass series. There are no biomass indices available to the assessment before 2012.

Acoustic estimates

Only biomass estimates from the AOS and the Graveyard and Morgue hills were used in the model (Table 12). Two alternative acoustic series were assumed, using just the AOS 38 kHz estimates (Acoustic 38), or just the 120 kHz estimates (Acoustic 120). The biomass estimates were assumed to represent ‘most’ of the spawning biomass each year. This was modelled by treating the acoustic estimates as relative biomass and estimating the proportionality constant (q) with an informed prior. The prior was normally distributed with a mean of 0.8 (i.e., ‘most’ = 80%) and a CV of 19% (see Orange Roughy Introduction). The CV of 19% was derived from the acoustic target strength uncertainty using the 38 kHz echosounder.

Table 12: Acoustic survey estimates of spawning biomass used in the assessment model. Surveys covered both the Graveyard and Morgue hills. Only biomass estimated from the AOS system are included. The CVs do not include any process error.

Year	Frequency	Snapshots	Estimate (t)	CV
2012	38 kHz	3	5 550	0.16
	120 kHz	3	4 254	0.16
2016	38 kHz	3	14 052	0.13
	120 kHz	3	12 494	0.10
2021	38 kHz	3	16 332	0.09
	120 kHz	3	13 228	0.09
2022	38 kHz	4	19 273	0.08
	120 kHz	4	13 680	0.08

4.2.3 Model runs and results

The model parameters estimated were the virgin (unfished, equilibrium) recruitment (R_0), the acoustic survey catchability scalar (q), and the natural mortality rate (M).

The model provided acceptable fits to the data (Figure 11). The posterior estimates for the acoustic qs and M were not very different from the priors (Figure 12). The model runs therefore estimated SSB to be very close to the acoustic biomass estimates. The assessment model therefore fits the recent acoustic biomass estimates according to the q prior, then back-calculates the B_0 using the catch history and estimated productivity, with the key productivity parameter (M) following the prior. The uncertainty in SSB estimates follows the assumed uncertainty in the q and M priors.

MPD sensitivity runs showed that the estimated stock size and status were sensitive to the mean of the assumed q prior (a 20% decrease in the mean of the prior produced a slightly larger stock and an increase in stock status from 32% to 37% B_0 ; a 20% increase in the mean of the prior produced a slightly smaller stock and a decrease in stock status to 28% B_0).




Figure 11: NWCR assessment model runs Acoustic 38 and Acoustic 120, MCMC estimates of SSB (solid line, median; shaded region, 95% credible intervals) and implied fits to the acoustic series (points; vertical lines, 95% CI).




Figure 12: NWCR assessment model runs Acoustic 38 and Acoustic 120, (left) prior (broken line) and MCMC posterior (solid line) for the acoustic q , with text giving the median and 95% credible intervals; (right) prior (broken line) and MCMC posterior (solid line) for natural mortality rate (M) with text giving the median and 95% credible intervals.

Biomass estimates

Virgin biomass, B_0 , was estimated to be similar at 59 200 or 59 900 t. Current stock status was also similar, at 34 or 36% B_0 (Table 13).

Table 13: NWCR, MCMC median estimates and 95 % credible intervals) of virgin spawning stock biomass (B_0), spawning stock biomass in 2025, and stock status (B_{2025} as % B_0) for the two model runs.

	B_0 (000 t)	B_{2025} (000 t)	B_{2025} (% B_0)
Acoustic 38	59.2 (47.3–76.7)	21.1 (16.8–29.0)	36 (25–49)
Acoustic 120	59.9 (46.9–78.3)	19.5 (15.0–28.9)	34 (21–49)

The probability that the stock was above 30% B_0 in 2025 was 85% for the Acoustic 38 run and 73% for the Acoustic 120 run.

ORANGE ROUGHY (ORH 3B) – May 2026

The estimated spawning stock biomass (SSB) trajectory showed a declining trend from 1980 (when the fishery started) through to 2004 when the biomass was close to the hard limit (Figure 13). From 2005 the estimated biomass increased steadily.

Although there is only a small difference between the results of the two model runs, the Acoustic 38 run has the advantage that it uses the principal echosounder historically used in orange roughy surveys, and has greater penetration through the water column than 120 kHz. The use of the 120 kHz series has the advantage that the 120 kHz should be more accurate for orange roughy (because it has a better signal to noise ratio for orange roughy).




Figure 13: NWCR, MCMC estimated spawning-stock biomass trajectory for assessment model runs using the 38 kHz AOS or 120 kHz AOS acoustic biomass series (solid line, median; shaded region, 95% credible intervals) Dotted lines indicate the hard limit (10% B_0) and soft limit (20% B_0), and dashed lines the management target range (30–50% B_0).

The fishery exceeded the target exploitation rate ($U_{30\%B_0}$ – $U_{50\%B_0}$) in almost every year until 2010–11, after which it was just below or just above the target range, being Very Likely (> 90%) to be below the lower bound of the target exploitation range in 2023–24 (Figure 14). Exploitation rates for the Acoustic 120 run reach 100% or more for a small proportion (<2%) of the runs, indicating the fished part of the model population was not large enough for the observed catches to be achieved (a catch penalty would be incurred).




Figure 14: NWCR, MCMC estimated exploitation rate trajectory for the two assessment model runs (boxplot where solid line, median; outer box, interquartile range; whiskers 95% SI) Green shaded area indicates the exploitation rate corresponding to the target zone (U_{30} to U_{50}).

Projections

Five-year biomass projections were made assuming future catches to be the current agreed catch limit (1150 t), or the 2023–24 catch (212 t; plus 5% over-run).

At the current catch (212 t), SSB is predicted to slowly increase over the next five years, and the probability of the SSB going below the soft limit is less than 1% (Table 14). At the current agreed catch limit (1150 t), SSB is predicted to slowly decrease over the next five years, and the probability of the SSB going below the soft limits is 5% or less (Table 14).

Table 14: ORH 3B NWCR, Bayesian median and 95% credible intervals (in parentheses) of projected B_{2030} , B_{2030} as a percentage of B_0 , B_{2030}/B_{2025} (%), and probability (%) of SSB being below the lower bound of the target zone (0.3 B_0) and below the soft limit (0.2 B_0) in 2030. Projections made for current catch (212 t) and TACC (1150 t), to which a 5% assumed catch over-run is added.

Model run	Catch (t)	B_{2030}	$B_{2030} (\%B_0)$	$B_{2030}/B_{2025} (\%)$	$p(B_{2030} > 0.3 B_0)$	$p(B_{2030} < 0.2 B_0)$
Acoustic 38	212	22 950 (17 940–31 620)	39 (29–53)	109 (101–114)	95	0
Acoustic 38	1 150	18 620 (13 660–27 350)	31 (22–46)	89 (78–95)	59	1
Acoustic 120	212	20 490 (16 970–29 550)	36 (25–49)	110 (101–116)	84	<1
Acoustic 120	1 150	16 170 (12 630–25 170)	28 (19–42)	86 (78–94)	34	5

Biological reference points, management targets and yield

Orange roughy stocks have had a target management range of 30–50% B_0 since 2014. A new Management Procedure is currently under development. Yield estimates are not reported for this stock.

4.3 Puysegur

A Bayesian stock assessment was conducted for the Puysegur stock in 2017 using very similar methods to those used in the 2014 orange roughy stock assessments of ESCR, NWCR, MEC, and ORH 7A (Cordue 2014a). An age-structured population model was fitted to an acoustic survey estimate of spawning biomass, two trawl survey indices and associated length frequencies, two spawning season age frequencies, and a small number of length frequencies from the commercial fishery.

4.3.1 Model structure

The model was single-sex and age-structured (1–120 years with a plus group), with maturity estimated separately (i.e., fish were classified by age and as mature or immature). Two time steps were used to model a non-spawning season fishery and a spawning season fishery. Spawning was taken to occur after 50% of the spawning season mortality and 100% of mature fish were assumed to spawn each year.

The catch history as reported in Table 6 (see above) was split into a spawning (June–August) and a non-spawning season (September–May) using the ratio of estimated catches, with the addition of catches during 2005, 2006, and 2015 when fish were caught during acoustic surveys. The catch for 2016–17 was assumed to be zero. Natural mortality was fixed at 0.045 and the stock-recruitment relationship was assumed to follow a Beverton-Holt function with steepness of 0.75. The remaining fixed biological parameters are given in table 2 of the Introduction – Orange Roughy chapter (ESCR growth parameters were assumed).

4.3.2 Input data and statistical assumptions

There were four main data sources used in the assessment: an acoustic-survey spawning biomass estimate in 2015 from the main spawning hill (Goomzy); two age frequencies during the spawning seasons in 1992 and 2015; biomass indices and length frequencies from trawl surveys in 1992 and 1994; and scaled length frequencies developed from Scientific Observer data collected from the commercial fishery in 1994 and 1997.

Acoustic estimate

Two types of acoustic survey estimates were available for use in the assessment: an estimate from a 38-kHz hull-mounted system during an AOS survey (AOS is a multi-frequency towed system, see for example Kloser et al 2011) and 38-kHz estimates from a hull-mounted system. The reliability of the data from the different surveys and the two main hills was considered and only the estimate from the 2015 survey on Goomzy was used in the base model (Table 15). The estimates from Godiva were unreliable because the surveyed marks contained a mix of species (Hampton et al 2005, 2006). In 2005 and 2006 it was not clear that the marks on Goomzy were exclusively orange roughy, but in 2015 there was strong evidence from both trawling and the multi-frequency system that the surveyed marks were almost exclusively orange roughy (Ryan & Tilney 2016).

ORANGE ROUGHY (ORH 3B) – May 2026

Table 15: Acoustic survey estimates of spawning biomass available to the stock assessment. Only the 2015 estimate from Goomzy was used in the base model.

Year	Area	Snapshots	Estimate (t)	CV (%)
2005	Godiva	3	2 600	23
	Goomzy	4	4 000	22
2006	Godiva	4	900	51
	Goomzy	3	3 200	50
2015	Godiva	2	180	Not calculated
	Goomzy	2	4 200	26

The acoustic estimate in 2015 from Goomzy was assumed to represent ‘most’ of the spawning biomass in that year. This was modelled by treating the acoustic estimate as relative biomass and estimating the proportionality constant (q) with an informed prior. The prior was lognormally distributed with a mean of 0.8 (i.e., ‘most’ = 80%) and a CV of 19% (see Introduction – Orange Roughy chapter).

Age frequencies

Age frequencies were developed for the *Giljanus* spawning season trawl survey in 1992 (Clark & Tracey 1993) and the targeted trawling on spawning marks during the 2015 acoustic survey (Ryan & Tilney 2016) (Ian Doonan, NIWA, pers. comm.). Approximately 400 otoliths were used for each age frequency and CVs were calculated for each proportion-at-age from bootstrapping. In 2015, the mode (for the smoothed distribution) is at about 40 years whereas in 1992 the mode is closer to 60 years (Figure 15). It is notable that in both years the ages extend out to at least 130 years (Figure 15). In the base model, the age frequencies were fitted as multinomial with effective sample sizes of 80 and 60, respectively. The sample size of 80 is the approximate number of trawl stations during the survey in 1992 and the value of 60 was derived from the between-year ratio of equivalent multinomial sample sizes derived from the bootstrap CVs.




Figure 15: Puysegur age frequency density from 1992 and 2015 used in the base model. The red lines were produced using the lowest smoother in R.

Trawl survey data

Trawl surveys of the Puysegur area were undertaken on *Tangaroa* in 1992 and 1994 (Clark & Tracey 1994, Clark et al 1996). However, the timing of the surveys was not ideal with the second survey being more than a month later than the first (Puysegur strata occupied in 1992: 8 August–11 September, and in 1994: 24 September–23 October). An analysis of seasonal CPUE suggested that catch rates in the later period could be expected to be 50% of those in the earlier period. Also, an analysis of fish length data suggested that larger fish were caught in June–August period—the period taken to be the ‘spawning season’ in the model (although spawning occurs in July). It appears that during the June–August period larger fish are more available to the fishing fleet and could have been more available to the trawl survey.

There was a very large reduction in the biomass indices for such a short period (Table 16).

Table 16: Trawl survey biomass indices for all fish from the *Tangaroa* trawl surveys of the Puysegur area in 1992 and 1994. The CVs given are those used in the modelling and include no process error.

	Biomass index (t)	CV (%)
1992	6 630	28
1994	1 160	24

To allow for a possible reduction in availability between the 1992 and 1994 surveys, due to the change in timing, the selectivity for the trawl survey was modelled separately for mature and immature fish and an availability parameter for mature fish was estimated for the 1994 survey. The length frequencies from the trawl surveys are bimodal which could be partly explained by two groups of fish distinguished by maturity (Figure 16).




Figure 16: Puysegur length frequency density for the *Tangaroa* trawl surveys in 1992 and 1994 (fitted in the model as beginning of year in 1993 and 1995). The effective samples sizes of $N = 70$ were the approximate number of stations in each survey.

Length frequencies (commercial fishery)

Scientific observer coverage of the Puysegur fishery was very patchy over the small number of years when the fishery operated. The best coverage was in the 1993–94 fishing year when there were 15 samples in the non-spawning season and 44 samples in the spawning season. The next best year, when more than one month was sampled in the non-spawning season, was 1996–97 when there were 6 non-spawning season samples and 3 spawning season samples. Scaled length frequencies were produced in those two years for the spawning and non-spawning seasons. The data were assumed to be multinomial with effective sample sizes equal to the number of samples.

4.3.3 Model runs and results

In the base model, the acoustic estimate from Goomzy in 2015 was used, with the *Tangaroa* trawl survey data, and natural mortality (M) was fixed at 0.045. There were six main sensitivity runs: exclude the *Tangaroa* trawl survey data, low weight on the age frequencies, high weight on the age frequencies, estimate M , and the *LowM-Highq* and *HighM-Lowq* ‘standard’ runs (see Introduction – Orange Roughy chapter). There were additional sensitivities: treating the trawl surveys as strictly comparable, using lognormal priors on the free year class strength parameters, alternative fixed non-spawning season fishing selectivities, adding a 5% over-run to the catch history, and using a higher CV on the acoustic q prior.

In the base model, the main parameters estimated were: virgin (unfished, equilibrium) spawning biomass (B_0), maturity ogive, trawl-survey selectivity, CV of mean-length-at-age for ages 1 and 120

years (linear relationship assumed for intermediate ages), and year class strengths (YCS) from 1917 to 1990 (with the Haist parameterisation and ‘nearly uniform’ priors on the free parameters).

Model diagnostics

The model provided good MPD fits to the data. Residuals were examined mainly at the MCMC level and these were all acceptable suggesting that the data weighting (CVs and effective sample sizes) was reasonable.

The marginal posterior distribution of the acoustic q shifted somewhat to the left of the prior but remained well within the distribution of the prior (Figure 17).

The MPD sensitivity runs where the trawl surveys were assumed strictly comparable, despite the difference in timing, were unable to fit the decline in the trawl indices and showed poorer fits to the trawl survey length frequencies than the base model. The objective function decreased by 7 likelihood units when the availability parameter for 1994 was estimated (which supports the inclusion of the single additional parameter).

When lognormal priors were used for the free YCS parameters the trawl survey indices were fitted adequately (because the availability parameter was estimated) but the fits to the composition data (length and age frequencies) were degraded compared with the base model (which used nearly uniform priors on the free YCS parameters). The worst example of the poor fits was for the *Tangaroa* trawl survey length frequency in 1994. The reason for the poorer fits to the composition data was because the use of a lognormal prior severely constrained the estimated YCS. The near uniform prior allows much more freedom in the pattern of estimated YCS. Behaviour in the MCMC runs is much improved for the lognormal priors but there is the issue that the choice of sigmaR is arbitrary (see the Introduction – Orange Roughy chapter).




Figure 17: Puysegur base, the marginal posterior distribution of the acoustic q (histogram) compared with its prior (red line). The black dot marks the median of the marginal posterior.

MCMC Results

For the base model, and the sensitivity runs, MCMC convergence diagnostics for virgin biomass (B_0) and stock status were very good. B_0 was estimated to be between 12 000 and 26 000 t for all runs (Table). Current stock status was similar across the base and the first four sensitivity runs. The slightly lower stock status when M was estimated reflects the lower estimates of M (0.040 rather than 0.045). For the two ‘bounding’ runs, where M and the mean of the acoustic q prior were shifted by 20%, median current stock status was within or above the biomass target range of 30–50% B_0 for both runs (Table 17). The sensitivity with a higher CV on the acoustic q prior gave similar results to the base model with a slightly higher B_0 and stock status. The 5% over-run model gave almost identical results to the base model. All other sensitivity runs gave stock status estimates within the range covered by the *LowM- Highq* and *HighM-Lowq* models.

Table17: Puysegur base, MCMC estimates of virgin biomass (B_0) and stock status (B_{2017} as % B_0) for the base model and six sensitivity runs.

	M	B_0 (000 t)	95% CI	B_{2017} (% B_0)	95% CI
Base	0.045	17	13–23	49	36–62
No trawl	0.045	17	13–24	51	39–64
Low AF	0.045	15	12–21	46	34–61
High AF	0.045	18	14–26	51	39–63
Estimate M	0.040	18	13–25	47	34–61
LowM-Highq	0.036	18	14–23	42	30–55
HighM-Lowq	0.054	17	12–25	57	44–69

For the base model (and all sensitivities), the stock is considered to be fully rebuilt according to the Harvest Strategy Standard (at least a 70% probability that the lower end of the management target range of 30–50% B_0 has been achieved).

The estimated YCSs show a trend across cohorts with above average recruitment prior to 1950 with below average recruitment up until about 1980 (Figure 18). The variation in the more recent (true) YCS is due to variation in depletion levels across the MCMC samples (and hence different levels of recruitment were generated from the stock-recruitment relationship).




Figure 18: Puysegur base, MCMC estimated ‘true’ YCS (R_y/R_0). The box in each year covers 50% of the distribution and the whiskers extend to 95% of the distribution.

The estimated spawning stock biomass (SSB) trajectory showed a declining trend from 1990 (when the fishery started) to 1998 when the fishery was closed (Figure 19). Since 1998 the estimated biomass has increased steadily and has been well within the target range for the last decade (Figure 19).

Fishing intensity was estimated in each year for each MCMC sample to produce a posterior distribution for fishing intensity by year. Fishing intensity is represented in terms of the median exploitation rate and the Equilibrium Stock Depletion (ESD). For the latter, a fishing intensity of $U_{x\% B_0}$ means that fishing (forever) at that intensity will cause the SSB to reach deterministic equilibrium at $x\% B_0$ (e.g., fishing at $U_{30\% B_0}$ forces the SSB to a deterministic equilibrium of 30% B_0). Fishing intensity in these units is plotted as 100–ESD so that fishing intensity ranges from 0 ($U_{100\% B_0}$) up to 100 ($U_{0\% B_0}$).

Estimated fishing intensity was above $U_{20\% B_0}$ for most of the history of the fishery before it was closed in 1998; it was briefly in the target range ($U_{30\% B_0}$ – $U_{50\% B_0}$) in 2006 when there was a combined acoustic and trawl survey (Figure 20).

ORANGE ROUGHY (ORH 3B) – May 2026




Figure 19: Puysegur base, MCMC estimated spawning stock biomass trajectory. The box in each year covers 50% of the distribution and the whiskers extend to 95% of the distribution. The hard limit (red), soft limit (blue), and biomass target range (green) are marked by horizontal lines.




Figure 20: Puysegur base, MCMC estimated fishing-intensity trajectory. The box in each year covers 50% of the distribution and the whiskers extend to 95% of the distribution. The fishing intensity range associated with the biomass target of 30–50% B_0 is marked by horizontal lines.

Biological reference points, management targets, and yield

Orange roughy stocks have had a target management range of 30–50% B_0 since 2014. A new Management Procedure is currently under development. Yield estimates are not reported for this stock.

5. FUTURE RESEARCH CONSIDERATIONS

ESCR and NWCR

Ageing

- Investigate representativeness of age frequencies derived from mark identification trawls including comparison with age frequencies from the commercial spawning fishery. Increase the number of samples and tows sampled as appropriate.
- Estimate age frequency for the spawning and non-spawning fisheries. If otoliths are not available, increase observer sampling to collect adequate otoliths.
- Estimates of ageing error should be made to ensure an appropriate signal is taken from age frequency data.
- Explore the utility of ageing otoliths from wide area trawl surveys undertaken in the 1990s (as the first stage in increasing the age data available for assessments).
- Explore spatial patterns in age data.

Surveys

- Determine why the acoustic 38 kHz and 120 kHz biomass estimates have diverged and which is most accurate. Explore target strength distributions at 38 kHz and 120 kHz where data available are from recent AOS surveys.
- For the near future, consider more frequent acoustic surveys be conducted that cover all the main spawning areas (ESCR, Old spawning plume, Rekohu, Mt. Muck; NWCR, Morgue, Graveyard, and other appropriate hills in the Graveyard complex).
- Investigate the use of the Chatham Rise *Tangaroa* trawl survey deep strata as a potential juvenile index to help inform projections.
- Re-investigate the information used to generate the informative prior describing the proportion of spawning biomass considered to be within the surveyed plumes.
- Further explore skipped spawning to determine whether it has an age component that might explain selectivity/spawning being older than maturity, and whether inter-annual variability might explain 'process error' in the surveys.
- Consider the use of 70 kHz in orange roughy acoustic surveys.
- Explore how better to obtain representative age frequency distributions and information on species composition from Morgue, which has been closed to bottom fishing since 2001.

Assessments

- Conduct further investigations into the utility of the CPUE data, differentiating between feature and flat fishing.
- Explore spatio-temporal models, incorporating all sources of abundance data (CPUE, trawl surveys, acoustic surveys).
- Develop a management procedure to provide advice on target exploitation rates for the fishery.
- Briefly catalogue, overview, and investigate data sources available for the stock assessment model.
- Develop stock assessment models to evaluate different hypotheses of spatial stock structure.
- Examine posterior predictive plots on MCMC outputs.
- Consider developments in model parameterisation including:
 - a wider plus group (potentially starting at age 70 or 80);
 - inclusion of trawl survey data as pseudo observations (assuming they are not fitted);
 - changing selectivity over time as the fishery has become less feature focussed;
 - conduct sensitivities at different fixed values of M.
- Apply best practices for Bayesian inference in low data situations (see Monnahan 2024) and explore prior predictive checks (Kim & Neubauer 2025).

Stock specific recommendations

- Northwest Chatham Rise: Video observations from the RV *Sonne* voyage in January 2025 observed aggregations of orange roughy on Morgue. Acoustic biomass surveys outside the spawning season could determine whether the aggregations are present throughout the year or

are absent and therefore likely to be vulnerable to fishing.

6. STATUS OF THE STOCKS


6.1 Chatham Rise


Stock Structure Assumptions

Chatham Rise orange roughy are believed to comprise two biological stocks; these are assessed and managed separately: one on the Northwest of the Chatham Rise and the other ranging throughout the East and South Chatham Rise. This assumed stock structure is based on the presence of two main areas where spawning takes place simultaneously, and observed and inferred migration patterns of adults and juveniles. These two biological stocks form the bulk of the ORH 3B Fishstock. They are geographically separated from all other ORH 3B biological stocks, which are mostly in Sub-Antarctic areas.

- East and South Chatham Rise

Stock Status	
Year of Most Recent Assessment	2025
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Very Low
Assessment Runs Presented	Four alternative models (Acoustic 38 kHz; Acoustic 120 kHz; Acoustic 38 kHz and age frequency (AF); Acoustic 120 kHz and AF)
Reference Points	Management Target: Biomass range 30–50% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: Fishing intensity range $U_{30\%B_0}$ – $U_{50\%B_0}$
Status in relation to Target	Across the four models considered, the median of B_{2025} ranged from 8–18% B_0 (CI of 6–25%). Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be above the lower bound of the target range.
Status in relation to Limits	Likely (> 60%) to be below the soft limit and Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the hard limit
Status in relation to Overfishing	Overfishing was Unlikely (< 40%) to be occurring in 2024





Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent trend in biomass or proxy	For all models, biomass has been steadily declining since about 2005.
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Fishing intensity decreased substantially in 2023–24 with the TACC reduction
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	Unstandardised CPUE (which is considered an index of local abundance, but not stock abundance) has been at historical lows within the last 5 years for most subareas, but some have since increased.

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	At current catch or TACC, the stock is predicted to increase slowly (runs Acoustic 38, and Acoustic 120), or decrease slowly (runs Acoustic 38 and AF, and Acoustic 120 and AF)
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	At current catch or TACC: Very Likely (> 90%) to remain below the soft limit for all four accepted runs Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below the Hard Limit for the two Acoustic 38 runs; About as Likely as Not (40–60%) to be below the Hard Limit for the Acoustic 120 and AF run; Likely (< 60%) to be below the Hard Limit for the Acoustic 120 run
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Overfishing is Unlikely (> 60%) at the current catch or TACC

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 1 - Full Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Age-structured CASAL model with Bayesian estimation of posterior distributions	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment: 2025	Next assessment: 2030
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Acoustic estimates of spawning biomass of the Old Spawning Plume (2002 – 2010) - Acoustic estimates of spawning biomass at Rekohu, Old Spawning Plume, and Mt. Muck (2011–2024) - Age frequency distributions for Rekohu, Old Spawning Plume, and Mt. Muck	1 – High Quality 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: inconsistencies in trend between 38 and 120 kHz series. 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: inconsistencies in the age frequencies

ORANGE ROUGHY (ORH 3B) – May 2026

Data not used 2025 (rank)	- CPUE - Trawl surveys of flat areas (2004, 2007) - Trawl surveys of Spawning Box (1984–1994) - Wide-area acoustic survey estimates (2004, 2007) - Chatham Rise trawl survey deepwater stations (2010–2024) - Egg survey estimate	3 – Low Quality: unlikely to be indexing stock-wide abundance 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: short time series 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: may not be representative of the stock 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: variable indices 2 – Use not yet investigated; no age compositions 3 – Low Quality: survey design assumptions not met
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	- Old Spawning Plume acoustic series (2002–10) treated as a relative biomass index. Only acoustic estimates from 2011 fitted with the informed prior on q - YCS (1931–94) no longer estimated, instead two levels of recruitment (change at 1980) with no stock-recruitment relationship (steepness equal to 1) estimated - Age frequencies for the three spawning areas no longer combined: age frequencies for Mt. Muck fitted with a separate selectivity ogive, and age frequencies for Old Spawning Plume and Rekohu fitted assuming selectivity equal to maturity - Maturity assumed from otolith transition zone estimates, rather than assumed equal to estimated selectivity - Three fisheries with separate catch histories and selectivity fitted using age frequencies (Mt. Muck, Rekohu and Old Spawning Plume, Non-spawn), instead of Spawning Box & flats (fitted with age frequencies), Eastern Hills, and Andes & South Rise (latter two fitted with length frequencies)	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- which of the acoustic 38 kHz or 120 kHz 120 series is reliable - inconsistencies in age data - lack of useable biomass indices from the initial fish down (1980–90s) - uncertainty in productivity (appears to be much lower than expected for ESCR; which is inconsistent with NWCR)	

Qualifying Comments

There are inconsistencies in stock assessment assumptions between the NWCR and ESCR

Fishery Interactions

Main bycatch species are smooth oreo, black oreo, rattails, deepwater dogfish, and hoki, with lesser bycatches of Johnson's cod and ribaldo. Low productivity bycatch species include deepwater sharks, skates, and corals. Observed incidental captures of protected species include corals, low numbers of seabirds, and occasional New Zealand fur seals. Orange roughy are caught using bottom trawl gear. Bottom trawling interacts with benthic habitats.


• Northwest Chatham Rise

Stock Status	
Year of Most Recent Assessment	2025
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Very Low
Assessment Runs Presented	Two alternative runs (Acoustic 38 kHz, Acoustic 120 kHz)

ORANGE ROUGHY (ORH 3B) – May 2026

Reference Points	Management Target: Biomass range 30–50% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: Fishing intensity range $U_{30\%B_0}$ – $U_{50\%B_0}$
Status in relation to Target	Across the two models considered the median of B_{2025} ranged from 34–36% B_0 (CI of 21–49%). About as Likely as Not (40–60%) to be at or above the lower bound of the target range; Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be at or above the upper bound of the target range.
Status in relation to Limits	Very Unlikely (<1%) to be below the soft limit and Very Unlikely (<1%) to be below the hard limit.
Status in relation to Overfishing	Overfishing was Very Unlikely (> 90%) to be occurring in 2024

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



Historical trajectory of spawning biomass (% B_0), median exploitation rate (%), and exploitation rate for the four model runs. The biomass target range of 30–50% B_0 and the corresponding exploitation rate range are marked in green. The soft limit (20% B_0) and the hard limit (10% B_0) are marked in red.

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent trend in biomass or proxy	For all models, biomass has been increasing since about 2005.
Recent trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Catches have been low since 2018–19 (< 33% of the catch limit), although acoustic estimates of spawning biomass have been increasing.
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	Unstandardised CPUE indices (which is considered an index of local abundance, but not stock abundance) have been flat or declining and were at historical lows between 2016–17 and 2021–22 with an increase in 2023–24.

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	Current catch is low and the spawning stock is expected to increase.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	At current catch: Soft Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) At current agreed catch limit: Soft Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%)
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Very Unlikely (< 90%) at current catch

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation	
Assessment Type	Level 1 - Full Quantitative Stock Assessment

ORANGE ROUGHY (ORH 3B) – May 2026

Assessment Method	Age-structured CASAL model with Bayesian estimation of posterior distributions	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment: 2025	Next assessment: 2030
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Acoustic estimates of spawning biomass on Graveyard and Morgue (2012, 2016, 2022, 2024).	2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: inconsistencies in trend between 38 and 120 series
Data not used 2018 (rank)	- 17 years of length frequency data - Morgue age frequency (2016, 2022, 2024) - Trawl survey age frequency (1994) - CPUE - Trawl surveys of hills (1990–2002) - Wide-area acoustic survey estimates - Chatham Rise trawl survey deepwater stations (2010–2016) - Egg survey estimate - Trawl survey proportion-spawning-at-age (1994)	1 – High Quality 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: potential non-representative sampling 1 – High Quality 3 – Low Quality: unlikely to be indexing stock-wide abundance 3 – Low Quality: unlikely to be indexing stock-wide abundance 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: large potential bias due to mixed-species 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: variable indices 3 – Low Quality: survey design assumptions not met 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: unlikely to be indexing whole stock
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	- M estimated, and YCS assumed deterministic (previously YCS estimated for 1931–94). - Maturity set equal to selectivity estimated from the Morgue age frequencies (i.e., the spawning aggregation), rather than from macroscopic maturity at age (trawl survey 1994) and length frequencies (where maturity assumed equal to estimated selectivity).	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Which of the acoustic 38 kHz or 120 kHz is reliable - Inconsistencies in age data - Lack of biomass indices from the initial fish down (1980-90s) - Uncertainty in productivity (appears to be much higher than expected for ESCR)	

Qualifying Comments

Unknown if there is movement of fish off the Morgue outside the spawning season
There are inconsistencies in stock assessment assumptions for the NWCR and ESCR

Fishery Interactions

Main bycatch species are smooth oreo, black oreo, rattails, deepwater dogfish, and hoki, with lesser bycatches of Johnson's cod and ribaldo. Low productivity bycatch species include deepwater sharks, skates, and corals. Observed incidental captures of protected species include corals, low numbers of seabirds, and occasional New Zealand fur seals. Orange roughy are caught using bottom trawl gear. Bottom trawling interacts with benthic habitats.

- **Southern ORH 3B fisheries**


There are several other small fisheries in ORH 3B in the southern waters of which Puysegur appears to be the largest stock.

- o **Puysegur**

Stock Status

Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2017	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Very Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2015–16	Catch: 0 t
Assessment Runs Presented	Base model only	
Reference Points	Management Target: Biomass range 30–50% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: Fishing intensity range $U_{30\% B_0}$	
Status in relation to Target	B_{2017} was estimated at 49% B_0 . Very Likely (> 90%) to be at or above the lower end of the management target range	
Status in relation to Limits	B_{2017} is Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%) to be below the Soft or Hard Limits	
Status in relation to Overfishing	An agreed closure of the fishery was in place until 2017. Overfishing in 2017 is Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%) to be occurring	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



Historical trajectory of spawning biomass (% B_0), median exploitation rate (%), and fishing intensity (100-ESD) (base model, medians of the marginal posteriors). The biomass target range of 30–50% B_0 and the corresponding exploitation rate range are marked in green. The soft limit (20% B_0) and the hard limit (10% B_0) are marked in red. Note that the left-hand Y-axis is non-linear.

ORANGE ROUGHY (ORH 3B) – May 2026

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Biomass reached its lowest point in 1998 and has increased steadily since then. According to the Harvest Strategy Standard, the stock is now considered to be fully rebuilt (at least a 70% probability that the lower end of the management target range of 30–50% B_0 has been achieved).
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Fishing intensity has been close to zero since the fishery was closed in 1997–98 with the exception of 2005, 2006, and 2015 when surveys were conducted.
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	No projections were conducted
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Current catch is zero
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Current catch is zero

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 1 - Full Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Age-structured CASAL model with Bayesian estimation of posterior distributions	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2017	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Acoustic estimate of spawning biomass on Goomzy (2015) - Trawl survey indices and length frequencies (1992, 1994) - Age frequencies (1992, 2015) - 2 years of length frequency data	1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	- CPUE - Winter trawl surveys (1991, 1992, 2006) - Acoustic survey estimates (2005, 2006) - Additional commercial length frequencies	3 – Low Quality: unlikely to be indexing stock-wide abundance 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: unlikely to be indexing stock-wide abundance 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: large potential bias due to mixed species 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: not enough months sampled within each year
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	- The previous assessment was in 1998 - Model now based on spawning biomass rather than transition-zone mature biomass - Age data included to enable estimation of year class strengths rather than assuming deterministic recruitment - Trawl survey indices better modelled to allow for difference in timing - A more stringent data quality threshold was imposed on data inputs (e.g., CPUE indices not used)	

Major Sources of Uncertainty	-The largest source of uncertainty is the proportion of the Puysegur spawning stock that is indexed by the acoustic survey in 2015. - The single acoustic estimate is the only recent biomass index. - Patterns in year class strengths are based on only two years of age frequencies.

Qualifying Comments

It should be noted that the model structure and suite of assumptions used from about 2014–2018 is now considered to have been overly optimistic in terms of estimating the stock rebuild and current stock status.

Fishery Interactions

Historically the Puysegur orange roughy fishery included black and smooth oreos, deepwater dogfish, black cardinal fish, slickheads, and rattails as significant bycatch. Interactions with other species are currently being characterised. Orange roughy are caught using bottom trawl gear. Bottom trawling interacts with benthic habitats.

- **Auckland Islands (Pukaki South)**

The Deepwater Working Group examined the data on orange roughy catch and effort from the Auckland Islands area in 2006 and found that there had been relatively little fishing activity in this area in the previous few years. There were insufficient data to conduct a standardised CPUE analysis, and it was believed that unstandardised CPUE did not provide a suitable index of relative abundance. Therefore, a stock assessment could not be carried out.

- **Other fisheries**

In 2006 the Deepwater Working Group examined the data on orange roughy catch and effort from other parts of ORH 3B—the Bounty Islands, Pukaki Rise, Snares Island, and the Arrow Plateau—and agreed that there were insufficient data to carry out standardised CPUE analyses for any of these areas.

7. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Anderson, O; Dunn, M (2012) Descriptive analysis of catch and effort data from New Zealand orange roughy fisheries in ORH 1, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 7A, and 7B to the end of the 2008–09 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2012/20*. 82 p.
- Annala, J H; Sullivan, K J; O'Brien, C J; Iball, S D (Comps) (1998) Report from the Fishery Assessment Plenary, May 1998: stock assessments and yield estimates. 409 p. (Unpublished report held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Bull, R; Doonan, I J; Tracey, D M; Coombs, R F (2000) An acoustic estimate of orange roughy abundance on the Northwest Hills, Chatham Rise, June–July 1999. New Zealand. Fisheries Assessment Research Document 2000/20. 36 p. (Unpublished report held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Bull, B; Francis, R I C C; Dunn, A; McKenzie, A; Gilbert, D J; Smith, M H (2003) CASAL (C++ algorithmic stock assessment laboratory): CASAL User Manual v2.01-2003/08/01. *NIWA Technical Report 124*. 223 p.
- Clark, M R; Anderson, O F; Dunn, M (2003) Descriptive analysis of catch and effort data from New Zealand orange roughy fisheries in ORH 1, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, and 7B to the end of the 2001–02 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/60*. 51 p.
- Clark, M R; Anderson, O F; Francis, R I C C; Tracey, D M (2000) The effects of commercial exploitation on orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) from the continental slope of the Chatham Rise, New Zealand, from 1979 to 1997. *Fisheries Research* 45(3): 217–238.
- Clark, M R; Anderson, O F; Tracey, D M (1996) Trawl survey of orange roughy, black oreo, and smooth oreo in southern New Zealand waters September–October 1994 (TAN9409). *New Zealand Fisheries Data Report No. 72*. 39 p.
- Clark, M R; Tracey, D M (1993) Orange roughy off the southeast coast of the South Island and Puysegur Bank: exploratory and research fishing, June–August 1992. *New Zealand Fisheries Technical Report No. 35*. 30 p.
- Clark, M R; Tracey, D M (1994) Trawl survey of orange roughy, black oreo, and smooth oreo in southern New Zealand waters August–September 1992 (TAN9208). *New Zealand Fisheries Data Report No. 40*. 37 p.
- Coburn, R P; Doonan, I J (1994) Orange roughy fishing on the North East Chatham Rise: a description of the commercial fishery, 1979–1988. *New Zealand Fisheries Technical Report No. 38*.
- Coburn, R P; Doonan, I J (1997) The fishery for orange roughy on the northeast Chatham Rise, 1988–99 to 1993–94. *New Zealand Fisheries Technical Report No. 48*. 28 p.
- Coombs, R F; Barr, R (2007) *In situ* measurements of orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) target strength. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 64: 1220–1234.
- Cordue, P L (2008) Review of estimates of Chatham Rise orange roughy biomass from plume surveys. Report prepared for the New Zealand Ministry of Fisheries. 39 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Cordue, P L (2010) Linear-model derived bottom-referenced weather corrections for the CR ORH plume time series (2002–2009). Report to the DWWG, DWWG2010-30, New Zealand Ministry of Fisheries. 71 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Cordue, P L (2014a) The 2014 orange roughy stock assessments. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/50*. 135 p.
- Cordue, P L (2014b) A Management Strategy Evaluation for orange roughy. ISL Client Report for Deepwater Group. (Unpublished report

ORANGE ROUGHY (ORH 3B) – May 2026

- held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Cordue, P L (2018) A brief update of the ORH3B ESCR and NWCR stock assessments to the end of the 2016–17 and 2017–18 fishing years with application of the Harvest Control Rule in both years. ISL Client Report for Deepwater Group Ltd. 59 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Deepwater Group Ltd (2024) A 2020 stock assessment update of ORH 3B East and South Chatham Rise. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/11*. 34 p.
- Doonan, I (2009) Re-analysis of the spawning plume biomass, towbody acoustics surveys 1998 & 2000. Deepwater Working Group document 2009/16. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Doonan, I; Bull, B (2001) Absolute biomass for 1999, NE and East Chatham Rise. WG-Deepwater-01/27. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Doonan, I; Hart, A C (2003) Notes on the abundance of mature orange roughy on the NW Chatham Rise and Graveyard Hills, ORH 3B, 20 June - 7 July 2002. WG-Deepwater- 03/01. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Doonan, I J (1991) Orange roughy fishery assessment, CPUE analysis - linear regression, NE Chatham Rise 1991. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1991/9. 48 p. (Unpublished report held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Doonan, I J (1994) Life history parameters of orange roughy; estimates for 1994. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1994/19. 13 p. (Unpublished report held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Doonan, I J; Bull, B; Dunford, A; Coombs, R; Tracey, D; Hart, A (2001) Acoustic estimates of the biomass of aggregations of orange roughy in the Spawning Box and on the Northeastern and Eastern Hills, Chatham Rise, July 2000. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/70*. 31 p.
- Doonan, I J; Dunn, M; Dunford, A; Hart, A C; Tracey, D (2006) Acoustic estimates of orange roughy abundance on the Northeastern and Eastern Chatham Rise, July 2004: wide-area survey and hill survey. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2006/58*. 45 p.
- Doonan, I J; Dunn, M; Hart, A C (2009) Abundance estimates of orange roughy on the Northeastern and Eastern Chatham Rise, July 2007: wide-area trawl survey and hill acoustic survey (TAN0709). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2009/20*. 38 p.
- Doonan, I J; Hart, A C; Bagley, N; Dunford, A (2012) Orange roughy abundance estimates of the north Chatham Rise Spawning Plumes (ORH3B), *San Waitaki* acoustic survey, June-July 2011. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2012/28*. 35 p.
- Doonan, I J; Horn, P L; Ó Maolagáin, C (2014a) Orange roughy age estimates: Chatham Rise (ORH 3B) spawning plumes in 2012, and mid-east coast North Island (ORH 2A) fishery from 1989–91 and 2010. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/24*. 19 p.
- Doonan, I J; Horn, P L; Ó Maolagáin, C (2014b) Age composition of orange roughy from ORH 3B (Chatham Rise: northwest, 1994, and northeast, 2013), and from ORH 7A (Challenger Plateau in 1987, 2006 and 2009). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/59*. 33 p.
- Doonan, I J; Horn, P L; Ó Maolagáin, C; Datta, S (2018) Age composition of orange roughy from ORH 3B, Chatham Rise, 2016: Mount Muck, Old Plume, Rekohu Plume, and Morgue. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2018/48*. 17 p.
- Dunn, M R (2007) CPUE analysis and assessment of the Northeast Chatham Rise orange roughy stock (part of ORH 3B) to the end of 2004–05 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/8*. 75 p.
- Dunn, M R (2024) Stock assessment research for Chatham Rise orange roughy in 2023. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/46*. 36 p.
- Dunn, M R; Anderson, O F; Doonan, I J (2008) Evaluation of stock status for orange roughy on the east and south Chatham Rise for 2008. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/65*. 30 p.
- Dunn, M R; Devine, J A (2010) An holistic approach to determining stock structure of orange roughy on the Chatham Rise. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2010/17*. 65 p.
- Dunn, M R; Doonan, I J (2018) Assessment of the Chatham Rise orange roughy stocks for 2017. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2018/59*. 60 p.
- Dunn, M R; Rickard, G J; Sutton, P J H; Doonan, I J (2009) Nursery grounds of orange roughy around New Zealand. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 66: 871–885.
- Dunn, M R; Doonan, I J; Anderson, O F (2025) Additional analyses for orange roughy (ORH 3B). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2025/18*. 43 p.
- Fisheries New Zealand (2023). Fisheries Assessment Plenary, May 2023: stock assessments and stock status. Compiled by the Fisheries Science Team, Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand. 1904 p.
- Francis, R I C C (1992) Recommendations concerning the calculation of maximum constant yield (MCY) and current annual yield (CAY). New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1992/8. 26 p. (Unpublished report held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Francis, R I C C (1995) The longevity of orange roughy: a reinterpretation of the radiometric data. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1995/2. 13 p. (Unpublished report held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Francis, R I C C (1996) Orange roughy sex ratios and catch rate distributions in the Chatham Rise Spawning Box. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1996/13. 27 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library.)
- Francis, R I C C (2006) Some recent problems in New Zealand orange roughy assessments. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2006/43*. 65 p.
- Francis, R I C C (2001a) Orange roughy CPUE on the South and east Chatham Rise. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/26*. 30 p.
- Francis, R I C C (2001b) Stock Assessment of orange roughy on the South Chatham Rise. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/27*. 25 p.
- Francis, R I C C (2001c) Stock assessment for 2001 of orange roughy on the northeast Chatham Rise. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/41*. 32 p.
- Francis, R I C C (2006) Some recent problems in New Zealand orange roughy assessments. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2006/43*. 65 p.
- Francis, R I C C; Bull, B (2000) Assessment of the northwest Chatham Rise orange roughy stock (part of ORH 3B). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/21*. 17 p.
- Francis, R I C C; Clark, M R; Coburn, R P; Field, K D; Grimes, P J (1995) Assessment of the ORH 3B orange roughy fishery for the 1994–95 fishing year. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1995/4. 43 p. (Unpublished report held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Francis, R I C C; Clark, M R; Grimes, P J (1997) Calculation of the recruited biomass of orange roughy on the northwest Chatham Rise using the 1996 Graveyard Hill egg survey (TAN9608). New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1997/29. 18 p. (Unpublished report held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Francis, R I C C; Horn, P L (1997) Transition zone in otoliths of orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) and its relationship to the onset of maturity. *Marine Biology* 129: 681–687.
- Francis, R I C C; Hurst, R J; Renwick, J A (2001) An evaluation of catchability assumptions in New Zealand stock assessments. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/1*. 37 p.
- Hampton, I; Soule, M A; Nelson, J C (2005) Acoustic survey of orange roughy on Graveyard hill and in the spawning plume, North Chatham Rise, and on Puysegur Bank, New Zealand, June/July 2005. 98 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Hampton, I; Soule, M A; Nelson, J C (2006) Acoustic and trawl survey of orange roughy on Puysegur Bank, and in the spawning plume and northeast hills on the North Chatham Rise, New Zealand, July 2006. 91 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand,

- Wellington.)
- Hampton, I; Soule, M; Nelson, J (2008) Standardisation of acoustic estimates of orange roughy biomass in the North Chatham Rise Spawning Plume between 1996 and 2007, made with vessel-mounted transducers. 26 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Hampton, I; Soule, M; Nelson, J (2009) Corrections to time series of acoustic estimates of orange roughy spawning biomass in the Spawning Plume in area ORH3B from vessel-mounted transducers, 1996 to 2008. 29 p. WG-Deepwater-09/14. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Hampton, I; Soule, M A; Nelson, J C (2010) Standardised acoustic estimates of orange roughy biomass in the Spawning Plume in area ORH 3B from vessel-mounted and towed transducers, 1996–2009. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Hicks, A C (2006) Changes in lengths from the commercial catch in the Spawning Box. WG-Deepwater-06/ (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Hilborn, R; Walters, C J (1992) *Quantitative fisheries stock assessment: choice, dynamics, and uncertainty*. Chapman and Hall, New York, 570 p.
- Horn, P L; Tracey, D M; Clark, M R (1998) Between-area differences in age and length at first maturity of the orange roughy *Hoplostethus atlanticus*. *Marine Biology* 132 (2): 187–194.
- Horn, P L; Tracey, D M; Doonan, I J; Krusic-Golub, K (2016) Age determination protocol for orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2016/03*. 30 p.
- Kim, K; Neubauer P (2025) Examining Potential Biases Through Prior Predictive Checks: Prior Mis-Specifications and Their Impact on Bayesian Stock Assessments. *Fisheries Research* 288: 107405.
- Kloser, R J; Home, J K (2003) Characterizing uncertainty in target-strength measurements of a deepwater fish: orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*). *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 60: 516–523.
- Kloser, R J; Macaulay, G; Ryan, T; Lewis, M (2011) Improving acoustic species identification and target strength using frequency difference and visual verification: example for a deep-sea fish orange roughy. DWWG 2011-52. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Macaulay, G; Kloser, R J; Ryan, T (2009) Visually verified *in situ* target strength measurements of orange roughy from the Chatham Rise, July 2007. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project ORH2006-01A, Objective 2. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 45 p.
- Mace, P M; Fenaughty, J M; Coburn, R P; Doonan, I J (1990) Growth and productivity of orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) on the north Chatham Rise. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 24: 105–119.
- McKenzie, A (2003) Standardised CPUE analysis and stock assessment of the northwest Chatham Rise orange roughy stock (part of ORH 3B). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/61*. 24 p.
- McKenzie, A (2005) Standardised CPUE analysis and stock assessment of the northwest Chatham Rise orange roughy stock (part of ORH 3B). Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Project (ORH2003-02). 42 p (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Monnahan, C C (2024) Toward good practices for Bayesian data-rich fisheries stock assessments using a modern statistical workflow. *Fisheries Research* 275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2024.107024>
- Robertson, D A; Mace, P M (1988) Assessment of the Chatham Rise orange roughy fishery for 1987/88. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1988/37. 5 p. (Unpublished report held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Ryan, T E; Tilney, R L (2016) Biomass surveys of orange roughy and oreo species using a net-attached acoustic optical system for New Zealand ORH7B and ORH3B Puysegur management zones in June, July 2015. 67 p. (Copy held by CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research, Hobart.)
- Smith, M H (2006) Northwest Chatham Rise mature biomass estimate for the stock assessment. WG-Deepwater-06/17. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Smith, P J; Benson, P G (1997) Genetic diversity in orange roughy from the east of New Zealand. *Fisheries Research* 31(3): 197–213.
- Soule, M A; Hampton, I; Nelson, J C; Tilney, R L (2010) Acoustic survey of orange roughy on the North Chatham Rise (ORH 3B), New Zealand. June/July 2010. Report prepared for New Zealand Deepwater Group Ltd.
- Soule, M A; Nelson, J C; Hampton, I (2007) Acoustic survey of orange roughy in the spawning plume on the North Chatham Rise, New Zealand. DWWG-2008/83. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Stephenson, F; Biggerstaff, A; Dunn, M; A'mar, T; Doonan, I; Rowden, A; Geange, S (2022) A 2022 orange roughy stock assessment for Louisville Ridge, West Norfolk Ridge, Lord Howe Rise, and Northwest Challenger Plateau. South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation, 10th Meeting of the Scientific Committee, Seoul, Korea, 26-30 September 2022. SC10-DW01_rev1. 37 p.
- Taylor, P (2001) Assessment of orange roughy fisheries in southern New Zealand for 2000. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/24*. 30 p.
- Tracey, D M; Fenaughty, J M (1997) Distribution and relative abundance of orange roughy on the Chatham Rise, May–July 1994. *New Zealand Fisheries Technical Report No. 44*. 43 p.
- Tracey, D; Horn, P; Marriott, P; Krusic-Golub, K; Gren, C; Gili, R; Mieres, L C (2007) Orange Roughy Ageing Workshop: otolith preparation and interpretation. (Unpublished report to the Deepwater Fisheries Assessment Working Group, held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)

ORANGE ROUGHY CHALLENGER PLATEAU (ORH 7A)

1. FISHERY SUMMARY

Allowances, TACCs, and TACs are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs, and TACs (t) for ORH 7A from 1 October 2024.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
ORH 7A	0	2	55	885	942

1.1 Commercial fisheries

Historically, the fishery mainly occurred in the south-western region of the Challenger Plateau, both inside and outside the EEZ. Fish were caught throughout the year, with most effort in winter when the orange roughy form aggregations for spawning. Domestic vessels caught most of the quota. Total landings peaked at 10 000–12 000 t annually from 1986–87 to 1988–89 (Table 2). Total landings and ORH 7A landings were less than 2100 t annually from 1990–91 until the closure in 2000–01 (Table 2, Figure 1), when the TACC for this stock was reduced to 1 t.

Table 2: Reported landings (t) and TACCs (t) from 1980–81 to present. QMS data from 1986–present. The last two columns are for research surveys on commercial vessels and give the research catch that was not recorded against ACE (WP = Westpac Bank).

Fishing year	EEZ	Outside	Total landings	TACC	EEZ extra	WP extra
1980–81†	1	32	33	-	0	0
1981–82†	3 539	709	4 248	-	0	0
1982–83†	4 535	7 304	11 839	-	0	0
1983–84†	6 332	3 195	9 527	-	0	0
1984–85†	5 043	74	5 117	-	0	0
1985–86†	7 711	42	7 753	-	0	0
1986–87†	10 555	937	11 492	10 000	0	0
1987–88	10 086	2 095	12 181	12 000	0	0
1988–89	6 791	3 450	10 241	12 000	0	0
1989–90	3 709	600	*4 309	2 500	0	0
1990–91	1 340	17	1 357	1 900	0	0
1991–92	1 894	17	1 911	1 900	0	0
1992–93	1 412	675	2 087	1 900	0	0
1993–94	1 594	138	1 732	1 900	0	0
1994–95	1 554	82	1 636	1 900	0	0
1995–96	1 206	463	1 669	1 900	0	0
1996–97	1 055	253	1 308	1 900	0	0
1997–98	+	+	1 502	1 900	0	0
1998–99	+	+	1 249	1 425	0	0
1999–00	+	+	629	1 425	0	0
2000–01	+	+	0.2	1	0	0
2001–02	+	+	0.1	1	0	0
2002–03	+	+	4	1	0	0
2003–04	+	+	< 0.1	1	0	0
2004–05	+	+	< 1	1	141	17
2005–06	+	+	< 1	1	196	22
2006–07	+	+	< 0.1	1	0	0
2007–08	+	+	< 0.1	1	0	0
2008–09	+	+	0.12	1	218	22
2009–10	+	+	< 0.1	1	339	5
2010–11	476	0	476	500	0	5
2011–12	504	7	511	500	0	0
2012–13	513	0	513	500	259	4
2013–14	484	13	497	500	0	50
2014–15	1 594	0	1 594	1 600	0	0
2015–16	1 248	320	1 568	1 600	0	0
2016–17	1 595	28	1 623	1 600	0	0
2017–18	1 026	575	1 601	1 600	126	53
2018–19	+	+	1 589	1 600	0	0
2019–20	+	+	1 897	2 058	0	0
2020–21	+	+	2 074	2 058	0	0
2021–22	+	+	2 193	2 058	0	0
2022–23	+	+	1 771	2 058	0	0
2023–24	+	+	846	2 058	0	0
2024–25			761	855		

†FSU data

*This is a minimum value, because of unreported catches by foreign vessels fishing outside the EEZ.

+Unknown distribution of catch between inside and outside the EEZ

Surveys since 2005 have shown an increase in biomass in the area. On 1 October 2010 the TACC was increased from 1 t to 500 t, with a 25 t allowance for other mortality, raising the TAC to a total of 525 t. This was to allow research surveys to be conducted using commercial fishing vessels. The TACC was further increased to 1600 t following a stock assessment in 2014, and to 2058 t following a stock assessment in 2019. Total landings since 2014–15 closely followed the TACCs, but declined to 846 t in 2023–24. The TACC was reduced to 885 t in 2024–25.




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for ORH 7A.

1.2 Recreational fisheries

There is no known recreational fishing for orange roughy in this area.

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

There is no known customary non-commercial fishing for orange roughy in this area.

1.4 Illegal catch

There is no quantitative information available on illegal catch which is likely to be negligible.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

Catch overruns from various sources (including lost and/or discarded fish, use of nominal tray weights and low conversion factors) have been estimated as: 1980–81 to 1987–88, 30%; 1988–89, 25%; 1989–90, 20%; 1990–91, 15%; 1991–92 to 1992–93, 10%; 1993–94 onwards, 5%. These estimates are used in the current stock assessment.

2. BIOLOGY

Biological parameters used in this assessment are presented in the Biology section at the beginning of the Introduction – Orange Roughy chapter.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

There is no new information on orange roughy stock structure beyond that presented in previous assessment documents.

Orange roughy on the southwest Challenger Plateau (Area 7A, including Westpac Bank) are regarded as a single stock. Size structure, parasite composition, flesh mercury levels, allozyme frequency and mitochondrial DNA studies show differences to other major fisheries. Spawning occurs at a similar time to fish on the Chatham Rise, Puysegur Bank, Ritchie Banks, Cook Canyon and Lord Howe Rise.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

A model-based Bayesian stock assessment was carried out for this stock in 2024 (Dunn in prep), following similar assessments conducted in 2014 and 2019 (Cordue 2014a, Cordue 2019).

4.1 Model structure

The model was single-sex and age-structured (1–100 years with a plus group), with maturity in the partition (i.e., fish were classified by age and as mature or immature). Two time steps were used: a full year of natural mortality followed by an instantaneous spawning season and fishery on the spawning fish. One fishery was modelled, including fishing within the EEZ and on Westpac Bank (which is outside of the EEZ). The fishery selectivity was estimated and assumed equal to maturity. 100% of mature fish were assumed to spawn each year.

The catch history was constructed from the catches in Table 2 and the over-run percentages in Section 1.5. The catch for 2023–24 was assumed equal to 2022–23. Natural mortality rate was estimated, and the stock-recruitment relationship was a Beverton-Holt function with steepness of 0.75. The remaining fixed biological parameters for growth are given in the Introduction – Orange Roughy chapter.

4.2 Input data and statistical assumptions

The main data sources for observations fitted in the assessment were spawning biomass estimates from acoustic and trawl research surveys (2005, 2006, 2009–2014, 2018) and acoustic survey only (2023); four age frequencies from the trawl surveys (1987, 2006, 2009, and 2018); and two age frequencies from Volcano (an Underwater Topographical Feature (UTF) on the Westpac Bank) (2014 and 2018).

Catch history

The catch history used in the stock assessment, including catch over-runs, is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Orange roughy ORH 7A stock assessment catch history (t) including over-runs (see Section 1.5). * 2023–24 assumed to be the same as 2022–23.

Fishing year	Catch (t)	Fishing year	Catch (t)	Fishing year	Catch (t)	Fishing year	Catch (t)
1980–81	43	1991–92	2 102	2002–03	5	2013–14	574
1981–82	5 523	1992–93	2 296	2003–04	0	2014–15	1 674
1982–83	15 391	1993–94	1 819	2004–05	166	2015–16	1 646
1983–84	12 386	1994–95	1 718	2005–06	229	2016–17	1 704
1984–85	6 652	1995–96	1 752	2006–07	0	2017–18	1 869
1985–86	10 179	1996–97	1 374	2007–08	0	2018–19	1 670
1986–87	14 940	1997–98	1 577	2008–09	252	2019–20	1 990
1987–88	15 836	1998–99	1 311	2009–10	361	2020–21	2 178
1988–89	12 801	1999–2000	660	2010–11	505	2021–22	2 301
1989–90	5 171	2000–01	0	2011–12	536	2022–23	1 860
1991–91	1 561	2001–02	0	2012–13	815	2023–24*	1 860

Research surveys

Trawl surveys of orange roughy on the Challenger Plateau were conducted regularly from 1983 to 1990. However, a variety of vessels and survey strata were used which makes comparisons problematic. Although a “comparable area” time series, as defined by Clark & Tracey (1994) and covering the period 1987–89, was selected for use in the 2019 assessment, these data were rejected for the 2024 assessment. This was because the decline in the biomass estimates over 1987–89 was far too large to be attributed to catches alone, and the Working Group has previously concluded the series did not reflect true stock abundance.

In 2005, a new series of combined trawl and acoustic surveys was begun using the FV *Thomas Harrison* with a survey area comparable to that used from 1987–1990 (Clark et al 2005). The survey was repeated in 2006 (with an enlarged survey area) and was then conducted annually from 2009–2013 (Clark et al 2006, NIWA & FRS 2009, Doonan et al 2010, Hampton et al 2013, Hampton et al 2014) with another survey in 2018. It was apparent from the later surveys that the 2005 survey did not cover an appropriate area as the spawning biomass distribution had shifted somewhat in the intervening years. The surveys from 2006 onwards appear to have covered the bulk of the spawning biomass. Also, in 2014 an acoustic survey of Volcano was conducted using an Acoustic Optical System (AOS) (Ryan et al 2015) in addition to a hull-mounted transducer. The data from all of the surveys since 2005 have been analysed

to produce separate acoustic and trawl survey indices of spawning biomass. In 2023, only an acoustic survey was completed. Since the 2019 assessment the acoustic data and trawl data have been used separately (Cordue 2019).

Acoustic survey indices

The acoustic biomass estimates from 2005 to 2018 have been reviewed and a number of adjustments were required to ensure that the time series of estimates were consistent (Cordue 2019). Estimates from the hull-mounted transducer were adjusted as necessary so that they all used the latest length to target strength relationship, the Doonan et al (2003) absorption coefficient, and a combined motion and bubble layer correction (1.33) borrowed from work done on the Chatham Rise (Cordue 2010b, Doonan et al 2012). The estimates from the AOS (2014 and 2018) were adjusted to use the Doonan et al (2003) absorption coefficient. In 2005, 2011, and 2013, the motion corrections applied to the snapshots were not documented and a factor of 1.06 (the mean for snapshots in 2006 and 2009) was used in the adjustment calculations. In those years the acoustic indices were assigned an additional 20% of error to account for the approximate adjustment.

The acoustic indices were used in one of two ways:

(1) Acoustic estimates of spawning aggregations on Volcano and in the West and East of the flats within the EEZ were used as three time series each providing an index of SSB (Table 4). This assumption followed the 2019 assessment, and assumed that the three spawning aggregations were independent, the proportion of the total SSB in each area was constant over time, and each area shared the same recruitment and exploitation pattern. This assumption has been given the label “3Series”. The acoustic estimates included in this series followed the estimates used by Cordue (2019) with the addition of the 2023 estimate for Volcano. Estimates were excluded where biomass was substantially lower than adjacent years and the Working Group concluded the survey had missed the aggregation (Volcano 2009, 2011, East 2011) and where the timing of the survey in relation to peak spawning was uncertain (Volcano 2010, 2018).

(2) Acoustic estimates of spawning aggregations on Volcano and in the West and East of the flats were summed, providing a total SSB for each year when all three areas were surveyed (Table 4). This assumption is the same as used for assessments of the Chatham Rise and Mid-East Coast orange roughy stocks, and allows for movement of SSB between aggregations. Movement of aggregations from west to east was noted in Challenger acoustic surveys in 2012 and 2018, and variable allocation of spawning biomass between spawning areas has been assumed in the East & South Chatham Rise assessment.

Table 4: Acoustic biomass estimates of spawning aggregations surveyed on Volcano, and the West and the East within the EEZ, and the total for all three areas. The CV is the observation error CV with an additional 20% of error in the years when the vessel motion correction was unknown (2005, 2011, and 2013). –, no survey conducted; a, included in All6 but not 3Series.

Year	West		East		Volcano		Total	
	Biomass (t)	CV (%)	Biomass (t)	CV (%)	Biomass (t)	CV (%)	Biomass (t)	Model CV (%)
2005	4 210	53	–	–	2 682	39	–	–
2006	4 383	59	–	–	6 329	39	–	–
2009	13 555	22	8 471	61	671	21	22 697	26
2010	8 114	14	1 707	34	1 132	24	10 953	12
2011	13 340	33	136	56	171	44	13 647	32
2013	10 183	22	5 365	26	4 559	34	20 107	15
2014	–	–	–	–	3 954	29	–	–
2018	9 966	9	0	NA	3 834	16	13 800	8
2023	0	NA	0	NA	8 132	17	8 132	17

Two alternatives for assumption 2 were used:

The first included acoustic biomass estimates that were accepted and biological samples showed the survey timing was likely to be around peak spawning. This included surveys of all areas in 2009 and 2013, and was given the label “All2”. The 2009 estimate for Volcano was rejected from previous assessments (which used assumption 1) because it was a relatively low estimate compared to previous years. Assuming the potential for movement of SSB between locations meant the 2009 Volcano estimate was included here.

The second added biomass estimates from four years to All2 from surveys where acoustic biomass was measured but it was uncertain that timing was around peak spawning (surveys of Volcano 2010, East & Volcano 2011; Volcano in 2018 and 2023), or where aggregations could not be located and surveyed despite search efforts (surveys of East in 2018; East & West in 2023). This included surveys in 2009, 2010, 2011, 2013, 2018, and 2023, and was given the label “All6”.

An acoustic survey of the East and West strata was also conducted in 2012 but rejected because substantial uncertainty in species mix made the biomass estimates unreliable (Hampton et al 2014). The acoustic survey in 2014 only surveyed the Volcano before moving to ORH 1.

Informed lognormal priors on the proportionality constants (q) were used for the acoustic time series. For 3Series, the means of the priors for each area were derived from the 2013 SSB proportions across aggregations, and the assumption that all three aggregations combined represented “most” of the spawning biomass (80%; Cordue 2014a). Splitting this prior into three components gave priors for the West, East, and Volcano q s respectively of LN(0.41, 30%), LN(0.22, 30%), and LN(0.18, 30%), based on the biomass split between areas from the 2013 survey. For the ALL2 and ALL6 runs, there was a single acoustic biomass q with prior LN(0.80, 30%) based on acoustic biomass estimates from the early 2000s on the north east Chatham Rise.

Process error was added to the acoustic series to balance MCMC implied residuals. The process errors added were in 3Series Volcano 0.2 and East 0.35 (none for West); in All6 0.15; no process error was added in All2 runs.

Trawl survey indices

The spawning biomass estimates from the *Thomas Harrison* trawl surveys excluding the rough terrain strata 9–11 (Table 5) were used as relative biomass with an uninformed q prior.

Table 5: Biomass indices from trawl surveys used in the stock assessment. The CV is the observation error CV with an additional 20% of process error (Cordue 2019).

Vessel	Year	Biomass (t)	Model CV (%)
<i>Thomas Harrison</i>	2006	13 987	34
	2009	34 864	31
	2011	18 425	33
	2012	22 451	27
	2013	18 993	55
	2018	48 038	55

Age frequencies

Age frequencies were available from four of the trawl surveys for use in the assessment. A previous analysis produced age frequencies for the 1987 *Amaltal Explorer* survey and the 2009 *Thomas Harrison* survey (Doonan et al 2013). Although that study was based on a relatively small number of otoliths, it showed that the 2009 age frequency had much younger fish than the 1987 age frequency. For the 2014 stock assessment, the existing age frequencies were augmented with an increased number of otoliths (for a total of about 300 for each survey) and a new age frequency (from about 300 otoliths) was produced for the 2006 *Thomas Harrison* survey. For the 2019 assessment the age data from the 2018 survey were used to produce an age frequency for the EEZ (750 otoliths) and Volcano (150 otoliths). An age frequency was also produced from the 2014 survey of Volcano (470 otoliths) (Doonan et al 2015). The sample of otoliths collected during the 2023 survey was considered unlikely to be representative of the stock (they almost all came from a single catch) and has not been aged.

The age frequencies were assumed to be multinomial and were assigned effective sample sizes of 10, except for the 2018 age frequency from Volcano which was reduced to 5 to reflect that it may not have been representative of the aggregation. No statistical reweighting was attempted because of the short time series. These effective sample sizes were substantially lower than used in 2019 (60, 30 for Volcano in 2018) to give greater weight to the acoustic biomass estimates.

There are no age frequencies from the commercial fishery.

4.3 Model runs and results

The main parameters estimated were: virgin biomass (B_0), the logistic maturity (=selectivity) ogive, and the natural mortality rate (M). The prior on M was informed from empirical M estimators and was very broad: $LN(0.078, 120\%)$. Proportionality constants (q) were also estimated for the trawl survey and the three (3Series) or one (All2, All6) acoustic survey time series. Year class strength (YCS) was assumed to be constant (deterministic).

YCSs were estimated in the 2019 assessment, for the years 1925 to 1995 (71 parameters), but in the 2024 assessment, sensitivity runs showed almost identical model fits and estimates of stock size, status, and uncertainty could be achieved by estimating a single parameter (M), providing a more parsimonious solution that reduced the potential for model over-parameterisation. When only YCS were estimated (with M fixed at the default value of 0.045) a correction to productivity was achieved by a strong historical trend in YCS from high to low. When M and YCS were estimated together, M was estimated to be lower and the YCS trend was almost flat. The estimates of M were influenced by the acoustic series estimates and q priors as well as by the age data, meaning the M was varying to fit the apparent productivity driven by the q prior rather than providing the most accurate fit to species longevity. The q prior and the age data imply different M values.

Other sensitivity runs were conducted assuming different M priors, dropping the 2023 acoustic estimate, including the *Amaltal Explorer* trawl series, excluding Volcano age data, or all age data (and fixing selectivity), changing the effective sample sizes assumed for the age data, and removing acoustic q priors. The fits to the data were generally similar and were not able to distinguish between the alternative hypotheses. The All6 runs were found to be most sensitive, and some incurred a catch penalty indicating that the biomass estimates were close to the minimum level able to satisfy the catch history (B_{min}) when the estimated acoustic q was closest to the mean of the q prior.

The model fits to the acoustic indices were acceptable, with the greater changes in the 3Series acoustic time series proving more difficult to fit with constant q s and selectivity, leading to a higher process error required to fit this data (Figure 2). The fits to the trawl series were good, although the high CV for 2013 and 2018 means that the trend was not very informative (Figure 3).




Figure 2: MCMC implied fits to the acoustic indices of the All6 and All2 runs (top panels) and Volcano, East, and West areas of the 3Series run (bottom panel). Each box covers the middle 50% of the distribution and the whiskers extend to 95% CIs. The solid black indicates the median fitted SSB. The observations are plotted as red points with red lines indicating 95% CIs (with a small offset by year to make them more visible).




Figure 3: MCMC implied fits to the *Thomas Harrison* trawl survey series for the All6, 3Series, All2 runs. Each box covers the middle 50% of the distribution and the whiskers extend to 95% CIs. The solid black indicates the median fitted SSB. The observations are plotted as red points with red lines indicating 95% CIs (with a small offset by year to make them more visible).

The posterior distributions of the acoustic q s, which had informed priors, were estimated to be lower than the prior (All2 and All6), or close to or lower than the prior (3Series) (Figure 4). The persistent move to lower q s shows that the model estimated SSB was greater than prior expectations across all model runs.




Figure 4: MCMC Prior distributions (solid lines) and marginal posterior distributions (dashed lines) for the All6 and All2 acoustic q s (top panels) and the Volcano, East, and West acoustic q s in the 3Series run (bottom panels). Inset values are the median and 95% credible intervals of the q estimates.

Natural mortality rate was estimated to be lower than the orange roughy default (0.045 yr^{-1}) in all model runs (Figure 5). Estimated M was lowest for the All6 run (0.024), where the estimated SSB was lowest and the acoustic q was closest to the prior (Figure 4); M was similar for the All2 and 3Series runs (0.033 and 0.031 respectively). In this context, estimated ' M ' is not directly comparable to natural mortality but includes other undefined factors and is a general descriptor of productivity.




Figure 5: MCMC Prior distributions (solid lines) and marginal posterior distributions (dashed lines) for natural mortality rate in the All6, All2, and 3Series runs. Inset values are the median and 95% credible intervals of the M estimates.

The selectivity was assumed equal to maturity, and A_{50} in all runs was close to 34 years. The variability between age frequencies, in particular for Volcano, meant that they could not all be fitted well with the single logistic selectivity (Figure 6). The age sample for Volcano 2018, for example, included a much greater proportion of older fish than 2014. The misfit to the plus group in EEZ 1987 is also apparent, and occurred because of a low M estimate, but the residual is no worse than for several individual cohorts at ages 30–40 in other samples. The fits to the age data were very similar across all model runs.




Figure 6: MPD fits (solid lines) to age frequencies (grey points) for the EEZ and Volcano for the All2 run.

Biomass estimates

The All2 run was chosen as a base model. The All6 run estimates were at or close to B_{min} , and relatively sensitive to model assumptions. The 3Series run was analogous to the 2019 assessment, but the independence of the three acoustic series indexing SSB was considered less plausible than the total acoustic estimates used in the All2 and All6 runs. The lack of recent data in the All2 run was reflected in relatively high uncertainty in current stock status (Table 6).

Virgin biomass (B_0) was estimated to be just under 100 000 t for all runs (Table 6). The main difference between runs was the productivity (M) estimates, which led to different current SSB size and status. For the base (All2) and 3Series runs, current stock status was estimated to be close to the lower bound of

the target biomass range of 30–50% B_0 . For the All6 run, with a lower M , current stock status was lower and between the hard (10% B_0) and soft (20% B_0) limits.

Table 6: MCMC estimates of estimated natural mortality rate (M), virgin biomass (B_0), stock status (B_{2024} as % B_0), and probability of being above the upper (50% B_0) and lower (30% B_0) limit of the target range and below the soft (20% B_0) and hard limit (10% B_0), for the base (All2) model, All6, and 3Series sensitivity runs.

	M	B_0 (000 t)	B_{2024} (% B_0)	$p(> 50\%B_0)$	$p(> 30\%B_0)$	$p(< 20\%B_0)$	$p(< 10\%B_0)$
Base (All2)	0.033 (0.020–0.054)	99.4 (87.6–117.2)	35 (16–57)	0.09	0.66	0.07	0
All6	0.024 (0.016–0.037)	98.5 (91.3–110.3)	16 (8–35)	0.00	0.06	0.71	0.12
3Series	0.031 (0.020–0.045)	97.5 (89.3–110.5)	29 (18–44)	0.09	0.44	0.05	0

In the base case, the stock status trajectory shows a steep decline to 11% B_0 in 1991, reflecting the large removals during the initial fish-down phase of this stock (Figure 7). From 1990, the All2 stock status remains low and slowly rebuilds until an upturn from about 2000. Biomass is estimated to have peaked in 2015 in all model runs, within the target range (All2 and 3Series runs) or just above the soft limit (All6 run), before the increased catches (enabled by a TACC increase), combined with a reduction in recruitment, caused a levelling out and then decline of the biomass trajectory after 2015 (Figure 7). The reduction in recruitment is a consequence of reduced SSB from the late 1980s, lagged by the estimated age of selectivity and maturity (A_{50}) of about 34 years, finally entering the fishery. The model predicts that recruitment will start to increase after about 2034 (2000 + 34).




Figure 7: MCMC estimated spawning-stock status (SSB_{2024}/B_0) trajectory. The solid line shows the median, the darker shaded areas covers 50% of the distribution, and the lighter shaded areas 95% of the distribution. The hard limit 10% B_0 (dashed red), soft limit 20% B_0 (dotted orange), and biomass target range 30–50% B_0 (green) are marked by horizontal lines.

Estimated exploitation rate (catch/SSB) was generally well above the target range ($U_{30\%B_0}$ – $U_{50\%B_0}$) during the fishing down period (1982–1989), above the target range (1990–1993), returning to the target range (1994–1999). Subsequently, it was well below the target range up until 2014, and from 2015 until 2024 it has remained in the lower half of the target range (Figure 8).




Figure 8: Base (All2) run, MCMC estimated exploitation rate trajectory. The box in each year covers 50% of the distribution and the whiskers extend to 95% of the distribution. The fishing-intensity range associated with the biomass target of 30–50% B_0 is marked by the green shaded area.

Projections

Five-year projections were conducted for a constant catch equal to the current TACC (2058 t), $0.8 \times \text{TACC}$, and $0.7 \times \text{TACC}$. A 5% catch over-run was assumed. At all future constant catch levels, the SSB is predicted to decrease slowly over the next five years (Table 7), with the base (All2) remaining within the target biomass range and with at most a 19% probability of being below the soft limit, and with at most a 2% probability of being below the hard limit, during the next five years (Figure 9).




Figure 9: Base (All2) run, future projections of SSB with catch equal to the TACC. The box in each year covers 50% of the distribution and the whiskers extend to 95% of the distribution. The hard limit 10% B_0 (dashed red), soft limit 20% B_0 (dotted orange), and biomass target range 30–50% B_0 (green) are marked by horizontal lines.

The TACC reduction required for the predicted SSB in 2028–29 to be the same as 2023–24 was $0.43 \times \text{TACC}$ for the base (All2) run, $0.30 \times \text{TACC}$ for the All6 run, and $0.46 \times \text{TACC}$ for the 3Series run.

Table 7: MCMC estimates of stock status (B_{2024} as % B_0) for the base model (All2) and two sensitivity runs (All 6 and 3Series) with constant future catches (TACC, $0.8 \times \text{TACC}$ and $0.7 \times \text{TACC}$), and the probability of the stock being above the upper and lower bound of the target range, below the soft limit (20% B_0) and hard limit (10% B_0).

SSB/ B_0	2023–24	2024–25	2025–26	2026–27	2027–28	2028–29
<i>All2</i>						
TACC	35 (16–57)	34 (15–56)	33 (14–56)	32 (13–55)	31 (11–54)	30 (10–53)
$0.8 \times \text{TACC}$	35 (16–57)	34 (15–57)	33 (14–56)	33 (14–56)	32 (13–55)	32 (12–55)
$0.7 \times \text{TACC}$	35 (16–57)	34 (15–57)	34 (15–56)	33 (14–56)	33 (14–56)	33 (13–56)
<i>All6</i>						
TACC	16 (8–35)	15 (6–34)	14 (5–33)	12 (3–32)	11 (2–31)	10 (1–30)
$0.8 \times \text{TACC}$	16 (8–35)	15 (6–34)	14 (6–34)	14 (5–33)	13 (4–33)	12 (3–32)
$0.7 \times \text{TACC}$	16 (8–35)	15 (7–35)	15 (6–34)	14 (5–34)	14 (4–33)	13 (3–33)
<i>3Series</i>						
TACC	29 (18–44)	28 (17–43)	27 (16–42)	26 (15–41)	25 (14–40)	24 (13–39)
$0.8 \times \text{TACC}$	29 (18–44)	28 (18–43)	28 (17–43)	27 (16–42)	27 (15–42)	26 (14–41)
$0.7 \times \text{TACC}$	29 (18–44)	29 (18–43)	28 (17–43)	28 (17–43)	27 (16–42)	27 (15–42)
p(SSB > 0.5)						
<i>All2</i>						
TACC	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.05
$0.8 \times \text{TACC}$	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.05
$0.7 \times \text{TACC}$	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.07
<i>All6</i>						
TACC	0	0	0	0	0	0
$0.8 \times \text{TACC}$	0	0	0	0	0	0
$0.7 \times \text{TACC}$	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>3Series</i>						
TACC	0	0	0	0	0	0
$0.8 \times \text{TACC}$	0	0	0	0	0	0
$0.7 \times \text{TACC}$	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 7 [Continued]

p(SSB > 0.3)	2023–24	2024–25	2025–26	2026–27	2027–28	2028–29
<i>All2</i>						
TACC	0.66	0.63	0.60	0.56	0.53	0.49
0.8×TACC	0.66	0.64	0.62	0.60	0.58	0.56
0.7×TACC	0.66	0.64	0.63	0.62	0.60	0.59
<i>All6</i>						
TACC	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.03
0.8×TACC	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04
0.7×TACC	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04
<i>3Series</i>						
TACC	0.44	0.39	0.33	0.28	0.24	0.20
0.8×TACC	0.44	0.41	0.37	0.34	0.31	0.28
0.7×TACC	0.44	0.41	0.39	0.36	0.34	0.32
p(SSB < 0.2)	2023–24	2024–25	2025–26	2026–27	2027–28	2028–29
<i>All2</i>						
TACC	0.07	0.09	0.11	0.14	0.16	0.19
0.8×TACC	0.07	0.08	0.1	0.11	0.13	0.14
0.7×TACC	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.11	0.12
<i>All6</i>						
TACC	0.71	0.75	0.79	0.82	0.85	0.87
0.8×TACC	0.71	0.75	0.77	0.79	0.81	0.83
0.7×TACC	0.71	0.74	0.76	0.78	0.79	0.81
<i>3Series</i>						
TACC	0.05	0.08	0.12	0.16	0.21	0.27
0.8×TACC	0.05	0.07	0.10	0.12	0.15	0.17
0.7×TACC	0.05	0.07	0.09	0.10	0.12	0.14
p(SSB < 0.1)	2023–24	2024–25	2025–26	2026–27	2027–28	2028–29
<i>All2</i>						
TACC	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02
0.8×TACC	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
0.7×TACC	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01
<i>All6</i>						
TACC	0.12	0.18	0.27	0.35	0.43	0.50
0.8×TACC	0.12	0.17	0.23	0.28	0.33	0.39
0.7×TACC	0.12	0.17	0.21	0.25	0.29	0.33
<i>3Series</i>						
TACC	0	0	0	0	0	0.01
0.8×TACC	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.7×TACC	0	0	0	0	0	0


5. FUTURE RESEARCH CONSIDERATIONS

- Revise the acoustic survey design and implementation to maximise probability that abundance estimates are obtained for all three aggregations ('East', 'West' and Volcano) in the same year.
- Review data available on the timing of aggregations and revisit survey selection criteria.
- Reconsider the otolith sampling approach from acoustic surveys to maximise probability that adequate otoliths are obtained from each aggregation and that these are obtained from multiple tows to support the stock assessment.
- Review current arrangements for sampling commercial catches for age to ensure that adequate samples are being obtained from both spawning and non-spawning fisheries to support the development of useable age frequencies (this could be through sampling by observers and/or industry).
- Review and update the acoustic q prior, in particular the assumption that 80% of the SSB is present in the three surveyed areas.
- Review and update the natural mortality rate (M) prior.
- Run alternative models with either a strong M prior or a strong acoustic prior.
- Reexamine trends in CPUE and its utility in stock assessments, specifically exploring the potential of separate standardised indices for fishing on the flat and fishing on features.
- Explore error assumptions in assessment models when fitting survey data when abundance is low.

6. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

Orange roughy on the southwest Challenger Plateau (Area 7A, including Westpac Bank) are regarded as a single stock.

Stock Status		
Year of Most Recent Assessment	2024	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Very Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2022–23	Catch: 1 860 t
Assessment Runs Presented	All2 Base model	
Reference Points	Management Target: Biomass range 30–50% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: Fishing intensity range $U_{30\%B_0}$ – $U_{50\%B_0}$	
Status in relation to Target	B_{2024} was estimated to be 35% B_0 About as Likely As Not (40–60%) to be at or above the lower end of the management target range and Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be at or above the upper end of the management target range	
Status in relation to Limits	B_{2024} is Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the Soft Limit B_{2024} is Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below the Hard Limit	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Fishing intensity in 2023–24 was estimated to be within the fishing intensity range. Overfishing is Unlikely (< 40%) to be occurring.	



Historical trajectory of spawning biomass (% B_0) and fishing intensity (exploitation rate) for the base (All2) model (medians of the marginal posteriors). The biomass target range of 30–50% B_0 and the corresponding exploitation rate target range are shaded in green. The soft limit (20% B_0) is marked in orange and the hard limit (10% B_0) in red.

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Median spawning biomass was estimated to have recovered from a low level in the early 2000s to about the mid point of the management range by 2014–2015, and to have slowly declined since then, but remained in the target range.

Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Fishing intensity has been increasing slowly within the target range since 2014–15.
Other Abundance Indices	An acoustic survey between 4 and 13 July 2023 did not detect any aggregated orange roughy on the Challenger Flats.
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis

Stock Projections or Prognosis	Biomass is expected to slowly decrease at the current TACC (2058 t) over the next 5 years.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below, or to decline below, Limits	At TACC: Soft Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) within the next five years Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) within the next five years
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unlikely (< 40%) within the next five years

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation

Assessment Type	Level 1 - Full Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Age-structured CASAL model with Bayesian estimation of posterior distributions	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2024	Next assessment: 2029
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Acoustic survey indices for West, East, and Volcano aggregations (2009, 2013) - One trawl survey time series: 2006, 2009–2012 - Age frequencies from the trawl surveys in 1987, 2006, 2009, and 2018 - Age frequencies from Volcano in 2014 and 2018	1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: inconsistent between years 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: inconsistent between years
Data not used (rank)	- Commercial CPUE - Acoustic surveys of UTFs other than Volcano - Other acoustic survey estimates (2005, 2006, 2010, 2011, 2014, 2018, 2023) - Early trawl surveys with different vessels covering different areas	3 – Low Quality: unlikely to be indexing stock-wide abundance 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: species identification and dead zone problems 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: not surveys of a spawning aggregation or timing uncertain – some used in sensitivities 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: not a consistent time series, or potentially biased
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	- Acoustic SSB estimates for the three areas (Volcano, West, and East) were summed and used as a single index, rather than each assumed to provide an independent index of SSB. - One fishery was modelled instead of two. - Recruitment deviates were fixed and M estimated, rather than recruitment estimated and M fixed. - A prior based on empirical estimates was used for M. - The statistical weights (effective sample sizes) of the age data were reduced. - The <i>Amaltal Explorer</i> trawl survey series was excluded.	

	- The informed q prior on the <i>Thomas Harrison</i> trawl survey was set to uniform.
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- The proportion of the stock that is indexed by the acoustic and trawl surveys - Recent stock productivity, as estimated using M and/or year class strength, and the assumed stock recruitment relationships effect on projected status - Selection criteria for acoustic surveys

Qualifying Comments

-There are no abundance indices in the base case since 2013. Recent acoustic surveys in 2018 and 2023 which have suggested lower abundance were not included in the base case.

Fishery Interactions

Since the fishery re-opened with a low level of catch and effort, bycatch levels have been relatively low at about 4 to 5%, with spiky oreo being 1.4% of the average catch for 2008–09 to 2013–14. The bycatch of low productivity species over this period includes a number of deepwater shark and coral species. There were four observed incidental captures of seabirds and no observed incidental captures of marine mammals between 2002–03 and 2020–21. Orange roughy are caught using bottom trawl gear. Bottom trawling interacts with benthic habitats.

7. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Annala, J H; Sullivan, K J; O'Brien, C J (Comps.) (2000) Report from the Fishery Assessment Plenary, May 2000: stock assessments and yield estimates. 495 p. (Unpublished report held in NIWA Greta Point library, Wellington.)
- Clark, M R (1991) Assessment of the Challenger Plateau (ORH 7A) orange roughy fishery for the 1991/92 fishing year. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1991/2. 19 p. (Unpublished document held in NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Clark, M R (1992) Assessment of the Challenger Plateau (ORH 7A) orange roughy fishery for the 1992/93 fishing year. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1992/6. 14 p. (Unpublished document held in NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Clark, M R; O'Driscoll, R L; Macaulay, G (2005) Distribution, abundance, and biology of orange roughy on the Challenger Plateau: results of a trawl and acoustic survey, June–July 2005 (THH0501). NIWA Client Report WLG2005-64.
- Clark, M R; O'Driscoll, R L; Macaulay, G; Bagley, N W; Gauthier, S (2006) Distribution, abundance, and biology of orange roughy on the Challenger Plateau: results of a trawl and acoustic survey, June–July 2006. NIWA Client Report WLG2006-83.
- Clark, M R; Tracey, D M (1994) Changes in a population of orange roughy, *Hoplostethus atlanticus*, with commercial exploitation on the Challenger Plateau, New Zealand. *Fishery Bulletin*, U.S. 92: 236–253.
- Cordue, P L (2010a) Estimation of absolute biomass from the 2009 trawl and acoustic survey of Challenger orange roughy. ISL Client Report. For Deepwater Group Ltd. 24 p.
- Cordue, P.L. (2010b) Linear-model derived bottom-referenced corrections for the Chatham Rise orange roughy plume acoustic time series 2002–2009 (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington).
- Cordue, P L (2012) Estimation of absolute biomass from the time series of trawl and acoustic surveys of Challenger orange roughy. ISL Client Report. For MAF. 30 p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Cordue, P L (2013) Estimating absolute orange roughy biomass for the southwest Challenger Plateau: 2005–2012. DWWG document 2013_25 Draft Report to MPI on ORH 7A.15 p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Cordue, P.L. (2014a) The 2014 orange roughy stock assessments. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/50*. 135 p.
- Cordue, P L (2014b) A Management Strategy Evaluation for orange roughy. ISL Client Report for Deepwater Group. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Cordue, P.L. (2019) A 2019 stock assessment of ORH 7A including Westpac Bank. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/33*. 45 p.
- Doonan, I J; Coombs, R; McClatchie, S (2003) The absorption of sound in seawater in relation to the estimation of deep-water fish biomass. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 60: 1047–1055.
- Doonan, I J; Hart A C; Bagley, N; Dunford, A (2012) Orange roughy abundance estimates of the north Chatham Rise Spawning Plumes (ORH3B), *San Waitaki* acoustic survey, June–July 2011. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2012/28*. 35 p.
- Doonan, I J; Horn, P L; Krusic-Golub, K (2013) Comparison of Challenger Plateau (ORH 7A) orange roughy age estimates between 1987 and 2009. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/2*. 19 p.
- Doonan, I J; Horn, P L; Ó Maolagáin, C (2015) Orange roughy age estimates for the Volcano seamount, Challenger Plateau (ORH 7A), for 2014. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/60*. 9 p.
- Doonan, I J; Parkinson, D; Gauthier, S (2010) Abundance, distribution, and biology of orange roughy on the southwest Challenger Plateau (area ORH 7A): results of a trawl and acoustic survey, June–July 2010. NIWA Client Report WLG2010-63.
- Doonan, I J; Roberts, J.; McMillan, P.J.; MacGibbon, D. (2018) Review of Challenger Plateau orange roughy abundance surveys 2005–13 and survey design options for future abundance estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2018/57*. 46 p.
- Dunn, M.R. (in prep). Stock assessment of orange roughy on the southwest Challenger Plateau (including Westpac Bank) (ORH 7A) in 2024. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/xx. xx p.
- Dutilloy, A; Horn, P L; O'Maolagáin, C (2019) Age composition of orange roughy on the south-west Challenger Plateau (ORH 7A) and Westpac Bank in 2018. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/67*. 16 p.
- Field, K D (1999) Assessment of the Challenger Plateau (ORH 7A) orange roughy fishery for the 1998–99 fishing year. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1999/9. 19 p. (Unpublished document held in NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Field, K D; Clark, M R (1996) Assessment of the ORH 7A orange roughy fishery for the 1996–97 fishing year. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1996/20. 16 p. (Unpublished document held in NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Field, K D; Francis, R I C C (2001) CPUE analysis and stock assessment of the Challenger Plateau orange roughy stock (ORH 7A) for the 2000–01 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/25*. 19 p.

- Francis, R I C C (1992) Recommendations concerning the calculation of maximum constant yield (MCY) and current annual yield (CAY). New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1992/8. 27 p. (Unpublished document held in NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Francis, R I C C; Clark, M R; Coburn, R P; Field, K D; Grimes, P J (1995) Assessment of the ORH 3B orange roughy fishery for the 1994–95 fishing year. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1995/4. 44 p. (Unpublished document held in NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Francis, R I C C; Robertson, D A; Clark, M R; Coburn, R P (1992) Assessment of the ORH 3B orange roughy fishery for the 1992–93 fishing year. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1992/4. 46 p. (Unpublished document held in NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Hampton, I (2010) Re-analysis of data from acoustic surveys of orange roughy on the Challenger Plateau (Area ORH7A) in 2005, 2006 and 2009. DWWG document 2010/38. 9 p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Hampton, I; Boyer, D C; Leslie, R W; Nelson, J C (2014) Acoustic and trawl estimates of orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) biomass on the southwest Challenger Plateau, June/July 2012. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report*. 2014/15. 43 p.
- Hampton, I; Boyer, D C; Leslie, R W; Nelson, J C; Soule, M A; Tilney, R L (2013) Acoustic and trawl estimates of orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) biomass on the southwest Challenger Plateau, June/July 2011. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report*. 2013/48. 45p.
- NIWA & FRS (2009) Abundance, distribution, and biology of orange roughy on the southwest Challenger Plateau (area ORH7A): results of a trawl and acoustic survey, June–July 2009. NIWA Client Report: 2009-59. FRS Client Report. 73 p.
- Ryan, T; Tilney, R; Cordue, P; Downie, R (2021) South-west Challenger Plateau trawl and acoustic biomass survey, June-July 2018. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report*. 2021/53. 55 p.
- Tracey, D; Horn, P; Marriott, P; Krusic-Golub, K; Gren, C; Gili, R; Mieres, L C (2007) Orange Roughy Ageing Workshop: otolith preparation and interpretation. Draft report to DWWG. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)

ORANGE ROUGHY WEST COAST SOUTH ISLAND (ORH 7B)

1. FISHERY SUMMARY

Allowances, TACCs, and TACs are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs, and TACs (t) for ORH 7B.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
ORH 7B	0	0	0	1	1

1.1 Commercial fisheries

The orange roughy west coast South Island Fishstock was introduced into the Quota Management System with a TACC of 1558 t on 1 October 1986. The TACC was increased to 1708 t for the fishing year 1988–89. Landings ranged from 1139 t to 1763 t in the mid-1980s and early 1990s, before decreasing rapidly to just 290 t by 1994–95. The TACC was lowered to 430 t in 1995 and 110 t in 2001, before being reduced to just 1 t in 2007. Landings averaged just 0.55 t during the fishing years 2008–09 to 2024–25.

The fishery was initially centred on an area near the Cook Canyon in Statistical Areas 033, 034 and 705. Up until 1996–97 approximately 80% of the catch was taken in winter (June–July) when fish form aggregations for spawning. From 1997–98 onwards about 50% of the catch was taken in winter. Reported domestic landings and TACCs are shown in Table 2, while the historical landings and TACC for ORH 7B are depicted in Figure 1.

Table 2: Reported landings (t) of orange roughy and TACCs (t) for ORH 7B from 1983–84 to present. QMS data from 1986–present. Catches (t) taken under special permits during winter research surveys after 2013–14 are also noted.

Fishing year	Reported landings	TACC	Research	Fishing	Reported	TACC	Research
1983–84*	2	-		2007–08	5.95	1	
1984–85*	282	-		2008–09	1.44	1	
1985–86*	1 763	1 558		2009–10	0.04	1	
1986–87*	1 446	1 558		2010–11	0.14	1	
1987–88	1 413	1 558		2011–12	0.06	1	
1988–89	1 750	1 708		2012–13	0.25	1	
1989–90	1 711	1 708		2013–14	0.62	1	
1990–91	1 683	1 708		2014–15	1.67	1	21.7
1991–92	1 604	1 708		2015–16	0.27	1	19.2
1992–93	1 139	1 708		2016–17	0.58	1	11.0
1993–94	701	1 708		2017–18	1.42	1	-
1994–95	290	1 708		2018–19	1.00	1	57.0
1995–96	446	430		2019–20	0.32	1	56.6
1996–97	425	430		2020–21	0.54	1	-
1997–98	330	430		2021–22	0.17	1	
1998–99	405	430		2022–23	0.30	1	
1999–00	284	430		2023–24	0.13	1	
2000–01	161	430		2024–25	0.32	1	
2001–02	95	110					
2002–03	90	110					
2003–04	119	110					
2004–05	106	110					
2005–06	77	110					

*FSU data.

1.2 Recreational fisheries

There is no known recreational fishery for orange roughy in this area.

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

There is no known customary non-commercial fishing for orange roughy in this area.




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for ORH 7B (Challenger South).

1.4 Illegal catch

There is no quantitative information available on illegal catch.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

There is no quantitative information available on other sources of mortality in this fishery.

2. STOCKS AND AREAS

There is no new information which would alter the stock boundaries given in previous assessment documents.

Orange roughy in this fishery are thought to be a single stock. Genetic studies have shown that samples of Cook Canyon orange roughy are significantly different from Challenger Plateau and Puysegur Bank samples (Smith et al 1996). Moreover, the size structure and parasite composition differ from fish on the Challenger Plateau (Lester et al 1988). Spawning occurs at a similar time to fish on the Challenger Plateau and the Puysegur Bank.

3. STOCK ASSESSMENT

The previous assessment for this stock was carried out in 2004 and is summarised in the 2006 Plenary Report. Virgin biomass (B_0) was estimated to be approximately 12 000 t with 2004 stock status at 17% B_0 (95% confidence interval 14–23%) when CPUE was assumed to be directly proportional to abundance (McKenzie 2005).

An updated assessment was attempted in 2007 with the addition of catch data up to 2005–06 and new standardised CPUE indices (McKenzie 2008). The Working Group rejected the assessment because of the poor fit to the CPUE data. The results were similar to those from the 2004 assessment; namely a slow rebuild up to 2006, which was not supported by the CPUE data.

A preliminary stock assessment was carried out in 2020 (Deepwater Group 2024) and some results from that assessment are reported here. Results from this assessment were inconclusive.

Results from the 2007 CPUE analysis and the previous assessments are retained below as they are relevant to the decision to effectively close the fishery from 1 October 2007. The use of CPUE analysis for an orange roughy fishery, to provide indices of biomass for use in stock assessment, has not been considered appropriate for more than a decade. Also, the previous assessments assume deterministic recruitment which is also inappropriate for orange roughy stock assessments (Cordue 2014).

3.1 The 2007 analysis of catch and effort data

Commercial catch and effort data are available from 1985. In 2007, these data were examined using both an unstandardised and a standardised analysis. Unstandardised catch rates declined substantially over the course of the fishery but showed no clear trend in the latter years of the fishery to 2005–06 (Table 3).

The standardised CPUE analysis was divided into two series to address reporting form changes: (i) using TCEPR data from 1985–86 through to 1996–97, and (ii) using CELR data from 1990–91 through to 2005–06. In addition, in order to increase vessel linkage across years, it was decided to use all months of data not just that from the winter fishery (June–July) as had been done for previous standardisations.

The standardised analysis for the TCEPR data used catch per tow in a linear regression model. Indices from this model (Table 4, Figure 2) show a steep decline after the first two years, followed by a more gradual decline and a slight increase in catch rates in 1995–96 and 1996–97.

Table 3: Summary of groomed data from TCEPR and CELR forms.

Fishing year	Number of vessel days	Number of tows	Total estimated catch (t)	Mean daily catch rate (t/tow)	Mean daily catch rate (t/h)
1985–86	138	357	1 544	4.5	2.9
1986–87	132	405	1 250	4.0	2.7
1987–88	132	420	1 250	3.4	2.3
1988–89	133	368	827	2.5	1.6
1989–90	123	356	1 282	4.5	5.6
1990–91	208	632	1 657	2.8	3.3
1991–92	238	810	1 601	2.0	1.4
1992–93	258	784	1 128	1.5	2.3
1993–94	298	708	660	1.1	0.9
1994–95	162	361	320	0.9	1.6
1995–96	66	150	275	2.2	1.7
1996–97	90	182	244	1.3	7.5
1997–98	96	228	170	0.7	0.3
1998–99	188	566	359	0.6	0.2
1999–00	213	647	259	0.4	0.1
2000–01	149	442	162	0.4	0.1
2001–02	117	282	76	0.3	0.1
2002–03	97	292	112	0.4	0.2
2003–04	90	252	118	0.4	0.2
2004–05	121	393	102	0.3	0.1
2005–06	87	257	73	0.3	0.2

Table 4: Standardised CPUE indices (relative year effect) based on TCEPR data with number of vessel tows from 1985–86 to 1996–97.

Year	CPUE index	CV	Number of tows	Year	CPUE index	CV	Number of tows
1985–86	1.99	0.20	153	1991–92	0.48	0.23	231
1986–87	2.13	0.23	150	1992–93	0.29	0.23	230
1987–88	1.11	0.26	212	1993–94	0.14	0.25	341
1988–89	0.58	0.22	310	1994–95	0.13	0.27	172
1989–90	0.61	0.22	236	1995–96	0.51	0.33	37
1990–91	0.76	0.23	238	1996–97	0.41	0.26	104

The standardised analysis for the CELR data used daily catch in a linear regression model. Indices from this model (Table 5, Figure 2) show a steep decline for the first four years, followed by an increase to a peak in 1995–96, and subsequent low catch rates after then.

3.2 Stock assessment estimates in 2004

Based on previous stock assessments using CPUE data the TACC was cut back severely from about 1700 t in 1994–95 to 110 t in 2000–01. By the late 1990s the stock was believed to be well below B_{MSY} where it continued until at least 2004 (17% B_0 in the 2004 assessment, Figure 3). Despite the large reduction in annual removals from the stock after 2001–02, catch rates did not increase over the subsequent 5 years.

Table 5: Standardised CPUE indices (relative year effect) based on CELR data with number of days from 1990–91 to 2005–06.

Year	CPUE index	CV	Number of days	Year	CPUE index	CV	Number of days
1990–1991	2.17	0.27	110	1999–2000	0.34	0.27	131
1991–1992	1.11	0.27	108	2000–2001	0.34	0.28	88
1992–1993	0.74	0.27	126	2001–2002	0.33	0.28	73
1993–1994	0.28	0.28	81	2002–2003	0.61	0.26	67
1994–1995	0.53	0.30	46	2003–2004	0.59	0.25	75
1995–1996	1.16	0.33	29	2004–2005	0.35	0.24	114
1996–1997	0.53	0.38	19	2005–2006	0.36	0.26	80
1997–1998	0.36	0.30	52				
1998–1999	0.39	0.28	112				

An updated assessment was attempted in 2007 with the addition of catch data up to 2005–06 and new standardised CPUE indices (Figure 2) based on TCEPR data (1986 to 1997) and a separate CELR series (1991 to 2006). These data were incorporated in a Bayesian stock assessment with deterministic recruitment to estimate stock size. The Working Group rejected the assessment because of the poor fit to the recent CPUE data. The model was insensitive to the recent CPUE data and predicted a rebuild (driven by the recruitment assumptions) that was not supported by any observations in the fishery.




Figure 2: The CPUE indices based on: (i) TCEPR data (solid line and crosses) covering 1985–86 to 1996–97, and (ii) CELR data (triangles and dashed line) covering 1990–91 to 2005–06. The CELR index has been scaled so that it has the same mean value as the TCEPR index in the years that they overlap.




Figure 3: Biomass trajectory derived from Maximum Posterior Density (MPD) estimate of the model parameters (2004 stock assessment). The biomass trajectory is shown by the solid line; crosses denote the CPUE index scaled to biomass.

3.3 Survey biomass estimates

There were three random trawl surveys on the WCSI: two used the FV *Arrow* (October 1983, and in late July-early August 1986); and another by the RV *Tangaroa* in October 1991 (Tracey et al 1990, Armstrong & Tracey 1987, Clark 1991). All three used different stratification, but they broadly covered the same total area. Estimates from these trawl surveys were not used for the 2004 assessment or the 2007 assessment attempt.

Since 2015, surveys have been regularly conducted in Cook Canyon aimed at locating and acoustically surveying spawning orange roughy plumes. In 2015 an orange roughy plume was seen in Cook Canyon during a search by FV *Amaltal Explorer* but it was transitory and could not be acoustically surveyed (Ryan & Tilney 2016). Another attempt was made from FV *Cook Canyon* from 8 to 11 July 2016 (Doonan et al 2016). There were two parts to the work in 2016: a search for spawning aggregations (plumes); and a random trawl survey in the area around the Cook Canyon, where most of the historical catch was caught. One main spawning plume was found on two consecutive nights, but it dispersed during daylight hours which is its historical behaviour. The plume was mapped using the vessel's echosounder (a fishing rather than a scientific echosounder), so it was not possible to perform acoustic integration and, hence, no acoustic abundance estimate was calculated. One short tow on the main plume produced about 18 t of spawning orange roughy with little bycatch. Most orange roughy catches in the random trawl survey (22 tows) were small (median 19 kg) with a wide size range (15 to 40 cm, mode at 22 cm), but there was one larger survey catch (600 kg) near the plume location which was composed of mainly spent (post-spawning) fish.

3.4 Acoustic surveys

A successful acoustic survey was conducted on FV *Amaltal Explorer* in 2017 using a CSIRO acoustic-optical towed system (AOS) (Ryan & Tilney 2017). Three snapshots of a single spawning plume in Cook Canyon gave an average estimate of 824 t (Table 6). The timing of the snapshots was not ideal as they appeared to be late relative to the spawning cycle with 40–50% of sampled fish having spent gonads (Ryan & Tilney 2017). In 2019, on FV *Amaltal Mariner* a plume at the same location as in 2017 was surveyed with a hull mounted system (Ryan & Tilney 2019). The snapshots spanned the main spawning season and there was no trend in the estimates with the increasing percentage of spent fish, which reached 45–65% on 10–11 July (Table 7). The average estimate in 2019 of 877 t was very similar to that in 2017 (Table 7).

Table 6: Biomass estimates from CSIRO's AOS system (38 kHz) during the 2017 acoustic survey. For each snapshot the date, number of transects, the biomass estimate, and the CV are given. It is also noted that for each snapshot orange roughy marks were seen on more than two transects (indicating that a genuine spawning plume was surveyed).

Snapshot	Date	Transects	Biomass (t)	CV (%)	Transects with marks
1	4 July 17	5	627	53	> 2
2	5 July 17	7	930	32	> 2
3	6 July 17	7	915	50	> 2
Average			824	26	

Table 7: Biomass estimates from the FV *Amaltal Mariner* 38 kHz hull-mounted system during the 2019 acoustic survey. For each snapshot the date, number of transects, the biomass estimate, and the CV are given. The number of transects on which orange roughy marks were seen is also given (1 transect indicates a poor-quality snapshot; 2 transects may be adequate but more than 2 indicates that a genuine spawning plume was surveyed).

Snapshot	Date	Transects	Biomass (t)	CV (%)	Transects with marks
1	26 June 19	6	318	48	2
2	26 June 19	6	1393	35	2
3	3 July 19	9	927	21	> 2
4	4 July 19	9	746	31	> 2
5	9 July 19	6	511	64	1
6	9 July 19	5	473	38	2
7	10 July 19	10	958	33	> 2
8	16 July 19	4	198	58	1
Average (2 or >2)			803	14	
Average (>2)			877	17	

3.5 2019 age frequency data

Orange roughy otoliths have routinely been collected during research surveys of Cook Canyon but they have only been aged for the 2019 acoustic survey. There are some otoliths from early trawl surveys in 1983 and 1986 but the first survey “took place before the spawning distribution was well known” and the second survey was “carried out after spawning was finished” (O’Driscoll 2001). For the 2015 acoustic survey there are 360 otoliths available for Cook Canyon but there was probably only 1 trawl in the spawning plume (which caught 18 t of orange roughy) (Ryan & Tilney 2016). In 2016, there are 476 otoliths available, but 299 of these were from a single trawl catch of 18 t on the plume (Doonan et al 2016). The otoliths collected in the 2017 acoustic survey are also likely to be unrepresentative of the spawning population that year as they were collected late in the spawning cycle and are heavily skewed towards females (452 female, 150 male) (Ryan & Tilney 2017). The age frequencies that could be created from these various collections of otoliths are likely not to be representative of the surveyed spawning fish population.

The 2019 age frequency was constructed using the method of Doonan et al (2013) from 500 otoliths collected over 6 trawls that targeted the plume. The trawls took place from 26 June to 16 July and caught from 2.5–18 t of orange roughy (Ryan & Tilney 2019). Males and females were almost equally represented and the age frequency across the 6 stations was similar. The scaled age frequency shows a large plus group at 100 years (Figure 4). The Working Group accepted that this sample was likely to be representative of the spawning plume.




Figure 4: The proportion of orange roughy at age for the scaled age frequency from trawls targeting the spawning plume in the 2019 acoustic survey. There is a plus-group at 100 years.

3.6 Preliminary 2020 stock assessment

A preliminary stock assessment was performed in 2020 fitting to the acoustic biomass estimates in 2017 and 2019 and the 2019 age frequency (Deepwater Group 2024). A single stock, single sex, single area, age-structured model was implemented in CASAL. There were three main model runs which used Bayesian estimation to estimate marginal posterior distributions for virgin biomass (B_0) and current stock status (SS_{2020}). Two of the models were constructed as “worst case” scenarios in an attempt to determine the lowest possible stock status consistent with the data and model assumptions. The other model used the standard approach for orange roughy stock assessments (e.g., Cordue 2014). The estimates of B_0 were consistent with previous estimates of virgin biomass. These estimates are driven by the total removals from the fishery.

The estimates of current biomass and stock status varied widely across the three preliminary models. The standard model adequately fitted the data. However, a low estimate of the acoustic q implied that the acoustic surveys had missed one or more spawning plumes. The other two models had lower stock status but were unable to fit the acoustic estimates and predicted much more spawning biomass in those years than had been observed (even allowing for the scaling effect of an acoustic q of about 0.6).

Therefore, all three of the models implied that the acoustic surveys may have missed one or more spawning plumes.

It should be noted that since the ORH 7A stock has rebuilt spawning plumes have developed in areas where they were not previously seen (e.g., Cordue 2019). Also, for the ESCR orange roughy stock, there is an “old plume” which has been found in the same location for many years and a “new plume” which developed in a different location and consists of younger fish (Doonan et al 2017). The Working Group was unwilling to accept an assessment where current stock status depends on the existence of spawning biomass that has not been observed. The main alternative to an additional unobserved spawning plume is that there has been little recruitment to the spawning population since the closure of the fishery.

3.7 Future research considerations

The preliminary stock assessment results highlight the discrepancy between the expected increase in spawning stock biomass due to a lack of fishing and the observed acoustic survey spawning biomass estimates. Either there are spawning fish that have not been found or there has been an extended period of very low recruitment to the spawning population.

The next survey of Cook Canyon should include more time for searching than has been allocated previously in order to:


- Obtain multiple snapshot estimates of the Cook Canyon spawning plume,
- Perform targeted trawling on the spawning plume to obtain a representative age frequency,
- Search for additional spawning plumes in new areas near but outside Cook Canyon (in orange roughy depths but not necessarily associated with a feature or previous fishing for orange roughy).

4. STATUS OF THE STOCK

Stock Structure Assumptions

The ORH 7B stock has been treated as a single spawning stock located around the Cook Canyon area. It is assessed and managed separately from other stocks and is assumed to be non-mixing with orange roughy stocks outside of the Cook Canyon area.

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2004; Preliminary results 2020	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Very Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2002–03	Catch: 90 t
Assessment Runs Presented	2004: One base case 2020: Preliminary exploration of “worst case” scenarios and a standard ORH model (following Cordue 2014)	
Reference Points	Target: 30–50% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: -	
Status in relation to Target	2004: B_{2004} was estimated to be 17% B_0 , Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be at or above the target 2020: Unknown	
Status in relation to Limits	2004: B_{2004} was Likely (> 60%) to be below the Soft Limit and Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the Hard Limit 2020: Unknown	
Status in relation to Overfishing	2004: Unknown 2020: The fishery has been effectively closed since October 2007, so overfishing is Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be occurring.	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status

Biomass trajectory derived from Maximum Posterior Density (2004 stock assessment model)

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	2004: Unknown, but biomass is thought to be very low. 2020: Unknown. Biomass likely to have increased since the closure of the fishery in 2007, although this has not been detected in acoustic surveys.
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	2020: Fishing mortality has been very low, limited to research catches, as the fishery has been closed since October 2007.
Other Abundance Indices	Acoustic surveys carried out in 2017 and 2019 showed no change in abundance
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis

Stock Projections or Prognosis	2004: Stable at current (2004) catch level 2020: Unknown but likely to be increasing at current catch levels
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	2004: Soft Limit: Already below Soft Limit 2004: Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) 2020: The fishery has been closed since October 2007

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation

Assessment Type	Type 1 – Full Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Age-structured model with Bayesian estimation of posteriors.	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment: 2004	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	N/A	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Catch history - CPUE indices (1985–2003)	1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	Trawl surveys 1983, 1986, 1991, 2016	3 – Low Quality: not considered to be an index of abundance
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	N/A	

Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Recruitment assumed to be deterministic - CPUE assumed to be directly proportional to stock biomass in base model

Qualifying Comments

A further assessment was attempted in 2007 with updated information; however, this was rejected by the working group as the model was insensitive to the CPUE data. The model indicated that the stock had been rebuilding since the mid 1990s, a trend not supported by any observations in the fishery.

The fishery was closed from 1 October 2007 and stock size was expected to increase.


A preliminary assessment was presented in 2020. The predicted spawning population, based on the estimated virgin biomass, catch history, and the expected increase with the lack of fishing since 2008, has not been detected by recent acoustic surveys.

Fishery Interactions

Historically, the main bycatch species were oreos and deepwater dogfish. Other bycatch species recorded include deepwater sharks, deepsea skates and corals. The fishery is currently closed.

5. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Anderson, O F; Dunn, M R (2012) Descriptive analysis of catch and effort data from New Zealand orange roughy fisheries in ORH 1, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 7A, and 7B to the end of the 2008–09 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2012/20*. 82 p.
- Armstrong, J H; Tracey, D M (1987) Arrow orange roughy charter-for-quota cruise, west coast South Island, July–August 1986. Fisheries Research Division Internal Report 58. 31 p. (Unpublished report held in NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Clark, M (1991) Voyage report West Coast South Island orange roughy, DEOR06. (Unpublished report, held in the CDF repository, NIWA, Greta Point.)
- Clark, M R; Tracey, D M (1988) Assessment of the west coast South Island and northern North Island orange roughy fisheries. New Zealand. Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1988/20. 11 p. (Unpublished report held in NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Clark, M R; Field, K D (1995) Assessment of the ORH 7B orange roughy fishery for the 1995–96 fishing year. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1995/19. 15 p. (Unpublished report held in NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Cordue, P L (2014) The 2014 orange roughy stock assessments. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/50*. 135 p.
- Cordue, P L (2019) A 2019 stock assessment of ORH 7A including Westpac Bank. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/33*. 45 p.
- Deepwater Group Ltd. (2024) A 2020 preliminary stock assessment of ORH 7B. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/12*. 22 p.
- Doonan, I J; Hart, A; Wood, B (2016) Orange roughy trawl survey and plume search, west coast South Island, ORH 7B. NIWA Client Report 2016-155WN for Talleys Group Limited. 22 p.
- Doonan, I J; Horn, P L; Krusic-Golub, K (2013) Comparison of Challenger Plateau (ORH 7A) orange roughy age estimates between 1987 and 2009. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/2*. 19 p.
- Doonan, I J; Horn, P L; Ó Maolagáin, C; Datta, S (2017) Age composition of orange roughy from ORH 3B, Chatham Rise, 2016: Mount Muck, Old Plume, Rekohu Plume, and Morgue. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2018/48*. 15 p.
- O'Driscoll, R L (2001) Assessment of the west coast South Island orange roughy fishery (ORH 7B) for the 2001–02 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/31*. 29 p.
- Lester, R J G; Sewell, K B; Barnes, A; Evans, K (1988) Stock discrimination of orange roughy *Hoplostethus atlanticus* by parasite analysis. *Marine Biology* 99: 137–143.
- McKenzie, A (2005) CPUE analysis and updated assessment for the west coast South Island orange roughy fishery (ORH 7B). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2005/24*. 35 p.
- McKenzie, A (2008) CPUE analysis and stock assessment for the west coast South Island orange roughy fishery (ORH 7B) to 2005-06. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/21*. 37 p.
- Ryan, T E; Tilney, R (2016) Biomass surveys of orange roughy and oreo species using a net-attached acoustic optical system for New Zealand ORH7B and ORH3B Puysegur management zones in June, July 2015. Final report to Deepwater Group Ltd. 67 p.
- Ryan, T E; Tilney, R (2017) Biomass estimates of orange roughy spawning aggregations in ORH7B using a net-attached acoustic optical system, July 2017. Final report to Deepwater Group Ltd and Fisheries New Zealand.
- Ryan, T E; Tilney, R (2019) 2019 abundance of orange roughy in ORH7B management zone -analysis and biomass estimation report. Final report to Deepwater Group Ltd and Fisheries New Zealand. 21 p.
- Smith, P J; McVeagh, S M; Ede, A (1996) Genetically isolated stocks of orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) but not hoki (*Macraronus novaezelandiae*) in the Tasman Sea and Southwest Pacific Ocean around New Zealand. *Marine Biology* 173: 783–793.
- Tracey, D M; McMillan, P J; Armstrong, J M; Banks, D A (1990) Orange roughy trawl survey: Challenger Plateau and West Coast South Island, 1983. *New Zealand Fisheries Technical Report 22*. 34 p.

ORANGE ROUGHY OUTSIDE THE EEZ (ORH ET)**1. FISHERY SUMMARY****1.1 Commercial fisheries**

Fisheries outside the EEZ in the New Zealand region occur on ridge systems and seamount chains in the Tasman Sea and southwest Pacific Ocean. There are five main fishing areas: Lord Howe Rise, Northwest Challenger Plateau, West Norfolk Ridge, South Tasman Rise, and Louisville Ridge (see figure above).

The first orange roughy fishery outside the EEZ developed on the Westpac Bank close to the main fishing grounds on the southwest Challenger Plateau in the early-mid 1980s. Catches were recorded as part of the straddling stock crossing into ORH 7A, and therefore excluded from this chapter, up until 2007. Further exploration in the region resulted in the development of commercial fisheries on the Lord Howe Rise in 1987–88, Northwest Challenger Plateau in 1988–89, Louisville Ridge in 1993–94, South Tasman Rise in 1997–98, and West Norfolk Ridge in 2001–02. Catches from all these fisheries are tabulated by fishing year up to 2006–07, excluding Westpac Bank catches (Table 1), and by calendar year from 2007 to present (Table 2), as required by the South Pacific Fisheries Management Organisation (SPRFMO).

Table 1: Estimated catches (t) of orange roughy for ORH ET fisheries from 1987–88 to 2006–07. (Data from New Zealand (FSU, QMS), Australia (AFMA), and various sources for other countries. Note that the fishing year for South Tasman Rise is March to February, all others are October to September). See Table 2 for catches from 2007 onwards.

Fishing year	Lord Howe	NW Challenger	Louisville	West Norfolk	South Tasman	Total ET
1987–88	4 000	5	0	0	0	4 005
1988–89	2 430	297	0	0	0	2 727
1989–90	927	425	0	0	0	1 352
1990–01	282	123	0	0	0	405
1991–02	859	620	0	0	0	1 479
1992–03	2 300	2 463	0	0	0	4 763
1993–04	840	1 731	689	0	0	3 260
1994–05	761	1 138	13 252	0	0	15 151
1995–06	5	500	8 816	0	0	9 321
1996–07	139	332	3 209	0	5	3 685
1997–08	26	397	1 404	0	3 930	5 757
1998–09	440	961	3 164	0	705	5 270
1999–00	52	473	1 369	0	4 110	6 004
2000–01	428	1 228	1 598	10	830	4 094
2001–02	120	2 075	1 004	649	170	3 729
2002–03	272	1 010	1 296	94	110	2 782
2003–04	324	654	1 419	90	3	2 490
2004–05	430	464	1 510	277	55	2 736
2005–06	240	201	675	727	12	1 855
2006–07	40	96	323	552	0	1 011

Catch totals include data from New Zealand and Australian vessels available from tow by tow fishing records, with estimated catches added for vessels from Japan, USSR, Korea, Norway, South Africa, and China. Catch statistics are likely to be incomplete.

These fisheries were historically unregulated, with the exception of the South Tasman Rise area, where catches by Australian and New Zealand vessels have at times been restricted by a TAC imposed under a Memorandum of Understanding between the two countries. The South Tasman Rise fishery is currently closed by SPRFMO.

South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (SPRFMO) Convention Area

The SPRFMO Convention was closed for signature in January 2011 and formally entered into force in August 2012. Since that time, monitoring and assessment of catches and fisheries, including for orange roughy, has been overseen by the SPRFMO Scientific Committee. New Zealand reports annual catch and effort information in an Annual Report available on the SPRFMO website.

Regulation of these fisheries was implemented following adoption of the SPRFMO interim measures in May 2007, and specific high sea fishing permits for the SPRFMO Area have been issued since 2007–08. Table 3 shows the number of New Zealand vessels that fished and their orange roughy catch by area. From 2007 to 2019, an orange roughy catch limit was applied for New Zealand vessels, being the average annual catch between 2002 and 2006 (1852 t). Australia implemented analogous limits for its vessels, and no other nations fished orange roughy in the SPRFMO area.

From 2019, SPRFMO has implemented orange roughy catch limits that are subsequently allocated to SPRFMO Members who are permitted to fish under SPRFMO Conservation and Management Measures. In 2019 and 2020, catch limits were set for the Tasman Sea (comprises NW Challenger, W. Norfolk Ridge, and Lord Howe Rise), for the Louisville Ridge, and for the Westpac Bank. For 2021, the catch limit in the Tasman Sea was divided to represent the three Tasman Sea stocks.

For 2023 the catch limits were adjusted based on an update stock assessment (see stock assessment section below) and the Louisville Ridge was divided into North, Central and South Louisville (Table 3). No ORH target fishing took place in 2023.

Table 2: Annual effort and catch (t) data for orange roughy from New Zealand vessels, by area, for the SPRFMO Area (calendar years). Westpac Bank is on the Challenger Plateau but is considered part of the straddling stock ORH 7A so landings from that area are tabulated separately. Australian catches over this period, mostly from the Tasman Sea, ranged from 0 to 148 t, mean 46 t per annum). No other nations fished in this area.

Year	Number of Vessels	Number of tows	Lord Howe	NW Challenger	West Norfolk	Westpac	Louisville	Other	All areas
2007	8	415	34	36	515	–	280	–	866
2008	4	208	380	31	426	–	–	–	837
2009	6	545	403	238	233	23	–	31	928
2010	7	1 170	385	415	79	5	584	6	1 474
2011	7	1 158	1	675	113	5	285	–	1 079
2012	6	652	121	247	49	8	288	8	721
2013	5	760	344	230	19	3	565	3	1 164
2014	5	403	79	57	–	54	754	54	998
2015	5	959	157	530	20	118	462	–	1 287
2016	6	943	208	486	–	234	27	–	954
2017	5	1 423	215	307	22	129	420	–	1 093
2018	6	858	180	399	5	569	81	–	1 232
2019	4	221	38	171	0	111	139	–	460
2020	3	329	2	76	3	88	133	–	301
2021	1	17	–	–	–	20	–	–	20
2022	0	0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2023	1	6	–	–	–	0.3	–	–	0.3
2024	2	96	1	84	–	253	–	–	338
2025	1	17	–	–	–	169	–	–	169

Table 3: Total and New Zealand allocated catch limits (t) from 2024 and 2025 revised limit (including carry forward). If catch is below the allocated or revised catch limit for orange roughy in an area, carry forward of the under-catch amount can occur. The total carry forward amount shall not exceed 100% of their allocated catch limit from the year prior.

Year	Lord Howe	NW Challenger	West Norfolk	Tasman Sea NZ limit	Westpac	Westpac NZ limit	Louisville North	Louisville Central	Louisville South	Louisville NZ limit	Other
2024	174	160	44	302	177	168	116	305	160	523	–
2025 (revised)				511		168				1046	

South Tasman Rise

Exploratory fishing south of Tasmania located aggregations of orange roughy on the South Tasman Rise just outside the Australian Fishing Zone (AFZ) in late 1997. The fishery rapidly increased in the next four years (Table 4), with Australian and New Zealand vessels working several small hill features on the rise. However, New Zealand vessels have not fished the South Tasman Rise since 2000–01. Effort dropped continuously from 2001–02, and mean catch per tow in 2004–05 was about 1 t/tow. Note that insufficient numbers of vessels have fished since 2005–06 to enable presentation of catch or effort summaries.

Table 4: Catch and effort data from the South Tasman Rise (combined Australian and New Zealand data).

Fishing year	Number of tows	Total recorded catch (t)	Mean tow length (h)	Mean catch rate (t/tow)	Mean catch rate (t/h)
1996–97	61	4	0.6	0.1	0.5
1997–98	1 132	3 930	0.7	3.5	17.4
1998–99	1 332	1 705	0.6	1.3	10.4
1999–00	1 086	3 360	0.5	3.1	21.1
2000–01	1 155	830	0.4	0.7	6.7
2001–02	201	170	0.8	1.0	3.5
2002–03	164	110	0.5	0.9	7.9
2003–04	67	2	0.3	0.1	0.4
2004–05	47	55	0.3	1.2	14.7

The fishery was formally regulated by a Memorandum of Understanding between Australia and New Zealand from December 1998. A precautionary TAC of 2100 t was applied, increased to 2400 t in 2000–01, and then progressively reduced to 600 t for 2004–05. The fishery was closed to all trawling in 2007. This area is now managed through SPRFMO and has a catch limit of zero tonnes.

1.2 Summary of trends in commercial fisheries

Information presented to the SPRFMO Scientific Committee shows that New Zealand catches of orange roughy have declined since the early 2000s and were relatively stable at about 1000 t between 2006–2018 and have decreased in 2019, 2020 and 2021. The distribution of catches between areas has varied substantially by year (Figure 1).




Figure 1: Trends in effort (number of vessels bottom trawling) and total landings of orange roughy (tonnes) for each of the four main areas fished by New Zealand vessels in the SPRFMO area by calendar year from 2002–2023.

Catch rates have varied considerably. Roux & Edwards (2017) developed a spatially-disaggregated CPUE index of stock abundance that corrects for some of the known issues with CPUE for orange roughy (Figure 2). This index shows less variability between years than unstandardised or standard GLM modelled-CPUE, but it is still not known whether it indexes biomass.

1.3 Recreational fisheries

There is no non-commercial fishery for orange roughy in these areas.

1.4 Customary non-commercial fisheries

There is no customary non-commercial fishing for orange roughy in these areas.

1.5 Illegal catch

In most of these areas, there were no regulations regarding limits on catch in international waters before 2007. The South Tasman Rise region has been subject to catch restrictions for Australian and New Zealand vessels under a Memorandum of Understanding between the two countries. In 1999–2000 vessels registered in South Africa and Belize fished the region. The estimated catch of at least 750 t has been included in the catch total for that year. No other information is available on any possible illegal catch on the South Tasman Rise, or the Westpac Bank part of ORH 7A.

1.6 Other sources of mortality

There may be some overrun of reported catch because of fish loss with trawl gear damage, ripped nets, discards, and conversion factor inaccuracies. In a number of other orange roughy fisheries, a current level of 5% has been applied (higher in the past). No corrections are made here because of limited information on the sources which may differ with each fishery.

2. STOCKS AND AREAS

Stock structure is uncertain but Clark et al (2016) analysed multiple data sets and recommended that fishing grounds in the following areas be considered as separate units for the purpose of stock assessment: Lord Howe Rise; NW Challenger; SW Challenger; West Norfolk Ridge; South Tasman Rise; and North, Central, and South Louisville (Figure 2).

Orange roughy on the South Tasman Rise are regarded as a straddling stock with fish inside the AFZ. Those on the Westpac Bank on the SW Challenger Plateau are regarded as a straddling stock with fish inside New Zealand's EEZ and the ORH 7A stock.




Figure 2: Comparison of new areas assumed for stock assessment purposes (in red) and previous areas (in blue) overlaid on the total distribution of catch rates for orange roughy. Where both areas are coincident, red boxes overlay blue boxes. See Clark et al (2016) for details.

3. STOCK ASSESSMENT

In 2022, stock assessment models using catch history, and age and length compositions, were used to estimate the minimum pre-fishing biomass that could have supported historical catches for each stock (Stephenson et al 2022). Estimates of the minimum pre-fishing biomass (B_{min}) were made for central, south, and north Louisville stocks, West Norfolk stock, Lord Howe Rise stock, and Northwest Challenger stock.

The B_{min} estimates replaced the previous Bayesian stock assessments after simulation modelling in 2022 found the data were insufficient to inform the most-likely (median) biomass estimates (B_0), and the previous assessments were therefore misleading (Stephenson et al 2022).

B_{min} was assumed to be the minimum initial biomass that did not incur a catch penalty (in deterministic calculations), or that incurred a catch penalty less than 5% or 10% of the time (in stochastic calculations). The catch penalty was incurred if the proportion of any age of fish that was caught in any year (the exploitation rate) was greater than 0.67. Recruitment was assumed constant in all estimates. B_{min} was calculated across a range of fixed B_0 and natural mortality rate (M) values, with deterministic calculations made for all stocks, and stochastic calculations also made for stocks having age frequency data (Central Louisville Ridge, Lord Howe Rise, and Northwest Challenger).

B_{min} was used as a proxy for B_0 , with sustainable yields calculated by applying a fixed scalar associated with an MCY policy (1.45%) to the B_{min} (i.e., sustainable yield = $0.0145 \times B_{min}$). The MCY scalar of 1.45% was intended to be applied to B_0 , therefore the yields here, being calculated using B_{min} , are precautionary.

4. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

The status of the stocks in the SPRFMO Convention Area is not well-known. The SPRFMO Scientific Committee has accepted stock assessments based on deterministic B_{min} with $M = 0.03$ for the main stocks (Tables 5 and 6).

Table 5: B_{min} estimates (t) as a proxy for B_0 for different assumed M , stochastic estimated probability of incurring the catch penalty (5% or 10%), and deterministic estimate (all parameters fixed). Analyses were conducted in 2022.

	5%		10%		Deterministic	
	$M = 0.030$	$M = 0.045$	$M = 0.030$	$M = 0.045$	$M = 0.030$	$M = 0.045$
Louisville Ridge central	26 000	28 000	25 000	26 000	21 000	23 000
Louisville Ridge north	–	–	–	–	8 000	8 000
Louisville Ridge south	–	–	–	–	11 000	10 000
West Norfolk Ridge	–	–	–	–	3 000	3 000
Lord Howe Rise	12 000	11 000	12 000	11 000	12 000	11 000
Northwest Challenger	11 000	9 000	11 000	9 000	11 000	9 000

Table 6: Sustainable yield estimates (t) by multiplying B_{min} from different assumed M and calculation methods (Table 5) by a fixed scalar of 0.0145. Analyses were conducted in 2022.

	5%		10%		Deterministic	
	$M = 0.030$	$M = 0.045$	$M = 0.030$	$M = 0.045$	$M = 0.030$	$M = 0.045$
Louisville Ridge central	377	406	363	377	305	334
Louisville Ridge north	–	–	–	–	116	116
Louisville Ridge south	–	–	–	–	160	145
West Norfolk Ridge	–	–	–	–	44	44
Lord Howe Rise	174	160	174	160	174	160
Northwest Challenger	160	131	160	131	160	131

5. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION


Anderson, O F (2006) A summary of biological information on the New Zealand fisheries for orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) for the 2003–04 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2006/16*. 25 p.

Clark, M R (2003) Estimation of orange roughy biomass on the Louisville Ridge: application of “Seamount Meta-analysis” results. Final Research Report to the Ministry of Fisheries for ORH2002/03. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)

- Clark, M R (2004) Descriptive analysis of orange roughy fisheries in the New Zealand region outside the EEZ: Lord Howe Rise, Northwest Challenger Plateau, West Norfolk Ridge, South Tasman Rise, and Louisville Ridge to the end of the 2002–03 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2004/51*. 36 p.
- Clark, M R (2006a) Descriptive analysis of orange roughy fisheries in the New Zealand region outside the EEZ: Lord Howe Rise, Northwest Challenger Plateau, West Norfolk Ridge, South Tasman Rise, and Louisville Ridge to the end of the 2003–04 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2006/25*. 37 p.
- Clark, M R (2006b) Descriptive analysis of orange roughy fisheries in the New Zealand region outside the EEZ: Lord Howe Rise, Northwest Challenger Plateau, West Norfolk Ridge, South Tasman Rise, and Louisville Ridge to the end of the 2004–05 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2006/56*. 38 p.
- Clark, M R (2008) Descriptive analysis of orange roughy fisheries in the New Zealand region outside the EEZ: Lord Howe Rise, Northwest Challenger Plateau, West Norfolk Ridge, South Tasman Rise, and Louisville Ridge to the end of the 2005–06 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/12*. 45 p.
- Clark, M R; Anderson, O F (2001) The Louisville Ridge orange roughy fishery: an update of commercial catch-effort data and CPUE analysis of the fishery to the end of the 1999–2000 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/74*. 31 p.
- Clark, M R; Anderson, O F (2003) The Louisville Ridge orange roughy fishery: an analysis of commercial catch-effort data and stock assessment of the fishery to the end of the 2000–01 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/3*. 26 p.
- Clark, M R; O'Driscoll, R L (2002) Descriptive analysis of orange roughy fisheries in the Tasman Sea outside the New Zealand EEZ: Lord Howe Rise, Northwest Challenger Plateau, and South Tasman Rise from 1986–87 to the end of the 2000–01 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2002/59*. 26 p.
- Clark, M R; McMillan, P J; Anderson, O F; Roux, M-J (2016) Stock management areas for orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) in the Tasman Sea and western South Pacific Ocean. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2016/19*. 27 p.
- Clark, M; Tilzey, R (1996) A summary of stock assessment information for orange roughy fisheries on the Lord Howe Rise: 1996. Bureau of Resource Sciences, Canberra. 23 p. (Available from BRS, P.O. Box E11, Canberra, Australia).
- Clark, M; Tilzey, R (2001) A summary of commercial catch and effort information for the orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) fishery on the South Tasman Rise from 1987 to 1999. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/3*. 16 p.
- Cordue, P L (2017a) Catch-history based stock assessments of seven SPRFMO orange roughy stocks. Paper SC05-DW14 for the Scientific Committee of the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation, Shanghai, 23–28 August 2017.
- Cordue, P L (2017b) A CPUE based stock assessment of the Louisville Central orange roughy stock. Paper SC05-INF03 for the Scientific Committee of the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation, Shanghai, 23–28 August 2017.
- Cordue, P L (2019) A 2019 orange roughy stock assessment for Louisville Ridge. Paper SC7-DW05 for the Scientific Committee of the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation, La Havana, Cuba. 7–12 October 2019.
- Cordue, P L (2020) A 2020 orange roughy stock assessment for Northwest Challenger and Lord Howe Rise. Paper SC8-DW10 for the Scientific Committee of the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation, Wellington, NZ. 3–8 October 2020.
- Cryer, M; Bock, T; Nicol, S (2017) Potential scientific advice for Orange roughy stocks / management units within the Western SPRFMO Area. Paper SC05-DW15_rev2 for the Scientific Committee of the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation, Shanghai, 23–28 August 2017.
- Edwards, C T T; Roux, M-J (2017) A simple delay-difference model for assessment of data-poor orange roughy stocks. Paper SC05-DW12 for the Scientific Committee of the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation, Shanghai, 23–28 August 2017.
- Galvez, M; Cryer, M; Nicol, S; Loveridge, C (2017) Report of the SPRFMO Deep Water Working Group Workshop. Paper SC05-DW08 for the Scientific Committee of the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation, Shanghai, 23–28 August 2017.
- O'Driscoll, R L (2001) CPUE analysis of orange roughy fisheries outside the New Zealand EEZ: Lord Howe Rise and Northwest Challenger Plateau, to the end of the 1999–2000 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/36*. 26 p.
- O'Driscoll, R L (2003) Catch-per-unit-effort analysis of orange roughy fisheries outside the New Zealand EEZ: Lord Howe Rise and Northwest Challenger Plateau to the end of the 2001–02 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/36*. 38 p.
- Roux, M-J; Doonan, I; Edwards, C T T; Clark, M R (2017) Low information stock assessment of orange roughy *Hoplostethus atlanticus* in the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation Convention area. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2017/01*. 62 p.
- Roux, M-J; Edwards, C T T (2017) A data-limited approach for assessing small-scale fisheries for orange roughy *Hoplostethus atlanticus* in the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation Convention Area (SPRFMO). Paper SC05-DW13 for the Scientific Committee of the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation, Shanghai, 23–28 August 2017.
- Smith, P J; Robertson, S; Horn, P; Bull, B; Anderson, O; Stanton, B R; Oke, C S (2002) Multiple techniques for determining stock relationships between orange roughy *Hoplostethus atlanticus* fisheries in the eastern Tasman Sea. *Fisheries Research* 58: 119–140.
- Stephenson, F; Biggerstaff, A; Dunn, M; A'mar, T; Doonan, I; Rowden, A; Geange, S (2022) A 2022 orange roughy stock assessment for Louisville Ridge, West Norfolk Ridge, Lord Howe Rise, and Northwest Challenger Plateau. South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation, 10th Meeting of the Scientific Committee, Seoul, Korea, 26–30 September 2022. SC10-DW01_rev1. 37 p.
- Tilzey, R (2000) South Tasman Rise trawl fishery. In: Caton, A., McLoughlin, K. (eds) Fishery status reports 1999: resource assessments of Australian Commonwealth fisheries. BRS, Canberra.
- Wayte, S; Bax, N; Clark, M; Tilzey, R (2003) Analysis of orange roughy catches on the South Tasman Rise, 1997–2002. Report provided to the Orange Roughy Assessment Group. 14 p. (Unpublished report held by CSIRO, Hobart.)

INTRODUCTION – OREOS (OEO)

(*Pseudocyttus maculatus*, *Allocyttus niger*, *Neocyttus rhomboidalis*, and *Allocyttus verucosus*)



1. INTRODUCTION

The oreo (OEO) complex consists of four species: smooth oreo (*Pseudocyttus maculatus*, SSO), black oreo (*Allocyttus niger*, BOE), spiky oreo (*Neocyttus rhomboidalis*, SOR), and warty oreo (*Allocyttus verucosus*, WOE). The species most commonly caught are smooth oreo and black oreo.

The main black oreo and smooth oreo fisheries have been assessed separately and individual reports produced for each as follows:

1. OEO 3A black oreo and smooth oreo
2. OEO 4 black oreo and smooth oreo
3. OEO 1 and OEO 6 black oreo and smooth oreo

2. BIOLOGY

2.1 Black oreo

Black oreo have been found within a 600 m to 1300 m depth range. The geographical distribution south of about 45° S is not well known. It is a southern species and is abundant on the south Chatham Rise, along the east coast of the South Island, the north and east slope of Pukaki Rise, the Bounty Plateau, the Snares slope, Puysegur Bank, and the northern end of the Macquarie Ridge. They most likely occur all around the slope of the Campbell Plateau.

Spawning occurs from late October to at least December and is widespread on the south Chatham Rise. Mean length at maturity for females, estimated from Chatham Rise trawl surveys (1986–87, 1990, 1991–93) using macroscopic gonad staging, is 34 cm total length (TL).

They appear to have a pelagic juvenile phase, but little is known about this phase because only about 12 fish less than 21 cm TL have been caught and measured. The pelagic phase may last for 4–5 years with lengths of up to 21–26 cm TL.

Unvalidated age estimates were obtained for Chatham Rise and Puysegur-Snares samples in 1995 and 1997, respectively, using counts of the zones (assumed to be annual) observed in thin sections of otoliths. These estimates indicate that black oreo is slow growing and long lived. The maximum estimated age was 153 years (45.5 cm TL fish). Australian workers used the same methods, i.e., sections of otoliths, and reported similar results. A von Bertalanffy growth curve was fitted to the Puysegur samples only (Table 1). Estimated age at maturity for females was 27 years.

Table 1: Biological parameters for black oreo and smooth oreo stock assessments. Values not estimated are indicated by –. Some parameters may be estimated in specific stock assessments.

Fishstock	Estimate					
<u>1. Natural Mortality - M (y^{-1})</u>						
	Females		Males		Unsexed	
Black oreo (McMillan et al 1997)	0.044 (0.028–0.075)		0.044 (0.028–0.075)		0.044	
Smooth oreo (Doonan et al 1997)	0.063 (0.042–0.099)		0.063 (0.042–0.099)			
<u>2. Age at recruitment - A_r (y)</u>						
Black oreo	–		–		–	
Smooth oreo	21		21			
<u>3. Age at maturity A_M (y)</u>						
Black oreo	27		–		–	
Smooth oreo	31		–			
<u>4. von Bertalanffy parameters</u>						
	Females			Males		Unsexed
	L_{∞} (cm, TL)	$k(y^{-1})$	t_0 (y)	L_{∞} (cm, TL)	$k(y^{-1})$	t_0 (y)
Black oreo	39.9	0.043	-17.6	37.2	0.056	-16.4
Smooth oreo	50.8	0.047	-2.9	43.6	0.067	-1.6
<u>5. Length-weight parameters (Weight = $a(\text{length})^b$ (Weight in g, length in cm fork length))</u>						
	Females		Males		Unsexed	
	a	b	a	b	a	b
Black oreo	0.008	3.28	0.016	3.06	0.0078	3.27
Smooth oreo	0.029	2.90	0.032	2.87	–	–
<u>6. Length at recruitment (cm, TL)</u>						
	Females		Males		Unsexed	
Black oreo	–		–		–	
Smooth oreo	34		–		–	
<u>7. Length at maturity (cm, TL)</u>						
Black oreo	34		–		–	
Smooth oreo	40		–		–	
<u>8. Recruitment variability (σ_R)</u>						
Black oreo	0.65		0.65		0.65	
Smooth oreo	0.65		0.65		–	
<u>9. Recruitment steepness</u>						
Black oreo	0.75		0.75		0.75	
Smooth oreo	0.75		0.75		–	

A first estimate of natural mortality (M), 0.044 (y^{-1}), was made in 1997 using the Puysegur growth data only. This estimate is uncertain because it appeared that the otolith samples were taken from a well fished part of the Puysegur area.

Black oreo appear to settle over a wide range of depths on the south Chatham Rise but appear to prefer to live in the depth interval 600–800 m that is often dominated by individuals with a modal size of 28 cm TL.

2.2 Smooth oreo

Smooth oreo occur from 650 m to about 1500 m depth. It is a southern species and is abundant on the south Chatham Rise, along the east coast of the South Island, the north and east slope of Pukaki Rise, the Bounty Plateau, the Snares slope, Puysegur Bank, and the northern end of the Macquarie Ridge. They most likely occur all around the slope of the Campbell Plateau, but the geographical distribution south of about 45° S is not well known.

Spawning occurs from late October to at least December and is widespread on the south Chatham Rise in small aggregations. Mean length at maturity for females, estimated from Chatham Rise trawl surveys (1986–87, 1990, 1991–93) using macroscopic gonad staging, is 40 cm TL.

They appear to have a pelagic juvenile phase, but little is known about this phase because only about six fish less than 16 cm TL have ever been caught. The pelagic phase may last for 5–6 years with lengths of up to 16–19 cm TL.

Unvalidated age estimates were obtained for Chatham Rise and Puysegur-Snares fish in 1995 and 1997, respectively, using counts of the zones (assumed to be annual) observed in thin sections of otoliths. These estimates indicate that smooth oreo is slow growing and long lived. The maximum estimated age was 86 years (51.3 cm TL fish). Australian workers used the same methods, i.e., sections of otoliths, and reported similar results. A von Bertalanffy growth curve was fitted to the age estimates from Chatham Rise and Puysegur-Snares fish combined and the parameters estimated for the growth curve are in Table 1. Estimated age at maturity for females was 31 years.

An estimate of natural mortality, $0.063 \text{ (y}^{-1}\text{)}$, was made in 1997 (Doonan et al 1997). The estimate was from a moderately exploited population of fish from the Puysegur region.

There are concentrations of recently settled smooth oreo south and southwest of Chatham Island, although small individuals (16–19 cm TL) occur widely over the south Chatham Rise at depths of 650–800 m.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

3.1 Black oreo

The stock structure of Australian and New Zealand samples was examined using genetic (allozyme and mitochondrial DNA) and morphological counts (fin rays, etc.). It was concluded that the New Zealand samples constituted a stock distinct from the Australian sample based on “small but significant difference in mtDNA haplotype frequencies (with no detected allozyme differences), supported by differences in pyloric caeca and lateral line counts”. The genetic methods used may not be suitable tools for stock discrimination around New Zealand.

A New Zealand pilot study examined stock relationships using samples from four management areas (OEO 1, OEO 3A, OEO 4, and OEO 6) of the New Zealand EEZ. Techniques used included genetic (nuclear and mitochondrial DNA), lateral line scale counts, settlement zone counts, parasites, otolith microchemistry, and otolith shape. Lateral line scale and pyloric caeca counts were different between samples from OEO 6 and the other three areas. The relative abundance of three parasites differed significantly between all areas. Otolith shape from OEO 3A samples was different to that from OEO 1 and OEO 4, but OEO 1, OEO 4, and OEO 6 otolith samples were not morphologically different. Genetic, otolith microchemistry, and settlement zone analyses showed no regional differences.

3.2 Smooth oreo

Stock structure of Australian and New Zealand samples was examined using genetic (allozyme and mitochondrial DNA) and morphological counts (fin rays, etc.). No differences between New Zealand and Australian samples were found using the above techniques. A broad scale stock is suggested by these results, but this seems unlikely given the large distances between New Zealand and Australia. The genetic methods used may not be suitable tools for stock discrimination around New Zealand.

A New Zealand pilot study examined stock relationships using samples from four management areas (OEO 1, OEO 3A, OEO 4, and OEO 6) of the New Zealand EEZ. Techniques used included genetic (nuclear and mitochondrial DNA), lateral line scale counts, settlement zone counts, parasites, otolith microchemistry, and otolith shape. Otolith shape from OEO 1 and OEO 6 was different to that from OEO 3A and OEO 4 samples. Weak evidence from parasite data, one gene locus, and otolith microchemistry suggested that northern OEO 3A samples were different from other areas. Lateral line scale and otolith settlement zone counts showed no differences between areas.

These data suggest that the stock boundaries given in previous assessment documents should be retained until more definitive evidence for stock relationships is obtained, i.e., retain the existing areas OEO 1, OEO 3A, OEO 4, and OEO 6.

The four species of oreos (black oreo, smooth oreo, spiky oreo, and warty oreo) are managed with separate catch limits for black and smooth in some areas. Each species could be managed separately. They have different depth and geographical distributions, different stock sizes, rates of growth, and productivity.

4. FISHERY SUMMARY

4.1 Commercial fisheries

Commercial fisheries occur for black oreo (BOE) and smooth oreo (SSO). Oreos are managed as a species group, which also includes warty and spiky oreo (SOR). The Chatham Rise (OEO 3A and OEO 4) is the main fishing area, but other fisheries occur off Southland on the east coast of the South Island (OEO 1/OEO 3A) and on the Pukaki Rise, Macquarie Ridge, and Bounty Plateau (OEO 6). In the past, oreo catch has been taken as bycatch of the more valuable orange roughy fisheries but target fisheries for smooth or black oreo are now much more common in most areas.

Total reported landings and TACCs are shown in Table 2, and Figure 1 depicts the historical landings and TACC values for the main OEO stocks. OEO 3A and OEO 4 were introduced into the QMS in 1982–83, and OEO 1 and OEO 6 were introduced later in 1986–87. Reported estimated catches by species from tow-by-tow data recorded in catch and effort logbooks and electronic reporting forms, and the ratio of estimated to landed catch reported, are given in Table 3.

OEO 1 was fished under the adaptive management programme up to the end of 1997–98. The OEO 1 TACC reverted back to pre-adaptive management levels from 1998–99. Landings have declined since then, and from 1 October 2007 the TACC was reduced to 2500 t; other sources of mortality were allocated 168 t.

Oreo landings from OEO 3A were less than the TACC from 1992–93 to 1995–96, substantially so in 1994–95 and 1995–96. The OEO 3A TACC was reduced from 10 106 t to 6600 t in 1996–97. A voluntary agreement between the fishing industry and the Minister of Fisheries to limit catch of smooth oreo from OEO 3A to 1400 t of the total oreo TACC of 6600 t was implemented in 1998–99. Subsequently the total OEO 3A TACC was reduced to 5900 t in 1999–00, 4400 in 2000–01, 4095 in 2001–02, and 3100 t in 2002–03. In 2009–10 the OEO 3A TACC was increased slightly to 3350 t and landings have been close to the TACC since then, averaging 3340 t between 2009–10 and 2018–19, and 2919 t between 2019–20 and 2024–25.

Total oreo landings from OEO 4 exceeded the TACC from 1991–92 to 1994–95 and were close to the TACC from 1995–96 to 2000–01 (Table 2). Landings remained high in OEO 4, whereas the orange roughy fishery declined. The OEO 4 TACC was reduced from 7000 t to 5460 t in 2001–02 but was restored to 7000 t in 2003–04. In 2015–16, following an assessment of SSO 4, the OEO 4 TACC was reduced to 3000 t and the landings of smooth oreo were approximately 2000 t. The OEO 4 TACC was increased to 3600 t for the fishing year 2018–19, and just under 3300 t of all oreo species combined were landed, but landings reduced again to 2951 t in 2019–20 but averaged 3473 between 2020–21 and 2024–25.

Landings from the Sub-Antarctic area (OEO 6) increased substantially in 1994–95 and exceeded the TACC in 1995–96. The OEO 6 TACC was increased from 3000 t to 6000 t in 1996–97. Landings exceeded the TACC slightly in 2002–03 and in 2005–06 but dropped substantially after 2009–10. Following a period of very low landings ranging from just 136 t to 367 t in 2012–13 to 2014–15, landings recovered slightly, averaging 1477 t between 2015–16 and 2024–25. There was also a voluntary agreement in 1998–99 not to fish for oreo in the Puysegur area. More recently there was a

voluntary agreement not to fish parts of the Pukaki and Bounty areas to allow fish to increase in size. This agreement was initially for 3 years starting 1 October 2012. It was reinstated on 1 October 2015 for a further 2 years until 1 October 2017.

Table 2: Total reported landings (t) for all oreo species combined by Fishstock from 1978–79 to present and TACCs (t) from 1982–83 to present.

Fishing year	OEO 1		OEO 3A		OEO 4		OEO 6		Totals	
	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC
1978–79*	2 808	–	1 366	–	8 041	–	17	–	12 231	–
1979–80*	143	–	10 958	–	680	–	18	–	11 791	–
1980–81*	467	–	14 832	–	10 269	–	283	–	25 851	–
1981–82*	21	–	12 750	–	9 296	–	4 380	–	26 514	–
1982–83*	162	–	8 576	10 000	3 927	6 750	765	–	13 680	17 000
1983–83#	39	–	4 409	#	3 209	#	354	–	8 015	#
1983–84†	3 241	–	9 190	10 000	6 104	6 750	3 568	–	22 111	17 000
1984–85†	1480	–	8 284	10 000	6 390	6 750	2 044	–	18 204	17 000
1985–86†	5 390	–	5 331	10 000	5 883	6 750	126	–	16 820	17 000
1986–87†	532	4 000	7 222	10 000	6 830	6 750	0	3 000	15 093	24 000
1987–88†	1 193	4 000	9 049	10 000	8 674	7 000	197	3 000	19 159	24 000
1988–89†	432	4 233	10 191	10 000	8 447	7 000	7	3 000	19 077	24 233
1989–90†	2 069	5 033	9 286	10 106	7 348	7 000	0	3 000	18 703	25 139
1990–91†	4 563	5 033	9 827	10 106	6 936	7 000	288	3 000	21 614	25 139
1991–92†	4 156	5 033	10 072	10 106	7 457	7 000	33	3 000	21 718	25 139
1992–93†	5 739	6 044	9 290	10 106	7 976	7 000	815	3 000	23 820	26 160
1993–94†	4 910	6 044	9 106	10 106	8 319	7 000	983	3 000	23 318	26 160
1994–95†	1 483	6 044	6 600	10 106	7 680	7 000	2 528	3 000	18 291	26 160
1995–96†	4 783	6 044	7 786	10 106	6 806	7 000	4 435	3 000	23 810	26 160
1996–97†	5 181	6 044	6 991	6 600	6 962	7 000	5 645	6 000	24 779	25 644
1997–98†	2 681	6 044	6 336	6 600	7 010	7 000	5 222	6 000	21 249	25 644
1998–99†	4 102	5 033	5 763	6 600	6 931	7 000	5 287	6 000	22 083	24 633
1999–00†	3 711	5 033	5 859	5 900	7 034	7 000	5 914	6 000	22 518	23 933
2000–01†	4 852	5 033	4 577	4 400	7 358	7 000	5 932	6 000	22 719	22 433
2001–02†	4 197	5 033	3 923	4 095	4 864	5 460	5 737	6 000	18 721	20 588
2002–03†	3 034	5 033	3 070	3 100	5 402	5 460	6 115	6 000	17 621	19 593
2003–04†	1 703	5 033	2 856	3 100	6 735	7 000	5 811	6 000	17 105	21 133
2004–05†	1 025	5 033	3 061	3 100	7 390	7 000	5 744	6 000	17 220	21 133
2005–06†	850	5 033	3 333	3 100	6 829	7 000	6 463	6 000	17 475	21 133
2006–07†	903	5 033	3 073	3 100	7 211	7 000	5 926	6 000	17 113	21 133
2007–08†	947	2 500	3 092	3 100	7 038	7 000	5 902	6 000	16 979	18 600
2008–09†	582	2 500	2 848	3 100	6 907	7 000	5 540	6 000	15 877	18 600
2009–10†	464	2 500	3 550	3 350	7 047	7 000	5 730	6 000	16 791	18 850
2010–11†	381	2 500	3 370	3 350	7 061	7 000	3 610	6 000	14 422	18 860
2011–12†	581	2 500	3 324	3 350	6 858	7 000	2 325	6 000	13 088	18 860
2012–13†	652	2 500	3 245	3 350	6 944	7 000	136	6 000	10 977	18 860
2013–14†	386	2 500	3 473	3 350	7 024	7 000	367	6 000	11 251	18 860
2014–15†	277	2 500	3 352	3 350	7 274	7 000	156	6 000	11 059	18 860
2015–16†	523	2 500	3 334	3 350	2 898	3 000	1 357	6 000	8 111	14 860
2016–17†	603	2 500	3 206	3 350	3 011	3 000	1 200	6 000	8 020	14 860
2017–18†	601	2 500	3 177	3 350	2 867	3 000	2 138	6 000	8 783	14 860
2018–19†	689	2 500	3 365	3 350	3 283	3 600	1 613	6 000	8 950	15 460
2019–20†	604	2 500	2 731	3 350	2 951	3 600	1 446	6 000	7 733	15 460
2020–21†	357	2 500	3 095	3 350	3 542	3 600	1 711	6 000	8 705	15 460
2021–22†	205	2 500	2 648	3 350	3 414	3 600	1 235	6 000	7 503	15 460
2022–23†	549	2 500	3 233	3 350	3 432	3 600	2 375	6 000	9 589	15 460
2023–24†	306	2 500	2 679	3 350	3 470	3 600	1 016	6 000	7 470	15 460
2024–25†	171	2 500	3 127	3 350	3 506	3 600	682	6 000	7 487	15 460

Source: FSU from 1978–79 to 1987–88; QMS/MFish/MPI from 1988–89 to 2013–14. *, 1 April to 31 March. #, 1 April to 30 September. Interim TACs applied. †, 1 October to 30 September. Data prior to 1983 were adjusted up due to a conversion factor change.




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the four main OEO stocks. OEO 1 (Central East - Wairarapa, Auckland, Central Egmont, Challenger, Southland, South East Catlin Coast, OEO 3A (South East Cook Strait/Kaikōura/Strathallan), and OEO 4 (South East Chatham Rise). [Continued on next page]




Figure 1 [Continued]: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the four main OEO stocks. OEO 6 (Sub-Antarctic).

Table 3: Reported estimated catch (t) by species (smooth oreo (SSO), black oreo (BOE)) by Fishstock from 1978–79 to 2020–21 and the ratio (percentage) of the total estimated SSO plus BOE, to the total reported landings (from Table 2). –, less than 1 t.

Year	SSO				BOE				Total estimated	Estimated landings (%)
	OEO 1	OEO 3A	OEO 4	OEO 6	OEO 1	OEO 3A	OEO 4	OEO 6		
1978–79*	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	9	–
1979–80*	16	5 075	114	0	118	5 588	566	18	11 495	98
1980–81*	1	1 522	849	2	66	8 758	5 224	215	16 637	64
1981–82*	21	1 283	3 352	2	0	11 419	5 641	4 378	26 096	98
1982–83*	28	2 138	2 796	60	6	6 438	1 088	705	13 259	97
1983–83#	9	713	1 861	0	1	3 693	1 340	354	7 971	100
1983–84†	1 246	3 594	4 871	1 315	1 751	5 524	1 214	2 254	21 769	99
1984–85†	828	4 311	4 729	472	544	3 897	1 651	1 572	18 004	99
1985–86†	4 257	3 135	4 921	72	1 060	2 184	961	54	16 644	99
1986–87†	326	3 186	5 670	0	163	4 026	1 160	0	14 531	96
1987–88†	1 050	5 897	7 771	197	114	3 140	903	0	19 072	100
1988–89†	261	5 864	6 427	–	86	2 719	1 087	0	16 444	86
1989–90†	1 141	5 355	5 320	–	872	2 344	439	–	15 471	83
1990–91†	1 437	4 422	5 262	81	2 314	4 177	793	222	18 708	87
1991–92†	1 008	6 096	4 797	2	2 384	3 176	1 702	15	19 180	88
1992–93†	1 716	3 461	3 814	529	3 768	3 957	1 326	69	18 640	78
1993–94†	2 000	4 767	4 805	808	2 615	4 016	1 553	35	20 599	88
1994–95†	835	3 589	5 272	1 811	385	2 052	545	230	14 719	81
1995–96†	2 517	3 591	5 236	2 562	1 296	3 361	364	1 166	20 093	84
1996–97†	2 203	3 063	5 390	2 492	2 578	3 549	530	1 950	21 755	88
1997–98†	1 510	4 790	5 868	2 531	1 027	1 623	811	1 982	20 142	95
1998–99†	2 958	2 367	5 613	3 462	820	3 147	844	1 231	20 442	93
1999–00†	2 487	1 230	5 879	4 427	953	2 773	627	1 036	19 412	86
2000–01†	4 117	1 288	6 009	4 241	316	2 423	803	1 128	20 325	89
2001–02†	3 135	1 272	3 860	4 471	709	1 906	515	983	16 851	90
2002–03†	2 402	1 025	4 090	3 952	470	1 144	862	1 642	15 587	88
2003–04†	958	884	5 098	3 771	457	1 095	973	1 496	14 732	86
2004–05†	622	1 150	6 013	3 863	209	1 163	852	1 618	15 490	90
2005–06†	412	1 005	5 202	3 292	218	1 336	763	2 633	14 861	85
2006–07†	509	989	5 978	2 214	262	1 223	796	3 071	15 042	88
2007–08†	414	1 402	6 171	2 182	429	1 469	592	3 022	15 681	92
2008–09†	435	1 258	5 703	2 703	143	1 388	766	2 832	15 228	96
2009–10†	319	1 581	6 204	2 487	67	1 781	942	3 032	16 413	98
2010–11†	107	1 558	6 472	1 672	235	1 563	539	1 501	13 647	95
2011–12†	210	1 442	6 183	562	326	1 620	487	1 540	12 370	95
2012–13†	319	1 408	5 920	104	224	1 582	973	31	10 561	96
2013–14†	214	1 391	6 000	286	114	1 722	988	50	10 765	96
2014–15†	75	1 369	6 447	119	170	1 783	961	16	10 940	99
2015–16†	248	1 480	1 948	583	259	1 782	858	809	7 967	98
2016–17†	367	1 520	2 357	1 000	182	1 727	678	156	7 987	100
2017–18†	363	1 539	2 095	1 123	130	1 550	758	850	8 408	96
2018–19†	400	1 522	2 479	908	199	1 737	671	586	8 502	95
2019–20†	272	1 394	2 327	824	221	1 326	538	430	7 332	95
2020–21†	192	1 762	2 781	950	142	1 291	659	761	8 538	98
2021–22†	106	1 332	2 516	603	78	1 265	835	631	7 366	98
2022–23†	321	1 742	2 682	1 572	210	1 472	716	802	9 517	99
2023–24†	190	1 525	2 656	272	109	1 127	754	743	7 375	99
2024–25†	124	1 709	2 655	497	39	1 393	788	184	7 388	99

Source: FSU from 1978–79 to 1987–88 and MFish from 1988–89 to 2006–07. *, 1 April to 31 March. #, 1 April to 30 September. †, 1 October to 30 September.

4.2 Recreational fisheries

There are no known recreational fisheries for black oreo and smooth oreo.

4.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

There is no known customary non-commercial fishing for black oreo and smooth oreo.

4.4 Illegal catch

Estimates of illegal catch are not available.

4.5 Other sources of mortality

Dumping of unwanted or small fish and accidental loss of fish (lost codends, ripped codends, etc.) were features of oreo fisheries in the early years. These sources of mortality were probably substantial in those early years but are now thought to be relatively small. No estimate of mortality from these sources has been made because of the lack of hard data and because mortality now appears to be small. Estimates of discards of oreos were made for 1994–95 and 1995–96 from MFish observer data. This involved calculating the ratio of discarded oreo catch to retained oreo catch and then multiplying the annual total oreo catch from the New Zealand EEZ by this ratio. Estimates were 207 t and 270 t for 1994–95 and 1995–96, respectively.

5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECOSYSTEM CONSIDERATIONS

The figures and tables in this section were updated and additional text included for the May 2025 Fishery Assessment Plenary. This summary is from the perspective of the orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish trawl fishery; a more detailed summary from an issue-by-issue perspective is available in the Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Annual Review where the consequences are also discussed ([Aquatic environment and biodiversity annual review \(AEBAR\) | NZ Government \(mpi.govt.nz\)](#)).

5.1 Role in the ecosystem

Smooth and black oreo dominate trawl survey relative abundance estimates of demersal fish species at 650–1200 m on the south and southwest slope of the Chatham Rise (e.g., Hart & McMillan 1998). They are probably also dominant at those depths on the southeast slope of the South Island and other southern New Zealand slope areas including Bounty Plateau and Pukaki Rise. They are replaced at depths of about 700–1200 m on the east and northern slope of Chatham Rise by orange roughy. The south Chatham Rise oreo fisheries are relatively long-standing, dating from Soviet fishing in the 1970s, but the effects of extracting approximately 6000 t per year of smooth oreo from the south Chatham Rise (OEO 4) ecosystem between 1983–84 and 2012–13 are unknown.

5.1.1 Trophic interactions

Smooth oreo feed mainly on salps (80%), molluscs (9%, of which 8% are squids but also including octopods), and teleosts (5%) (percentage frequency of occurrence in stomachs with food, Stevens et al 2011). Black oreo feed on teleosts (48%), crustaceans (36%), salps (24%), and cephalopods (mainly squid, 6%) (Stevens et al 2011). Diet varies with fish size but salps remained the main prey for smooth oreo in the largest fish with small numbers of Scyphozoa, fish, and squids. Salps were the main prey for smaller black oreo, but amphipods and natant decapod crustaceans were important for intermediate sized fish (Clark et al 1989). Smooth oreo and black oreo occur with orange roughy at times. Orange roughy diet was mainly crustaceans (58%), teleosts (41%), and molluscs (10%, particularly squids) (frequency of occurrence, Stevens et al 2011) suggesting little overlap with the salp-dominated diet of smooth oreo. Where they co-occur, orange roughy and black oreo may compete for teleost and crustacean prey.

Predators of oreos probably change with fish size. Larger smooth oreo, black oreo, and orange roughy were observed with healed soft flesh wounds, typically in the dorso-posterior region. Wound shape and size suggest they may be caused by one of the deepwater dogfishes (Dunn et al 2010).

5.1.2 Ecosystem indicators

Tuck et al (2009, 2014) used data from the Sub-Antarctic and Chatham Rise middle-depth trawl surveys to derive indicators of fish diversity, size, and trophic level. However, fishing for oreos occurs mostly deeper than the depth range of these surveys and is only a small component of fishing in the areas considered by Tuck et al (2009, 2014).

5.2 Non-target fish and invertebrate catch

Anderson & Finucci (2022) summarised the bycatch of oreo trawl fisheries from 2002–03 to 2019–20. Since 2002–03, oreo species (five species, mainly smooth oreo and black oreo) accounted for about 95% of the total estimated catch from all observed trawls targeting oreos. In total, over 500 species or species groups were identified by observers in the target fishery. Total annual fish bycatch in the oreo fishery ranged from a low of 135 t in 2019–20 to a high of 1457 t in 2002–03, with a general declining trend through time and the five lowest values in the last seven years. Orange roughy (2.3%) was the main bycatch species, with no other species or group of species accounting for more than 0.5% of the total catch. Other recorded bycatch species included Baxter’s lantern dogfish (*Etmopterus granulosus*, 0.49%), hoki (0.37%), and rattails (0.27%), all of which were usually discarded. Estimated annual bycatch of non-QMS species was roughly equal to that of QMS species. From 2002–03 to 2019–20, the overall discard fraction value was 0.014 kg (range of 0.01–0.05 kg) and tended to be lower after 2005–06 (Anderson & Finucci 2022).

Non-QMS invertebrate bycatch made up a very small fraction of the overall catch (0.3%) and included warty squid (0.07%), and bushy hard coral (0.07%, Anderson & Finucci 2022). Other observed species or species groups each accounted for less than 0.01% of the observed catch. Tracey et al (2011) analysed the distribution of nine groups of protected corals based on bycatch records from observed trawl effort from 2007–08 to 2009–10, primarily from 800–1000 m depth. For the oreo target fishery, the highest catches were reported from the north and south slopes of the Chatham Rise, east of the Pukaki Rise, and on the Macquarie Ridge.

Finucci et al (2019) analysed bycatch trends in deepwater fisheries, including oreo trawl, from 1990–91 until 2016–17. They found that the most common bycatch species by weight (t) were orange roughy (ORH), unspecified sharks (SHA), and Baxter’s dogfish (ETB). Moreover, among the 228 bycatch species examined, 40 showed a decrease in catch over time (7 were statistically significant) and 44 showed an increase (9 were significant). The species showing the greatest decline were dark ghost shark (*Hydrolagus novaezealandiae*, GSH), unspecified shark (SHA), and lanternshark (*Etmopterus* sp., ETM), whereas the greatest increases were found for longnose velvet dogfish (*Centroscyrmnus crepidater*, CYP), ridge scaled rattail (*Macrourus carinatus*, MCA), and Baxter’s dogfish (*Etmopterus granulosus*, ETB). The decline in unspecified shark could be linked to better identification of specimens through time, which would match the increases seen in other deepwater shark bycatch.

5.3 Incidental capture of Protected Species (seabirds, mammals, and protected fish)

For protected species, capture estimates presented here include all animals recovered to the deck of fishing vessels (alive, injured, or dead), but do not include any cryptic mortality (e.g., a seabird struck by a warp but not brought on board the vessel, Middleton & Abraham 2007, Brothers et al 2010).

5.3.1 Marine mammal captures

Trawlers targeting orange roughy, oreo, and black cardinalfish occasionally catch New Zealand fur seal (which were classified as ‘Not Threatened’ under the New Zealand Threat Classification System in 2009, Baker et al 2010). Between 2002–03 and 2007–08, there were 14 observed captures of New Zealand fur seal in orange roughy, oreo, and black cardinalfish trawl fisheries. There have been two observed captures in the period between 2008–09 and 2019–20, during which time the average level of annual observer coverage was 26.2% (Table 4). Corresponding annual estimated captures between 2008–09 and 2015–16 ranged 0–4 (mean 1.75) based on statistical capture models (Thompson et al 2013, Abraham et al 2016). All observed fur seal captures occurred in the Sub-Antarctic region.

Table 4: Number of tows by fishing year and observed and estimated New Zealand fur seal captures in orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish trawl fisheries. No. obs, number of observed tows; % obs, percentage of tows observed; Rate, number of captures per 100 observed tows. Estimates are based on methods described by Abraham & Richard (2020) and are available online at <https://protectedspeciescaptures.nz/PSCv9/released/>.

Fishing year	Fishing effort			Observed captures		Estimated captures	
	Tows	Observed tows	% observed	Number	Rate	Mean	95% c.i.
2002–03	8 870	1 380	15.6	0	0.00	6	1–13
2003–04	8 008	1 262	15.8	2	0.16	8	3–17
2004–05	8 424	1 618	19.2	4	0.25	10	5–18
2005–06	8 291	1 357	16.4	2	0.15	8	3–16
2006–07	7 369	2 322	31.5	2	0.09	4	2–9
2007–08	6 730	2 811	41.8	5	0.18	7	5–11
2008–09	6 133	2 372	38.7	0	0.00	4	0–9
2009–10	6 013	2 136	35.5	0	0.00	4	0–9
2010–11	4 177	1 205	28.8	0	0.00	2	0–7
2011–12	3 655	922	25.2	0	0.00	1	0–4
2012–13	3 099	346	11.2	0	0.00	1	0–3
2013–14	3 606	434	12.0	0	0.00	1	0–3
2014–15	3 812	978	25.7	1	0.10	1	1–3
2015–16	4 083	1 421	34.8	0	0.00	1	0–3
2016–17	3 971	1 226	30.9	0	0.00	0	0–2
2017–18	3 752	903	24.1	0	0.00	0	0–2
2018–19	3 906	1 189	30.4	1	0.08	1	1–3
2019–20	3 944	1 171	29.7	0	0.00	0	0–3
2020–21	4 072	1 322	32.5	0	0.00	0	0–2
2021–22	3 527	1 273	36.1	0	0.00	0	0–2
2022–23	3 316	1 326	40.0	0	0.00	0	0–2

5.3.2 Seabird captures

Annual observed seabird capture rates ranged from 0 to 1.02 per 100 tows in orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish trawl fisheries between 2002–03 and 2022–23 (Table 5). Capture rates have fluctuated without obvious trend at this low level. The average observed capture rate in deepwater trawl fisheries (including orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish) for the period from 2002–03 to 2022–23 is about 0.41 birds per 100 tows, a very low rate relative to other New Zealand trawl fisheries; e.g., for scampi (3.81 birds per 100 tows) and squid (12.05 birds per 100 tows) over the same years.

Table 5: Number of tows by fishing year and observed seabird captures in orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish trawl fisheries. No. obs, number of observed tows; % obs, percentage of tows observed; Rate, number of captures per 100 observed tows. Estimates are based on methods described by Abraham & Richard (2020).

Fishing year	Fishing effort			Obs. captures		Est. captures	
	Tows	No. Obs	% obs	Captures	Rate	Mean	95% c.i.
2002–03	8 870	1 380	15.6	0	0.00	38	22–57
2003–04	8 008	1 262	15.8	3	0.24	37	22–54
2004–05	8 424	1 618	19.2	7	0.43	39	25–56
2005–06	8 291	1 357	16.4	8	0.59	40	26–56
2006–07	7 369	2 322	31.5	1	0.04	24	13–38
2007–08	6 730	2 811	41.8	7	0.25	28	17–42
2008–09	6 133	2 372	38.7	7	0.30	25	15–38
2009–10	6 013	2 136	35.5	19	0.89	37	27–51
2010–11	4 177	1 205	28.8	1	0.08	16	7–28
2011–12	3 655	922	25.2	2	0.22	17	8–29
2012–13	3 099	346	11.2	2	0.58	16	7–28
2013–14	3 606	434	12.0	2	0.46	20	10–34
2014–15	3 812	978	25.7	0	0.00	16	7–29
2015–16	4 083	1 421	34.8	4	0.28	17	9–29
2016–17	3 971	1 226	30.9	2	0.16	16	8–28
2017–18	3 752	903	24.1	4	0.44	18	9–29
2018–19	3 906	1 189	30.4	11	0.93	24	16–35
2019–20	3 944	1 171	29.7	5	0.43	18	10–28
2020–21	4 072	1 322	32.5	10	0.76	23	15–34
2021–22	3 527	1 273	36.1	13	1.02	23	17–33
2022–23	3 316	1 326	40.0	6	0.45	15	9–24

Salvin's albatross was the most frequently captured albatross (38% of observed albatross captures), but eight different species have been observed captured since 2002–03. Cape petrels were the most frequently captured other taxon (29%, Table 6). Seabird captures in the orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish fisheries have been observed mostly around the Chatham Rise and off the east coast South

Island. These numbers should be regarded as only a general guide on the distribution of captures because the observer coverage is not uniform across areas and may not be representative.

Table 6: Number of observed seabird captures in orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish fisheries, 2002–03 to 2022–23, by taxon and area. The risk category is an estimate of aggregate potential fatalities for trawl and longline fisheries relative to the Population Sustainability Threshold, PST (an analogue of the PBR approach) (Edwards et al 2023). The current version of the risk assessment does not include recovery factor.

Species	Risk Category	Chatham Rise	East coast South Island	Fiordland	Sub-Antarctic	Stewart-Snares shelf	West coast South Island	West coast North Island	Total
Salvin's albatross	High	17	6	0	3	0	0	0	26
Southern Buller's albatross	Very high	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	5
Chatham Island albatross	Medium	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	12
New Zealand white-capped albatross	High	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	8
Gibson's albatross	Medium	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Antipodean albatross	Medium	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Northern royal albatross	Low	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Southern royal albatross	Low	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3
Black-browed albatrosses	NA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Albatrosses	NA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
All albatrosses		43	7	2	5	0	3	0	60
Double-banded plover	NA	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Northern giant petrel	Low	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	4
White-chinned petrel	Low	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
Grey petrel	Negligible	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3
Sooty shearwater	Negligible	5	3	0	0	0	1	0	9
Common diving petrel	Negligible	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	9
New Zealand white-faced storm petrel	Negligible	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Grey-backed storm petrel	NA	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Cape petrel	NA	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	7
Snares Cape petrel	Low	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Southern giant petrel	NA	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Fairy prion	Negligible	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Short-tailed shearwater	NA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Petrels, prions, and shearwaters	NA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total other birds		32	7	6	3	1	4	1	54

The deepwater trawl fisheries (including the orange roughy target fishery) contribute to the total risk posed by New Zealand commercial fishing to seabirds (see Table 7). The two species to which the fishery poses the most risk are Chatham Island albatross and Southern royal albatross, with this suite of fisheries posing 0.09 and 0.01 of risk (Table 7). Chatham Island albatross is assessed as at medium risk and Southern royal albatross as at low risk (Edwards et al 2023).

Table 7: Risk ratio of seabirds predicted by the SEFRA for the deepwater trawl fishery and all fisheries included in the SEFRA, 2006–07 to 2019–20, with a risk posed by the domestic tuna and swordfish SLL fishery. The risk ratio is an estimate of aggregate potential fatalities across trawl and longline fisheries relative to the Population Sustainability Threshold, PST (an analogue of the PBR approach) (Edwards et al 2023). The current version of the risk assessment does not include a recovery factor. The New Zealand threat classifications are shown (Robertson et al 2021).

Species name	Risk ratio			Risk category	NZ Threat Classification
	Deepwater trawl	Total risk from NZ commercial fishing	% of total risk from NZ commercial fishing		
Salvin's albatross	0.01	0.69	1.3	High	Threatened: Nationally Critical
Chatham Island albatross	0.09	0.27	34.0	Medium	At Risk: Naturally Uncommon
Northern Buller's albatross	<0.01	0.19	1.3	Medium	At Risk: Naturally Uncommon
Southern royal albatross	0.01	0.08	9.1	Low	Threatened: Nationally Vulnerable

Mitigation methods such as streamer (tori) lines, Brady bird bafflers, warp deflectors, and offal management are used in the orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish trawl fisheries. Warp mitigation was voluntarily introduced from about 2004 and made mandatory in April 2006 (Department of Internal Affairs 2006). The 2006 notice mandated that all trawlers over 28 m in length use a seabird scaring device while trawling (being “paired streamer lines”, “bird baffler” or “warp deflector” as defined in the Notice).

5.4 Benthic interactions

The spatial extent of seabed contact by trawl fishing gear in New Zealand's EEZ and Territorial Sea has been estimated and mapped in numerous studies for trawl fisheries targeting deepwater species (Baird et al 2011, Black et al 2013, Black & Tilney 2015, Black & Tilney 2017, Baird & Wood 2018, and Baird & Mules 2019, 2021a, b), species in waters shallower than 250 m (Baird et al 2015, Baird & Mules 2021a, b), and all trawl fisheries combined (Baird & Mules 2021a, b, MacGibbon et al 2024). The most recent estimates of the deepwater trawl footprint was for the period 1989–90 to 2023–24 and was completed using a combination of fisher reported and Geospatial Position Reporting (GPR) data by MPI.

Orange roughy and oreo are taken using bottom trawls and accounted for about 18% of all tows reported on TCEPR forms that fished on or close to the bottom between 1989–90 and 2023–24. From 1989–90 to 2023–24, about 65 226 bottom trawls targeting oreo species were reported on TCEPRs and ERS: between 1600–2500 tows were reported a year during 1989–90 to 1994–95; 2000–3300 tows between 1995–96 and 2009–10; and annual tows decreased from almost 2000 tows in 2010–11 to about 800 tows since 2015–16. The total footprint generated from these tows was estimated at about 17 400 km². This footprint represented coverage of 0.4% of the seafloor of the combined EEZ and the Territorial Sea areas; 1.3% of the 'fishable area', that is, the seafloor area open to trawling, in depths of less than 1600 m. For the 2023-24 fishing year, 723 oreo bottom tows had an estimated footprint of 251 km² which represented coverage of less than 0.1% of the EEZ and Territorial Sea and less than 0.1% of the fishable area.

The overall trawl footprint for oreo (1989–90 to 2020-21) covered 5% of the seafloor in 800–1000 m, 3% of 1000–1200 m seafloor, and 0.8% of the 1200–1600 m seafloor (MacGibbon & Mules 2023). The oreo footprint contacted 0.1%, less than 0.1%, and less than 0.1% of those depth ranges in 2023-24, respectively.

Trawling for orange roughy, oreo, and cardinalfish, like trawling for other species, is likely to have effects on benthic community structure and function (e.g., Rice 2006) and there may be consequences for benthic productivity (e.g., Jennings et al 2001, Hermesen et al 2003, Hiddink et al 2006, Reiss et al 2009). These consequences are not considered in detail here but are discussed in the Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Annual Review 2021 (Fisheries New Zealand 2021).

The New Zealand EEZ contains Benthic Protection Areas (BPAs) and seamount closures that are closed to bottom trawl fishing for the protection of benthic biodiversity. These combined areas include 28% of underwater topographic features (including seamounts), 52% of all seamounts over 1000 m elevation, and 88% of identified hydrothermal vents.

5.5 Other considerations

5.5.1 Spawning disruption

Fishing during spawning may disrupt spawning activity or success. Morgan et al (1999) concluded that Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) "exposed to a chronic stressor are able to spawn successfully, but there appears to be a negative impact of this stress on their reproductive output, particularly through the production of abnormal larvae". Morgan et al (1997) also reported that "Following passage of the trawl, a 300-m-wide "hole" in the [cod spawning] aggregation spanned the trawl track. Disturbance was detected for 77 min after passage of the trawl." There is no research on the disruption of spawning smooth oreo and black oreo by fishing in New Zealand, but spawning of both species appears to be over a protracted period (October to February) and over a wide area (O'Driscoll et al 2003). Fishing continues during the spawning period, possibly because localised spawning schools of smooth oreo, in particular, may provide good catch rates.

5.5.2 Genetic effects

Fishing and environmental changes, including those caused by climate change or pollution, could alter the genetic composition or diversity of a species. There are no known studies of the genetic diversity of

smooth or black oreo from New Zealand. Genetic studies for stock discrimination are reported under Section 3.

5.5.3 Habitat of particular significance to fisheries management

Fisheries New Zealand have developed guidelines on the identification of habitats of particular significance for fisheries management ([Habitats of particular significance for fisheries management | NZ Government](#)), and is in the process of reviewing available evidence for the development of an online register of habitats. O’Driscoll et al (2003) identified the south Chatham Rise as important for smooth oreo spawning, and the north, east, and south slopes as important for juveniles. The south Chatham Rise is also important for black oreo spawning and juveniles. Deepsea corals such as the reef-forming scleractinian corals and gorgonian sea fan corals are thought to provide prey and refuge for deep-sea fish (Fosså et al 2002, Stone 2006, Mortensen et al 2008). Large aggregations of deepwater species like orange roughy, oreos, and cardinalfish occur above seamounts with high densities of such ‘reef-like’ taxa, but it is not known if there are any direct linkages between the fish and corals. Bottom trawling for orange roughy, oreos, and cardinalfish has the potential to affect features of the habitat that could qualify as habitat of particular significance to fisheries management.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Abraham, E R; Berkenbusch, K; Richard, Y; Thompson, F (2016) Summary of the capture of seabirds, mammals, and turtles in New Zealand commercial fisheries, 2002–03 to 2012–13. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No.169*. 205 p.
- Abraham, E R; Richard, Y (2017) Summary of the capture of seabirds in New Zealand commercial fisheries, 2002–03 to 2013–14. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 184*. 88 p.
- Abraham, E R; Richard, Y (2018) Estimated capture of seabirds in New Zealand trawl and longline fisheries, 2002–03 to 2014–15. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 197*. 97 p.
- Abraham, E R; Richard, Y (2020) Estimated capture of seabirds in New Zealand trawl and longline fisheries, to 2017–18. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 249*. 86 p.
- Abraham, E R; Thompson, F N (2009) Capture of protected species in New Zealand trawl and longline fisheries, 1998–99 to 2006–07. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 32*. 197 p.
- Abraham, E R; Thompson, F N (2011) Summary of the capture of seabirds, marine mammals, and turtles in New Zealand commercial fisheries, 1998–99 to 2008–09. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 80*.
- Abraham, E R; Thompson, F N; Berkenbusch, K (2013) Estimated capture of seabirds in New Zealand trawl and longline fisheries, 2002–03 to 2010–11. Final Research Report for Ministry for Primary Industries project PRO2010-01 (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Abraham, E R; Tremblay-Boyer, L; Berkenbusch, K (2021) Estimated captures of New Zealand fur seal, common dolphin, and turtles in New Zealand commercial fisheries, to 2017–18. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 258*. 94 p.
- Anderson, O F; Finucci, B (2022) Non-target fish and invertebrate catch and discards in New Zealand orange roughy and oreo trawl fisheries from 2002–03 to 2019–20. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 282*. 117 p.
- Baird, S J; Hewitt, J E; Wood, B A (2015) Benthic habitat classes and trawl fishing disturbance in New Zealand waters shallower than 250 m. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 144*. 184 p.
- Baird, S J; Mules, R (2019) Extent of bottom contact by New Zealand commercial trawl fishing for deepwater Tier 1 and Tier 2 target species determined using CatchMapper software, fishing years 2008–17. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 229*. 106 p.
- Baird, S J; Mules, R (2021a) Extent of bottom contact by commercial fishing activity in New Zealand waters, for 1989–90 to 2017–18. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 259*. 143 p.
- Baird, S J; Mules, R (2021b) Extent of bottom contact by commercial trawling and dredging in New Zealand waters, 1989–90 to 2018–19. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 260*. 157 p.
- Baird, S J; Tracey, D; Mormede, S; Clark, M (2013) The distribution of protected corals in New Zealand waters. (Unpublished NIWA Client Report No: WLG2012-43 Prepared for the Department of Conservation.) 93 p. Available online at <https://www.doc.govt.nz/Documents/conservation/marine-and-coastal/marine-conservation-services/pop-2011-06-coral-distribution.pdf>
- Baird, S J; Wood, B A (2012) Extent of coverage of 15 environmental classes within the New Zealand EEZ by commercial trawling with seafloor contact. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 89*. 43 p.
- Baird, S J; Wood, B A (2018) Extent of bottom contact by New Zealand commercial trawl fishing for deepwater Tier 1 and Tier 2 target fishstocks, 1989–90 to 2015–16. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 193*. 102 p.
- Baird, S J; Wood, B A; Bagley, N W (2011) Nature and extent of commercial fishing effort on or near the seafloor within the New Zealand 200 n. mile Exclusive Economic Zone, 1989–90 to 2004–05. *New Zealand Aquatic Environmental and Biodiversity Report No. 73*. 48 p.
- Baker, C S; Boren, L; Childerhouse, S; Constantine, R; van Helden, A; Lundquist, D; Rayment, W; Rolfe, J. R (2019) Conservation status of New Zealand marine mammals, 2019. *New Zealand Threat Classification Series 29*. Department of Conservation, Wellington. 18 p.
- Baker, C S; Chilvers, B L; Childerhouse, S; Constantine, R; Currey, R; Mattlin, R; van Helden, A; Hitchmough, R; Rolfe, J (2016) Conservation status of New Zealand marine mammals, 2013. *New Zealand Threat Classification Series 14*. Department of Conservation, Wellington. 18 p.
- Baker, C S; Chilvers, B L; Constantine, R; DuFresne, S; Mattlin, R H; van Helden, A; Hitchmough, R (2010) Conservation status of New Zealand marine mammals (suborders Cetacea and Pinnipedia), 2009. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 44: 101–115.
- Ballara, S L; Anderson, O F (2009) Fish discards and non-target fish catch in the trawl fisheries for arrow squid and scampi in New Zealand waters. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 38*. 102 p.

- Black, J; Wood, R; Berthelsen, T; Tilney, R (2013) Monitoring New Zealand's trawl footprint for deepwater fisheries: 1989–1990 to 2009–2010. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 110*. 57 p.
- Black, J; Tilney, R (2015) Monitoring New Zealand's trawl footprint for deepwater fisheries: 1989–1990 to 2010–2011. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 142*. 56 p.
- Black, J; Tilney, R (2017) Monitoring New Zealand's trawl footprint for deepwater fisheries: 1989–90 to 2012–13. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 176*. 65 p.
- Brothers, N; Duckworth, A R; Safina, C; Gilman, E L (2010) Seabird bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries is grossly underestimated when using only haul data. *PLoS One* 5(8): e12491.
- Clark, M R; Anderson, O F; Gilbert, D J (2000) Discards in trawl fisheries for southern blue whiting, orange roughy, hoki, and oreos in waters around New Zealand. *NIWA Technical Report 71*. 73 p.
- Clark, M R; King, K J; McMillan, P J (1989) The food and feeding relationships of black oreo, *Allocyttus niger*, smooth oreo, *Pseudocyttus maculatus*, and eight other fish species from the continental slope of the south-west Chatham Rise, New Zealand. *Journal of Fish Biology* 35: 465–484.
- Clark, M; O'Driscoll, R (2003) Deepwater fisheries and aspects of their impact on seamount habitat in New Zealand. *Journal of Northwest Atlantic Fishery Science* 31: 441–458.
- Clark, M R; Rowden, A A (2009) Effect of deepwater trawling on the macro-invertebrate assemblages of seamounts on the Chatham Rise, New Zealand. *Deep Sea Research I* 56: 1540–1554.
- Coburn, R P; McMillan, P J (2006) Descriptions of the black oreo and smooth oreo fisheries in OEO 1, OEO 3A, OEO 4, and OEO 6 from 1977–78 to the 2004–05 fishing years. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2006/60*. 70 p.
- Coburn, R P; McMillan, P J; Gilbert, D J (2007) Inputs for a stock assessment of smooth oreo, Pukaki Rise (part of OEO 6). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/23*. 32 p.
- Department of Internal Affairs. (2006) Seabird Scaring Devices – Circular Issued Under Authority of the Fisheries (Commercial Fishing) Amendment Regulations 2006 (No. F361). *New Zealand Gazette* 6 April 2006: 842–846.
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Hart, A C (1997) Revision of smooth oreo life history parameters. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1997/9. 11 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Hart, A C (2008) Ageing of smooth oreo otoliths for stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/08*. 29 p.
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Kalish, J M; Hart, A C (1995) Age estimates for black oreo and smooth oreo. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document. 1995/14. 26 p. (Unpublished document held in NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Duffy, C; Francis, M; Dunn, M; Finucci, B; Ford, R; Hitchmough, R; Rolfe, J (2018) Conservation status of New Zealand chondrichthyans (chimaeras, sharks and rays), 2016. *New Zealand Threat Classification Series* 23. Department of Conservation, Wellington. 13 p.
- Dunn, M R; Szabo, A; McVeagh, M S; Smith, P J (2010) The diet of deepwater sharks and the benefits of using DNA identification of prey. *Deep-Sea Research I* 57: 923–930.
- Edwards, C T T; Peatman, T; Goad D; Webber, D N (2023) Update to the risk assessment for New Zealand seabirds. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 314*. 66 p.
- Finucci, B; Edwards, C T T; Anderson, O F; Ballara, S L (2019) Fish and invertebrate bycatch in New Zealand deepwater fisheries from 1990–91 until 2016–17. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 210*. 77 p.
- Fisheries New Zealand (2019) Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Annual Review 2018. Compiled by Fisheries Science, Fisheries New Zealand. 704 p.
- Fisheries New Zealand (2020) Fisheries Assessment Plenary, May 2020: stock assessments and stock status. Compiled by the Fisheries Science and Information Group, Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand. 1746 p.
- Fisheries New Zealand (2021) Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Annual Review 2019–20. Compiled by the Aquatic Environment Team, Fisheries Science and Information, Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand. 765 p.
- Fosså, J H; Mortensen, P B; Furevik, D M (2002) The deep-water coral *Lophelia pertusa* in Norwegian waters: distribution and fishery impacts. *Hydrobiologia* 471: 1–12.
- Hart, A C; McMillan, P J (1998) Trawl survey of oreos and orange roughy on the south Chatham Rise, October–November 1995 (TAN9511). *NIWA Technical Report 27*. 48 p.
- Hart, A C; McMillan, P J (2006) A summary of observer biological information on the New Zealand black oreo and smooth oreo fisheries from 1979–80 to 2004–05. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2006/55*. 39 p.
- Hermesen, J M; Collie, J S; Valentine, P C (2003) Mobile fishing gear reduces benthic megafaunal production on Georges Bank. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 260: 97–108.
- Hiddink, J G; Jennings, S; Kaiser, M J; Queiros, A M; Duplisea, D E; Piet, G J (2006) Cumulative impacts of seabed trawl disturbance on benthic biomass, production, and species richness in different habitats. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 63: 721–736.
- Jennings, S; Dinmore, T A; Duplisea, D E; Warr, K J; Lancaster, J E (2001) Trawling disturbance can modify benthic production processes. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 70: 459–475.
- Leathwick, J R; Rowden, A; Nodder, S; Gorman, R; Bardsley, S; Pinkerton, M; Baird, S J; Hadfield, M; Currie, K; Goh, A (2012) A Benthic-optimised Marine Environment Classification (BOMEC) for New Zealand waters. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 88*. 54 p.
- McKenzie, A (2007) Stock assessment for east Pukaki Rise smooth oreo (part of OEO 6). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/34*. 27 p.
- McMillan, P J; Doonan, I J; Hart, A C (1997) Revision of black oreo life history parameters. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1997/8. 13 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Middleton, D A J; Abraham, E R (2007) The efficacy of warp strike mitigation devices: Trials in the 2006 squid fishery. Final Research Report for research project IPA2006/02. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington).
- Morgan, M J; DeBlois, E M; Rose, G A (1997) An observation on the reaction of Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) in a spawning shoal to bottom trawling. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 54(Suppl. 1): 217–223.
- Morgan, M J; Wilson, C E; Crim, L W (1999) The effect of stress on reproduction in Atlantic cod. *Journal of Fish Biology* 54: 477–488.
- Mortensen, P B; Buhl-Mortensen, L; Gebruk, A V; Krylova, E M (2008) Occurrence of deep-water corals on the Mid-Atlantic Ridge based on MAR-ECO data. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography* 55: 142–152.
- MPI (2017) Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Annual Review 2017. Compiled by the Fisheries Management Science Team, Ministry for Primary Industries, Wellington, New Zealand. 724 p.
- O'Driscoll, R L; Booth, J D; Bagley, N W; Anderson, O F; Griggs, L H; Stevenson, M L; Francis, M P (2003) Areas of importance for spawning, pupping or egg-laying, and juveniles of New Zealand deepwater fish, pelagic fish, and invertebrates. *NIWA Technical Report 119*. 377 p.
- Ramm, K C (2011) Conservation Services Programme Observer Report for the period 1 July 2008 to 30 June 2009. Available at: www.doc.govt.nz/documents/science-and-technical/2008-09-csp-observer-report.pdf

- Ramm, K (2012a) Conservation Services Programme Observer Report: 1 July 2009 to 30 June 2010. Department of Conservation, Wellington. 130 p.
- Ramm, K (2012b) Conservation Services Programme Observer Report: 1 July 2010 to 30 June 2011. Department of Conservation, Wellington. 121 p.
- Reiss, H; Greenstreet, S P R; Siebe, K; Ehrlich, S; Piet, G J; Quirijns, F; Robinson, L; Wolff, W J; Kronke, I (2009) Effects of fishing disturbance on benthic communities and secondary production within an intensively fished area. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 394: 201–213.
- Rice, J (2006) Impacts of Mobile Bottom Gears on Seafloor Habitats, Species, and Communities: A Review and Synthesis of Selected International Reviews. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Research Document 2006/057. 35 p. (available from http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/CSAS/Csas/DocREC/2006/RES2006_057_e.pdf).
- Richard, Y; Abraham, E R (2013) Risk of commercial fisheries to New Zealand seabird populations. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 109*. 62 p.
- Richard, Y; Abraham, E R (2015) Assessment of the risk of commercial fisheries to New Zealand seabirds, 2006–07 to 2012–13. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 162*. 85 p.
- Richard, Y; Abraham, E R; Berkenbusch, K (2017) Assessment of the risk of commercial fisheries to New Zealand seabirds, 2006–07 to 2014–15. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 191*. 133 p.
- Richard, Y; Abraham, E R; Berkenbusch, K (2020) Assessment of the risk of commercial fisheries to New Zealand seabirds, 2006–07 to 2016–17. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 237*. 57 p.
- Richard, Y; Abraham, E R; Filippi, D (2011) Assessment of the risk to seabird populations from New Zealand commercial fisheries. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries research projects IPA2009-19 and IPA2009-20. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 66 p.
- Robertson, H A; Baird, K A; Elliott, G P; Hitchmough, R A; McArthur, N J; Makan, T D; Miskelly, C M; O'Donnell, C F J; Sagar, P M; Scofield, R P; Taylor, G A; Michel, P (2021) Conservation status of birds in Aotearoa New Zealand, 2021. *New Zealand Threat Classification Series* 36. Department of Conservation, Wellington. 43 p.
- Smith, P; McMillan, P; Proctor, C; Robertson, S; Knuckey, I; Diggles, B; Bull, B (1999) Stock relationships of smooth oreo in New Zealand waters. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project DEE9801. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 76 p.
- Smith, P; Proctor, C; Robertson, S; McMillan, P; Bull, B; Diggles, B (2000) Stock relationships of black oreo in New Zealand waters. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project DEE9801. Objective 1 (Part two). (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 79 p.
- Stevens, D W; Hurst, R J; Bagley, N W (2011) Feeding habits of New Zealand fishes: a literature review and summary of research trawl database records 1960 to 2000. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 85*. 218 p.
- Stewart, B D; Smith, D C (1994) Development of methods to age commercially important dories and oreos. Final Report to the Fisheries Research and Development Corporation, Australia.
- Stone, R P (2006) Coral habitat in the Aleutian Islands of Alaska: depth distribution, fine-scale species associations, and fisheries interactions. *Coral Reefs* 25: 229–238.
- Thompson, F N; Berkenbusch, K; Abraham, E R (2013) Marine mammal bycatch in New Zealand trawl fisheries, 1995–96 to 2010–11. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 105*. 73p.
- Tracey, D M; Rowden, A A; Mackay, K A; Compton, T (2011) Habitat-forming cold-water corals show affinity for seamounts in the New Zealand region. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 430: 1–22.
- Tuck, I; Cole, R; Devine, J (2009) Ecosystem indicators for New Zealand fisheries. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 42*. 188 p.
- Tuck, I D; Pinkerton, M H; Tracey, D M; Anderson, O A; Chiswell, S M (2014) Ecosystem and environmental indicators for deepwater fisheries. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 127*. 143 p.
- Ward, R D; Elliot, N G; Yearsley, G K; Last, P R (1996) Species and stock delineation in Australasian oreos (Oreosomatidae). Final Report to Fisheries Research and Development Corporation. 144 p. (Report held by National Library of Australia.)
- Williams, A; Schlacher, T A; Rowden, A A; Althaus, F; Clark, M R; Bowden, D A; Stewart, R; Bax, N J; Consalvey, M; Kloser, R J (2010) Seamount megabenthic assemblages fail to recover from trawling impacts. *Marine Ecology* 31 (Suppl. 1): 183–199.

OREOS — OEO 3A BLACK ORO AND SMOOTH ORO

1. FISHERY SUMMARY

This is presented in the Fishery Summary section at the beginning of the Introduction – Oreos chapter.

2. BIOLOGY

This is presented in the Biology section at the beginning of the Introduction – Oreos chapter.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

This is presented in the Stocks and Areas section at the beginning of the Introduction – Oreos chapter.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

The smooth oreo stock assessment is unchanged from 2009. The black oreo stock assessment for 2008 has been withdrawn but the CPUE series has been updated to 2012.

4.1 Introduction

The following assumptions were made in the stock assessment analyses to estimate biomasses and yields for black oreo and smooth oreo.

- (a) The acoustic abundance estimates were unbiased absolute values.
- (b) The CPUE analyses provided indices of abundance for either black oreo or smooth oreo in the whole of OEO 3A. Most of the oreo commercial catches came from the CPUE study areas. Research trawl surveys indicated that there was little habitat for, and biomass of, black oreo or smooth oreo outside those areas.
- (c) The ranges used for the biological values covered their true values.
- (d) The maximum fishing mortality (F_{MAX}) was assumed to be 0.9, varying this value from 0.5 to 3.5 altered B_0 for smooth oreo in OEO 3A by only about 6% in the 1996 assessment.
- (e) Recruitment was deterministic and followed a Beverton and Holt relationship with steepness of 0.75.
- (f) Catch overruns were 0% during the period of reported catch.
- (g) The populations of black oreo and smooth oreo in OEO 3A were discrete stocks or production units.
- (h) The catch histories were accurate.

4.1.1 Black oreo

The last accepted assessment was in 2008. A three-area population model was used to accommodate the structure of the catch and length data, with age-dependent migration between areas. However, new age data collected within each area suggest that, based on 2013 analyses, assumptions made by this model are incorrect. Specifically, differences in the size distribution between areas now seem likely to be due to differential growth rates, rather than to movement. The model applied in 2008 was therefore considered inadequate and has been withdrawn. No stock assessment is presented here; a new approach needs to be developed.

4.1.2 Smooth oreo

A new assessment of smooth oreo in OEO 3A was completed in 2009. This used a CASAL age-structured population model employing Bayesian methods. Input data included research and observer-collected length data, one absolute abundance estimate from a research acoustic survey carried out in 1997 (TAN9713), and three relative abundance indices from standardised catch per unit effort analyses.

4.2 Black oreo

Partition of the main fishery into 3 areas

The main fishery area was split into three areas: a northern area that contained small fish and was generally shallow (Area 1), a southern area that contained large fish in the period before 1993 and which was generally deeper (Area 3), and a transition area (Area 2) that lay between Areas 1 and 3 (Figure 1).




Figure 1: The three spatial areas used in the CASAL model and 2002 acoustic abundance survey. Area 1 at the top with right sloping shading; Area 2 in the middle with vertical shading; Area 3 at the bottom with left sloping shading. The thick dark line encloses management area OEO 3A.

The boundary between Areas 1 and 2 was defined in terms of the northern edge of the area that enclosed 90% of the total catch from the fishery. Areas 2 and 3 contained most of the fishery while Area 1 consisted of lightly fished and unfished ground. The boundary between Areas 2 and 3 was defined by the 32.5 cm contour in mean fish length for data before 1993 so that the fishery is split into an area containing smaller fish and another that has larger fish. The population outside the main fishery was assumed to follow the same relative dynamics.

Rejection of spatial model based on migration

The previous model reconciled the differences in commercial length distribution by using three areas. No age data were incorporated and instead lengths were used as a proxy for age. The dynamics were assumed to be recruitment in the shallow area (Area 1), with migration from Area 1 to Area 2, and also from Area 2 to Area 3, i.e., a one way movement to generally deeper water. The differences in the length distributions between areas drove the estimated migration rates by age. The stock assessment predicted that mature fish in the relatively unfished area (Area 1) comprised about 25% B_0 and so there were no sustainability concerns as this area was largely not fished.

To test the above migration hypothesis, otoliths sampled from acoustic survey mark identification trawls were aged and age distributions estimated for Area 1 and for the combined Areas 2 and 3 (Doonan, pers. comm.). The results showed deficiencies in the use of length data as a proxy for age in the stock assessment model. The age frequency in Area 1 was similar to that from Areas 2 and 3, but the model predicted them to be very different. Growth in Areas 2 and 3 appears to be faster than in Area 1 and this may drive the observed differences in length distributions. The migration model assumed the same growth in all areas. Maturity may be related to length rather than age, but it is age-based in the model. For these reasons, the Working Group rejected the stock assessment model in 2013. No formal stock assessment is presented here.

4.2.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

Catches by area

Catches were partitioned into the three areas by scaling up the estimated catch of black oreo from each area to the total reported catch (see tables 2 and 3 in the Fishery Summary section at the beginning of the Introduction – Oreos chapter) and are given in Table 1.

Table 1: Estimated black oreo catch (tonnes) for each fishing year in the three spatial model areas.

Year	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Total	Year	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Total
1972–73	110	2 010	1 320	†3 440	1992–93	180	2 221	1 717	4 117
1973–74	130	2 214	1 456	†3 800	1993–94	339	2 509	1 353	4 200
1974–75	170	2 970	1 960	†5 100	1994–95	139	1 894	845	2 878
1975–76	40	736	484	†1 260	1995–96	231	2 744	1 099	4 074
1976–77	130	2 260	1 490	†3 880	1996–97	418	2 095	1 035	3 548
1977–78	190	3 350	2 210	†5 750	1997–98	257	874	1 267	2 397
1978–79	27	750	30	806	1998–99	138	2 047	572	2 756
1979–80	39	2 189	4 762	6 990	1999–00	133	2 246	906	3 285
1980–81	793	7 813	4 090	12 696	2000–01	89	1 804	761	2 653
1981–82	12	7 616	3 851	11 479	2001–02	58	1 447	620	2 126
1982–83	57	3 384	2 577	6 018	2002–03	82	997	236	1 314
1983–84	682	5 925	3 192	9 800	2003–04	233	775	464	1 471
1984–85	148	1 478	2 218	3 844	2004–05	61	766	360	1 187
1985–86	13	814	1 112	1 938	2005–06	55	1 315	312	1 682
1986–87	33	1 863	1 908	3 805	2006–07	48	914	698	1 659
1987–88	49	2 399	1 439	3 888	2007–08	53	926	629	1 607
1988–89	244	3 532	811	4 588	2008–09	59	920	671	1 649
1989–90	696	1 164	1 288	3 148	2009–10	115	973	885	1 973
1990–91	753	1 947	1 330	4 030	2010–11	38	859	762	1 659
1991–92	289	1 250	1 816	3 355	2011–12	31	534	910	1 475

† Soviet catch, assumed to be mostly from OEO 3A and to be 50:50 black oreo: smooth oreo.

Observer length frequencies by area

Catch at length data collected by observers in Areas 1, 2, and 3 were extracted from the *obs_lfs* database (Table 2). Derived length frequencies for each group were calculated from the sample length frequencies weighted by the catch weight of each sample.

Table 2: Number of observed commercial tows where black oreo was measured for length frequency. A total of 60 tows were excluded because they had fewer than 30 fish measured, extreme mean lengths or missing catch information.

Year	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Other	Year	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Other
1985–86	0	1	0	0	1999–00	7	94	11	6
1986–87	0	2	6	0	2000–01	3	110	22	2
1987–88	0	6	3	0	2001–02	8	23	8	5
1988–89	30	8	4	2	2002–03	3	17	4	4
1989–90	12	6	1	0	2003–04	9	1	2	3
1990–91	2	5	7	1	2004–05	3	5	3	1
1991–92	0	10	1	0	2005–06	0	38	7	7
1992–93	0	0	0	0	2006–07	6	1	2	5
1993–94	8	16	2	5	2007–08	0	9	5	7
1994–95	0	4	2	2	2008–09	4	16	9	3
1995–96	2	3	2	6	2009–10	4	14	4	2
1996–97	0	1	1	2	2010–11	1	15	7	2
1997–98	13	2	5	0	2011–12	3	6	1	0
1998–99	2	1	0	3					

Research acoustic survey length frequencies by area

The 1997, 2002, 2006 and 2011 acoustic survey abundance at length data were converted to a length frequency using the combined sexes fixed length-weight relationship (“unsexed” in table 1, Biology section above) to convert the abundance to numbers at length (Table 3).

Absolute abundance estimates from the 1997, 2002, 2006 and 2011 acoustic surveys

Absolute estimates of abundance for black oreo are available from four acoustic surveys of oreos carried out from 10 November to 19 December 1997 (TAN9713), 25 September to 7 October 2002 (TAN0213), 17–30 October 2006 (TAN0615) and 17 November to 1 December 2011 (SWA1102). The 1997 survey covered the “flat” with a series of random north-south transects over six strata at depths of 600–1200 m. Seamounts were also sampled using parallel and “starburst” transects. Targeted and some random

(background) trawling was carried out to identify targets and to determine species composition. The 2002 survey was limited to flat ground with 77 acoustic transect and 21 mark identification tows completed. The 2006 (78 transects and 22 tows) and 2011 (72 transects and 25 tows) surveys were very similar to the 2002 survey and covered the main area of the black oreo fishery. The estimated total abundance (immature plus mature) for each survey by area is shown in Table 4.

Relative abundance estimates from standardised CPUE analysis

Standardised CPUE indices were obtained for each area. Because of the apparent changes in fishing practice attributable to the introduction of GPS, the data were split into pre- and post-GPS series. There were also major changes in the fishery from 1998–99 to 2001–02 when there were TACC reductions and the start of a voluntary industry catch limit on smooth oreo (1998–99). Two post-GPS series were therefore developed. The first of these was from 1992–93 to 1997–98 (early series) and the second was from 2002–03 onwards (late series) with data from the intervening years ignored. Since there are no new data for either the pre-GPS series or the post-GPS early series, these are left unchanged from previous standardisation results. Only the post-GPS late series is updated here, using data that extends from 2002–03 to 2011–12.

Table 3: Research length frequency proportions for the model area for the 1997, 2002, 2006 and 2011 acoustic surveys.
- no data for 1997 to 2006, lengths below 25 cm and greater than 38 were pooled.

Length (cm)	1997			2002			2006			2011		
	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3
22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.001	0.001	0.000
23	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.007	0.008	0.002
24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.021	0.019	0.007
25	0.015	0.013	0.009	0.022	0.016	0.008	0.009	0.017	0.015	0.031	0.029	0.010
26	0.035	0.027	0.019	0.039	0.030	0.013	0.026	0.035	0.032	0.027	0.027	0.019
27	0.113	0.061	0.029	0.051	0.038	0.018	0.066	0.073	0.055	0.044	0.047	0.032
28	0.165	0.090	0.038	0.085	0.062	0.029	0.118	0.105	0.077	0.083	0.086	0.055
29	0.153	0.104	0.064	0.117	0.091	0.044	0.152	0.143	0.113	0.112	0.114	0.072
30	0.143	0.105	0.065	0.139	0.119	0.060	0.175	0.153	0.132	0.153	0.154	0.107
31	0.131	0.119	0.089	0.123	0.122	0.086	0.156	0.157	0.154	0.159	0.157	0.125
32	0.102	0.121	0.105	0.137	0.133	0.127	0.117	0.136	0.169	0.121	0.119	0.153
33	0.046	0.094	0.098	0.112	0.123	0.141	0.073	0.089	0.119	0.121	0.118	0.175
34	0.041	0.086	0.097	0.065	0.084	0.138	0.059	0.056	0.076	0.069	0.067	0.126
35	0.029	0.058	0.083	0.054	0.064	0.100	0.032	0.026	0.037	0.026	0.029	0.057
36	0.015	0.043	0.091	0.021	0.052	0.104	0.014	0.009	0.014	0.018	0.018	0.034
37	0.006	0.037	0.080	0.015	0.025	0.049	0.001	0.001	0.004	0.005	0.005	0.018
38	0.006	0.042	0.131	0.020	0.041	0.083	0.003	0.001	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.005
39	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.000	0.000	0.002
40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.000	0.000	0.000
41	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.000	0.000	0.000
42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.000	0.000	0.000

Table 4: Total (immature plus mature) black oreo abundance estimates (t) and CVs for the 1997, 2002, 2006 and 2011 acoustic surveys for the three model areas in OEO 3A.

Acoustic survey	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Total
1997	148 000 (29)	10 000 (26)	5 240 (25)	163 000 (26)
2002	43 300 (31)	15 400 (27)	4 710 (38)	64 000 (22)
2006	56 400 (37)	16 400 (30)	5 880 (34)	78 700 (30)
2011	138 100 (27)	36 800 (30)	7 400 (34)	182 300 (25)

Only data within a pre-defined spatial area were considered useful for assessing abundance (Figure 2).

Quota management area: OEO3A




Figure 2: Spatial areas from which CPUE data were collected for inclusion in the standardisation. Areas A1 and A3 are shown, with A2 being the area between the two.

This area corresponds to the main fishing area and overlaps with the acoustic survey area (Figure 1). Tows were initially selected for inclusion in the CPUE standardisation if they targeted or caught black oreo within this area.

Uncertainty was assessed by bootstrapping the data, re-estimating the indices for each iteration, and estimating the coefficient of variation (CV) for each year/area from this distribution. The indices and CV estimates are listed in Table 5 and shown in Figure 3.

Table 5: OEO 3A black oreo pre-GPS and post-GPS time series of standardised catch per unit effort indices and bootstrapped CV estimates (%). Values for each series have been renormalized to a geometric mean of one. - indicates no estimate.

Fishing Year	Pre-GPS						Post-GPS					
	Area1		Area2		Area3		Area1		Area2		Area3	
	Index	CV	Index	CV	Index	CV	Index	CV	Index	CV	Index	CV
1979–80	-	-	1.45	39	1.52	125	-	-	-	-	-	-
1980–81	-	-	1.84	17	2.55	15	-	-	-	-	-	-
1981–82	-	-	1.71	22	2.15	9	-	-	-	-	-	-
1982–83	-	-	1.41	8	1.80	14	-	-	-	-	-	-
1983–84	-	-	0.99	8	1.04	19	-	-	-	-	-	-
1984–85	-	-	0.95	27	0.99	12	-	-	-	-	-	-
1985–86	-	-	0.63	31	0.66	33	-	-	-	-	-	-
1986–87	-	-	0.81	22	0.88	36	-	-	-	-	-	-
1987–88	-	-	0.45	20	0.49	23	-	-	-	-	-	-
1988–89	-	-	0.72	21	0.23	44	-	-	-	-	-	-
1989–90	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1990–91	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1991–92	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1992–93	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.62	14	2.46	20
1993–94	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.17	17	1.20	15
1994–95	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.96	13	0.82	17
1995–96	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.89	15	0.68	22
1996–97	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.06	18	0.96	17
1997–98	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.58	47	0.64	63
1998–99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1999–00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2000–01	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2001–02	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2002–03	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.62	90	1.11	24	0.9	38
2003–04	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.99	45	1.15	27	1.05	37
2004–05	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.33	63	0.85	32	0.8	56
2005–06	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.1	63	1.34	23	0.99	31
2006–07	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.51	78	1.05	27	1.49	24
2007–08	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.52	44	0.67	66	0.84	33
2008–09	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.65	73	0.84	44	0.75	30
2009–10	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.17	29	1.02	26	1.06	30
2010–11	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.38	52	0.89	30	0.9	22
2011–12	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.37	44	1.28	24	1.49	18

4.3 Smooth oreo

2009 assessment

The stock assessment analyses were conducted using the CASAL age-structured population model employing Bayesian statistical techniques. The 2005 assessment was updated by including five more years of catch, CPUE and observer length data, and used two new series of post-GPS standardised CPUE, one before and the second after major TACC and catch limit changes. The modelling took account of the sex and maturity status of the fish and treated OEO 3A as a single smooth oreo fishery, i.e., no sub-areas were recognised. The base case model used the 1997 absolute acoustic abundance estimate, pre-GPS and early and late post-GPS series of standardised CPUE indices, and the mean natural mortality estimate (0.063 yr^{-1}). Acoustic and observer length frequencies were used in a preliminary model run to estimate selectivity and the base case fixed these selectivity estimates but did not use the length frequencies. Other cases investigated the sensitivity of the model to data sources including:

- Use of the upper and lower 95% confidence interval values for estimates of natural mortality ($0.042\text{--}0.099 \text{ yr}^{-1}$);
- Use of only the left hand limb of the 1994 observer length frequency (plus the 1997 acoustic survey length frequency) with growth not estimated by the model.




Figure 3: Standardised commercial CPUE series for black oreo in each area within OEO 3A. Pre-GPS and post-GPS (early and late) series are shown, each renormalized to a geometric mean of one. Error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals assuming a lognormal error distribution and using the CVs listed in Table 5.

4.3.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

Catch history

The estimated catches were scaled up to the total reported catch (see tables 2 and 3 in the Fishery Summary section at the beginning of the Introduction – Oreos chapter) and are given in Table 6.

Table 6: Reconstructed catch history (t)

Year	Catch	Year	Catch	Year	Catch	Year	Catch
1972–73	†3 440	1981–82	1 288	1990–91	5 054	1999–00	1 789
1973–74	†3 800	1982–83	2 495	1991–92	6 622	2000–01	1 621
1974–75	†5 100	1983–84	3 979	1992–93	4 334	2001–02	1 673
1975–76	†1 260	1984–85	4 351	1993–94	4 942	2002–03	1 412
1976–77	†3 880	1985–86	3 142	1994–95	4 199	2003–04	1 254
1977–78	†5 750	1986–87	3 190	1995–96	4 022	2004–05	1 457
1978–79	650	1987–88	5 905	1996–97	3 239	2005–06	1 445
1979–80	5 215	1988–89	6 963	1997–98	4 733	2006–07	1 306
1980–81	2 196	1989–90	6 459	1998–99	2 474	2007–08	1 526

† Soviet catch, assumed to be mostly from OEO 3A and to be 50:50 black oreo:smooth oreo.

Observer length frequencies

Observer length data were extracted from the observer database. These data represent proportional catch at length and sex. All length samples were from the CPUE study area (see Figure 4). Only samples where 30 or more fish were measured, and the catch weight and a valid depth were recorded, were included in the analysis. Data from adjacent years were pooled because of the paucity of data in some years. The pooled length frequencies were applied in the model at the year that the median observation of the grouped samples was taken (Table 7).




Figure 4: Locations of all tows in OEO 3A with a reported catch of smooth oreo from 1979–80 to 2002–03 (dots). The study area is shown along with the line chosen to split north from south Chatham rise catches.

Table 7: Observer length frequencies; numbers of length samples (tows sampled), number of fish measured and groups of pooled years. * - year that the length data were applied in the stock assessment model. -, not applicable.

Year	No. length samples	No. fish measured	Year group code	Year	No. length samples	No. fish measured	Year group code
1979–80	32	3 499	1*	1994–95	7	752	4
1980–81	0	0	-	1995–96	2	207	4
1981–82	0	0	-	1996–97	3	365	5
1982–83	0	0	-	1997–98	13	1 720	5
1983–84	0	0	-	1998–99	5	770	5
1984–85	0	0	-	1999–00	77	7 595	5*
1985–86	1	106	2	2000–01	93	9 389	6*
1986–87	4	387	2	2001–02	20	3 030	7*
1987–88	10	1 300	2*	2002–03	14	1 427	8*
1988–89	14	1 512	2	2003–04	4	321	8
1989–90	0	0	-	2004–05	9	840	8
1991–92	9	919	3	2005–06	26	3 207	9*
1992–93	0	0	-	2006–07	2	205	9
1993–94	13	1 365	4*	2007–08	8	816	9

Length frequency data from the 1997 acoustic survey

Length data collected during the 1997 survey were used to generate a population length frequency by sex. A length frequency was generated from the trawls in each mark-type and also for the seamounts. These frequencies were combined using the fraction of smooth oreo abundance in each mark-type. The overall frequency was normalised over both male and female frequencies so that the sum of the frequencies over both sexes was 100%. The CV for each length class was given by the regression, $\log(\text{CV}) = 0.86 + 8.75/\log(\text{proportion})$. This regression was estimated from the CVs obtained by bootstrapping the data and provides a smoothed estimate of the CVs. The estimated length frequency is in Figure 5.

Absolute abundance estimates from the 1997 acoustic survey

Absolute estimates of abundance for smooth oreo are available from the acoustic survey on oreos carried out from 10 November to 19 December 1997 (TAN9713) using the same approach as described for OEO 3A black oreo. The abundance estimates used in the 1999 OEO 3A smooth oreo assessment were revised in 2005 using new target strength estimates for smooth oreo, black oreo and a number of bycatch species. The revised estimate was 25 200 t with a CV of 23% (the 1999 estimate was 35 100 t with a CV of 27%). There is uncertainty in the estimates of biomass because the acoustic estimate includes smooth oreo in layers that are a mixture of species for which the acoustic method has potential bias problems.




Figure 5: Population length frequency derived from the 1997 acoustic survey data. The bold line is the estimated value and the shaded area is the spread from 300 bootstraps.

Relative abundance estimates from standardised CPUE analysis

The CPUE study area is shown in Figure 4. Three analyses were carried out; a pre-GPS analysis (unchanged from 2005) that included data from 1980–81 to 1988–89 and two post-GPS analyses that included data from 1992–93 to 1997–98 and 2002–03 to 2007–08. The years from 1998–99 to 2001–02 were not included because a voluntary smooth oreo catch limit (1400 t) was introduced and substantial oreo TACC reductions were made during that time (6600 down to 3100 t). The pre-GPS series shows a downward trend, and declines to approximately a third of the initial level over the nine-year period. The early post-GPS also has

a downward trend but the late post-GPS series has an upward trend and then flattens out. The base case stock assessment used all three indices (Table 8).

Fishing Industry members of the Deepwater Fishery Assessment Working Group expressed concern about the accuracy of the historical Soviet catch and effort data (pre-GPS series) and felt that it was inappropriate to use those data in the stock assessment.

Table 8: CPUE indices by year and jackknife CV (%) estimates from the pre-GPS and the two post-GPS analyses.

Pre-GPS						Post-GPS		
Year	Index	CV	Year	Index	CV	Year	Index	CV
1980–81	1.00	27	1992–93	1.00	24	2002–03	0.55	23
1981–82	0.82	26	1993–94	0.88	11	2003–04	0.77	22
1982–83	0.72	62	1994–95	0.74	14	2004–05	0.99	22
1983–84	0.59	61	1995–96	0.48	17	2005–06	0.96	31
1984–85	0.72	22	1996–97	0.56	15	2006–07	1.00	20
1985–86	0.61	19	1997–98	0.50	19	2007–08	0.92	21
1986–87	0.46	16						
1987–88	0.42	16						
1988–89	0.26	28						

4.3.2 Biomass estimates

The posterior distributions from the MCMC on the base case are shown in Figure 6. The probability that the current mature biomass (2008–09) and the biomass 5 years out (2013–14) are above 20% B_0 is 1 for both.




Figure 6: Smooth oreo OEO 3A: posterior distribution for the virgin biomass (top plot) and the mature biomass trajectories as a percentage of virgin biomass (bottom plot) from the MCMC analysis of the “NoLF” case with $M = 0.063$ (base case). In the top plot, the vertical line is the median of the distribution. In the bottom plot, the grey area is the point-wise 95% confidence intervals of the trajectories and the solid line is the median.

Biomass estimates derived from the MCMC are in Table 9. Total mature biomass for 2008–09 was estimated to be 36% of the initial biomass (B_0). Sensitivity case results for the base case using the lower and upper 95% confidence interval value estimates for M gave estimates of current biomass between 26% and 49% of B_0 . The sensitivity case that used the left hand limb of the 1994 observer length frequency (plus the 1997 acoustic survey length frequency) with growth not estimated by the model gave estimates of current biomass for the mean estimate of M (0.063 yr^{-1}) of 30 % of B_0

while estimates using the lower and upper 95% confidence interval value estimates for M gave estimates of 2008 biomass between 12% and 59% of B_0 .

Projections were carried out for five years with the current catch limit of 1400 t. The trajectory shows increasing biomass (Figure 6).

Table 9 (a): Base case (in bold) and sensitivity to M values (biomass estimates). Bcurr is 2008.

	$M = 0.063$			$\dagger M = 0.042$			$\dagger M = 0.099$		
	Median	CI.05	CI.95	Median	CI.05	CI.95	Median	CI.05	CI.95
B_0	85 000	77 300	96 500	97 700	90 100	110 000	68 500	60 300	79 600
B_{cur}	30 900	22 400	43 000	26 300	18 000	38 800	33 800	25 000	45 500
$B_{cur}(\%B_0)$	36	29	45	27	20	35	49	41	57

Table 9 (b): Sensitivity (biomass estimates). In these runs the left hand limb of the 1994 observer length was fitted, the 1997 acoustic survey length frequency was included and growth was not estimated by the model.

	$\dagger M = 0.063$			$\dagger M = 0.042$			$\dagger M = 0.099$		
	Median	CI.05	CI.95	Median	CI.05	CI.95	Median	CI.05	CI.95
B_0	77 400	74 800	80 200	82 800	81 600	84 200	82 300	76 700	89 200
B_{cur}	23 100	19 900	26 400	10 200	8 480	12 100	48 800	42 900	56 200
$B_{cur}(\%B_0)$	30	27	33	12	10	14	59	56	63

4.3.3 Other factors

Because of differences in biological parameters between the species, it would be appropriate to split the current TACC for black oreo and smooth oreo. The WG noted that separate species catch limits are in place to reduce the risk of over- or under-fishing either smooth oreo or black oreo.

The model estimates of uncertainty are unrealistically low. Uncertainties that are not included in the model include:

- the assumption that recruitment is deterministic;
- that the acoustic index is assumed to be an absolute estimate of abundance;
- the selectivity in the base case is fixed at the MPD estimate from the preliminary case where all length data is used;
- uncertainty in the estimate of M .

In addition, the growth is fixed and known. The WG has previously noted the impact of the different ages of maturity for males and females. Due to the fact that males mature at a much smaller size than females (age at 50% maturity is 18–19 years for males and 25–26 for females), the sex ratio needs to be taken into account when assessing the sustainability of any particular catch level.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

The smooth oreo stock assessment is unchanged from 2009. The black oreo stock assessment is updated using CPUE data up to 2011–12.

Stock Structure Assumptions

The two oreo stocks in FMA 3A are assessed separately but managed as a single stock. For both the black oreo and smooth oreo stocks it is assumed that there is potential mixing with stocks outside of the OEO 3A area.

- **OEO 3A (Black Oreo)**

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2013	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Very Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2011–12	Catch: 1 475 t

Assessment Runs Presented	Age-structured CASAL spatial assessment model rejected by the Working Group; CPUE accepted
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: $F_{40\% B_0}$
Status in relation to Target	Unknown
Status in relation to Limits	Unknown
Status in relation to Overfishing	Unknown
Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status	
-	

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Unknown
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Catch has decreased with TACC since the early 1990s and remained low and relatively constant over the last 10 years.
Other Abundance Indices	CPUE since 2002–03 has stabilised in all three areas after significant declines in the two deeper areas in the 1980s and 1990s.
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	-
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unknown

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 2 – Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	CPUE	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2013	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	CPUE abundance	1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)		
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	The three area model with migration based on age is thought to be flawed and the previous model has been withdrawn.	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	-	


Qualifying Comments
-

Fishery Interactions
Both species of oreo are sometimes taken as bycatch in orange roughy target fisheries, mostly in other areas e.g. OEO 4. The main bycatch species in the OEO 3A black oreo target fishery include smooth oreo, hoki, javelinfish, Baxter's dogfish, pale ghost shark, ridge scaled rattail, and basketwork eel. Bycatch species that may be vulnerable to overfishing include deepwater sharks and rays. Protected species catches include seabirds and deepwater corals. Oreo are caught using bottom trawl gear. Bottom trawling interacts with benthic habitats.

- OEO 3A (Smooth Oreos)

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2009	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2007–08	Catch: 1 526 t
Assessment Runs Presented	One base case and 5 sensitivity runs	
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold:	
Status in relation to Target	For the base case, B_{2009} was estimated at 36% B_0 , About as Likely as Not (40–60%) to be at or above the target.	
Status in relation to Limits	B_{2009} is Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the Soft Limit and Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below the Hard Limit.	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



Mature biomass trajectories as a percentage of virgin biomass from the base case. The grey area is the point-wise 95% confidence intervals of the trajectories and the solid line is the median.

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Biomass is projected to have been increasing since the late 1990s.
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	Unknown
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis (2009)

Stock Projections or Prognosis	The biomass is expected to increase over the next 5 years given the current catch limit of 1400 t.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%)
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	-

Assessment Methodology

Assessment Type	Level 1 – Full Quantitative Stock Assessment
Assessment Method	Age-structured CASAL model with Bayesian estimation of posterior distributions

Assessment dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2009	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	-	
Main data inputs (rank)	- One acoustic absolute abundance estimate (1997) - three standardised CPUE indices (1981–82 to 1988–89, 1992–93 to 1997–98, 2002–03 to 2007–08) - Natural mortality estimate (0.063) - Selectivity estimated from acoustic and observer length frequencies New information from previous (2005) assessment: - Updated with additional catch, CPUE, observer length data collected since last assessment - two new standardised post-GPS CPUE series	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- The single acoustic index (1997) is assumed to be an absolute estimate of abundance - Sex ratio needs to be taken into account, as males mature at a much smaller size than females. - Recruitment is assumed to be deterministic. - Uncertainty in the estimates of natural mortality (M) - Selectivity is fixed in the base case at the MPD estimate from the preliminary study	

Qualifying Comments

-

Fishery Interactions

Both species of oreo are sometimes taken as bycatch in orange roughy target fisheries, mostly in other areas e.g. OEO 4. The main bycatch species in the OEO 3A smooth oreo target fishery include black oreo, hoki, javelinfish, Baxter's dogfish, pale ghost shark, ridge scaled rattail and basketwork eel. Low productivity bycatch species include deepwater sharks and rays. Protected species catches include seabirds and deepwater corals. Oreos are caught using bottom trawl gear. Bottom trawling interacts with benthic habitats.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Coburn, R P; Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J (1999) Black oreo abundance indices from standardised catch per unit of effort data for OEO 3A. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1999/32. 18 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Coburn, R P; Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J (2006) Smooth oreo OEO 3A abundance estimates from standardised catch per unit of effort data, 1979–80 to 2002–03. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2006/35*. 38 p.
- Coburn, R P; McMillan, P J; Gilbert, D J (2007) Inputs for a stock assessment of smooth oreo, Pukaki Rise (part of OEO 6). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/23*. 32 p.
- Cordue, P L (1996) A model-based method for bounding virgin biomass using a catch history, relative biomass indices, and ancillary information. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1996/8. 48 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Doonan, I J; Coburn, R P; McMillan, P J (2009) Assessment of OEO 3A black oreo for 2006–07. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2009/12*. 46 p.
- Doonan, I J; Coburn, R P; McMillan, P J; Hart, A C (2004) Assessment of OEO 3A black oreo for 2002–03. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2004/52*. 54 p.
- Doonan, I J; Coombs, R F; McMillan, P J; Dunn, A (1998) Estimate of the absolute abundance of black and smooth oreo in OEO 3A and 4 on the Chatham Rise. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project OEO9701. 47 p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J (2001) A non-parametric age selectivity ogive for OEO 3A black oreo for 2001–02. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/40*. 17 p.
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (1996) Assessment of Chatham Rise smooth oreo (OEO 3A and OEO 4) for 1996. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1996/17. 21 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (1997) Assessment of Chatham Rise smooth oreo (OEO 3A and OEO 4) for 1997. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1997/21. 26 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (1999a) Assessment of OEO 3A smooth oreo for 1999–2000. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1999/45. 21 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)

- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (1999b) Assessment of OEO 3A black oreo for 1999–2000. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1999/52. 30 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (2003) Assessment of OEO 4 smooth oreo for 2002–03. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/50*. 55 p.
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C; Cordue, P L (1995) Assessment of smooth oreo for 1995. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1995/12. 31 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Hart, A C (2008) Ageing of smooth oreo otoliths for stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/08*. 29 p.
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Hart, A H (2016) Comparison of the fraction of mature black oreo between Area 1 and Area 2&3 (OEO 3A). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2016/20*.
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Hart, A C; Coombs, R F (2003) Smooth oreo abundance estimates from the October–November 2001 acoustic survey of the south Chatham Rise (OEO 4). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/26*. 21 p.
- Francis, R I C C (1992) Recommendations concerning the calculation of maximum constant yield (MCY) and current annual yield (CAY). New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1992/8. 27 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- McKenzie, A (2007) Stock assessment for east Pukaki Rise smooth oreo (part of OEO 6). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/34*. 27 p.
- McMillan, P J; Doonan, I J; Hart, A C; Coburn, R P (1998) Oreos stock assessment. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project OEO9702. 16 p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- McMillan, P J; Hart, A C (1991) Assessment of black and smooth oreos for the 1991–92 fishing year. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1991/10. 29 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Smith, M H; Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Hart, A C (2006) Black oreo abundance estimates from the September–October 2002 acoustic survey of the south Chatham Rise (OEO 3A). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2006/33*. 20 p.

OREOS – OEO 4 BLACK ORO AND SMOOTH ORO

1. FISHERY SUMMARY

This is presented in the Fishery Summary section at the beginning of the Introduction – Oreos chapter.

2. BIOLOGY

This is presented in the Biology section at the beginning of the Introduction – Oreos chapter.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

This is presented in the Stocks and Areas section at the beginning of the Introduction – Oreos chapter.

4. STOCK ASSESMENT

4.1 Introduction

In 2018, the stock assessment was updated for smooth oreo in OEO 4.

4.2 Black oreo

Investigations were carried out in 2009 using age-based single sex single step preliminary models in CASAL. The data used in these models were four standardised CPUE indices (pre- and post-GPS in the east and west), and observer length frequencies. Growth and maturity were also estimated in some of the runs.

4.2.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

Absolute abundance estimates from the 1998 acoustic survey

Absolute estimates of abundance were available from an acoustic survey on oreos which was carried out from 26 September to 30 October 1998 on *Tangaroa* (voyage TAN9812). Transects on flat ground were surveyed to a stratified random design and a random sample of seamounts were surveyed with either a random transect (large seamounts) or a systematic “star” transect design. For some seamounts the flat ground nearby was also surveyed to compare the abundance of fish on and near the seamount either by extending the length of the star transects or by extra parallel transects. Acoustic data were collected concurrently for flat and seamounts using both towed and hull mounted transducers. The OEO 4 survey covered 59 transects on the flat and 29 on seamounts. A total of 95 tows were carried out for target identification and to estimate target strength and species composition. In situ and swimbladder samples for target strength data were collected and these have yielded revised estimates of target strength for both black oreo and smooth oreo.

Acoustic abundance estimates for recruit black oreo from seamounts and flat for the whole of OEO 4 are in Table 1. About 59% of the black oreo abundance came from the background mark-type. This mark-type is not normally fished by the commercial fleet and this implies that the abundance estimate did not cover the fish normally taken by the fishery. In addition the scaling factor to convert the acoustic area estimate to the trawl survey area estimate was 4.3, i.e., the acoustic survey area only had about 23% of the abundance. The magnitude of this ratio suggests that the size of the area surveyed was borderline for providing a reliable abundance estimate.

Relative abundance estimates from standardised CPUE analyses – 2009 analysis

The CPUE analysis method involved regression based methods on the positive catches only. Sensitivities were run where the positive catch tow data and the zero catch tow data were analysed separately to produce

positive catch and zero catch indices. All data were included, whether they were target or bycatch fisheries, with the target offered to the model (and not accepted).

Table 1: OEO 4 recruit black oreo seamount, flat, and total acoustic abundance estimates (t) and recruit CV (%) based on knife-edge recruitment (23 years).

	Abundance (t)	CV (%)
Seamount	127	91
Flat	13 800	56
Total	13 900	55

The best data-split was investigated using the Akaike Information Criteria (AIC) on a number of potential regressions. Four indices were subsequently used, pre- and post-GPS in the east and west areas respectively. These two areas are very distinct: the west consists of flat fishing and the east of hill fishing, the west area was fished 10 years prior to the east, and there has been a move by the fishery since the early 1990s from the west to the east. However, despite these differences, the two series present almost identical patterns of decline in relative standardised CPUEs from the time fishing started in earnest (1980 in the west and 1992 in the east) which would suggest that for this fishery CPUE might be a reasonable index of abundance (because less influenced by technology, fishing patterns, hills or flats etc).

The standardised CPUE series and CVs are described in Table 2. Over comparable time periods and data sets, the trends from the updated series were similar to those from the 2000 analyses (Coburn et al 2001b). The west CPUE reduced to between 5% of the 1980 value and 15% of the 1981 value by 1990. The post-GPS west series is either flat or slightly increasing. The east CPUE reduced to 4% of the 1984 value and 21% of the 1985 value by 1990 even though catches were low. The post-GPS east series showed a further steep initial decline with total reduction to 15% of the 1993 value by 2008.

Table 2: OEO 4 black oreo standardised CPUE analyses in 2009 (expressed in t / tow).

Fishing year	Pre-GPS east		Pre-GPS west		Fishing year	Post-GPS east		Post-GPS west	
	Index	CV	Index	CV		Index	CV	Index	CV
1980			8.97	0.17	1993	0.71	0.15	0.73	0.41
1981			4.00	0.11	1994	0.63	0.13	0.45	0.32
1982			2.24	0.10	1995	0.31	0.15	0.41	0.31
1983			2.20	0.09	1996	0.21	0.15	0.28	0.27
1984	0.47	0.95	1.54	0.10	1997	0.24	0.12	0.61	0.27
1985	0.41	0.28	1.51	0.07	1998	0.20	0.11	0.45	0.23
1986	0.38	0.32	1.28	0.10	1999	0.16	0.12	0.46	0.23
1987	0.65	0.30	0.67	0.10	2000	0.17	0.12	0.68	0.25
1988	0.10	0.18	0.54	0.13	2001	0.14	0.08	0.62	0.24
1989	0.02	0.20	0.48	0.12	2002	0.18	0.07	0.47	0.29
					2003	0.13	0.06	0.49	0.24
					2004	0.13	0.06	0.93	0.24
					2005	0.14	0.07	0.91	0.26
					2006	0.13	0.07	0.68	0.26
					2007	0.12	0.07	1.00	0.27
					2008	0.10	0.09	0.88	0.24

Relative abundance estimates from trawl surveys

The estimates, and their CVs, from the four standard *Tangaroa* south Chatham Rise trawl surveys are treated as relative abundance indices (Table 3).

Table 3: OEO 4 black oreo research survey abundance estimates (t). N is the number of stations. Estimates were made using knife-edge recruitment set at 33 cm TL. Previously knife-edge recruitment was set at 27 cm and estimates of abundance based on that value are also provided for comparison.

Year	Mean abundance		CV (%)	N
	27 cm	33 cm		
1991	34 407	13 065	40	105
1992	29 948	12 839	46	122
1993	20 953	6 515	30	124
1995	29 305	9 238	30	153

Observer length frequencies

Observer length frequencies were available for about 20% of the yearly catch from 1989 to 2008. Analyses conducted on these data indicated that they were not representative of the spatial spread of the

fishery. When stratified by depth, the length frequencies had double-modes, centred around 28 cm and 38 cm, with inconsistent trends in the modes between years. Alternative stratification by subarea, hill, etc, did not resolve the problem; some tows showed bimodality. These patterns in length frequencies were an issue because the yearly shifts in length frequencies and double mode cannot be representative of the underlying fish population since black oreo is a slow growing long-lived fish. They are more likely linked with discrete spatial sub-groups of the population.

A similar double mode was reported for some strata in the same area from the 1994 *Tangaroa* trawl survey (Tracey & Fenaughty 1997). It is likely that there is further spatial stock structure that is currently unaccounted for.

4.2.2 Biomass estimates

The 2009 stock assessment of OEO 4 black oreo was inconclusive as assessment models were unable to represent the observer length frequency structure, and were considered unreliable. The CPUE was fitted satisfactorily under a two-stock model but could not be fitted in a single homogeneous stock model. However, the WG agreed that:

1. The CPUE indices are consistent with a two-stock structure or at least a minimally-mixing single stock.
2. The updated CPUE estimates were probably a reasonable indicator of abundance (at the spatial scale of the east and west analyses).

4.2.3 Estimation of Maximum Constant Yield (MCY)

In 2000, MCY was estimated using the equation, $MCY = c \cdot Y_{AV}$ (Method 4). There was no trend in the annual catches, nominal CPUE, or effort from 1982–83 to 1987–88 so that period was used to calculate the MCY estimate (1200 t). The MCY calculation was not updated in 2009.

4.2.4 Estimation of Current Annual Yield (CAY)

CAY cannot be estimated because of the lack of current biomass estimates.

4.3 Smooth oreo

Smooth oreo was assessed in 2018 using a CASAL age-structured population model with Bayesian estimation, incorporating stochastic recruitment, life history parameters (table 1 of the Biology section at the beginning of the Introduction – Oreos chapter), and catch history up to 2017–18. In early assessments (Doonan et al 2001, 2003, 2008), the stock area was split at 178° 20' W into a west and an east fishery based on an analysis of commercial catch, standardised CPUE, and research trawl and acoustic result, and data fitted in the model included acoustic survey abundance estimates, standardised CPUE indices, observer length data, and the acoustic survey length data. In 2012, the Deepwater Working Group decided that using CPUE to index abundance should be discontinued, due to changes in fishing patterns over time within the stock area. With no CPUE indices, the 2012 assessment was simplified to a single area model using only the observations of vulnerable biomass from acoustic surveys carried out in 1998, 2001, 2005, and 2009.

A 2014 stock assessment updated the 2012 assessment model using the same single area model structure and used an additional observation of biomass from the research acoustic survey carried out in 2012. The assessment also revised the previous assessments by including the age frequency estimates from the 1998 and 2005 acoustic surveys and by estimating relative year class strengths. The 2018 assessment updated the 2014 assessment with the inclusion of an additional acoustic survey biomass estimate in 2016 and the associated age frequency. An age frequency from a 1991 trawl survey was also included together with an age frequency from the commercial fishery in 2009. With the addition of three new age frequencies natural mortality was estimated within the model (with a Normal prior with the mean equal to 0.063 and CV=25% – see table 1 in the Biology section).

Year class strengths (YCS) were estimated for 1940–2005 (based on the range of age estimates in the age frequency data). A “near uniform” prior was used (parameterised as a lognormal distribution with

a mode of 1 and sigma of 4), which places minimum constraint on the free YCS parameters (Haist parameterisation).

An informed prior was used for the acoustic survey proportionality constant q (lognormal with mean of 0.83 and CV of 0.3). The prior was based on limited information on target strength, the QMA scaling-factor, and the proportion of vulnerable biomass in the vulnerable acoustic marks (Fu & Doonan 2013).

A brief description of the base case and sensitivity runs presented are summarised in Table 4. The following assumptions were made in the stock assessment analyses:

- (a) Recruitment followed a Beverton–Holt relationship with steepness of 0.75.
- (b) Catch overruns were 0% during the period of reported catch.
- (c) The population of smooth oreo in OEO 4 was a discrete stock or production unit.
- (d) The acoustic biomass selectivity and the commercial fishery selectivity were assumed to be identical (logistic, estimated within the model).
- (e) A separate selectivity was estimated for the age frequencies that were derived from trawl catches during the acoustic surveys (double normal, estimated within the model).

Bayesian estimation was used in the assessment to capture the uncertainties in model estimates of biomass and other parameters:

1. Model parameters were estimated using maximum likelihood and the prior probabilities;
2. Samples from the joint posterior distribution of parameters were generated with the Monte Carlo Markov Chain procedure (MCMC) using the Hastings-Metropolis algorithm;
3. A marginal posterior distribution was found for each quantity of interest by integrating the product of the likelihood and the priors over all model parameters; each marginal posterior distribution was described by its median and a 95% credibility interval (95% CI).

Bayesian estimates were based on results from three 15 million long MCMC chains. After a burn-in of 1 million, the last 14 million of the chain was sampled at each 1000th value. Posterior distributions were obtained from samples combined over the three chains (after the burn-in).

Table 4: Descriptions of the model runs of the 2018 smooth oreo assessment. LN, lognormal distribution with mean and CV given in the bracket. N, normal distribution with mean and CV in the bracket. All use Haist parameterisation for YCS.

Model run	Description
Base	Acoustic q estimated with a LN(0.83, 0.3) prior, nearly uniform prior on YCS, M estimated with a N(0.063, 0.25) prior, adult biomass indices (school marks)
LowM-Highq	M fixed at 0.0632 (20% less than the base estimate) and the mean of the acoustic q prior 20% higher
HighM-Lowq	M fixed at 0.0948 (20% higher than the base estimate) and the mean of the acoustic q prior 20% lower
Plus LFs	Base but with commercial length frequencies included
Fixed M	Base but with fixed $M = 0.063$ (as assumed in the 2014 assessment)

4.3.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

The 2018 assessment incorporated the catch history and the adult acoustic biomass indices. Five age frequencies were fitted. Commercial length frequencies (five scaled length frequencies between 1996 and 2008) were not included in the base model but were fitted in a sensitivity run (see Table 4).

Catch history

A catch history for smooth oreo in OEO 4 was developed by scaling the estimated catch to the QMS values (Table 5). A catch of 2876 t was recorded for 2017–18.

Biomass estimates from the 1998, 2001, 2005, 2009, 2012, and 2016 acoustic surveys

Estimates of biomass were available from six acoustic surveys:

- (i) 26 September to 30 October 1998 on *Tangaroa* (voyage TAN9812);

- (ii) 16 October to 14 November 2001 using *Tangaroa* for acoustic work (voyage TAN0117) and *Amaltal Explorer* (voyage AEX0101) for trawling;
- (iii) 3–22 November 2005 using *Tangaroa* for acoustic work (voyage TAN0514) and 3–20 November 2005 using *San Waitaki* (SWA0501) for mark identification trawling;
- (iv) 2–18 November 2009 using *Tangaroa* for acoustic work (voyage TAN0910) and 2–18 November 2009 using *San Waitaki* (SWA0901) for mark identification trawling;
- (v) 8–26 November 2012 using *Tangaroa* for acoustic work (voyage TAN01214) and 8–26 November 2012 using *San Waitaki* (SWA1201) for mark identification trawling;
- (vi) 16 October to 17 November 2016 on *Amaltal Explorer* (AEX1602).

Table 5: Catch history for OEO 4 smooth oreo.

Year	Catch (t)	Year	Catch (t)	Year	Catch (t)	Year	Catch (t)
1978–79	1 321	1989–90	6 789	1999–00	6 357	2010–11	6 518
1979–80	112	1990–91	6 019	2000–01	6 491	2011–12	6 357
1980–81	1 435	1991–92	5 508	2001–02	4 291	2012–13	5 964
1981–82	3 461	1992–93	5 911	2002–03	4 462	2013–14	6 016
1982–83	3 764	1993–94	6 283	2003–04	5 656	2014–15	6 318
1983–84	5 759	1994–95	6 936	2004–05	6 473	2015–16	1 992
1984–85	4 741	1995–96	6 378	2005–06	5 955	2016–17	2 279
1985–86	4 895	1996–97	6 359	2006–07	6 363	2017–18	2 867
1986–87	5 672	1997–98	6 248	2007–08	6 422		
1987–88	7 764	1998–99	6 030	2008–09	6 090		
1988–89	7 223	1998–99	6 030	2009–10	6 118		

The method of estimating variance and bias was the same as in previous oreo surveys (Doonan et al 1998, 2000). Variance was estimated separately for the flat and for hills and then combined. Sources of variance were:

- sampling error in the mean backscatter
- the proportion of smooth oreo and black oreo in the acoustic survey area
- sampling error in catches which affects the estimate of the proportion of smooth oreo
- error in the target strengths of other species in the mix
- variance in the estimate of smooth oreo target strength
- sampling error of fish lengths (negligible)
- variance of the mean weight, for smooth oreo

Vulnerable smooth oreo was estimated based on the acoustic mark types, where vulnerable biomass was the sum over two flat mark types: DEEP SCHOOLS and SHALLOW SCHOOLS, with the hill biomass added on. These estimates were made for smooth oreo in the whole of OEO 4 (Table 6).

One major source of uncertainty in the 2012 survey estimates was that about 25% of the total estimate came from one school mark on the flat. The species composition of this mark was not able to be verified by trawling. Excluding this mark, i.e., assuming they were not smooth oreo, reduced the total biomass for smooth oreos to 36 550 t. However, the consensus of skippers consulted about the mark is that it was likely to be smooth oreo.

Table 6: Estimated smooth oreo vulnerable biomass (t) and CV (%), after the addition of 20% process error) from acoustic surveys in 1998, 2001, 2005, and 2009, 2012, and 2016; includes school marks and hills.

Year	Biomass (t)	CV (%)
1998	65 679	33
2001	81 633	33
2005	63 237	32
2009	26 953	33
2012	58 603	36
2016	34 022	38

Age frequencies from the 1998, 2005, and 2016 acoustic surveys

Age frequency distributions were derived from trawl samples taken for smooth oreo in OEO 4 during three acoustic surveys carried out in 1998 and 2005 (Doonan et al 2008) and 2016. All of the sampled otoliths (n = 546) from the 1998 survey and randomly selected otoliths (n = 500) from the 1800 otoliths collected during the 2005 survey were read, with 398 otoliths used from the 2016 survey.

The age frequency distribution was estimated using the aged otoliths from tows in each mark-type weighted by the catch rates and the proportion of abundance in the mark-type. Age frequencies were estimated by sex and combined over sexes. The variance was estimated by bootstrapping the tows within mark-types (e.g., Doonan et al 2008). The ageing error was estimated by comparing age estimates from two readers and also by using repeated readings from the same reader. The age frequencies had a mean weighted CV of 36% (1998) and 45% (2005). The ageing error was estimated to be about 8.5% which was used in the assessment. The age frequencies (male and female combined) were included in order to estimate year class strength.

Other age frequencies

Two additional age frequencies were constructed for the 2018 assessment. The first was for the commercial catch in 2008–2009. The 1284 otoliths available from the observer programme were sampled at random (with replacement) until 400 unique otoliths were obtained. The probability of selection was proportional to the tow catch and inversely proportional to the number of otoliths sampled in the tow. The mean weighted CV was 30% (obtained by bootstrapping). The second age frequency was constructed for the 1991 trawl survey of OEO 4 (TAN9104). Otoliths collected during the trawl survey were sampled at random until 400 unique otoliths were obtained. The probability of selection was proportional to the stratum biomass estimate and by tow catch within stratum, divided by the number of otoliths available from the tow. The mean weighted CV was 35% (obtained by bootstrapping).

Observer length frequencies

Observer length data were extracted from the observer database. These data were stratified by season (October–March and April–September) and into west and east parts. The length frequencies were combined over strata by the proportion of catch in each stratum.

Five scaled length frequencies from 1996 to 2008 were used in a sensitivity run but not used in the base model.

4.3.2 Biomass estimates, year class strengths, and exploitation rates

For the base model, and all of the sensitivities, B_0 was estimated at about 140 000 t with 95% CIs ranging from about 110 000 t to 210 000 t (Table 7). Current stock status is estimated to be at the target level of 40% for the base case. However, it is estimated to be just above 30% B_0 for the LowM-Highq and Fixed M runs (Table 7). For all of the runs the estimated probability of current stock status being below the soft limit of 20% B_0 is less than 5% (Table 7). The probability of current stock status being below the hard limit of 10% B_0 was estimated at 0 for all runs (Table 7).

Table 7: Bayesian estimates of M , B_0 , and current stock status (B_{18}/B_0) for the base model and sensitivities (the median and 95% CIs are given). The probability of current stock status being below 10% or 20% B_0 is also given.

	M (yr ⁻¹)	B_0 (000 t)	ss_{18} (% B_0)	$P(ss_{18} < 10\%)$	$P(ss_{18} < 20\%)$
Base	0.079 (0.057–0.01)	138 (111–184)	40 (23–59)	0.00	0.01
LowM-Highq	0.0632	138 (118–173)	31 (19–46)	0.00	0.04
HighM-Lowq	0.0948	146 (111–208)	50 (33–67)	0.00	0.00
Incl. LFs	0.085 (0.067–0.011)	133 (111–172)	42 (26–60)	0.00	0.00
Fixed M	0.063	143 (121–184)	33 (21–50)	0.00	0.02

The spawning biomass trajectory for the base model shows a decreasing trend from the start of the fishery in the 1980s with a flattening off in 2015–16 when catches were substantially reduced (Figure 1, Table 5). Current stock status is estimated to be at the target biomass although the 95% CIs are very wide (Figure 1, Table 7).

The estimated year class strengths show a pattern (in the medians) from 1972 to 1987 of above average cohort strength with below average cohort strength from 1990 to 2005 (Figure 2), consistent with the age composition data.




Figure 1: Base, MCMC estimated spawning-stock biomass trajectory. The box in each year covers 50% of the distribution and the whiskers extend to 95% of the distribution. The soft limit (red) and target biomass (green) are marked by horizontal lines.




Figure 2: Base, MCMC estimated "true" YCS (R_t/R_0). The box in each year covers 50% of the distribution and the whiskers extend to 95% of the distribution.

Exploitation rates in the fishery were estimated to be generally increasing from the start of the fishery up until 2014–15 (Figure 3). Catches in the years immediately prior to the TACC reduction in 2015–16 were at a level increasingly above the exploitation rate corresponding to the target biomass, $U_{40\%B0}$. With the substantial catch reduction in 2015–16 the estimated exploitation rate (median) dropped to below 5% where it has remained (Figure 3).




Figure 3: Base, MCMC estimated exploitation rate trajectory. The box in each year covers 50% of the distribution and the whiskers extend to 95% of the distribution. The exploitation rate, $U_{40\%B_0}$, corresponding to the biomass target of 40% B_0 is marked by the middle horizontal line ($U_{x\%B_0}$ is the exploitation rate that will drive deterministic spawning biomass to $x\%$ B_0). $U_{30\%B_0}$ and $U_{50\%B_0}$ are also marked by horizontal lines.

4.3.3 Yield estimates and projections

Five year projections were made from the base model at a constant catch of 2300 t which is the approximate level of the last reported annual catch (2279 t in 2016–17) and also at 3000 t (the TACC for OEO 4). Year class strengths from 2006 onwards were sampled at random from the last 10 estimated year class strengths (1996–2005). Based on the projections, stock status is expected to stay fairly constant over the next five years for annual catches in the range 2300–3000 t (Figures 4 and 5, Table 8). There is a small upward trend in median stock status at annual catches of 2300 t (Figure 4, Table 8).




Figure 4: Base, MCMC projections at a constant annual catch of 2300 t. The box in each year covers 50% of the distribution and the whiskers extend to 95% of the distribution. The target biomass (40% B_0) is marked by the horizontal green line and the soft limit (20% B_0) by the horizontal red line.




Figure 5: Base, MCMC projections at a constant annual catch of 3000 t. The box in each year covers 50% of the distribution and the whiskers extend to 95% of the distribution. The target biomass (40% B_0) is marked by the horizontal green line and the soft limit (20% B_0) by the horizontal red line.

Table 8: The expected value of stock status in 2023 ($E(ss_{23})$) and the probabilities of being above the target biomass (40% B_0) or below the soft limit (20% B_0) or below the hard limit (10% B_0) under projected annual catches of 2300 t or 3000 t.

Annual catch (t)	$E(ss_{23})$ (% B_0)	$P(ss_{23} > 40\%)$	$P(ss_{23} < 20\%)$	$P(ss_{23} < 10\%)$
2300	42	0.57	0.01	0.00
3000	40	0.49	0.02	0.00

4.3.4 Other factors

The Working Group considered that there were a number of other factors that should be considered in relation to the stock assessment results presented here. These include:

- uncertainty in the estimates of species composition of catch histories,
- confounding of estimates of M with others parameters in the model, and
- the assumption that acoustic selectivity is the same as the commercial selectivity.

4.3.5 Future research considerations

- Regular acoustic surveys are required to monitor the trend in adult biomass.
- Improved estimates of smooth oreo target strength would reduce the uncertainty in the assessment as would additional age frequency data.
- A continued emphasis on mark identification of large schools during the surveys is important.
- Sensitivities to assumptions about the species composition in deriving catch histories could be insightful.
- It would also be useful to investigate correlations between model parameters.
- A more generic research consideration, possibly to be undertaken by the Stock Assessment Methods Working Group, is to develop guidelines for when M should be estimated in models, and when (and how) it should be independently estimated.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

There is an updated stock assessment in 2018 for the smooth oreo stock in OEO 4.

Stock Structure Assumptions

Black and smooth oreo in OEO 4 are assessed separately but managed as a single stock (although catches are often estimated separately). For black oreos the population has been found to be genetically similar to other oreo stocks and it is likely that some mixing occurs. Smooth oreos in OEO 4 are assumed to be distinct from OEO 1 and 6 stocks but may mix with the 3A stock.

- **OEO 4 (Black Oreos)**

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2009	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Very Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2007–08	Catch: 598 t
Assessment Runs Presented	No quantitative stock assessment model	
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: Not defined	
Status in relation to Target	Unknown	
Status in relation to Limits	Unknown	
Status in relation to Overfishing	-	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status

<No plot available>

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	CPUE has been stable for the last 5 years, after initial substantial decline during the 1980s and 1990s.
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	Unknown
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis

Stock Projections or Prognosis	Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unknown

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation

Assessment Type	Level 2 – Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Age-based model in CASAL	
Period of Assessment	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2009	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	-	
Main data inputs (rank)	- 4 standardised CPUE indices (pre/post GPS and east/west) - Observer length frequencies	- -

Data not used (rank)	N/A
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	None
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Assessments unable to represent observer length frequency data. - CPUE could be fitted to a two-stock model but not a homogenous model. - A portion of the abundance estimates were based on data from areas not normally covered by the trawl fishery, and the surveyed area was scaled by a factor of 4.3 – the area surveyed was borderline for providing a reliable abundance estimate.

Qualifying Comments


The Working Group agreed that the stock might be split into east and west areas that were independent or at least minimally mixing for future assessments.

Fishery Interactions

Both species of oreo are sometimes taken as bycatch in orange roughy target fisheries and in smaller numbers in hoki target fisheries. Target fisheries for oreos do exist, with main bycatch being orange roughy, rattails and deepwater sharks. Bycatch species recorded include deepwater sharks and rays, seabirds and deepwater corals. Oreos are caught using bottom trawl gear. Bottom trawling interacts with benthic habitats.

- **OEO 4 (Smooth Oreos)**

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2018	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2017–18	Catch: 2 500 t
Assessment Runs Presented	Base model fitted to vulnerable acoustic biomass estimates, based on school marks, and age frequencies	
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 Soft limit: 20% B_0 Hard limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: $U_{40\%B_0}$	
Status in relation to Target	B_{2018} was estimated at 40% B_0 for the base model. B_{2018} is About as Likely as Not (40-60%) to be at or above the target.	
Status in relation to Limits	B_{2018} is Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below the Soft limit and Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%) to be below the Hard Limit.	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Overfishing is Unlikely (< 40%) to be occurring.	

Historical Stock Status and Exploitation Rate Trajectory

Historical trajectory of spawning biomass (% B_0) and exploitation rate (%) (base model, medians of the marginal posteriors). A reference range of 30-50% B_0 and the corresponding exploitation rate range are coloured in green. The soft limit (20% B_0) is marked by a red line and the target biomass (40% B_0) and corresponding exploitation rate are marked by blue lines.

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	There has been little change in estimated biomass in the last 4 years.
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Following the large reduction in TACC and catch in 2015–16, estimated exploitation rates declined.
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	Below average cohort strength was estimated from 1990 to 2005.

Projections and Prognosis

Stock Projections or Prognosis	Little change in projected biomass over the next five years at annual catches of 2300–3000 t
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) Hard Limit: Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%)
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unlikely (< 40%) for the current catch or TACC

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation

Assessment Type	Type 1 – Full Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Age-structured CASAL model with Bayesian estimation of posterior distributions	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2018	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Six acoustic biomass indices (1998, 2001, 2005, 2009, 2012, 2016) - Age frequencies from acoustic surveys (1998, 2005, 2016) - Trawl survey age frequency (1991) - Commercial age frequency (2009)	1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality

	- Observer length data (used in a sensitivity)	1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	- Commercial CPUE	3 – Low Quality: substantial changes in fishing patterns over time
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	- Added age data (trawl survey and commercial) and estimated M in the model	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Uncertainties in the prior for the survey catchability (q) - o estimated target strength - o scaling factor from the trawl survey area to acoustic area - o scaling factor from acoustic area to the QMA area - o proportion of vulnerable biomass in the surveyed marks - o acoustic mark identification - Single commercial age frequency - Confounding of estimates of M with other parameters in the model - Assumption that acoustic selectivity is the same as the commercial selectivity	

Qualifying Comments

-

Fishery Interactions

Both species of oreo are sometimes taken as bycatch in orange roughy target fisheries and in smaller numbers in hoki target fisheries. Target fisheries for oreos do exist, with main bycatch being orange roughy, rattails and deepwater sharks. Low productivity species taken in oreo fisheries include orange roughy, rattails, and deepwater sharks and rays. Incidental captures have also been recorded for seabirds and deepwater corals. Oreos are caught using bottom trawl gear. Bottom trawling interacts with benthic habitats.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Bull, B; Francis, R I C C; Dunn, A; Gilbert, D J (2002) CASAL (C++ algorithmic stock assessment laboratory): CASAL User Manual v1.02.2002/10/21. *NIWA Technical Report 117*. 199 p.
- Coburn, R P; Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J (2001a) Smooth oreo abundance indices from standardised catch per unit of effort data for OEO 4. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/11*. 39 p.
- Coburn, R P; Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J (2001b) Black oreo abundance indices from standardised catch per unit of effort data for OEO 4. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/39*. 24 p.
- Doonan, I J; Coombs, R F; McMillan, P J; Dunn, A (1998) Estimate of the absolute abundance of black and smooth oreo in OEO 3A and 4 on the Chatham Rise. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project OEO9701. 47 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Doonan, I J; Hart, A C; Lacroix, Y; McMillan, P J (2018) Smooth oreo abundance estimates from the October–November 2016 acoustic survey of the south Chatham Rise (OEO 4). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2018/58*. 23 p.
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J (2011) Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project OEO2009-01. 10 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand/Wellington.)
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (1996) Assessment of Chatham Rise smooth oreo (OEO 3A and OEO 4) for 1996. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1996/17. 21p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library.)
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (1997) Assessment of Chatham Rise smooth oreo (OEO 3A and OEO 4) for 1997. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1997/21. 26p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library.)
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (2001) Assessment of OEO 4 black oreo for 2000–01. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/30*. 32p.
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (2001) Assessment of OEO 4 smooth oreo for 2000–01. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/21*. 37 p.
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (2003) Assessment of OEO 4 smooth oreo for 2002–03. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/50*. 55 p.
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (2008) Assessment of OEO 4 smooth oreo for 2006–07. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/40*. 45 p.
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C; Cordue, P L (1995) Assessment of smooth oreo for 1995. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1995/12. 31p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library.)

- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Hart, A C (2001) The use of mean length data for stock assessments of black oreo and smooth oreo in OEO 4. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/34*. 16 p.
- Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J; Hart, A C (2008) Ageing of smooth oreo otoliths for stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/8*. 29 p.
- Francis, R I C C (1999) The impact of correlations in standardised CPUE indices. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1999/42. 30p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library.)
- Francis, R I C C (1992) Recommendations concerning the calculation of maximum constant yield (MCY) and current annual yield (CAY). New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1992/8. 27p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library.)
- Fu, D; Doonan, I J (2013) Assessment of OEO 4 smooth oreo for 2009–10. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/22*. 35 p.
- Fu, D.; Doonan, I J (2015). Assessment of OEO 4 smooth oreo for 2012–13. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/7*. 41 p.
- McMillan, P J; Doonan, I J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C (1996) Is the south Chatham Rise trawl survey providing an index of smooth oreo abundance in OEO 4?. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1996/16. 18p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library.)
- McMillan, P J; Doonan, I J; Hart, A C; Coburn, R P (1998) Oreo stock assessment. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project OEO9702. 16p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand Wellington.)
- McMillan, P J; Hart, A C (1991) Assessment of black and smooth oreos for the 1991–92 fishing year. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1991/10. 29p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library.)
- Tracey, D M; Fenaughty, J M (1997). Distribution and relative abundance of orange roughy on the Chatham Rise, May-July 1994. *N.Z. Fisheries Technical Report No. 44*. 43 p.

OREOS – OEO 1 AND OEO 6 BLACK OREO AND SMOOTH OREO

1. FISHERY SUMMARY

This is presented in the Fishery Summary section at the beginning of the Introduction – Oreos chapter.

2. BIOLOGY

This is presented in the Biology section at the beginning of the Introduction – Oreos chapter.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

This is presented in the Stocks and Areas section at the beginning of the Introduction – Oreos chapter.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

4.1 Introduction

New assessments for Pukaki Rise black oreo and Pukaki Rise smooth oreo were attempted in 2013 but were rejected by the Working Group and are only briefly discussed here. The previously reported assessments for Southland (OEO 1/OEO 3A) and Bounty Plateau smooth oreo (only MPD results) are repeated.

4.2 Southland smooth oreo fishery

This assessment was updated in 2007 and applies only to the study area as defined in Figure 1 and does not include areas to the north (Waitaki) and east (Eastern canyon) of the main fishing grounds.

This fishery is mostly in OEO 1 off the east coast of the South Island but catches at the northern end of the fishery straddle and cross the boundary line between OEO 1 and OEO 3A at 46° S. This is an old fishery with catch and effort data available from 1977–78. Smooth oreo catch from Southland was about 480 t (mean of 2003–04 to 2005–06). There is an industry catch limit of 400 t smooth oreo which was implemented after the previous (2003) assessment. There were no fishery-independent abundance estimates, so relative abundance estimates from pre- and post-GPS (Global Positioning System) standardised CPUE analyses and length frequency data collected by Ministry (SOP) and industry (ORMC) observers were used.

The following assumptions were made in this analysis.

1. The CPUE analysis indexed the abundance of smooth oreo in the study area of OEO 1/3A.
2. The length frequency samples were representative of the population being fished.
3. The ranges used for the biological values covered their true values.
4. Recruitment was deterministic and followed a Beverton-Holt relationship with steepness of 0.75.
5. The population of smooth oreo in the study area was a discrete stock or production unit.
6. Catch overruns were 0% during the period of reported catch.
7. The catch histories were accurate.
8. The maximum fishing pressure (U_{MAX}) was 0.58.

An age-structured CASAL model employing Bayesian statistical techniques was developed. A two-fishery model was employed with a split into deep and shallow fisheries because of a strong relationship found between smaller fish in shallow water and large fish in deeper water. The boundary between deep and shallow was 975 m. The 2007 analysis used five extra years of catch and observer length frequency data compared with the 2003 assessment. The model was partitioned by the sex and maturity status of the fish and used population parameters previously estimated from fish sampled on the Chatham Rise

and Puysegur Bank fisheries. The maturity ogive used was estimated from Chatham Rise research samples.

4.2.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

Catch history

A catch history (Table 1) was derived using declared catches of OEO from OEO 1 (see table 2 in the Fishery Summary section at the beginning of the Introduction – Oreos chapter) and tow-by-tow records of catch from the study area (Figure 1). The tow-by-tow data were used to estimate the species ratio (SSO/BOE) and therefore the amount of SSO taken. It was assumed that the reported landings provided the best information on total catch quantity and that the tow-by-tow data provided the best information on the species and area breakdown of catch.

Table 1: Catch history of smooth oreo from Southland rounded to the nearest 10 t.

Fishing year	Shallow	Deep	Fishing year	Shallow	Deep
1977–78	210	0	1992–93	410	250
1978–79	10	0	1993–94	220	150
1979–80	40	0	1994–95	80	150
1980–81	0	0	1995–96	600	500
1981–82	0	0	1996–97	440	70
1982–83	0	0	1997–98	320	230
1983–84	480	660	1998–99	480	620
1984–85	170	510	1999–00	650	480
1985–86	480	3 760	2000–01	400	610
1986–87	30	160	2001–02	580	1 470
1987–88	130	860	2002–03	130	1 320
1988–89	0	240	2003–04	330	420
1989–90	210	430	2004–05	140	290
1990–91	410	420	2005–06	120	140
1991–92	530	380			




Figure 1: Smooth oreo estimated catch from all years up to (and including) 2005–06. The area was divided into cells that are 0.1 degrees square and catches were summed for each cell. Circles proportional in area to the catch are plotted centred on the cells. Catches less than 10 tonnes per cell are not shown. Circles are layered so that smaller circles are never hidden by larger ones. The assessment area and bottom topography are also shown.

Length data

All SOP records where smooth oreo were measured from within the assessment area are shown in Table 2: 78 samples were shallow and 51 were deep. Only 13 shallow and 4 deep samples were collected before 1999–2000 (Table 2). Composite length frequency distributions were calculated for each year. Each sample was weighted by the catch weight of the tow from which the sample was taken. This was modified slightly by estimating the number of fish that would be in a unit weight of catch and multiplying by that.

Table 2: Summary of length frequency data for smooth oreo available for the study area. Year group, year applied, and the total number of length frequency samples (lfs) for the shallow and deep year groups.

Year group	Year applied	No. of lfs
<u>Shallow</u>		
a=1993–94 to 1997–98	1995–96	13
b=1999–2000	1999–00	30
c=2000–01 to 2001–02	2001–02	22
d=2002–03 to 2005–06	2004–05	13
<u>Deep</u>		
e=1997–98 to 2001–02	2001–02	27
f=2002–03 to 2004–05	2003–04	21

Relative abundance estimates from CPUE analyses

The standardised CPUE analyses used a two part model which separately analysed the tows which caught smooth oreo using a log-linear regression (referred to as the positive catch regression) and a binomial part which used a Generalised Linear Model with a logit link for the proportion of successful tows (referred to as the zero catch regression). The binomial part used all the tows but considered only whether or not the species was caught and not the amount caught. The yearly indices from the two parts of the analysis (positive catch index and zero catch index) were multiplied together to give a combined index. The pre-GPS data for 1983–84 to 1987–88 have been left unmodified since 2003 and were used as an index of the deep fishery because most fishing in that period was deep (Table 3). The post-GPS data covered 1992–93 to 2005–06 split into shallow and deep fisheries, but the indices for the last two years (2004–05, 2005–06) were dropped because catch was constrained by the industry catch limit of 400 t for smooth oreo introduced after the 2003 assessment (Table 4).

Table 3: Smooth oreo pre-GPS combined index estimates by year, and jackknife CV estimates from analysis of all tows in the study area that targeted smooth oreo, black oreo, or unspecified oreo.

Fishing year	Combined index	Jackknife CV (%)
1983–84	1.75	22
1984–85	1.65	29
1985–86	1.19	33
1986–87	0.48	23
1987–88	0.61	27

Table 4: Smooth oreo post-GPS combined index estimates by year, and jackknife CV estimates from analysis of all tows in the study area that targeted smooth oreo, black oreo, or unspecified oreo.

Fishing year	Shallow		Deep	
	Index (kg/tow)	Bootstrap CV (%)	Index (kg/tow)	Bootstrap CV (%)
1992–93	1 489	57	1 401	73
1993–94	956	47	916	53
1994–95	1 521	72	428	121
1995–96	1 173	37	1 862	84
1996–97	511	84	2 117	41
1997–98	1 477	39	502	59
1998–99	939	42	915	50
1999–00	842	44	611	48
2000–01	758	46	385	72
2001–02	573	44	658	53
2002–03	303	48	406	76
2003–04	480	57	719	218

4.2.2 Biomass estimates

Biomass estimates were made based on a Markov chain Monte Carlo analysis which produced a total of about 1.4 million iterations. The first 100 000 iterations were discarded and every 1000th point was retained, giving a final converged chain of about 1300 points.

Biomass estimates for the base case are given in Table 5 and Figure 2. These biomass estimates are uncertain because of the reliance on commercial CPUE data for abundance indices.

Table 5: Biomass estimates (t) for the base case.

	5%	Median	Mean	95%	CV (%)
Free parameters					
Virgin mature biomass (B_0)	15 600	17 400	17 900	21 700	12
Selectivity, shallow	a1	17.2	19.0	21.0	6
	sL	3.9	4.8	5.8	12
	sR	5.9	8.3	11.2	20
Selectivity, deep	a50	22.1	26.0	30.8	10
	to95	1.9	7.1	11.0	37
Derived quantities					
Current mature biomass (% initial)	19	27	28	41	25
Current selected shallow biomass (% initial)	56	65	65	73	8
Current selected deep biomass (% initial)	12	20	22	36	36




Figure 2: Estimated biomass trajectories from the 2007 base case assessment — mature biomass and selected biomass for the shallow and deep fisheries. Also shown are the CPUE indices from the pre- and post-GPS analysis for the deep fishery (in green) and the post-GPS analyses for the shallow fishery (in black). CPUE indices are shown with ± 2 s.e. confidence interval indicated by the vertical lines (the post-GPS CPUE data are slightly offset to avoid over plotting). The CPUE data were scaled by catchability coefficients to match the biomass scale.

4.3 Pukaki Rise smooth oreo fishery (part of OEO 6)

A second assessment for this fishery was attempted in 2013, applying only to the assessment area as defined in Figure 3. The first assessment for this fishery was in 2006–07 (Coburn et al 2007, McKenzie 2007). This is the main smooth oreo fishery in OEO 6 with an annual catch in 2011–12 of 290 t, taken mainly by New Zealand vessels, down substantially from previous years (Table 6). There was also a small early Soviet fishery (1980–81 to 1985–86) with mean annual catches of less than 100 t. There were no fishery-independent abundance estimates, so relative abundance estimates from a post-GPS standardised CPUE analysis and length frequency data collected by Ministry and industry observers were considered. Biological parameter values estimated for Chatham Rise and Puysegur Bank smooth oreo were used in the assessment because there are no research data from Pukaki Rise. However, the CPUE analysis was not accepted as an index of abundance for smooth oreo in the Pukaki Rise (OEO 6) assessment area, principally due to the complex temporal and spatial patterns of this fishery and associated fisheries, and the small number of vessels. As a result, the assessment was not accepted by the Working Group, and only catch history, length frequency distributions, and unstandardised catch and effort data are reported here.




Figure 3: The Pukaki Rise fishery assessment area (polygon) abutting the north boundary of OEO 6. The dots show all tows where the target species or catch was OEO, SSO, BOE, or ORH, with the red dots being those within the Pukaki assessment area.

Table 6: Catch history of smooth oreo from the Pukaki Rise fishery assessment area. Catches are rounded to the nearest 10 t.

Year	Catch	Year	Catch	Year	Catch	Year	Catch
1980–81	30	1988–89	0	1996–97	1 650	2004–05	1 370
1981–82	20	1989–90	0	1997–98	1 340	2005–06	1 470
1982–83	0	1990–91	10	1998–99	1 370	2006–07	1 790
1983–84	640	1991–92	0	1999–00	2 270	2007–08	1 260
1984–85	340	1992–93	70	2000–01	2 580	2008–09	1 200
1985–86	10	1993–94	0	2001–02	2 020	2009–10	770
1986–87	0	1994–95	130	2002–03	1 340	2010–11	820
1987–88	180	1995–96	1 360	2003–04	1 660	2011–12	290
						2012–13	136

4.3.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

Catch history

A catch history was derived using declared catches of OEO from OEO 6 (table 2 in the Fishery Summary section of the Introduction – Oreos chapter) and tow-by-tow records of catch from the assessment area (Figure 3). The tow-by-tow data were used to estimate the species ratio (SSO/BOE)

and therefore the amount of SSO taken. It was assumed that the reported landings provided the best information on total catch quantity and that the tow-by-tow data provided the best information on the species and area breakdown of catch. There may be unreported catch from before records started, though this is thought to be small. Before the 1983–84 fishing year the species catch data were combined over years to get an average figure that was then applied in each of those early years. For the years from 1983–84 onwards, each year's calculation was made independently. The catch history used in the population model is given in Table 6.

Length data

Smooth oreo length frequency data collected by observers are available for the years 1997–98 to 2011–12 (Table 7). An in-depth analysis of these data in the previous assessment (covering fishing years 1998–2005) indicated that they were reasonably representative of the fishery in terms of spatial, depth, and temporal coverage in those years that had adequate data (Coburn et al 2007). The depths fished by the sampled fleet varied between years, so the length data were stratified by depth resulting in shallow (less than 900 m), middle (900–990 m), and deep strata (greater than 990 m). The data from adjacent years were also grouped because some years had few samples. The resulting length frequency distributions are shown in Figure 4.

Table 7: Summary of length frequency data for smooth oreo available for the assessment area. The table shows the number of tows sampled by year, the sample source, and the year group. –, no data.

Year	Year group	Number of tows sampled		
		ORMC	SOP	All
1997–98	98–99	–	15	15
1998–99	98–99	64	9	73
1999–00	00–01	5	36	41
2000–01	00–01	37	17	54
2001–02	01–02	42	22	64
2002–03	03–04	4	12	16
2003–04	03–04	–	19	19
2004–05	05–06	–	30	30
2005–06	05–06	–	20	20
2006–07	06–07	–	205	205
2007–08	07–08	–	124	124
2008–09	08–09	–	66	66
2009–10	09–10	–	46	46
2010–11	10–11	–	107	107
2011–12	10–11	–	21	21
Totals		152	149	301

Catch and effort data

Core vessels for the fishery were defined to develop a standardised CPUE series, but the standardised series was rejected by the Working Group. Unstandardised catch and effort data are presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Catch and effort data for vessels with three or more consecutive fishing years with at least 10 records from 1995–96 (1996) to 2011–12 (2012).

Fishing year	No. of tows	No. of vessels	Estimated catch (t)	Mean t/tow	Zero catch tows (%)	SSO target (%)
1996	193	2	810	4.20	–	6
1997	322	3	1 270	3.90	4	4
1998	264	4	1 020	3.90	6	9
1999	262	4	1 050	4	1	15
2000	528	5	2 030	3.90	32	37
2001	588	7	2 280	3.90	49	52
2002	409	5	1 920	4.70	9	9
2003	498	5	1 230	2.50	14	18
2004	512	4	1 300	2.50	9	13
2005	588	6	1 170	2	21	27
2006	656	5	1 260	1.90	13	14
2007	806	5	1 550	1.90	23	25
2008	933	2	1 110	1.20	13	16
2009	918	3	1 200	1.30	21	23
2010	948	3	740	0.80	8	11
2011	593	3	720	1.20	22	25
2012	397	2	260	0.70	10	12




Figure 4: Length frequencies for Pukaki Rise smooth oreo, stratified by depth (see text), and grouped by years.
[Continued on next page]




Figure 4 [Continued]: Length frequencies for Pukaki Rise smooth oreo, stratified by depth (see text), and grouped by years.

4.4 Bounty Plateau smooth oreo fishery (part of OEO 6)

The first assessment for this fishery was developed in 2008 and applies only to the study area as defined in Figure 5. There were no fishery-independent abundance estimates, so relative abundance estimates from a post-GPS standardised CPUE analysis and length frequency data collected by Ministry (SOP) and industry (ORMC) observers were considered. Biological parameter values estimated for Chatham Rise and Puysegur Bank smooth oreo were used in the assessment because there are no research data from Bounty Plateau.

The following assumptions were made in this analysis.

1. The CPUE analysis indexed the abundance of smooth oreo in the Bounty Plateau (OEO 6) assessment area.
2. The length frequency samples were representative of the population being fished.
3. The biological parameters values used (from other assessment areas) are close to the true values.
4. Recruitment was deterministic and followed a Beverton & Holt relationship with steepness of 0.75.
5. The population of smooth oreo in the assessment area was a discrete stock or production unit.
6. Catch overruns were 0% during the period of reported catch.
7. The catch histories were accurate.
8. The maximum exploitation rate (E_{MAX}) was 0.58.

Data inputs included catch history, relative abundance estimates from a standardised CPUE analysis, and length data from SOP and ORMC observers. The observational data were incorporated into an age-based Bayesian stock assessment (CASAL) with deterministic recruitment to estimate stock size. The stock was considered to reside in a single area, with a partition by sex. Age groups were 1–70 years, with a plus group of 70+ years.

The length-weight and length-at-age population parameters are from fish sampled on the Chatham Rise and Puysegur Bank fisheries (table 1 of the Biology section of the Introduction – Oreos chapter). The natural mortality estimate is based on fish sampled from the Puysegur Bank fishery. The maturity ogive is from fish sampled on the Chatham Rise, and the age at which 50% are mature is between 18 and 19 years for males and between 25 and 26 years for females.

4.4.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

Catch history

Table 9: Catch history (t) of smooth oreo from the Bounty Plateau fishery assessment area. Catches are rounded to the nearest 10 t.

Fishing year	Catch	Fishing year	Catch
1983–84	620	1996–97	610
1984–85	0	1997–98	650
1985–86	0	1998–99	1 200
1986–87	0	1999–00	870
1987–88	10	2000–01	550
1988–89	0	2001–02	980
1989–90	0	2002–03	1 530
1990–91	20	2003–04	1 420
1991–92	0	2004–05	2 190
1992–93	110	2005–06	1 790
1993–94	490	2006–07	670
1994–95	1 450	2007–08	670
1995–96	900		

A catch history was derived using declared catches of oreo from OEO 6 (table 2 in the Fishery Summary section of the Introduction – Oreos chapter) and tow-by-tow records of catch from the assessment area (Figure 5). The tow-by-tow data were used to estimate the species ratio (SSO/BOE) and therefore the amount of SSO taken. The catch history used in the population model is given in Table 9.




Figure 5: The Bounty Plateau fishery assessment study area.

Length data

Smooth oreo length frequency data collected by SOP and ORMC observers are available from 1991–92. An in-depth analysis indicated that these data were reasonably representative of the fishery in terms of spatial, depth, and temporal coverage in those years that had adequate data. Length frequencies were based on tows from the core area (a subset of the study area where about 80% of the catch is taken). The data from adjacent years were grouped because some years had few samples (Table 10). The resulting length frequency distributions are shown in Figure 6. In the final model runs the 1994–95 year of the length frequency series was omitted because it contained very few samples.

Table 10: Core length analysis year group, year applied and the number of length frequency samples (lfs). Smooth oreo sample catch weight, fishery catch, and sample catch as percentage of the fishery.

Year group	Year applied	No. of lfs	Catch sampled (t)	Fishery catch (t)	% fishery
1991–92 to 1995–96	1994–95	7	88	1 505	6
1998–99 to 1999–2000	1998–99	30	246	1 121	22
2000–2001 to 2002–03	2001–02	25	398	2 261	18
2003–04 to 2004–05	2004–05	29	261	2 280	11
2005–06	2005–06	32	379	1 121	34
2006–07 to 2007–08	2006–07	17	168	494	34

Relative abundance estimates from CPUE analyses

The small early Soviet fishery had too few data for a standardised CPUE analysis. The standardised CPUE analysis was, therefore, from the New Zealand vessel fishery and only included data from those vessels that had fished at least three years. A single vessel put in significant continuous effort from 1995 to 2007, with the effort of the rest of the vessels confined to mainly either 1995–2000 (early) or 2001–2007 (late). Because of this, in addition to the single standardised CPUE covering the entire time period, two separate standardised CPUE indices were calculated for the early and late periods. The final indices are shown in Tables 11 and 12.

4.4.2 Biomass estimates

In all preliminary model runs the length-frequency data series were not well fitted and gave a strong but contrasting biomass signal relative to the CPUE indices. Therefore, for final model runs, the length frequency data were down-weighted by using just the 1999 length frequency data.

The base case model used early and late period CPUE indices and the 1999 length frequency data. Current mature biomass was estimated to be 33% of a virgin biomass of 17 400 t (Figure 7).




Figure 6: Length frequency distribution plots for core data only (thick lines) with 95% confidence interval (thin lines).

Table 11: Early and late period CPUE combined index estimates by fishing year, with bootstrap CV estimates.

Early period	Kg/tow	CV	Late period	Kg/tow	CV
1995-96	3 551	0.423	2000-01	850	0.487
1996-97	3 322	0.496	2001-02	2 976	0.274
1997-98	2 306	0.980	2002-03	1 489	0.243
1998-99	781	0.391	2003-04	1 727	0.260
1999-2000	1 536	0.306	2004-05	1 604	0.227
			2005-06	1 386	0.310
			2006-07	966	0.232

Table 12: Single period CPUE combined index estimates by fishing year, and bootstrap CV estimates.

Fishing year	Kg/tow	CV
1995-96	7 472	0.286
1996-97	4 453	0.735
1997-98	3 366	1.264
1998-99	1 444	0.406
1999-2000	2 835	0.286
2000-01	2 817	0.436
2001-02	632	0.680
2002-03	1 973	0.663
2003-04	1 296	0.615
2004-05	1 284	0.445
2005-06	1 289	0.563
2006-07	1 056	1.200




Figure 7: Model run showing the MPD fit to the CPUE data (vertical lines are the 95% confidence intervals for the indices) and the trajectory of mature biomass.

Two sensitivity model runs were carried out with the 1999 length frequency data dropped from the model but retaining the fishery selectivity estimated using the length data. The first model run used the early and late period CPUE indices and current biomass was estimated to be 39% of a virgin biomass of 19 300 t. The second model run used the single CPUE series covering the same period and current biomass was estimated to be 17% of a virgin biomass of 13 900 t. No MCMC runs were carried out with the base case model because the sensitivity runs showed that the assessment was quite different if the CPUE analysis was not split into two series.

Biomass estimates are uncertain because of the reliance on commercial CPUE data, the use of biological parameter estimates from other oreo stocks, and because of contrasting biomass signals from using either a single, or split, CPUE indices.

4.4.3 Projections

No projections were made because of the uncertainty in the assessment.

4.5 Pukaki Rise black oreo stock (part of OEO 6)

A second assessment for this fishery was attempted in 2013, applying only to the assessment area as defined in Figure 8. The first assessment for this fishery was in 2009 (Doonan et al 2010). This is currently the largest black oreo fishery in the New Zealand EEZ with both current (2011–12) and mean (1994–95 to 2011–12) annual catches of 1900 t, but with annual catches of 2800–3400 t between 2005–06 and 2009–10. There was an early Soviet and Korean fishery (1980–81 to 1984–85) with mean annual catches of about 1700 t. Fishery-independent abundance estimates were not available, so a series of relative abundance indices, based on an analysis of post-GPS standardised CPUE, was developed. Length frequency data collected by Ministry (SOP) and industry (ORMC) observers were included in the model. The assessment used biological parameter values estimated for Chatham Rise and Puysegur Bank black oreo because no biological data from Pukaki Rise are available. As stated above, the Pukaki Rise smooth oreo CPUE was thought to be unreliable until further investigations are conducted. Since the black oreo fishery is in the same area, the Working Group determined that the black oreo CPUE analysis also could not be accepted as an index of abundance of black oreo in the Pukaki Rise (OEO 6) assessment area, and as a result the assessment was rejected. Therefore, only catch history, length frequency distributions, and unstandardised catch and effort data are reported here.

4.5.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

Catch history

A catch history for black oreo was derived (Table 13) using declared catches of OEO from OEO 6 (table 2 in the Fishery Summary section of the Introduction – Oreos chapter) and tow-by-tow records of catch from the assessment area (Figure 8). The catch history used in the assessment is given in Table 13.

Table 13: Catch history (t) of black oreo from the Pukaki Rise fishery assessment area.

Fishing year	Catch	Fishing year	Catch	Fishing year	Catch
1978–79	17	1990–91	15	2002–03	1 701
1979–80	5	1991–92	27	2003–04	1 530
1980–81	283	1992–93	27	2004–05	1 588
1981–82	4 180	1993–94	10	2005–06	2 811
1982–83	1 084	1994–95	242	2006–07	3 434
1983–84	1 150	1995–96	1 352	2007–08	3 346
1984–85	1 704	1996–97	2 413	2008–09	2 818
1985–86	46	1997–98	2 244	2009–10	3 093
1986–87	0	1998–99	1 181	2010–11	1 641
1987–88	0	1999–00	1 061	2011–12	1 671
1988–89	0	2000–01	1 158		
1989–90	0	2001–02	988		




Figure 8: The Pukaki Rise fishery black oreo assessment area (polygon) abutting the boundary of OEO 6/OEO 1 in the north-west. The dots show tow positions where black oreo catch was reported between 1980–81 and 2011–12. A, B, and C are the three areas defined in the standardised CPUE analysis.

Length data

Black oreo length frequency data collected by SOP and ORMC observers are available for 1996–97 to 2011–12 (Table 14). An analysis indicated that there was a trend in fish size across years (with smaller mean lengths in more recent years) and with depth (deeper fish being larger). The length data were considered to be representative of the fishery in terms of the spatial, depth, and temporal coverage for those years that had adequate data. The length data were stratified into two depth bins: shallow (less than 900 m) and deep (greater than 900 m). Length data from adjacent years were grouped because of the low number of samples in some years (Figure 9). There is no trend in mean length over the first six year groups, but fish sizes appear to be generally smaller in the later year groups, with the mode of the distributions shifting to the left between 2005–06 and 2007–08.

Table 14: Summary of length frequency data for black oreo available from the assessment area. The table shows the number of tows sampled by year, the sample source, and the year group.

Fishing year	Year group	Number of tows sampled		
		SOP	ORMC	All
1996–97	97–98	7	0	7
1997–98	97–98	25	0	25
1998–99	99–00	7	44	51
1999–00	99–00	6	0	6
2000–01	01–02	8	18	26
2001–02	01–02	2	8	10
2002–03	03–05	7	2	9
2003–04	03–05	18	0	18
2004–05	03–05	21	0	21
2005–06	06	21	42	63
2006–07	07	154	11	165
2007–08	08	31	9	40
2008–09	08	61	9	70
2009–10	09	46	0	46
2010–11	10	57	0	57
2011–12	11–12	13	0	13
Total		477	134	611




Figure 9: Observer length frequencies for Pukaki Rise black oreo, stratified by depth (see text), and grouped by years (in the legends 1997=1996–97, etc.). The vertical dashed lines indicate the approximate overall mean length as an aid to comparing the distributions.

Catch and effort data

The fishery taking Pukaki Rise black oreo is divided into two distinct periods: a pre-GPS period 1980–81 to 1984–85, when much of the catch was taken by Soviet and Korean vessels, and a post-GPS period, 1995–96 to 2011–12 when most of the catch was taken by New Zealand vessels. The intervening period was characterised by low catches and the introduction of GPS technology in the fleet. Standardisation of CPUE for the pre-GPS period was attempted but rejected due to poor linkage of vessels across years and the shifting of fishing effort between areas. For the post-GPS period, the Working Group rejected CPUE as an index of abundance because of the variability in recorded target species over time and space in the overlapping Pukaki fisheries for black oreo, smooth oreo, and orange roughy. The Working

Group believed that recording of target species in these fisheries was likely to have been inconsistent between vessels and skippers over time and that the practice of separately examining these fisheries according to recorded target species was inappropriate. Unstandardised catch and effort data for defined core vessels are presented in Table 15.

Table 15: Catch and effort data for vessels fishing in the eastern areas (B and C in Figure 8) with a minimum of 15 successful tows for black oreo in at least three years from 1995–96 to 2011–12.

Fishing year	No. of tows	CPUE	CV	Fishing year	No. of tows	CPUE	CV
1995–96	63	1.94	0.09	2004–05	309	0.73	0.13
1996–97	55	1.44	0.13	2005–06	481	0.88	0.09
1997–98	219	1.53	0.07	2006–07	650	0.80	0.09
1998–99	235	0.98	0.11	2007–08	795	0.62	0.12
1999–00	252	0.82	0.12	2008–09	734	0.61	0.12
2000–01	199	1.11	0.10	2009–10	979	0.33	0.21
2001–02	175	1.07	0.11	2010–11	450	0.51	0.16
2002–03	320	0.91	0.10	2011–12	430	0.72	0.12
2003–04	343	0.97	0.09				

No projections were made because the assessment was not accepted by the Working Group.

4.5.2 Biomass estimates

No biomass estimates are reported.

4.5.3 Yield estimates and projections

No yield estimates were made.

4.6 Other oreo fisheries in OEO 1 and OEO 6

4.6.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

Relative abundance estimates from trawl surveys

Two comparable trawl surveys were carried out in the Puysegur area of OEO 1 (TAN9208 and TAN9409). The 1994 oreo abundance estimates are markedly lower than the 1992 values (Table 16).

Table 16: OEO 1. Research survey abundance estimates (t) for oreos from the Puysegur and Snares areas. N is the number of stations. Estimates for smooth oreo were made based on a recruited length of 34 cm total length. Estimates for black oreo were made using knife-edge recruitment set at 27 cm total length.

Smooth oreo						
Puysegur area (strata 0110–0502)						
	Mean biomass	Lower bound	Upper bound	CV (%)	N	
1992	1 397	736	2 058	23	82	
1994	529	86	972	41	87	
Snares area (strata 0801–0802)						
	Mean biomass	Lower bound	Upper bound	CV (%)	N	
1992	2 433	0	5 316	59	8	
1994	118	0	246	54	7	
Black oreo						
Puysegur area (strata 0110–0502)						
	Mean biomass	Lower bound	Upper bound	CV (%)	N	
1992	2 009	915	3 103	27	82	
1994	618	0	1 247	50	87	
Snares area (strata 0801–0802)						
	Mean biomass	Lower bound	Upper bound	CV (%)	N	
1992	3 983	0	8 211	53	8	
1994	1 564	0	3 566	64	7	

4.6.2 Biomass estimates

Estimates of virgin and current biomass are not yet available.

4.6.3 Yield estimates and projections

MCY cannot be estimated because of the lack of current biomass estimates for the other stocks.

CAY cannot be estimated because of the lack of current biomass estimates for the other stocks.

4.6.4 Other factors

Recent catch data from this fishery may be of poor quality because of area misreporting.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

Stock Structure Assumptions


Oreos in the OEO 1 and 6 FMAs are managed as a single stock but assessed as four separate stocks, separated by species and geography.

The Southland smooth oreo stock is based off the east coast of the South Island in OEO 1 but extends slightly into OEO 3. It does not include the Waitaki and Eastern canyon areas but is likely to have some level of mixing with other smooth oreo fishstocks. The Pukaki Rise smooth oreo stock comprises the major part of OEO 6 stocks and is centred on its namesake. Some mixing with other smooth oreo fishstocks is thought to occur. The Bounty Plateau smooth oreo stock is located across the Bounty Plateau. Some mixing is thought to occur with other smooth oreo fishstocks.

The Pukaki Rise black oreo stock is the main black oreo fishstock in OEO 6 and the largest black oreo fishstock in the New Zealand EEZ. It extends the entire length of the Pukaki Rise towards OEO 1. It is assessed separately to other fishstocks but managed as a part of OEO 6. Black oreo on the Pukaki Rise are thought to be non-mixing with other black oreo fishstocks.

- **OEO 1 and OEO 3A Southland (Smooth Oreo)**

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2007	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2005–06	Catch: 260 t
Assessment Runs Presented	One base case only	
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold:	
Status in relation to Target	B_{2007} was estimated at 27% B_0 , Unlikely (< 40%) to be at or above the target.	
Status in relation to Limits	B_{2007} was estimated to be Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the Soft Limit and Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below the Hard Limit.	
Status in relation to Overfishing	-	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status

Predicted biomass trajectories for the 2007 base case assessment— mature biomass and selected biomass for the shallow and deep fisheries. Also shown are the CPUE indices from the pre- and post-GPS analysis for the deep fishery (in green) and the post-GPS analyses for the shallow fishery (in black). CPUE indices are shown with ± 2 s.e. confidence interval indicated by the vertical lines (the post-GPS CPUE data are slightly offset to avoid over plotting). The CPUE data were scaled by catchability coefficients to match the biomass scale.

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Biomass has been declining at a steady rate since the late 1980s.
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	Unknown
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis

Stock Projections or Prognosis	None because of assessment uncertainty
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	-

Assessment Methodology

Assessment Type	Type 1 - Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Age-structured CASAL model with Bayesian estimation of posterior distributions.	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2007	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	-	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Length-frequency data collected by SOP and ORMC observers - A second, earlier fishery based on Soviet vessels was included in the assessment using historical catch data.	

	- Standardised CPUE indices were derived from the historical and modern datasets.	
Data not used (rank)	-	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Scarcity of observer length frequency data - Poor quality area catch data due to significant misreporting - Lack of fishery-independent abundance estimates creates reliance on commercial CPUE data.	

Qualifying Comments

-

Fishery Interactions

Both species of oreo are sometimes taken as bycatch in orange roughy target fisheries and in smaller numbers in hoki target fisheries. Target fisheries for oreos do exist, with main bycatch being orange roughy, rattails, and deepwater sharks and rays. Other bycatch species recorded include seabirds and deepwater corals. Oreos are caught using bottom trawl gear. Bottom trawling interacts with benthic habitats.

- **OEO 6 Pukaki Rise (Smooth Oreos)**

Stock Status

Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2006	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2004–05	Catch: 1 370 t
Assessment Runs Presented	CASAL assessment based on CPUE	
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: $F_{40\% B_0}$	
Status in relation to Target	Unknown	
Status in relation to Limits	Unknown	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Unknown	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status

-

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Biomass is likely to have been declining since 1996.
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Unknown
Other Abundance Indices	CPUE has steadily declined.
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-
Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	No projections were made due to the uncertainties in the assessment.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown

Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unknown

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation

Assessment Type	Type 1 – Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	CASAL assessment based on CPUE	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2006	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	3 – Low Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	-	
Data not used (rank)	Commercial CPUE	3 – Low Quality: does not track stock biomass
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Lack of fishery-independent biomass estimates creates reliance on commercial CPUE data. - Lack of biological parameters specific to Smooth Oreo in the target area – data from Chatham Rise/Puysegur Bank had to be substituted instead.	

Qualifying Comments

Further investigations into CPUE are required.


Fishery Interactions

Both species of oreo are sometimes taken as bycatch in orange roughy target fisheries and in smaller numbers in hoki target fisheries. Target fisheries for oreos do exist, with main bycatch being orange roughy, rattails, and deepwater sharks. Low productivity bycatch species include deepwater sharks and rays. Protected species interactions occur with seabirds and deepwater corals.

- OEO 6 Bounty Plateau (Smooth Oreo)**

Stock Status

Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2008	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2006–07	Catch: 670 t
Assessment Runs Presented	A base case with two sensitivity runs	
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0	
Status in relation to Target	B_{2008} was estimated at 33% B_0 ; Unlikely (< 40%) to be at or above the target.	
Status in relation to Limits	B_{2008} is Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the Soft Limit and Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below the Hard Limit.	
Status in relation to Overfishing	-	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status

Model run showing the MPD fit to the CPUE data (vertical lines are the 95% confidence intervals for the indices) and the trajectory of mature biomass.

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Biomass is estimated to have been decreasing rapidly since 1995.
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	Unknown
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis

Stock Projections or Prognosis	No projections were made because of the uncertainty of the assessment.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing overfishing to continue or to commence	Unknown

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation

Assessment Type	Type 1 - Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Age-structured CASAL model with Bayesian estimation of posterior distributions	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2008	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank		
Main data inputs (rank)	- Catch history - Abundance estimates derived from a standardised CPUE - Length data from SOP and ORMC observers	
Data not used (rank)	-	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Reliance on commercial CPUE data - To estimate biological parameters, data was used from different stocks (Puysegur Bank + Chatham Rise) to the target stock	

	- Using a single CPUE index instead of split indices gives contrasting biomass signals

Qualifying Comments

-

Fishery Interactions

Both species of oreo are sometimes taken as bycatch in orange roughy target fisheries and in smaller numbers in hoki target fisheries. Target fisheries for oreos do exist, with main bycatch being orange roughy, rattails, and deepwater sharks. Other bycatch species recorded include deepwater sharks and rays, seabirds, and deepwater corals. Oreo are caught using bottom trawl gear. Bottom trawling interacts with benthic habitats.

- **OEO 6 Pukaki Rise (Black Oreo)**

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2009	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Very Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2007–08	Catch: 3 346 t
Assessment Runs Presented	CASAL assessment based on CPUE	
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: $F_{40\% B_0}$	
Status in relation to Target	Unknown	
Status in relation to Limits	Unknown	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Unknown	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status

-

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Biomass is likely to have been decreasing since the 1980s with a major decline starting about 1995.
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Unknown
Other Abundance Indices	CPUE declined, but has levelled out in the last four years.
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	-
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unknown

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation	
Assessment Type	Type 1 – Full Quantitative Stock Assessment
Assessment Method	CASAL assessment based on CPUE

Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2009	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	3 – Low Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	-	
Data not used (rank)	Commercial CPUE	3 – Low Quality: does not track stock biomass
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Lack of fisheries-independent data causes reliance on commercial CPUE data - Lack of biological parameter estimates specific to black oreo in this assessment area	

Qualifying Comments

Further investigations into CPUE are needed.

Fishery Interactions


Both species of oreo are sometimes taken as bycatch in orange roughy target fisheries and in smaller numbers in hoki target fisheries. Target fisheries for oreos do exist, with main bycatch being orange roughy, rattails, and deepwater sharks. Low productivity bycatch species include deepwater sharks and rays. Protected species interactions occur with seabirds and deepwater corals. Oreo are caught using bottom trawl gear. Bottom trawling interacts with benthic habitats.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Coburn, R P; Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J (2002) CPUE analyses for the Southland black oreo and smooth oreo fisheries, 1977–78 to 1999–2000. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2002/3*. 28 p.
- Coburn, R P; Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J (2002) CPUE analyses for the major black oreo and smooth oreo fisheries in OEO 6, 1980–81 to 1999–2000. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2002/6*. 29 p.
- Coburn, R P; Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J (2003) Stock assessment of smooth oreo in the Southland fishery (OEO 1 and 3A) for 2003. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/62*. 32 p.
- Coburn, R P; Doonan, I J; McMillan, P J (2008) A stock assessment of smooth oreo in Southland (part of OEO 1 & OEO 3A). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/37*. 43 p.
- Coburn, R P; McMillan, P J; Gilbert, D J (2007) Inputs for a stock assessment of smooth oreo, Pukaki Rise (part of OEO 6). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/23*. 32 p.
- Doonan, I J; Anderson, O F; McMillan, P J (2010) Assessment of Pukaki (OEO 6) black oreo for 2008–09. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2010/39*.
- McKenzie, A (2007) Stock assessment for east Pukaki Rise smooth oreo (part of OEO 6). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/34*. 27 p.
- McMillan, P J; Coburn, R P; Hart, A C; Doonan, I J (2002) Descriptions of black oreo and smooth oreo fisheries in OEO 1, OEO 3A, OEO 4, and OEO 6 from 1977–78 to the 2000–01 fishing year. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2002/40*. 54 p.

PADDLE CRABS (PAD)

(*Ovalipes catharus*)
Papaka

**1. FISHERY SUMMARY**

Paddle crabs were introduced into the QMS from 1 October 2002. Allowances, TACCs, and TACs are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs, and TACs (t) for paddle crabs, by Fishstock.

Fishstock	Description	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
PAD 1	Auckland (East)	20	10	–	220	250
PAD 2	Central (East)	10	5	–	110	125
PAD 3	South East (Coast)	8	2	–	100	110
PAD 4	South East (Chatham Rise)	4	1	–	25	30
PAD 5	Southland	4	1	–	50	55
PAD 6	Sub-Antarctic	–	–	–	0	0
PAD 7	Challenger	4	1	–	100	105
PAD 8	Central (West)	4	1	–	60	65
PAD 9	Auckland (West)	20	10	–	100	130
PAD 10	Kermadec	–	–	–	0	0

1.1 Commercial fisheries

Commercial interest in paddle crabs was first realised in New Zealand in 1977–78 when good numbers of large crabs were caught off Westshore Beach, Napier in baited lift and set-pots. Annual catches have varied, mainly due to marketing problems, and estimates are likely to be conservative. Landings increased in the early fishery, from 775 kg in 1977 to 306 t in 1985, and ranging from 403 t to 519 t from 1995–96 to 1999–00, but have since generally decreased. Since 2018–19, landings (mostly originating from PAD 3) dropped to the lowest levels since the 1980s. Paddle crabs are known to be discarded from inshore trawl operations targeting species such as flatfish, and this may have resulted in under-reporting of catches. Crabs are marketed live, as whole cooked crabs, or as crab meat. Attempts were made to establish a soft-shelled crab industry in New Zealand in the late 1980s.

Bycatch is commonly taken during trawl, dredge and set netting operations. Catch rates vary considerably with method, season and area, and there is no clear seasonal trend to paddle crab landings. It is likely that catches are related to the availability of fishers and/or market demands. Commercial landings since 1989–90 are shown in Table 2, while Figure 1 shows the historical landings and TACC for the six main PAD

stocks. Paddle crab can be returned to the sea under the Fisheries (Landings and Discards) Notice if taken using potting and likely to survive on return.

Table 2: Reported landings (t) and TACCs (t) from 1989–90 to present. [Continued on next page]

QMA	PAD 1		PAD 2		PAD 3		PAD 4		PAD 5		PAD 6	
	Land	TACC	Land	TACC	Land	TACC	Land	TACC	Land	TACC	Land	TACC
1989–90	20	-	57	-	38	-	< 1	-	< 1	-	0	-
1990–91	34	-	37	-	26	-	0	-	6	-	0	-
1991–92	96	-	32	-	31	-	< 1	-	< 1	-	0	-
1992–93	175	-	14	-	36	-	0	-	< 1	-	0	-
1993–94	277	-	18	-	46	-	0	-	< 1	-	0	-
1994–95	237	-	6	-	36	-	< 1	-	< 1	-	0	-
1995–96	183	-	5	-	18	-	< 1	-	1	-	55	-
1996–97	165	-	25	-	36	-	0	-	1	-	25	-
1997–98	158	-	126	-	18	-	< 1	-	13	-	7	-
1998–99	195	-	197	-	21	-	< 1	-	2	-	10	-
1999–00	265	-	21	-	27	-	1	-	14	-	14	-
2000–01	32	-	10	-	17	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
2001–02	221	-	34	-	22	-	0	-	2	-	22	-
2002–03	145	220	65	110	18	100	< 1	25	< 1	50	< 1	0
2003–04	239	220	46	110	20	100	0	25	0	50	0	0
2004–05	163	220	44	110	30	100	0	25	0	50	0	0
2005–06	109	220	49	110	11	100	0	25	< 1	50	0	0
2006–07	53	220	21	110	13	100	0	25	3	50	0	0
2007–08	86	220	9	110	19	100	0	25	< 1	50	0	0
2008–09	36	220	14	110	37	100	0	25	1	50	0	0
2009–10	35	220	17	110	37	100	0	25	< 1	50	0	0
2010–11	49	220	18	110	47	100	0	25	< 1	50	0	0
2011–12	12	220	41	110	47	100	< 1	25	< 1	50	0	0
2012–13	< 1	220	36	110	39	100	< 1	25	< 1	50	0	0
2013–14	3	220	6	110	74	100	1	25	< 1	50	0	0
2014–15	23	220	1	110	45	100	0	25	< 1	50	0	0
2015–16	69	220	6	110	48	100	0	25	< 1	50	0	0
2016–17	36	220	12	110	18	100	< 1	25	< 1	50	0	0
2017–18	3	220	5	110	17	100	< 1	25	0	50	0	0
2018–19	< 1	220	3	110	15	100	< 1	25	< 1	50	0	0
2019–20	< 1	220	4	110	9	100	0	25	0	50	0	0
2020–21	< 1	220	< 1	110	4	100	< 1	25	< 1	50	< 1	0
2021–22	< 1	220	< 1	110	16	100	< 1	25	< 1	50	0	0
2022–23	0	220	< 1	110	16	100	0	25	< 1	50	0	0
2023–24	0	220	< 1	110	9	100	< 1	25	0	50	0	0
2024–25	0	220	< 1	110	1	100	0	25	< 1	50	0	0

QMA	PAD 7		PAD 8		PAD 9		PAD 10		Total	
	Land	TACC	Land	TACC	Land	TACC	Land	TACC	Land	TACC
1989–90	94	-	22	-	0	-	0	-	231	-
1990–91	68	-	12	-	0	-	0	-	183	-
1991–92	83	-	21	-	0	-	0	-	264	-
1992–93	59	-	24	-	0	-	0	-	308	-
1993–94	49	-	27	-	5	-	0	-	423	-
1994–95	71	-	46	-	< 1	-	0	-	397	-
1995–96	82	-	58	-	< 1	-	< 1	-	403	-
1996–97	106	-	44	-	< 1	-	1	-	403	-
1997–98	63	-	25	-	< 1	-	< 1	-	410	-
1998–99	59	-	34	-	0	-	1	-	519	-
1999–00	45	-	50	-	0	-	< 1	-	437	-
2000–01	0	-	< 1	-	0	-	0	-	59	-
2001–02	33	-	24	-	0	-	0	-	358	-
2002–03	42	100	11	60	0	100	0	0	281	765
2003–04	50	100	17	60	< 1	100	0	0	372	765
2004–05	40	100	14	60	1	100	0	0	292	765
2005–06	48	100	14	60	1	100	0	0	232	765
2006–07	32	100	11	60	< 1	100	0	0	132	765
2007–08	47	100	7	60	0	100	0	0	168	765
2008–09	35	100	11	60	0	100	0	0	134	765
2009–10	17	100	13	60	0	100	0	0	120	765
2010–11	11	100	14	60	0	100	0	0	140	765
2011–12	7	100	14	60	0	100	0	0	121	765
2012–13	11	100	17	60	0	100	0	0	103	765
2013–14	4	100	13	60	0	100	0	0	101	765
2014–15	0	100	1	60	0	100	0	0	71	765
2015–16	0	100	4	60	0	100	0	0	127	765
2016–17	< 1	100	3	60	0	100	0	0	66	765

Table 2 [Continued]:

QMA	PAD 7		PAD 8		PAD 9		PAD 10		Total	
	Land	TACC	Land	TACC	Land	TACC	Land	TACC	Land	TACC
2017–18	< 1	100	1	60	0	100	0	0	27	765
2018–19	0	100	1	60	0	100	0	0	22	765
2019–20	< 1	100	< 1	60	0	100	0	0	13	765
2020–21	< 1	100	< 1	60	0	100	0	0	5	765
2021–22	0	100	< 1	60	0	100	0	0	16	765
2022–23	0	100	< 1	60	0	100	0	0	16	765
2023–24	0	100	0	60	0	100	0	0	9	765
2024–25	0	100	0	60	0	100	0	0	1	765




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACCs for the six main PAD stocks: PAD 1 (Auckland East), PAD 2 (Central East) and PAD 3 (south East Coast). [Continued on next page]




Figure 1 [Continued]: Reported commercial landings and TACCs for the six main PAD stocks: PAD 5 (Southland), PAD 7 (Challenger) and PAD 8 (Central Egmont).

1.2 Recreational fisheries

Paddle crabs are targeted by recreational fishers using baited pots or baited mesh (which crabs become tangled in) and they are taken as bycatch when beach and estuarine seining and in setnets throughout much of their geographical range. A National Panel Survey of recreational fishers was conducted for the first time throughout the 2011–12 fishing year (Wynne-Jones et al. 2014). The panel survey used face-to-face interviews of a random sample of 30 390 New Zealand households to recruit a panel of fishers and non-fishers for a full year. The panel members were contacted regularly about their fishing activities and harvest information collected in standardised phone interviews. The national panel survey was repeated during the 2017–18 and 2022–23 fishing years using very similar methods to produce directly comparable results (Wynne-Jones et al. 2019; Heinemann & Gray 2024). Recreational catch estimates

from the three national panel surveys are given in Table 3. Note that national panel survey estimates do not include recreational harvest taken on charter vessel trips or under s111 general approvals. These estimates are all very uncertain because of the small number of fishers reporting catch.

Table 3: Recreational harvest estimates for paddle crab stocks from the national panel surveys (2011–12, 2017–18 and 2022–23). *: no estimates of mean weights were available to convert catches in numbers to tonnes. From Wynne-Jones et al. (2014), Wynne-Jones et al. (2019) and Heinemann & Gray (2024).

Area	Number (thousands)	CV	Catch (t)*
2011–12 (national panel survey)			
PAD 1	2 003	0.86	-
PAD 2	827	1.02	-
PAD 3	1 768	1.01	-
PAD 5	2 532	1.02	-
PAD 8	2 225	0.71	-
PAD total	9 354	0.43	-
2017–18 (national panel survey)			
PAD 1	775	0.84	-
PAD 7	5 139	1.00	-
PAD total	5 914	0.88	-
2022–23 (national panel survey)			
PAD 1	682	1.00	-
PAD 3	145	1.01	-
PAD 7	221	1.02	-
PAD total	1 048	0.70	-

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

Paddle crabs form a fishery for customary non-commercial, but the total annual catch is not known.

Māori customary fishers can utilise the provisions under both the recreational fishing regulations and the various customary regulations. Many tangata whenua may harvest paddle crabs under their recreational allowance and these are not included in records of customary catch. Customary reporting requirements vary around the country. Customary fishing authorisations issued in the South Island and Stewart Island would be under the Fisheries (South Island Customary Fishing) Regulations 1999. Many rohe moana / areas of the coastline in the North Island and Chatham Islands are gazetted under the Fisheries (Kaimoana Customary Fishing) Regulations 1998 which require reporting on authorisations. In the areas not gazetted, customary fishing permits would be issued would be under the Fisheries (Amateur Fishing) Regulations 2013, where there is no requirement to report catch.

The information on Māori customary harvest under the provisions made for customary fishing is very limited (Table 4). These numbers are likely to be an underestimate of customary harvest as only the catch approved and harvested in kilograms and numbers are reported in the table.

Table 4: Fisheries New Zealand records of customary harvest of paddle crabs (approved and reported as weight (kg) and numbers), since 2007-08. – no data.

Stock	Fishing year	Weight (kg)		Numbers	
		Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
PAD 1	2010–11	10	0	50	0
PAD 3	2007–08	—	—	50	0

1.4 Illegal catch

There is qualitative data to suggest illegal, unreported, unregulated (IUU) activity in this Fishery.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

There is no quantitative information available on other sources of mortality, although unknown quantities of paddle crabs have been discarded from commercial fishing operations such as the inshore trawl, setnet and dredge fisheries.

2. BIOLOGY

Paddle crabs are found off sandy beaches and in harbours and estuaries throughout mainland New Zealand, the Chatham Islands, and east and South Australia. They are abundant from the intertidal zone to at least

10 m depth, although they do occur in much deeper water. Paddle crabs are mainly active in early evening or at night, when they move into the shallow intertidal zone to feed.

Paddle crabs are versatile and opportunistic predators. They feed mainly on either molluscs or crustaceans, but also on polychaetes, several fish species, cumacean crustaceans, and occasionally on algae. A high proportion of the molluscs eaten are *Paphies* species. These include: tuatua (*P. subtriangulata*); pipi (*P. australis*); and toheroa (*P. ventricosa*). The burrowing ghost shrimp *Callinassa filholi*, isopods and amphipods are important crustacean prey items. Cannibalism is common, particularly on small crabs and during the winter moulting season.

Anecdotal information suggests there has been a significant increase in paddle crab numbers since the 1970s. Concern has been expressed as to the impact of an increased number of paddle crabs on bivalve shellfish stocks in coastal waters. Feeding studies have shown that although paddle crabs do eat large adult toheroa and other shellfish, they more usually eat bivalve shellfish spat which are found in abundance.

Mating generally occurs during winter and spring (May to November) in sheltered inshore waters. Female paddle crabs can only mate when they are soft-shelled. Male crabs protect and carry pre-moult females to ensure copulation. Female crabs are thought to migrate to deeper water to spawn over the warmer months (September to March). After spawning, the eggs are incubated until they hatch. Paddle crab (*Ovalipes catharus*) has an extended larval life characterised by eight zoea stages and a (crab-like) megalopa. The larvae are thought to live offshore in deeper water, migrating inshore in the megalopa stage to settle from January to May.

Two spawning mechanisms have been observed in *O. catharus*. In Wellington, Tasman Bay, and Canterbury, spawning does not appear to be synchronised and females may spawn several times during the season (non-synchronous spawning). In Blueskin Bay, Otago, paddle crabs are group-synchronous, with one clutch of eggs developing to maturity over winter and spawned from September to February.

Annual fecundity is determined by the number of eggs per brood (brood fecundity) and the number of broods per year. Both these parameters are size dependent and highly variable. Brood fecundity estimates vary considerably geographically from between 82 000–638 000 in Wellington waters, to 100 000–1 200 000 in Canterbury waters, and 931 000–2 122 807 in Otago waters. The number of broods per year also varies geographically from 1.2–3.3 in Wellington waters, to 1.2–2.2 in Canterbury waters, and 1 brood per year in Otago waters (group synchronous spawning).

O. catharus is a relatively large and fast-growing species of *Ovalipes*. In Canterbury waters, paddle crabs reach a maximum size of 130 mm carapace width (CW - males only) after 13 postlarval moults and 3 to 4 years after settlement. Other studies have reported maximum sizes up to 150 mm CW. In Wellington waters, crabs of approximately 100 mm carapace width, of either sex, would be at least 3 years old, while larger crabs could be 4 or 5 years old.

The Intrinsic Productivity Level is categorised as High for this species.

The differences in growth rate, size at first maturity, and fecundity (particularly the number of broods) appear to be largely environmentally regulated. At lower temperatures and higher latitudes, paddle crabs grow slower, mature at a larger size, have a shorter breeding season, and produce fewer broods per year.

Estimates of biological parameters relevant to stock assessment are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Estimates of biological parameters.

Fishstock	Estimate				Source
<u>1. Natural mortality (females only)</u>					
(Percentage mortality at each instar stage)					
Instar	Tasman Bay (QMA 7)		Canterbury (QMA 3)		Osborne (1987)
8	15.3		15.0		
9	31.2		30.0		
10 (68–75 mm CW)	78.1		39.1		
11	30.7		38.9		
12	55.6		18.2		
13 (> 100 mm CW)	100		100		
<u>2. $\log_{10}(\text{weight}) = a + b * \log_{10}(\text{CW})$ (carapace width)</u>					
	Females		Males		Davidson & Marsden (1987)
Canterbury (QMA 3)	a	b	a	b	
	-3.32	2.79	-3.46	2.89	

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

It is not known whether biologically distinct stocks occur, although this seems unlikely given that the species is found throughout New Zealand waters, and from tagging experiments, appears to be highly migratory. There is probably also widespread larval dispersal as larvae spend two months offshore in deeper water (to at least 700 m). Genetically distinct populations may occur in isolated areas such as the Chatham Islands.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

4.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

None are available at present.

4.2 Biomass estimates

No estimates of current or virgin biomass are available. The landings, CPUE, and area data are considered too unreliable or incomplete to allow modelling.

4.3 Yield estimates and projections

MCY cannot be estimated.

CAY cannot be estimated because of the lack of current biomass estimates.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

Until the early 2000s, landings have fluctuated significantly in most QMAs, mainly due to market variations. Until recently, paddle crabs were considered to be abundant throughout most of their range and the fishery only lightly exploited. However, commercial catch in recent years has declined to low levels compared to historical catches. For all PAD fishstocks there is insufficient information to estimate current stock status


6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Armstrong, J H (1985) Aspects of the biology of the swimming crab, *Ovalipes catharus* (White, 1843) in the Otago region. Unpublished MSc thesis, University of Otago, Dunedin.
- Clark, M R (1978) Aspects of the population biology of the swimming crab *Ovalipes catharus* (White, 1843) (Crustacea; Decapoda; Portunidae) in the Plimmerton Area, Wellington. Unpublished BSc (Hons). Zoology Department, Victoria University, Wellington. 115 p.
- Davidson, R J (1987) Natural food and predatory activity of the paddle crab, *Ovalipes catharus*. Unpublished MSc thesis. Zoology Department, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand. 110 p.
- Davidson, R J; Marsden, I D (1987) Size relationships and relative growth of the New Zealand swimming crab *Ovalipes catharus* (White, 1983). *Journal of Crustacean Biology* 7: 308–317.
- Haddon, M (1988) Impact of paddle crabs on shellfish. *Catch* 15: 9–11.

- Heinemann A; Gray, A. (2024) National Panel Survey of Recreational Marine Fishers 2022-23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/51*. 116 p.
- Kung, H T (1973) Some aspects of the biology of the swimming crab *Ovalipes catharus* (White, 1843) in Paremata Harbour, New Zealand. Unpublished MSc thesis, Victoria University, Wellington.
- McLay, C L (1988) Brachyura and crab-like Anomura of New Zealand. Leigh Laboratory Bulletin No: 22, University of Auckland. 463 p.
- NZFIB (1996) The New Zealand seafood industry economic review 1994–1996. New Zealand Fishing Industry Board, Wellington. 65 p.
- Osborne, T A (1987) Life history and population biology of the paddle crab, *Ovalipes catharus*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Zoology Department, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand. 156 p.
- Stead, D (1983) Paddle crab investigations. *Catch* 10: 14–15.
- Stead, D (1984) Crab fishery expansion possible. *Catch* 11: 13–14.
- Stevens, D W (1999) A summary of biology and commercial landings and a stock assessment of paddle crabs *Ovalipes catharus* White, 1843 (Crustacea, Portunidae) in New Zealand waters. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1999/18*. 26 p.
- Wear, R G (1988a) Paddle crab fishery has potential in New Zealand. *Catch* 15: 11 p.
- Wear, R G (1988b) Paddle crabs eat small shellfish. *Catch* 15: 12–13.
- Wear, R G; Haddon, M (1987) Natural diet of the crab *Ovalipes catharus* (Crustacea, Portunidae) around central and northern New Zealand. *Marine Ecology (Progress series)* 35: 39–49.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–2018. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/24*. 104 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Hill, L; Heinemann, A (2014) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2011–12: Harvest Estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/67*.

PARORE (PAR)

(*Girella tricuspidata*)
 Parore



1. FISHERY SUMMARY

Parore was introduced into the Quota Management System (QMS) on 1 October 2004 with the TACs, TACCs and allowances shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs, and TACs (t) for parore by Fishstock.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
PAR 1	6	3	4	61	74
PAR 2	1	1	0	2	4
PAR 9	2	1	1	21	25
PAR 10	0	0	0	0	0

1.1 Commercial fisheries

Parore is principally caught as a bycatch in the grey mullet, flatfish and trevally setnet fisheries in northern New Zealand. Most of the catch comes from eastern Northland and the Firth of Thames (FMA 1) and the Kaipara and Manukau Harbours (FMA 9) (Figure 1). Highest catch rates occur during September to October. Few parore are caught in the other FMAs.

Historical estimated and recent reported parore landings and TACCs are shown in Tables 2, 3 and 4. Between 2004–05 and 2022–23 total landings ranged between 56 t and 98 t. Landings exceeded the PAR 1 TACC by 9 t in 2009–10 and slightly in 2010–11 and 2012–13, and were at the TACC in 2019–20 and exceeded it by 15 t in 2023–24 and 1 t in 2024–25. In PAR 9 landings have remained below the TACC in most years, only slightly exceeding the TACC in 2009–10, 2018–19 and 2023–24, with the highest landings of the series (29 t) exceeding the TACC by 8 t in 2024–25 (Table 4).

Fishers may confuse the codes PAR (parore) and POR (porae) when reporting catches, but given that both species occur in shallow northern waters, misreporting is difficult to discern.

1.2 Recreational fisheries

Parore is taken by recreational fishers in northern areas as a bycatch when targeting other species such as snapper, trevally, and mullet using rod and line or set net. There is some opportunistic targeting by

spear fishers. No estimates of recreational harvest of parore were generated from the telephone-diary surveys conducted in 1994, 1996 and 2000 because so few were reported. A National Panel Survey was conducted for the first time throughout the 2011–12 fishing year. The panel survey used face-to-face interviews of a random sample of 30 390 New Zealand households to recruit a panel of fishers and non-fishers for a full year (Wynne-Jones et al 2014). The panel members were contacted regularly about their fishing activities and harvest information collected in standardised phone interviews. The national panel survey was repeated during the 2017–18 and 2022–23 fishing years using very similar methods to produce directly comparable results (Wynne-Jones et al 2019; Heinemann & Gray 2024). Recreational catch estimates from the three national panel surveys are given in Table 5. Note that national panel survey estimates do not include recreational harvest taken on charter vessel trips or under s111 general approvals.

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

There is no quantitative information on customary harvest of parore. Customary fishers are likely to catch small quantities of parore when targeting other species such as snapper, trevally, and mullet. Parore is considered to be a low value customary species and current catches are likely to be low.

Table 2: Reported landings (t) for the main QMAs from 1931 to 1982.

Year	PAR 1	PAR 2	PAR 9	Year	PAR 1	PAR 2	PAR 9
1931–32	0	0	0	1957	19	0	0
1932–33	0	0	0	1958	22	0	1
1933–34	0	0	0	1959	13	0	1
1934–35	0	0	0	1960	6	0	0
1935–36	0	0	0	1961	12	0	1
1936–37	0	0	0	1962	28	0	2
1937–38	0	0	0	1963	29	0	2
1938–39	1	0	0	1964	62	0	2
1939–40	0	0	0	1965	56	0	2
1940–41	0	0	0	1966	42	0	2
1941–42	0	0	0	1967	19	0	2
1942–43	15	0	0	1968	39	0	0
1943–44	13	0	0	1969	67	0	2
1944	21	0	0	1970	69	1	4
1945	41	0	0	1971	82	0	3
1946	75	0	0	1972	67	0	3
1947	31	0	0	1973	50	0	5
1948	4	0	0	1974	55	0	2
1949	7	0	0	1975	37	1	7
1950	13	0	0	1976	67	1	13
1951	7	0	0	1977	65	0	7
1952	20	0	0	1978	62	0	3
1953	11	0	0	1979	53	0	5
1954	16	0	0	1980	40	6	6
1955	12	0	1	1981	50	0	6
1956	7	0	0	1982	52	1	12

Notes:

1. The 1931–1943 years are April–March but from 1944 onwards are calendar years.
2. Data for the period 1931 to 1982 are based on reported landings by harbour and are likely to be underestimated as a result of under-reporting and discarding practices. Data includes both foreign and domestic landings

Table 3: Reported landings (t) of parore by FMA, fishing years 1989–90 to 2003–04.

	FMA 1	FMA 2	FMA 3	FMA 4	FMA 5	FMA 7	FMA 8	FMA 9
1989–90	18	< 1	0	0	< 1	< 1	0	< 1
1990–91	81	2	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	0
1991–92	100	< 1	< 1	0	0	2	0	0
1992–93	109	< 1	< 1	0	< 1	< 1	0	0
1993–94	95	< 1	0	< 1	0	< 1	< 1	0
1994–95	95	< 1	< 1	0	0	< 1	0	3
1995–96	89	< 1	0	0	0	< 1	< 1	9
1996–97	70	< 1	< 1	< 1	0	3	< 1	6
1997–98	73	< 1	< 1	0	0	< 1	< 1	5
1998–99	73	< 1	< 1	< 1	0	< 1	< 1	6
1999–00	79	< 1	< 1	0	< 1	< 1	< 1	4
2000–01	91	< 1	< 1	0	0	< 1	< 1	9
2001–02	67	1	< 1	0	< 1	< 1	0	3
2002–03	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
2003–04	49	< 1	< 1	0	0	0	< 1	6

Table 4: Reported domestic landings (t) of Parore Fishstocks and TACC, fishing years 2004–05 to present.

Fishstock FMA	PAR 1		PAR 2		PAR 9		Total	
	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC
2004–05	42	61	< 1	2	14	21	56	84
2005–06	48	61	< 1	2	15	21	63	84
2006–07	52	61	< 1	2	10	21	61	84
2007–08	57	61	< 1	2	11	21	68	84
2008–09	59	61	< 1	2	20	21	79	84
2009–10	70	61	< 1	2	22	21	92	84
2010–11	62	61	< 1	2	18	21	80	84
2011–12	61	61	< 1	2	18	21	78	84
2012–13	65	61	< 1	2	18	21	83	84
2013–14	53	61	< 1	2	18	21	72	84
2014–15	49	61	< 1	2	19	21	68	84
2015–16	49	61	< 1	2	17	21	66	84
2016–17	49	61	0	2	20	21	70	84
2017–18	50	61	0	2	15	21	65	84
2018–19	60	61	< 1	2	22	21	82	84
2019–20	61	61	0	2	17	21	78	84
2020–21	56	61	< 1	2	18	21	74	84
2021–22	45	61	< 1	2	14	21	59	84
2022–23	51	61	< 1	2	20	21	71	84
2023–24	76	61	0	2	22	21	98	84
2024–25	62	61	< 1	2	29	21	91	84




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the two main PAR stocks. From top PAR 1 (Auckland East) and PAR 9 (Auckland West).

Table 5: Recreational harvest estimates (in numbers of fish) for parore stocks (Wynne-Jones et al 2014, 2019, Heinemann & Gray 2024).

Stock	Year	Method	Number of fish	Total weight (t)	CV
PAR 1	2011–12	Panel survey	4 328	-	0.50
	2017–18	Panel survey	7 302	-	0.34
	2022–23	Panel survey	609	-	0.81
PAR 2	2011–12	Panel survey	-	-	-
	2017–18	Panel survey	109	-	1.01
	2022–23	Panel survey	-	-	-
PAR 9	2011–12	Panel survey	-	-	-
	2017–18	Panel survey	834	-	0.70
	2022–23	Panel survey	405	-	0.77

2. BIOLOGY

Parore (*Girella tricuspidata*) occur along both east and west coasts of the North Island, from North Cape to Cook Strait (Anderson et al 1998). It has not been recorded around the Chatham Islands. They usually occur in schools, ranging from half a dozen to several hundred individuals. Although there is evidence that large individuals display territorial behaviour on some reef systems, work in Australia has shown that parore are capable of moving distances of hundreds of kilometres (Pollock 1981).

Parore grow to a maximum size of at least 600 mm, but most adult fish are around 300–400 mm in length. The maximum age for this species on the North Island east coast, as estimated by scale ring counts (validated by seasonal increments), is 10 years (Morrison 1990). As scales tend to provide underestimates of the age of older fish, maximum age could be considerably higher. Growth is relatively rapid in the first year of life, with fish reaching a size of about 100 mm at age one. Fish reach a length of 300 mm by age five, at which time growth slows. Growth rates of males and females, and of open coast and estuarine populations, appear similar. No growth studies have been undertaken on the west coast of the North Island, but large parore (about 600 mm) are sometimes taken in harbour set-nets as bycatch. Parore reach sexual maturity at a length of 280 mm and spawning takes place in late spring to early summer (Morrison 1990). Larvae are neustonic, occurring near the ocean's surface, often in association with drifting material such as seaweed clumps.

Juveniles enter estuaries in January at a length of about 11 mm. They are initially found on seagrass meadows and beds of Neptune's Necklace (*Hormosira banksii*) on shallow reefs, but after 3–4 months move down the estuary to other habitats e.g., brown kelp beds. At approximately one year old, they move out to coastal reefs in the immediate vicinity of estuary mouths and over the following 2–3 years move to reef systems further off- and along-shore (Morrison 1990).

Parore are important herbivores in coastal systems and may play a major role in structuring algal assemblages (Morrison 1990). Juvenile parore have been found in the stomachs of kahawai and John dory.

The Intrinsic Productivity Level is categorised as Medium for this species.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

There is insufficient biological information available on this species to indicate the existence of separate stocks around New Zealand. However, reliance on localized nursery areas suggests that more than one biological stock may exist.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

There has been no scientific assessment of the maximum sustainable yield for parore stocks.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

There is no fishery-dependent or fishery-independent information to determine the stock status of parore. Biomass estimates cannot be determined for this species with existing data. Estimates of current and reference biomass are not available. For all Fishstocks there is insufficient information to estimate current stock status.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Anderson, O F; Bagley, N W; Hurst, R J; Francis, M P; Clark, M R; McMillan, P J (1998) Atlas of New Zealand fish and squid distributions from research bottom trawls. *NIWA Technical Report* 42. 303 p.
- Heinemann A; Gray, A. (2024) National Panel Survey of Recreational Marine Fishers 2022-23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2024/51. 116 p.
- Morrison, M A (1990) Ontogenetic shifts in the ecology of the parore, *Girella tricuspidata*. Unpublished MSc thesis, University of Auckland. 66 p.
- Pollock, B R (1981) Age determination and growth of luderick, *Girella tricuspidata* (Quoy and Gaimard), taken from Moreton Bay, Australia. *Journal of Fisheries Biology* 19: 475–485.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–2018. Draft New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report held by Fisheries New Zealand.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Hill, L; Heinemann, A (2014) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2011–12: Harvest Estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2014/67.

INTRODUCTION – PĀUA (PAU)

(*Haliotis iris*, *Haliotis australis*)



1. INTRODUCTION

Pāua are important shellfish both commercially and for non-commercial fishers. For assessment purposes, individual reports on the largest commercial fisheries have been produced separately:

1. PAU 2 – Wairarapa / Wellington / Taranaki
2. PAU 3A – Kaikoura
3. PAU 3B – Canterbury
4. PAU 4 – Chatham Islands
5. PAU 5A – Fiordland
6. PAU 5B – Stewart Island
7. PAU 5D – Southland / Otago
8. PAU 7 – Marlborough/Nelson

In 1986–87, pāua stocks were introduced into the Quota Management System (QMS) and most Quota Management Areas (QMA) have since been managed with a Total Allowable Catch (TAC) that is made up of Total Allowable Commercial Catch (TACC), recreational and customary catch, and other sources of mortality (Table 1).

Table 1 Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs and TACs (t) for pāua by Fishstock from 1 October 2025.

Fishstock	Description	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
PAU 1*	Auckland	–	–	–	1.93	–
PAU 2	Wairarapa / Wellington / Taranaki	48	12	11	109	180
PAU 3A	Kaikoura	18	7.5	7	46	78.5
PAU 3B	Canterbury	9	15	10	46	80
PAU 4	Chatham Islands	3	3	2	326	334
PAU 5A	Fiordland	5	5	3	89	102
PAU 5B	Stewart Island	6	7	3	107	123
PAU 5D	Southland / Otago	22	3	20	89	134
PAU 6*	Challenger / Westland	–	–	–	1	–
PAU 7	Marlborough	15	15	10	93.62	133.62
PAU 10*	Kermadec	–	–	–	1	–

* allowances and TAC not set

Commercial fisheries

The commercial fishery for pāua dates from the mid-1940s. In the early years of this commercial fishery, shell was the main product but the meat was usually sold on the domestic market for paua sausages or for fish and chip market, or used as bait. However, by the late 1950s, both meat and shell were being sold. Since the 1986–87 fishing season, the Quota Management Areas have been managed with an individual transferable quota system with a TAC, allowances for recreational and customary catch, and other sources of mortality and a TACC. Paua can be returned to the sea under the Fisheries (Landings and Discards) Notice if uninjured and returned to substrate from which it was taken.

Fishers gather pāua by hand while free diving. The use of underwater breathing apparatus (UBA) is not permitted except in the PAU 4 fishery. Due to safety concerns of great white shark interactions, the use of UBAs has been permitted in the Chatham Island pāua fishery (PAU 4) since 2012. Most of the catch is from the Wairarapa coast southwards: the major fishing areas are in the Chatham Islands (PAU 4), Wairarapa (PAU 2), Marlborough (PAU 7), Stewart Island (PAU 5B), and Fiordland (PAU 5A). Virtually the entire commercial fishery is for the black-foot pāua, *Haliotis iris*, with a minimum legal size for harvesting of 125 mm shell length. A minimum harvest size greater than the minimum legal size is used by commercial divers in all QMAs to reflect differences in pāua growth, with the aim to protect a substantial proportion of the spawning biomass to ensure long-term reproduction and sustainability. The yellow-foot pāua, *H. australis* is less abundant than *H. iris* and is caught only in small quantities; it has a minimum legal size of 80 mm. Catch statistics include both *H. iris* and *H. australis*.

Concerns about the status of some stocks, or a desire to increase biomass levels to above B_{MSY} , led to the commercial fishers agreeing to voluntarily reduce their Annual Catch Entitlement (ACE). This management tool is still in place in some QMAs. When relevant, information is available in the individual Working Group reports.

Up until the 2002 fishing year, catch was reported by general statistical areas; however, from 2002 onwards, a finer scale system of pāua specific statistical areas was put in place throughout each QMA (refer to the QMA specific Plenary chapters). The historical landings for the main PAU stocks are shown in Figure 1 (from 1986-87 present). On 1 October 1995 PAU 5 was divided into three separate QMAs: PAU 5A, PAU 5B, and PAU 5D. On 1 October 2021 PAU 3 was divided into two separate QMAs: PAU 3A and PAU 3B.




Figure 1: Historical landings for the major pāua QMAs from 1986-87 to present.

Table 2: TACCs and reported landings (t) of pāua by Fishstock from 1983–84 to present. * FSU data. H experimental landings. [Continued on next page]

Fishstock	PAU 1		PAU 2		PAU 3		PAU 3A		PAU 3B		PAU 4		PAU 5		PAU 5A	
	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC
1983–84*	1	–	110	–	114.00	–	–	–	–	–	409.00	–	550	–	–	–
1984–85*	0	–	154	–	92.00	–	–	–	–	–	278.00	–	353	–	–	–
1985–86*	0	–	92	–	51.00	–	–	–	–	–	221.00	–	228	–	–	–
1986–87*	0.01	1.00	96.2	121.19	54.02	91.62	–	–	–	–	267.37	326.54	418.9	492.06	–	–
1987–88*	0.98	1.00	122.11	121.19	62.99	91.62	–	–	–	–	279.57	326.54	465	492.06	–	–
1988–89*	0.05	1.93	121.5	121.19	57.55	91.62	–	–	–	–	284.73	326.54	427.97	492.06	–	–
1989–90	0.28	1.93	127.28	121.19	73.46	91.62	–	–	–	–	287.38	326.54	459.46	492.06	–	–
1990–91	0.16	1.93	125.82	121.19	90.68	91.62	–	–	–	–	253.61	326.54	528.16	492.06	–	–
1991–92	0.27	1.93	116.66	121.19	90.25	91.62	–	–	–	–	281.59	326.54	486.76	492.06	–	–
1992–93	1.37	1.93	119.13	121.19	94.52	91.62	–	–	–	–	266.38	326.54	440.15	443.00	–	–
1993–94	1.05	1.93	125.22	121.19	85.09	91.62	–	–	–	–	297.76	326.54	440.39	443.00	–	–
1994–95	0.26	1.93	113.28	121.19	93.26	91.62	–	–	–	–	282.10	326.54	436.13	443.00	–	–
1995–96	0.99	1.93	119.75	121.19	92.89	91.62	–	–	–	–	220.17	326.54	–	–	138.53	148.98
1996–97	1.28	1.93	118.86	121.19	89.65	91.62	–	–	–	–	251.71	326.54	–	–	143.85	148.98
1997–98	1.28	1.93	122.41	121.19	93.88	91.62	–	–	–	–	301.69	326.54	–	–	145.22	148.98
1998–99	1.13	1.93	115.22	121.19	92.54	91.62	–	–	–	–	281.76	326.54	–	–	147.39	148.98
1999–00	0.69	1.93	122.48	121.19	90.30	91.62	–	–	–	–	321.56	326.54	–	–	143.91	148.98
2000–01	1.00	1.93	122.92	121.19	93.19	91.62	–	–	–	–	326.89	326.54	–	–	148.22	148.98
2001–02	0.32	1.93	116.87	121.19	89.66	91.62	–	–	–	–	321.64	326.54	–	–	148.53	148.98
2002–03	0.00	1.93	121.19	121.19	90.92	91.62	–	–	–	–	325.62	326.54	–	–	148.76	148.98
2003–04	0.05	1.93	121.06	121.19	91.58	91.62	–	–	–	–	325.85	326.54	–	–	148.98	148.98
2004–05	0.27	1.93	121.19	121.19	91.43	91.62	–	–	–	–	319.24	326.54	–	–	148.95	148.98
2005–06	0.45	1.93	121.14	121.19	91.60	91.62	–	–	–	–	322.53	326.54	–	–	148.92	148.98
2006–07	0.76	1.93	121.20	121.19	91.61	91.62	–	–	–	–	322.76	326.54	–	–	104.03	148.98
2007–08	1.14	1.93	121.06	121.19	91.67	91.62	–	–	–	–	323.98	326.54	–	–	105.13	148.98
2008–09	0.47	1.93	121.18	121.19	90.84	91.62	–	–	–	–	324.18	326.54	–	–	104.82	148.98
2009–10	0.20	1.93	121.13	121.19	91.61	91.62	–	–	–	–	323.57	326.54	–	–	105.74	148.98
2010–11	0.12	1.93	121.18	121.19	90.40	91.62	–	–	–	–	262.15	326.54	–	–	104.40	148.98
2011–12	0.77	1.93	120.01	121.19	91.14	91.62	–	–	–	–	262.07	326.54	–	–	106.23	148.98
2012–13	1.06	1.93	122.00	121.19	90.01	91.62	–	–	–	–	263.33	326.54	–	–	105.56	148.98
2013–14	0.71	1.93	120.00	121.19	90.85	91.62	–	–	–	–	291.98	326.54	–	–	102.30	148.98
2014–15	0.47	1.93	115.00	121.19	90.44	91.62	–	–	–	–	295.16	326.54	–	–	106.95	148.98
2015–16	0.13	1.93	123.74	121.19	91.73	91.62	–	–	–	–	294.73	326.54	–	–	106.84	148.98
2016–17	0.25	1.93	123.69	121.19	66.29	91.62	–	–	–	–	264.63	326.54	–	–	106.50	148.98
2017–18	0.00	1.93	113.87	121.19	45.59	45.80	–	–	–	–	203.03	326.54	–	–	107.45	148.98
2018–19	0.22	1.93	122.89	121.19	44.05	45.80	–	–	–	–	185.06	326.54	–	–	99.66	148.98
2019–20	1.36	1.93	122.28	121.19	43.09	45.80	–	–	–	–	188.47	326.54	–	–	103.03	148.98
2020–21	0.64	1.93	126.26	121.19	47.10	45.80	–	–	–	–	196.65	326.54	–	–	106.02	148.98
2021–22	0.93	1.93	110.91	121.19	–	–	22.96	23.00	46.56	46.00	209.10	326.54	–	–	114.88	148.98
2022–23	0.42	1.93	129.39	121.19	–	–	22.71	23.00	46.02	46.00	202.04	326.54	–	–	111.51	148.98
2023–24	0.00	1.93	120.14	121.19	–	–	22.45	23.00	44.40	46.00	191.33	326.54	–	–	93.86	148.98
2024–25	0.00	1.93	124.56	121.19	–	–	45.50	46.00	40.37	46.00	169.23	326.54	–	–	97.41	148.98

PĀUA (PAU) – May 2026

Table 2 [Continued]:

Fishstock	PAU 5B		PAU 5D		PAU 6		PAU 7		PAU 10		Total	
	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land	TACC	Land.	TACC
1983–84*	–	–	–	–			330.00	–			853.00	0.00
1984–85*	–	–	–	–			230.00	–			600.00	0.00
1985–86*	–	–	–	–			236.09	–			508.09	0.00
1986–87*	–	–	–	–	0.00	1.00	242.18	–	0.00	1.00	1 078.67	1 302.81
1987–88*	–	–	–	–	0.00	1.00	255.94	–	0.00	1.00	1 180.05	1 302.81
1988–89*	–	–	–	–	0.00	1.00	246.03	–	0.00	1.00	1 177.22	1 302.81
1989–90	–	–	–	–	0.00	1.00	267.05	267.48	0.00	1.00	1 233.82	1 302.81
1990–91	–	–	–	–	0.23	1.00	273.25	267.48	0.00	1.00	1 303.02	1 302.81
1991–92	–	–	–	–	0.00	1.00	268.31	267.48	0.00	1.00	1 252.94	1 302.81
1992–93	–	–	–	–	0.00	1.00	264.80	267.48	0.00	1.00	1 199.09	1 253.75
1993–94	–	–	–	–	0.10	1.00	255.47	267.48	0.00	1.00	1 204.67	1 253.75
1994–95	–	–	–	–	9.29 ^H	1.00	247.11	267.48	0.00	1.00	1 186.45	1 253.75
1995–96	144.66	148.98	167.42	148.98	28.62 ^H	1.00	268.74	267.48	0.00	1.00	1 215.77	1 257.69
1996–97	142.36	148.98	146.6	148.98	0.11	1.00	267.59	267.48	0.00	1.00	1 210.05	1 257.69
1997–98	145.34	148.98	146.99	148.98	0.00	1.00	266.65	267.48	0.00	1.00	1 220.79	1 257.69
1998–99	148.55	148.98	148.78	148.98	0.00	1.00	265.05	267.48	0.00	1.00	1 217.76	1 257.69
1999–00	118.07	143.98	147.66	148.98	1.04	1.00	264.64	267.48	0.00	1.00	1 208.99	1 252.69
2000–01	89.92	112.19	149.00	148.98	0.00	1.00	215.92	267.48	0.00	1.00	1 146.87	1 220.90
2001–02	89.96	112.19	148.74	148.98	0.00	1.00	187.15	240.73	0.00	1.00	1 102.86	1 194.15
2002–03	89.86	90.00	111.69	114.00	0.00	1.00	187.22	187.24	0.00	1.00	1 075.26	1 083.49
2003–04	90.00	90.00	88.02	89.00	0.00	1.00	159.55	187.24	0.00	1.00	1 025.09	1 058.49
2004–05	89.97	90.00	88.82	89.00	0.00	1.00	166.94	187.24	0.00	1.00	1 026.81	1 058.49
2005–06	90.47	90.00	88.93	89.00	0.00	1.00	183.36	187.24	0.00	1.00	1 047.40	1 058.49
2006–07	89.16	90.00	88.98	89.00	1.00	1.00	176.05	187.24	0.00	1.00	995.54	1 058.49
2007–08	90.21	90.00	88.97	89.00	1.00	1.00	186.84	187.24	0.00	1.00	1 010.00	1 058.49
2008–09	90.00	90.00	88.77	89.00	1.00	1.00	186.85	187.24	0.00	1.00	1 008.11	1 058.49
2009–10	90.23	90.00	89.45	89.00	1.00	1.00	187.02	187.24	0.00	1.00	1 010.61	1 058.49
2010–11	89.67	90.00	88.70	89.00	1.00	1.00	186.77	187.24	0.00	1.00	944.39	1 058.49
2011–12	89.59	90.00	89.23	89.00	1.00	1.00	186.98	187.24	0.00	1.00	947.02	1 058.49
2012–13	90.58	90.00	87.91	89.00	1.00	1.00	149.75	187.24	0.00	1.00	911.43	1 058.49
2013–14	88.84	90.00	84.59	89.00	1.00	1.00	145.52	187.24	0.00	1.00	926.16	1 058.49
2014–15	89.45	90.00	71.87	89.00	0.96	1.00	133.58	187.24	0.00	1.00	903.56	1 058.50
2015–16	88.39	90.00	65.95	89.00	0.84	1.00	139.79	187.24	0.00	1.00	912.14	1 058.50
2016–17	92.99	90.00	63.12	89.00	1.06	1.00	93.61	93.62	0.00	1.00	812.15	964.88
2017–18	89.33	90.00	62.48	89.00	1.04	1.00	81.88	93.62	0.00	1.00	704.67	919.06
2018–19	89.03	90.00	55.55	89.00	1.00	1.00	79.70	93.62	0.00	1.00	677.16	919.06
2019–20	87.19	107.00	56.55	89.00	1.00	1.00	81.98	93.62	0.00	1.00	684.97	936.06
2020–21	89.60	107.00	57.78	89.00	1.00	1.00	81.34	93.62	0.00	1.00	706.37	936.06
2021–22	92.97	107.00	67.57	89.00	0.99	1.00	86.79	93.62	0.00	1.00	753.66	959.26
2022–23	105.06	107.00	62.76	89.00	0.00	1.00	76.54	93.62	0.00	1.00	756.45	959.26
2023–24	109.25	107.00	69.18	89.00	0.36	1.00	61.44	93.62	0.00	1.00	712.41	959.26
2024–25	102.41	107.00	65.91	89.00	0.88	1.00	48.46	93.62	0.00	1.00	694.73	982.26

PAU 1 landings have been below the TACC since its introduction to the QMS in 1986–87 with an average of 0.56 t caught per year and with no landings recorded for 2017–18. Landings increased to 1.36 t in 2019–20, close to the TACC of 1.93 t and at a level not seen since 1992–93. In contrast, PAU 6 landings have been close to the TACC since the fishing year 2006–07, except in 2022–23 when there were no landings. For information on landings specific to other pāua QMAs refer to the specific chapters.

1.1 Recreational fisheries

There is a large recreational fishery for pāua. Estimated catches from telephone and diary surveys of recreational fishers (Teirney et al. 1997, Bradford 1998, Boyd & Reilly 2004, Boyd et al. 2004) are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Estimated annual harvest of pāua (t) by recreational fishers from telephone-diary surveys*.

Fishstock	PAU 1	PAU 2	PAU 3	PAU 5	PAU 5A	PAU 5B	PAU 5D	PAU 6	PAU 7
1991–92	–	–	35–60	50–80	–	–	–	–	–
1992–93	–	37–89	–	–	–	–	–	0–1	2–7
1993–94	29–32	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1995–96	10–20	45–65	–	20–35	–	–	–	–	–
1996–97	–	–	–	N/A	–	–	22.5	–	–
1999–00	40–78	224–606	26–46	36–70	–	–	26–50	2–14	8–23
2000–01	16–37	152–248	31–61	70–121	–	–	43–79	0–3	4–11

*1991–1995 Regional telephone/diary estimates, 1995/96, 1999/00, and 2000/01 National Marine Recreational Fishing Surveys.

The harvest estimates provided by telephone-diary surveys between 1993 and 2001 are no longer considered reliable for various reasons. A Recreational Technical Working Group concluded that these harvest estimates should be used only with the following qualifications: a) they may be very inaccurate; b) the 1996 and earlier surveys contain a methodological error; and c) the 2000 and 2001 estimates are implausibly high for many important fisheries. In response to these problems and the cost and scale challenges associated with onsite methods, a national panel survey was conducted for the first time throughout the 2011–12 fishing year. The panel survey used face-to-face interviews of a random sample of 30 390 New Zealand households to recruit a panel of fishers and non-fishers for a full year. The panel members were contacted regularly about their fishing activities and harvest information collected in standardised phone interviews. The national panel survey was repeated during the 2017–18 and 2022–23 fishing years using very similar methods to produce directly comparable results (Wynne-Jones et al. 2019; Heinemann & Gray 2024). Recreational catch estimates from the three national panel surveys are given in Table 4. Note that national panel survey estimates do not include recreational harvest taken on charter vessel trips or under s111 general approvals. These estimates are very uncertain for some stocks because of the small number of fishers reporting catch, and more precise estimates of recreational harvest are provided by on site approaches (e.g. PAU 3A).

Table 4: Recreational harvest estimates for pāua stocks from the national panel survey in 2011–12 (Wynne-Jones et al. 2014), 2017–18 (Wynne-Jones et al. 2019) and 2022–23 (Heinemann & Gray 2024). Mean weights from boat ramp surveys (Hartill & Davey 2015, Davey et al. 2019, 2024). [Continued on next page].

Stock	Fishers	Events	Number of pāua	CV	Total weight (t)	CV
2011–12 (national panel survey)						
PAU 1	39	63	43 480	0.27	12.16	0.27
PAU 2	157	376	285 038	0.15	81.63	0.15
PAU 3	35	67	60 717	0.31	16.98	0.31
PAU 5A	2	3	1 487	0.76	0.42	0.76
PAU 5B	4	4	2 729	0.54	0.76	0.54
PAU 5D	41	84	80 290	0.3	22.45	0.3
PAU 7	19	41	50 534	0.34	14.13	0.34
2017–18 (national panel survey)						
PAU 1	26	40	26 393	0.35	8.32	0.35
PAU 2	151	365	281 472	0.15	82.7	0.15
PAU 3	21	46	28 140	0.35	8.79	0.35
PAU 5A	2	3	2 293	0.8	0.71	0.81
PAU 5B	10	21	15 361	0.45	4.88	0.45
PAU 5D	48	88	55 141	0.21	19.28	0.21
PAU 6	3	7	3 076	0.6	0.95	0.61
PAU 7	11	16	10 576	0.36	3.02	0.36
2022–23 (national panel survey)						
PAU 1	8	14	28 178	0.87	8.12	0.87

Table 4 [Continued]:

Stock	Fishers	Events	Number of pāua	CV	Total weight (t)	CV
PAU 2	72	143	114 522	0.17	33.01	0.17
PAU 3A	9	12	1 979	0.68	0.57	0.68
PAU 3B	19	23	8 277	0.33	2.39	0.33
PAU 5A	3	5	5 489	0.68	1.58	0.68
PAU 5B	12	26	11 989	0.33	3.46	0.33
PAU 5D	31	62	71 650	0.30	20.65	0.30
PAU 7	9	15	9 908	0.35	2.87	0.35

1.2 Customary fisheries

Pāua is a taonga species and as such there is an important customary use of pāua by Māori for food, and the shells have been used extensively for decorations and fishing devices. Pāua forms an important fishery for customary non-commercial, but the total annual catch is not known.

Māori customary fishers utilise the provisions under both the recreational fishing regulations and the various customary regulations. Many tangata whenua harvest pāua under their recreational allowance and these are not included in records of customary catch. Customary reporting requirements vary around the country. Customary fishing authorisations issued in the South Island and Stewart Island would be under the Fisheries (South Island Customary Fishing) Regulations 1999. Many rohe moana / areas of the coastline in the North Island and Chatham Islands are gazetted under the Fisheries (Kaimoana Customary Fishing) Regulations 1998 which require reporting on authorisations. In the areas not gazetted, customary fishing permits would be issued would be under the Fisheries (Amateur Fishing) Regulations 2013, where there is no requirement to report catch.

The information on Māori customary harvest under the provisions made for customary fishing can be limited (Table 5). These numbers are likely to be an underestimate of customary harvest as only the catch approved and harvested in kilograms and numbers are reported in the table.

Table 5: Fisheries New Zealand records of customary harvest of pāua (approved and reported as weight (kg) and in numbers), since 1998–99, for the year when reports were recorded. – no data. These numbers are likely to be an underestimate of customary harvest as only the catch approved and harvested in kilograms and numbers are reported in the table [Continued on next two pages]

Fishing year	PAU 1				PAU 2			
	Weight (kg)		Numbers		Weight (kg)		Numbers	
	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
1998–99	–	–	–	–	40	40	–	–
1999–00	–	–	–	–	–	–	1 400	820
2000–01	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2001–02	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2002–03	–	–	30	30	–	–	–	–
2003–04	–	–	184	146	–	–	4 805	4 685
2004–05	–	–	240	220	–	–	2 780	2 440
2005–06	125	100	40	40	–	–	5 349	4 385
2006–07	705	581	2 175	1 925	–	–	7 088	3 446
2007–08	460	413	2 155	1 618	–	–	11 298	6 164
2008–09	491	191	2 915	2 228	–	–	30 312	24 155
2009–10	184	43	2 825	2 225	–	–	5 505	4 087
2010–11	154	129	5 915	3 952	–	–	20 570	17 062
2011–12	25	8	470	470	243	243	29 759	23 932
2012–13	20	20	1 305	1 193	10	6	51 275	27 653
2013–14	–	–	–	–	–	–	61 486	30 129
2014–15	45	33	700	536	–	–	25 215	16 449
2015–16	50	9	1 425	756	–	–	11 540	6 383
2016–17	–	–	2 190	618	100	100	13 698	6 877
2017–18	15	15	4 632	3 162	–	–	6 960	1 942
2018–19	–	–	1 368	710	–	–	8 565	3 189
2019–20	60	20	120	115	–	–	–	–
2020–21	40	0	375	176	–	–	–	–
2021–22	40	40	–	–	–	–	–	–
2022–23	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2023–24	–	–	655	251	–	–	200	90
2024–25	–	–	–	–	–	–	520	74

Table 5 [Continued]:

Fishing year	PAU 3*				PAU 3A			
	Weight (kg)		Numbers		Weight (kg)		Numbers	
	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
2000–01	–	–	300	230	–	–	–	–
2001–02	–	–	6 239	4 832	–	–	–	–
2002–03	–	–	3 422	2 449	–	–	–	–
2003–04	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2004–05	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2005–06	–	–	1 580	1 220	–	–	–	–
2006–07	–	–	5 274	4 561	–	–	–	–
2007–08	–	–	7 515	5 790	–	–	–	–
2008–09	–	–	10 848	8 232	–	–	–	–
2009–10	–	–	8 490	6 467	–	–	–	–
2010–11	–	–	8 360	7 449	–	–	–	–
2011–12	–	–	5 675	4 242	–	–	–	–
2012–13	–	–	15 036	12 874	–	–	–	–
2013–14	–	–	10 259	7 566	–	–	–	–
2014–15	–	–	8 761	7 035	–	–	–	–
2015–16	–	–	14 801	11 808	–	–	–	–
2016–17	–	–	11 374	9 217	–	–	–	–
2017–18	–	–	2 708	1 725	–	–	–	–
2018–19	–	–	480	278	–	–	–	–
2019–20	–	–	30 288	21 527	–	–	–	–
2020–21	–	–	11 462	8 609	–	–	–	–
2021–22	–	–	–	–	–	–	9 228	7 905
2022–23	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2023–24	–	–	–	–	–	–	31 438	29 707

Fishing year	PAU 3B				PAU 4			
	Weight (kg)		Numbers		Weight (kg)		Numbers	
	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
2009–10	–	–	–	–	–	–	635	635
2010–11	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2011–12	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2012–13	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2013–14	–	–	–	–	–	–	110	110
2014–15	–	–	–	–	–	–	150	150
2015–16	–	–	–	–	–	–	320	120
2016–17	–	–	–	–	–	–	366	366
2017–18	–	–	–	–	53	85	820	764
2018–19	–	–	–	–	330	330	–	–
2019–20	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2020–21	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2021–22	–	–	6 041	4 013	–	–	–	–
2022–23	–	–	4 895	2 096	–	–	–	–
2023–24	–	–	8 321	5 231	–	–	–	–
2024–25	–	–	580	191	1	1	–	–

Fishing year	PAU 5A				PAU 5B			
	Weight (kg)		Numbers		Weight (kg)		Numbers	
	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
2000–01	–	–	–	–	–	–	50	50
2001–02	–	–	80	70	–	–	610	590
2002–03	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2003–04	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2004–05	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2005–06	–	–	–	–	–	–	140	90
2006–07	–	–	–	–	–	–	485	483
2007–08	–	–	100	100	–	–	2 685	2 684
2008–09	–	–	100	100	–	–	3 520	3 444
2009–10	–	–	150	150	–	–	2 680	2 043
2010–11	–	–	150	150	–	–	2 053	1 978
2011–12	–	–	512	462	–	–	495	495
2012–13	–	–	590	527	–	–	1 875	1 828
2013–14	–	–	–	–	–	–	130	130
2014–15	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2015–16	–	–	255	50	–	–	2 195	2 003
2016–17	–	–	–	–	–	–	75	75
2017–18	–	–	200	200	–	–	2 245	2 245
2018–19	–	–	–	–	–	–	1 405	1 337
2019–20	–	–	–	–	–	–	835	815
2020–21	–	–	850	820	–	–	2 645	2 495
2021–22	–	–	–	–	–	–	70	70
2022–23	–	–	–	–	–	–	1 060	980
2023–24	–	–	–	–	–	–	110	110

Table 5 [Continued]:

Fishing year	PAU 5D				PAU 6			
	Weight (kg)		Numbers		Weight (kg)		Numbers	
	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
2000–01	–	–	665	417	–	–	–	–
2001–02	–	–	5 530	3 553	–	–	–	–
2002–03	–	–	2 435	1 351	–	–	–	–
2003–04	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2004–05	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2005–06	–	–	1 560	1 560	–	–	–	–
2006–07	–	–	2 845	2 126	–	–	100	100
2007–08	–	–	5 600	5 327	–	–	60	60
2008–09	–	–	6 646	6 094	–	–	–	–
2009–10	–	–	4 840	4 150	–	–	–	–
2010–11	–	–	15 806	15 291	–	–	230	130
2011–12	–	–	7 935	7 835	–	–	–	–
2012–13	–	–	10 254	8 782	–	–	–	–
2013–14	–	–	5 720	5 358	–	–	–	–
2014–15	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2015–16	–	–	15 922	13 110	–	–	50	50
2016–17	–	–	3 676	3 576	–	–	80	80
2017–18	–	–	3 588	3 310	–	–	–	–
2018–19	–	–	950	894	–	–	–	–
2019–20	–	–	6 905	6 439	–	–	–	–
2020–21	–	–	10 257	10 030	–	–	–	–
2021–22	–	–	1 730	1 670	–	–	–	–
2022–23	–	–	3 100	2 741	–	–	–	–
2023–24	–	–	2 882	2 562	–	–	–	–
2024–25	–	–	260	260	–	–	–	–

Fishing year	PAU 7			
	Weight (kg)		Numbers	
	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
2007–08	–	–	1 110	808
2008–09	–	–	1 270	1 014
2009–10	–	–	1 085	936
2010–11	–	–	60	31
2011–12	–	–	20	20

* Data before 2010–11 exclude the area between the Hurunui River and the South Shore (just north of Banks Peninsula), as Tangata Tiaki were not appointed there until November 2009.

1.3 Illegal catch

There are qualitative data to suggest significant Illegal, Unreported, Unregulated (IUU) activity in this fishery. Current quantitative levels of illegal harvests are not known. In the past, annual estimates of illegal harvest for some Fishstocks were provided by MFish Compliance based on seizures. In the current pāua stock assessments, nominal illegal catches are used.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

Pāua may die from wounds caused by removal desiccation or osmotic and temperature stress if they are brought to the surface. Sub-legal pāua may be subject to handling mortality by the fishery if they are removed from the substrate to be measured. Further mortality may result indirectly from being returned to unsuitable habitat or being lost to predators or bacterial infection. Gerring (2003) observed pāua (from PAU 7) with a range of wounds in the laboratory and found that only a deep cut in the foot caused significant mortality (40% over 70 days). In the field this injury reduced the ability of pāua to right themselves and clamp securely onto the reef and consequently made them more vulnerable to predators. The tool generally used by divers in PAU 7 is a custom-made stainless-steel knife with a rounded tip and no sharp edges. This design makes cutting the pāua very unlikely (although abrasions and shell damage may occur). Gerring (2003) estimated that in PAU 7, 37% of pāua removed from the reef by commercial divers were undersized and were returned to the reef. His estimate of incidental mortality associated with fishing in PAU 7 was 0.3% of the landed catch. Incidental fishing mortality may be higher in areas where other types of tools and fishing practices are used. Mortality may increase if pāua are kept out of the water for a prolonged period or returned onto sand. To date, the stock assessments developed for pāua have assumed that there is no mortality associated with capture of undersized animals. The level of mortality for sub-legal pāua caught and returned to sea by amateur fishers is unknown.

2. BIOLOGY

Pāua are herbivores which can form large aggregations on reefs in shallow subtidal coastal habitats. Movement is over a sufficiently small spatial scale that the species may be considered sedentary. Pāua are broadcast spawners and spawning is usually annual. Habitat related factors are an important source of variation in the post-settlement survival of pāua. Growth, morphometrics, and recruitment can vary over short distances and may be influenced by factors such as water temperature, wave exposure, habitat structure and the availability of food. Naylor & Fu (2016) analysed demographic variation in pāua in New Zealand. They concluded that there were large differences in the growth rates and maximum size over a large latitudinal range. Their analysis indicated that water temperature, as indicated by sea surface temperature, was an important determinant of these. Pāua become sexually mature when they are about 70–90 mm long, or 3–5 years old.

The Intrinsic Productivity Level is categorised as Low for this species.

A summary of generic estimates for biological parameters for pāua is presented in Table 6. Parameters specific to individual pāua QMAs are reported in the specific Working Group report chapters.

Table 6: Estimates of biological parameters for pāua (*H. iris*).

Fishstock	Estimate	Source
<u>1. Natural mortality (<i>M</i>)</u>		
All	0.02–0.25	Sainsbury (1982)
<u>2. Weight = a (length)^{<i>b</i>} (weight in kg, shell length in mm)</u>		
$a = 2.99\text{E}^{-08}$	$b = 3.303$	Schiel & Breen (1991)

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

Using both mitochondrial and microsatellite markers Will & Gemmell (2008) found high levels of genetic variation within samples of *H. iris* taken from 25 locations spread throughout New Zealand. They also found two patterns of weak but significant population genetic structure. Firstly, *H. iris* individuals collected from the Chatham Islands were found to be genetically distinct from those collected from coastal sites around the North and South islands. Secondly a genetic discontinuity was found loosely associated with the Cook Strait region. Genetic discontinuities within the Cook Strait region have been previously identified in sea stars, mussels, limpets, and chitons and are possibly related to contemporary and/or past oceanographic and geological conditions of the region. This split may have some implications for management of the pāua stocks, with populations on the south of the North Island and the north of the South Island potentially warranting management as separate entities; a status they already receive under the zonation of the current fisheries regions, PAU 2 on the North Island and PAU 7 on the South Island.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECOSYSTEM CONSIDERATIONS

This section was updated for the 2021 Fishery Assessment Plenary. A more detailed summary from an issue-by-issue perspective is available in the Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Annual Review 2021 (Fisheries New Zealand 2021), online at <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/dmsdocument/51472-Aquatic-Environment-and-Biodiversity-Annual-Review-AEBAR-2021-A-summary-of-environmental-interactions-between-the-seafood-sector-and-the-aquatic-environment>.

4.1 Ecosystem role

McCowan (2019) conducted a review of all relevant literature about the role of pāua in ecosystems and the environmental factors (natural and human-induced) affecting pāua distribution, abundance, and behaviour.

Pāua are eaten by a range of predators, and smaller pāua are generally more vulnerable to predation. Smaller pāua are consumed by blue cod (Carbines & Beentjes 2003), snapper (Francis 2003), banded

wrasse (Russell 1983), spotties (McCardle 1983), triplefins (McCardle 1983), and octopus (Andrew & Naylor 2003). Large pāua are generally well protected by their strong shells but are still vulnerable to rock lobsters (McCardle 1983) and the large predatory starfishes *Astrostele scabra* and *Coscinasterias muricata* (Andrew & Naylor 2003). Large pāua are also vulnerable to predation by eagle rays (McCardle 1983), but Ayling & Cox (1982) suggested that eagle rays feed almost exclusively on Cook's turban. There are no known predators that feed exclusively on pāua.

Pāua feed preferentially on drift algae, but at high densities they also feed by grazing attached algae. They are not generally considered to have a large structural impact upon algal communities, but at high densities they may reduce the abundance of algae. There are no recognised interactions with pāua abundance and the abundance or distribution of other species, except for kina which, at very high densities, appear to exclude pāua (Naylor & Gerring 2001). Research at D'Urville Island and on Wellington's south coast suggests that there is some negative association between pāua and kina (Andrew & MacDiarmid 1999).

4.2 Fish and invertebrate bycatch

Because pāua are harvested by hand gathering, incidental bycatch is limited to epibiota attached to or within the shell. The most common epibiont on pāua shell is non-geniculate coralline algae, which, along with most other plants and animals which settle and grow on the shell, such as barnacles, oysters, sponges, bryozoans, and algae, appears to have general habitat requirements (i.e., these organisms are not restricted to the shells of pāua). Several boring and spiral-shelled polychaete worms are commonly found in and on the shells of pāua. Most of these are found on several shellfish species, although within New Zealand's shellfish, the onuphid polychaete *Brevibrachium maculatum* has been found only in pāua shell (Read 2004). This species, however, has also been reported to burrow into limestone or attach its tube to the holdfasts of algae (Read 2004). It is also not uncommon for pāua harvesters to collect predators of pāua (mainly large predatory starfish) while fishing and to effectively remove these from the ecosystem. The levels of these removals are unlikely to have a significant effect on starfish populations (nor, in fact, on the mortality of pāua caused by predation).

4.3 Incidental catch (seabirds, mammals, and protected fish)

There is no known bycatch of threatened, endangered, or protected species associated with the hand gathering of pāua.

4.4 Benthic interactions

The environmental impact of pāua harvesting is likely to be minimal because pāua are selectively hand gathered by free divers. Habitat contact by divers at the time of harvest is limited to the area of pāua foot attachment, and pāua are usually removed with a blunt tool to minimise damage to the flesh. The diver's body is also seldom in full contact with the benthos. Vessels anchoring during or after fishing have the potential to cause damage to the reef depending on the type of diving operation (in many cases, vessels do not anchor during fishing and, if they do, they will try to anchor on sand where possible). Damage from anchoring is likely to be greater in areas with fragile species such as corals than it is on shallow temperate rocky reefs. Corals are relatively abundant at shallow depths within Fiordland, but there are seven areas within the sounds with significant populations of fragile species where anchoring is prohibited.

4.5 Other considerations

4.5.1 Genetic effects

Fishing, and environmental changes, including those caused by climate change or pollution, could alter the genetic composition or diversity of a species and there is some evidence to suggest that genetic changes may occur in response to fishing of abalones. Miller et al. (2009) suggested that, in *Haliotis rubra* in Tasmania, localised depletion may lead to reduced local reproductive output which may, in turn, lead to an increase in genetic diversity because migrant recruitment will contribute more to total recruitment. Enhancement of pāua stocks with artificially-reared juveniles has the potential to lead to genetic effects if specific lineages of broodstock are used.

4.5.2 Biosecurity issues

Undaria pinnatifida is a highly invasive opportunistic kelp which spreads mainly via fouling on boat hulls. It can form dense stands underwater, potentially resulting in competition for light and space which may lead to the exclusion or displacement of native plant and animal species. *Undaria* may be transported on the hulls of pāua dive tenders to unaffected areas. Bluff Harbour, for example, supports a large population of *Undaria* and is one of the main ports of departure for fishing vessels harvesting pāua in Fiordland, which appears to be devoid of *Undaria* (R. Naylor pers. comm.). In 2010, a small population of *Undaria* was found in Sunday Cove in Breaksea Sound, and attempts to eradicate it appear to have been successful (see <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/biosecurity/marine-pest-disease-management/fiordland-marine-biosecurity-programme/>). There is also in place an Envirosouth-developed code of practice applicable to fishing vessels to prevent unwanted pest transfers.

4.5.3 Kaikōura Earthquake

Research was undertaken to investigate the influence of the November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake on pāua stocks along the Kaikōura coastline. The results estimated that the seabed uplift led to a loss of up to 50% of the pre-earthquake fished area across PAU 3 statistical areas. Annual biomass surveys have showed a recovery of the stock which led to the reopening of the fishery in 2021–22 for 3 months and then different season lengths and timings since. More details can be found in the PAU 3A Working Group report chapter.

4.5.4 Marine heatwave

A baseline report summarising trends in climatic and oceanographic conditions in New Zealand that are of potential relevance for fisheries and marine ecosystem resource management in the New Zealand region was completed by Hurst et al. (2012). There is also an updated chapter on oceanic trends in the Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Annual Review 2021 (Fisheries New Zealand 2021). Any effects of recent warmer temperatures (such as the high surface temperatures off the WCSI during the 2016 and 2017 spawning seasons, marine heatwaves, and general warming of the Tasman Sea (Sutton & Bowen 2019) on fish distribution, growth, or spawning success have yet to be determined.

Shellfish fisheries have been identified as likely to be vulnerable to ocean acidification (Capson & Guinotte 2014). A recent project that has just reached completion describes the state of knowledge of climate change-associated predictions for components of New Zealand’s marine environment that are most relevant to fisheries (Cummings et al. 2021). Past and future projected changes in coastal and ocean properties, including temperature, salinity, stratification and water masses, circulation, oxygen, ocean productivity, detrital flux, ocean acidification, coastal erosion and sediment loading, wind and waves are reviewed. Responses to climate change for these coastal and ocean properties are discussed, as well as their likely impact on the fisheries sector, where known.

A range of decision support tools in use overseas were evaluated with respect to their applicability for dissemination of the state of knowledge on climate change and fisheries. Three species, for which there was a relatively large amount of information available were chosen from the main fisheries sectors for further analysis. These were pāua, snapper, and hoki (shellfish, inshore, and middle-depths/deepwater fisheries, respectively). An evaluation of the sensitivity and exposure of pāua to climate change-associated threats, based on currently available published literature and expert opinion, assessed pāua vulnerability to climate change effects as ‘very high’ (Cummings et al. 2021).

5. STOCK ASSESSMENT

The dates of the most recent survey or stock assessment for each QMA are listed in Table 7.

5.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

For further information on fishery parameters and abundance specific to each pāua QMA refer to the specific Working Group report chapter.

In QMAs where quantitative stock assessments have been undertaken, standardised CPUE is used as input data for the Bayesian length-based stock assessment model. There is however a large amount of

literature on abalone which suggests that any apparent stability in CPUE should be interpreted with caution and CPUE may not be proportional to abundance because it is possible to maintain high catch rates despite a falling biomass. This occurs because pāua tend to aggregate and, to maximise their catch rates, divers move from areas that have been depleted of pāua to areas with higher density. The consequence of this fishing behaviour is that overall abundance is decreasing while CPUE is remaining stable. This process of hyperstability is believed to be of less concern in most commercial areas because fishing in these QMAs is consistent across all fishable areas. Further, the single study of CPUE as a proxy of abundance for pāua demonstrated a near linear relationship between CPUE and available biomass, indicating it is a useful tool (Abraham & Neubauer 2015). Exceptions are the D’Urville Island and Northern Faces areas of PAU 7, where catches have declined substantially, and CPUE now only reflects a few remaining areas. Other areas may be highly depleted but fishery dependent CPUE does not reflect abundance in these areas any longer.

Table 7: Recent survey and stock assessment information for each pāua QMA.

QMA	Type of survey or assessment	Date	Comments
PAU 1	No surveys or assessments have been undertaken		
PAU 2	Qualitative evaluation	2025	A large proportion of PAU 2, including the Wellington south coast and west of Turakirae, is either a Marine Reserve or voluntarily closed to commercial fishing. The data collected from the commercial fishery and assessment only applies to the south east component of PAU 2 (Wairarapa), about 20% of PAU 2. A qualitative assessment was conducted in 2025 on the basis of a standardised CPUE series of recent ERS data, which is declining in all areas of the commercial fishery.
PAU 3A	Length based Bayesian integrated assessment	2024	The PAU 3A stock assessment used the length-based population dynamics model described by Breen et al. (2003). Although the overall population-dynamics model remained unchanged, the 2024 assessment of the PAU 3A stock used a number of changes from previous models used in PAU 3, including that the 2024 model is spatially explicit. The high CSLF weight (highCSLFW) model without explicit earthquake impacts was accepted as the base assessment model, noting that recent estimated recruitment was low and likely proxying for earthquake impacts. The estimated stock status for the model was 46% of unfished spawning biomass and very low risk of being below limit reference points, reflecting a large rebuild of biomass post-earthquake from below target levels.
PAU 3B	CPUE Standardisation	2022	A stock assessment for the PAU 3B area was attempted in 2021–22, based on estimates of historical catches, CPUE trends and commercial length frequency data. CPUE trends were found to be stable despite steady increases in catch over the past decades.
PAU 4	Operating model and harvest control rule	2022	A series of projects developed spatial length-based operating models (pāua statistical areas scale), and tested management procedures to formalise statistical-area scale industry management initiatives. Unreliable catch and CPUE series meant stock assessment models could not be fitted statistically, but were conditioned on assumed catch series. Conditioned models suggested a range of outcomes across individual statistical areas; differences were attributed to conditioning assumptions. While application of control rules led to variable outcomes at the statistical area scale, the spatial variability averaged out, leading to highly stable trends at the QMA scale for an implementation window of 5 years, and indicating low risk of further declines under the trialed preliminary harvest control rules
PAU 5A	Qualitative evaluation	2025	A qualitative assessment was conducted in 2025 on the basis of a standardised CPUE series of recent ERS data, which is declining in all areas of the commercial fishery.
PAU 5B	Quantitative assessment using a Bayesian length-based model	2018	The 2018 Plenary accepted this assessment as best scientific information. The status of the stock was estimated to be 47% B_0 .
PAU 5D	Quantitative assessment using a Bayesian length-based model	2023	The base case model suggested a recent increase from low levels in spawning stock biomass over the past seven years, following a slow downwards trend from 2010 to 2015. The base case also indicated that the stock is currently as likely as not to be at the interim target spawning stock biomass of 40% SSB , it is very unlikely to be below the soft limit. Relative available biomass was markedly lower than the spawning stock biomass, meaning that a considerable part of the spawning biomass was below the minimum harvest size and is therefore not accessible to the fishery. Projections suggested increasing SSB for scenarios of current catch, with relatively stable stock levels expected with fishing at the current TACC.
PAU 6	Biomass estimate	1996	This fishery has a TACC of 1 t.
PAU 7	Quantitative assessment using a Bayesian length-based model	2022	The PAU 7 assessment applies to the Cook Strait. Currently, spawning stock biomass is estimated to be 33% B_0 and is Unlikely to be at or above the target. It is also Very Unlikely to be below the soft and hard limits. Overfishing is About as Likely as Not to be occurring.
PAU 10	No surveys or assessments have been undertaken		

In PAU 4, 5A, 5B, 5D, and 7 the relative abundance of pāua was also estimated from independent research diver surveys (RDS) for a number of years. In PAU 7, seven surveys have been completed over a number of years but only two surveys were conducted in PAU 4. In 2009 and 2010 several reviews were conducted (Cordue 2009, Haist 2010) to assess: i) the reliability of the research diver survey index as a proxy for abundance; and ii) whether the RDS data, when used in the pāua stock assessment models, result in model outputs that do not adequately reflect the status of the stocks. The reviews concluded that:

- Due to inappropriate survey design the RDS data appear to be of very limited use for constructing relative abundance indices.
- There was clear non-linearity in the RDS index, the form of which is unclear and could be potentially complex.
- CVs of RDS index ‘year’ effects are likely to be underestimated, especially at low densities.
- Different abundance trends among strata reduces the reliability of RDS indices, and the CVs are likely to be uninformative about this.
- It is unlikely that the assessment model can determine the true non-linearity of the RDS index-abundance relationship because of the high variability in the RDS indices.
- The non-linearity observed in the RDS indices is likely to be more extreme at low densities, so the RDSI is likely to mask trends when it is most critical to observe them.
- Existing RDS data is likely to be most useful at the research stratum level.

For these reasons, RDS data are not used in any recent PAU stock assessments.

5.2 Biomass estimates

Biomass was estimated for PAU 6 in 1996 (McShane et al. 1996). However, the survey area was limited to the area from Kahurangi Point to the Heaphy River.

Biomass has been estimated, as part of the stock assessments, for PAU 2, 5A, 5B, 5D, and 7 (Table). Biomass surveys have been conducted in PAU 3A since 2017, following the 2016 Kaikōura earthquakes. For further information on biomass estimates specific to each pāua QMA refer to the specific Working Group report chapter.

5.3 Yield estimates and projections

Yield estimates and projections are estimated as part of the stock assessment process. Both are available for PAU 2, PAU 5A, PAU 5B, PAU 5D, and PAU 7. For further information on yield estimates and projections specific to each pāua QMA refer to the specific Working Group report chapter.

5.4 Management procedures for pāua fisheries

Management procedures (MPs) for pāua were developed and evaluated using a Management Procedure Evaluation (MPE) framework. Under this framework, operating models (OMs) that represent current knowledge of stock dynamics — including uncertainty — were used to test the performance of candidate harvest control rules (HCRs) through stochastic forward projection. The process produces quantitative evidence on trade-offs between yield and stock status, under both the most plausible representation of stock dynamics (reference model set) and a set of robustness scenarios designed to challenge the MP’s assumptions.

The MP development process proceeded in three broad stages: (1) design of an HCR whose structure is appropriate for pāua data and management context; (2) tuning of the HCR’s key parameters to meet a specified stock-status objective; and (3) evaluation of the tuned MPs across the full range of QMAs and robustness scenarios.

5.4.1 Operating models

For each QMA, a range of plausible operating models was constructed, to build an ensemble of models covering key uncertainties across regional growth, CPUE hyper-stability, and data weighting. Each model was derived from the stock-assessment model described in Section 5.1, and models were combined into a weighted OM ensemble by drawing from each model’s Bayesian Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) samples proportionally to model weights. The final OM ensemble produces an ensemble of plausible stock trajectories (Figure 2).




Figure 2: Example operating model ensemble: historical fit and stochastic forward projections of relative spawning stock biomass (SSB) for PAU 2. Shaded bands show 5th–95th percentile range across iterations.

5.4.2 Harvest control rule structure

The MP applies a CPUE- & length-based spawning potential ratio (LBSPR)-driven harvest control rule to inform the annual TACC. The rule combines three signals from the monitoring data:

1. **SPR component** — the estimated current spawning potential ratio relative to the target, derived from length-frequency samples using the LBSPR estimator.
2. **CPUE trend component** — the rate of change in a CPUE index over a fixed look-back window, estimated via local-regression smoothing. This captures short-term directional trends in relative abundance.
3. **CPUE absolute component** — the level of the CPUE index relative to a target band, providing an absolute abundance signal independent of historical trajectory.

Each component generates a fractional current catch multiplier; the three multipliers are combined with configurable weights to produce the recommended annual adjustment (Figure 3). This multiplier is applied to the current commercial catch to inform a new TACC.




Figure 3: Schematic of the CPUE/LBSPR harvest control rule, illustrating two of the three component signals per panel, illustrating how they combine to determine the TACC multiplier (the multiplier that is applied to the current commercial catch to inform the new TACC).

5.4.3 MP tuning

The HCR for PAU MPs contains three free parameters that are optimised separately for each QMA via stochastic simulation, based on three key management choices:

- **Spawning biomass target.** The mid-point of the target band for target spawning biomass (SSB) depletion. Three values were evaluated: 0.45 (target band 0.40–0.50), 0.50 (band 0.45–0.55), and 0.55 (band 0.50–0.60). A target of 0.50 corresponds to 50% of unfished spawning output and serves as the default.
- **Target probability.** The probability of the SSB falling within the target band at the end of the tuning window. Evaluated values were $P = 0.50$ (50%) and $P = 0.80$ (80%). Higher probability requirements produce more conservative TAC trajectories.
- **Tuning window.** The projection period over which the MP's alignment with the target SSB and target probability are optimised. Six windows were considered (Table 8). The default window (TW5, years 10–15 beyond the assumed next-review year) emphasises medium-long term performance. TW3 (5 years post-review) produces a more precautionary near-term trajectory; TW4 applies an exponential discount to weight near-term years more heavily, but optimises the MP over the full simulation horizon.

The HCR's CPUE target parameter was derived from simulations based on perfect stock knowledge, using all CPUE values that matched trajectories meeting the stock-status objective (specified SSB target range).

Table 8: Tuning window definitions. The review year is assumed to be five years after the assessment year (2030 for the 2025 assessment).

Window	Definition	Projection years
TW1	Assessment year to review year	0–5
TW2	Review year only	5
TW3	Five years post-review	5–10
TW4	Full simulation, discounted post-review	0–26 (discounted)
TW5	Years 10–15 post-review (default)	10–15
TW6	Years 10–20 post-review	10–20

5.4.4 Performance evaluation

Candidate MPs were evaluated on the following performance metrics, reported at four time horizons: short-term (years 1–5), end-year (year 5), medium-term (years 5–10), and long-term (full simulation horizon):

- **Mean catch** — mean annual commercial catch across simulations.
- **P(target)** — probability of rSSB being within the SPR target band.
- **P(soft limit)** — probability of rSSB exceeding 0.40.
- **P(collapse)** — probability of rSSB falling below 0.20.
- **CPUE** — mean CPUE index relative to its reference level.
- **AAV** — average annual variation in commercial catch, a measure of year-to-year TAC stability.




Figure 4: Example of trade-off plots for PAU 5B (truncated for visibility, risk panels for $P(\text{target})$, $P(\text{soft limit})$, and $P(\text{collapse})$ are not shown): mean catch versus mean relative SSB ($rSSB$), mean CPUE, and catch variability (AAV) across candidate SSB targets (0.45, 0.50, 0.55) at the default tuning window and probability (TW5, $P = 0.50$). Each point represents the mean outcome for a tuned MP over a time horizon of 10–15 years after initialisation of the simulations.

5.4.5 Robustness testing

Each QMA's default MP (SSB target 0.50, TW5, $P = 0.50$) was evaluated against nine robustness scenarios designed to reflect key axes of projection and process uncertainty not captured by the base-case OM. The scenarios fall into four groups:

Natural mortality uncertainty

- Increased M variability ($CV = 0.2$)
- Increased M variability with upward shift in mean ($CV = 0.1$, $\mu = 1.33 \times \text{base}$)

Recruitment and initial biomass uncertainty

- Increased R_0 variability ($CV = 0.2$)
- Increased R_0 variability with downward shift ($CV = 0.1$, $\mu = 0.66 \times \text{base}$)

Growth uncertainty

- Increased growth variability ($CV = 0.2$)
- Increased growth variability with downward shift ($CV = 0.1$, $\mu = 0.66 \times \text{base}$)

Observation model uncertainty

- Increased length-frequency observation error ($CV = 0.01 \rightarrow 0.10$)
- Doubled CPUE observation error ($CV \times 2$)
- CPUE hyperstability (exponent = 0.25)

In each scenario the MP was the one tuned under the base-case OM — the tuned HCR parameters were held fixed while only the OM projection settings were altered. This tests whether the rule, once set by managers, continues to perform adequately if the stock dynamics or observation assumptions differs from the base-case assessment.

5.4.6 Monitoring and exceptional circumstances

Each annual MP application is accompanied by a set of automated assumption checks that compare the observed monitoring inputs against the distribution the operating model produced at the same projection year. Three "in-range" tests check whether the realised CPUE index, the LB-SPR estimate, and the year-on-year catch ratio fall within the simulation's 5–95% interval; a fourth, sequential-run test counts the longest observed run of consecutive same-direction CPUE changes and compares it against the distribution of equivalent maximum run lengths across all OM iterations, identifying the region if fewer than 5% of simulated trajectories ever produced a run as long as the observed one. A single warning prompts closer review of the inputs and the recommended TACC; a combination of flags — particularly an out-of-range CPUE together with a low-probability sequential run — is treated as evidence that the realised dynamics have departed from the OM ensemble (i.e., exceptional circumstances are present). These break-out rules will be used by the SFWG to determine the ongoing validity of the management procedure for setting catch limits.

Two extensions are being developed as additional inputs to provide context and facilitate interpretation of exceptional circumstance criteria:

- Spatial fishery footprint — area fished, year-on-year contraction of fished statistical areas, and concentration of catch/CPUE would indicate serial depletion and potential hyperstability that a region-wide CPUE index may be masking.
- Climate and environmental drivers -- marine heatwave (MHW) exposure indices from openly available SST products would flag recruitment- or cumulative-stress as an external, fishery observation-independent context to exceptional circumstances.

5.4.7 Caveats on current use

The development of the OM and MPs is still in progress (see future research considerations below), but significant developments have been made. Although demonstrated issues with the current operating models remain to be fully investigated and robustness-tested (e.g., further exploration of model performance is required, incorporation of uncertainty into the correction of bias, consideration of regional scale hyperstability), the Plenary considered the model outputs were suitable for informing future short term catch limits.

5.5 Other factors

In the last few years, the commercial fisheries have been implementing voluntary management actions in the commercial fished QMAs. These management actions include raising the minimum harvest size, subdividing QMAs into smaller management areas, and effort spreading through a system of capping catch in the different areas and in some QMAs, not catching the full Annual Catch Entitlement (ACE) in a particular fishing year.




Figure 5: Robustness testing example for PAU 2 under alternative observation model assumptions. Under strongly hyper-stable CPUE, the catch adjustment is delayed (top panel), but catch is still adjusted based on the LB-SPR metric to allow for a stock rebuild to the target within the specified evaluation window.

6. FUTURE RESEARCH CONSIDERATIONS

- Ageing of pāua and developing more robust growth studies that allow for good spatio-temporal coverage and estimating of growth trends. This is especially relevant given strong temperature dependent growth.

- Improve information on recreational harvest across all stocks.
- Further develop the CPUE standardisation, including:
 - incorporating statistical area variation and MHS differences back into CPUE;
 - exploring the sensitivity to the use of diver and client effects, including fisher learning and evidence of potential diver statistical area interactions and the consistency of diver (or other relevant) effects between PCELR and ERS models;
 - exploring sensitivity to the inclusion of only core statistical areas in CPUE series.
- Investigate density dependence in growth and potential consequences for assessment models and in the context of increasing MHS and changing biomass levels in some areas.
- Explore routine collection of clean shell data within catch sampling programme as a measure of relative exploitation.

Management Procedures and assessment/operating models

- Further development of stock assessment/operating models, including:
 - investigating issues with recent recruitment estimates in models, and poor fit to recent CPUE indices;
 - investigating the most appropriate way to handle the large amounts of length frequency information in recent years which has caused problems with models in some areas (PAU 7);
 - incorporating changes in productivity in pāua stocks;
 - evaluating which MPs are relevant for each stock.
- Validate the use of clean flat shells as a measure of the size at maturity.
 - consider hyperstability at a regional rather than QMA scale, as this is considered a more likely scenario;
 - explore ways of providing a continuous CPUE series (PCELR and ERS) scaled by appropriate q s;
 - further exploration of model performance. PAU 5A model performance seems particularly poor. For all models check for evidence of over-parameterisation. Examine density distribution of estimated parameters (and in relation to priors and the MAP) and likelihood profiles. Check influence of catch penalties;
 - explore ways to incorporate uncertainty into the correction of bias in the MPE tuning;
 - expand the range of scenarios considered within the robustness tests, including wider model misspecification (e.g., M , growth, data weighting, hyperstability) for the full data period rather than just future impacts;
 - consider a degree of simulation testing with spatial aspects within the robustness tests;
 - given the low information from current indicators, and the need for conservative management that forgoes potential yield, simulation-test to evaluate how specific data improvements (e.g., ageing, fishery-independent abundance index) would improve yield.
- Further develop management procedures, including:
 - evaluating which MPs are relevant for each stock;
 - consideration of other size metrics (e.g., mean size above MHS) or other alternative stock status indicators (e.g., RH limb indicators related to the right hand limb of the length composition);
 - explore sensitivity of MPs to the choice of CPUE CV and the validity of the assumption of 10%;
 - explore how LBSPR metrics (e.g., the estimated F) or alternative length metrics from catch sampling data relate to other reference points, or thresholds or estimation model outputs;
 - explore potential environmentally driven changes in productivity;
 - explore a wider range of monitoring, breakout rules or metrics, including the spatial footprint of the fishery, changes in the pool of active fishers, proportion clean shells and environmental indices (e.g., marine heatwave index);
 - For each MP, output the CPUE trajectory with the CPUE reference level tuned by the MP and the annual total catch for ease of comparison.

7. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

The status of pāua stocks PAU 2, PAU 3A, PAU 3B, PAU 4, PAU 5A, PAU 5B, PAU 5D, and PAU 7 are given in the relevant Working Group report chapters.


8. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Abraham, E R; Neubauer, P (2015) Relationship between small-scale catch-per-unit-effort and abundance in New Zealand abalone (*pāua*, *Haliotis iris*) fisheries. PeerJ PrePrints 3:e1388v2 <https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.1388v2>
- Andrew, N L; Breen, P A; Naylor, J R; Kendrick, T H; Gerring, P K (2000a) Stock assessment of paua *Haliotis iris* in PAU 7 in 1998–99. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/49*.
- Andrew, N L; MacDiarmid, A B (1999) Sea urchin fisheries and potential interactions with a kina fishery in Fiordland. *Conservation Advisory Science Notes No. 266*. Department of Conservation, Wellington.
- Andrew, N; Naylor, R (2003) Paua. In: Andrew, N & Francis, M (Eds) *The Living reef. The ecology of New Zealand's rocky reefs*. Craig Potton Publishing, Nelson, New Zealand.
- Andrew, N L; Naylor, J R; Gerring, P; Notman, P R (2000b) Fishery independent surveys of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5B and 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/3*. 21 p.
- Andrew, N L; Naylor, J R; Gerring, P (2000c) A modified timed-swim method for paua stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/4*. 23 p.
- Andrew, N L; Naylor, J R; Kim, S W (2002) Fishery independent surveys of the relative abundance and size-structure of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5B and PAU 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2002/41*.
- Annala, J H; Sullivan, K J; O'Brien, C; Iball, S (Comps.) (1998) Report from the Fishery Assessment Plenary, May 1998: Stock assessments and yield estimates. 409 p. (Unpublished report held by ESNZ library, Wellington.)
- Ayling, T; Cox, G J (1982) *Collins' guide to sea fishes of New Zealand*. Collins. Auckland. 343 p.
- Boyd, R O; Gowing, L; Reilly, J L (2004) 2000–2001 national marine recreational fishing survey: diary results and harvest estimates. (Unpublished New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Report for the Ministry of Fisheries Project REC2000-01 held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 92 p.
- Boyd, R O; Reilly, J L (2004) 1999/2000 National Marine Recreational Fishing Survey: harvest estimates. (Unpublished New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Report for the Ministry of Fisheries Project REC9803 held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 28 p.
- Bradford, E (1998) Harvest estimates from the 1996 national recreational fishing surveys. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1998/16*. 27 p.
- Breen, P A; Andrew, N L; Kendrick, T H (2000b) Stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5B and PAU 5D using a new length-based model. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/33*.
- Breen, P A; Andrew, N L; Kendrick, T H (2000c) The 2000 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5B using an improved Bayesian length-based model. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/48*.
- Breen, P A; Andrew, N L; Kim, S W (2001) The 2001 stock assessment of paua *Haliotis iris* in PAU 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/55*.
- Breen, P A; Kim, S W (2004) The 2004 stock assessment of paua *Haliotis iris* in PAU 5A. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2004/40*.
- Breen, P A; Kim, S W (2005) The 2005 stock assessment of paua *Haliotis iris* in PAU 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2005/47*.
- Breen, P A; Kim, S W (2007) The 2006 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) stocks PAU 5A (Fiordland) and PAU 5D (Otago). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/09*.
- Breen, P A; Smith, A N (2008a) The 2007 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) stock PAU 5B (Stewart Island). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/05*.
- Breen, P A; Smith, A N (2008b) Data used in the 2007 stock assessment for paua (*Haliotis iris*) stock 5B (Stewart Island). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/06*.
- Capson, T L; Guinotte, J (Eds) (2014) Future proofing New Zealand's shellfish aquaculture: monitoring and adaptation to ocean acidification. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 136*. 42 p.
- Carbines, G D; Beentjes, M P (2003) Relative abundance of blue cod in Dusky Sound in 2002. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/37*. 25 p.
- Cordue, P L (2009) Analysis of PAU 5A diver survey data and PCELR catch and effort data. SeaFic and PAUMac 5 report. 45 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Cummings, V J; Lundquist, C J; Dunn, M R; Francis, M; Horn, P; Law, C; Pinkerton, M H; Sutton, P; Tracey, D; Hansen, L; Mielbrecht, E (2021) Assessment of potential effects of climate-related changes in coastal and offshore waters on New Zealand's seafood sector. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 261*. 153 p.
- Davey, N; Hartill, B; Carter, M (2019) Mean weight estimates for recreational fisheries in 2017–18. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/35*. 32 p.
- Davey, N K; Johnson, K S; Maggs, J Q (2024) Mean weight estimates for recreational fisheries in 2022–23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/28*. 39 p.
- Francis, R I C C (1990) A maximum likelihood stock reduction method. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1990/4. 8 p. (Unpublished report held by ESNZ library, Wellington.)
- Francis, M (2003) Snapper. In: Andrew, N & Francis, M (Eds), pp. 186–191, *The Living reef. The ecology of New Zealand's rocky reefs*. Craig Potton Publishing, Nelson, New Zealand.
- Fisheries New Zealand (2021) Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Annual Review 2021. Compiled by the Aquatic Environment Team, Fisheries Science and Information, Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand. 779 p.
- Gerring, P K (2003) Incidental fishing mortality of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/56*. 13 p.
- Haist, V (2010) Paua research diver survey: review of data collected and simulation study of survey method. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2010/38*.
- Hartill, B; Davey, N (2015) Mean weight estimates for recreational fisheries in 2011–12. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/25*.
- Heinemann A; Gray, A. (2024) National Panel Survey of Recreational Marine Fishers 2022-23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/51*. 116 p.
- Hurst, R J; Renwick, J A; Sutton, P J H; Uddstrom, M J; Kennan, S C; Law, C S; Rickard, G J; Korpela, A; Stewart, C; Evans, J (2012) Climate and ocean trends of potential relevance to fisheries in the New Zealand region. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 90*. 202 p.

- Kendrick, T H; Andrew, N L (2000) Catch and effort statistics and a summary of standardised CPUE indices for paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5A, 5B, and 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/47*.
- McCardle, I (1983) Young paua in peril. *Shellfisheries Newsletter* 20.
- McCowan, T (2019) Ecosystem approaches to management of pāua fisheries: Review and considerations. https://www.paua.org.nz/_files/ugd/bcdcbd_93a4486463094b64ab28af95d4603938.pdf?index=true
- McShane, P E (1992) Paua fishery assessment 1992. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1992/3*. 26 p.
- McShane, P E (1996) Patch dynamics and effects of exploitation on abalone (*Haliotis iris*) populations. *Fisheries Research* 25: 191–199.
- McShane, P E; Mercer, S; Naylor, R (1993) Paua (*Haliotis* spp.) fishery assessment 1993. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1993/6*. 22 p.
- McShane, P E; Mercer, S F; Naylor, J R; Notman, P R (1994a) Paua fishery assessment 1994. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1994/16*. 47 p.
- McShane, P E; Mercer, S F; Naylor, J R (1994b) Spatial variation and commercial fishing of New Zealand abalone (*Haliotis iris* and *H. australis*). *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 28: 345–355.
- McShane, P E; Mercer, S F; Naylor, J R; Notman, P R (1996) Paua (*Haliotis iris*) fishery assessment in PAU 5, 6, and 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document*. 1996/11.
- McShane, P E; Naylor, J R (1995) Small-scale spatial variation in growth, size at maturity, and yield- and egg-per-recruit relations in the New Zealand abalone *Haliotis iris*. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 29: 603–612.
- McShane, P E; Schiel, D R; Mercer, S F; Murray, T (1994c) Morphometric variation in *Haliotis iris* (Mollusca:Gastropoda): analysis of 61 populations. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 28: 357–364.
- Miller, K J; Maynard, B T; Mundy, C N (2009) Genetic diversity and gene flow in collapsed and healthy abalone fisheries. *Molecular Ecology* 18(2): 200–211.
- Naylor, J R; Andrew, N L (2000) Determination of growth, size composition, and fecundity of paua at Taranaki and Banks Peninsula. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/51*.
- Naylor, J R; Andrew, N L (2002) Determination of paua growth in PAU 2, 5A, 5B, and 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2002/34*.
- Naylor, J R; Andrew, N L; Kim, S W (2003) Fishery independent surveys of the relative abundance, size-structure and growth of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 4. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/08*.
- Naylor, J R; Andrew, N L; Kim, S W (2006) Demographic variation in the New Zealand abalone *Haliotis iris*. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 57: 215–224.
- Naylor, J R; Fu, D (2016) Estimating growth in paua. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2016/14*. 76 p.
- Naylor, J R; Gerring, P (2001) Interaction between paua and kina. *Water & Atmosphere* 9(2): 16–17.
- Naylor, J R; Kim, S W (2004) Fishery independent surveys of the relative abundance and size-structure of paua *Haliotis iris* in PAU 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2004/48*.
- Naylor, J R; Notman, P R; Mercer, S F; Gerring, P (1998) Paua (*Haliotis iris*) fishery assessment in PAU 5, 6, and 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document*. 1998/05.
- Pirker, J G (1992) Growth, shell-ring deposition and mortality of paua (*Haliotis iris* Martyn) in the Kaikoura region. MSc thesis, University of Canterbury. 165 p.
- Read, G B (compiler) (2004) Guide to New Zealand Shell Polychaetes. <https://niwa.co.nz/oceans/resources/marine-identification-guides-and-fact-sheets>
- Russell, B C (1983) The food and feeding habits of rocky reef fish of north-eastern New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 17 (2): 121–145.
- Sainsbury, K J (1982) Population dynamics and fishery management of the paua, *Haliotis iris*. 1. Population structure, growth, reproduction and mortality. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 16: 147–161.
- Schiel, D R; Breen, P A (1991) Population structure, ageing and fishing mortality of the New Zealand abalone *Haliotis iris*. *Fishery Bulletin* 89: 681–691.
- Schwarz, A; Taylor, R; Hewitt, J; Phillips, N; Shima, J; Cole, R; Budd, R (2006) Impacts of terrestrial runoff on the biodiversity of rocky reefs. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No 7*. 109 p.
- Sutton, P J H; Bowen, M (2019) Ocean temperature change around New Zealand over the last 36 years. *New Zealand Journal of Marine & Freshwater Research* 53(3): 305–326. doi: 10.1080/0028830.2018.1562945.
- Teirney, L D; Kilner, A R; Millar, R E; Bradford, E; Bell, J D (1997) Estimation of recreational catch from 1991/92 to 1993/94. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1997/15*. 43 p.
- Will, M C; Gemmell, N J (2008) Genetic Population Structure of Black Foot paua. New Zealand Fisheries Research Report. GEN2007A: 37 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–2018. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/24*. 104 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Hill, L; Heinemann, A (2014) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2011–12: Harvest Estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/67*. 139 p.

PĀUA (PAU 2) – Wairarapa / Wellington / Taranaki

(*Haliotis iris*)
Pāua



1. FISHERY SUMMARY

PAU 2 was introduced into the Quota Management System in 1986–87 with a TACC of 100 t. As a result of appeals to the Quota Appeal Authority, the TACC was increased to 121.19 t in 1989. On 1 October 2023, a TAC of 192.19 t was set with a TACC of 121.19 t, a customary allowance of 12 t, a recreational allowance of 48 t and an allowance of 11 t for other sources of mortality (Table 1).

Table 1: Total allowable catches (TAC, t), allowances for customary fishing, recreational fishing, and other sources of mortality (t), and Total Allowable Commercial Catches (TACC, t) declared for PAU 2 since introduction to the Quota Management System (QMS).

Year	TAC	Customary	Recreational	Other mortality	TACC
1986–1989	–	–	–	–	100
1989–2023	–	–	–	–	121.19
2023–present	192.19	12	48	11	121.19

1.1 Commercial fisheries

The fishing year runs from 1 October to 30 September. Most of the commercial catch comes from the Wairarapa and Wellington South coasts between Castlepoint and Turakirae Head. The western areas between Tirua Point and the Whanganui River, and Turakirae Head and the Waikanae River, and the eastern area between Cape Runaway and Blackhead Lighthouse are closed to commercial fishing.

On 1 October 2001 it became mandatory to report catch and effort on PCELRs using the fine-scale reporting areas that had been developed by the New Zealand Pāua Management Company for their voluntary logbook programme (Figure 1). Landings for PAU 2 are shown in Table 2 and Figure 2. Landings have been at or very close to the TACC since 1988–89.

1.2 Recreational fisheries

The most recent National Panel Survey (Heinemann & Gray 2024), estimated that about 33 t of pāua were harvested by recreational fishers in PAU 2 in 2022–23.

Because pāua around Taranaki are naturally small and never reach the minimum legal size (MLS) of 125 mm, a new MLS of 85 mm was introduced for recreational fishers from 1 October 2009. The new length applies between the Awakino and Wanganui rivers.

In September 2023, the recreational daily bag limit for pāua in PAU 2 was reduced from 10 yellowfoot pāua and 10 blackfoot pāua per fisher per day to 5 of each species per fisher, per day.

For further information on recreational fisheries refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.



Figure 1: Map of fine-scale statistical reporting areas for PAU 2.




Figure 2: Historical landings and TACC for PAU 2 from 1983–84 to the present. QMS data from 1986 to present.

Table 2: TACC and reported landings (t) of pāua in PAU 2 from 1983–84 to the present.

Fishing year	Landings	TACC	Fishing year	Landings	TACC
1983–84*	110	–	2004–05	121.19	121.19
1984–85*	154	–	2005–06	121.14	121.19
1985–86*	92	–	2006–07	121.20	121.19
1986–87*	96.2	100	2007–08	121.06	121.19
1987–88*	122.11	111.33	2008–09	121.18	121.19
1988–89*	121.5	120.12	2009–10	121.13	121.19
1989–90	127.28	121.19	2010–11	121.18	121.19
1990–91	125.82	121.19	2011–12	120.01	121.19
1991–92	116.66	121.19	2012–13	122.00	121.19
1992–93	119.13	121.19	2013–14	120.00	121.19
1993–94	125.22	121.19	2014–15	115.00	121.19
1994–95	113.28	121.19	2015–16	123.74	121.19
1995–96	119.75	121.19	2016–17	123.69	121.19
1996–97	118.86	121.19	2017–18	113.87	121.19
1997–98	122.41	121.19	2018–19	122.89	121.19
1998–99	115.22	121.19	2019–20	122.28	121.19
1999–00	122.48	121.19	2020–21	126.26	121.19
2000–01	122.92	121.19	2021–22	110.91	121.19
2001–02	116.87	121.19	2022–23	129.39	121.19
2002–03	121.19	121.19	2023–24	120.14	121.19
2003–04	121.06	121.19	2024–25	124.56	121.19

* FSU data.

1.3 Customary fisheries

Pāua is a taonga species and as such there is an important customary use of pāua by Maori for food, and the shells have been used extensively for decorations and fishing devices.

For information on customary catch regulations and reporting refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

Estimates of customary catch for PAU 2 are given in table 5 of the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report. These numbers are likely to be an underestimate of customary harvest because only the catch in kilograms and numbers are reported in the table. In addition, many tangata whenua also harvest pāua under their recreational allowance and these are not included in records of customary catch.

1.4 Illegal catch

It is widely believed that the level of illegal harvesting is high around Wellington and on the Wairarapa coast. For further information on illegal catch refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

For further information on other sources of mortality refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

2. BIOLOGY

For further information on pāua biology refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report. A summary of published estimates of biological parameters for PAU 2 is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Estimates of biological parameters (*H. iris*)

Area		Estimate	Source
<u>1. Size at maturity (shell length)</u>			
Wellington	50% mature	71.7 mm	Naylor et al. (2006)
Taranaki	50% mature	58.9 mm	Naylor & Andrew (2000)
Meta-analysis for fished areas (all QMAs)	50% mature	90.5 mm	Neubauer & Tremblay-Boyer (2019)
<u>2. Fecundity = a (length)^{b} (eggs, shell length in mm)</u>			
Taranaki		$a = 43.98$ $b = 2.07$	Naylor & Andrew (2000)

Table 3 [Continued]:

Area		Estimate	Source
3. Exponential growth parameters (both sexes combined)			
Wellington	g ₅₀	30.58 mm	Naylor et al. (2006)
	g ₁₀₀	14.8 mm	
	G ₂₅	18.4 mm	Naylor & Andrew (2000)
Taranaki	G ₇₅	2.8 mm	
Assessment fit for commercially fished area	G ₇₅	14.01 mm	Neubauer (2022)
		(SE 1.36mm)	
	G ₁₂₅	2.00 mm	
		(SE 0.30 mm)	

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

For further information on stocks and areas refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

In 2020, the Shellfish Fisheries Assessment Working Group evaluated the overall CPUE trend and concluded (given experience with other QMAs) that the data were potentially sufficient to conduct a full length-based stock assessment in line with those run for other QMAs (e.g., Neubauer & Tremblay-Boyer 2019, Neubauer 2022). However, the Fisheries Assessment Plenary considered the stock assessment results to be insufficiently robust given concerns about the choice of the base-case scenario and sensitivities, and issues with use of the early CPUE data (i.e., FSU and CELR data). Concerns were also raised about the validity of region-wide CPUE and Catch Sampling Length-Frequency (CSLF) trends given the fine-scale stock structure of pāua. An updated model addressing concerns raised in the 2020 plenary was presented to plenary in May 2021, including updated data to the 2020 fishing year. In reviewing standardised CPUE series in 2025 the Plenary raised significant concerns over the plausibility of the 2021 assessment (given its sensitivity to assumptions, concerns about hyper-stability and the lack of signal in the standardised PCELR CPUE series). The Plenary therefore considered that the 2021 assessment was no longer appropriate for future assessment and management and undertook a qualitative evaluation on the basis of a standardised ERS CPUE series which only covers the most recent 5 years.

4.1 2025 Management procedure development and standardised CPUE series

4.1.1 Management procedure development

Two projects in 2025 were combined to develop management procedures (MPs) and harvest control rules across all PAU QMAs in order to facilitate timely TACC adjustments based on trends in CPUE and length compositions of the catch. Although much of the development has been completed, the process to develop, simulation-test and implement management procedures is ongoing, and no management procedures developed under the projects had been adopted by May 2025.

The types of management procedures under consideration rely on standardised CPUE in recent years, as well as trends in CPUE and the over-all length compositions. Although no management procedures have been adopted, developing MP inputs showed a number of areas with consistent declines in CPUE over a number of years. These trends are substantial enough to pose a potential sustainability risk, and the Shellfish Working Group therefore decided to explore a partial quantitative stock assessment for PAU 2 on the basis of recent (PCELR & ERS) CPUE trends.

4.1.2 Standardised CPUE for PCELR and ERS data

CPUE standardisation was carried out using a Bayesian Generalised Linear Mixed Model (GLMM) which partitioned variation among management zones within QMAs. The model was run

independently over PCELR (2002–2020) and ERS (2020–2025) data, using offset year CPUE (April–March) in order to include the most recent available data.

CELR data prior to 2002 were considered unreliable and unlikely to reflect abundance trends, in accordance with other recent assessments. Gear improvements and fisher turnover in the fishery during the late 1980s to the late 1990s likely cause substantial hyper-stability in CELR CPUE indices for pāua. In addition, spatial reporting during CELR years was at scales of CELR statistical areas, which do not line up with QMA boundaries. As a result, large amounts of CELR catch-per-unit effort data cannot be used for CPUE analyses at the QMA scale as the data cannot be unambiguously attributed to a single QMA.

CPUE was defined as the log of daily catch per hour and number of statistical areas. Variables in the model were fishing year, client number (ACE holder), management zone (region), and diver ID. Unlike previous standardisations of PCELR and ERS CPUE, the statistical area was not used as a covariate, but the number of statistical areas fished was treated as an additional component of fishing effort.

Variability in CPUE was mostly explained by differences among divers and ACE-holders (Clients; Figure 3). CPUE declined early in the PCELR series but was largely fluctuating without strong trends at the QMA level during the PCELR years. At the regional level, some differences are apparent, with slow and steady declines over the first half of the time-series in South Wairarapa and Palliser, followed by a flat trend, while Turakirae had above average CPUE towards the end of the PCELR time-series after initial declines. The northern statistical areas (Statistical Areas 001–020) appear to fluctuate without a clear trend. The Plenary rejected the PCELR CPUE series because of apparent standardisation effects and concerns that it may not reflect abundance. Recent CPUE trends showed a substantial decline since 2021 in all areas (Figure 4) and for the stock as a whole (Figure 5).




Figure 3: Effect size for the CPUE index standardisation models across PCELR data (2002–2020) and ERS (2020–2025) offset-year data, used to explore partial quantitative stock assessment in 2025. RS: management zone (research stratum), CatcherID: diver number.




Figure 4: Standardised CPUE indices with 95% confidence intervals (solid line and ribbon) and unstandardised geometric CPUE (points) for the ERS time-series for the individual PAU 2 regions.




Figure 5: Standardised CPUE indices with 95% confidence intervals (solid line and ribbon) and unstandardised geometric CPUE (points) for the ERS time-series for PAU 2.

The Shellfish Working Group explored options for a partial quantitative stock assessment using a combined CPUE series aligning the separate PCELR and ERS CPUE series, defining a reference period between 2010 and 2018 (catch and PCELR series stable), but this approach was rejected by the Plenary owing to concerns over the PCELR series, and uncertainty over the appropriateness of aligning the two series.

4.2 Management procedure

The development and evaluation of management procedures (MPs) for pāua is described in section 5.4 of the pāua introductory chapter. MPs are being developed across all assessed QMAs using a common Management Procedure Evaluation (MPE) framework, with each QMA's operating model conditioned on regional information for each stock. For PAU 2, MP development is ongoing.

4.3 Other factors

A key assumption of using CPUE in stock assessments or MPs is that CPUE is a reliable index of abundance. The literature on abalone fisheries suggests that this assumption is questionable and that CPUE is difficult to use in abalone stock assessments due to the serial depletion behaviour of fishers along with the aggregating behaviour of abalone. Serial depletion is when fishers consecutively fish-down beds of pāua but maintain their catch rates by moving to new unfished beds; thus CPUE stays high while the overall population biomass is actually decreasing. The aggregating behaviour of pāua results in the timely re-colonisation of areas that have been fished down, as the cryptic pāua, that were unavailable at the first fishing event, move to and aggregate within the recently depleted area. Both serial depletion and aggregation behaviour cause CPUE to have a hyperstable relationship with abundance (i.e., abundance is decreasing at a faster rate than CPUE) thus potentially making CPUE a poor proxy for abundance. The strength of the effect that serial depletion and aggregating behaviour have on the relationship between CPUE and abundance in PAU 2 is difficult to determine. However, because fishing has been consistent for a number of years and effort has been reasonably well spread, it could be assumed that recent CPUE is not as strongly influenced by these factors, relative to the early CPUE series.

The assumption of CPUE being a reliable index of abundance in PAU 2 can also be upset by exploitation of spatially segregated populations of differing productivity. This can conversely cause non-linearity and hyper-depletion in the CPUE-abundance relationship, making it difficult to accurately track changes in abundance by using changes in CPUE as a proxy.


5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

Stock Structure Assumptions


- PAU 2 - Wairarapa

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2025	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2023–24	Catch: 120 t
Assessment Runs Presented	Standardised CPUE for the ERS period (offset year April-March, excluding 2019–20)	
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 (Default as per HSS) Soft Limit: 20% B_0 (Default as per HSS) Hard Limit: 10% B_0 (Default as per HSS) Overfishing threshold: $U_{40\%B_0}$	
Status in relation to Target	Unknown	
Status in relation to Limits	Unknown	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Unknown	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



Standardised CPUE indices with 95% confidence intervals (solid line and ribbon) and unstandardised geometric CPUE (points) for the ERS time-series for the individual PAU 2 regions.



Standardised CPUE indices with 95% confidence intervals (solid line and ribbon) and unstandardised geometric CPUE (points) for the ERS time-series for PAU 2.

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Recent CPUE is declining in all regions
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or proxy	Unknown

Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis

Stock Projections or Prognosis	Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or commence	Unknown

Assessment Methodology

Assessment Type	Level 3 - Qualitative Evaluation	
Assessment Method	Standardised CPUE 2020–21 to 2024–25 (offset year)	
Period of Assessment	Latest assessment: 2025	Next assessment: 2030
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	ERS CPUE series	1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	- PCELR CPUE series	3 – Medium or Mixed Quality: uncertainty over standardisation and ability to link with ERS series
	- CELR CPUE series	3 – Low Quality: variable catchability and changes in technology
	- FSU CPUE series - Commercial sampling length frequencies	3 – Low Quality: poor recording 1 – High Quality
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	Rejection of standardised PCELR series, analysis of recent ERS data only	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	Selectivity in the commercial fishery has varied spatially and over time as the voluntarily agreed Minimum Harvest Size (MHS) has changed. Different MHSs have been applied to different statistical areas within the assessed area in the same year. CPUE may be hyperstable.	

Qualifying Comments

A large proportion of PAU 2, including the Wellington south coast and west of Turakirae, is either a marine reserve or voluntarily closed to commercial fishing. This means that the data collected from the commercial fishery are exclusive of this large area and therefore the assessment only applies to the south-east component of PAU 2 (Wairarapa).

The short time series of CPUE makes estimation of stock status and biological reference points difficult.

Fishery Interactions


-

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Andrew, N L; Naylor, J R; Gerring, P (1999) A modified timed-swim method for paua stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/4*. 23 p.
- Breen, P A; Kim, S W (2004) The 2004 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 4. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2004/55*. 79 p.
- Breen, P A; Kim, S W; Andrew, N L (2003) A length-based Bayesian stock assessment model for abalone. *Marine and Freshwater Research 54*(5): 619–634.
- Chen, Y; Breen, P A; Andrew, N L (2000) Impacts of outliers and mis-specification of priors on Bayesian fish stock assessment. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science 57*: 2293–2305.
- Fu, D (2014) 2014 PAU 2 stock assessment – Model input. SFWG 14-76. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand.)
- Fu, D; McKenzie, A; Naylor, R (2014a) Summary of input data for the 2013 PAU 3 stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/42*.
- Fu, D; McKenzie, A; Naylor, R (2014b) Summary of input data for the 2013 PAU 5B stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/43*.
- Gerring, P K; Andrew, N L; Naylor, J R (2003) Incidental fishing mortality of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in the PAU 7 commercial fishery. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/56*. 13 p.
- Heinemann, A; Gray, A (2024) National Panel Survey of Recreational Marine Fishers 2022–23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/51*. 116 p.
- Kendrick, T H; Andrew, N L (2000) Catch and effort statistics and a summary of standardised CPUE indices for paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5A, PAU 5B, and PAU 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/47*. 25
- McKenzie, A (2015) Standardised CPUE analyses for paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 2, 1989–90 to 2013–14 (Draft New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report held by Fisheries New Zealand.)
- McKenzie, A; Naylor, J R; Smith, N H (2009) Characterisation of PAU 2 and PAU 3. Final Research Report. 58 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Naylor, J R; Andrew, N L (2000) Determination of growth, size composition, and fecundity of paua at Taranaki and Banks Peninsula. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/51*.
- Naylor, J R; Andrew, N L; Kim, S W (2003) Fishery independent surveys of the relative abundance, size-structure, and growth of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 4. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/08*. 16 p.
- Naylor, J R; Andrew, N L; Kim, S W (2006) Demographic variation in the New Zealand abalone *Haliotis iris*. *Marine and Freshwater Research 57*: 215–224.
- Neubauer, P (2017) Spatial bias in pāua (*Haliotis iris*) catch-per-unit-effort. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2017/57*. 33 p.
- Neubauer, P (2022) The 2021 stock assessment of pāua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 2. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/35*. 108 p.
- Neubauer, P (2020) Development and application of a spatial stock assessment model for pāua (*Haliotis iris*). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2020/30*. 42 p.
- Neubauer, P (2022a) The 2020 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 5A. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/33*. 103p.
- Neubauer, P (2022b) The 2021 stock assessment of pāua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 2. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/35*. 108p.
- Neubauer, P; Tremblay-Boyer, L (2019) The 2018 stock assessment of pāua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/39*. 58 p.
- Pirker, J G (1992) Growth, shell-ring deposition and mortality of paua (*Haliotis iris* Martyn) in the Kaikoura region. (MSc thesis, University of Canterbury, New Zealand.) 165 p.
- Punt, A E (2003) The performance of a size-structured stock assessment method in the face of spatial heterogeneity in growth. *Fisheries Research 65*(1): 391–409.
- Sainsbury, K J (1982) Population dynamics and fishery management of the paua, *Haliotis iris*. 1. Population structure, growth, reproduction and mortality. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research 16*: 147–161.
- Schiel, D R (1992) The paua (abalone) fishery of New Zealand. In: Shepherd, S A; Tegner, M J; Guzman del Proo, S (Eds.), *Abalone of the World: Biology, fisheries, and culture*. Blackwell Scientific, Oxford.
- Schiel, D R; Breen, P A (1991) Population structure, ageing and fishing mortality of the New Zealand abalone *Haliotis iris*. *Fishery Bulletin 89*: 681–691.
- Will, M C; Gemmell, N J (2008) Genetic Population Structure of Black Foot paua. Research Report prepared for project GEN2007A. 37 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–2018. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/24*. 104 p.

PĀUA (PAU 3A) – Kaikōura

(*Haliotis iris*)
Pāua



1. FISHERY SUMMARY

Prior to October 2021, PAU 3A was part of the PAU 3 QMA. The PAU 3 fishery was introduced into the QMS on 1 October 1986 with a TACC of 57 t and later increased to 91.62 t in 1995 as a result of appeals to the Quota Appeal Authority (Table 1).

The coastline between the Clarence River and Conway River was closed to commercial and recreational pāua fishing to protect the surviving pāua populations and associated habitats (see coastline in red in Figure above) due to a significant loss of pāua habitat resulting from coastal uplift following the 2016 Kaikōura earthquakes. In addition, the TACC for PAU 3 was lowered to 45.8 t, and the TAC was set at 79.3 t with a customary allowance of 15 t, a recreational allowance of 8.5 t, and other sources of mortality were at 10 t (Table 1). The closure of the Kaikōura coastline to fishing caused fishing effort to move onto the unaffected open Canterbury coastline (now PAU 3B).

Table 1: Total allowable catches (TAC, t) allowances for customary fishing, recreational fishing, and other sources of mortality (t) and Total Allowable Commercial Catches (TACC, t) declared for PAU 3 and PAU 3A since introduction to the QMS.

Year	TAC	Customary	Recreational	Other mortality	TACC
1986–1995*	—	—	—	—	57.0
1995–2017*	—	—	—	—	91.62
2017–2021*	79.3	15	8.5	10	45.8
2021–2024	40.5	7.5	5	5	23.0
2024–present	78.5	7.5	18	7	46.0

*PAU 3 figures

On 1 October 2021, the PAU 3 QMA was subdivided into two smaller QMAs—PAU 3A (Kaikōura) and PAU 3B (Canterbury)—in response to the changed nature of the fishery (see Figure above). At that time, a new TAC, TACC, and allowances were set to reflect the QMA subdivision, pre-earthquake catch levels, and the need to adopt a precautionary approach to enable the fishery to rebuild to continue while providing for utilisation opportunities.

In response to a rebuilding of pāua biomass, the commercial and recreational fisheries were initially reopened for a limited three-month period in December 2021. The commercial fishery was later

reopened on a permanent basis in January 2023, and the recreational fishery for a two-month season between April and June 2023. The TAC and TACC were increased for the 2024–25 fishing year. The allowance for recreational fishing was also increased at this time and the timing of the recreational fishing seasons in the following years has changed to reflect this (details are provided in Section 1.2).

1.1 Commercial fisheries

The fishing year runs from 1 October to 30 September.

Commercial fishers in PAU 3A gather pāua by hand while freediving. The commercial sector accounted for most of the harvest in the previous PAU 3 fishery. Prior to the 2016 earthquakes, commercial catches predominantly came from the northern part of the QMA, now PAU 3A, between the northern end of Pegasus Bay and the Clarence River, and from the southern side of Banks Peninsula. Annual commercial catches were generally evenly distributed between these two fishing areas with about 45 tonnes (50% of the 91.6 tonne TACC) being caught in each area.

Reported landings for PAU 3 are shown in Figure 1 and Table 2 between 1983–84 and 2020–21. Landings in PAU 3 closely followed the TACC between the fishing year 1991–92 and the 2016 earthquake closure. Following the 2016 earthquake, the coastline from Clarence Point in the north to the Conway River in the south was closed to all commercial (and recreational) pāua fishing. This caused all commercial catches to be taken entirely from the open unaffected Canterbury areas, mainly the southern side of Banks Peninsula but also from the Motunau and Gore Bay areas. The reported landings in 2020–21 totalled 47.10 t, with a TACC of 45.8 t, all of which came from areas unaffected by the earthquake, which remained open to commercial fishing. These areas now make up the PAU 3B QMA.




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for PAU 3 (top) from 1983–84 to 2020–21 (last year before the QMA subdivision) and PAU 3A (bottom) from 2001–02 to present. The PAU 3A reconstructed landings between 2001–02 and 2020–21 correspond to the PAU 3 estimated catch for Pāua Statistical Areas P301 to P310 which correspond to the PAU 3A QMA created in 2021–22. No catch from 2017–18 to 2020–21 reflects the fishery closure following the 2016 Kaikōura earthquake.

Table 2: TACC and reported landings (t) of pāua in PAU 3 between 1983–84 and 2020–21 and in PAU 3A from 2022–23. The PAU 3A reconstructed landings between 2001–02 and 2020–21 correspond to the PAU 3 estimated catch for Pāua Statistical Areas P301 to P310 which correspond to the PAU 3A QMA created in 2021–22.

Year	PAU 3		PAU 3A		
	Landings	TACC	Reconstructed estimated catch	Landings	TACC
1983–84*	114.00	–			
1984–85*	92.00	–			
1985–86*	51.00	–			
1986–87*	54.02	57.00			
1987–88*	62.99	60.49			
1988–89*	57.55	66.48			
1989–90	73.46	69.43			
1990–91	90.68	77.24			
1991–92	90.25	91.50			
1992–93	94.52	91.50			
1993–94	85.09	91.50			
1994–95	93.26	91.50			
1995–96	92.89	91.62			
1996–97	89.65	91.62			
1997–98	93.88	91.62			
1998–99	92.54	91.62			
1999–00	90.30	91.62			
2000–01	93.19	91.62			
2001–02	89.66	91.62	71.36		
2002–03	90.92	91.62	52.47		
2003–04	91.58	91.62	54.64		
2004–05	91.43	91.62	52.50		
2005–06	91.60	91.62	66.66		
2006–07	91.61	91.62	63.27		
2007–08	91.67	91.62	60.34		
2008–09	90.84	91.62	62.38		
2009–10	91.61	91.62	59.01		
2010–11	90.40	91.62	56.93		
2011–12	91.14	91.62	52.78		
2012–13	90.01	91.62	48.54		
2013–14	90.85	91.62	46.03		
2014–15	90.44	91.62	55.08		
2015–16	91.73	91.62	56.90		
2016–17	66.29	91.62	17.03		
2017–18	45.59	45.80	0		
2018–19	44.05	45.80	0		
2019–20	43.09	45.80	0		
2020–21	47.10	45.80	0		
2021–22†				22.96	23.00
2022–23				22.71	23.00
2023–24				22.45	23.00
2024–25				45.50	46.00

* FSU data.

† The 2021–22 season was 1 December 2021 to 28 February 2022.

On 1 October 2001 it became mandatory to report catch and effort on Pāua Catch Effort Landing Returns (PCELRs) using fine-scale reporting areas that had been developed by the New Zealand Pāua Management Company for their voluntary logbook programme (Figure 2). The PAU 3A QMA effective since 1 October 2021 corresponds to the Pāua Statistical Areas P301 to P310.

Table 2 shows the reconstructed estimated catch equivalent to PAU 3A from the estimated PAU 3 catch between 2001–02 and 2020–21. Table 2 also shows the reported landings for PAU 3A since 2021–22, noting the fishing season for 2021–22 was only 3 months (1 December 2021 to 28 February 2022).

Since 2001, a redistribution of fishing effort within PAU 3 was undertaken by the industry as a response to fears that the more accessible northern part of the fishery was being overfished. A voluntary subdivision was agreed by PāuaMAC3 which divided PAU 3 into four management zones. A voluntary harvest cap was placed on each management zone and this cap was reviewed annually. Minimum harvest sizes (MHS) were also agreed each year for each zone in addition to the legislated minimum legal size (MLS). These management initiatives were officially in place until 2020–21.

In 2021, the Minister for Oceans and Fisheries approved a Fisheries Plan for the PAU 3 fishery under s11A of the Fisheries Act 1996 to better manage commercial harvest activity across the wider fishery. This Plan prescribes an ‘adaptive rebuild’ approach in response to the Kaikōura earthquakes using a number of tools including catch spreading arrangements, harvest control rules, a larger minimum harvest size, and fine scale catch reporting and monitoring. The Plan includes new voluntary management areas (Table 3). On the basis of survey information (see Section 4.1), the fishery was reopened in December 2021 with a commercial total allowable catch (TACC) of 23 t, a figure that was thought of as precautionary (catch prior to the earthquake was regularly in excess of 50 t).

Following the biomass survey of the adult pāua population conducted in 2021–22 as well as a survey of the recreational catch during that short 2021–22 fishing season, the Minister approved the permanent reopening of the PAU 3A commercial fishery from 5 January 2023. The TACC was increased to 46 t in 2024–25.




Figure 2: Map of fine scale Pāua Statistical Areas for PAU 3.

Table 3: Summary of the management zones within PAU 3A as initiated by PāuaMAC3.

Management zone (since 2021)	Area	Pāua Statistical Area zone
3A1	Paparoa	P301–P302
3A2	Rakautara	P303–P304
3A3	Omihi	P307–P308
3A4	Oaro	P309–P310

1.2 Recreational fisheries

For further information on recreational fisheries refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report. The ‘National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–18: Harvest Estimates’ estimated that the recreational harvest for PAU 3 was 8.8 t with a CV of 35% (Wynne-Jones. 2019). For the 2013 stock assessment, the Shellfish Working Group (SFWG) agreed to assume that the recreational catch rose linearly from 5 t in 1974 to 17 t in 2013.

Following initial high levels of mortality related to the earthquake, local pāua abundance recovered significantly, and the pāua fishery was re-opened on 1 December 2021, until 1 March 2022. The significant local interest in the fishery and high numbers of easily accessible pāua were considered likely to lead to a very active recreational fishery, once reopened. Therefore, a recreational harvest estimation survey (Holdsworth 2021) using a roving access design was implemented over the December to March fishing period. The survey estimated a recreational take of 42 tonnes (CV 17.5%) over the three-month open season (Holdsworth 2022). Pre- and post-fishery surveys indicated

significant removal of legal sized pāua in the most popular recreational fishing sites during the fishery, but high densities of sub-legal sized pāua remained (Gerrity & Schiel 2023).

After reviewing the results of the recreational catch survey and the biomass survey of the adult pāua population conducted in 2021–22, the Minister agreed to reopen the recreational fishery between 15 April 2023 and 15 June 2023 with a daily limit of 3 pāua per person. Subsequent surveys during the open season estimated recreational of 11.66 t (CV 25%) in 2024 (Holdsworth et al. 2023) and 15.83 t (CV 18%) in 2024 (Holdsworth et al. 2025).

In the 2023–24 fishing year, the recreational fishing season was again open for a short period (22 April to 21 June 2024). The Kaikōura pāua fishery opened to recreational pāua-gathering with a larger minimum legal size of 130 mm, for a slightly longer four-month season from 1 May 2025 until 31 August along with the increased recreational allowance. Fisheries New Zealand coordinated a spatially and temporally stratified random car count survey, as discussed in MAFWG meetings associated with Holdsworth et al. (2025), to estimate the number of gatherers, and Fisheries New Zealand Fishery Officers collected pāua bag size information as part of routine compliance inspections. These data were combined to estimate a total pāua harvest of 18.55 t (95% CI 14.97 – 22.45) for the 2025 season (Fisheries New Zealand 2025). Uncertainty round this harvest estimate is considered to be underestimated.

1.3 Customary fisheries

Pāua is a taonga species and as such there is an important customary use of pāua by Maori for food, and the shells have been used extensively for decorations and fishing devices.

For information on customary catch regulations and reporting refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

Estimates of customary catch for PAU 3 until 2020–21 are shown in Table 5 of the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report. These numbers are likely to be an underestimate of customary harvest because only the catch approved and harvested in numbers are reported in the table. In addition, many tangata whenua also harvest pāua under their recreational allowance and these are not included in records of customary catch.

Landings before 2010–11 do not include the area between the Hurunui River and the South Shore (just north of Banks Peninsula), because tangata tiaki were not appointed there until November 2009.

Estimates of customary take before the 2016 earthquakes ranged from about 7 to 13 tonnes. Customary take then initially declined, given the immediate loss of significant pāua abundance along the Kaikōura coastline, but increased in 2019–20 in response to feeding the local communities during the Covid-19 event. Information is not available at the PAU 3A level up to 2020–21 and customary estimates since 2021–22 for PAU 3A are given in table 5 of the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

1.4 Illegal catch

For further information on illegal catch refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

For the purpose of the 2013 stock assessment and recent operational models (Neubauer & Kim 2023), the SFWG agreed to assume that illegal catches rose linearly from 5 t in 1974 to 15 t in 2000 and remained at 15 t between 2001 and 2013.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

The Working Group agreed that handling mortality would not be included in the model.

For further information on other sources of mortality refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

On 16 November 2016 a 7.8 magnitude earthquake hit the upper east coast of the South Island, causing extensive uplift of about 110 km of coastline by as much as 6 m in some areas. This resulted in the widespread mortality of marine organisms, changes to the structure of intertidal and subtidal rocky reefs, and significant alterations to the structure of nearshore reef communities (Alestra et al. 2019). Ongoing monitoring of these nearshore reef communities has revealed signs of recovery in the low intertidal zones, whereas sub-tidally there has been little recovery in areas that were de-vegetated and previously abundant algal stands appear to have become sparser and more fragmented (Alestra et al. 2020).

The whole northern part of the PAU 3 fishery (Pāua Statistical Areas P301 to P310, now PAU 3A, Figure 3) was impacted to varying degrees by the earthquake. The earthquake caused the direct mortality of a large number of juvenile and adult pāua that became exposed to the terrestrial environment with no means of being able to return to the water. More indirect mortality was also expected from the earthquake due to an immediate loss of pre-earthquake pāua habitat that now lies above the new post-earthquake high tide mark.

Although the impacts of the seabed uplift on pāua populations around Kaikōura will only become clear in the longer term, work was undertaken to evaluate the area utilised by the pāua fishery that is now above the post-earthquake low tide mark (Neubauer 2017). The results suggested that the seabed uplift led to a loss of up to 50% of the pre-earthquake fished area in the pāua statistical areas P301 to P310. In area P301, the habitat loss was 7 ha, which corresponds to 52% of the fished area. However, this area contributed relatively little to the commercial catch. In area P302, which has contributed a larger proportion of the PAU 3 commercial catch, the area lost was 43 ha, which corresponds to 43% of the fished area. In other affected areas, the area lost was generally less than 10%. Across PAU 3 statistical areas, a total of 21% of the fished area (24% of catch weight as recorded on PCELR forms) was impacted by uplift (Figure 3).

The immediate loss of area to the fishery, assumed to be good habitat for pāua, is only part of the impact that the seabed uplift associated with the Kaikōura earthquake will have on pāua populations. Juvenile pāua recruit in shallow water, and so the loss of juvenile habitat will have been higher than the loss of adult habitat. This will impact on the number of juvenile pāua growing into the fishery over the coming years. Recent surveys have indicated large scale recovery of pāua populations in the affected areas (McCowan & Neubauer 2021, 2022, 2023).




Figure 3: Percent fished area above the post-earthquake low tide mark for statistical areas within the Kaikōura earthquake fishery closure zone. Grey indicates that no post-earthquake elevation data were available.

2. BIOLOGY

For further information on pāua biology refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report. A summary of published estimates of biological parameters for PAU 3 is presented in Table 4. Note that these values are from the most recent stock assessment covering the whole of PAU 3 and may therefore not be appropriate for PAU 3A. No area-specific, representative biological data are available for PAU 3A.

Table 4: Estimates of biological parameters (*H. iris*) in PAU 3.

	Estimate	Source
1. Natural mortality (<i>M</i>)	0.13 (0.120–0.14)	Median (5–95% range) of posterior distribution for the base case model
2. $Weight = a(length)^b$ (Weight in g, length in mm shell length)		
All	a 2.99×10^{-5}	b 3.303 Schiel & Breen (1991)
3. Size at maturity (shell length)	50% maturity at 82 mm (80–84)	Median (5–95% range) of posterior distribution for the base case model
	95% maturity at 102 mm (96–108)	Median (5–95% range) of posterior distribution for the base case model

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

For further information on stocks and areas refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

Since 2018, the recovery of the PAU 3A fishery area has been monitored with biomass surveys. The fishery reopened in 2021–22. Since 2021, models have been under development to assess and simulate the PAU 3A fishery, and an assessment has been accepted in 2024.

4.1 Biomass survey and monitoring

Following the 2016 Kaikōura earthquake, a biomass survey was implemented to estimate and monitor pāua abundance and recruitment in the earthquake-affected area, to inform management decisions relating to the re-opening of the pāua fishery (McCowan & Neubauer 2018, 2021, 2022, 2023). To estimate abundance, novel methodologies using GPS dive loggers and underwater electronic callipers were developed. Thirty-five sites were initially surveyed to obtain baseline estimates of site- and fishery-level abundance and length-frequency.

Pāua were mostly found in aggregations, preferentially in shallow water. This was not just the case for small pāua but also for large individuals (i.e., over 120 mm), although smaller individuals (under 100 mm) showed a strongly decreasing trend with depth. Initially estimated pāua density was 0.028 pāua per square metre (geometric mean; 95% confidence interval (CI) [0.009; 0.08]) across the earthquake-affected fishery closure. Scaling density estimates to total biomass or abundance was difficult due to the lack of robust estimates of habitat area for pāua. In the absence of a defensible solution, only density was calculated. After the first two years, the project was extended for another three years until mid-2023.

As of March of 2024, six further rounds of surveys of the 35 initially surveyed sites have been undertaken to monitor pāua abundance and recruitment trends (Figure 4), although not all sites could be surveyed in each round due to adverse weather conditions. Surveys in 2021–22 were split into pre- and post-season surveys in an attempt to assess impacts of fishing after re-opening the fishery. The post-season survey, however, encountered difficult survey conditions, and only some sites in PAU 3A could be surveyed. As a result, apparent declines in abundance in the post-season survey are likely to be confounded by the dive conditions and non-random subset of sites that were re-surveyed. As a

result, these results are unlikely to provide a reliable index of abundance (McCowan & Neubauer 2023); these results are therefore excluded from survey indices used in models to evaluate management procedures.

The number of measurements per unit effort (MPUE) was initially used as a proxy for pāua density to overcome issues with missing data from GPS dive units (originally used to delimit area to estimate density) and to enable the use of significantly larger data sets of measurements and counts of pāua at each site. An assessment of the appropriateness of MPUE, as well as biomass per unit of survey effort (BPUE, number of measurements multiplied by the weights inferred from the length frequency distribution of measured pāua), showed that both correlated well ($R^2=0.86$) with density. Therefore, BPUE has since been used as the main index of changes in pāua abundance.

An overall increase in pāua abundance was observed at a QMA-wide level in both QMAs over the seven survey periods (Figure 4). Increased abundance was generally more pronounced in PAU 7 than in PAU 3. In PAU 3, abundance trended slightly downwards in the second survey period, which was likely to be due to the consistently poor survey conditions during the period, as well as a potential bias towards sampling sites with lower rates of increase due to weather conditions. Since the reopening of the fishery, the survey index has declined slightly.

There was high variability in abundance trends across sites. This variability was in part related to variability in the amount of uplift at each site, because sites with a larger increase in abundance were those with less uplift (Figure 5). Variability in abundance trends across sites could also be linked to habitat-related factors and pre-earthquake abundance. Comparison of length frequency profiles across the four survey periods showed reasonably stable profiles in larger size classes (125–160 mm, Figure 6), with an increase in the number of individuals in the 80–100 mm size range in both QMAs, which is likely to be indicative of post-earthquake recruitment. Recruitment signals were variable between sites due to differences in available recruitment habitat and variability in uplift.




Figure 4: Marginal trend (relative to a geometric mean of 1) in biomass per unit effort (BPUE) across survey years for QMAs PAU 3 and PAU 7 from the BPUE model after accounting for confounding variables.




Figure 5: Marginal trend (relative to a geometric mean of 1 at each site) in biomass per unit effort (BPUE) across survey years for all sites, plotted across industry management zones (“Region”) in QMAs PAU 3A and PAU 7 from the BPUE model after accounting for confounding variables.




Figure 6: Cumulative length-frequency profiles for all pāua measured over four survey periods in PAU 3 and PAU 7. Vertical lines show the legal size of 125 mm (MLS; solid line), 135 mm (dashed line), and 145 mm (dotted line).

4.2 Stock assessment model

Prior to the earthquake, the PAU 3 quota management area was assessed on the basis of a length-based statistical stock assessment (Fu 2014). The stock was thought to be in healthy condition, although large uncertainties about stock status remained due to insufficient biological information that can inform understanding of local stock productivity. Two projects conducted since 2021 attempted to develop assessment models and test management options for PAU 3A as the fishery rebuilds. The work focused on key uncertainties that remained for management of the fishery long term: modelling of earthquake impacts and recovery, and the development of estimates of recreational catch over time.

The most recent model, developed in 2024, was accepted as a stock assessment and to evaluate management procedures. The model was spatially explicit across four main sub-areas (A – Paparoa, B – Rakautara, C – Omihi, and D – Oaro), based on length-based assessment models used in other areas, and tested a range of simple assumptions about plausible earthquake impacts. The model excluded areas around the Kaikoura peninsula (Pāua Statistical Areas P305 and P306), which are not currently commercially fished. It was fitted to commercial CPUE as well as length compositions from commercial shed sampling and (post-earthquake) onboard sampling of catch compositions. Survey data were integrated into the model by fitting to the survey index for each of the four sub-areas and to survey length frequencies summarised across survey sites falling within each of the four sub-areas.

Commercial catch is only known with certainty since 2002 (Table 2). Catch prior to 2002 was reconstructed based on the catch proportions coming from PAU 3A statistical areas in the first four years of PCELR reporting (2002–2006). For catch between 1974 and 1984, catch was taken from Murray & Ackroyd (1984) with the same catch proportions applied. Recreational catch is poorly known prior to the earthquake, and alternative recreational catch scenarios were explored, either fixing recreational catch at 24 t, or applying a ramp from 12 t to 24 t. Alternative models were run with an assumed catch at 12 t. For these models, catch proportions estimated from effort in recent recreational surveys were applied to all recreational catch. Illegal catch was assumed to be high in the 1990s and early 2000s, with high compliance effort leading to lower illegal catch in recent years. Although customary catch reporting has been highly variable, it was assumed to be steady at 5 t in the assessment. The model was initiated at the equilibrium biomass with no catch in 1964, with all catches ramping up linearly to 1974. The assumed catch history for all sub-areas is shown in Figure 7.

4.2.1 Relative abundance estimates from standardised CPUE analyses

The 2024 stock assessment used a combined series of PCELR data covering 2002–2016, and ERS data from 2022–2023. These data were combined in a single index. The 2017 fishing year, which includes some data prior to the earthquake in that fishing year, was included in the estimation of the CPUE index, but was not used in the stock assessment.

CPUE standardisation was carried out using a Bayesian Generalised Linear Mixed Model (GLMM) which partitioned variation among sub-areas within QMAs, and statistical areas within sub-areas, while accounting for effects of ACE-holders and individual divers. CELR data prior to 2002 cannot be attributed to PAU 3A because General Statistical Area 018 straddles PAU 7, PAU 3A and PAU 3B, and therefore these data were not used.

CPUE was defined as the log of daily catch, standardized for effort defined as time per statistical area and day (formulated as a cubic spline within the model). Other variables in the model were fishing year, FIN (Fisher Identification Number), sub-areas, diver ID, and fine-scale statistical area, as well as the interaction between sub-areas and year to derive an index by area. Variability in CPUE was mostly explained by differences among ACE-holders and individual divers (Figure 8). CPUE prior to the earthquake showed little directional trend, but post-earthquake CPUE was substantially higher, mirroring signs of biomass recovery seen in the surveys (Figure 9). In all regions, recent CPUE was above the highest CPUE in the time-series seen prior to the earthquake.

In some circumstances, commercial CPUE may not be proportional to abundance because it is possible to maintain catch rates of pāua despite a declining biomass, with divers searching larger areas. This occurs because pāua tend to aggregate and divers move among areas to maximise their catch rates. Apparent stability in CPUE should therefore be interpreted with caution.




Figure 7: Assumed catch history for the base model for PAU 3A, by sub-areas. NF represents the area around the Kaikoura peninsula that is not currently commercially fished, and was not part of the stock assessment.




Figure 8: Effect size for the CPUE index standardisation model used for the base-case stock assessment model. RS: management zone (research stratum), CatcherID: diver number.




Figure 9: Standardised CPUE indices with 95% confidence intervals (solid line and ribbon) and unstandardized geometric CPUE and variability (points and inter-quartile error bars) for the combined PCELR and ERS time-series used in the base-case assessment model. Series presented by sub-area, NF represents the area around the Kaikoura peninsula that is not currently commercially fished, and was not part of the stock assessment.

4.2.2 Stock assessment methods

The 2024 PAU 3A stock assessment used the length-based population dynamics model first described by Breen et al. (2003). Although the overall population-dynamics model remained unchanged, the 2024 assessment of the PAU 3A stock incorporated a number of changes from the previous models used in PAU 3.

1. Catch sampling length-frequency (CSLF) data were standardised using an improved model (Neubauer & Kim 2023) to better estimate uncertainty in removals.
2. Selectivity was allowed to vary in time, along an estimated offset parameterised by the mean minimum harvest size for each year. Due to changes in the spatial extent of the fishery among years, and variable harvest sizes, selectivity cannot be assumed to be constant.
3. The model was spatially explicit.

The model simulated the population from 1965 to 2023. The model structure assumed a single sex population within each area (defined as management zones for spatial models), with length classes from 70 mm to 170 mm, in bins of 2 mm. Growth was length-based, without reference to age, mediated through a growth transition matrix that describes the probability of each length class changing in each year. The transition matrix was estimated in the model from a meta-analysis derived informative prior and length compositions. Pāua entered the partition following recruitment and were removed by natural mortality and fishing mortality, as well as enforced earthquake assumptions.

Recruitment was assumed to take place at the beginning of the annual cycle, and length at recruitment was defined by a uniform distribution with a range between 70 and 80 mm. The stock-recruitment relationship is unknown for pāua; the assessment used a Beverton-Holt stock-recruitment relationship, with steepness (h) fixed at 0.7 for the 2024 stock assessment.

Growth, maturation and natural mortality were estimated within the model, although no fitting to raw data was performed, and all inputs were provided as priors with mean and uncertainty. The model estimated the commercial fishing selectivity, which was assumed to follow a logistic curve and to reach an asymptote. The selectivity was estimated as varying in time, with a random effect describing deviations from an estimated offset parameterised by the mean minimum harvest size in the QMA for each year. Survey selectivity was also estimated, with vague priors centered around the age of emergence for pāua. Catchability was parameterised as a nuisance parameter with a flat prior. All other parameters were given either informative (M, growth) or vaguely informative priors, and likelihood profiles were constructed to inspect for potentially unintended consequences of priors on stock size. Parameters estimated in the assessment model and their assumed Bayesian priors are summarised in Table 5.

Table 5: A summary of estimated model parameters and type of prior, (N, normal; LN = lognormal; MVN = multivariate normal, MA = prior derived from meta-analysis), mean and standard deviation of the prior.

Parameter	Prior	μ	SD	CV
Unfished recruitment [$\ln(R0)$]	N	12		2
D_{50} (Length at 50% selectivity for the commercial catch)	LN	125		1
D_{95-50} (Length between 50% and 95% selectivity the commercial catch)	LN	5		1
SD of time varying selectivity	LN	1		1
Survey L_{50} (Length at 50% selectivity for the survey)	LN	90		0.2
Survey L_{95-50} (Length between 50% and 95% survey selectivity)	LN	2		1
Natural mortality (M)	LN	0.12		0.2
Recruitment deviations [$\ln(\epsilon)$]	N	0	0.4	
Growth transition matrix	MVN	MA	MA	

The observational data were:

1. A standardised CPUE series covering 2002–2023 (with a break from 2017–2021 when the fishery was closed) based on combined PCELR and ERS data.
2. A commercial catch sampling length frequency series for 2002–2023 (with a break from 2017–2021 when the fishery was closed)
3. Survey length frequencies (2018–2023)
4. Survey index (2018–2023)

Assumptions about earthquake impacts were tested using the model and evaluated on the basis of fits to survey and commercial data. While the Plenary acknowledged that this does not provide a strong basis for definitively modeling earthquake impacts, it provides a way to discard assumptions that are incompatible with observations to date. Models used either i) no earthquake impact (hypothesizing that models can deal with earthquake impacts by estimating low recruitment deviates), ii) a high but exponentially declining earthquake mortality (scaled by the level of uplift observed in each management area), or iii) an exponentially declining temporary reduction in recruitment (also scaled by the amount of coastline uplift).

The assessment calculates the following quantities from the marginal posterior distributions of various partitions of the biomass: the equilibrium (unfished) spawning stock biomass (SSB_0) assuming that recruitment is equal to the average recruitment, and the relative spawning and available biomass for 2023 (SSB_{2023} and B_{2023}^{Avail}). This assessment also reports the following fishery indicators:

Relative SSB	Estimated spawning stock biomass in the final year relative to unfished spawning stock biomass
Relative B_{2023}^{Avail}	Estimated available biomass in the final year relative to unfished available stock biomass
$P(SSB_{2023} > 40\% SSB_0)$	Probability that the spawning stock biomass in 2023 was greater than 40% of the unfished spawning stock
$P(SSB_{2023} > 20\% SSB_0)$	Probability that the spawning stock biomass in 2023 was greater than 20% of the unfished spawning stock (soft limit)

4.2.3 Model results

Although most models could fit increases in post-earthquake survey indices (Figure 10), assumptions about lower recruitment from the earthquake (assumption iii) did not fit with the observed levels of increase in the most impacted sub-area (A - Paparoa). This assumption was therefore not retained further when evaluating model sensitivities. The weight placed on length compositions was influential for the estimated stock trajectory and stock status (especially in sub-area B - Rakautara; Figure 11), as were assumptions about natural mortality and earthquake mortality (especially in sub-area A - Paparoa).

The Plenary accepted the high CSLF weight (highCSLFW) model without explicit earthquake impacts as the base assessment model, noting that recent estimated recruitment was low and likely proxying for earthquake impacts in the model. The base model provided good fits to survey data (Figure 10) and reasonable fits to CPUE trends and could fit CSLF data reasonably well (Figure 12), reflecting commercial selectivity for large pāua since the earthquake. It estimated a natural mortality of 0.13 (95% CI: 0.12–0.14), with relatively fast growth (compared with the meta-analysis derived prior mean, estimated from other QMAs).

The estimated stock status for the model was 46% [95% CI: 41–51%] of unfished spawning biomass and very low risk of being below limit reference points (0% estimated; Figure 13), reflecting a large rebuild of biomass post-earthquake from below target levels. Other model sensitivities showed a similar status, with estimates ranging from 0.36 to 0.51 (Figure 11), and similarly low risk, with earthquake mortality assumptions leading to the lowest status estimates of stock status in sub-area A (Paparoa).

Estimates of relatively low pre-earthquake biomass relative to current levels were largely driven by commercial catch compositions that were dominated by small individuals (relative to sizes seen post-earthquake) in years prior to the earthquake, especially in Rakautara (Figures 11, 12). The estimated commercial exploitation rate was relatively high in this area, whereas in Omihi, the recreational exploitation rate was as high as the commercial one, meaning that the combined exploitation rate was estimated to be relatively high pre-earthquake as well (Figure 14). Post-earthquake exploitation rates were low by comparison to pre-earthquake years in all areas except Omihi, where the bulk of the recreational harvest was estimated to have occurred post-reopening.




Figure 10: Estimated fit to survey indices generated from post-earthquake surveys for pāua in four management zones in the PAU 3A fishery, comparing plausible operating models with different assumptions about model weights for commercial length frequencies CSLFw [high vs low weight]; natural mortality [fixed at 0.12, length-based (estimated) or length-invariant (estimated)]; and explicit earthquake mortality (EqM).




Figure 11: Estimated relative spawning stock biomass (SSB) trend for pāua in four management zones in the PAU 3A fishery, comparing plausible operating models with different assumptions about model weights for commercial length frequencies CSLFw [high vs low weight]; natural mortality [fixed at 0.12, length-based (estimated) or length-invariant (estimated)]; and explicit earthquake mortality (EqM).




Figure 12: Estimated length composition (blue line) and corresponding model inputs (points and uncertainty by length bin) for the base model for the 2024 PAU 3A stock assessment. Residuals are marked as positive (blue) and negative (red).




Figure 13: Estimated stock trajectory for relative spawning biomass (relative to unfished spawning biomass). Shown are the posterior median (black line), and interquartile (dark shade) and 95% confidence bounds (light shade).




Figure 14: Estimated exploitation rate for commercial (ERate), illegal (illegal_ERate) and recreational+customary (recre_ERate) fishery components assumed in the model.

4.3 Evaluation of management procedures for PAU 3A

New management procedures were developed in 2024 on the basis of length-based estimators of spawning potential ratio (SPR; Hordyk et al. 2016) and CPUE. These rules set a spawning potential target and use CPUE or survey indices to indicate the “direction of travel”, adjusting catch to drive biomass towards the target SPR (Figure 15). The SPR can be estimated from commercial or survey data. The combination of SPR and indices was aimed at offsetting the relatively slow response of SPR to changes in exploitation and recruitment. The target SPR was set at 50% to reflect a precautionary target for pāua.




Figure 15: SPR control rule for pāua in PAU 3A. The spawning potential ratio target is set and TACCs are adjusted to steer CPUE in the direction of the target SPR.

Control rules were tested against a range of models and with a range of “base settings”, including starting commercial and recreational catch levels, as well as minimum legal sizes for pāua harvest. All models used for testing suggested substantial recovery post-earthquake of pāua biomass, however, the models did so under different productivity assumptions and with different estimated stock status levels. These models were used to test the robustness of starting settings and subsequent management under the length-based SPR management procedure under different productivity and status assumptions.

Performance of the control rules in terms of catch and risk was only minimally influenced by the rule settings over the short-medium term, but catch trends were strongly influenced by initial TACC settings. The largest differences in medium to long-term outcomes were seen under alternative model assumptions, with lower initial stock status leading to lower average stock status and catch (Figure 16). However, no combination of models, initial management settings and control rules led to overfishing risk, largely due to the high minimum commercial harvest size which protects nearly 20% of the spawning biomass by virtue of making a large proportion of spawning biomass inaccessible to commercial fisheries. Although recreational and customary fisheries can still access smaller fish under settings of unchanged legal harvest sizes, the assumed levels of catch combined with a responsive commercial fishery catch do not appear to lead to risk in the medium or long-term.




Figure 16: Simulated total catch (top) and relative spawning stock biomass (SSB; bottom) trends for pāua, comparing operating models with different assumptions about model weights for commercial length frequencies CSLfw [high vs low weight]; natural mortality [fixed at 0.12 or estimated]; and explicit earthquake mortality (EqM). Management was applied according to the tested control rules for each management zone in quota management area PAU 3A. The dashed vertical line shows the beginning of simulated trends based on the assessed harvest control rule, the dotted vertical line shows the tested limit of validity (3 years) of the tested rule. The last projection year is 2041.

4.3.1 Updated management procedure

The development and evaluation of management procedures (MPs) for pāua is described in section 5.4 of the pāua introductory chapter. MPs are being developed across all assessed QMAs using a common Management Procedure Evaluation (MPE) framework, with each QMA's operating model conditioned on regional information for each stock. For PAU 3A, MP development is ongoing.

Future research considerations

Recreational harvest

Regular estimates of recreational harvest are required to evaluate the effects of this important component of the fishery.

Surveys

Evaluate alternative survey designs to increase effort in each subarea on a rotational basis to improve precision.

CPUE

In CPUE models investigate fisher specific relationships with catch per hour.

Stock assessment

Exploration of the sensitivity to pre 2002 harvests, and potentially starting the model in 2002.
Exploration of approaches to the timing of the survey within the model year the assessment model.
Use strata specific (rather than global) in the length frequency regression analysis.

Harvest control rule

Evaluating HCR with different historical harvest (including different levels of recreational harvest).
Investigate the implications of autocorrelation in CPUE abundance indices.
Investigate available data on earthquake impact to identify potential alternative hypotheses.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

• PAU 3A – Kaikōura region

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2024	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2022–23	Catch: 22.71 t
Assessment Runs Presented	One base run (High CSLFw)	
Reference Points	Default Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: $U_{40\%B_0}$	
Status in relation to Target	B_{2023} was estimated to be 46% B_0 ; About as Likely as Not (40–60%) at or above the target	
Status in relation to Limits	Soft Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the Soft Limit Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below the Hard Limit	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Unknown	

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Recent trends in the survey index provide evidence of a substantial recovery of biomass since the 2016 earthquake.
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Little trend since the fishery was reopened in December 2021.

Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	Slight increase in abundance under current (2023) catch settings
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) at current catch settings Hard Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) at current catch settings
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unknown

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 1 - Full Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Length based Bayesian integrated assessment in STAN	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2024	Next: 2029
Overall assessment quality (rank)	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Catch history - CPUE (PCELR & ERS) - Commercial length samples - Survey biomass index - Survey length samples	1 – High Quality; catch history prior to 2002 requires an assumption of a catch split between adjacent QMAs. Pre 2016 recreational harvest highly uncertain 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 2 – Medium or mixed Quality: low sample sizes in some strata / years
Data not used (rank)	Recreational length samples	2 – Medium or mixed Quality: short time series, post earthquake only, that might not represent recreational selectivity
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	No previous assessment for PAU 3A. Previously assessed as PAU 3.	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	Impact of earthquake on medium term stock productivity Pre earthquake recreational harvest	

Qualifying Comments:
Recreational harvest currently exceeds recreational allowance.


Fishery Interactions
-

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Alestra, T; Gerrity, S; Dunmore, R A; Marsden, I; Pirker, J; Schiel, D R (2019) Rocky reef impacts of the Kaikōura earthquake: quantification and monitoring of nearshore habitats and communities. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 212*. 120 p.
- Alestra, T; Gerrity, S; Dunmore, R A; Schiel, D R (2020) Rocky reef impacts of the Kaikōura earthquake: extended monitoring of nearshore habitats and communities – Year 1 results. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/01*. 40 p.
- Breen, P A; Kim, S W; Andrew, N L (2003) A length-based Bayesian stock assessment model for abalone. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 54(5): 619–634.
- Fisheries New Zealand (2025) Kaikoura recreational paua harvest, 2025. Presentation to the Marine Amateur Fisheries Working Group, 26/11/2025.
- Fu, D (2013) The 2012 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/57*.
- Fu, D (2014) The 2013 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 3. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/44*.
- Gerring, P K; Andrew, N L; Naylor, J R (2003) Incidental fishing mortality of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in the PAU 7 commercial fishery. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/56*. 13 p.
- Gerrity, S T; Schiel, D R (2023) Recreational fishing effects on wadeable pāua populations along the Kaikōura coast, 2021–22. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2023/01*. 27 p.
- Gorfine, H K; Dixon, C D (2000) A behavioural rather than resource-focused approach may be needed to ensure sustainability of quota managed abalone fisheries. *Journal of Shellfish Research* 19: 515–516.
- Holdsworth, J C (2021) Pāua amateur harvest survey design for the Kaikōura Marine Area. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2021/63*. 13 p.
- Holdsworth, J (2022) Harvest estimates from land-based amateur fishers—Kaikōura Marine Area to Marfell's Beach. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/40*. 27 p.
- Holdsworth, J C; Curtis, S; Neubauer, P (2023) Pāua harvest estimates by land-based amateur fishers—Kaikōura Marine Area in 2023. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2023/62*. 21 p.
- Holdsworth, J C; Curtis, S; Neubauer, P (2025) Estimates of pāua harvest by land-based amateur fishers—Kaikōura Marine Area in 2024. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2025/08*. 23 p.
- Hordyk, A R; Ono, K; Prince, J D; Walters, C J (2016) A simple length-structured model based on life history ratios and incorporating size-dependent selectivity: application to spawning potential ratios for data-poor stocks. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 73(12), 1787–1799.
- Kim, S W (2004) CPUE analysis of fine-scale logbook data for PAU 3. Ministry of Fisheries Research Report PAU 2001/01 Obj. 7. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- McCowan, T; Neubauer, P (2018) Pāua biomass estimates and population monitoring in areas affected by the November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2018/54*. 24 p.
- McCowan, T; Neubauer, P (2021) Pāua abundance trends and population monitoring in areas affected by the November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2021/26*. 23 p.
- McCowan, T A; Neubauer, P (2022) Pāua abundance trends and population monitoring in areas affected by the November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake, December 2021 update. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/15*. 20 p.
- McCowan, T A; Neubauer, P (2023) Pāua population monitoring in areas affected by the November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake, February 2023 update. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2023/26*. 19 p.
- McKenzie, A; Naylor, J R; Smith, N H (2009) Characterisation of PAU 2 and PAU 3. Final Research Report. 58 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Murray, T; Ackroyd, J (1984) The New Zealand paua fishery. An update and review of biological considerations to be reconciled with management goals. Internal Report No. 5. Fisheries Research Division. 25 p.
- Naylor, J R; Andrew, N L (2000) Determination of growth, size composition, and fecundity of paua at Taranaki and Banks Peninsula. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/51*. 25 p.
- Naylor, J R; Andrew, N L; Kim, S W (2006) Demographic variation in the New Zealand abalone *Haliotis iris*. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 57: 215–224.
- Neubauer, P (2017) Area lost to the paua fishery from the November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake, 7 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand.)
- Neubauer, P; Kim, K (2023) Operating model and management procedure evaluation for pāua (*Haliotis iris*) fisheries in PAU 3A. *New Zealand Fishery Assessment Report 2023/28*. 109 p.
- Pirker, J G (1992) Growth, shell-ring deposition and mortality of paua (*Haliotis iris* Martyn) in the Kaikōura region. (MSc thesis, University of Canterbury.) 165 p.
- Poore, G C B (1972) Ecology of New Zealand abalones, *Haliotis* species (Mollusca: Gastropoda). 3. Growth. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 6: 534–59.
- Poore, G C B (1973) Ecology of New Zealand abalones, *Haliotis* species (Mollusca: Gastropoda). 4. Reproduction. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 7 (1&2): 67–84.
- Sainsbury, K J (1982) Population dynamics and fishery management of the paua, *Haliotis iris*. 1. Population structure, growth, reproduction and mortality. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 16: 147–161.
- Schiel, D R (1992) The paua (abalone) fishery of New Zealand. In: Shepherd, S A; Tegner, M J; Guzman del Proo, S (Eds.), *Abalone of the World: Biology, fisheries, and culture*. Blackwell Scientific, Oxford.
- Schiel, D R; Breen, P A (1991) Population structure, ageing and fishing mortality of the New Zealand abalone *Haliotis iris*. *Fishery Bulletin* 89: 681–691.
- Shepherd, S A; Partington, D (1995) Studies on Southern Australian abalone (genus *Haliotis*). XVI. Recruitment, habitat and stock relations. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 46: 669–680.
- Will, M C; Gemmell, N J (2008) Genetic Population Structure of Black Foot paua. (Unpublished report for GEN2007A, held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 37 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–2018. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/24*. 104 p.

PĀUA (PAU 3B) - Canterbury

(*Haliotis iris*)
Pāua



1. FISHERY SUMMARY

Prior to October 2021, PAU 3B was part of the PAU 3 QMA, which was introduced into the QMS on 1 October 1986 with a TACC of 57 t and later increased to 91.62 t in 1995 as a result of appeals to the Quota Appeal Authority (Table 1).

The coastline between the Clarence River and Conway River was closed to commercial and recreational pāua fishing to protect the surviving pāua populations and associated habitats (see coastline in red in figure above) due to a significant loss of pāua habitat resulting from coastal uplift following the 2016 Kaikōura earthquakes. In addition, the TACC was lowered to 45.8 t, and a TAC was set at 79.3 t with a customary allowance of 15 t, a recreational allowance of 8.5 t, and other sources of mortality were at 10 t (Table 1). The closure of the Kaikōura coastline to fishing caused fishing effort to move onto the remaining open Canterbury coastline, which was unaffected by the earthquake, south of statistical area P310 (now PAU 3B).

On 1 October 2021, the PAU 3 QMA was subdivided into two smaller QMAs—PAU 3A (Kaikōura) and PAU 3B (Canterbury)— in response to the changed nature of the fishery (see figure above). At that time, a new TAC, TACC, and allowances were set to reflect the QMA subdivision, pre-earthquake catch levels, and the need to adopt a precautionary approach to enable the PAU 3A fishery rebuild to continue while providing for utilisation opportunities.

Table 1: Total allowable catches (TAC, t) allowances for customary fishing, recreational fishing, and other sources of mortality (t) and Total Allowable Commercial Catches (TACC, t) declared for PAU 3 and PAU 3B since introduction to the QMS.

Year	TAC	Customary	Recreational	Other mortality	TACC
1986–1995*	—	—	—	—	57.0
1995–2017*	—	—	—	—	91.62
2017–2021*	79.3	15	8.5	10	45.8
2021–present	80	15	9	10	46

*PAU 3 figures

1.1 Commercial fisheries

The fishing year runs from 1 October to 30 September. Commercial fishers gather pāua by hand while freediving.

On 1 October 2001 it became mandatory to report catch and effort on Pāua Catch Effort Landing Returns (PCELRs) using fine-scale reporting areas that had been developed by the New Zealand Pāua Management Company for their voluntary logbook programme. Figure 1 shows these fine scale statistical reporting areas with a focus on PAU 3B which became effective on 1 October 2021 and which corresponds to the fine-scale reporting statistical areas 311 to 339.




Figure 1: Map of fine scale statistical reporting areas for PAU 3.

Reported landings for PAU 3 are shown in Figure 2 and Table 2 between 1983–84 and 2020–21. Landings in PAU 3 have closely followed the TACC since the fishing year 1991–92. The commercial sector accounts for most of the harvest in the previous PAU 3 fishery.

Prior to the 2016 earthquakes, commercial catches predominantly came from the Kaikōura coastline (now PAU 3A) and Motunau/Banks Peninsula. Annual commercial catches were generally evenly distributed between these two fishing areas with about 45 tonnes (50% of the 91.6 tonne TACC) being caught in each area.




Figure 2: Reported commercial landings and TACC for PAU 3 (top) from 1983–84 to 2020–21 (last year before the QMA subdivision) and PAU 3B (bottom). The PAU 3B reconstructed landings between 2001–02 and 2020–21 correspond to the PAU 3 estimated catch for Statistical Areas 311 to 339 which correspond to PAU 3B QMA created in 2021–22.

Since 2001, a redistribution of fishing effort within PAU 3 has been undertaken by the industry as a response to fears that the more accessible northern part of the fishery was being overfished. A voluntary subdivision was agreed by PāuaMAC3 which divided PAU 3 into four management zones.

A voluntary harvest cap was placed on each management zone and this cap was reviewed annually. Minimum harvest sizes (MHS) were also agreed each year for each zone in addition to the legislated minimum legal size (MLS). These management initiatives were officially in place until 2020–21.

Following the 2016 earthquakes, the coastline from Clarence Point in the north to the Conway River in the south was closed to all commercial (and recreational) fishing. This caused all commercial catches to be taken entirely from the open unaffected Canterbury areas, mainly the southern side of Banks Peninsula.

Table 2 also shows the reconstructed estimated catch equivalent to PAU 3B from the estimated PAU 3 catch between 2001–02 and 2020–21 and the reported landings for PAU 3B since 2021–22. The reported PAU 3B landings in 2021–22 totalled 46.56 t, with a TACC (t) of 46 t.

In 2021, the Minister for Ocean and Fisheries approved a Fisheries Plan for the PAU fishery under s11A of the Fisheries Act 1996 to better manage commercial harvest activity across the wider fishery. This Plan prescribes using an ‘adaptive rebuild’ approach in response to the Kaikōura earthquakes using a number of tools including catch spreading arrangements, harvest control rules, larger minimum harvest size, and fine scale catch reporting and monitoring. The Plan includes new voluntary management areas (Table 3).

Table 2: TACC and reported landings (t) of pāua in PAU 3 between 1983–84 and 2020–21 and in PAU 3B from 2021–22. The PAU 3B reconstructed landings between 2001–02 and 2020–21 correspond to the PAU 3 estimated catch for Statistical Areas 311 to 339 which correspond to PAU 3B QMA created in 2021–22.

Year	PAU 3		PAU 3B		
	Landings	TACC	Reconstructed estimated catch	Landings	TACC
1983–84*	114.00	–	–	–	–
1984–85*	92.00	–	–	–	–
1985–86*	51.00	–	–	–	–
1986–87*	54.02	57.00	–	–	–
1987–88*	62.99	60.49	–	–	–
1988–89*	57.55	66.48	–	–	–
1989–90	73.46	69.43	–	–	–
1990–91	90.68	77.24	–	–	–
1991–92	90.25	91.50	–	–	–
1992–93	94.52	91.50	–	–	–
1993–94	85.09	91.50	–	–	–
1994–95	93.26	91.50	–	–	–
1995–96	92.89	91.62	–	–	–
1996–97	89.65	91.62	–	–	–
1997–98	93.88	91.62	–	–	–
1998–99	92.54	91.62	–	–	–
1999–00	90.30	91.62	–	–	–
2000–01	93.19	91.62	–	–	–
2001–02	89.66	91.62	19.67	–	–
2002–03	90.92	91.62	37.29	–	–
2003–04	91.58	91.62	35.47	–	–
2004–05	91.43	91.62	36.01	–	–
2005–06	91.60	91.62	23.80	–	–
2006–07	91.61	91.62	26.72	–	–
2007–08	91.67	91.62	28.50	–	–
2008–09	90.84	91.62	26.73	–	–
2009–10	91.61	91.62	31.50	–	–
2010–11	90.40	91.62	33.59	–	–
2011–12	91.14	91.62	38.15	–	–
2012–13	90.01	91.62	40.99	–	–
2013–14	90.85	91.62	44.19	–	–
2014–15	90.44	91.62	33.73	–	–
2015–16	91.73	91.62	32.66	–	–
2016–17	66.29	91.62	48.76	–	–
2017–18	45.59	45.80	45.49	–	–
2018–19	44.05	45.80	44.46	–	–
2019–20	43.09	45.80	41.20	–	–
2020–21	47.10	45.80	45.54	–	–
2021–22	–	–	–	46.56	46.00
2022–23	–	–	–	46.02	46.00
2023–24	–	–	–	44.40	46.00
2024–25	–	–	–	40.37	46.00

* FSU data.

Table 3: Summary of the management zones within PAU 3B as initiated by PāuaMAC3.

Management zone (since 2021)	Area	Statistical area zone
3B1	Conway River to Motunau Island	P311–P317
3B2	Motunau Island	P318
3B3	Motunau Island to Hickory Bay	P319–P329
3B4	Hickory Bay to Te Oka Bay	P330–P335
3B5	Te Oka Bay to Waitaki River	P336–P339

1.2 Recreational fisheries

For further information on recreational fisheries refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report. The National Panel Survey estimated that the recreational harvest for PAU 3B was 2.4 t with a CV of 33% (Heinemann & Gray 2024). Previous National Panel Survey estimates from the PAU 3B area are 6.7 t (CV 56%) and 8.8 t (CV 36%) in 2011–12 and 2017–18 (Wynne-Jones et al. 2014; 2019).

1.3 Customary fisheries

Pāua is a taonga species and as such there is an important customary use of pāua by Maori for food, and the shells have been used extensively for decorations and fishing devices.

For information on customary catch regulations and reporting refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

Estimates of customary catch for PAU 3 until 2020–21 are shown in table 5 of the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report. These numbers are likely to be an underestimate of customary harvest because only the catch approved and harvested in numbers are reported in the table. In addition, many tangata whenua also harvest pāua under their recreational allowance and these are not included in records of customary catch.

Landings before 2010–11 do not include the area between the Hurunui River and the South Shore (just north of Banks Peninsula), because tangata tiaki were not appointed there until November 2009.

Estimates of customary take before the 2016 earthquakes ranged from about 7 to 13 tonnes. Customary take then initially declined given the immediate loss of significant pāua abundance along the Kaikōura coastline, but increased in 2019–20 in response to feeding the local communities during the Covid-19 event. Information is not available at the PAU 3B level up to 2020–21 and customary estimates since 2021–22 for PAU 3B are shown in table 5 of the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

1.4 Illegal catch

For further information on illegal catch refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

Within the 2021 stock assessment process (no accepted assessment was produced), the SFWG agreed to assume that illegal catches rose linearly from 1 t in 1974 to 10 t in 1990 and remained at 10 t between 1990 and 2000. A subsequent decline in illegal fishing from 10 t in 2000 to 2 t by 2010 was assumed due to perceived advances in fisheries enforcement.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

For further information on other sources of mortality refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

On 16 November 2016 a 7.8 magnitude earthquake hit the upper east coast of the South Island, causing extensive uplift of about 110 km of coastline by as much as 6 m in some areas. This resulted in the widespread mortality of marine organisms, changes to the structure of intertidal and subtidal rocky reefs, and significant alterations to the structure of nearshore reef communities (Alestra et al. 2019).

The whole northern part of the PAU 3 fishery (Pāua Statistical Areas P301 to P310, now PAU 3A) was impacted to varying degrees by the earthquake; however, the area now included within PAU 3B was largely unaffected. The earthquake caused the direct mortality of a large number of juvenile and adult pāua that became exposed to the terrestrial environment with no means of being able to return to the water. More indirect mortality was also expected from the earthquake due to an immediate loss of pre-earthquake pāua habitat that now lies above the new post-earthquake high tide mark.

2. BIOLOGY

For further information on pāua biology refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report. A summary of published estimates of biological parameters for PAU 3 is presented in Table 4. Note, that these values are from the most recent stock assessment covering the whole of PAU 3 and may therefore not be appropriate for PAU 3B. No area-specific, representative biological data are available for PAU 3B.

Table 4: Estimates of biological parameters (*H. iris*) in PAU 3.

	Estimate	Source
<u>1. Natural mortality (<i>M</i>)</u>		
	0.135 (0.120–0.153)	Median (5–95% range) of posterior distribution for the base case model
<u>2. Weight = $a(\text{length})^b$ (Weight in g, length in mm shell length)</u>		
All	a 2.99×10^{-5}	b 3.303 Schiel & Breen (1991)
<u>3. Size at maturity (shell length)</u>		
	50% maturity at 82 mm (80–84)	Median (5–95% range) of posterior distribution for the base case model
	95% maturity at 102 mm (96–108)	Median (5–95% range) of posterior distribution for the base case model

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

For further information on stocks and areas refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

A stock assessment for the PAU 3B area was attempted in 2021–22, based on estimates of historical catches, CPUE trends, and commercial length frequency data. CPUE trends were found to be stable despite steady increases in catch over the past decades. For this reason, all stock assessment models that were attempted estimated an exceedingly high biomass that was judged to be implausible by the Fisheries New Zealand Shellfish Working Group. In the absence of an acceptable assessment model, the Shellfish Working Group explored comparative analyses of absolute CPUE in PAU 3B in comparison with areas of assessed stock status. These analyses were used to gain a qualitative understanding of current biomass level and exploitation rate in the fishery.

4.1 Relative abundance estimates from standardised CPUE analyses

PCELR and ERS data from 2002 to 2021 were used to derive a standardised, fishery-dependent index of abundance, initially for use within a stock assessment model, and subsequently to estimate median current absolute CPUE. Data prior to 2002 (CELR, FSU reporting) were not used in the assessment process; as for other recent assessments, changes to the composition of the fleet and gear during the 1990s, combined with inconsistent reporting, mean that the trends in CPUE from CELR data are questionable and likely hyper-stable to an unknown degree in most PAU QMAs.

CPUE standardisation was carried out using Bayesian Generalised Linear Mixed Models (GLMM) which partitioned variation among fixed (research strata) and random variables. CPUE was defined as the log of daily catch. Variables in the model were fishing year, estimated fishing effort, client number, research stratum, diver ID (PCELR). Previous standardisation models for PCELR data routinely used small scale statistical areas as a standardising variable. For the present assessment, this variable was not available with sufficient precision for recent (ERS) data, where it is inferred from position data, and was therefore omitted. Nevertheless, follow-up work on the quality of ERS data for pāua CPUE suggested limited effects of spatial reporting and the inclusion, or not, of statistical areas in the standardisation made little difference to resulting indices before 2021 (Neubauer & Kim 2023).

Standardised CPUE in all areas suggested increases in recent years, after nearly two decades of stable CPUE (Figure 3), with the most notable increase in zone B2 - Motunau Island and highly variable trends in raw CPUE in other areas. While other zones (B3, B4) also showed increases in raw CPUE in 2020 and 2021, these increases were largely compensated by the standardisation model. Median absolute CPUE (> 50 kg/h) was found to be substantially higher than in all assessed PAU QMAs (< 50 kg/h), suggesting that current PAU densities in PAU 3B are high relative to other QMAs. The latter may be linked to relatively low catches across the PAU 3B area prior to the 2016 Kaikōura earthquake, when most of the commercial catch was located in areas P301–P310, which now make up the PAU 3A QMA.




Figure 3: Raw CPUE (points are median with inter-quartile interval indicated by vertical intervals) and standardised CPUE index (line) with 95% confidence interval (shaded ribbon) by industry management zone (B1–B5) and overall (All). Shading of points indicates the relative amount of data available for standardisation.

4.2 Operating model and testing management procedures

With the establishment of PAU 3B, there has been increased interest in understanding the stock status of the area and in developing management measures that can maintain the fishery at target levels. Between 2020 and 2022, a project aimed to develop models to understand stock status and to test potential management procedures in PAU 3B.

The project compiled catch, catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE), and length frequency information to inform models for stock in PAU 3B. Catch and CPUE information is only known with some certainty since the early 2000s and the establishment of fine-scale pāua statistical areas, which allow partitioning of PAU 3 catches and catch and effort data into PAU 3A and PAU 3B components. Assumptions about spatial catch splits needed to be made to reconstruct catches prior to 2002. Nevertheless, early catches were likely relatively low because the area was less targeted by commercial fisheries than the northern area

of PAU 3. The CPUE remained relatively constant throughout the 2000s, with a small increase in recent years (see Section 4.1).

An initial attempt to fit stock assessment models was unsuccessful based on the flat or increasing CPUE, which occurred in the context of increasing catch over time. In the absence of a robust stock assessment model, the use of CPUE (kg/h) relative to CPUE in other areas was explored as an indirect measure of potential stock status or exploitation rate. This approach suggested a relatively low exploitation rate and high stock status.

To test potential harvest control rules, empirical estimates of stock status were used to condition operating models using depletion-based stock reduction analysis. The operating models produced a range of outcomes depending on productivity assumptions and conditioning constraints and were used to test the suitability of control rules to maintain target catch rates.

4.3 Management procedure

The development and evaluation of management procedures (MPs) for pāua is described in Section 5.4 of the pāua introductory chapter. MPs are being developed across all assessed QMAs using a common Management Procedure Evaluation (MPE) framework, with each QMA's operating model conditioned on regional information for each stock. For PAU 3B, MP development is ongoing.

4.4 Other factors

Another source of uncertainty are the catch data. The commercial catch is known with accuracy since 1985 but is probably not well estimated before that. Furthermore, the recent split of PAU 3 into PAU 3A and PAU 3B following the Kaikōura earthquake and subsequent fishery closure did not match the early (CELR) reporting areas, leading to substantial uncertainties about catch prior to 2002, when PCELR and fine-scale reporting was introduced. In addition, non-commercial catch estimates are poorly determined. Therefore, better information on the scale and trend in recreational catch needs to be collated for more accurate assessment of the stock status.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

• PAU 3B - Canterbury

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2022, not successful given conflicting signals in catch and CPUE trends	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2020–21	Catch: 46 t
Assessment Runs Presented	-	
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 (Default as per HSS) Soft Limit: 20% B_0 (Default as per HSS) Hard Limit: 10% B_0 (Default as per HSS) Overfishing threshold: $U_{40\%B_0}$	
Status in relation to Target	Unknown, but likely relatively high given that CPUE levels are well above most other mainland QMAs	
Status in relation to Limits	Unknown	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Unknown	

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	CPUE has been stable or increasing in all management zones, despite increasing catches.
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Steady increase in catch over the past decades, but high and stable CPUE suggests low overall exploitation rates.
Other Abundance Indices	-

Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unknown

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	None accepted	
Assessment Method	N/A	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2021	Next: unknown
Overall assessment quality (rank)	N/A	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Catch history	1 – High Quality for commercial catch 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality for recreational catch, which is not believed to be fully representative over the history of the fishery
	- CPUE indices early series	2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: not believed to be proportional to abundance
	- CPUE indices later series (since 2002)	1 – High Quality
	- Commercial sampling length frequencies	1 – High Quality
	- Tag recapture data (to estimate growth)	2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: no area specific data, inferred from meta-analysis of New Zealand-wide data
	- Maturity at length data	1 – Medium or Mixed Quality: no area specific data, inferred from meta-analysis of New Zealand-wide data
Data not used (rank)	N/A	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	No accepted stock assessment model	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Catch levels and trends uncertain prior to 2002 - CPUE may not be a reliable index of abundance at low exploitation rates - Very little growth data available and growth not well known	

Qualifying Comments:
-


Fishery Interactions
-

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Alestra, T; Gerrity, S; Dunmore, R A; Marsden, I; Pirker, J; Schiel, D R (2019) Rocky reef impacts of the Kaikōura earthquake: quantification and monitoring of nearshore habitats and communities. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 212*. 120 p.
- Alestra, T; Gerrity, S; Dunmore, R A; Schiel, D R (2020) Rocky reef impacts of the Kaikōura earthquake: extended monitoring of nearshore habitats and communities – Year 1 results. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/01*. 40 p.
- Breen, P A; Kim, S W; Andrew, N L (2003) A length-based Bayesian stock assessment model for abalone. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 54(5): 619–634.
- Fu, D (2013) The 2012 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/57*.
- Fu, D (2014) The 2013 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 3. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/44*.
- Gerring, P K; Andrew, N L; Naylor, J R (2003) Incidental fishing mortality of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in the PAU 7 commercial fishery. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/56*. 13 p.
- Gorfine, H K; Dixon, C D (2000) A behavioural rather than resource-focused approach may be needed to ensure sustainability of quota managed abalone fisheries. *Journal of Shellfish Research* 19: 515–516.
- Heinemann, A; Gray, A. (2024) National Panel Survey of Recreational Marine Fishers 2022–23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/51*. 116 p.
- Kim, S W (2004) CPUE analysis of fine-scale logbook data for PAU 3. Ministry of Fisheries Research Report PAU 2001/01 Obj. 7. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- McCowan, T; Neubauer, P (2018) Paua biomass estimates and population monitoring in areas affected by the November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2018/54*. 24 p.
- McCowan, T; Neubauer, P (2021) Pāua abundance trends and population monitoring in areas affected by the November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2021/26*. 23 p.
- McCowan, T A; Neubauer, P (2022) Pāua abundance trends and population monitoring in areas affected by the November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake, December 2021 update. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/15*. 20 p.
- McCowan, T A; Neubauer, P (2023) Pāua population monitoring in areas affected by the November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake, February 2023 update. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2023/26*. 19 p.
- McKenzie, A; Naylor, J R; Smith, N H (2009) Characterisation of PAU 2 and PAU 3. Final Research Report. 58 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Naylor, J R; Andrew, N L (2000) Determination of growth, size composition, and fecundity of paua at Taranaki and Banks Peninsula. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/51*. 25 p.
- Naylor, J R; Andrew, N L; Kim, S W (2006) Demographic variation in the New Zealand abalone *Haliotis iris*. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 57: 215–224.
- Neubauer, P (2017) Area lost to the paua fishery from the November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake, 7 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand.)
- Neubauer, P; Kim, K (2023) Developing an operating model and testing management procedures for pāua (*Haliotis iris*) fisheries in PAU 3B. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2023/27*. 65 p.
- Pirker, J G (1992) Growth, shell-ring deposition and mortality of paua (*Haliotis iris* Martyn) in the Kaikōura region. (MSc thesis, University of Canterbury.) 165 p.
- Poore, G C B (1972) Ecology of New Zealand abalones, *Haliotis* species (Mollusca: Gastropoda). 3. Growth. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 6: 534–559.
- Poore, G C B (1973) Ecology of New Zealand abalones, *Haliotis* species (Mollusca: Gastropoda). 4. Reproduction. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 7 (1&2): 67–84.
- Sainsbury, K J (1982) Population dynamics and fishery management of the paua, *Haliotis iris*. 1. Population structure, growth, reproduction and mortality. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 16: 147–161.
- Schiel, D R (1992) The paua (abalone) fishery of New Zealand. In: Shepherd, S A; Tegner, M J; Guzman del Proo, S (Eds.), *Abalone of the World: Biology, fisheries, and culture*. Blackwell Scientific, Oxford.
- Schiel, D R; Breen, P A (1991) Population structure, ageing and fishing mortality of the New Zealand abalone *Haliotis iris*. *Fishery Bulletin* 89: 681–691.
- Shepherd, S A; Partington, D (1995) Studies on Southern Australian abalone (genus *Haliotis*). XVI. Recruitment, habitat and stock relations. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 46: 669–680.
- Will, M C; Gemmell, N J (2008) Genetic Population Structure of Black Foot paua. (Unpublished report GEN2007A held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington). 37 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Hill, L; Heinemann, A (2014) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2011–12: Harvest Estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/67*. 139 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–2018. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/24*. 104 p.

PĀUA (PAU 4) – Chatham Islands

(*Haliotis iris*)
Pāua

**1. FISHERY SUMMARY**

PAU 4 was introduced into the Quota Management System (QMS) in 1986–87 with a TACC of 261 t. The TACC was increased to 269 t in 1987–88, 271 t in 1988–89, and 287 in 1989–90. As a result of appeals to the Quota Appeal Authority, the TACC was further increased in 1995–96 to 326 t and has remained unchanged to the current fishing year (Table 1). Before the Fisheries Act (1996) a TAC was not required, and only a TACC was set when PAU 4 entered the QMS.

As a result of a court injunction a review of sustainability measures was undertaken for the 2019–20 fishing year, beginning 1 October 2019. The agreement reached resulted in a TAC, as well as allowances for Māori customary and recreational fishers being set. The TAC was set at 334 t, the TACC at 326.543 t, other mortality at 2 t, customary allowance at 3 t, and the recreational allowance at 3 t.

Because the pāua biomass appeared to be declining, the PAU 4 Fishery Plan (approved in 2019 under section 11A of the Fisheries Act 1996) provides a commitment by PAU 4 quota owners to shelve 40% of the PAU 4 ACE.

Table 1: Total allowable catches (TAC, t) allowances for customary fishing, recreational fishing, and other sources of mortality (t) and Total Allowable Commercial Catches (TACC, t) declared for PAU 4 since introduction into the QMS.

Year	TAC	Customary	Recreational	Other mortality	TACC
1986–1987	–	–	–	–	261
1987–1988	–	–	–	–	269
1988–1989	–	–	–	–	271
1989–1995	–	–	–	–	287
1995–2019	–	–	–	–	326
2019 onwards	334	3	3	2	326

1.1 Commercial fisheries

The fishing year runs from 1 October to 30 September. On 1 October 2001 it became mandatory to report catch and effort on PCELRs using fine-scale reporting areas that had been developed by the New Zealand Pāua Management Company for their voluntary logbook programme (see figure above).

At the beginning of the 2009–10 fishing year, reporting of catch in PAU 4 was changed from reporting in greenweight to reporting in meatweight. The TACC was still set in greenweight but fishers were required to report greenweight catch that is estimated from the meatweight measured by the Licensed Fish Receiver (LFR). The meatweight to greenweight conversion factor was 2.50 (equivalent to 40% meatweight recovery). The change was made to curb the practice of converting meatweight to landed greenweight after shucking to obtain artificially high recovery rates. It was also made to encourage catch spreading by making it commercially viable for fishers to harvest areas where shells are heavily fouled and meatweight recovery is low. Heavy fouling on shells is a problem that occurs in a number of areas around the Chatham Islands. This meatweight reporting requirement was changed back to greenweight at the beginning of the 2017–18 year. This was due to issues with the accurate meatweight being recorded and delays in weighting the meat which meant that the conversion back to greenweight was not accurate due to blood and moisture loss being variable across the different processors and LFRs.

Reported landings have remained below the TACC since 2010–11, averaging 276 t between 2010–11 and 2016–17 before decreasing to an average of 192 t between 2018–19 and 2024–25. Landings for PAU 4 are shown in Table 2 and Figure 1.

Table 2: TACC and reported landings (t) of pāua in PAU 4 from 1983–84 to the present. The last column shows the TACC after shelving has been accounted for.

Year	Landings	TACC	Shelving	Year	Landings	TACC	Shelving
1983–84*	409.00	–		2004–05	319.24	326.54	–
1984–85*	278.00	–		2005–06	322.53	326.54	–
1985–86*	221.00	–		2006–07	322.76	326.54	–
1986–87*	267.37	261.00	–	2007–08	323.98	326.54	–
1987–88*	279.57	269.08	–	2008–09	324.18	326.54	–
1988–89*	284.73	270.69	–	2009–10	323.57	326.54	–
1989–90	287.38	287.25	–	2010–11	262.15	326.54	261.24
1990–91	253.61	287.25	–	2011–12	262.07	326.54	261.24
1991–92	281.59	287.25	–	2012–13	263.33	326.54	261.24
1992–93	266.38	287.25	–	2013–14	291.98	326.54	293.89
1993–94	297.76	287.25	–	2014–15	295.16	326.54	293.89
1994–95	282.10	287.25	–	2015–16	294.73	326.54	293.89
1995–96	220.17	326.54	–	2016–17	264.63	326.54	261.24
1996–97	251.71	326.54	–	2017–18	203.03	326.54	195.93
1997–98	301.69	326.54	–	2018–19	185.06	326.54	195.93
1998–99	281.76	326.54	–	2019–20	188.47	326.54	195.93
1999–00	321.56	326.54	–	2020–21	196.65	326.54	195.93
2000–01	326.89	326.54	–	2021–22	209.10	326.54	195.93
2001–02	321.64	326.54	–	2022–23	202.04	326.54	195.93
2002–03	325.62	326.54	–	2023–24	191.33	326.54	195.93
2003–04	325.85	326.54	–	2024–25	169.23	326.54	195.93

* FSU data

1.2 Recreational fisheries

The only recreational harvest available for PAU 4 is 3.76 t in 2008–09 (Davey et al. 2011). The 1996, 1999–2000, and 2000–01 national marine recreational fishing surveys and the 2011–12, 2017–18 and 2022–23 National Panel Surveys did not include the Chatham Islands. There are 14 areas around the Chatham Islands which are closed to commercial fishing and act as recreational/customary only fishing areas. It is assumed that a significant portion of recreational catch is taken from these areas.

1.3 Customary fisheries

Pāua is a taonga species and as such there is an important customary use of pāua by Maori for food, and the shells have been used extensively for decorations and fishing devices.

For information on customary catch regulations and reporting refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

Estimates of customary catch for PAU 4 are shown in table 5 of the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report. These numbers are likely to be an underestimate of customary harvest because only the catch approved and harvested in kilograms and numbers are reported in the table. In addition, many tangata whenua also harvest pāua under their recreational allowance and these are not included in records of customary catch.

For the 2004 stock assessment the customary catch was assumed to be zero.




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for PAU 4 from 1983–84 to the present.

1.4 Illegal catch

There are no estimates of illegal catch for PAU 4. For the 2004 stock assessment and 2023 operational models for harvest control rule evaluations this catch was assumed to be zero. For further information on illegal catch refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

For further information on other sources of mortality refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

2. BIOLOGY

For further information on pāua biology refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

For further information on stocks and areas refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

4.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

A standardised CPUE analysis for PAU 4 (Fu 2010) from 1989–90 to 2007–08 was completed in February 2010.

The Shellfish Working Group (SFWG) agreed that, because of extensive misreporting of catch in PAU 4, catch and effort data from the Fisheries Statistical Unit and from the CELR and PCELR forms might be misleading in CPUE analyses and therefore, CPUE cannot be used as an index of abundance in this fishery.

4.2 Stock assessment 2004

The last stock assessment for PAU 4 was completed in 2004 (Breen & Kim 2004). A Bayesian length-based stock assessment model was applied to PAU 4 data to estimate stock status and yield.

In February 2010 the SFWG agreed that, because of the lack of adequate data as input into the Bayesian length-based model, a stock assessment for PAU 4 using this model was not appropriate.

4.3 Operating model development and harvest control rule evaluation

From 2020 to 2023, a series of projects aimed to develop an operating model and to test management procedures that could formalise current statistical area-scale industry management initiatives (Neubauer & Kim 2023). Operating models were developed as spatial length-based models at the scale of individual pāua statistical areas. Due to a lack of sufficiently reliable time series of catch and CPUE, stock assessment models could not be fitted statistically but were conditioned on assumed catch time series. Conditioning assumed a distribution of plausible current stock status levels and simulated a range of stock trajectories that are consistent with assumed status.

Status assumptions were initially derived from a meta-analysis of stock status against catch-per-unit-effort in QMAs with accepted stock assessments. Results from this analysis suggested very high status and did not reflect industry concerns that have led to shelving of annual catch entitlements over the past decade. More conservative assumptions about stock status were therefore used to condition models, with conditioning scaled spatially from an analysis of recent spatial CPUE, which was judged more reliable than past CPUE trends based on CELR or PCELR data.

Control rules for management procedures were developed from a template applied in other pāua fisheries and centred on a target catch-rate given by fishers and catches as specified in the 2022 PAU 4 annual operating plan for each statistical area. Rules were then scaled according to assumed differences in available biomass between statistical areas derived from spatial CPUE (Figure 2). These rules were used as a preliminary set of rules to test the potential of formalising current industry management practice which considers catch as a function of perceived status at the statistical area level.

Conditioned models suggested a range of outcomes across individual statistical areas; these differences were attributed to conditioning assumptions in the model. While application of control rules led to variable outcomes at the statistical area-scale, the spatial variability averaged out on the large scale, leading to highly stable trends at the QMA scale for an implementation window of 5 years (Figure 3) and indicating low risk of further declines under the trialled preliminary harvest control rules.

4.4 Biomass estimates

There are no current biomass estimates for PAU 4.

4.5 Yield estimates and projections

There are no estimates of PAU 4.




Figure 2: Preliminary harvest control rules for PAU 4 (by statistical area): total commercial catch (TCC) as a function of catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE). Target CPUE is shown as the dashed vertical line, recent CPUE and corresponding control rule catch are shown in coloured dotted lines, corresponding to estimates of areas being below ('Rebuild'), at ('Target'), or above target ('High').




Figure 3: Projected relative spawning stock biomass (SSB) under base conditioning and biological assumptions in the PAU 4 operating model. The dashed vertical line shows the beginning of simulated trends based on the assessed harvest control rule, the dotted vertical line shows the tested limit of validity (5 years) of the tested rule. The last projection year is 2041.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

Stock Structure Assumptions

Haliotis iris individuals collected from the Chatham Islands were found to be genetically distinct from those collected from coastal sites around the North and South Islands (Will & Gemmell 2008).

PAU 4 - Chatham Islands

Due to concerns over reported catch and effort, no formal integrated stock assessment of the resource has been successful for several years, and the status of the fishery continues to be unknown. However, an operating model was developed in 2022, and management procedures were tested to attempt to formalise current statistical-area scale industry management initiatives.

Operating models were developed as spatial length-based models at the scale of individual pāua statistical areas. Due to a lack of sufficiently reliable time-series of catch and CPUE, stock assessment models could not be fitted statistically, but were conditioned on assumed catch times series. Conditioning assumed a distribution of plausible current stock status levels and simulated a range of stock trajectories that are consistent with assumed status.

Status assumptions were initially derived from a meta-analysis of stock status against catch-per-unit-effort in QMAs with accepted stock assessments. Results from this analysis suggested very good status and did not reflect industry concerns that have led to shelving of annual catch entitlements over the past decade. More conservative assumptions about stock status were therefore used to condition models, with conditioning scaled spatially from an analysis of recent spatial CPUE, which was judged more reliable than past CPUE trends based on CELR or PCELR data.


The model suggested potential declines in statistical areas with low CPUE and low past catch. However, due to their low biomass, these areas contribute relatively little to the QMA-wide trends. Despite a range of outcomes and variable trends at small spatial scales, trends at the QMA scale were relatively stable and suggested an overall stable fishery with low risk of further declines under the trialled harvest control rules.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Breen, P A; Kim, S W (2004) The 2004 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 4. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2004/55*. 79 p.
- Davey, N K; Hartill, B; Carter, M (2011) Characterisation of marine non-commercial fishing around the Chatham Islands during the 2008–09 fishing year, including catch estimates for selected species. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2011/49*. 72 p.
- Fu, D (2010) Summary of catch and effort data and standardised CPUE analyses for paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 4, 1989–90 to 2007–08. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/01*. 50 p.
- Naylor, J R; Andrew, N L; Kim, S W (2003) Fishery independent surveys of the relative abundance, size-structure, and growth of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 4. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/08*. 16 p.
- Neubauer, P; Kim, K (2023) Developing an operating model and testing management procedures for pāua (*Haliotis iris*) fisheries in PAU 4. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2023/29*. 50 p.
- Pirker, J G (1992) Growth, shell-ring deposition and mortality of paua (*Haliotis iris* Martyn) in the Kaikoura region. MSc thesis, University of Canterbury. 165 p.
- Sainsbury, K J (1982) Population dynamics and fishery management of the paua, *Haliotis iris*. 1. Population structure, growth, reproduction and mortality. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 16: 147–161.
- Schiel, D R (1992) The paua (abalone) fishery of New Zealand. In: Shepherd, S A; Tegner, M J; Guzman del Proo, S (Eds.), *Abalone of the World: Biology, fisheries, and culture*. Blackwell Scientific, Oxford.
- Schiel, D R; Breen, P A (1991) Population structure, ageing and fishing mortality of the New Zealand abalone *Haliotis iris*. *Fishery Bulletin* 89: 681–691.
- Will, M C; Gemmell, N J (2008) Genetic Population Structure of Black Foot paua. Final Research Report for project GEN2007A. 37 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand.)

PĀUA (PAU 5A) – Fiordland*(Haliotis iris)*

Pāua

**1. FISHERY SUMMARY**

Prior to 1995, PAU 5A was part of the PAU 5 QMA, which was introduced into the QMS in 1986 with a TACC of 445 t. As a result of appeals to the Quota Appeal Authority, the TACC increased to 492 t in the 1991–92 fishing year; PAU 5 was then the largest QMA by number of quota holders and TACC. Concerns about the status of the PAU 5 stock led to a voluntary 10% reduction in the TACC in 1994–95. On 1 October 1995, PAU 5 was divided into three QMAs (PAU 5A, PAU 5B, and PAU 5D; see the figure above) and the TACC was divided equally among them; the PAU 5A quota was set at 148.98 t.

In 2025, a TAC of 102 t for PAU 5A was set and includes allowances for customary (5 t), recreational (5 t), other mortality (3 t), and TACC (89 t) (Table 1): before the Fisheries Act (1996) a TAC was not required.

Table 1: Total allowable catches (TAC, t) allowances for customary fishing, recreational fishing, and other sources of mortality (t) and Total Allowable Commercial Catches (TACC, t) declared for PAU 5 and PAU 5A since introduction to the QMS.

Year	TAC	Customary	Recreational	Other mortality	TACC
1986–1991*	-	-	-	-	445
1991–1994*	-	-	-	-	492
1994–1995*	-	-	-	-	442.8
1995–2025	-	-	-	-	148.98
2025–present	102	5	5	3	89

*PAU 5 TACC figures

1.1 Commercial fisheries

The fishing year runs from 1 October to 30 September.

On 1 October 2001 it became mandatory to report catch and effort on Pāua Catch Effort Landing Returns (PCELRs) using fine-scale reporting areas that had been developed by the New Zealand Pāua Management Company for their voluntary logbook programme (Figure 1). Since 2006, the commercial industry has adopted some voluntary management initiatives which include raising the minimum harvest size for commercial fishers in specific statistical reporting areas. Starting in 2006–07, commercial fishers have been voluntarily shelving a percentage of their Annual Catch Entitlement (ACE), which is reflected by the annual catch landings falling below the TACC (Figure 2, Table 2).

These voluntary measures are now implemented under the PAU 5 Fisheries Plan approved under section 11A of the Fisheries Act by the Minister for Oceans and Fisheries in 2023.

PAU 5A landings were close to the TACC from the fishing year 1995–96 to 2005–06, but dropped to an average of 105 t a year from 2006–07 onwards (Table 2 and Figure 2) due to shelving agreed to in the fisheries plan. Landings for PAU 5 prior to 1995–96 are reported in the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.




Figure 1: Map of Pāua Statistical Areas, and voluntary management strata in PAU 5A.

Table 2: TACC and reported landings (t) of pāua in PAU 5A from 1995–96 to the present from MHR returns. The last column shows the TACC after shelving has been accounted for.

Year	Landings	TACC	Shelving	Year	Landings	TACC	Shelving
1995–96	139.53	148.98	—	2010–11	104.40	148.98	104.29
1996–97	141.91	148.98	—	2011–12	106.23	148.98	104.29
1997–98	145.22	148.98	—	2012–13	105.56	148.98	104.29
1998–99	147.36	148.98	—	2013–14	102.30	148.98	104.29
1999–00	143.91	148.98	—	2014–15	106.95	148.98	104.29
2000–01	147.70	148.98	—	2015–16	106.84	148.98	104.29
2001–02	148.53	148.98	—	2016–17	106.50	148.98	104.29
2002–03	148.76	148.98	—	2017–18	107.45	148.98	104.29
2003–04	148.98	148.98	—	2018–19	99.66	148.98	104.29
2004–05	148.95	148.98	—	2019–20	103.03	148.98	104.29
2005–06	148.92	148.98	—	2020–21	106.02	148.98	104.29
2006–07	104.03	148.98	104.29	2021–22	114.88	148.98	104.29
2007–08	105.13	148.98	104.29	2022–23	111.51	148.98	111.74
2008–09	104.82	148.98	104.29	2023–24	93.86	148.98	111.74
2009–10	105.74	148.98	104.29	2024–25	97.41	148.98	111.74




Figure 2: Landings and TACC for PAU 5A from 1995–96 to the present. For historical landings in PAU 5 prior to 1995–96, refer to figure 1 and table 1 in the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

1.2 Recreational fisheries

The National Panel Survey estimated that about 0.42 t (CV 0.76) of pāua were harvested by recreational fishers in PAU 5A in 2011–12 (Wynne-Jones et al. 2014). The National Panel Survey was repeated in 2017–18 (Wynne-Jones et al. 2019) and the estimated harvest for PAU 5A was 0.71 t (CV 0.81). The most recent survey harvest estimate for PAU 5A is 1.58 t (CV 0.68) for 2022–23 (Heinemann & Gray 2024).

For further information on recreational fisheries refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

1.3 Customary fisheries

Pāua is a taonga species and as such there is an important customary use of pāua by Maori for food, and the shells have been used extensively for decorations and fishing devices.

For information on customary catch regulations and reporting refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

Estimates of customary catch for PAU 5A are shown in table 5 of the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report. These numbers are likely to be an underestimate of customary harvest as only the catch approved and harvested in numbers is reported in the table. In addition, many tangata whenua also harvest pāua under their recreational allowance and these are not included in records of customary catch.

Records of customary non-commercial catch taken under the South Island Regulations show that about 70 pāua were taken in 2001–2002, then nothing until 2007–08. From 2007–08 to 2012–13, 100 to 500 pāua were collected each year. Since then, less pāua has been reported caught (maximum 200 t in 2017–18).

For further information on customary fisheries refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

1.4 Illegal catch

There is qualitative data to suggest Illegal, Unreported, or Unregulated (IUU) activity in this Fishery. There are no quantitative estimates of illegal catch for PAU 5A.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

For further information on other sources of mortality refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

2. BIOLOGY

For further information on pāua biology refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report. Biological parameters derived using data collected from PAU 5A are summarised in Table 3. Size-at-maturity, natural mortality and annual growth increment parameters were estimated within the assessment model.

Table 3: Estimates of biological parameters (*H. iris*). All estimates are external to the model.

Stock area		Estimate		Source
<u>1. Weight = a (length)^b (weight in kg, shell length in mm)</u>				
PAU 5A	a = 2.99E-08	b = 3.303	Schiell & Breen (1991)	
<u>2. Size at maturity (shell length)</u>				
PAU 5A	50% mature	91 mm (89–93)	Median (5–95% range) estimated outside of the assessment	
	95% mature	103 mm (101–105)		
<u>3. Estimated annual growth increments (both sexes combined)</u>				
PAU 5A	At 75 mm	16.65 mm (15.96–24.29)	Median (5–95% range) estimated outside of the assessment	
	At 120 mm	4.57 mm (3.27–6.40)		

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

For further information on stocks and areas refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

For 2010 and 2014, the stock assessments for PAU 5A had split PAU 5A into two subareas; the southern area which included the Chalky and South Coast strata, and the northern area which included the Milford, George, Central, and Dusky strata (Figure 1). Separate stock assessments were conducted in each subarea. The division was based on the availability of data, differences in exploitation history and management initiatives. Prior to 2010 the area was assessed as a single area. The 2020 assessment re-evaluated the split of PAU 5A into two subareas, and concluded that the data used for the separate assessments did not adequately reflect the differences in these areas, and the 2020 assessment was therefore run in two configurations: as a single area assessment over all of PAU 5A, and by splitting the area into three areas (statistical areas around Milford Sound (large scale Statistical Area 032) were separated from the previously defined Northern area due to slower growth) and fitting a spatial version of the assessment model (Neubauer 2020). Initial assessment runs suggested no difference in key estimated quantities between the spatial and single-area models, and the SFWG decided to proceed with the more parsimonious single area model. In reviewing the standardised CPUE series in 2025 the Plenary raised significant concerns over the plausibility of the 2020 assessment (given its sensitivity to assumptions, concerns about hyper-stability and the lack of signal in the standardised PCELR CPUE series despite significant shelving of catch since 2007). The Plenary therefore considered that the 2020 assessment was no longer appropriate for future assessment and management and undertook a qualitative evaluation on the basis of a standardised ERS CPUE series which only covers the most recent 5 years.

4.1 Relative abundance estimates from research diver surveys

Relative abundance of pāua in PAU 5A has previously been estimated from research diver surveys conducted in 1996, 2002, 2003, 2006, and 2008–2010. Not every stratum was surveyed in each year, and before 2005–06 surveys were conducted only in the area south of Dusky Sound.

Concerns about the reliability of this data as an estimate of relative abundance instigated several reviews in 2009 (Cordue 2009) and 2010 (Haist 2010). The reviews assessed i) the reliability of the research diver survey index as a proxy for abundance and ii) whether the Research Diver Survey Index (RDSI), when used in the pāua stock assessment models, results in model outputs that do not adequately reflect the status of the stocks. Both reviews suggest that outputs from pāua stock assessments using the RDSI

should be treated with caution. Consequently, these data were not included in the assessment. For a summary of the conclusions from the reviews refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

4.2 2025 Management procedure development and standardised CPUE series

4.2.1 Management procedure development

Two projects in 2025 were combined to develop management procedures (MPs) and harvest control rules across all PAU QMAs in order to facilitate timely TACC adjustments based on trends in CPUE and length compositions of the catch. Although much of the development has been completed, the process to develop, simulation-test and implement management procedures is ongoing, and no management procedures developed under the projects had been adopted by May 2025.

The types of management procedures under consideration rely on standardised CPUE in recent years, as well as trends in CPUE and the overall length compositions. Although no management procedures have been adopted, developing MP inputs showed a number of areas with consistent declines in CPUE over a number of years. These trends are substantial enough to pose a potential sustainability risk, and the Shellfish Working Group therefore decided to explore a partial quantitative stock assessment for PAU 5A on the basis of recent (PCELR & ERS) CPUE trends.

4.2.2 Standardised CPUE for PCELR and ERS data

CPUE standardisation was carried out using a Bayesian Generalised Linear Mixed Model (GLMM) which partitioned variation among management zones within QMAs. The model was run independently over PCELR (2002–2020) and ERS (2020–2025) data, using offset year CPUE (April–March) in order to include the most recent available data.

CELR data prior to 2002 were considered unreliable and unlikely to reflect abundance trends, in accordance with other recent assessments. Gear improvements and fisher turnover in the fishery during the late 1980s to the late 1990s likely cause substantial hyper-stability in CELR CPUE indices for pāua. In addition, spatial reporting during CELR years was at scales of CELR statistical areas, which do not line up with QMA boundaries. As a result, large amounts of CELR catch-per-unit effort data cannot be used for CPUE analyses at the QMA scale as the data cannot be unambiguously attributed to a single QMA.

CPUE was defined as the log of daily catch per hour and number of statistical areas. Variables in the model were fishing year, client number (ACE holder), management zone (region), and diver ID. Unlike previous standardisations of PCELR and ERS CPUE, the statistical area was not used as a covariate, but the number of statistical areas fished was treated as an additional component of fishing effort.

Variability in CPUE was mostly explained by differences among divers and ACE-holders (Clients; Figure 3). Early variation in CPUE between 2002 and 2010 is likely to be attributed to catch reductions (shelving) since 2007 and associated catch-spreading arrangements, leading to region scale CPUE series that were fluctuating without trends during the PCELR years, and a PAU 5A series that was very stable. The Plenary rejected the PCELR CPUE series because of apparent standardisation effects and concerns that it may not reflect abundance. Recent CPUE trends showed a substantial decline since 2021 (Figure 4, Figure 5).




Figure 3: Effect size for the CPUE index standardisation models across PCELR data (2002–2020) and ERS (2020–2025) offset-year data, used to explore partial quantitative stock assessment in 2025. RS: management zone (research stratum), CatcherID: diver number.




Figure 4: Standardised CPUE indices with 95% confidence intervals (solid line and ribbon) and unstandardised geometric CPUE (points) for the ERS time-series for the individual PAU 5A fishery regions.




Figure 5: Standardised CPUE indices with 95% confidence intervals (solid line and ribbon) and unstandardised geometric CPUE (points) for the ERS time-series for PAU 5A.

The Shellfish Working Group explored options for a partial quantitative stock assessment using a combined CPUE series aligning the separate PCELR and ERS CPUE series, defining a reference period between 2010 and 2018 (catch and PCELR series stable), but this approach was rejected by the Plenary owing to concerns over the PCELR series, and uncertainty over the appropriateness of aligning the two series.

4.3 Updated management procedure

The development and evaluation of management procedures (MPs) for pāua is described in section 5.4 of the pāua introductory chapter. MPs are being developed across all assessed QMAs using a common Management Procedure Evaluation (MPE) framework, with each QMA's operating model conditioned on regional information for each stock. For PAU 5A, MP development is ongoing.

4.4 Other factors

A key assumption of using CPUE in stock assessments or MPs is that CPUE is a reliable index of abundance. The literature on abalone fisheries suggests that this assumption is questionable and that CPUE is difficult to use in abalone stock assessments due to the serial depletion behaviour of fishers along with the aggregating behaviour of abalone. Serial depletion is when fishers consecutively fish-down beds of pāua but maintain their catch rates by moving to new unfished beds; thus CPUE stays high while the overall population biomass is actually decreasing. The aggregating behaviour of pāua results in the timely re-colonisation of areas that have been fished down, as the cryptic pāua that were unavailable at the first fishing event, move to and aggregate within the recently depleted area. Both serial depletion and aggregation behaviour cause CPUE to have a hyperstable relationship with abundance (i.e. abundance is decreasing at a faster rate than CPUE) thus potentially making CPUE a poor proxy for abundance. The strength of the effect that serial depletion and aggregating behaviour have on the relationship between CPUE and abundance in PAU 5A is difficult to determine. However, because fishing has been consistent for a number of years and effort has been reasonably well spread, it could be assumed that CPUE is not as strongly influenced by these factors, relative to the early CPUE series.

The assumption of CPUE being a reliable index of abundance in PAU 5A can also be upset by exploitation of spatially segregated populations of differing productivity. This can conversely cause

non-linearity and hyper-depletion in the CPUE-abundance relationship, making it difficult to accurately track changes in abundance by using changes in CPUE as a proxy.


5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS


Stock Structure Assumptions

A genetic discontinuity between North Island and South Island pāua populations was found approximately around the area of Cook Strait (Will & Gemmell 2008).

- PAU 5A - Fiordland

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2025	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2023–24	Catch: 93 t
Assessment Runs Presented	Standardised CPUE for the ERS period (offset year April–March, excluding 2019–20)	
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 (Default as per HSS) Soft Limit: 20% B_0 (Default as per HSS) Hard Limit: 10% B_0 (Default as per HSS) Overfishing threshold: $U_{40\%B_0}$	
Status in relation to Target	Unknown	
Status in relation to Limits	Unknown	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Unknown	





Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Recent CPUE is declining overall and in most regions.
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Unknown
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Likely (> 60%) at current catch levels Very Likely (> 90%) at TACC levels

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 3 - Qualitative Evaluation	
Assessment Method	Standardised CPUE 2020–21 to 2024–25 (offset year)	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2025	Next assessment: 2030
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- ERS CPUE series	1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	- PCELR CPUE series	3 – Medium or Mixed Quality: uncertainty over standardisation and ability to link with ERS series

	- Commercial sampling length frequencies - Tag recapture data (for growth estimation) - Maturity at length data - Research Dive Survey Indices	2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: not believed to be fully representative of the entire QMA 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 3 – Low Quality: not believed to index the stock
	Research Dive Length Frequencies	3 – Low Quality: not believed to be representative of the entire QMA
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	- Rejection of standardised PCELR series, analysis of recent ERS data only	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Selectivity in the commercial fishery has varied spatially and over time as voluntarily agreed Minimum Harvest Size (MHS) has changed. - Different MHSs have been applied to different statistical areas within the assessed area in the same year. - CPUE may be hyperstable.	

Qualifying Comments

The short time series of CPUE makes estimation of stock status and biological reference points difficult.

Fishery Interactions

-

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION


- Andrew, N L; Naylor, J R; Gerring, P (1999) A modified timed-swim method for paua stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/4*. 23 p.
- Andrew, N L; Naylor, J R; Kim, S W (2002) Fishery independent surveys of the relative abundance and size structure of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5B and 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2002/41*. 41 p.
- Breen, P A; Andrew, N L; Kendrick, T H (2000) The 2000 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5B using an improved Bayesian length-based model. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/48*. 36 p.
- Breen, P A; Kim, S W (2004) The 2004 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5A. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2004/40*. 86 p.
- Breen, P A; Kim, S W (2005) The 2005 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2005/47*. 114 p.
- Breen, P A; Kim, S W (2007) The 2006 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) stocks PAU 5A (Fiordland) and PAU 5D (Otago). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/09*. 164 p.
- Breen, P A; Kim, S W; Andrew, N L (2003) A length-based Bayesian stock assessment model for abalone. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 54(5): 619–634.
- Breen, P A; Smith, A N H (2008) Data used in the 2007 assessment for paua (*Haliotis iris*) stock PAU 5B (Stewart Island). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/6*. 45 p.
- Chen, Y; Breen, P A; Andrew, N L (2000) Impacts of outliers and mis-specification of priors on Bayesian fish stock assessment. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science* 57: 2293–2305.
- Cordue, P L (2009) Analysis of PAU 5A diver survey data and PCELR catch and effort data. SeaFic and PAUMac 5 report. 45 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Francis, R I C C (2011) Data weighting in statistical fisheries stock assessment models. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 68: 1124–1138.
- Fu, D (2013) The 2012 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/57*.
- Fu, D (2014) The 2013 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 5B. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/45*.
- Fu, D (2015a) The 2014 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for Chalky and South Coast in PAU 5A. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/64*.
- Fu, D (2015b) The 2014 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for Milford, George, Central, and Dusky in PAU 5A. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/65*.
- Fu, D; McKenzie, A (2010a) The 2010 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for Chalky and South Coast in PAU 5A. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2010/36*.
- Fu, D; McKenzie, A (2010b) The 2010 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for Milford, George, Central, and Dusky in PAU 5A. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2010/46*.
- Fu, D; McKenzie, A; Naylor, R (2010) Summary of input data for the 2010 PAU 5A stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2010/35*.

- Fu, D; McKenzie, A; Naylor, R (2015) Summary of input data for the 2014 PAU 5A stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/68*.
- Gerring, P K; Andrew, N L; Naylor, J R (2003) Incidental fishing mortality of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in the PAU 7 commercial fishery. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/56*. 13 p.
- Haist, V (2010) Paua research diver survey: review of data collected and simulation study of survey method. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2010/38*.
- Hart, A M (2005) Review of paua research surveys. Final Research Report to the Ministry of Fisheries for project SAP2005-02. 20 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Heinemann A; Gray, A. (2024) National Panel Survey of Recreational Marine Fishers 2022–23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/51*. 116 p.
- Kendrick, T H; Andrew, N L (2000) Catch and effort statistics and a summary of standardised CPUE indices for paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5A, PAU 5B, and PAU 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/47*. 25 p.
- McKenzie, A; Smith, A N H (2009) The 2008 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2009/34*. 84 p.
- Naylor, J R; Andrew, N L (2002) Determination of paua growth in PAU 2, 5A, 5B, and 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2002/34*.
- Naylor, J R; Breen, P A (2008) Fine-scale growth in paua populations. (Unpublished Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Project PAU2006/04 held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 33 p.
- Neubauer, P (2020) Development and application of a spatial stock assessment model for paua (*Haliotis iris*). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2020/30*. 42 p.
- Neubauer, P (2022) The 2020 stock assessment of pāua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 5A. *New Zealand Fishery Assessment Report 2022/33*. 103 p.
- Neubauer, P; Tremblay-Boyer, L (2019) The 2018 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/39*. 58 p.
- Pirker, J G (1992) Growth, shell-ring deposition and mortality of paua (*Haliotis iris* Martyn) in the Kaikoura region. MSc thesis, University of Canterbury. 165 p.
- Sainsbury, K J (1982) Population dynamics and fishery management of the paua, *Haliotis iris*. 1. Population structure, growth, reproduction and mortality. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 16: 147–161.
- Schiel, D R (1992) The paua (abalone) fishery of New Zealand. In: Shepherd, S A; Tegner, M J; Guzman del Proo, S (Eds.) *Abalone of the World: Biology, fisheries, and culture*. Blackwell Scientific, Oxford.
- Schiel, D R; Breen, P A (1991) Population structure, ageing and fishing mortality of the New Zealand abalone (*Haliotis iris*). *Fishery Bulletin* 89: 681–691.
- Will, M C; Gemmell, N J (2008) Genetic Population Structure of Black Foot paua. New Zealand Final Research Report for project GEN2007A: 37 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington).
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–2018. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/24*. 104 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Hill, L; Heinemann, A (2014) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2011–12: Harvest Estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/67*.

PĀUA (PAU 5B) - Stewart Island

(Haliotis iris)

Pāua



1. FISHERY SUMMARY

Before 1995, PAU 5B was part of the PAU 5 QMA, which was introduced into the QMS in 1986 with a TACC of 445 t. As a result of appeals to the Quota Appeal Authority, the TACC increased to 492 t in the 1991–92 fishing year; PAU 5 was then the largest pāua QMA by number of quota holders and TACC. Concerns about the status of the PAU 5 stock led to a voluntary 10% reduction in the TACC in 1994–95. On 1 October 1995, PAU 5 was divided into three QMAs (PAU 5A, PAU 5B, and PAU 5D; see the figure above) and the TACC was divided equally among them; the PAU 5B TACC was set at 148.98 t.

On 1 October 1999 a TAC of 155.98 t was set for PAU 5B, comprising a TACC of 143.98 t (a 5 t reduction) and customary and recreational allowances of 6 t each. The TAC and TACC were subsequently reduced twice, and TAC was set at 105 t in 2002, with a TACC of 90 t, customary and recreational allowances at 6 t each and an allowance of 3 t for other mortality. In 2018 the PAU 5B TACC was increased to 107 t, and the customary allowance to 7 t, bringing the TAC to 123 t. Prior to the increase being triggered however an injunction was filed by parties concerned about the possible impact on s.28N rights in the fishery. Subsequently, in 2022, the 28N Rights in question were extinguished and the injunction withdrawn, which allowed the TAC increase to proceed at the start of the October 2022 season (Table 1).

Table 1: Total allowable catches (TAC, t) allowances for customary fishing, recreational fishing, and other sources of mortality (t) and Total Allowable Commercial Catches (TACC, t) declared for PAU 5 and PAU 5B since introduction into the QMS. † The decision to increase the PAU5B TACC and customary allowance on 1 October 2018 was not implemented due to a High Court issued interim order. That order was discharged on 30 September 2022 and the increase actioned on 1 October 2022.

Year	TAC	Customary	Recreational	Other mortality	TACC
1986–1991*	-	-	-	-	445
1991–1994*	-	-	-	-	492
1994–1995*	-	-	-	-	442.8
1995–1999	-	-	-	-	148.98
1999–2000	155.9	6	6	-	143.98
2000–2002	124.87	6	6	-	112.187
2002–2018	105	6	6	3	90
2018–Present	123†	7†	6	3	107†

*PAU 5 TACC figures

1.1 Commercial fishery

The fishing year runs from 1 October to 30 September.

Concerns about the status of the stock led to the commercial fishers agreeing to voluntarily reduce their Annual Catch Entitlement (ACE) by 25 t for the 1999–00 fishing year. This shelving continued for the 2000–01 and 2001–02 fishing years at a level of 22 t, but was discontinued at the beginning of the 2002–03 fishing year (Table 2). Voluntary measures are now implemented under the PAU 5 Fisheries Plan approved under section 11A of the Fisheries Act by the Minister for Oceans and Fisheries.

On 1 October 2001 it became mandatory to report catch and effort on Pāua Catch Effort Landing Returns (PCELRs) using fine-scale reporting areas that had been developed by the New Zealand Pāua Management Company for their voluntary logbook programme (Figure 1).




Figure 1: Map of fine scale statistical reporting areas for PAU 5B.

Table 2: TACC and reported commercial landings (t) of pāua in PAU 5B, 1995–96 to present, from QMR, MHR and ERS returns. The last column shows the TACC after shelving has been accounted for.

Year	Landings	TACC	Shelving	Year	Landings	TACC	Shelving
1995–96	144.66	148.98	–	2010–11	89.67	90.00	–
1996–97	142.36	148.98	–	2011–12	89.59	90.00	–
1997–98	145.34	148.98	–	2012–13	90.58	90.00	–
1998–99	148.55	148.98	–	2013–14	88.84	90.00	–
1999–00	118.07	143.98	–	2014–15	89.45	90.00	–
2000–01	89.92	112.19	90.19	2015–16	88.39	90.00	–
2001–02	89.96	112.19	90.00	2016–17	92.99	90.00	–
2002–03	89.86	90.00	–	2017–18	89.33	90.00	–
2003–04	90.00	90.00	–	2018–19	89.03	90.00	–
2004–05	89.97	90.00	–	2019–20	87.19	107.00	–
2005–06	90.47	90.00	–	2020–21	89.60	107.00	–
2006–07	89.16	90.00	–	2021–22	92.97	107.00	–
2007–08	90.21	90.00	–	2022–23	105.06	107.00	–
2008–09	90.00	90.00	–	2023–24	109.25	107.00	–
2009–10	90.23	90.00	–	2024–25	102.41	107.00	–

PAU 5B commercial landings have been close to the TACC in most fishing years since 1995, with the exception of the fishing years 1999–00, 2000–01, and 2001–02, when the TACC was not reached (Table 2 and Figure 2). Landings for PAU 5 prior to 1995 are reported in the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.




Figure 2: Reported commercial landings and TACC for PAU 5B from 1995–96 to present. For reported commercial landings in PAU 5 before 1995–96 refer to figure 1 and table 1 in the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

1.2 Recreational fisheries

The National Panel Survey estimated that the recreational harvest for PAU 5B was 0.76 t with a CV of 54% in 2011–12 (Wynne-Jones et al. 2014). For the 2017 assessment model, the SFWG agreed to assume that the recreational catch rose linearly from 1 t in 1974 to 5 t in 2006, and remained at 5 t between 2007 and 2017. The National Panel Survey was repeated in the 2017–18 fishing year (Wynne-Jones et al. 2019). The estimated recreational catch for that year was 4.88 tonnes (CV 0.45). The most recent national panel survey harvest estimate for PAU 5B is 3.46 t (CV 0.33) for 2022–23 (Heinemann & Gray 2024). For further information on recreational fisheries refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

1.3 Customary fisheries

Pāua is a taonga species and as such there is an important customary use of pāua by Maori for food, and the shells have been used extensively for decorations and fishing devices.

For information on customary catch regulations and reporting refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

Estimates of customary catch for PAU 5B are shown in table 5 of the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report. These numbers are likely to be an underestimate of customary harvest as only the catch approved and harvested in numbers is reported in the table. In addition, many tangata whenua also harvest pāua under their recreational allowance and these are not included in records of customary catch.

For the 2017 assessment model the SFWG agreed to assume that customary catch was equal to 1 t from 1974–2017.

1.4 Illegal catch

There is qualitative data to suggest significant illegal, unreported, unregulated (IUU) activity in this Fishery. Illegal catch was estimated by the Ministry of Fisheries to be 15 t, but “Compliance express extreme reservations about the accuracy of this figure.” The SFWG agreed to assume for the 2013 assessment that illegal catch was zero before 1986, then rose linearly from 1 t in 1986 to 5 t in 2006 and remained constant at 5 t between 2007 and 2013. For further information on illegal catch refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

For further information on other sources of mortality refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

2. BIOLOGY

For further information on pāua biology refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report. A summary of biological parameters used in the PAU 5B assessment is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Estimates of biological parameters (*H. iris*).

	Estimate	Source
1. Natural mortality (<i>M</i>)	0.10 (CV 0.10)	Assumed prior probability distribution
2. Weight = $a(\text{length})^b$ (Weight in g, length in mm shell length).		
	All	
	a	b
	2.99×10^{-5}	3.303
3. Size at maturity (shell length)		Schiel & Breen (1991)
	50% maturity at 91 mm	Naylor (NIWA unpub. data)
	95% maturity at 133 mm	Naylor (NIWA unpub. data)
4. Growth parameters (both sexes combined)		
Growth at 75 mm	Growth at 120 mm	Median (5–95% range) of posterior distributions estimated by the assessment model
26.1 mm (24.8 to 27.2)	6.9 mm (6.5–7.3)	

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

For further information on stocks and areas refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

The stock assessment was done with a length-based Bayesian estimation model, with parameter point estimates based on the mode of the joint posterior distribution and uncertainty estimated from marginal posterior distributions generated from Markov chain-Monte Carlo simulations. The most recent stock assessment was conducted in 2017 for the fishing year ended 30 September 2017. A base case model (0.1) was chosen from the assessment. The SFWG also suggested several sensitivity runs; model 0.4 which assumed an alternate catch history and model 0.6 where a time varying catchability was estimated.

4.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

Parameters estimated in the assessment model and their Bayesian prior distributions are summarized in Table 4.

4.1.1 Relative abundance estimates from standardised CPUE analyses

The 2017 stock assessment used two sets of standardised CPUE indices: one based on CELR data covering 1990–2001, and another based on PCELR data covering 2002–2017. For both series, standardised CPUE analyses were carried out using Generalised Linear Models (GLMs). A stepwise procedure was used to select predictor variables, with variables entering the model in the order that gave the maximum decrease in the residual deviance. Predictor variables were accepted in the model only if they explained at least 1% of the deviance.

For both the CELR and PCELR data, the Fisher Identification Number (FIN) was used in the standardisations instead of vessel, because the FIN is associated with a permit holder who may employ a suite of grouped vessels, which implies that there could be linkage in the catch rates among vessels operated under a single FIN.

Table 4: A summary of estimated model parameters, lower bound, upper bound, type of prior, (U, uniform; N, normal; LN = lognormal), mean and CV of the prior.

Parameter	Phase	Prior	μ	CV	Lower	Upper
$\ln(R_0)$	1	U	–	–	5	50
M (natural mortality)	3	U	–	–	0.01	0.5
g_1 (Mean growth at 75 mm)	2	U	–	–	0.01	150
g_2 (Mean growth at 120 mm)	2	U	–	–	0.01	150
g_{50}	2	U	–	–	0.01	150
$g_{50-95\%}$	2	U	–	–	0.01	150
g_{max}	1	U	–	–	0.01	50
α	2	U	–	–	0.01	10
β	2	U	–	–	0.01	10
$\ln(q')$ (catchability coefficient of CPUE)	1	U	–	–	-30	0
$\ln(q'')$ (catchability coefficient of PCPUE)	1	U	–	–	-30	0
L_{50} (Length at 50% maturity)	1	U	–	–	70	145
L_{95-50} (Length between 50% and 95% maturity)	1	U	–	–	1	50
D_{50} (Length at 50% selectivity for the commercial catch)	2	U	–	–	70	145
D_{95-50} (Length between 50% and 95% selectivity for the commercial catch)	2	U	–	–	0.01	50
D_s	1	U	–	–	0.01	10
ϵ (Recruitment deviations)	1	N	0	0.4	-2.3	2.3

The observational data were:

1. A 1990–2001 standardised CPUE series based on CELR data.
2. A 2002–2017 standardised CPUE series based on PCELR data.
3. A commercial catch sampling length frequency series for 1998, 2002–04, 07, 2009–2012.
4. Tag-recapture length increment data.
5. Maturity at length data

For the CELR data (1990–2001) there is ambiguity in what is recorded for estimated daily fishing duration (total fishing duration for all divers), and it has not been used in past standardisations as a measure of effort; instead the number of divers has been used. However, there is evidence that the fishing duration for a diver changes over time, and because of this, criteria were used to identify records for which the recorded fishing duration should predominantly be recorded correctly. The criteria used to subset the data were: (i) just one diver or (ii) fishing duration ≥ 8 hours and number of divers ≥ 2 . For the other records the recorded fishing duration was multiplied by the number of divers. The data set consisting of predominantly correct records for the recorded fishing duration, and others with the recorded fishing duration scaled up by the number of divers was used for the CELR standardisation using estimated daily catch and effort as estimated fishing duration.

For the PCELR data (2002–2017) the unit of catch was diver catch, with effort as diver duration.

FIN codes were used to select a core group of fishers from the CELR data, with the requirement that there be a minimum of 7 records per year for a minimum of 2 years to qualify for the core fisher group. This retained 84% of the catch over 1990–2001. For the PCELR data the FIN was also used to select a core group of fishers, with the requirement that there be a minimum of 20 records per year for a minimum of 3 years. This retained 87% of the catch over 2002–2017.

For the CELR data, year was forced into the model and other predictor variables offered to the model were FIN, Statistical Area (025, 027, 029, 030), month and fishing duration (as a cubic polynomial). For the PCELR data, fishing year was forced into the model and variables offered to the model were month, diver key, FIN statistical area, diver duration (third degree polynomial), and diving conditions.

The standardised CPUE from the CELR data shows an increase from 1990 to 1991 followed by a steady decline through to 2001 at which point it is 49% of its initial 1990 level (Figure 3-top). The standardised CPUE from the PCELR data shows a 74% increase from 2002 to 2014 then a slight decline from 2014 to 2017. This 13% decline between 2014 and 2017 is not unexpected and is most likely due to the commercial fishers voluntarily increasing the minimum harvest size (Figure 3-bottom).




Figure 3: The standardised CPUE indices with 95% confidence intervals for the CELR series covering 1990–2001 (blue line for top-figure). The standardised CPUE indices with 95% confidence intervals for the PCELR series covering 2002–2017 (blue line for bottom-figure). For both indices the unstandardised geometric CPUE is calculated as catch divided by fishing duration.

4.1.2 Relative abundance estimates from research diver surveys

The relative abundance of pāua in PAU 5B has also been estimated from a number of independent research diver surveys (RDSI) undertaken in various years between 1993 and 2007. The survey strata included Ruggedy, Waituna, Codfish, Pegasus, Lords, and East Cape. These data were included in the assessment although there is concern that the data are not a reliable index of abundance.

Concerns about the ability of the data collected in the independent Research Dive surveys to reflect relative abundance instigated several reviews in 2009 (Cordue 2009) and 2010 (Haist 2010). The reviews assessed the reliability of the research diver survey index as an index of abundance and whether the RDSI, when used in the pāua stock assessment models, results in model outputs that adequately reflect the status of the stocks. Both reviews suggested that outputs from pāua stock assessments using the RDSI should be treated with caution however this data was included in the 2017 assessment based on recommendations arising from the pāua stock assessment review workshop (Butterworth et al. 2015).

4.2 Stock assessment methods

The 2017 PAU 5B stock assessment used the same length-based model as the 2017 PAU 5D assessment (Marsh & Fu 2017). The model was described by Breen et al. (2003). PAU 5B was last assessed in 2013 (Fu 2014 and Fu et al. 2014).

The model structure assumed a single sex population residing in a single homogeneous area, with length classes from 70 mm to 170 mm in 2 mm bins. Growth is length-based, without reference to age, mediated through a growth transition matrix that describes the probability of transitions among length class

at each time step. Pāua enter the model following recruitment and are removed by natural mortality and fishing mortality.

The model simulates the population from 1965 to 2017. Catches were available for 1974–2017 although catches before 1995 must be estimated from the combined PAU 5 catch. Catches were assumed to increase linearly between 1965 and 1973 from 0 to the 1974 catch level. Catches included commercial, recreational, customary, and illegal catch, and all catches occurred within the same time step.

Recruitment was assumed to take place at the beginning of the annual cycle, and length at recruitment was defined by a uniform distribution with a range between 70 and 80 mm. No explicit stock-recruitment relationship was modelled in previous assessments; however, the Shellfish Working Group agreed to use a Beverton-Holt stock-recruitment relationship with steepness (h) of 0.75 for this assessment.

Maturity is not required in the population partition but is necessary for estimating spawning biomass. The model estimated proportions mature from length-at-maturity data. Growth and natural mortalities were also estimated within the model. The model estimated the commercial fishing selectivity, assumed to follow a logistic curve and asymptote at 1. The increase in Minimum Harvest Size between 2006 and 2017 was modelled as an annual shift in fishing selectivity.

The assessment was conducted in several steps. First, the model was fitted to the data with parameters estimated at the mode of their joint posterior distribution (MPD). Next, from the resulting fit, Markov chain-Monte Carlo (MCMC) simulations were made to obtain a large set of samples from the joint posterior distribution. From this set of samples, forward projections were made and an agreed set of biological indicators obtained. Model sensitivity was explored by comparing MPD fits made under alternative model assumptions.

The base case incorporated a number of changes since the last assessment of PAU 5B in 2013. First, a more flexible functional form (inverse logistic) was used to describe the variance associated with the mean growth increment at length. Second, the predicted CPUE is now calculated after 50% of the fishing and natural mortality have occurred (previously the CPUE indices were fitted to the vulnerable biomass calculated after 50% of the catch was taken). This is considered to be appropriate if fishing occurs throughout a year (Schnute 1985). The change was recommended by the pāua review workshop held in Wellington in March 2015 (Butterworth et al. 2015). Accordingly, mid-season numbers (and biomass) was calculated after half of the natural mortality and half of the fishing mortality was applied.

The third change was made to the likelihood function, fitting the tag-recapture observations so that weights could be assigned to individual data sets. This also followed the pāua review workshop's recommendation that "the tagging data should be weighted by the relative contribution of average yield from the different areas so that the estimates could better reflect the growth rates from the more productive areas" (Butterworth et al. 2015). Two smaller changes were added in this iteration of the assessment model, including: 1) adding a lag between recruitment and spawning for models where the partition was started at > 2 mm; and 2) adding a time varying parameter on the catchability coefficient of the CPUE observations.

The base case model (0.1) and the six sensitivities (0.1all and 0.2–0.6) were considered (Table 5): two separate CPUE series (0.2), excluding research diver observations (0.3), alternative catch history (0.4), modelling the partition at 2 mm (0.5), and estimating a time varying catchability (0.6). MCMCs were carried out for the base case and model runs 0.4 and 0.6.

Table 5: Summary descriptions of base case (0.1) and sensitivity model runs.

Model	Description
0.1	inverse logistic growth model, tag-recapture weighted, CSLF data up to 2016, M prior Uniform, tag data > 70 mm, RDLF and RDSI included, Combined CPUE series, Catch history assumption 3
0.1 all	The same as model 0.1 with CSLF data up to and including the 2017 fishing year.
0.2	Model 0.1 with split CPUE series, one for the CELR and another for the PCELR
0.3	Model 0.1 but with the RDLF and RDSI data excluded
0.4	Model 0.1 but with catch history assumption 1
0.5	Model 0.1 but start modelling at 2 mm instead of 70 mm
0.6	Model 0.1 but with a time varying catchability coefficient, with an estimated drift parameter $\sim \text{Uniform}(-0.05, 0.05)$

The assessment calculated the following quantities from their posterior distributions: the equilibrium spawning stock biomass with recruitment equal to the average recruitment from the period for which recruitment deviation were estimated (B_0), the mid-season spawning and recruited biomass for 2013 (B_{2013} and B_{proj}^r) and for the projection period (B_{proj} and B_{proj}^r). This assessment also reported the following fishery indicators:

$B\%B_0$	Current or projected spawning biomass as a percentage of B_0
$B\%B_{msy}$	Current or projected spawning biomass as a percentage of B_{msy}
$Pr(B_{proj} > B_{msy})$	Probability that projected spawning biomass is greater than B_{msy}
$Pr(B_{proj} > B_{2012})$	Probability that projected spawning biomass is greater than $B_{current}$
$B\%B_0^r$	Current or projected recruited biomass as a percentage of B_0^r
$B\%B_{msy}^r$	Current or projected recruited biomass as a percentage of B_{msy}^r
$Pr(B_{proj} > B_{msy}^r)$	Probability that projected recruit-sized biomass is greater than B_{msy}^r
$Pr(B_{proj} > B_{2012}^r)$	Probability that projected recruit-sized biomass is greater than B_{2012}^r
$Pr(B_{proj} > 40\%B_0)$	Probability that projected spawning biomass is greater than 40% B_0
$Pr(B_{proj} < 20\%B_0)$	Probability that projected spawning biomass is less than 20% B_0
$Pr(B_{proj} < 10\%B_0)$	Probability that projected spawning biomass is less than 10% B_0
$Pr(U_{proj} > U_{40\%B_0})$	Probability that projected exploitation rate is greater than $U_{40\%B_0}$

4.3 Stock assessment results

The base case model (0.1) estimated that the unfished spawning stock biomass (B_0) was about 3948 t (3630–4271 t) (Figure 4), and the spawning stock population in 2017 (B_{2017}) was about 47% (39–58%) of B_0 (Table 6). The base case indicated that spawning biomass increased rapidly after 2002 when the stock was at its lowest level.

Three-year projections (2018–2020) were run for two alternative recruitment assumptions, with the period of recruitment sampled from the past 10 years of estimates and from the past 5 years of estimates (explored due to recent lower-than-average recruitment), and with four different future harvest levels based on changes to the total allowable catch (TACC), with the TACC increasing by 5% (94.5 t), 10% (99 t), 15% (103.5 t) and 20% (108 t) (Tables 7–10). The base case model suggested that the current stock status was very unlikely to fall below the target of 40% B_0 . The projections suggested that with an increase of 20% of the current TACC, future biomass was likely to remain constant over the next 3 years. The conclusion was similar across all sensitivity runs.

The MCMC simulation started at the MPD parameter values and the traces show good mixing. MCMC chains starting at either higher or lower parameter values also converged after the initial burn-in phase. The base case model estimated an M of 0.10 with a 90% credible interval between 0.08 and 0.12. The midpoint of the commercial fishery selectivity (pre-2006), where selectivity is 50% of the maximum, was estimated to be about 125 mm and the selectivity ogive was very steep. The model estimated an annual shift of about 1.9 mm in selectivity, with a total increase of about 10 mm between 2006 and 2011.




Figure 4: Recruitment deviations around the stock recruitment relationship estimated and forecasted for model 0.1. The red line is the time up to where recruitment deviations were resampled from. The top figure (A) is when we resample from the last 10 years. The bottom figure (B) is when we resample from the last 5 years.

The estimated recruitment deviations showed a period of relatively low recruitment through the 1990s to the early 2000s. From the early 2000s to 2010 recruitment was above the average however, from 2011 until 2015 recruitment has been lower than the long-term average. (Figure 5). Exploitation rates peaked around 2002, but have decreased since then. The base case estimated exploitation rate in 2017 to be about 0.09 (0.07–0.11) (Table 6).




Figure 5: Posterior distributions of spawning stock biomass and spawning stock biomass as a percentage of the unfished level from MCMC for models 0.1, 0.4 and 0.6. The box shows the median of the posterior distribution (horizontal bar), the 25th and 75th percentiles (box), with the whiskers representing the full range of the distribution.

Table 6: Summary of the marginal posterior distributions from the MCMC chain from the base case (Model 0.1), and the sensitivity trials (models 0.4 and 0.6). The columns show the median, the 5th and 95th percentiles values observed in the 1000 samples. Biomass is in tonnes.

	MCMC 0.1	MCMC 0.4	MCMC 0.6
B_0	3948 (3630–4271)	4470 (4112–4841)	3947 (3608–4287)
B_{2017}	1873 (1513–2360)	2144 (1750–2686)	1711 (1223–2410)
$B_{2017} \% B_0$	47 (39–58)	48 (40–59)	44 (32–59)
rB_0	3553 (3221–3876)	4029 (3655–4400)	3569 (3223–3882)
rB_{2017}	1524 (1230–1906)	1755 (1435–2178)	1374 (964–1970)
rB_{2017}/rB_0	0.43 (0.35–0.53)	0.44 (0.36–0.53)	0.39 (0.27–0.54)
$U_{40\%B_0}$	16 (13–23)	13 (10–17)	6 (5–9)
U_{msy}	33 (24–53)	33 (24–53)	30 (21–51)
U_{2017}	9 (7–11)	8 (6–9)	10 (7–14)

4.4 Other factors

The assessment used CPUE as an index of abundance. The assumption that CPUE indexes abundance is questionable. The literature on abalone fisheries suggests that CPUE is problematic for stock assessments because of serial depletion. This can happen when fishers deplete unfished or lightly fished beds and maintain their catch rates by moving to new areas. Thus CPUE stays high while the biomass is actually decreasing. For PAU 5B, the model estimate of stock status was strongly driven by the trend

in the recent CPUE indices. It is unknown to what extent the CPUE series tracks stock abundance. The SFWG believed that the increasing trend in recent CPUE series are credible, corroborating anecdotal evidence from the commercial divers in PAU 5B that the stock has been in good shape in recent years.

Natural mortality is an important productivity parameter. It is often difficult to estimate M reliably within a stock assessment model and the estimate is strongly influenced by the assumed prior. For the pāua assessment, the choice of prior has been based on current belief on the plausible range of the natural mortality for pāua, and therefore it is reasonable to incorporate available evidence to inform the estimation of M . The sensitivity of model results to the assumptions on M could be assessed through the use of alternative priors.

Another source of uncertainty is the data. The commercial catch is unknown before 1974 and is estimated with uncertainty before 1995. Major differences may exist between the catches we assume and what was actually taken. In addition, non-commercial catch estimates are poorly determined and could be substantially different from what was assumed, although generally non-commercial catches appear to be relatively small compared with commercial catch. The estimate of illegal catch in particular is uncertain.

Table 7: Projected quantities for the Base model with an assumed 5% TACC increase and recruitment based on the past 10 years.

	2018	2019	2020
Bt	1898 (1460–2528)	1916 (1451–2594)	1936 (1439–2655)
%B₀	0.48 (0.38–0.63)	0.49 (0.38–0.64)	0.49 (0.37–0.65)
rBt	1536 (1176–2031)	1550 (1176–2077)	1569 (1177–2124)
%rB₀	0.43 (0.34–0.56)	0.44 (0.34–0.58)	0.44 (0.34–0.59)
Pr (>B_{current})	0.65	0.69	0.71
Pr (>40% B₀)	0.93	0.93	0.93
Pr (<20% B₀)	0	0	0
Pr (<10% B₀)	0	0	0
Pr (>rB_{current})	0.61	0.64	0.69
Pr (U>U40% B₀)	0	0	0.01

Table 8: Projected quantities for the Base model with an assumed 20% TACC increase and recruitment based on the past 10 years.

	2018	2019	2020
Bt	1892 (1453–2521)	1896 (1431–2574)	1904 (1407–2624)
%B₀	0.48 (0.38–0.62)	0.48 (0.37–0.63)	0.48 (0.37–0.64)
rBt	1529 (1169–2024)	1530 (1156–2057)	1537 (1144–2092)
%rB₀	0.43 (0.34–0.56)	0.43 (0.33–0.57)	0.43 (0.33–0.58)
Pr (>B_{current})	0.58	0.59	0.59
Pr (>40% B₀)	0.93	0.92	0.91
Pr (<20% B₀)	0	0	0
Pr (<10% B₀)	0	0	0
Pr (>rB_{current})	0.53	0.51	0.53
Pr (U>U40% B₀)	0.02	0.02	0.03

Table 9: Projected quantities for the Base model with an assumed 5% TACC increase and recruitment based on the past 5 years.

	2018	2019	2020
Bt	1876 (1434–2530)	1879 (1406–2571)	1876 (1373–2646)
%B₀	0.48 (0.37–0.62)	0.48 (0.37–0.64)	0.48 (0.36–0.65)
rBt	1536 (1175–2032)	1545 (1167–2073)	1551 (1154–2119)
%rB₀	0.43 (0.34–0.56)	0.44 (0.34–0.58)	0.44 (0.33–0.59)
Pr (>B_{current})	0.47	0.49	0.48
Pr (>40% B₀)	0.92	0.9	0.88
Pr (<20% B₀)	0	0	0
Pr (<10% B₀)	0	0	0
Pr (>rB_{current})	0.6	0.6	0.59
Pr (U>U40% B₀)	0	0	0.01

Table 10: Projected quantities for the Base model with an assumed 20% TACC increase and recruitment based on the past 5 years.

	2018	2019	2020
<i>Bt</i>	1869 (1427–2523)	1859 (1386–2551)	1844 (1341–2614)
% <i>B₀</i>	0.47 (0.37–0.62)	0.47 (0.36–0.63)	0.47 (0.35–0.65)
<i>rBt</i>	1529 (1168–2025)	1525 (1147–2053)	1519 (1121–2087)
% <i>rB₀</i>	0.43 (0.34–0.56)	0.43 (0.33–0.57)	0.43 (0.32–0.58)
Pr (> <i>B_{current}</i>)	0.41	0.39	0.37
Pr (>40% <i>B₀</i>)	0.91	0.89	0.85
Pr (<20% <i>B₀</i>)	0	0	0
Pr (<10% <i>B₀</i>)	0	0	0
Pr (> <i>rB_{current}</i>)	0.52	0.48	0.44
Pr (U>U40% <i>B₀</i>)	0.02	0.02	0.03

The model treats the whole of the assessed area of PAU 5B as if it were a single stock with homogeneous biology, habitat and fishing pressures. The model assumes homogeneity in recruitment and natural mortality, and assumes that growth has the same mean and variance throughout. Heterogeneity in growth can be a problem for this kind of model (Punt 2003). Variation in growth is addressed to some extent by having a stochastic growth transition matrix based on increments observed in several different places; similarly the length frequency data are integrated across samples from many places.

The effect of these factors is likely to make model results optimistic. For instance, if some local stocks are fished very hard and others not fished, recruitment failure can result because of the localized depletion of spawners. Spawners must be close to each other to breed and the dispersal of larvae is unknown and may be limited. Recruitment failure is a common observation in overseas abalone fisheries, so local processes may decrease recruitment, an effect that the current model cannot account for.

Another source of uncertainty is that fishing may cause spatial contraction of populations (Shepherd & Partington 1995), or that some populations become relatively unproductive after initial fishing (Gorfine & Dixon 2000). If this happens, the model will overestimate productivity in the population as a whole. Past recruitments estimated by the model might instead have been the result of serial depletion.

4.4 Updated management procedure

The development and evaluation of management procedures (MPs) for pāua is described in section 5.4 of the pāua introductory chapter. MPs are being developed across all assessed QMAs using a common Management Procedure Evaluation (MPE) framework, with each QMA's operating model conditioned on regional information for each stock. For PAU 5B, MP development is ongoing.

4.5 Future research considerations

- Continue to develop fisheries-independent survey methodologies that are representative of the PAU 5B area;
- Further investigate *q*-drift to determine how to quantify it and its implications for assessment outcomes;
- Ensure models are robust to assumptions about, or estimates of, natural mortality and stock-recruitment parameters;
- Review the commercial catch sampling programme in light of the increasing trend of live or frozen-in-shell exports.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCK


Stock Structure Assumptions

PAU 5B is assumed to be a homogenous stock for purposes of the stock assessment.


- PAU 5B - Stewart Island

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication	2018	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2016–17	Catch: 93 t
Assessment Runs Presented	MCMC 0.1 (base case)	
Reference Points	Target: 40% B_0 (Default as per HSS) Soft Limit: 20% B_0 (Default as per HSS) Hard Limit: 10% B_0 (Default as per HSS) Overfishing threshold: $U_{40\%B_0}$	
Status in relation to Target	B_{2017} was estimated to be 47% B_0 for the base case; Likely (> 60%) to be at or above the target	
Status in relation to Limits	Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below the soft and hard limits	
Status in Relation to Overfishing	Overfishing is Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be occurring	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



Posterior distributions of spawning stock biomass as a percentage of the unfished level from MCMC 0.1. The box shows the median of the posterior distribution (horizontal bar), the 25th and 75th percentiles (box), with the whiskers representing the full range of the distribution.



Trajectory of exploitation rate as a ratio $U_{40\%B_0}$ and spawning stock biomass as a ratio of B_0 from the start of assessment period 1965 to 2017 for MCMC 0.1 (base case). The vertical lines at 10%, 20% and 40% B_0 represent the hard limit, the soft limit, and the target respectively. $U_{40\%B_0}$ is the exploitation rate at which the spawning stock biomass would stabilise at 40% B_0 over the long term. Each point on trajectory represents the estimated annual stock status: the value on x axis is the mid-season spawning stock biomass (as a ratio of B_0) and the value on the y axis is the corresponding exploitation rate (as a ratio $U_{40\%B_0}$) for that year. The estimates are based on MCMC medians and the 2017 90% CI is shown by the crossed line.

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Biomass decreased to its lowest level in 2002 but has increased since then.
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	Exploitation rate peaked in late 1990s and has since declined.
Other Abundance Indices	Standardised CPUE generally declined until the early 2000s, but has shown an overall increase since then.
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	Estimated recruitment was relatively low through the 1990s to the early 2000s, increased from 2002 until 2010 and has since fallen below the long-term average.

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	At the current catch level biomass is expected to remain at or above the target over the next 3 years.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Results from all models suggest it is Very Unlikely (< 10%) that current catch or TACC will cause a decline below the limits.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC to cause Overfishing to continue or to commence	Very Unlikely (< 10%)

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 1 - Full Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Length-based Bayesian model	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2018	Next: Unknown
Overall assessment quality (rank)	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Catch history	1 – High Quality for commercial catch 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality for recreational, customary and

	- CPUE indices early series - CPUE indices later series - Commercial sampling length frequencies - Tag recapture data (for growth estimation) - Maturity at length data - Research Dive Survey Indices	illegal as catch histories are not believed to be fully representative of the QMA 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: not believed to be fully representative of the whole QMA 1 – High Quality 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: not believed to be fully representative of the whole QMA 1 – High Quality 1 – High Quality 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: uncertain whether it indexes the stock
Data not used (rank)	- Research Dive Length Frequencies	2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: not believed to be representative of the entire QMA
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	New model	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- <i>M</i> may not be estimated accurately - CPUE may not be a reliable index of abundance and it is unclear whether catchability has changed over time - The model treats the whole of the assessed area of PAU 5B as if it were a single stock with homogeneous biology, habitat and fishing pressure - Any effect of voluntary increases in MHS from 125 mm to 137 mm between 2006 and 2017 may not have been adequately captured by the model, which could therefore be underestimating the spawning biomass in recent years	

Qualifying Comments:

-

Fishery Interactions

-

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION


- Andrew, N L; Naylor, J R; Gerring, P (2000a) A modified timed-swim method for paua stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/4*. 23 p.
- Andrew, N L; Naylor, J R; Gerring, P; Notman, P R (2000b) Fishery independent surveys of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5B and 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/3*. 21 p.
- Andrew, N L; Naylor, J R; Kim, S W; Doonan, I J (2002) Fishery independent surveys of the relative abundance and size-structure of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5B and PAU 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2002/41*. 25 p.
- Bradford, E (1998) Harvest estimates from the 1996 national recreational fishing surveys. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document*. 1998/16. 27 p.
- Breen, P A; Andrew, N L; Kendrick, T H (2000a) Stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5B and PAU 5D using a new length-based model. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/33*. 37 p.
- Breen, P A; Andrew, N L; Kendrick, T H (2000b) The 2000 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5B using an improved Bayesian length-based model. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/48*. 36 p.
- Breen, P A; Andrew, N L; Kim, S W (2001) The 2001 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/55*. 53 p.
- Breen, P A; Kim, S W (2005) The 2005 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2005/47*. 114 p.
- Breen, P A; Kim, S W; Andrew, N L (2003) A length-based Bayesian stock assessment model for abalone. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 54(5): 619–634.
- Breen, P A; Smith, A N H (2008) The 2007 assessment for paua (*Haliotis iris*) stock PAU 5B (Stewart Island). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2008/05*. 64 p.

- Butterworth, D; Haddon, M; Haist, V; Helidoniotis, F (2015) Report on the New Zealand Paua stock assessment model; 2015. *New Zealand Fisheries Science Review* 2015/4. 31 p.
- Cordue, P L (2009) Analysis of PAU 5A diver survey data and PCELR catch and effort data. SeaFic and PAUMac 5. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 45 p.
- Fu, D (2013) The 2012 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2013/57.
- Fu, D (2014) The 2013 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 5B. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2014/45. 51 p.
- Fu, D; McKenzie, A; Naylor, R (2014) Summary of input data for the 2013 PAU 5B stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2014/43. 61 p.
- Gerring, P K (2003) Incidental fishing mortality of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in the PAU 7 commercial fishery. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2003/56.
- Gorfine, H K; Dixon, C D (2000) A behavioural rather than resource-focused approach may be needed to ensure sustainability of quota managed abalone fisheries. *Journal of Shellfish Research* 19: 515–516.
- Haist, V (2010) Paua research diver surveys: review of data collected and simulation study of survey method. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2010/38. 54 p.
- Heinemann A; Gray, A. (2024) National Panel Survey of Recreational Marine Fishers 2022-23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2024/51. 116 p.
- Kendrick, T H; Andrew, N L (2000) Catch and effort statistics and a summary of standardised CPUE indices for paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5A, 5B, and 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2000/47. 25 p.
- Marsh, C; Fu, D (2017) The 2016 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2017/33.
- Punt, A E (2003) The performance of a size-structured stock assessment method in the face of spatial heterogeneity in growth. *Fisheries Research* 65: 391–409.
- Schiel, D R; Breen, P A (1991) Population structure, ageing and fishing mortality of the New Zealand abalone *Haliotis iris*. *Fishery Bulletin* 89: 681–691.
- Schnute, J (1985) A General Theory for Analysis of Catch and Effort Data. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 42(3): 414–429.
- Shepherd, S A; Partington, D (1995) Studies on Southern Australian abalone (genus *Haliotis*). XVI. Recruitment, habitat and stock relations. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 46: 669–680.
- Will, M C; Gemmell, N J (2008) Genetic Population Structure of Black Foot paua. New Zealand Fisheries Research Report. GEN2007A: 37 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–2018. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2019/24. 104 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Hill, L; Heinemann, A (2014) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2011–12: Harvest Estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2014/67. 139 p.

PĀUA (PAU 5D) – Southland / Otago

(Haliotis iris)

Pāua



1. FISHERY SUMMARY

Before 1995, PAU 5D was part of the PAU 5 QMA, which was introduced into the QMS in 1986 with a TACC of 445 t. As a result of appeals to the Quota Appeal Authority, the TACC increased to 492 t for the 1991–92 fishing year; PAU 5 was then the largest QMA by number of quota holders and TACC. Concerns about the status of the PAU 5 stock led to a voluntary 10% reduction in the TACC in 1994–95. On 1 October 1995, PAU 5 was divided into three QMAs (PAU 5A, PAU 5B, and PAU 5D; see figure above) and the TACC was divided equally among them; the PAU 5D quota was set at 148.98 t.

On 1 October 2002 a TAC of 159 t was set for PAU 5D, comprising a TACC of 114 t, customary and recreational allowances of 3 t and 22 t, respectively, and an allowance of 20 t for other mortality. The TAC and TACC have been changed since then, but customary, recreational, and other mortality allowances have remained unchanged (Table 1).

Table 1: Total allowable catches (TAC, t) allowances for customary fishing, recreational fishing, and other sources of mortality (t) and Total Allowable Commercial Catches (TACC, t) declared for PAU 5 and PAU 5D since introduction to the QMS.

Year	TAC	Customary allowance	Recreational allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC
1986–1991*	–	–	–	–	445
1991–1994*	–	–	–	–	492
1994–1995*	–	–	–	–	442.8
1995–2002	–	–	–	–	148.98
2002–2003	159	3	22	20	114
2003–present	134	3	22	20	89

*PAU 5 TACC figures.

1.1 Commercial fishery

The fishing year runs from 1 October to 30 September. On 1 October 2001, it became mandatory to report catch and effort on Pāua Catch Effort Landing Return (PCELR) forms using fine-scale reporting areas that had been developed by the New Zealand Pāua Management Company for their voluntary logbook programme (Figure 1). Since 2010, the commercial industry has adopted some voluntary management initiatives which include raising the minimum harvest size for commercial fishers over specific statistical reporting areas. The industry has also voluntarily closed, to commercial harvesting,

specific areas that are of high importance to recreational pāua fishers. In recent years commercial fishers have been voluntarily shelving a percentage of their Annual Catch Entitlement (ACE), which is reflected by the annual catch landings falling below the TACC (Figure 2, Table 2). These voluntary measures are now implemented under the PAU 5 Fisheries Plan approved under section 11A of the Fisheries Act by the Minister for Oceans and Fisheries.

Commercial landings for PAU 5D are shown in Table 2 and Figure 2. Landings matched the TACC until 2012–13, and then declined to an average of 65 t between 2013–14 and 2024–25.




Figure 1: Map of fine scale statistical reporting areas for PAU 5D.




Figure 2: Reported commercial landings and TACC for PAU 5D from 1995–96 to present. For reported commercial landings in PAU 5 prior to 1995–96 refer to figure 1 and table 1 of the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

Table 2: TACC and reported landings (t) of pāua in PAU 5D from 1995–96 to the present. The last column shows the TACC after shelving has been accounted for.

Year	Landings	TACC	Shelving	Year	Landings	TACC	Shelving
1995–96	167.42	148.98	–	2010–11	88.70	89.00	–
1996–97	146.6	148.98	–	2011–12	89.23	89.00	–
1997–98	146.99	148.98	–	2012–13	87.91	89.00	–
1998–99	148.78	148.98	–	2013–14	84.59	89.00	–
1999–00	147.66	148.98	–	2014–15	71.87	89.00	–
2000–01	149.00	148.98	–	2015–16	65.95	89.00	62.30
2001–02	148.74	148.98	–	2016–17	63.12	89.00	62.30
2002–03	111.69	114.00	–	2017–18	62.48	89.00	62.30
2003–04	88.02	89.00	–	2018–19	55.55	89.00	57.85
2004–05	88.82	89.00	–	2019–20	56.55	89.00	57.85
2005–06	88.93	89.00	–	2020–21	57.78	89.00	57.85
2007–08	88.98	89.00	–	2021–22	67.57	89.00	62.30
2006–07	88.97	89.00	–	2022–23	62.76	89.00	62.30
2008–09	88.77	89.00	–	2023–24	69.18	89.00	66.75
2009–10	89.45	89.00	–	2024–25	65.91	89.00	66.75

1.2 Recreational fisheries

The National Panel Survey estimated that the recreational harvest for PAU 5D was 80 290 pāua (22.45 t) with a CV of 30% in 2011–12 (Wynne-Jones et al. 2014). The National Panel Survey was repeated in the 2017–18 fishing year (Wynne-Jones et al. 2019). The estimated recreational catch for that year was 19.28 tonnes with a CV of 21%.

For the purpose of the 2023 stock assessment model, the SFWG agreed to assume that the recreational catch in 1974 was 2 t and that it increased linearly to 10 t by 2005, where it has remained unchanged to date. The estimate used within the assessment was lower than estimates from the National Panel Survey as only a portion of recreational activity overlaps with commercial fisheries.

The most recent national panel survey harvest estimate for PAU 5D is 20.65 t (CV 0.30) for 2022–23 (Heinemann & Gray 2024). For further information on recreational fisheries refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

1.3 Customary fisheries

Pāua is a taonga species and as such there is an important customary use of pāua by Maori for food, and the shells have been used extensively for decorations and fishing devices. For information on customary catch regulations and reporting refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

Estimates of customary catch for PAU 5D are shown in table 5 of the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report. These numbers are likely to be an underestimate of customary harvest as only the catch approved and harvested in numbers is reported in the table. In addition, many tangata whenua also harvest pāua under their recreational allowance and these are not included in records of customary catch.

For the purpose of the 2023 stock assessment model, the SFWG agreed to assume that, for PAU 5D, the customary catch has been constant at 2 t from 1974 to the current stock assessment.

1.4 Illegal catch

For the purpose of the stock assessment model, the SFWG agreed to assume that, for PAU 5D, illegal catches have been constant at 10 t from 1974 to the current stock assessment. For further information on illegal catch refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

For further information on other sources of mortality refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report. Other sources of mortality are considered to be negligible, except in the case of occasional environmentally induced local freshwater inundation events.

2. BIOLOGY

For further information on pāua biology refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report. A summary of biological parameters used in the PAU 5D assessment is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Estimates of biological parameters (*H. iris*).

	Estimate	Source
<u>1. Natural mortality (<i>M</i>)</u>		
	0.11 (0.09–0.14)	Median (5–95% range) of posterior estimated by the base case model
<u>2. Weight = $a(\text{length})^b$ (Weight in g, length in mm shell length)</u>		
All	a 2.99×10^{-5}	b 3.303 Schiel & Breen (1991)
<u>3. Size at maturity (shell length)</u>		
	50% maturity at 91 mm (89–93)	Median (5–95% range) estimated outside of the assessment
	95% maturity at 103 mm (103–105)	Median (5–95% range) estimated outside of the assessment
<u>4. Estimated annual growth increments (both sexes combined)</u>		
	Growth at 75 mm 25.70 (21.79–30.26)	Median (5–95% range) of posterior estimated by the base case model
	Growth at 125 mm 5.61 (4.35–7.28)	Median (5–95% range) of posterior estimated by the base case model

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

For further information on stocks and areas refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

The stock assessment was implemented as a length-based Bayesian estimation model representing the commercially fished area of PAU 5D, with uncertainty of model estimates investigated using the marginal posterior distributions generated from Markov chain Monte Carlo simulations. The most recent stock assessment was conducted for the fishing year ended 30 September 2022. A base case model was chosen from the assessment. Spatial models were initially trialled for the area but were highly sensitive to assumptions due to data deficiencies in the southern region and were therefore not pursued further (models with reasonable parameter estimates were very close to single area models). Compared with previous analyses, the most recent stock assessment estimated lower stock status, due largely to the dropping of CELR CPUE. Estimates of growth were higher than in previous assessment, although QMA-specific growth patterns remain highly uncertain due to high spatial variability in growth and relatively low spatial coverage of the tag-recapture programme to estimate pāua growth. This uncertainty translates into uncertainty about stock status and stock trajectories.

4.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance indices

Parameters estimated in the assessment model and their assumed Bayesian priors are summarised in Table 4.

Table 4: A summary of estimated model parameters, lower bound, upper bound, type of prior, (U, uniform; N, normal; LN = lognormal; Beta = beta distribution), mean and CV of the prior.

Parameter	Prior	μ	sd
$\ln(R_0)$	LN	$\exp(13.5)$	3
D_{50} (Length at 50% selectivity for the commercial catch)	LN	$\log(123)$	0.05
D_{95-50} (Length between 50% and 95% selectivity the commercial catch)	LN	$\log(5)$	0.5
Steepness (h)	Fixed	0.75	
Recruitment deviations (ϵ)	LN	0	0.4

The observational data were:

1. A standardised CPUE series covering 2002–2022 based on combined PCELR and ERS data.
2. A commercial catch sampling length frequency series for 2002–2022.
3. Tag-recapture length increment data.
4. Maturity at length data.

4.1.1 Relative abundance estimates from standardised CPUE analyses

The 2022 stock assessment used a combined series of PCELR data covering 2002–2019, and ERS data from 2019 to 2022. These data were combined, but due to concerns with ERS data reporting in the area (see Neubauer 2023), a number of sensitivities were run:

- ERS and PCELR data were treated as a single time series,
- ERS reported data were subsetting to clients for which reporting showed no substantial difference from PCELR reporting, as measured by the likelihood of differences between the reporting periods exceeding 0.5, or 0.05, leading to two sensitivity runs as detailed by Neubauer (2023),
- fishing duration was dropped from the analysis, such that CPUE was analysed as catch-per-day in a given statistical area.

CPUE standardisation was carried out using a Bayesian Generalised Linear Mixed Model (GLMM) which partitioned variation among management zones within QMAs, and statistical areas within management zones, while accounting for effects of ACE-holders and individual divers. Unlike previous assessments for PAU 5D, CELR data prior to 2002 were considered unreliable and unlikely to reflect abundance trends, in accordance with recent assessments in PAU 7 and PAU 2. Gear improvements and fisher turnover in the fishery during the late 1980s to the late 1990s likely caused substantial hyper-stability in CELR CPUE indices for pāua. In addition, spatial reporting during CELR years was at the scale of CELR statistical areas, which do not line up with QMA boundaries. As a result, large amounts of CELR catch-per-unit effort data cannot be used for CPUE analyses at the QMA scale because the data cannot be unambiguously attributed to a single QMA.

CPUE was defined as the log of daily catch-per-unit-effort. Variables in the model were fishing year, FIN (Fisher Identification Number), management zone, diver ID, and fine-scale statistical area. Sensitivities for the CPUE data showed little variation from the base model (Figure 3), apart from model runs removing fishing duration from the analysis. The latter was taken as a sensitivity analysis for stock assessment runs.

Variability in CPUE was mostly explained by differences among divers (Figure 4). CPUE trends showed some similarity among management zones, which showed an increasing trend from 2002 to about 2011. However, CPUE subsequently declined to below-average levels, with a low point between 2015 and 2017, and substantial subsequent increases since 2017 (Figure 5). In nearly all models and regions, recent CPUE was near or above the highest CPUE in the time series.

In some circumstances, commercial CPUE may not be proportional to abundance because it is possible to maintain catch rates of pāua despite a declining biomass, with divers searching larger areas. This occurs because pāua tend to aggregate and divers move among areas to maximise their catch rates. Apparent stability in CPUE should therefore be interpreted with caution. The assumption of CPUE being proportional to biomass was investigated using the assessment model.




Figure 3: Standardised CPUE indices with 95% confidence intervals (solid line and ribbon) for the combined PCELR and ERS time series. Base uses all available CPUE data (after grooming procedures were applied), REM FD removed fishing duration from the analysis, and REM FD $P > 0.5$ and $P > 0.05$ removed clients unless reporting was as likely as not (0.5) and highly likely (0.05) to have remained the same.




Figure 4: Effect size for the CPUE index standardisation model used for the base-case stock assessment model. RS: management zone (research stratum), CatcherID: diver number.

4.1.2 Relative abundance estimates from research diver surveys

The relative abundance of pāua in PAU 5D has also been estimated from a number of independent research diver surveys undertaken in various years between 1994 and 2004. The survey strata (Catlins East and Catlins West) cover the areas that produced about 25% of the recent catches in PAU 5D. These data were not included in the assessment because there is concern that the data are not a reliable enough index of abundance and the data are not representative of the entire PAU 5D QMA.

Concerns about the ability of the data collected in the independent Research Dive surveys to reflect relative abundance instigated reviews in 2009 (Cordue 2009) and 2010 (Haist 2010). The reviews assessed the reliability of the research diver survey index (RDSI) as a proxy for abundance and whether the RDSI, when used in the pāua stock assessment models, results in model outputs that adequately reflect the status of the stocks. Both reviews suggested that outputs from pāua stock assessments using the RDSI should be treated with caution. For a summary of the review's conclusions refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

4.2 Stock assessment methods

The 2023 PAU 5D stock assessment used the length-based population dynamics model first described by Breen et al. (2003). PAU 5D was last assessed using data up to the 2017–18 fishing year (Neubauer & Tremblay-Boyer 2019), and the most recent assessment uses data up to the 2021–22 fishing year. Although the overall population-dynamics model remained unchanged, the most recent iteration of the PAU 5D stock assessment incorporates a number of changes to the previous methodology:

1. CELR data were dropped from the analysis, in order to avoid potential confounding from efficiency creep in the fishery in the 1990s.
2. Length-frequency data were standardised using an improved model (Neubauer & Kim 2023) to better estimate uncertainty in estimated removals.
3. Selectivity was allowed to vary in time, along an estimated offset parameterised by the mean minimum harvest size in the QMA for each year. Due to changes in the spatial extent of the fishery among years, and variable harvest sizes, selectivity cannot be assumed to be stationary.
4. Both spatial and single-area models were trialled, but spatial models were highly sensitive to assumptions due to a lack of length-frequency data from southern areas, and only single area models were therefore retained.




Figure 5: Standardised CPUE indices with 95% confidence intervals (solid line and ribbon) and unstandardised geometric CPUE and variability (points and error bars) for the combined PCELR and ERS time series used in the base-case assessment model.

The model structure assumed a single sex population within each area (defined as management zones for spatial models, and the whole QMA for single-area models), with length classes from 70 mm to 170 mm, in groups of 2 mm. Growth was length-based, without reference to age, mediated through a growth transition matrix that describes the probability of each length class changing in each year. Pāua entered the partition following recruitment and were removed by natural mortality and fishing mortality.

The model simulated the population from 1965 to 2022. Catches were available for 1974–2022, although catches before 1995 must be estimated from the combined PAU 5 catch and were assumed to

increase linearly between 1965 and 1973 from 0 to the 1974 catch level. Catches included commercial, recreational, customary, and illegal catch, and all catches occurred within the same time step.

Recruitment was assumed to take place at the beginning of the annual cycle, and length at recruitment was defined by a uniform distribution with a range between 70 and 80 mm. The stock-recruitment relationship is unknown for pāua. However, the Shellfish Working Group agreed to use a Beverton-Holt stock-recruitment relationship, with steepness (h) fixed at 0.75 for this assessment.

Growth, maturation, and natural mortality were also estimated within the model, although no fitting to raw data was performed, and all inputs were provided as priors with mean and observation error. The model estimated the commercial fishing selectivity, which was assumed to follow a logistic curve and to reach an asymptote. The selectivity was estimated as varying in time, with a random effect describing deviations from an estimated offset parameterised by the mean minimum harvest size in the QMA for each year.

The assessment initially attempted to fit both spatial and non-spatial models. However, length-composition data from the Southern area of the QMA is sparse until recently, and models were found to be highly sensitive to assumptions and inputs, with models often estimating unrealistically high stock status (low depletion levels). The single area models did not share this sensitivity and were therefore retained. Single area models were used to explore sensitivity to natural mortality (fitted in the base case), selectivity assumptions and CPUE scenarios, as well as hyper-stability scenarios.

The reference model (model 0) excluded the RDSI and Research Diver Length Frequency data, fitted the combined CPUE series for PCELR and ERS data (excluding CELR data) and the mean Catch Sampling Length Frequency (CSLF) and observation error, estimated process error for CPUE and CSLF, updated growth estimates within the model, and estimated M within the model. The data weights in this model led to satisfactory fits to both datasets.

The assessment calculates the following quantities from the marginal posterior distributions of various partitions of the biomass: the equilibrium (unfished) spawning stock biomass (SSB_0) assuming that recruitment is equal to the average recruitment, and the relative spawning and available biomass for 2022 (SSB_{2022} and B_{2022}^{Avail}) and for the projection (*Proj*) period (SSB_{Proj} and B_{Proj}^{Avail}). This assessment also reports the following fishery indicators:

Relative SSB	Estimated spawning stock biomass in the final year relative to unfished spawning stock biomass
Relative B^{Avail}	Estimated available biomass in the final year relative to unfished available stock biomass
$P(SSB_{2022} > 40\% SSB_0)$	Probability that the spawning stock biomass in 2022 was greater than 40% of the unfished spawning stock
$P(SSB_{2022} > 20\% SSB_0)$	Probability that the spawning stock biomass in 2022 was greater than 20% of the unfished spawning stock (soft limit)
$P(SSB_{Proj} > 40\% SSB_0)$	Probability that projected future spawning stock biomass will be greater than 40% of the unfished spawning stock given assumed future catches
$P(SSB_{Proj} > 20\% SSB_0)$	Probability that projected future spawning stock biomass will be greater than 20% of the unfished spawning stock given assumed future catches
$P(B_{Proj} > B_{2022})$	Probability that projected future biomass (spawning stock or available biomass) is greater than estimated biomass for the 2022 fishing year given assumed future catches

4.3 Stock assessment results

The base case model suggested a recent increase from low levels in spawning stock biomass over the past seven years, following a slow downwards trend from 2010 to 2015 (Figure 6). The base case also indicated that although the stock is currently as likely as not at the interim target spawning stock biomass of 40% SSB (Table 5), there is little to no probability that it is below the soft limit of 20% SSB. Relative available biomass was markedly lower than the spawning stock biomass, meaning that a considerable part of the spawning biomass was below the minimum harvest size and is therefore not accessible to the fishery.




Figure 6: Posterior distributions of spawning stock biomass from the base case model. The black line shows the median of the posterior distribution; the 25th and 75th percentiles are indicated by the dark grey band, with the light grey representing the 95% confidence range of the posterior distribution. Coloured lines for projections relate to alternative future catch levels indicated in the legend.

Table 5: Model sensitivity runs for the stock assessment of pāua in management area PAU 5D. Stock status (posterior mean relative spawning stock biomass), relative available biomass and probability of the stock status being above the soft limit ($P(SSB_{proj} > 20\% SSB_0)$). Numbers are posterior medians.

Sensitivity	Stock status	Available	$P(SSB_{proj} > 20\% SSB_0)$
Base	0.38	0.28	1.00
$M=0.1$	0.33	0.24	1.00
$M=0.16$	0.66	0.46	1.00
No time-varying selectivity	0.34	0.26	1.00
CPUE without fishing duration	0.39	0.28	1.00

High shelving rates up to > 35% and increased minimum harvest sizes for many areas in PAU 5D since 2015 have led to a strong reduction in exploitation rate (Figure 7), which is currently below U_{40} . It is likely that this reduction in catch has led to the current increase in biomass from previously low levels near the soft limit of 20% SSB.




Figure 7: Estimated selectivity by year (left) and exploitation rate (right) for commercial (ERate), illegal (illegal_ERate), and recreational fishery components assumed in the model. Vertical dashed and dotted lines show the minimum legal size and 130 mm as a reference.

Projections suggested increasing SSB for scenarios of current catch and 20% increased or decreased catch (Table 6); however, the estimated equilibrium biomass at 89 t (i.e., the current TACC) appears close to 40% SSB whereas at current catch (67.5 t), SSB is projected to increase further and is projected to be more likely than not to be above target by 2026, with a long-term likelihood of exceeding target harvest rates (U_{40}) of 8%, compared to a risk of exceeding target harvest rates near 60% for projections at the TACC (89 t).

Sensitivities were set up to investigate the robustness of the model to key assumptions about CPUE and time-varying selectivity, as well as specific values of M . For CPUE, an alternative CPUE time series derived from CPUE without fishing duration (no-FD) was used to fit the model but resulted in only very minor deviation from the base case model, with slightly lower stock status estimated. Models without time-varying selectivity and fixed M at 0.1 gave a similar result, whereas a model with high M at 0.16 produced a far more optimistic estimate of stock status across the time series.

For a number of reasons, reference points based on deterministic MSY or B_{MSY} are not currently used for managing pāua stocks and were therefore not calculated. B_{MSY} is not considered a suitable target for management of the pāua fishery. Deterministic MSY is commonly much higher than realised catch for pāua stocks (e.g., Marsh & Fu 2017) and deterministic B_{MSY} is estimated at biomass levels corresponding to very low available biomass levels. Management based on deterministic MSY -based reference points would likely lead to biomass occasionally falling below 20% B_0 , the default soft limit according to the Harvest Strategy Standard. Thus, the actual target needs to be above this theoretical deterministic biomass, but the extent to which it needs to be above has not been determined.

In the meantime, an interim target of 40% B_0 is used as a proxy for a more realistic interpretation of B_{MSY} .

Table 6: Projections for key fishery indicators from the base case model: probabilities of being above 40% and 20% of unfished spawning biomass (SSB) [$P(SSB_{Proj} > 40\% SSB_0)$ and $P(SSB_{Proj} > 20\% SSB_0)$], the probability that SSB in the projection year is above current SSB, the posterior median relative to SSB, the posterior median relative available spawning biomass B_{Proj}^{Avail} , and the probability that the exploitation rate (U) in the projection year is above $U_{40\% SSB_0}$, the exploitation rate that leads to 40% SSB_0 . The total commercial catch (TCC) marked with * corresponds to current commercial catch under 25% shelving of the current TACC (89 t). Other scenarios show projections at the current TACC and 20% decreased catch relative to current catch. Simulations to equilibrium (assumed to have been reached after 50 projection years) are indicated with Eq. in the year column.

TACC (t)	Year	$P(SSB_{Proj} > 40\% SSB_0)$	$P(SSB_{Proj} > 20\% SSB_0)$	$P(SSB_{Proj} > SSB_{2022})$	Median rel. SSB_{Proj}	Median rel. B_{Proj}^{Avail}	$P(U > U_{40\% SSB_0})$
54	2023	0.37	1.00	0.67	0.38	0.28	0.13
	2024	0.47	1.00	0.90	0.40	0.30	0.11
	2025	0.56	1.00	0.94	0.42	0.32	0.10
	2026	0.65	1.00	0.96	0.44	0.33	0.09
	2027	0.73	1.00	0.98	0.46	0.35	0.09
	Eq.	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.79	0.69	0.03
67.5*	2023	0.37	1.00	0.67	0.38	0.28	0.31
	2024	0.43	1.00	0.80	0.40	0.29	0.29
	2025	0.50	1.00	0.85	0.41	0.30	0.28
	2026	0.55	1.00	0.88	0.42	0.31	0.27
	2027	0.61	1.00	0.90	0.44	0.32	0.24
	Eq.	0.99	1.00	1.00	0.68	0.58	0.08
89	2023	0.33	1.00	0.66	0.38	0.28	0.63
	2024	0.35	1.00	0.58	0.38	0.27	0.63
	2025	0.37	0.99	0.57	0.38	0.27	0.62
	2026	0.38	0.99	0.57	0.38	0.27	0.62
	2027	0.38	0.99	0.57	0.38	0.27	0.61
	Eq.	0.62	0.91	0.70	0.44	0.33	0.51

4.4 Other factors

To run the stock assessment model a number of assumptions must be made, one of these being that CPUE is a reliable index of abundance. Recent empirical data (Abraham & Neubauer 2015, McCowan & Neubauer 2021) provide some evidence of linear relationships between CPUE and abundance, albeit at spatial scales that are smaller than that of the overall fishery.

The commercial catch is unknown before 1974 and is estimated with uncertainty before 1995. Differences may exist between assumed catches and what was actually taken. Non-commercial catch estimates, including illegal catch, are also poorly determined and could be substantially different from what was assumed. Sensitivities to alternative catch histories are considered.

The model treats the whole of the assessed area of PAU 5D as if it were a single stock with homogeneous biology, habitat, and fishing pressure. The model assumes homogeneity in recruitment and natural mortality.

Heterogeneity in growth can be a problem for this kind of model (Punt 2003). Variation in growth is addressed to some extent by having a stochastic growth transition matrix based on increments observed in several different places; similarly the length frequency data are integrated across samples from many places. Thus, length frequency data collected from the commercial catch may not represent the available biomass represented in the model with high precision.

Another source of uncertainty is that fishing may cause spatial contraction of populations (Shepherd & Partington 1995), or that it may result in some populations becoming relatively unproductive after initial fishing (Gorfine & Dixon 2000). If this happens, the model will overestimate productivity in the population as a whole. Past recruitments estimated by the model might instead have been the result of serial depletion.

The effect of these factors is likely to make model results optimistic. For instance, if some local stocks are fished very hard and others not fished, recruitment failure can result because of the depletion of spawners, as spawners must breed close to each other, and the dispersal of larvae is unknown and may be limited. Recruitment failure is a common observation in overseas abalone fisheries, so local processes may decrease recruitment, an effect that the current model does not account for.

4.5 Testing management procedures

Management procedures have been operating in the PAU 5D fishery since 2016. A harvest control rule developed with commercial fisheries stakeholders was tested at the time using the available stock assessment model as an operating model. The control rule was updated in the context of the 2023 stock assessment for PAU 5D to introduce further safeguards (a lag year on increases, allowing increases in catch only if two successive increases in CPUE are observed), and allowing a maximum of 5% increase in catch per year.

Testing of the control rule included testing against a range of sensitivities used in the stock assessment process (levels of natural mortality), as well as scenarios of poor recruitment. The control rule was able to maintain steady exploitation rates, and maintained the stock at or above the interim target by applying catch that was fluctuating between current catch levels and the TACC. The control rule was highly likely to maintain biomass above limit reference points.

4.6 Updated management procedure

The development and evaluation of management procedures (MPs) for pāua is described in Section 5.4 of the pāua introductory chapter. MPs are being developed across all assessed QMAs using a common Management Procedure Evaluation (MPE) framework, with each QMA's operating model conditioned on regional information for each stock. For PAU 5D, MP development is ongoing.

5. FUTURE RESEARCH CONSIDERATIONS

- Consider sensitivity analyses with alternative catch histories.
- Improve estimates of growth. Expand collection of tagging and environmental data to investigate drivers of growth.
- Further investigate data weighting procedures for pāua stocks. Replace use of likelihood multipliers using observational errors to set initial data weights.
- Re-examine the historical diver surveys and length frequencies to determine their utility.
- Collect additional data to update the length-weight relationship.

- Explore alternative selectivity parameterisation, considering non symmetrical ogives and allowing both L_{50} and a_{95} to vary over time.

6. STATUS OF THE STOCK


Stock Structure Assumptions

PAU 5D is assumed in the model to be a discrete and homogenous stock within the area of PAU 5D that is commercially fished.


PAU 5D - Southland / Otago

Stock Status		
Year of Most Recent Assessment	2023	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2021–22	Catch: 68 t
Assessment Runs Presented	Base case MCMC	
Reference Points	Interim Target: 40% SSB_0 Soft Limit: 20% SSB_0 Hard Limit: 10% SSB_0 Overfishing threshold: $U_{40\%SSB_0}$	
Status in relation to Target	SSB_{2022} was estimated to be 38% SSB_0 . About as Likely as Not (40–60%) to be at or above the target	
Status in relation to Limits	Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below both the soft and hard limits	
Status in Relation to Overfishing	Overfishing is About as Likely as Not (40–60%) to be occurring	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



Plot of SSB relative to unfished spawning biomass (SSB_0), and exploitation rate (U) relative to exploitation rate at 40% of SSB_0 .



Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Biomass decreased up to about 2015 and has been increasing recently towards the interim target reference point.
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	Exploitation rate peaked in 2002 and has since declined.
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	At the current catch level, biomass is About as Likely as Not (40–60%) to rebuild above the interim target reference biomass. At the current TACC, biomass is About as Likely as Not (40–60%) to remain at the interim target in the short term.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Results from all model assessment runs presented suggest it is Unlikely (< 40%) that current levels of catch or the TACC will cause a decline below the soft or hard limits.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unlikely (<40%) for current catch; About as Likely as Not (40–60%) for current TACC.

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	1 - Full Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Length based Bayesian model	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2023	Next: 2028
Overall assessment quality (rank)	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Catch History	2 – Medium or Mixed

	- CPUE Indices PCELR & ERS series - Commercial sampling length frequencies - Tag recapture data - Maturity at length data	Quality: not believed to be fully representative of catch in the QMA 1 – High Quality 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: not believed to be representative of the whole fishery 2 – Medium or Mixed Quality: not believed to be representative of the whole QMA 1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	- Research Dive survey indices - Research Dive length frequencies - CPUE (CELR series years)	3 – Low Quality: not believed to be a reliable indicator of abundance in the whole QMA 3 – Low Quality: not believed to be a reliable indicator of length frequency in the whole QMA 3 – Low Quality: not believed to be fully representative of CPUE in the QMA
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	- CELR data were dropped from the analysis, to avoid potential confounding from efficiency creep in the fishery in the 1990s. - Length frequency data were standardised using an improved model to better estimate uncertainty in estimated removals. - Selectivity was allowed to vary over time through an estimated offset to L_{50} parameterised by the fishery minimum harvest size.	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Growth estimates were informed by a weakly informed prior - Influence of changes in reporting due to ERS on CPUE indices may have a small effect on stock status determinations.	

Qualifying Comments

Uncertainties in the input data and model structure necessitate caution in the interpretation of the assessed status of the stock. However, the high minimum harvest size relative to length-at-maturity (along with closed areas) means that a relatively large proportion of the spawning stock is not available to the fishery and provides a buffer from the effects of fishing for the stock.

Fishery Interactions


-

7. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Abraham, E R; Neubauer, P (2015) Relationship between small-scale catch-per-unit-effort and abundance in New Zealand abalone (*Haliotis iris*) fisheries. *PeerJ PrePrints* No. e1733.
- Andrew, N L; Kim, S W; Naylor, J R; Gerring, P; Notman, P R (2002) Fishery independent surveys of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5B and PAU 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2002/3*. 21 p.
- Andrew, N L; Naylor, J R; Gerring, P (2000a) A modified timed-swim method for paua stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/4*. 23 p.
- Andrew, N L; Naylor, J R; Gerring, P; Notman, P R (2000b) Fishery independent surveys of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5B and 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/3*. 21 p.
- Breen, P A; Andrew, N L; Kendrick, T H (2000a) Stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5B and PAU 5D using a new length-based model. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/33*. 37 p.
- Breen, P A; Andrew, N L; Kendrick, T H (2000b) The 2000 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5B using an improved Bayesian length-based model. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/48*. 36 p.
- Breen, P A; Kim, S W (2005) The 2005 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2005/47*. 114 p.
- Breen, P A; Kim, S W (2007) The 2006 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) stocks PAU 5A (Fiordland) and PAU 5D (Otago). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/09*. 164 p.
- Breen, P A; Kim, S W; Andrew, N L (2003) A length-based Bayesian stock assessment model for abalone. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 54(5): 619–634.
- Butterworth, D; Haddon, M; Haist, V; Helidoniotis, F (2015) Report on the New Zealand Paua stock assessment model; 2015. *New Zealand Fisheries Science Review 2015/4*. 31 p.
- Cordue, P L (2009) Analysis of PAU 5A diver survey data and PCELR catch and effort data. SeaFic and PAUMac 5 report. 45 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Elvy, D; Grindley, R; Teirney, L (1997) Management Plan for Paua 5. Otago Southland Paua Management Working Group Report. 57 p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Dunedin.)
- Francis, R I C (2011) Data weighting in statistical fisheries stock assessment models. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 68: 1124–1138.
- Fu, D (2013) The 2012 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/57*. 51 p.
- Fu, D (2016) The 2015 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2016/35*. 52 p.
- Fu, D; McKenzie, A; Naylor, J R (2012) Summary of input data for the 2011 PAU 7 stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2012/26*. 46 p.
- Fu, D; McKenzie, A; Naylor, J R (2013) Summary of input data for the 2012 PAU 5D stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/56*. 51 p.
- Gerring, P K (2003) Incidental fishing mortality of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/56*. 13 p.
- Gorfine, H K; Dixon, C D (2000) A behavioural rather than resource-focused approach may be needed to ensure sustainability of quota managed abalone fisheries. *Journal of Shellfish Research* 19: 515–516.
- Haist, V (2010) Paua research diver surveys: review of data collected and simulation study of survey method. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2010/38*. 54 p.
- Heinemann A; Gray, A. (2024) National Panel Survey of Recreational Marine Fishers 2022-23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/51*. 116 p.
- Kendrick, T H; Andrew, N L (2000) Catch and effort statistics and a summary of standardised CPUE indices for paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5A, 5B, and 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/47*. 25 p.
- Marsh, C; Fu, D (2017) The 2016 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2017/33*.
- McCowan, T; Neubauer, P (2021) Pāua abundance trends and population monitoring in areas affected by the November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2021/26*. 23 p.
- McShane, P E; Naylor, J R (1995) Small-scale spatial variation in growth, size at maturity, and yield- and egg-per-recruit relations in the New Zealand abalone (*Haliotis iris*). *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 29: 603–612.
- Neubauer, P; Tremblay-Boyer, L (2019) The 2018 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 5 D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/39*. 62 p.
- Neubauer, P (2023) Quantifying effects of reporting changes for pāua (*Haliotis iris*) catch-per-unit-effort. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2023/18*. 19 p.
- Neubauer, P.; Kim, K. (2023). The 2023 stock assessment and management procedure evaluation for pāua (*Haliotis iris*) fisheries in PAU 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2023/46*. 82 p.
- Pirker, J G (1992) Growth, shell-ring deposition and mortality of paua (*Haliotis iris* Martyn) in the Kaikoura region. MSc thesis, University of Canterbury. 165 p.
- Punt, A E (2003) The performance of a size-structured stock assessment method in the face of spatial heterogeneity in growth. *Fisheries Research* 65: 391–409.
- Sainsbury, K J (1982) Population dynamics and fishery management of the paua, *Haliotis iris*. 1. Population structure, growth, reproduction and mortality. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 16: 147–161.
- Schiel, D R (1989) Paua fishery assessment 1989. *New Zealand Fishery Assessment Research Document 1989/9*. 20 p.
- Schiel, D R (1992) The paua (abalone) fishery of New Zealand. In: Shepherd, S A; Tegner, M J; Guzman del Proo, S (Eds.) *Abalone of the World: Biology, fisheries, and culture*. Blackwell Scientific, Oxford.
- Schiel, D R; Breen, P A (1991) Population structure, ageing and fishing mortality of the New Zealand abalone (*Haliotis iris*). *Fishery Bulletin* 89: 681–691.
- Stan Development Team (2018) RStan: the R interface to Stan. R package version 2.17.3. Retrieved from <http://mc-stan.org/>.
- Shepherd, S A; Partington, D (1995) Studies on Southern Australian abalone (genus *Haliotis*). XVI. Recruitment, habitat and stock relations. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 46: 669–680.
- Will, M C; Gemmell, N J (2008) Genetic Population Structure of Black Foot paua. New Zealand Fisheries Research Report. GEN2007A. 37 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–2018. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/24*. 104 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Hill, L; Heinemann, A (2014) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2011–12: Harvest Estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/67*. 139 p.

PĀUA (PAU 7) – Marlborough

(*Haliotis iris*)
Pāua



1. FISHERY SUMMARY

PAU 7 was introduced into the Quota Management System in 1986–87 with a TACC of 250 t. As a result of appeals to the Quota Appeal Authority, the TACC was increased to 267.48 t by 1989. On 1st October 2001 a TAC of 273.73 t was set with a TACC of 240.73 t, customary and recreational allowances of 15 t each and an allowance of 3 t for other mortality. On 1 October 2002 the TAC was reduced to 220.24 t and the TACC was set at 187.24 t; no changes were made to the customary, recreational, or other mortality allowances. In 2016 the TACC was further reduced to 93.62 t, and the allowance for other mortality was increased to 10 t, setting the TAC to 133.62 t (Table 1).

Table 1: Total Allowable Catches (TAC, t) allowances for customary fishing, recreational fishing, and other sources of mortality (t), and Total Allowable Commercial Catches (TACC, t) declared for PAU 7 since introduction into the QMS.

Year	TAC	Customary	Recreational	Other mortality	TACC
1986–89	–	–	–	–	250.00
1989–01	–	–	–	–	267.48
2001–02	273.73	15	15	3	240.73
2002–16	220.24	15	15	3	187.24
2016–Present	133.62	15	15	10	93.62

1.1 Commercial fisheries

The fishing year runs from 1 October to 30 September. In 2000–01 concerns about the status of the PAU 7 fishery led to a decision by the commercial sector to voluntarily shelve 20% of the TACC for that fishing year. From the 2003–04 to the 2006–07 fishing years, the industry proposed to shelve 15% of the TACC. In the 2012–13 and 2013–14, the industry shelved 20% of the 187.24 t TACC. In 2014–15, PAU 7 stakeholders again agreed to voluntarily shelve 30%. However, some only shelved 20% and some shelved 30%; an average of 28% was shelved overall. In October 2016 the TACC was reduced by 50%. Almost immediately following this, as a result of the Kaikōura earthquake of November 2016, the southern area of the fishery was closed under emergency provisions; this was later replaced by an official s11 closure. This area historically accounted for approximately 10% of the total PAU 7 catch. From 1 October 2017 the TAC was reduced a further 10%, but this decision was set aside by agreement following a court injunction so the TAC is still set at 133.63 t for PAU 7. However, PAU 7 stakeholders

agreed to a 10% shelving, and annual landings averaged 81.5 t after 2017–18. Shelving increased to around 50% in 2023–24. The customary and recreational allowances are still set at 15 t. The east coast fishery re-opened on 1 December 2021 and was subsequently fished according to pre-agreed geographical zone limits.

On 1 October 2001 it became mandatory to report catch and effort on PCELRs using fine-scale reporting areas (Figure 1) that had been developed by the New Zealand Pāua Management Company for their voluntary logbook programme. Reported landings and TACCs for PAU 7 are shown in Table 2 and Figure 2. The early catches from Schiel (1992) were not considered for the base case in the 2022 stock assessment (Neubauer 2023). Reporting switched to electronic reporting in 2019–20, with no explicit reporting of statistical areas, which were inferred from fishing locations until their explicit re-introduction in 2021–22.




Figure 1: Map of fine scale statistical reporting areas for PAU 7.

1.2 Recreational fisheries

A nationwide panel survey of over 7000 marine fishers who reported their fishing activity over the fishing year from 1 October 2011 to 30 September 2012 was conducted by The National Research Bureau Ltd in close consultation with Marine Amateur Fishing Working Group (Wynne-Jones et al. 2014). The survey was based on an improved survey method developed to address issues and to reduce bias encountered in past surveys. The survey estimated that 14.13 t (CV of 34%), were harvested by recreational fishers in PAU 7 for 2011–12. In 2017–18, the national panel survey was repeated and the estimated recreational catch was 3.02 t (CV of 36%) (Wynne-Jones et al. 2019). The most recent national panel survey harvest estimate for PAU 7 is 2.87 t (CV 0.35) for 2022–23 (Heinemann & Gray 2024).

For further information on recreational fisheries refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

For the 2021 stock assessment, the SFWG agreed to assume that recreational catch was 5 t in 1974 and that it increased linearly to 15 t in 2000 and then remained at 15 t until 2008, with a subsequent decline to 2 t by 2018.

Table 2: Reported landings and TACC in PAU 7 from 1983–84 to the present. The last column shows the TACC after shelving has been accounted for. Catches from 1980–81 to 1986–85 from Schiel (1992).

Year	Landings (t)	TACC (t)	Shelving	Year	Landings (t)	TACC (t)	Shelving
1974–75	197.91	–	–	2000–01	215.92	267.48	213.98
1975–76	141.88	–	–	2001–02	187.15	240.73	186.97
1976–77	242.73	–	–	2002–03	187.22	187.24	–
1977–78	201.17	–	–	2003–04	159.55	187.24	159.15
1978–79	304.57	–	–	2004–05	166.94	187.24	159.15
1979–80	223.43	–	–	2005–06	183.36	187.24	159.15
1980–81	490.00	–	–	2006–07	176.05	187.24	159.15
1981–82	370.00	–	–	2007–08	186.84	187.24	–
1982–83	400.00	–	–	2008–09	186.85	187.24	–
1983–84	330.00	–	–	2009–10	187.02	187.24	–
1984–85	230.00	–	–	2010–11	186.77	187.24	–
1985–86	236.09	–	–	2011–12	186.98	187.24	–
1986–87	242.18	250	–	2012–13	149.75	187.24	149.79
1987–88	255.94	250	–	2013–14	145.52	187.24	149.79
1988–89	246.03	250	–	2014–15	133.58	187.24	131.07
1989–90	267.05	267.48	–	2015–16	139.79	187.24	131.07
1990–91	273.25	267.48	–	2016–17	93.61	93.62	–
1991–92	268.31	267.48	–	2017–18	81.88	93.62	–
1992–93	264.80	267.48	–	2018–19	79.70	93.62	82.39
1993–94	255.47	267.48	–	2019–20	81.98	93.62	82.39
1994–95	247.11	267.48	–	2020–21	81.34	93.62	79.58
1995–96	268.74	267.48	–	2021–22	86.79	93.62	85.39
1996–97	267.59	267.48	–	2022–23	76.54	93.62	85.39
1997–98	266.65	267.48	–	2023–24	61.44	93.62	46.81
1998–99	265.05	267.48	–	2024–25	48.46	93.62	46.81
1999–00	264.64	267.48	–				




Figure 2: Reported commercial landings and TACC for PAU 7 from 1986–87 to present.

1.3 Customary fisheries

Pāua is a taonga species and as such there is an important customary use of pāua by Maori for food, and the shells have been used extensively for decorations and fishing devices.

For information on customary catch regulations and reporting refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

Customary catch was incorporated into the PAU 7 TAC in 2002 as an allowance of 15 t. Estimates of customary catch for PAU 7 are shown in Table 5 of the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report. These numbers are likely to be an underestimate of customary harvest because only the catch in numbers approved and harvested are reported in the table. In addition, many tangata whenua also harvest pāua under their recreational allowance and these are not included in records of customary catch.

Records of customary catch taken under the South Island Regulations show that about 20 to 1014 pāua were reported to have been collected each year from 2007–08 to 2011–12, with an average of 449 pieces each year. Those numbers were substantially lower than the annual allowances. There have not been any reports since.

For the 2021 stock assessment, the Working Group agreed to assume that customary catch was 1 t in 1974, increasing linearly to 2 t between 1974 and 2000 and then remaining at 2 t until 2015, with recent catches around 1 t.

1.4 Illegal catch

There are no estimates of illegal catch for PAU 7.

For the 2021 stock assessment, the Working Group agreed to assume that illegal catch was 1 t in 1974 and that it increased linearly to 15 t between 1974 and 2000, remaining at 15 t from 2000 to 2005, then decreasing linearly to 2.5 t in 2015, and remaining at 2.5 subsequently.

For further information on illegal catch refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

For further information on other sources of mortality refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

On 16 November 2016, a 7.8 magnitude earthquake hit the upper east coast of the South Island, uplifting areas of the coast by as much as 4 m. In the PAU 7 fishery, pāua statistical areas P701 to P710 were impacted to varying degrees by the earthquake. The earthquake caused direct mortality of a large number of juvenile and adult pāua that became exposed to the terrestrial environment with no means of being able to return to the water. More indirect mortality occurred from the earthquake due to an immediate loss of pre-earthquake pāua habitat that now lies above the new post-earthquake high tide mark.

Impacts of the seabed uplift on pāua populations in PAU 7 will only become clear in the longer term. The immediate loss of area to the fishery, assumed to be good habitat for pāua, is only part of the impact that the seabed uplift associated with the earthquake will have on pāua populations. Juvenile pāua recruit in shallow water, and so the loss of juvenile habitat will have been higher than the loss of adult habitat. Recent surveys, however, have indicated large scale recovery of pāua populations in the affected areas (McCowan & Neubauer 2021, 2022).

2. BIOLOGY

For further information on pāua biology refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report. A summary of biological parameters used in the PAU 7 stock assessment is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Estimates of biological parameters (*H. iris*).

Fishstock		Estimate	Source
<u>1. Natural mortality (<i>M</i>)</u>			
All		0.02–0.25	Sainsbury (1982)
PAU 7		0.12	Fixed in the base case assessment model based on estimates of <i>M</i> in other areas
<u>2. Weight = a (length)^{<i>b</i>} (weight in g, shell length in mm)</u>			
	$a = 2.59\text{E-}08$	$b = 3.322$	Schiel & Breen (1991)
<u>3. Size at maturity (shell length)</u>			
Meta-analysis for fished areas (all QMAs)	50% mature	90.5 mm	Neubauer & Tremblay-Boyer (2019a)
<u>4. Growth-increment estimates (both sexes combined)</u>			
Assessment fit for main commercially fished area (Cook Strait)	G_{75}	17.38 mm (SE 1.44 mm)	Neubauer (2023)
	G_{125}	2.71 mm (SE 0.36 mm)	

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

For further information on stocks and areas refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

The stock assessment is implemented as a length-based Bayesian estimation model, with uncertainty of model estimates investigated using the marginal posterior distributions generated from Markov chain-Monte Carlo simulations. In contrast to previous assessments, which assumed a single population across Statistical Areas 017 and 038, the most recent stock assessment split the area into finer scale units that align more closely with industry management units (Figure 3), due to strong differences in catch trends among these regions (Figure 4). In particular, D’Urville Island and Northern Faces statistical areas accounted for approximately 40 t of catch through the early 2000s, with subsequent declines in catch to very low levels in recent years. By contrast, statistical areas in Cook Strait have continuously yielded between 70 and 150 t per year since the early 2000s. This area constitutes over 80% of the fishery in recent years.




Figure 3: Region definition used in the stock assessment; the stock assessment was run for Cook Strait, Northern Faces, and D’Urville Island only. The East Coast area was closed following the 2016 Kaikōura earthquake; the West Coast is only sporadically fished with relatively small proportions of catch coming from the area.




Figure 4: Trend in pāua catch (kg) over time by statistical areas in quota management area PAU 7 for the period from 2002 to 2021, with mean commercial catch over the same time period (right-hand side). Statistical reporting areas used for the stock assessment within PAU 7 are colour coded blue (Cook Strait); other areas were excluded from the stock assessment given limited recent catch (but included in catch per unit effort (CPUE) analyses).

4.1 Estimates of abundance indices

4.1.1 Relative abundance estimates from standardised CPUE analyses

PCELR and ERS data from 2002 were used to derive a standardised, fishery-dependent index of abundance. Previously used CELR data were not used in the present assessment; as for other recent assessments, changes to the composition of the fleet and gear during the 1990s, combined with

inconsistent reporting, mean that the trends in CPUE from CELR data are questionable, and likely hyper-stable to an unknown degree.

CPUE standardisation was carried out using Bayesian Generalised Linear Mixed Models (GLMM) which partitioned variation among fixed (research strata) and random variables. CPUE was defined as the log of daily catch. Variables in the model were fishing year, estimated fishing effort, client number, research stratum, and diver ID (PCELR). Previous standardisation models for PCELR data routinely used small scale statistical areas as a standardising variable. For the present assessment, this variable was not available with sufficient precision for recent (ERS) data, where it is inferred from position data, and was therefore omitted. Nevertheless, follow-up work on the quality of ERS data for pāua CPUE suggested limited effects of spatial reporting and the inclusion, or not, of statistical areas in the standardisation made little difference to resulting indices for Cook Strait. Indices for other subareas were sensitive to the inclusion of statistical area.

Standardised CPUE in all areas suggested increases in recent years (Figure 5), with most notable increases in Cook Strait, and highly variable trends in raw CPUE in other areas. Although initial models were attempted for D’Urville Island and Northern Faces, the Shellfish Working Group decided that, due to recent reductions and spatial concentration of catch in these areas to a limited number of statistical areas, CPUE may not be representative of these areas as a whole anymore.

For Cook Strait, standardisation acted to reduce the rate of recent increases relative to raw CPUE alone. Client (ACE-holder) and diver ID had the strongest standardising effects for recent CPUE (Figure 6), due to concentration of ACE in the hands of a smaller number of efficient fishing operations in recent years. Nevertheless, recent increases in standardised CPUE are of the order of 50% since the TACC was reduced in 2016–17.

4.1.2 Relative abundance estimates from research diver surveys

The relative abundance of pāua in PAU 7 was also estimated from a number of independent research diver surveys (RDSI) undertaken in various years between 1992 and 2005. Concerns about the reliability of these data to estimate relative abundance instigated reviews in 2009 (Cordue 2009) and 2010 (Haist 2010). The reviews assessed i) the reliability of the research diver survey index as a proxy for abundance and ii) whether the RDSI, when used in the pāua stock assessment models, results in model outputs that adequately reflect the status of the stocks. Both reviews suggested that outputs from pāua stock assessments using the RDSI should be treated with caution. For a summary of the conclusions from the reviews refer to the Introduction – Pāua Working Group report.

4.1.3 Biomass survey and monitoring for earthquake affected areas

Following the 2016 Kaikōura earthquake, a biomass survey was implemented to estimate and monitor pāua abundance and recruitment in the earthquake-affected areas of PAU 7 and PAU 3 (now PAU 3A), to inform management decisions relating to the re-opening of the pāua fishery (McCowan & Neubauer 2018, 2022). To estimate abundance, novel methodologies using GPS dive loggers and underwater electronic callipers were developed. Thirty-five sites were initially surveyed to obtain baseline estimates of site- and fishery-level abundance and length frequency (LF).

Pāua were mostly found in aggregations, preferentially in shallow water. This was not just the case for small pāua but also for large individuals (i.e., over 120 mm), although smaller individuals (under 100 mm) showed a strongly decreasing trend with depth. Initially, estimated pāua density was 0.028 pāua per square metre (geometric mean; 95% confidence interval (CI) [0.009; 0.08]) across the earthquake-affected fishery closure. Scaling density estimates to total biomass or abundance was difficult due to the lack of robust estimates of habitat area for pāua. In the absence of a defensible solution, only density was calculated. After the first two years, the project has been extended for another three years until mid-2023. As of March 2022, four further rounds of surveys of the 35 initially surveyed sites have been undertaken to monitor pāua abundance and recruitment trends.




Figure 5: Raw CPUE (points are median with inter-quartile interval indicated by vertical intervals) and standardised CPUE index (line) with 95% confidence interval (shaded ribbon). Shading of points indicates the relative amount of data available for standardisation, showing low available data for D'Urville Island and Northern Faces in recent years.




Figure 6: Relative importance (in terms of proportion of variance explained) of standardising variables in the GLMM used to standardise PAU 7 CPUE.

Initially an assessment was made of the appropriateness of using the number of measurements per unit effort (MPUE) as a proxy for pāua density to overcome issues with missing data from GPS dive units (originally used to delimit area to estimate density) and to enable the use of significantly larger data sets of measurements and counts of pāua at each site. The measurements per unit effort, as well as biomass per unit of survey effort (BPUE; number of measurements multiplied by the length frequency distribution of measured pāua), correlated well ($R^2=0.86$) with density. Therefore, MPUE and BPUE were used as indices of changes in pāua density.

An overall increase in pāua abundance was observed at a QMA-wide level in both QMAs over the four survey periods (Figure 7). Increased abundance was generally more pronounced in PAU 7 than in PAU 3. In PAU 3, abundance trended slightly downwards in the second survey period, which was likely due to the consistently poor survey conditions during the period, as well as a potential bias towards sampling sites with lower rates of increase due to weather conditions. There was high variability in abundance trends across sites. This variability was in part related to variability in the amount of uplift at each site, because sites with a larger increase in abundance were those with less uplift (Figure 8). Variability in abundance trends across sites could also be linked to habitat related factors and pre-earthquake abundance. Comparison of length frequency profiles across the four survey periods showed reasonably stable profiles in larger size classes (125–160 mm; Figure 9), with an increase in the number of individuals in the 80–100 mm size range in both QMAs, which is likely to be indicative of post-earthquake recruitment. Recruitment signals were variable between sites due to differences in available recruitment habitat and variability in uplift.

4.2 Stock assessment methods

The 2021 stock assessment for PAU 7 used an updated version of the length-based population dynamics model described by Breen (et al. 2003), and the most recent assessment uses catch and commercial length frequency data up to the 2019–20 fishing year, as well as the above-mentioned CPUE index for years 2002–2021. Although the overall population-dynamics model remained unchanged from Breen et al. (2003), the PAU 7 stock assessment incorporates changes to the previous methodology first

introduced in the 2018 assessment of PAU 5D (Neubauer & Tremblay-Boyer 2019b). In addition, illegal and recreational catch were, for the first time, split from commercial catch, and illegal catch was modelled as taking pāua in proportion to abundance rather than according to commercial selectivity. Although commercial minimum harvest size (MHS) increased in recent years, recreational catch retained a logistic selectivity centred on the minimum legal size (MLS).




Figure 7: Marginal trend (relative to a geometric mean of 1) in biomass per unit effort (BPUE) across survey years for QMAs PAU 3 and PAU 7 from the BPUE model after accounting for confounding variables.




Figure 8: Marginal trend (relative to a geometric mean of 1 at each site) in biomass per unit effort (BPUE) across survey years for QMAs PAU 3 and PAU 7 from the BPUE model after accounting for confounding variables.




Figure 9: Length frequency profiles (as relative densities) for all pāua measured over four survey periods in PAU 3 and PAU 7. Vertical lines show the legal size of 125 mm (MLS; solid line), 135 mm (dashed line), and 140 mm (dotted line).

Due to substantial reductions in catch without evident effects on CPUE in D’Urville Island and Northern Faces, these areas were split from the Cook Strait area in initial assessment runs, which were performed using a spatial assessment model. In addition, the earthquake-affected area on the east coast of PAU 7 was excluded from the assessment, with surveys used to monitor rebuilding of the fishery in that area. Only the model for Cook Strait was accepted by the working group as a reasonable model for the current PAU 7 fishery. This model was subsequently run as a single area assessment. The model structure assumed a single-sex population residing in a single homogeneous area, with length classes from 70 mm to 170 mm in groups of 2 mm.

Growth was length-based, without reference to age, mediated through an estimated growth transition matrix that describes the probability of each length class to change at each time step. A growth prior was formulated from a meta-analysis of pāua growth across fished areas in New Zealand (Neubauer & Tremblay-Boyer 2019a), and the functional form of the resulting growth was encoded in a multivariate normal (Gaussian process) prior on the growth transition matrix. Pāua entered the partition following recruitment and were removed by natural mortality and fishing mortality.

The model simulated the population from 1965 to 2021. Catches were available for 1974–2021 at a broad spatial scale, although catches before the 1990s are considered highly uncertain. Catches were assumed to increase linearly from 0 in 1965 to the 1974 catch level (Figure 10). Detailed spatial reporting of catches is only available since 2002, when PCELR forms introduced recording of estimated catch for fine-scale statistical areas. Catches prior to 2002 were partitioned into regions using average catch splits for the first 4 years of PCELR data only (2002–2006), to avoid undue influences from reductions in catch from areas other than Cook Strait. Two different catch levels were initially tried to account for overall catch uncertainty in the assessment (Figure 10). Catches included commercial, recreational, customary, and illegal catch, and all catches occurred within the same time step.

Recruitment was assumed to take place at the beginning of the annual cycle, with recruitment deviates estimated from 1984 to 2017, and length at recruitment was defined by a uniform distribution with a range between 70 and 80 mm. Natural mortality in the base model was fixed at 0.12. The model estimated the commercial fishing selectivity, assumed to follow a logistic curve, with increases in recent

years due to changes in the minimum harvest size in some areas. The model was initiated with likelihood weights that were found to lead to subjectively appropriate fits to both CPUE and CSLF inputs in other areas (PAU 5, PAU 7), and relative fits for CPUE and CSLF data were examined based on model fits and residuals.




Figure 10: Assumed catch histories for industry management areas within PAU 7. Grey shading indicates components of the total catch, with the solid lines showing the base-case assumption of total catch (commercial, recreational, and illegal), including unreported catches prior to QMS entry of PAU 7, and the dashed line showing a sensitivity with high assumed pre-QMS catches.

The assessment calculated the following quantities from the marginal posterior distributions of various partitions of the biomass: the equilibrium (unfished) spawning stock biomass (SSB_0) assuming that recruitment is equal to the average recruitment, and the relative spawning and available biomass for 2021 (SSB_{2021} and B_{2021}^{Avail}) and for the projection (*Proj*) period (SSB_{Proj} and B_{Proj}^{Avail}). This assessment also reported the following fishery indicators:

Relative SSB	Estimated spawning stock biomass in the final year relative to unfished spawning stock biomass
Relative B^{Avail}	Estimated available biomass in the final year relative to unfished available stock biomass
$P(SSB_{2021} > 40\% SSB_0)$	Probability that the spawning stock biomass in 2021 was greater than 40% of the unfished spawning stock
$P(SSB_{2021} < 20\% SSB_0)$	Probability that the spawning stock biomass in 2021 was less than 20% of the unfished spawning stock (soft limit)
$P(SSB_{Proj} > 40\% SSB_0)$	Probability that projected future spawning stock biomass will be greater than 40% of the unfished spawning stock given assumed future catches
$P(SSB_{Proj} < 20\% SSB_0)$	Probability that projected future spawning stock biomass will be less than 20% of the unfished spawning stock given assumed future catches
$P(B_{Proj} > B_{2018})$	Probability that projected future biomass (spawning stock or available biomass) is greater than estimated biomass for the 2018 fishing year given assumed future catches

4.2.1 Estimated parameters

Parameters estimated in the assessment model and their assumed Bayesian priors are summarised in Table 4.

Table 4: A summary of key model parameters, lower bound, upper bound, type of prior, (U, uniform; N, normal; LN = lognormal; Beta = beta distribution), mean and standard deviation of the prior. Bounds for fixed parameters represent model sensitivities.

Parameter	Prior	μ	sd	Bounds	
				Lower	Upper
$\ln(R0)$	LN	13.5	10		
M	fixed	0.12		0.08	0.16
Steepness (h)	Beta(1,1) on (0.2;1)	0.6	0.23	0	1
Growth	MVN	From Neubauer & Tremblay-Boyer 2019b			
D_{50} (Length at 50% selectivity for recreational and commercial catch before adjustments for commercial minimum harvest size)	LN	125	6.25	100	145
D_{95-50} (Length between 50% and 95% selectivity the commercial catch)	LN	5.6	3	0.01	50
$\ln(\epsilon)$ (Recruitment deviations; 1985–2017)	LN	0	0.4		-

The observational data were:

- A standardised CPUE series covering 2002–2021 based on PCELR and ERS data.
- Commercial catch sampling length frequency from 1990 to 2020.
- Catches were assumed to be known without error, although a catch penalty was applied in the model.

4.3 Stock assessment results

The base model with $M=0.12$ estimated a steady reduction in spawning biomass from the beginning of the fishing history (assumed to be 1965) to the early 2000s (Figure 11), with a subsequent increase in biomass driven by trends in CPUE (see Figure 5) after considerable (40%) reductions in catch between 2001 and 2004 (Figure 10). The recovery largely stalled, and the stock started to decline again after a 15% shelving was lifted in 2007–08 (Figure 11). Although subsequent shelving from 2012–13 to 2014–15 reduced fishing pressure somewhat, these reductions did not lead to the desired increases in biomass. Current harvest rates, following the 50% TACC reduction in 2016–17, have approached target levels, and have led to a recent rebuild of the biomass to levels approaching target biomass levels.

The base model with $M=0.12$ and estimated growth gave a relatively good fit to CPUE and CSLF data. Although CPUE responded to reductions in catch in the early 2000s, leading to a strong subsequent increase in biomass, this initial increase in CPUE was partly explained by recruitment in the model. The latter suggests that the assumed productivity was not enough to explain the level of increase in CPUE in the early 2000s. By contrast, recent recruitment estimates were only slightly above average, suggesting that more recent increases were in line with assumed (and estimated) levels of productivity.

Alternative models investigated uncertainty in M , early (pre-PCELR) catch levels, steepness, and data weights. All models estimated very similar trends in biomass, with slightly different outcomes in terms of recent stock status; low M and high early catch scenarios had the lowest estimates of recent biomass with 27% and 31% of unfished spawning biomass in 2021. Despite these differences, all models suggested recent increases in biomass, with relatively rapid expected rebuilding under the base model (by 2026, Table 5).




Figure 11: Posterior distributions of relative spawning stock biomass (*SSB*, top panel) and trends in relative commercial exploitation rate (bottom panel) in the base case model for Cook Strait in PAU 7. Exploitation rate (*U*) is relative to the exploitation rate that would result in a stock depletion to 40% of unfished spawning biomass (U_{40}). The dark purple line shows the median of the posterior distribution, the 25th and 75th percentiles are shown as dark ribbons, with light ribbons representing the 95% confidence range of the distribution.

Table 5: Projections for key fishery indicators from the base case model: probabilities of being above 40% and 20% of unfished spawning biomass (SSB) [$P(SSB_{Proj} > 40\% SSB_0)$ and $P(SSB_{Proj} > 20\% SSB_0)$], the probability that SSB in the projection year is above current SSB, the posterior mean relative to SSB, the posterior mean relative available spawning biomass B_{Proj}^{Avail} , and the probability that the exploitation rate (U) in the projection year is above $U_{40\% SSB_0}$, the exploitation rate that leads to 40% SSB_0 . The total commercial catch (TCC) marked with * corresponds to current commercial catch (TACC at 74.6 t). Other projection scenarios show 20% catch reduction to 56 t and a 20% TACC increase (89.5 t). Simulation to equilibrium (assumed to have been reached after 50 projection years) are indicated with Eq. in the year column.

Region	TCC(t)	Year	$P(SSB_y > 0.4 \cdot SSB_0)$	$P(SSB_y < 0.2 \cdot SSB_0)$	$P(SSB_y > SSB_{cur})$	SSB_y	B_y^{avail}	$P(H_y > H_{0.4-SSB})$
Cook Strait	60	2021	0.09	0	1.00	0.33	0.12	0.51
Cook Strait	60	2022	0.26	0	0.92	0.36	0.14	0.10
Cook Strait	60	2023	0.40	0	0.96	0.38	0.17	0.03
Cook Strait	60	2024	0.49	0	0.97	0.40	0.20	0.01
Cook Strait	60	2025	0.56	0	0.98	0.42	0.23	0.01
Cook Strait	60	2026	0.62	0	0.98	0.43	0.25	0.01
Cook Strait	60	Eq.	0.98	0	1.00	0.58	0.45	0.00
Cook Strait	75	2021	0.09	0	1.00	0.33	0.12	0.51
Cook Strait	75	2022	0.26	0	0.92	0.36	0.14	0.32
Cook Strait	75	2023	0.37	0	0.93	0.38	0.17	0.19
Cook Strait	75	2024	0.43	0	0.93	0.39	0.19	0.13
Cook Strait	75	2025	0.48	0	0.94	0.40	0.21	0.10
Cook Strait	75	2026	0.52	0	0.94	0.41	0.23	0.08
Cook Strait	75	Eq.	0.85	0	0.98	0.51	0.36	0.01
Cook Strait	90	2021	0.09	0	1.00	0.33	0.12	0.51
Cook Strait	90	2022	0.26	0	0.92	0.36	0.14	0.54
Cook Strait	90	2023	0.34	0	0.87	0.37	0.16	0.41
Cook Strait	90	2024	0.39	0	0.85	0.38	0.18	0.33
Cook Strait	90	2025	0.40	0	0.84	0.39	0.19	0.28
Cook Strait	90	2026	0.43	0.01	0.85	0.39	0.20	0.25
Cook Strait	90	Eq.	0.55	0.03	0.81	0.42	0.26	0.18

4.3.1 Other factors

The stock assessment model assumed homogeneity in recruitment, and that natural mortality does not vary by size or year, and that growth has the same mean and variance throughout the entire area. However, it is known that pāua fisheries are spatially variable and that apparent growth and maturity in pāua populations can vary over very short distances. Variation in growth is addressed to some extent by having a stochastic growth transition matrix based on tagging data collected from a range of different locations. Similarly, the length frequency data are integrated across samples from many places. The effect of this integration across local areas is likely to make model results optimistic.

For instance, if some local stocks are fished very hard and others not fished, local recruitment failure can result due to the limited dispersal range of this species. Recruitment failure is a common observation in overseas abalone fisheries and may have been experienced in D’Urville and Northern Faces.

CPUE provides information on changes in relative abundance. However, CPUE is generally considered to be a poor index of stock abundance for pāua, due to the ability of divers to maintain catch rates by moving from area to area despite a decreasing biomass (hyperstability). Breen & Kim (2003) argued that standardised CPUE might be able to relate to the changes of abundance in a fully exploited fishery such as PAU 7, and a large decline in the CPUE is most likely to reflect a decline in the fishery. Analysis of CPUE currently relies on Pāua Catch Effort Landing Return (PCELR) forms and ERS, which record daily fishing time and catch per diver on a relatively small spatial scale. These data will likely remain the basis for stock assessments and formal management in the medium term.

Between October 2010 and 2018, a dive-logger data collection program was operated by the commercial industry to achieve fine-scale monitoring of pāua fisheries (Neubauer et al. 2014, Neubauer & Abraham 2014). Using fishing data logged at fine spatial and temporal scales can substantially improve effort calculations and the resulting CPUE indices and allow complex metrics such as spatial CPUE to be developed (Neubauer & Abraham 2014). Data from the loggers have been analysed to provide comprehensive descriptions of the spatial extent of the fisheries and insight on relationships between diver behaviour, CPUE, and changes in abundance on various spatial and temporal scale (Neubauer et al. 2014, Neubauer & Abraham 2014). However, the data-loggers, and recent changes to fine-scale electronic statutory reporting, can potentially change how the divers operate such that they may become more effective in their fishing operations (the divers become capable of avoiding areas that have been heavily fished or that have relatively low CPUE without them having to go there to discover this), therefore changing the meaning of diver CPUE (Butterworth et al. 2015, Neubauer 2017).

Commercial catch length frequencies provide information on changes in population structure under fishing pressure. However, if serial depletion has occurred and fishers have moved from area to area, samples from the commercial catch may not correctly represent the population of the entire stock. For PAU 7, there has been a long time series of commercial catch sampling and the spatial coverage of the available samples is generally considered to be adequate throughout the years.

Areas outside Cook Strait are now poorly monitored by CPUE. The declines in CPUE in areas that are fished (D’Urville and Northern Faces) and contribute to CPUE therefore may substantially underestimate the true extent of declines in these areas. While anecdotal evidence suggests that environmental factors have played a primary role in these declines, no firm conclusion can be reached about the relative contributions of environmental changes and fishing impacts on declines of pāua populations in the areas. Although these areas now only contribute very little to the commercial fishery, it is unclear whether these areas can be expected to recover, and in the absence of CPUE to monitor abundance there is currently a lack of information that can inform about local trends in these areas.

4.4 Updated management procedure

The development and evaluation of management procedures (MPs) for pāua is described in Section 5.4 of the pāua introductory chapter. MPs are being developed across all assessed QMAs using a common Management Procedure Evaluation (MPE) framework, with each QMA’s operating model conditioned on regional information for each stock. For PAU 7, MP development is ongoing.

4.5 Future research considerations

- Monitoring of biomass in areas where CPUE does not provide an index of biomass (D’Urville Island and Northern Faces).
- Continued monitoring of growth and maturation to understand effects of changing environment, particularly with respect to SST. This might also be achieved by meta-analysis across stocks and could include consideration of SST effects on CPUE across stocks. Consider including more of the east coast in the assessment, noting that this would need to be considered as a separate fishery due to recent earthquake impacts and new management settings.
- Estimate recreational harvest using approaches linked to stock size.
- Explore use of smaller time steps within the assessment model to improve fits to LF data.


5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

Stock Structure Assumptions

The 2022 assessment was conducted for Cook Strait (pāua Statistical Areas 711–730), but these include most (more than 90%) of the recent catch.

- **PAU 7- Marlborough**

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication	2022	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2020–21	Catch: -
Assessment Runs Presented	Base case MCMC	
Reference Points	Interim Target: 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: $U_{40\%B_0}$	
Status in relation to Target	Spawning stock biomass was estimated to be 33% B_0 and is Unlikely (< 40%) to be at or above the target	
Status in relation to Limits	Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below the soft and hard limits	
Status in relation to Overfishing	About as Likely as Not (40–60%) that overfishing is occurring	



Stock Projections or Prognosis	Five-year projections suggest that, at current catch levels, the biomass will be rebuilt to target levels by 2026.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Very Unlikely (< 10%) Hard Limit: Exceptionally Unlikely (< 1%)
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or commence	Unlikely (< 40%)

Assessment Methodology & Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 1 - Full Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Length based Bayesian model	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2022	Next assessment: 2027
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- CPUE indices PCELR & ERS series	1 – High Quality
	- Commercial sampling length frequencies	1 – High Quality
	Growth estimate priors	2 – Medium or mixed quality: fine scale spatial (and potentially temporal) variation in growth rates
Data not used (rank)	CELR CPUE series	3 – Low Quality: variable catchability and changes in technology
	FSU CPUE series	3 – Low Quality: poor recording
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	- Assessment area reduced to Cook Strait only, due to poor representation of other areas in fishery-dependent data in recent years - Changed growth to use a prior derived from meta-analysis, model does not explicitly fit to PAU 7 growth data (deemed poorly representative of spatial growth variation) - Fixed M in base case (estimated M from this model is consistent with previous estimate and current fixed value) - Length frequency likelihood logistic normal, rather than multinomial	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Recruitment: length composition data available to the stock assessment provide little information about relative year class strengths - Assessment model is sensitive to natural mortality, which is poorly quantified - Early catch history: Pre QMS pāua exports exceeded catches reported to FMAs, and it is unclear which areas these catches came from	

Qualifying Comments
-This assessment covers only the Cook Strait component of the catch. The stock appears to be depleted in D'Urville and Northern Faces. - The East Coast portion of the QMA was closed to fishing following the Kaikōura earthquake in 2016, and subsequent surveys suggest an appreciable increase.

Fishery Interactions
-

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION


- Andrew, N L; Breen, P A; Kendrick, T H; Naylor, J R (2000) Stock assessment of PAU 7 for 1998–99. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/48*. 22 p.
- Andrew, N L; Naylor, J R; Gerring, P (1999) A modified timed–swim method for paua stock assessment. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/4*. 23 p.
- Breen, P A; Andrew, N L; Kendrick, T H (2000) Stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 5B and PAU 5D using a new length-based model. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/33*. 37 p.
- Breen, P A; Kim, S W (2003) The 2003 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 7. *New Zealand Fishery Assessment Report 2003/41*. 119 p.
- Breen, P A; Kim, S W (2005) The stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2005/47*. 114 p.
- Breen, P A; Kim, S W; Andrew, N L (2003) A length-based Bayesian stock assessment model for abalone. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 54(5): 619–634.
- Butterworth, D; Haddon, M; Haist, V; Helidoniotis, F (2015) Report on the New Zealand Paua stock assessment model; 2015. *New Zealand Fisheries Science Review 2015/4*. 31 p.
- Chen, Y; Breen, P A; Andrew, N L (2000) Impacts of outliers and mis-specification of priors on Bayesian fish stock assessment. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 57: 2293–2305.
- Cordue, P L (2009) Analysis of PAU 5A diver survey data and PCELR catch and effort data. SeaFic and PAUMac 5 report. 45 p. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Francis, R I C C (2011) Data weighting in statistical fisheries stock assessment models. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 68(6): 1124–1138.
- Fu, D (2012) The 2011 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2012/27*. 57 p.
- Fu, D; McKenzie, A; Naylor, R (2012) Summary of input data for the PAU 7 stock assessment for the 2010–11. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2012/26*.
- Gerring, P; Andrew, N L; Naylor, J R (2003) Incidental fishing mortality of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in the PAU 7 commercial fishery. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2003/56*. 13 p.
- Gorfine, H K; Dixon, C D (2000) A behavioural rather than resource-focused approach may be needed to ensure sustainability of quota managed abalone fisheries. *Journal of Shellfish Research* 19: 515–516.
- Haist, V (2010) Paua research diver surveys: review of data collected and simulation study of survey method. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2010/38*. 54 p.
- Heinemann A; Gray, A. (2024) National Panel Survey of Recreational Marine Fishers 2022–23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/51*. 116 p.
- McCowan, T; Neubauer, P (2018) Paua biomass estimates and population monitoring in areas affected by the November 2016 Kaikoura earthquake. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2018/54*. 24 p.
- McCowan, T; Neubauer, P (2021) Pāua abundance trends and population monitoring in areas affected by the November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2021/26*. 23 p.
- McCowan, T A; Neubauer, P (2022) Pāua abundance trends and population monitoring in areas affected by the November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake, December 2021 update. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/15*. 20 p.
- McKenzie, A (2004) Alternative CPUE standardisation for PAU 7. NIWA Client Report WLG2004-74. 18 p.
- McKenzie, A (2010) CPUE standardisation for PAU 7 in 2010. NIWA Client Report, WLG2010-29. 12 p.
- McKenzie, A; Smith, A N H (2009a) Data inputs for the PAU 7 stock assessment in 2008. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2009/33*. 34 p.
- McKenzie, A; Smith, A N H (2009b) The 2008 stock assessment of paua (*Haliotis iris*) in PAU 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2009/34*. 86 p.
- McShane, P E; Naylor, J R (1995) Small-scale spatial variation in growth, size at maturity, and yield- and egg-per-recruit relations in the New Zealand abalone *Haliotis iris*. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 29: 603–612.
- Neubauer, P. (2017) Spatial bias in pāua (*Haliotis iris*) catch-per-unit-effort. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2017/57*. 33 p.
- Nuebauer, P. (2023) The 2022 stock assessment of pāua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 7. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2023/17*. 46 p.
- Neubauer, P; Abraham, E (2014) Using GPS logger data to monitor change in the PAU7 pāua (*Haliotis iris*) fishery. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/31*. 18 p.
- Neubauer, P; Abraham, E; Knox, C; Richard, Y (2014) Assessing the performance of pāua (*Haliotis iris*) fisheries using GPS logger data. Final Research Report for Ministry for Primary Industries project PAU2011-03 (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Neubauer, P; Tremblay-Boyer, L (2019a) Input data for the 2018 stock assessment of pāua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/38*. 44 p.
- Neubauer, P; Tremblay-Boyer, L (2019b) The 2018 stock assessment of pāua (*Haliotis iris*) for PAU 5D. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/39*. 58 p.
- Pirker, J G (1992) Growth, shell–ring deposition and mortality of paua (*Haliotis iris* Martyn) in the Kaikoura region. MSc thesis, University of Canterbury. 165 p.
- Punt, A E (2003) The performance of a size-structured stock assessment method in the face of spatial heterogeneity in growth. *Fisheries Research* 65: 391–409.
- Sainsbury, K J (1982) Population dynamics and fishery management of the paua, *Haliotis iris*. 1. Population structure, growth, reproduction and mortality. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 16: 147–161.
- Schiel, D R (1989) Paua fishery assessment 1989. *New Zealand Fishery Assessment Research Document 1989/9*: 20 p.
- Schiel, D R (1992) The paua (abalone) fishery of New Zealand. In: Shepherd, S A; Tegner, M J; Guzman del Proo, S (Eds.), *Abalone of the World: Biology, fisheries, and culture*. Blackwell Scientific, Oxford.
- Schiel, D R; Breen, P A (1991) Population structure, ageing and fishing mortality of the New Zealand abalone *Haliotis iris*. *Fishery Bulletin* 89: 681–691.

PĀUA (PAU 7) – May 2026

- Shepherd, S A; Partington, D (1995) Studies on Southern Australian abalone (genus *Haliotis*). XVI. Recruitment, habitat and stock relations. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 46: 669–680.
- Will, M C; Gemmell, N J (2008) Genetic Population Structure of Black Foot paua. (Unpublished report for GEN2007A, held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 37 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–2018. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/24*. 104 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Hill, L; Heinemann, A (2014) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2011–12: Harvest Estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/67*. 139 p.

PILCHARD (PIL)

(*Sardinops sagax*)
Mohimohi

**1. FISHERY SUMMARY**

Pilchards were introduced into the QMS in October 2002 with allowances, TACCs and TACs as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs and TACs (t) for pilchard by Fishstock from 1 October 2024.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary Non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
PIL 1	20	10	0	2 000	2 030
PIL 2	10	5	0	200	215
PIL 3	5	2	0	60	67
PIL 4	3	2	0	10	15
PIL 7	10	5	6	115	136
PIL 8	10	5	7	135	157
PIL 10	–	–	–	0	0

1.1 Commercial fisheries

Pilchards occur around most of New Zealand, however, commercial fisheries have only developed in north-eastern waters (east Northland to Bay of Plenty), and in Tasman Bay and Marlborough Sounds at the north of the South Island. Historical estimated and recent reported pilchard landings and TACCs are shown in Tables 2, 3, and 4, while Figure 1 shows the historical and recent landings and TACC values for the main pilchard stocks.

The first recorded commercial landings of pilchards were in 1931 (Table 2), but a minor fishery existed before this. Informal sales, mainly as bait, or as food for zoos and public aquariums, were unreported. A fishery for pilchards developed in the Marlborough Sounds in 1939 and operated through the war years providing canned fish for the armed forces. Landings reached over 400 t in 1942, but the fishery was unsuccessful for a variety of reasons and ceased in 1950. Between 1950 and 1990 landings were generally less than 20 t, intermittently reaching 70–80 t.

From 1990–91 the northeastern fishery was developed by vessels using both lampara nets and purse seines (Table 4). Lampara netting was the main method in the first couple of years, and continued at a low level through the 1990s. From 1993–94 onwards, purse seining became the dominant method. A diminishing catch (less than 10 t annually) was caught by beach seine. Almost all the pilchard catch

(particularly in the northeastern fishery) is targeted. A small catch (less than 10 t annually), has been recorded as a bycatch of jack mackerel targeting.

Table 2: Reported landings (t) for the main QMAs from 1931 to 1982.

Year	PIL 1	PIL 2	PIL 3	PIL 4	PIL 7	PIL 8	Year	PIL 1	PIL 2	PIL 3	PIL 4	PIL 7	PIL 8
1931–32	5	0	0	0	0	0	1960	3	3	0	0	3	0
1932–33	4	0	0	0	0	0	1961	0	8	0	0	8	0
1933–34	2	0	0	0	0	0	1962	0	1	0	0	1	0
1934–35	0	0	0	0	0	0	1963	0	0	0	0	0	0
1935–36	0	0	0	0	0	0	1964	0	0	0	0	0	0
1936–37	0	0	0	0	0	0	1965	2	0	0	0	1	0
1937–38	0	0	0	0	0	0	1966	3	0	0	0	0	0
1938–39	0	0	0	0	0	0	1967	8	0	0	0	0	1
1939–40	0	5	0	0	5	0	1968	8	2	0	0	0	0
1940–41	3	41	0	0	49	0	1969	3	4	0	0	7	0
1941–42	15	73	0	0	79	0	1970	1	0	1	0	81	0
1942–43	0	69	0	0	69	0	1971	1	0	0	0	0	0
1943–44	0	9	0	0	9	0	1972	0	0	8	0	0	0
1944	0	0	0	0	217	0	1973	0	67	0	0	3	0
1945	0	0	0	0	74	0	1974	18	1	0	0	0	0
1946	0	0	0	0	61	0	1975	2	0	0	0	0	0
1947	0	0	0	0	5	0	1976	6	0	0	0	0	0
1948	0	0	0	0	46	0	1977	20	0	0	0	0	0
1949	0	0	0	0	11	0	1978	5	0	0	0	0	0
1950	0	0	0	0	0	0	1979	1	0	2	0	0	0
1951	0	0	0	0	0	0	1980	1	16	0	0	24	0
1952	0	0	0	0	9	0	1981	0	8	0	0	8	0
1953	0	0	0	0	0	0	1982	0	16	0	0	16	0
1954	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1955	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1956	4	0	0	0	0	0							
1957	2	0	0	0	0	0							
1958	8	0	0	0	0	0							
1959	3	2	0	0	2	0							
1960	3	3	0	0	3	0							

Notes:

1. The 1931–1943 years are April–March but from 1944 onwards are calendar years.
2. Data are from fishing returns based on reported landings by harbour and are likely to be underestimated as a result of under-reporting and discarding practices. Data includes both foreign and domestic landings.

Total annual landings increased steadily from 1990 as the fishery developed in northeastern waters, reaching over 1200 t in 1999–00, and almost 1500 t in 2000–01. Total commercial landings declined consistently after 2003–04, largely influenced by catches from PIL 1, and since 2010–11 have been between 221 and 624t. Landings in PIL 1 have been below the TACC since this stock was introduced to the QMS in 2002, declining to 129 t in 2019–20. Landings in PIL 7 have generally been low, but reached 93 t in 2001–02, and 233 t in 2017–18, exceeding the 150 t TACC. The TACC was reduced to 115 t in 2024–25. Landings in PIL 8 have fluctuated between 12 t and 162 t since this stock was introduced to the QMS. The sudden increase in catches in PIL 8 from 2000–2001 to 2005–06 was thought to be in part the result of previously unreported catches now being reported due to the species being introduced to the QMS. After 2006 landings in PIL 8 exceeded the TACC in 2007–08, 2013–14, 2017–18 and 2019–20. The TACC was increased to 135 t in 2024–25.

Table 3: Reported total New Zealand landings (t) of pilchard from 1931 to 1990.

Year	Landings	Year	Landings	Year	Landings	Year	Landings	Year	Landings	Year	Landings
1931	5	1941	168	1951	0	1961	17	1971	1	1981	17
1932	4	1942	418	1952	9	1962	2	1972	8	1982	32
1933	2	1943	219	1953	0	1963	0	1973	70	1983	-
1934	0	1944	218	1954	0	1964	1	1974	19	1984	-
1935	0	1945	74	1955	0	1965	3	1975	2	1975	49
1936	0	1946	61	1956	4	1966	3	1976	6	1986	29
1937	0	1947	5	1957	2	1967	9	1977	20	1987	70
1938	0	1948	46	1958	8	1968	10	1978	6	1988	6
1939	10	1949	11	1959	7	1969	15	1979	4	1989	1
1940	93	1950	0	1960	8	1970	83	1980	41	1990	2

Source: Annual reports on fisheries and subsequent MAF data.

A 2000 t annual Commercial Catch Limit (CCL) was introduced for FMA 1 from 01 October 2000. The CCL was subject to a logbook programme, a catch spreading arrangement and the avoidance of areas

of particular importance to non-commercial fishers. The CCL was superseded when the PIL 1 stock was introduced to the QMS with a TACC of 2000 t on 1st October 2002.

Table 4: Reported landings (t) of pilchard by Fishstock from 1990–91 to present.

QMA	PIL 1		PIL 2		PIL 3		PIL 7		PIL 8		Total	
	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land.	Land.	Land.	Land.	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC
1990–91	15	-	0	-	0	-	9	-	< 1	-	25	-
1991–92	59	-	0	-	0	-	< 1	-	0	-	59	-
1992–93	163	-	2	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	164	-
1993–94	258	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	-	259	-
1994–95	317	-	0	-	0	-	< 1	-	< 1	-	317	-
1995–96	168	-	< 1	-	0	-	2	-	0	-	170	-
1996–97	419	-	0	-	0	-	2	-	< 1	-	421	-
1997–98	440	-	0	-	0	-	1	-	0	-	447	-
1998–99	785	-	0	-	< 1	-	2	-	1	-	788	-
1999–00	1 227	-	0	-	0	-	4	-	< 1	-	1 231	-
2000–01	1 290	-	0	-	0	-	12	-	188	-	1 491	-
2001–02	574	-	0	-	0	-	93	-	129	-	796	-
2002–03	792	2 000	0	200	0	60	8	150	153	65	953	2 485
2003–04	1 284	2 000	0	200	< 1	60	1	150	34	65	1 320	2 485
2004–05	853	2 000	0	200	< 1	60	< 1	150	106	65	959	2 485
2005–06	892	2 000	< 1	200	< 1	60	2	150	116	65	1 010	2 485
2006–07	808	2 000	0	200	0	60	11	150	45	65	864	2 485
2007–08	635	2 000	0	200	0	60	10	150	71	65	716	2 485
2008–09	644	2 000	< 1	200	0	60	3	150	23	65	670	2 485
2009–10	599	2 000	0	200	4	60	10	150	54	65	667	2 485
2010–11	319	2 000	< 1	200	< 1	60	2	150	12	65	333	2 485
2011–12	178	2 000	0	200	< 1	60	< 1	150	42	65	221	2 485
2012–13	332	2 000	< 1	200	0	60	2	150	58	65	391	2 485
2013–14	255	2 000	< 1	200	< 1	60	13	150	97	65	365	2 485
2014–15	210	2 000	< 1	200	< 1	60	6	150	19	65	235	2 485
2015–16	261	2 000	0	200	0	60	19	150	44	65	324	2 485
2016–17	226	2 000	0	200	0	60	21	150	37	65	284	2 485
2017–18	229	2 000	< 1	200	0	60	233	150	162	65	624	2 485
2018–19	203	2 000	< 1	200	0	60	78	150	63	65	343	2 485
2019–20	129	2 000	< 1	200	< 1	60	18	150	115	65	262	2 485
2020–21	257	2 000	< 1	200	< 1	60	82	150	92	65	431	2 485
2021–22	70	2 000	< 1	200	< 1	60	31	150	92	65	194	2 485
2022–23	146	2 000	< 1	200	< 1	60	72	150	62	65	279	2 485
2023–24	196	2 000	< 1	200	0	60	15	150	100	65	311	2 485
2024–25	403	2 000	< 1	200	< 1	60	24	115	128	135	555	2 520




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the two main PIL stocks. PIL 1 (Auckland East). [Continued on next page]




Figure 1 [Continued]: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the two main PIL stocks. PIL 7 (West coast South Island), PIL 8 (Central Egmont, Auckland West).

1.2 Recreational fisheries

Recreational fishers seldom target pilchards, except for bait. However bait is generally bought in commercially frozen packs (the main product of the commercial fishery). Pilchard may be caught accidentally in small mesh nets that are set or dragged to catch mullet, or on small hooks fished from wharves.

Table 5: Recreational harvest estimates for pilchard stocks (Wynne-Jones et al 2014; 2019, Heinemann & Gray 2024). Mean fish weights were not available from boat ramp surveys to convert these catches to tonnes.

Stock	Year	Method	Number of fish	Total weight (t)	CV
PIL 1	2011–12	Panel survey	6 888	-	0.33
	2017–18	Panel survey	14 876	-	0.46
	2011–23	Panel survey	4 596	-	0.71
PIL 2	2011–12	Panel survey	1 022	-	0.83
	2017–18	Panel survey	2 875	-	0.63
	2011–23	Panel survey	-	-	-
PIL 3	2011–12	Panel survey	9 144	-	0.99
	2017–18	Panel survey	4 407	-	1.00
	2011–23	Panel survey	-	-	-
PIL 7	2011–12	Panel survey	101	-	1.05
	2017–18	Panel survey	10 346	-	0.74
	2011–23	Panel survey	-	-	-
PIL 8	2011–12	Panel survey	137	-	1.01
	2017–18	Panel survey	27 864	-	0.91
	2011–23	Panel survey	11 293	-	0.99

A National Panel Survey of recreational fishers was conducted for the first time throughout the 2011–12 fishing year. The panel survey used face-to-face interviews of a random sample of 30 390 New

Zealand households to recruit a panel of fishers and non-fishers for a full year (Wynne-Jones et al 2014). The panel members were contacted regularly about their fishing activities and harvest information collected in standardised phone interviews. The national panel survey was repeated during the 2017–18 and 2022–23 fishing years using very similar methods to produce directly comparable results (Wynne-Jones et al 2019; Heinemann & Gray 2024). Recreational catch estimates from the three national panel surveys are given in Table 5. Note that national panel survey estimates do not include recreational harvest taken on charter vessel trips or under s111 general approvals.

1.3 Customary non-commercial catch

Pilchards were known by the early Maori as mohimohi, and could have been taken in fine mesh nets, but there are very few accounts of pilchard capture and use. An estimate of the current customary non-commercial catch is not available.

1.4 Illegal catch

There is no known illegal catch of pilchards.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

Some accidental captures by vessels purse seining for jack mackerel or kahawai may be discarded if no market is available. Pilchard mortality is known to be high in some places as a result of scale loss resulting from net contact.

2. BIOLOGY

The taxonomy of *Sardinops* is complex. The New Zealand pilchard was previously identified as *Sardinops neopilchardus*, but there is now considered to be a single species, *S. sagax*, with several regional subspecies or populations.

Pilchard are generally found inshore, particularly in gulfs, bays, and harbours. They display seasonal changes in abundance (e.g. locally abundant in Wellington Harbour during spring), reflecting schooling and dispersal behaviour, localised movement, and actual changes in population size. The geographical extent of their movements in New Zealand is unknown.

Their vertical distribution in the water column varies, but on the inner shelf they move between the surface and the seafloor. Pilchards form compact schools (known as ‘meatballs’), particularly during summer, and these are heavily preyed upon by larger fishes, seabirds, and marine mammals and are thought to form an important part of the diet for many species. There have been no biological studies that are directly relevant to the recognition of separate stocks.

Spawning is recorded from many coastal regions over the shelf during spring and summer. The pelagic eggs are at times extremely abundant. Otolith readings suggest that pilchard are relatively fast growing and short-lived. They reach a maximum length of about 25 cm, and perhaps 9 years, but the main size range is of 10–20 cm fish, 2 to 6 years old. Maturity is probably at age 2. The Intrinsic Productivity Level is categorised as High for this species.

A study on the feeding of Northland pilchards found that phytoplankton was probably the dominant food, but organic detritus was also important, and small zooplankton - mainly copepods - were taken and at times were the main component. Feeding by females diminished during the spawning season. Although they generally comprise single-species schools, pilchards associate with other small pelagic fishes, particularly anchovy. In northern waters they also occur with juvenile jack mackerel, and in southern waters with sprats.

Biological parameters relevant to stock assessment are shown in Table 6.

During the 1990s pilchard populations were severely impacted by natural mass mortalities, generally attributed to a herpes virus. The first outbreak occurred in Australia and New Zealand in 1995 and Australia experienced another outbreak in 1998.

Table 6: Estimates of biological parameters.

Fishstock	Estimate	Source
<u>1. Natural mortality (<i>M</i>)</u>		
PIL 1	$M = 0.66$	NIWA, unpublished estimate ¹
PIL 1	$M = 0.46$	NIWA, unpublished estimate ²
<u>2. Weight = a (length)^b</u>		
	<u>Both sexes combined</u>	
PIL 1	$a = 2.2$	Paul et al (2001) ³
PIL 7	$a = 3.7$	Baker (1972) ⁴

Notes:

1. Hoenig's rule-of-thumb estimate, maximum age = 7 years.
2. Hoenig's rule-of-thumb estimate, maximum age = 10 years.
3. Fork length in mm, weight in g, $n = 493$.
4. Standard length in mm, weight in g, $n = 660$.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

No biological information is available on which to make an assessment on whether separate pilchard biological stocks exist in New Zealand (in Australia there is evidence of small differences between some populations off the southwest coast).

Pilchard and anchovy are often caught together. Pilchard fishstock boundaries are fully aligned with those for anchovy.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

There have been no stock assessments of New Zealand pilchard.

4.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

No fishery parameters are available.

4.2 Biomass estimates

No estimates of biomass are available.

4.3 Yield estimates and projections

(i) Northeast North Island (PIL 1)

MCY has been estimated using the equation $MCY = cY_{AV}$ (Method 4). The most appropriate Y_{AV} was considered the average of landings for the three years 1998–99 to 2000–01. Although a brief period, three years represents at least half the exploited life span for this species. The mean of these landings is 1101 t. With provisional values of M about 0.4 or 0.6, the value of c becomes 0.6 (i.e. high natural variability).

1998–99 to 2000–01

$$\begin{aligned}
 MCY &= 0.6 \times 1101 \text{ t} \\
 &= 661 \text{ t (rounded to 660 t)}
 \end{aligned}$$

However, the *MCY* approach is considered to be of limited value for pilchards, because this fishery has been developing rapidly, was historically infrequently targeted, and since 2000 has been subject to a CCL and more recently a TACC. The level of risk to the stock by harvesting the northeast North Island population at the estimated *MCY* value cannot be determined.

(ii) Tasman Bay/Marlborough Sounds (PIL 7)

MCY cannot be estimated for this region because the fishery has been largely unexploited since the 1940s, and no appropriate biological parameters exist.

(iii) Other regions

MCY cannot be estimated because of insufficient information, and absence of fisheries.

Current biomass cannot be estimated, so CAY cannot be determined.

4.4 Other factors

It is likely that pilchard, although not strongly migratory, will vary considerably in their regional abundance over time. The larger vessels in the fleet that targets them are capable of travelling moderate distances to the best grounds. Thus, while the resource may have a relatively localised distribution, the catching sector of the fishery does not. Should the pilchard fishery develop again after its recent decline it is likely to become one component of a set of fisheries for small pelagic species (anchovy, sprats, and small jack mackerels). Mixed catches will be inevitable.

Pilchard is abundant in some New Zealand regions. However, it is unlikely that the biomass is comparable to the very large stocks of pilchard (sardine) in some world oceans where strong upwelling promotes high productivity. It is more likely that the New Zealand pilchard comprises abundant but localised coastal populations, comparable to those of southern Australia. They appear to be adaptable feeders, able to utilise food items from organic detritus through phytoplankton to zooplankton. East Northland is a region where under neutral to El Niño conditions moderately productive upwelling predominates but, in La Niña years, downwelling and oceanic water incursion will limit recruitment and may affect adult condition and survival.

In those regions of the world where small pelagic fishes are particularly abundant and have been well studied, there is often a reciprocal relationship between the stock size of pilchard and anchovy, as well as great variability in their overall abundance. Many pilchard/anchovy fisheries have undergone boom-and-bust cycles. In both Australia and New Zealand, pilchard have been affected by mass mortality events, the two in Australia are estimated to have each killed over 70% of the adult fish. The mortality rate of the 1995 event in New Zealand is not known, but was high. In combination, these features of the pilchard's biology suggest that the yield from the New Zealand stock will be variable, both short-term (annual) and long-term (decadal).

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

For all Fishstocks there is insufficient information to estimate current stock status.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION


- Baker, A N (1972) Reproduction, early life history, and age-growth relationships of the New Zealand pilchard, *Sardinops neopilchardus* (Steindachner). *Fisheries Research Bulletin* No. 5. 64 p.
- Heinemann A; Gray, A. (2024) National Panel Survey of Recreational Marine Fishers 2022-23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2024/51. 116 p.
- Jacobson, L D; De Oliveira, J A A; Barange, M; Cisneros-Mata, M A; Félix-Uraga, R; Hunter, J R; Kim, J Y; Matsuura, Y; Niqueen, M; Porteiro, C; Rothschild, B; Sanchez, R P; Serra, R; Uriarte, A; Wada, T (2001) Surplus production, variability, and climate change in the great sardine and anchovy fisheries. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 58(9): 1891–1903.
- Paul, L J; Bradford-Grieve, J M; Tasker, R A; Chang, F H; Manning, M J (2005) Guts, gill rakers, and ENSO oceanography: a pilot study on feeding patterns in the New Zealand pilchard, *Sardinops sagax*, off east Northland. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Research Project PIL2003/01, Objective 1. 30 p. (Unpublished Report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington).
- Paul, L J; Taylor, P R; Parkinson, D M (2001) Pilchard (*Sardinops neopilchardus*) biology and fisheries in New Zealand, and a review of pilchard (*Sardinops*, *Sardina*) biology, fisheries, and research in the main world fisheries. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report* 2001/37. 44 p.
- Schwartzlose, R A; Ahleith, J; Bakun, A; Baumgartner, T R; Cloete, R; Crawford, R J M; Fletcher, W; Green-Ruiz, Y; Hagen, E; Kawasaki, T; Lluch-Belda, D; Lluch-Cota, S E; MacCall, A D; Matsuura, Y; Nevarez-Martínez, M O; Parrish, R H; Roy, C; Serra, R; Shust, K V; Ward, M N; Zuzunaga, J Z (1999) Worldwide large-scale fluctuations of sardine and anchovy populations. *South African Journal of Marine Science* 21: 289–347.
- Ward, T M; Hoedt, F; McLeay, L; Dimmlich, W F; Kinloch, M; Jackson, G; McGarvey, R; Rogers, P J; Jones, K (2001) Effects of the 1995 and 1998 mass mortality events on the spawning biomass of sardine, *Sardinops sagax*, in South Australian waters. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 58(4): 865–875.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–2018.

PILCHARD (PIL) – May 2026

Draft New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report held by Fisheries New Zealand.
Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Hill, L; Heinemann, A (2014) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2011–12: Harvest Estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/67*.

INTRODUCTION – PIPI (PPI)

(*Paphies australis*)
Pipi



1. FISHERY SUMMARY

Pipi are important shellfish both commercially and for non-commercial fishers. PPI 1A (Whangarei harbour) was introduced into the Quota Management System (QMS) on 1 October 2004; the other PPI stocks listed in Table 1 were introduced in October 2005. TACs, TACCs, and allowances are presented in Table 1.

For assessment purposes, an individual report on the largest commercial fishery, PPI 1A, has been produced separately.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs and TACs (t) for pipi by Fishstock.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
PPI 1A	25	25	0	200	250
PPI 1B	76	76	8	0	160
PPI 1C	115	115	10	3	243
PPI 2	3	3	1	0	7
PPI 3	9	9	1	0	19
PPI 4	1	1	1	0	3
PPI 5	1	1	1	0	3
PPI 7	1	1	1	1	4
PPI 8	1	1	1	0	3
PPI 9	10	10	1	0	21

Since 1992, Fisheries New Zealand and its predecessors has commissioned biomass surveys for cockles and pipi in the northern North Island on beaches where there is known recreational and customary fishing pressure. The objective of the surveys is to determine the distribution, abundance, and size frequency of cockles and pipi on selected beaches in the Auckland Fisheries Management Areas (FMA 1 and FMA 9).

Over the years, a total of 37 beaches have been monitored. On average, 12 beaches are sampled each year (Berkenbusch & Hill-Moana 2025). The last survey was conducted in 2026 (Berkenbusch & Hill-Moana 2026). Pipi were present at eight sites, Bowentown Beach, Grahams Beach, Hokianga Harbour, Little Waihi Estuary, Marsden Bank, Ngunguru Estuary, and Whangamatā and Whangateau harbours. Pipi abundance estimates ranged from 0.17 million (CV: 15.76%) pipi at Bowentown Beach to 115.37 million (CV: 12.77%) pipi at Little Waihi Estuary. The pipi population at Little Waihi Estuary also had the highest density estimate of 695 pipi per m². Density estimates were also high (i.e., several hundred individuals per m²) at Hokianga Harbour, Marsden Bank, and Ngunguru Estuary. The CV values associated with the estimates were above 20% at Grahams Beach and Whangateau Harbour, in spite of increased sampling effort aimed at lowering the uncertainty of the estimates. At both sites, pipi were highly localised. At Grahams Beach, the low abundance of pipi and their patchy distribution (of mostly recruits) led to high uncertainty around the population estimates. At Whangateau Harbour, pipi were confined to a designated pipi bed, but missing from the overall sampling extent, leading to the high CV value for the population estimate overall.

The tools employed to manage these fisheries include daily bag limits and seasonal, temporary, and permanent closures. Size limits are also an option, but these are not currently in use. Customary management tools such as 186A closures, taiāpure, and mātaītai may also be implemented at the request of tangata whenua. The fishing pressure and the depletion of some shellfish beds have led to the introduction of a range of the above measures at finer spatial scales which can be found on the MPI website: [Customary fisheries management areas, rules, and maps](#) and in Table 1:

Table 1: Management measures at fine spatial scales.

Mātaītai reserves	Bay of Plenty Waikato	Aotea Harbour and adjacent waters Marokopa
Temporary closures to shellfish harvesting under s186A of the Act	Northland Auckland Auckland Coromandel Gisborne Gisborne Napier Taranaki	Tutukaka Harbour, Ngunguru Bay, Ngunguru River, Horahora River and surrounding areas (Rehuotane Ki Tai) Marsden bank and Mair Bank Ōmaha Bay and Kawau Bay Te Mātā and Waipatukahu Tangoiro/Waihirere Motuoroi Te Ohoho O Parapara Rāhui Western Taranaki
Closures gazetted under s11 sustainability measures	Northland Northland Auckland	Ngunguru estuary Whangateau Harbour Cockle Bay
Fisheries (Amateur Fishing) Regulations 2013 Permanent shellfish closures		Cheltenham Eastern Beach
Taiāpure	Waikato	Kawhia Aotea

1.1 Commercial fisheries

Commercial catches are measured in greenweight. The largest commercial fishery was in PPI 1A until Mair Bank was closed to fishing in 2014 due to historically low biomass.

Regulations require that all commercial gathering is conducted done by hand. Fishers typically use a mask and snorkel. There is no minimum legal size (MLS) for pipi, although fishers probably favour larger pipi (over 60 mm shell length). There is no apparent seasonality in the pipi fishery, because pipi are available for harvest year-round.

Some commercial catch was taken from PPI 1C during the 2005–06 to 2009–10 fishing years, but no landings have been reported since 2010 (Table 3 and Figure 1). The great majority of commercial catch was reported from PPI 1A until 2011–12 (see PPI 1A Working Group report). Pipi can be returned to the sea under the Fisheries (Landings and Discards) Notice if likely to survive on return.

New Zealand operates a mandatory shellfish quality assurance programme for all areas of commercial growing or harvesting bivalve shellfish for human consumption. Shellfish caught outside this

programme can be sold only for bait. This programme is based on international best practice and is managed by Food Safety New Zealand in cooperation with the District Health Board Public Health Units and the shellfish industry¹. Before any area can be used to grow or harvest bivalve shellfish, public health officials survey both the water catchment area to identify any potential pollution issues and microbiologically sample water and shellfish over at least a 12-month period, so that all seasonal influences are explored. This information is evaluated and, if suitable, the area is classified and listed by New Zealand Food Safety for harvest. There is then a requirement for regular monitoring of the water and shellfish flesh to verify levels of microbiological and chemical contaminants. Management measures stemming from this testing include closure after rainfall to deal with microbiological contamination from runoff. Natural marine biotoxins can also cause health risks, so testing also occurs for this at regular intervals. If toxins are detected above the permissible level, the harvest areas are closed until the levels fall below the permissible level. Products are also traceable so the source and time of harvest can always be identified in case of contamination.

Table 3: Reported commercial landings and TACC of pipi (t greenweight) for PPI 1C from 2004–05 to present.

Year	Landings	TACC	Year	Landings	TACC	Year	Landings	TACC
2004–05	0	3	2014–15	0	3	2024–25	0	3
2005–06	0.86	3	2015–16	0	3			
2006–07	1.69	3	2016–17	0	3			
2007–08	1.80	3	2017–18	0	3			
2008–09	0.38	3	2018–19	0	3			
2009–10	0.62	3	2019–20	0	3			
2010–11	0	3	2020–21	0	3			
2011–12	0	3	2021–22	0	3			
2012–13	0	3	2022–23	0	3			
2013–14	0	3	2023–24	0	3			




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for PPI 1C (Hauraki Gulf and the Bay of Plenty).

1.2 Recreational fisheries

The recreational fishery is harvested entirely by hand digging. Large pipi 50 mm (maximum shell length) or greater are probably preferred. The 1996, 1999–2000, and 2000–01 telephone-diary surveys recorded recreational harvests in FMA 1 of 2.1, 6.6, and 7.2 million pipi, respectively, but no mean weight was available to convert these harvest estimates to tonnages. The harvest estimates provided by these telephone-diary surveys are no longer considered reliable for various reasons. A Recreational Technical Working Group concluded that these harvest estimates should be used only with the following qualifications: a) they may be very inaccurate; b) the 1996 and earlier surveys contain a methodological error; and c) the 2000 and 2001 estimates are implausibly high for many important fisheries. In response to these problems and the cost and scale challenges associated with onsite methods, a national panel survey was conducted for the first time throughout the 2011–12 fishing year. The panel survey used face-to-face interviews of a random sample of 30 390 New Zealand households to recruit a panel of fishers and non-fishers for a full year. The panel members were contacted regularly about their fishing activities and harvest information collected in standardised phone interviews. The

¹ For full details of this programme, refer to the Animal Products (Regulated Control Scheme-Bivalve molluscan Shellfish) Regulations 2006 and the Animal Products (Specifications for Bivalve Molluscan Shellfish) Notice 2006 (both referred to as the BMSRCS), at: <http://www.foodsafety.govt.nz/industry/sectors/seafood/bms/growers-harvesters.htm>

panel survey was repeated in 2017–18 and 2022–23 (Wynne-Jones et al. 2019, Heinemann & Gray 2024). Harvest estimates (in numbers of pipi) are given in Table 4.

Table 4: Recreational harvest estimates for pipi stocks from the national panel survey in 2011–12, 2017–18 and 2022–23 (Wynne-Jones et al. 2014, 2019, Heinemann & Gray 2024). Mean weights were not available to convert these estimates to weights.

Stock	2011–12		2017–18		2022–23	
	Number of pipi	CV	Number of pipi	CV	Number of pipi	CV
PPI 1A	21 620	0.89	0	–	0	–
PPI 1B	84 476	0.39	46 243	0.44	59 445	0.62
PPI 1C	255 207	0.30	315 540	0.38	99 747	0.36
PPI 2	167 155	0.54	16 157	0.59	5 581	0.72
PPI 3	5 295	0.51	14 892	0.82	1 062	1.01
PPI 7	10 057	0.58	12 326	1.00	4 673	0.69
PPI 8	32 632	0.52	27 997	0.70	25 929	0.66
PPI 9	45 847	0.48	102 037	0.53	6 616	1.01
PPI total	622 288	0.20	112 785	0.63	203 052	0.27

1.3 Customary fisheries

In common with many other intertidal shellfish, pipi are very important to Māori as a traditional food. Pipi form an important fishery for customary non-commercial, but the total annual catch is not known.

Māori customary fishers utilise the provisions under both the recreational fishing regulations and the various customary regulations. Many tangata whenua harvest pipi under their recreational allowance and these are not included in records of customary catch. Customary reporting requirements vary around the country. Customary fishing authorisations issued in the South Island and Stewart Island would be under the Fisheries (South Island Customary Fishing) Regulations 1999. Many rohe moana / areas of the coastline in the North Island and Chatham Islands are gazetted under the Fisheries (Kaimoana Customary Fishing) Regulations 1998 which require reporting on authorisations. In the areas not gazetted, customary fishing permits would be issued under the Fisheries (Amateur Fishing) Regulations 2013, where there is no requirement to report catch.

The information on Māori customary harvest under the provisions made for customary fishing can be limited (Table 5). These numbers are likely to be an underestimate of customary harvest as only the catch approved and harvested in kilograms and numbers are reported in the table.

Table 5: Fisheries New Zealand records of customary harvest of pipi (approved and reported as weight (kg) and in numbers), for the years available since 2001–02. – no data. [Continued on next page]

Fishing year	PPI 1A				PPI 1B			
	Weight (kg)		Numbers		Weight (kg)		Numbers	
	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
2006–07	–	–	–	–	350	350	300	300
2007–08	–	–	–	–	150	150	–	–
2008–09	120	120	–	–	270	270	450	450
2009–10	235	235	–	–	100	100	–	–
2010–11	100	100	–	–	380	380	–	–
2011–12	80	40	–	–	350	350	–	–
2012–13	110	110	–	–	140	140	–	–
2013–14	–	–	–	–	–	–	400	400

Fishing year	PPI 1C				PPI 2			
	Weight (kg)		Numbers		Weight (kg)		Numbers	
	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
2003–04	–	–	5 000	4 000	–	–	–	–
2004–05	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2005–06	763	638	4 500	2 000	–	–	–	–
2006–07	10 411	9 806	12 850	9 850	–	–	9 076	8 076
2007–08	5 235	3 360	6 000	3 750	–	–	29 576	25 076
2008–09	5 760	4 889	10 000	8 000	–	–	30 250	24 350
2009–10	3 585	3 105	6 700	6 700	–	–	2 000	2 000
2010–11	4 558	3 741	4 430	4 430	–	–	56 000	54 200
2011–12	900	660	500	300	–	–	66 100	63 400
2012–13	1 340	950	–	–	–	–	92 600	58 300
2013–14	40	40	–	–	–	–	44 400	20 800
2014–15	3 035	2 800	5 000	5 000	–	–	–	–
2015–16	2 345	1 653	–	–	–	–	–	–
2016–17	2 675	1 878	30	0	–	–	–	–
2017–18	1 522	1 212	–	–	–	–	–	–

Table 5 [Continued]

Fishing year	PPI 1C				PPI 2			
	Weight (kg)		Numbers		Weight (kg)		Numbers	
	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
2018–19	755	525	–	–	–	–	–	–
2019–20	600	375	800	0	–	–	–	–
2020–21	475	325	–	–	–	–	–	–
2021–22	120	60	–	–	–	–	–	–
2022–23	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2023–24	10	10	–	–	–	–	–	–

Fishing year	PPI 3				PPI 4			
	Weight (kg)		Numbers		Weight (kg)		Numbers	
	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
2001–02	–	–	202	202	–	–	–	–
2002–03	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2003–04	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2004–05	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2005–06	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2006–07	–	–	1 000	30	–	–	–	–
2007–08	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2008–09	–	–	2 500	1 987	–	–	–	–
2009–10	–	–	–	–	–	–	400	400
2010–11	–	–	100	100	–	–	–	–
2011–12	–	–	950	950	–	–	–	–
2012–13	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2013–14	–	–	120	119	–	–	–	–
2014–15	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2015–16	–	–	60	60	–	–	–	–
2016–17	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2017–18	–	–	350	350	–	–	–	–
2018–19	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2019–20	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2020–21	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2021–22	–	–	450	325	–	–	–	–
2022–23	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2023–24	–	–	500	500	–	–	–	–

Fishing year	PPI 5				PPI 7			
	Weight (kg)		Numbers		Weight (kg)		Numbers	
	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
2006–07	–	–	–	–	–	–	80	80
2007–08	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2008–09	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2009–10	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2010–11	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2011–12	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2012–13	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2013–14	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2014–15	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2015–16	–	–	50	50	–	–	–	–

Fishing year	PPI 9			
	Weight (kg)		Numbers	
	Approved	Harvested	Approved	Harvested
2006–07	–	–	1 383	883
2007–08	25	25	–	–
2008–09	80	80	4 000	3 500
2009–10	350	340	–	–
2010–11	60	60	–	–
2011–12	450	450	–	–
2012–13	390	308	–	–
2013–14	580	475	–	–
2014–15	670	670	–	–
2015–16	110	110	–	–
2016–17	230	130	–	–
2017–18	–	–	–	–
2018–19	–	–	–	–
2019–20	200	100	–	–

1.4 Illegal catch

No quantitative information on the level of illegal catch is available.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

No quantitative nationwide information on the level of other sources of mortality is available.

2. BIOLOGY

The pipi (*Paphies australis*) is a common burrowing bivalve mollusc of the family Mesodesmatidae. Pipi are distributed around the New Zealand coastline, including the Chatham and Auckland Islands (Powell 1979), and are characteristic of sheltered beaches, bays and estuaries (Morton & Miller 1968). Pipi are tolerant of moderate wave action, and commonly inhabit coarse shell sand substrata in bays and at the mouths of estuaries where silt has been removed by waves and currents (Morton & Miller 1968). They have a broad tidal range, occurring intertidally and subtidally in high-current harbour channels to water depths of at least 7 m (Dickie 1986a, Hooker 1995a), and are locally abundant, with densities greater than 1000 m⁻² in certain areas (Grace 1972).

Pipi reproduce by free-spawning, and most individuals are sexually mature at about 40 mm shell length (SL) (Hooker & Creese 1995a). Gametogenesis begins in autumn, and by late winter many pipi have mature, ready-to-spawn gonads (Hooker & Creese 1995a). Pipi have an extended breeding period from late winter to late summer, with greatest spawning activity occurring in spring and early summer. Fertilised eggs develop into planktotrophic larvae, and settlement and metamorphosis occur about three weeks after spawning (Hooker 1997). In general, pipi have been considered sedentary when settled, although Hooker (1995b) found that pipi may utilise water currents to disperse actively within a harbour. The trigger for movement is unknown, but this ability to migrate may have important implications to their population dynamics.

Pipi growth dynamics are not well known. Growth appears to be fairly rapid, at least in dynamic, high-current environments such as harbour channels. Hooker (1995a) showed that pipi at Whangateau harbour (northeastern New Zealand) grew to about 30 mm in just over one year (16–17 months), reached 50 mm after about three years, and grew very slowly after attaining 50 mm. There was a strong seasonal component to growth, with rapid growth occurring in spring and summer, and little growth in autumn and winter. Williams et al. (2007) used Hooker’s (1995a) tag-recapture and length frequency time series data to generate formal growth estimates for Whangateau harbour pipi (Table 6). Estimates are also available from time series of size frequencies on sheltered Auckland beaches (Table 6; Morrison & Browne 1999, Morrison et al. 1999), although these were likely to have been poorly estimated due to variability in the length data. Growth on the intertidal section of Mair Bank was estimated by Pawley et al. (2013) using the results of a notch-tagging experiment in 2009–10. These estimates are likely to underestimate growth of pipi in the commercial fishery because tagged shells came from the intertidal zone whereas commercial harvesting is conducted primarily in the subtidal (where growth is expected to be quicker).

Table 6: Estimates of biological parameters for pipi.

Growth		Location	Year	Source
L_{∞} (mm SL)	K			
57.3	0.46	Inner Whangateau Harbour site	1992–93	Williams et al. (2007)
63.9	0.57	Whangateau Harbour entrance	1992–93	Williams et al. (2007)
41.1	0.48	Cheltenham Beach, North Shore	1997–98	Morrison et al. (1999)
58.9	0.15	Mill Bay, Manukau Harbour	1997–98	Morrison et al. (1999)
84.6	0.09	Mill Bay, Manukau Harbour	1998–99	Morrison & Browne (1999)
Natural mortality				
$M = 0.3\text{--}0.5$ (assumed values)		–	–	Williams et al. (2007)
Size at maturity				
40 mm SL		Whangateau Harbour	–	Hooker & Creese (1995a)

Little is known about the natural mortality or maximum longevity of pipi. Haddon (1989) suggested that pipi are unlikely to live much more than 10 years, and used assumed maximum ages of 10, 15, and 20 years old to estimate maximum constant yield for Mair Bank pipi in 1989. The estimation of the rate of instantaneous natural mortality (M) is difficult for pipi because of the immigration and emigration of individuals from different areas. As the timing and frequency of these movements are largely unknown, the separation of mortality from movement effects is likely to be problematic. Williams et al. (2007)

assumed values of $M = 0.3$, 0.4 , and 0.5 to estimate yields for Mair Bank in 2005–06. The Intrinsic Productivity Level is categorised as Medium for this species.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

A molecular study was undertaken to determine patterns of population structure and genetic connectivity in *P. australis* and the location of any potential barriers to connectivity (Hannan et al. 2016). The study suggested that, at a large spatial scale, *P. australis* could be differentiated into three genetically distinct groups (northern, south eastern, south western), but at a smaller spatial scale there was evidence for genetic differentiation amongst populations separated by only tens to hundreds of kilometres (Figure 2).

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

A stock assessment has been conducted for PPI 1A (see PPI 1A Working Group report).

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

The status of all PPI stocks other than PPI 1A are unknown. There has not been any reported commercial catch since 2016–17. Following sustainability concerns by recreational or customary fishers, several beaches have been closed to fishing across Northland, Auckland, Coromandel and Bay of Plenty. Local populations might be reduced from historical overfishing but that might not be reflective of the status of the stocks at the QMA level. In many estuaries, sedimentation has (a) reduced habitat suitability which has resulted in a reduced contemporary distribution, and (b) resulted in reduced growth rates.




Figure 2: Location of genetically differentiated populations of *Paphies australis* and barriers to genetic connectivity. Populations are those sampling locations enclosed by red dashed lines. The geographic areas where barriers to genetic connectivity are assumed to occur are indicated by shaded grey boxes (these boxes cover large sections of coastline because it was not possible to pinpoint the exact location of barriers; it is assumed the barrier lies somewhere within the shaded area).

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Berkenbusch, K.; Hill-Moana, T. (2025). Intertidal shellfish monitoring in the northern North Island region, 2024–25. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2025/27*. 111 p.
- Berkenbusch, K.; Hill-Moana, T. (2026). Intertidal shellfish monitoring in the northern North Island region, 2025–26. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2026/xx*. 114 p.
- Cranfield, H J; Michael, K P; Stotter, D (1993) Estimates of growth, mortality, and yield per recruit for New Zealand surf clams. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1993/20*. 47 p.
- Dickie, B N (1986a) Physical and biological survey of a subtidal *Paphies australis* population in the lower Whangarei Harbour. Whangarei Water Quality Management Plan. Working Report 4. 45 p. (Unpublished report to the Northland Catchment Commission and Regional Water Board, New Zealand).
- Dickie, B N (1986b) Topographic survey of three intertidal *Paphies australis* habitats in the lower Whangarei Harbour. Whangarei Water Quality Management Plan. Working Report 2. 45 p. (Unpublished report to the Northland Catchment Commission and Regional Water Board, New Zealand).
- Fournier, D A; Sibert, J R; Majkowski, J; Hampton, J (1990) MULTIFAN: a likelihood-based method for estimating growth parameters and age composition from multiple length frequency data sets illustrated using data for southern bluefin tuna (*Thunnus maccoyi*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 47: 301–317.
- Francis, R I C C (1988) Maximum likelihood estimation of growth and growth variability from tagging data. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 22(1): 43–51.
- Grace, R G (1972) The benthic ecology of the entrance to the Whangateau Harbour, Northland, New Zealand. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Haddon, M (1989) Biomass estimate of the pipi *Paphies australis* on Mair Bank, Whangarei Harbour. 23 p. (Unpublished report to MAF Fisheries North, Auckland, New Zealand).
- Hannan, D A; Constable, H B; Silva, C N S; Bell, J J; Ritchie, P A; Gardner, J P A (2016) Genetic connectivity amongst New Zealand's open sandy shore and estuarine coastal taxa. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report No. 172*. 93 p.
- Heinemann A; Gray, A. (2024) National Panel Survey of Recreational Marine Fishers 2022–23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/51*. 116 p.
- Hooker, S H (1995a) Life history and demography of the pipi *Paphies australis* (Bivalvia: Mesodesmatidae) in northeastern New Zealand. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand. 230 p.
- Hooker, S H (1995b) Preliminary evidence for post-settlement movement of juvenile and adult pipi, *Paphies australis* (Gmelin 1790) (Bivalvia: Mesodesmatidae). *Marine and Freshwater Behaviour and Physiology* 27(1): 37–47.
- Hooker, S H (1997) Larval and postlarval development of the New Zealand pipi, *Paphies australis* (Bivalvia : Mesodesmatidae). *Bulletin of Marine Science* 61(2): 225–240.
- Hooker, S H; Creese, R G (1995a) The reproductive biology of pipi, *Paphies australis* (Gmelin 1790) (Bivalvia: Mesodesmatidae). I. Temporal patterns of the reproductive cycle. *Journal of Shellfish Research* 14(1): 7–15.
- Hooker, S H; Creese, R G (1995b) The reproductive biology of pipi, *Paphies australis* (Gmelin 1790) (Bivalvia: Mesodesmatidae). II. Spatial patterns of the reproductive cycle. *Journal of Shellfish Research* 14(1): 17–24.
- Morrison, M A; Browne, G N (1999) Intertidal shellfish population surveys in the Auckland region, 1998–99, and associated yield estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 99/43*. 21 p.
- Morrison, M A; Pawley, M D M; Browne, G N (1999) Intertidal surveys of shellfish populations in the Auckland region, 1997–98, and associated yield estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 99/25*. 25 p.
- Morton, J E; Miller, M C (1968) *The New Zealand Sea Shore*. Collins, Auckland, New Zealand. 653 p.
- OtterResearch (1992) MULTIFAN 32(f). *User's Guide and Reference Manual*. Otter Research Ltd., Nanaimo, Canada. 67 p.
- Pawley M D; Hannaford O; Morgan, K (2013) Biomass survey and stock assessment of pipi (*Paphies australis*) on Mair and Marsden Bank, Whangarei Harbour. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/42*. 32 p.
- Powell, A W B (1979) *New Zealand Mollusca: Marine, Land and Freshwater Shells*. Collins, Auckland, New Zealand. 500 p.
- Sullivan, K J; Mace, P M; Smith, N W M; Griffiths, M H; Todd, P R; Livingston, M E; Harley, S J; Key, J M; Connell, A M (Comps.) (2005) Report from the Fishery Assessment Plenary, May 2005: stock assessments and yield estimates. 792 p. (Unpublished report held in ESNZ library, Wellington).
- Venus, G C (1984) *Paphies australis* (pipis) in Whangarei Harbour. Whangarei Harbour Study Technical Report No. 6. 60 p. (Unpublished technical report coordinated by the Northland Harbour Board.)
- Williams, J R; Cryer, M; Hooker, S H; Smith, M D; Watson, T G; MacKay, G; Tasker, R (2007) Biomass survey and stock assessment of pipi (*Paphies australis*) on Mair Bank, Whangarei Harbour, 2005. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2007/03*. 29 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–2018. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/24*. 104 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Hill, L; Heinemann, A (2014) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2011–12: Harvest Estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/67*. 139 p.

PIPI (PPI 1A) – Whangarei Harbour

(*Paphies australis*)
Pipi



1. FISHERY SUMMARY

PPI 1A was introduced into the Quota Management System (QMS) on 1 October 2004 with a TAC of 250 t, comprising a TACC of 200 t, and customary and recreational allowances of 25 t each.

Marsden Bank was closed to the collection of pipi in February 2011, with the subsequent closure of adjacent Mair Bank on 1 October 2014 due to historically low pipi biomass levels.

1.1 Commercial fisheries

Prior to 2004, the year FMA PPI 1 and FMA PPI 1A (Whangarei Harbour) were introduced to the QMS, the commercial fishery area in Whangarei Harbour was defined in regulation as the area within 1.5 nautical miles of the coastline from Home Point, at the northern extent of the Whangarei Harbour entrance, to Mangawhai Heads, south of the harbour. The fishery was limited by daily limits which summed to 657 t greenweight in a 365 day year, but there was no explicit annual restriction.

Commercial fishers typically gathered pipi from the seaward edge of Mair Bank, particularly the southern end, and avoided the centre of the bank itself where there is a lot of shell debris. Regulations require that all gathering be done by hand, and fishers typically use a mask and snorkel. There is no minimum legal size (MLS) for pipi, although a sample measured from the commercial catch in PPI 1A in 2005 suggested that fishers favour larger pipi (over 60 mm SL, Williams et al 2007). Pipi have in the past been harvested year-round, so there is no apparent seasonality in the fishery.

Over 99% of the total commercial landings of pipi in New Zealand over time have been from General Statistical Area 003 and FMA PPI 1. Later on, when a distinction was made between the two areas, virtually all the landings have been from PPI 1A (Whangarei Harbour). Total commercial landings of pipi reported on Licensed Fish Receiver Returns (LFRRs) remained reasonably stable through time, averaging 177 t annually in New Zealand from 1986–87 until 2009–10 (Table 1). Landings subsequently decreased to an average of just 71 t in 2010–11 to 2011–12; no landings were reported after 2012. The highest recorded landings were in 1991–92 (326 t). There is no evidence of any consistent seasonal pattern in either the level of effort or catch per unit effort (CPUE) in the pipi fishery.

PIPI (PPI 1A) – May 2026

CPUE in the pipi targeted fishery increased between 1989–90 and 1992–93, was then relatively stable up to 2002–03 but increased in 2003–04 and 2004–05 (Williams et al 2007). No CPUE information has since been analysed.

Table 1: Reported commercial landings (from Licensed Fish Receiver Returns; LFRR) of pipi (t greenweight) since 1986–87.

Year	Landings	TACC	Year	Landings	TACC	Year	Landings	TACC
1986–87	131	657	2001–02	191	657	2016–17	0	200
1987–88	133	657	2002–03	191	657	2017–18	0	200
1988–89	134	657	2003–04	266	657	2018–19	0	200
1989–90	222	657	2004–05	206	200	2019–20	0	200
1990–91	285	657	2005–06	137	200	2020–21	0	200
1991–92	326	657	2006–07	135	200	2021–22	0	200
1992–93	184	657	2007–08	142	200	2022–23	0	200
1993–94	258	657	2008–09	131	200	2023–24	0	200
1994–95	172	657	2009–10	136	200	2024–25	0	200
1995–96	135	657	2010–11	87	200			
1996–97	146	657	2011–12	55	200			
1997–98	122	657	2012–13	0	200			
1998–99	130	657	2013–14	0	200			
1999–00	143	657	2014–15	0	200			
2000–01	184	657	2015–16	0	200			

Prior to the introduction of PPI 1A to the QMS, there were nine permit holders for Whangarei Harbour. No new entrants have entered the fishery since 1992, when commercial access to the fishery was constrained by the general moratorium on granting new fishing permits for non-QMS fisheries. Access to the fishery has, however, been restricted through other regulations since the mid-1980s, and more formally since 1988. Under previous non-QMS management arrangements, there was a daily catch limit of 200 kg per permit holder, meaning that collectively the nine permit holders could theoretically take 657 t of pipi per year. The permit holders indicated that annual harvest quantities were considerably less than the potential maximum because of the relatively low market demand for commercial product rather than the availability of the resource. On 1 October 2004, pipi in Whangarei Harbour (PPI 1A) were introduced into the QMS, and the nine existing permits were replaced with individual transferable quotas. The 200 kg daily catch limit no longer applies. A total allowable catch (TAC) of 250 t was set, comprised of a total allowable commercial catch (TACC) of 200 t, a customary allowance of 25 t, and a recreational allowance of 25 t.

Figure 1 shows the historical landings and TACC values for PPI 1A. After 1 October 2014, all take of pipi from Mair Bank was prohibited due to historically low pipi biomass levels.




Figure 1: Total commercial landings and TACC for PPI 1A (Whangarei Harbour). QMS data from 2004–05 to present.

1.2 Recreational fisheries

The only estimate of recreational harvest of pipi comparable with the commercial fishery on Mair Bank is the estimate of harvest from the whole of Whangarei Harbour from the 2011–12 National Panel Survey (<1 tonne, see Table 3 in Introduction – Pipi chapter). Thus, the recreational harvest of pipi from

the bank was small relative to commercial landings there prior to 1 October 2014. After 1 October 2014 all take of pipi from Mair Bank was prohibited due to very low biomass levels.

For further information on recreational fisheries refer to the Introduction – Pipi chapter.

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

In common with many other intertidal shellfish, pipi are very important to Māori as a traditional food.

Māori customary fishers can utilise the provisions under both the Fisheries (Amateur Fishing) Regulations 2013 and the Fisheries (Kaimoana Customary Fishing) Regulations 1998. Patuharakeke gazetted their rohe moana which covers the southern shoreline of the Whangarei harbour in 2009. In 2021, Te Rerenga Parāoa gazetted their rohe moana which covers the northern side of the Harbour and sits adjacent to the Patuharakeke Rohe Moana on the south side of the Harbour. The entire Whangarei Harbour is now a gazetted Rohe Moana. When tangata whenua harvest pipi under their recreational allowance, these are not included in records of customary catch.

Estimates of customary catch under the provisions made for customary fishing for PPI 1A between 2008-09 and 2012-13 are shown in Table 2. These numbers are likely to be an underestimate of customary harvest because only the approved and harvested catch in weight (kg) are reported in the table. There have not been reports since 2013-14 under these criteria. In addition, until the closure of Mair Bank to recreational fishing in 2014, tangata whenua may have harvested pipi under their recreational allowance and these are not included in records of customary catch.

Table 2: Fisheries New Zealand records of customary harvest of pipi (approved and reported as weight (kg)) in PPI 1A, between 2008–09 and 2012–13. No data since 2013–14.

Fishing year	Weight (kg)	
	Approved	Harvested
2008–09	120	120
2009–10	235	235
2010–11	100	100
2011–12	80	40
2012–13	110	110

For further information on customary fisheries refer to the Introduction – Pipi chapter.

1.4 Illegal catch

For further information on illegal catch refer to the Introduction – Pipi chapter.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

There is some concern about the possibility of changes in banks stability that could arise from operations other than fishing in Whangarei Harbour (e.g., harbour dredging, port developments), which could lead to changes in the pipi populations. Radical changes to the local hydrology could affect the size or substratum of Mair Bank, with consequent effects on its pipi population. Also, as suspension feeders, pipi may be adversely affected by increased sediment loads in the water column.

The potential causes of low biomass from the 2014 biomass survey in Mair Bank were investigated in the desktop report of Williams & Hume (2014). They concluded that: *“potential causes of the pipi decline were high natural mortality of an ageing pipi population and low recruitment, both of which may be related to observed changes in the morphology of Mair Bank. There was no evidence of disease in the population, and the decline did not appear to be associated with potential anthropogenic sources of mortality (e.g., sedimentation, contaminants, harvesting). It is possible that substances not measured in shellfish, sediment, or water quality monitoring work may have influenced the pipi decline.”*

Assessments of the pipi (kōkota) health (e.g., presence of toxins and intracellular bacteria) have also been conducted by Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board (Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board 2025a). Repeated mass mortality events in the Whangārei Harbour area have also led to research towards a health baseline for resident pipi, focusing on intracellular bacteria *Endozoicomonas* species (Howells et al. 2024).

2. BIOLOGY

This is covered in the Introduction – Pipi chapter.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

Little is known of the stock structure of pipi. The commercial fishery based on Mair Bank in Whangarei Harbour (PPI 1A) forms a geographically discrete area and is assumed for management purposes to be a separate stock.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

Stock assessment for Mair Bank pipi was conducted in 2005 and 2010 using absolute biomass surveys and yield per recruit and spawning stock biomass per recruit modelling. MPI, in association with Northland Regional Council and the Harbour board, also commissioned a biomass survey in 2014 in response to local concerns about low biomass.

Cockle and pipi populations across northern North Island are part of a long-standing monitoring programme. Pipi at Marsden Bank have been part of seven surveys in this monitoring series, starting in 2009–10; there are no cockles at this site.

4.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

Estimates of the fishing mortality reference point $F_{0.1}$ are available from yield per recruit modelling (Table 3). Parallel spawning stock biomass per recruit modelling was conducted to estimate the SSBPR corresponding with each estimate of $F_{0.1}$. These estimates are sensitive to the assumed value of natural mortality (M) and uncertainty in pipi growth parameters.

Table 3: Estimates of the reference rate of fishing mortality $F_{0.1}$ and corresponding spawning stock biomass per recruit at three different assumed rates of natural mortality (M) for two harvest strategies ('no restriction' and 'current'). SL, shell length (at recruitment). Estimates from Williams et al (2007).

'No restriction' strategy (harvest pipi of a size that maximizes YPR)					
<i>Assumed M</i>	Optimal age at recruitment (y)	SL (mm)	$F_{0.1}$	YPR (g)	SSBPR (%)
0.3	3	52	0.437	4.93	44
0.4	2.75	51	0.550	3.50	45
0.5	2.5	49	0.648	2.58	45
'Current' strategy (harvest pipi 60 mm and over)					
<i>Assumed M</i>	Age at recruitment (y)	SL (mm)	$F_{0.1}$	YPR (g)	SSBPR (%)
0.3	5	60	0.564	3.98	62
0.4	5	60	0.755	2.41	70
0.5	5	60	0.949	1.47	76

4.2 Biomass estimates

Virgin biomass (B_0) and the biomass that will support the maximum sustainable yield (B_{MSY}) are unknown for Mair Bank pipi. Only four biomass estimates have been made for the Mair Bank pipi population: in 1989 using a grid survey, in 2005 using stratified random sampling, in 2010 using a systematic random start and in 2014 using a stratified grid sampling design. The 1989 estimate of 2245 t ($\pm 10\%$) can be considered conservative because only the intertidal area of the bank was surveyed, and pipi are known to exist in the shallow subtidal area of the bank. Estimates of biomass are available for Mair Bank (excluding from the 2014 survey) and are sensitive to the assumed size at recruitment (Table 4). The high CV for the 2014 estimates were due to unexpectedly low and patchy biomass at the time.

Table 4: Estimated recruited biomass (*B*) of pipi on Mair Bank in 2005 and 2010 for different assumed sizes at recruitment to the fishery. Source: Williams et al (2007), Pawley et al (2013) and Pawley (2014).

Year	Assumed shell length at recruitment (mm)	Intertidal stratum		Subtidal stratum		Mair Bank Total	
		<i>B</i> (t)	CV (%)	<i>B</i> (t)	CV (%)	<i>B</i> (t)	CV (%)
2005	1 (total biomass)	3 602	11.4	6 940	19.5	10 542	13.4
2005	40	3 569	11.4	6 922	19.5	10 490	13.4
2005	45	3 434	11.4	6 791	19.6	10 226	13.6
2005	50	2 986	11.3	5 989	20.1	8 975	14.0
2005	55	2 022	11.1	3 855	23.8	5 877	16.0
2005	60	1 004	13.1	2 013	37.5	3 017	25.4
2010	1 (total biomass)	2 233	17.4	2 218	33.0	4 452	15.2
2010	50	2 001	18.1	1 889	36.0	3 890	16.6
2010	60	1 751	18.3	1 393	33.7	3 145	17.4
2014	5 (total biomass)	46	50.8	28	25.9	73.5	30.8

As part of the long-standing monitoring programme, Marsden Bank was surveyed again in 2025–26. Throughout the survey series, the marked decline of pipi at Marsden Bank has led to considerable changes in the location and area of the sampling extent. The 2025–26 survey focused on a similar sampling extent as the immediately-preceding assessment in 2023–24, encompassing a small area in the northern part of the bank, associated with the harbour channel. In this area, pipi were sampled in a total of 80 points within a single stratum (Berkenbusch & Hill-Moana 2026).

Based on the field sampling, the 2025–26 pipi population had an estimated total abundance of 0.96 million (CV: 16.37%) individuals, with an estimated density of 205 pipi per m². Both estimates reflected marked population increases from the immediately-preceding abundance and density estimates in 2023–24 of 0.45 million (CV: 15.66%) pipi and 120 pipi per m². These recent estimates confirmed the return of the pipi population, albeit at a small scale, particularly following their absence in the 2021–22 survey at Marsden Bank. In addition, following the lack of large pipi (≥50 mm shell length) since 2012–13, the present population included a small number of large individuals. Their estimated abundance was 0.12 million (CV: 24.81%) individuals, occurring at an estimated average density of 25 large pipi per m² (Berkenbusch & Hill-Moana 2026).

Growth to larger sizes was also evident in the recruits size class: after forming most (87.57%) of the total population in 2023–24, their recent growth beyond the 20-mm cut-off augmented the medium size class, which in turn contributed 80.57% of all individuals in 2025–26. Mean and modal shell lengths increased between the two recent surveys from 15.49 mm and 13 mm shell length, respectively in 2023–24 to 38.01 mm and 35 mm shell length, respectively in 2025–26. The shift in the composition of the population was also evident in the change from a unimodal to a bimodal population size structure (Berkenbusch & Hill-Moana 2026).

Assessments of the pipi population and habitat have also been regularly conducted by Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board (e.g., Howells et al. 2024, Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board 2025).

4.3 Yield estimates and projections

Maximum Constant Yield (*MCY*) was estimated using method 2 (see the guide to biological reference points in the introduction chapter of this plenary document):

$$MCY = 0.5F_{0.1}B_{av}$$

where $F_{0.1}$ is a reference rate of fishing mortality and B_{av} is the historical average recruited biomass (estimated as the mean recruited biomass from the 2005 and 2010 surveys). M is assumed to be 0.3 and the corresponding $F_{0.1}$ is 0.564 (Williams et al 2007 revised version). The size at recruitment is assumed to remain at 60 mm and the corresponding B_{av} is 3081 t.

$$\begin{aligned} MCY &= 0.5 \times 0.564 \times 3\,081\,t \\ &= 869\,t \end{aligned}$$

This estimate of MCY would have a CV at least as large as those associated with the 2005 and 2010 estimates of recruited biomass (17–25%), and is sensitive to the assumed size at recruitment to the fishery, the assumed natural mortality, and to uncertainty in $F_{0.1}$ (arising from the considerable uncertainty in model input values for growth and M) (Table 5).

Table 5: Sensitivity of maximum constant yield (MCY , method 2) to estimates of size at recruitment and the assumed natural mortality, M . B_{av} , the historical average recruited biomass, was estimated for two sizes at recruitment (50 and 60 mm SL) using the 2005 and 2010 survey data.

SL at recruitment (mm)	B_{av}	M	$F_{0.1}$	MCY (t)
50	6433	0.3	0.40	1 300
		0.4	0.54	1 729
		0.5	0.68	2 182
60	3081	0.3	0.56	869
		0.4	0.76	1 163
		0.5	0.95	1 462

CAY was not estimated because there is no estimate of current biomass.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

Stock Structure Assumptions

For the purpose of this assessment PPI 1A is assumed to be a discrete stock. The assessment is done for Mair Bank within Whangarei Harbour.

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2015	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Medium	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2013–14	Catch: 0 t
Reference Points	Target: Default 40% B_0 Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: F_{MSY}	
Status in relation to Target	Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be at or above the target	
Status in relation to Limits	Soft Limit: Very Likely (> 90%) to be below Hard Limit: Very Likely (> 90%) to be below	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Unknown	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status

Biomass has not been measured in consistent units for all surveys, but has declined sharply from a total biomass (> 1 mm) of 10 542 tonnes in 2005 to a total biomass (> 5 mm) of 73.5 tonnes in 2014.

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Surveys were conducted in 2005, 2010 and 2014. These surveys have shown a sharp decline in biomass to very low levels.
Recent Trend in Fishing Intensity or Proxy	No commercial landings have been reported since the 2011–12 fishing year.
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Variables or Indicators	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	The stock has declined below limits (causing the fishery to be closed) due to unknown reasons and the likelihood of recovery is unknown.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	There is no current legal catch as biomass has declined below the TACC and limits.
Probability of Current catch or TACC causing Overfishing to Continue or to commence	There is no current legal catch as biomass has declined below the TACC and limits. However, the amount of illegal take is unknown.

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Reference rate of fishing mortality applied to absolute biomass estimates from quadrat surveys	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2012	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Two absolute abundance estimates (quadrat surveys)	1 – High Quality
	- Biological parameters for YPR/SSBPR models	1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	-	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	- Growth for the subtidal portion of this population is poorly known. The available data come from other areas or the intertidal portion, both of which can be expected to support slower growth than the area where the fishery occurs. This, together with poor information on M and the size at recruitment to the fishery, makes the YPR modelling and reference rate of fishing mortality very uncertain.	

Qualifying Comments
Recruitment appears from the 2005 and 2010 survey length frequency distributions to be variable. This may lead to larger variations in the spawning and recruited biomass than the estimates of biomass suggest. The 2014 survey showed very low biomass levels and the commercial, recreational and customary fisheries have been closed since 1 October 2014.

Fishery Interactions
This is a hand-gathering fishery with no substantial bycatch or other interactions.


6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Berkenbusch, K.; Hill-Moana, T. (2026). Intertidal shellfish monitoring in the northern North Island region, 2025–26. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2026/xx*. Xxx p.
- Cranfield, H J; Michael, K P; Stotter, D (1993) Estimates of growth, mortality, and yield per recruit for New Zealand surf clams. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1993/20. 47 p. (Unpublished report held by NIWA library, Wellington).
- Dickie, B N (1986a) Physical and biological survey of a subtidal *Paphies australis* population in the lower Whangarei Harbour. Whangarei Water Quality Management Plan. Working Report 4. 45 p. (Unpublished report to the Northland Catchment Commission and Regional Water Board, New Zealand).
- Dickie, B N (1986b) Topographic survey of three intertidal *Paphies australis* habitats in the lower Whangarei Harbour. Whangarei Water Quality Management Plan. Working Report 2. 45 p. (Unpublished report to the Northland Catchment Commission and Regional Water Board, New Zealand).
- Fournier, D A; Sibert, J R; Majkowski, J; Hampton, J (1990) MULTIFAN: a likelihood-based method for estimating growth parameters and age composition from multiple length frequency data sets illustrated using data for southern bluefin tuna (*Thunnus maccoyi*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 47: 301–317.
- Francis, R I C C (1988) Maximum likelihood estimation of growth and growth variability from tagging data. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 22(1): 43–51.

- Grace, R G (1972) The benthic ecology of the entrance to the Whangateau Harbour, Northland, New Zealand. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Haddon, M (1989) Biomass estimate of the pipi *Paphies australis* on Mair Bank, Whangarei Harbour. 23 p. (Unpublished report to MAF Fisheries North, Auckland, New Zealand).
- Hooker, S H (1995a) Life history and demography of the pipi *Paphies australis* (Bivalvia: Mesodesmatidae) in northeastern New Zealand. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand. 230 p.
- Hooker, S H (1995b) Preliminary evidence for post-settlement movement of juvenile and adult pipi, *Paphies australis* (Gmelin 1790) (Bivalvia: Mesodesmatidae). *Marine and Freshwater Behaviour and Physiology* 27(1): 37–47.
- Hooker, S H (1997) Larval and postlarval development of the New Zealand pipi, *Paphies australis* (Bivalvia : Mesodesmatidae). *Bulletin of Marine Science* 61(2): 225–240.
- Hooker, S H; Creese, R G (1995a) The reproductive biology of pipi, *Paphies australis* (Gmelin 1790) (Bivalvia: Mesodesmatidae). I. Temporal patterns of the reproductive cycle. *Journal of Shellfish Research* 14(1): 7–15.
- Hooker, S H; Creese, R G (1995b) The reproductive biology of pipi, *Paphies australis* (Gmelin 1790) (Bivalvia: Mesodesmatidae). II. Spatial patterns of the reproductive cycle. *Journal of Shellfish Research* 14(1): 17–24.
- Howells, J; Maria, L; Shirkey, T; Carrington, A; Lane, H S (2024) Testing a health baseline during a bivalve mollusc mortality event: An investigation into die-offs of pipi *Paphies australis* from Aotearoa New Zealand. *Journal of Invertebrate Pathology*: 108110.
- Morrison, M A; Browne, G N (1999) Intertidal shellfish population surveys in the Auckland region, 1998–99, and associated yield estimates. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 99/43. 21 p. (Unpublished report held in NIWA library, Wellington).
- Morrison, M A; Pawley, M D M; Browne, G N (1999) Intertidal surveys of shellfish populations in the Auckland region, 1997–98, and associated yield estimates. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 99/25. 25 p. (Unpublished report held in NIWA library, Wellington).
- Morton, J E; Miller, M C (1968) *The New Zealand Sea Shore*. Collins, Auckland, New Zealand. 653 p.
- OtterResearch (1992) MULTIFAN 32(f). User's Guide and Reference Manual. Otter Research Ltd., Nanaimo, Canada. 67 p.
- Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board (2025). Health investigation of kōkota/pipi, *Paphies australis*, from Whangārei, New Zealand. Unpublished report prepared by Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board. 11 p.
- Pawley, M (2014) Population and biomass survey of pipi (*Paphies australis*) on Mair Bank, Whangarei Harbour, 2014. Report Prepared for Northland Regional Council. 15 p.
- Pawley, M D; Hannaford, O; Morgan, K (2013) Biomass survey and stock assessment of pipi (*Paphies australis*) on Mair and Marsden Bank, Whangarei Harbour. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/42*. 32 p.
- Powell, A W B (1979) *New Zealand Mollusca: Marine, Land and Freshwater Shells*. Collins, Auckland, New Zealand. 500 p.
- Sullivan, K J; Mace, P M; Smith, N W M; Griffiths, M H; Todd, P R; Livingston, M E; Harley, S J; Key, J M; Connell, A M (Comps.) (2005) Report from the Fishery Assessment Plenary, May 2005: stock assessments and yield estimates. 792 p. (Unpublished report held in NIWA library, Wellington).
- Venus, G C (1984) *Paphies australis* (pipis) in Whangarei Harbour. Whangarei Harbour Study Technical Report No. 6. 60 p. (Unpublished technical report coordinated by the Northland Harbour Board).
- Williams, J, Hume, T (2014) Investigation into the decline of pipi at Mair Bank, Whangarei Harbour. Report Prepared for Northland Regional Council. 44 p.
- Williams, J R; Cryer, M; Hooker, S H; Smith, M D; Watson, T G; MacKay, G; Tasker, R (2007) Biomass survey and stock assessment of pipi (*Paphies australis*) on Mair Bank, Whangarei Harbour, 2005. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report, 2007/03*. 29 p.
- Williams, J.; Roberts, C.; Chetham, J. (2017) Initiation of a community-based pipi monitoring programme. Unpublished report prepared for Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board by the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research, NIWA Client Report 2017255AK. 47 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Hill, L; Heinemann, A (2014) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2011–12: Harvest Estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/67*.

PŌRAE (POR)

(*Nemadactylus douglasii*)
Pōrae



1. FISHERY SUMMARY

Pōrae was introduced into the Quota Management System on 1 October 2004 and current TACs, TACCs, and allowances are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs and TACs (t) for pōrae by Fishstock.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
POR 1	6	3	8	68	85
POR 2	1	1	2	18	22
POR 3	1	1	1	2	5
POR 10	1	1	1	1	4

1.1 Commercial fisheries

Commercial catches of pōrae throughout New Zealand are generally small. Landings were first reported in 1978 (Table 2). The proportion of vessels landing catch declined steadily during the 1990s; annual landings in FMA 1, where the majority of pōrae are caught, have approximately halved since the early 1990s when an average of 110 t were reported annually (Table 3). POR 1 landings have generally been lower than the TACC since its introduction in 2004, only slightly exceeding it in 2006–07, 2010–11, and 2016–17 (Figure 1, Table 4) POR 1 landings have averaged 36 t between 2017–18 and 2024–25. Landings of POR 2 (FMAs 2, 8, and 9) have remained low and below the TACC (except for the fishing year 2016–17), averaging 14 t between 2013–14 and 2021–22, and 8 t between 2022–23 and 2024–25 . POR 3 landings have consistently remained below 1 t; no landings have been reported from FMAs 4, 5, or 6. POR 10 landings were last reported in 1994–95.

Pōrae is principally caught as a bycatch in inshore set net fisheries in northern New Zealand. It is generally taken in association with snapper and trevally off east Northland and Coromandel, and tarakihi and blue moki around Gisborne. Small quantities are taken by bottom longline and trawl fisheries targeting snapper off east Northland and Ninety Mile Beach.

Fishers may confuse the codes PAR (parore) and POR (pōrae) when reporting catches, but given that both species occur in shallow northern waters, misreporting is difficult to discern.

Table 2: Reported landings (t) for the main QMAs from 1931 to 1982.

Year	POR 1	POR 2	POR 3	Year	POR 1	POR 2	POR 3
1931–32	0	0	0	1957	0	0	0
1932–33	0	0	0	1958	0	0	0
1933–34	0	0	0	1959	0	0	0
1934–35	0	0	0	1960	0	0	0
1935–36	0	0	0	1961	0	0	0
1936–37	0	0	0	1962	0	0	0
1937–38	0	0	0	1963	0	0	0
1938–39	0	0	0	1964	0	0	0
1939–40	0	0	0	1965	0	0	0
1940–41	0	0	0	1966	0	0	0
1941–42	0	0	0	1967	0	0	0
1942–43	0	0	0	1968	0	0	0
1943–44	0	0	0	1969	0	0	0
1944	0	0	0	1970	0	0	0
1945	0	0	0	1971	0	0	0
1946	0	0	0	1972	0	0	0
1947	0	0	0	1973	0	0	0
1948	0	0	0	1974	0	0	0
1949	0	0	0	1975	0	0	0
1950	0	0	0	1976	0	0	0
1951	0	0	0	1977	0	0	0
1952	0	0	0	1978	191	4	0
1953	0	0	0	1979	107	0	0
1954	0	0	0	1980	83	4	0
1955	0	0	0	1981	82	8	0
1956	0	0	0	1982	92	5	0

Notes:

1. The 1931–1943 years are April–March but from 1944 onwards are calendar years.
2. Data up to 1985 are from fishing returns; Data from 1986 to 1990 are from Quota Management Reports.
3. Data for the period 1931 to 1982 are based on reported landings by harbour and are likely to be underestimated as a result of under-reporting and discarding practices. Data includes both foreign and domestic landings.

Table 3: Reported landings (t) of pōrae by FMA, fishing years 1989–90 to 2003–04.

Year	FMA 1	FMA 2	FMA 3	FMA 7	FMA 8	FMA 9	FMA 10
1989–90	98	4	< 1	< 1	< 1	0	0
1990–91	115	2	0	0	< 1	4	0
1991–92	121	5	< 1	0	0	3	0
1992–93	121	8	0	1	< 1	< 1	0
1993–94	77	12	2	0	< 1	1	< 1
1994–95	109	5	0	0	< 1	1	< 1
1995–96	94	8	< 1	< 1	< 1	4	0
1996–97	80	7	< 1	1	< 1	2	0
1997–98	75	4	< 1	< 1	< 1	3	0
1998–99	58	3	3	< 1	< 1	1	0
1999–00	55	4	< 1	2	< 1	1	0
2000–01	64	2	1	< 1	< 1	2	0
2001–02	55	3	1	< 1	< 1	< 1	0
2002–03	62	2	< 1	0	< 1	2	0
2003–04	32	2	< 1	< 1	< 1	2	0




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for POR 1 (Auckland East).

Table 4: Reported domestic landings (t) and TACC (t) by pōrae Fishstock, fishing years 2004–05 to present.

Fishstock FMA	POR 1		POR 2		POR 3		POR 10		Total	
	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC
2004–05	52	62	5	6	< 1	2	0	1	57	71
2005–06	47	62	2	6	< 1	2	0	1	49	71
2006–07	64	62	9	6	0	2	0	1	73	71
2007–08	45	62	7	6	< 1	2	0	1	53	71
2008–09	52	62	5	6	0	2	0	1	57	71
2009–10	57	62	11	6	< 1	2	0	1	68	71
2010–11	65	62	7	6	< 1	2	0	1	72	71
2011–12	43	62	7	6	< 1	2	0	1	51	71
2012–13	58	62	9	18	0	2	0	1	67	83
2013–14	55	62	10	18	< 1	2	0	1	66	83
2014–15	58	62	14	18	< 1	2	0	1	72	83
2015–16	57	62	9	18	< 1	2	0	1	66	83
2016–17	66	62	24	18	< 1	2	0	1	90	83
2017–18	41	62	13	18	< 1	2	0	1	55	83
2018–19	43	62	12	18	< 1	2	0	1	55	83
2019–20	43	62	11	18	< 1	2	0	1	54	83
2020–21	41	68	15	18	< 1	2	< 1	1	56	89
2021–22	30	68	18	18	0	2	0	1	45	89
2022–23	26	68	7	18	< 1	2	0	1	33	89
2023–24	27	68	8	18	0	2	0	1	36	89
2024–25	38	68	9	18	0	2	< 1	1	47	89

1.2 Recreational fisheries

A National Panel Survey of recreational fishers was conducted for the first time throughout the 2011–12 fishing year. The panel survey used face-to-face interviews of a random sample of 30 390 New Zealand households to recruit a panel of fishers and non-fishers for a full year (Wynne-Jones et al 2014). The panel members were contacted regularly about their fishing activities and harvest information collected in standardised phone interviews. The national panel survey was repeated during the 2017–18 and 2022–23 fishing years using very similar methods to produce directly comparable results (Wynne-Jones et al 2019; Heinemann & Gray 2024). Recreational catch estimates from the three national panel surveys are given in Table 5. Note that national panel survey estimates do not include recreational harvest taken on charter vessel trips or under s111 general approvals.

Table 5: Recreational harvest estimates for pōrae stocks (Wynne-Jones et al 2014, 2019, Heinemann & Gray 2024). Mean weights from boat ramp surveys (Hartill & Davey 2015, Davey et al 2019, 2024).

Stock	Year	Method	Number of fish	Total weight (t)	CV
POR 1	2011–12	Panel survey	12 055	15.0	0.26
	2017–18	Panel survey	5 229	6.5	0.37
	2022–23	Panel survey	4 188	4.8	0.38
POR 2	2011–12	Panel survey	2 529	3.1	0.72
	2017–18	Panel survey	1 604	2.0	0.53
	2022–23	Panel survey	169	0.2	1.00
POR 3	2011–12	Panel survey	104	0.1	1.05
	2017–18	Panel survey	-	-	-
	2022–23	Panel survey	74	0.1	1.00

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

There is no quantitative information on customary non-commercial harvest levels of pōrae. Customary non-commercial fishers are likely to catch small quantities of pōrae when targeting other species such as snapper, tarakihi and trevally.

2. BIOLOGY

Pōrae (*Nemadactylus douglasii*) is a common inshore species of northern New Zealand (Kermadec Islands, west Auckland and Northland, east Northland, Hauraki Gulf, and the Bay of Plenty). It is also found at some localities as far south as Kapiti Island, Cook Strait, and Kaikoura over the summer months, but has not been recorded around the Chatham Islands. Pōrae also occurs in southeast Australia (New South Wales to Tasmania), where it is known as the grey or rubberlip morwong.

Pōrae are generally found on reef/sand interfaces in 10–60 m depths, but have been recorded at 100 m. This diurnal species tends to aggregate to form small to large groups over sandy areas. Adults are thought to occupy distinctive home ranges, with individuals residing in the same area for many years. A study along the east coast of Northland recorded an average of 200 pōrae for each kilometre of rocky coastline.

Very little is known about the biology of this species. Pōrae spawn in late summer and autumn, and have an extended planktonic post-larval stage. Juveniles settle to the seafloor when 8–10 cm long. Although they attain a maximum length of at least 70 cm, the average size is 40–60 cm. They live to at least 30 years and growth is believed to slow substantially at maturity (Ayling & Cox 1984, Francis 2001).

The Intrinsic Productivity Level is categorised as Low for this species.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

There is no biological information to suggest separate stocks around New Zealand. However, evidence of residential behaviour and the fact that they are long-lived, suggests that localised depletion is likely to occur.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT


There is no fishery independent stock assessment information to determine the stock status of pōrae. Biomass estimates have not been determined for pōrae.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

For all Fishstocks there is insufficient information to estimate current stock status.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Ayling, T; Cox, G J (1984) *Collins guide to the sea fishes of New Zealand*. Collins, Auckland. 343 p.
- Davey, N; Hartill, B; Carter, M (2019) Mean weight estimates for recreational fisheries in 2017–18. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/25*. 32 p.
- Davey, N K; Johnson, K S; Maggs, J Q (2024) Mean weight estimates for recreational fisheries in 2022–23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/28*. 39 p
- Francis, M (2001) *Coastal fishes of New Zealand. An identification guide*. Reed Books, Auckland. 103 p. + pls.
- Hartill, B; Davey, N (2015) Mean weight estimates for recreational fisheries in 2011–12. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/25*.
- Heinemann A; Gray, A. (2024) National Panel Survey of Recreational Marine Fishers 2022-23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/51*. 116 p.
- Stewart, P (1993) Morwong, *Nemadactylus* species. In Kailola *et al* (Eds), *Australian fisheries resources*. pp. 324–326. Bureau of Resource Sciences, Canberra. 422 p.
- Thompson, S (1981) *Fish of the Marine Reserve. A guide to the identification and biology of common coastal fish of north-eastern New Zealand*. Leigh Laboratory, University of Auckland. 364 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–2018. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/24*. 104 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Hill, L; Heinemann, A (2014) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2011–12: Harvest Estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/67*. 139 p.

PRAWN KILLER (PRK)*(Ibacus alticrenatus)***1. FISHERY SUMMARY**

Prawn killer (*Ibacus alticrenatus*) was introduced into the Quota Management System on 1 October 2007, with a total TAC of 37.4 t and TACC of 36 t. There are no allowances for customary non-commercial or recreational fisheries. A total of 1.4 t was allocated for other sources of mortality. Allowances, TACCs, and TACs are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs and TACs (t) for prawn killer by Fishstock.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
PRK 1	0	0	1.2	24.5	25.7
PRK 2	0	0	0.2	3.5	3.7
PRK 3	0	0	0	1.0	1.0
PRK 4A	0	0	0	1.0	1.0
PRK 5	0	0	0	1.0	1.0
PRK 4A	0	0	0	1.0	1.0
PRK 4A	0	0	0	1.0	1.0
PRK 7	0	0	0	1.0	1.0
PRK 8	0	0	0	1.0	1.0
PRK 10	0	0	0	0	0

1.1 Commercial fisheries

Almost all prawn killer are taken as a bycatch in the scampi target bottom trawl fishery mainly in the Bay of Plenty region and to a lesser extent in the Hawke Bay and Wairarapa region (SCI 1 and SCI 2). Reported catches in PRK 1 peaked at 42 t in 1992–93 (Figure 1), but declined to less than 0.5 t since 2011–12. Landings in PRK 2 reached a maximum of 8.09 t in 2002–03, but have been minimal since with less than 0.01 t reported in 2018–19, and no landings reported since 2019–20 (Table 2, Figure 1). Landings are minimal to non-existent in other QMAs. Years with higher landings coincide with years in which the scampi fleet fished at shallower depths than usual.

TACCs for all QMAs have been in place since the species entered the Quota Management System (QMS) on 1 October 2007. Since then reported landings have ranged from 0.896 to 7.51 t (Table 2), considerably lower than the overall TACC of 36 t. The only QMA where the TACC has been exceeded is PRK 7 in the 2007–08, 2015–16 and 2016–17 fishing years (20%, 66% and 37% overruns respectively).

Table 2: TACCs and reported landings (t) of prawn killer by Fishstock from 1990–91 until the present from CELR and CLR data. QMAs are shown as defined in 2007–08. [Continued on next page]

Fishstock	PRK 1		PRK 2		PRK 3		PRK 4A	
	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC
1990–91	11.59	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1991–92	3.34	–	0.48	–	0	–	0	–
1992–93	42.24	–	6.86	–	0	–	0	–
1993–94	10.95	–	0.03	–	0	–	0	–
1994–95	0.52	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1995–96	1.78	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1996–97	23.13	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1997–98	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1998–99	0	–	0.19	–	0	–	0	–
1999–00	0.08	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
2000–01	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
2001–02	6.05	–	0.37	–	0	–	0	–
2002–03	20.99	–	8.09	–	0	–	0	–
2003–04	24.35	–	0.57	–	0.01	–	0.01	–
2004–05	3.25	–	1.15	–	0	–	0	–
2005–06	2.25	–	0.20	–	0	–	0	–
2006–07	4.6	–	0.10	–	0	–	0	–
2007–08	5.36	24.5	0.92	3.5	0.01	1	0.02	1
2008–09	0.22	24.5	0.08	3.5	0	1	0	1
2009–10	0.75	24.5	0.03	3.5	0	1	0	1
2010–11	3.55	24.5	0.08	3.5	0	1	0	1
2011–12	0.42	24.5	0.17	3.5	0	1	0	1
2012–13	0.26	24.5	0.02	3.5	0	1	0	1
2013–14	0.10	24.5	0.04	3.5	0	1	0	1
2014–15	0.00	24.5	0.04	3.5	0	1	0	1
2015–16	0.02	24.5	0.07	3.5	0	1	0	1
2016–17	0.35	24.5	0.15	3.5	0	1	0.01	1
2017–18	0.45	24.5	0.01	3.5	0	1	0	1
2018–19	0.30	24.5	< 0.01	3.5	0	1	< 0.01	1
2019–20	< 0.01	24.5	0	3.5	< 0.01	1	0	1
2020–21	0.02	24.5	0	3.5	0	1	0	1
2021–22	< 0.01	24.5	0	3.5	0	1	0	1
2022–23	0.24	24.5	0	3.5	0	1	0	1
2023–24	0.31	24.5	0	3.5	< 0.01	1	0	1
2024–25	0.24	24.5	< 0.01	3.5	0	1	< 0.01	1

Fishstock	PRK 5		PRK 6A		PRK 6B		PRK 7	
	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC
1990–91	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1991–92	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1992–93	0	–	0	–	0.02	–	0	–
1993–94	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1994–95	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1995–96	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1996–97	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1997–98	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1998–99	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
1999–00	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
2000–01	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
2001–02	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
2002–03	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
2003–04	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
2004–05	0	–	0	–	0	–	0	–
2005–06	0	–	0	–	0	–	0.01	–
2006–07	0	–	0	–	0	–	0.03	–
2007–08	0	1	0	1	0	1	1.2	1
2008–09	0	1	0	1	0	1	0.88	1
2009–10	0	1	0	1	0	1	0.48	1
2010–11	0	1	0	1	0	1	0.69	1
2011–12	0	1	0	1	0	1	0.73	1
2012–13	0	1	0	1	0	1	0.60	1
2013–14	0.001	1	0	1	0	1	0.66	1
2014–15	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1
2015–16	0	1	0	1	0	1	1.66	1
2016–17	0	1	0	1	0	1	1.37	1
2017–18	0	1	0	1	0	1	0.55	1
2018–19	0	1	0	1	0	1	0.45	1
2019–20	0	1	0	1	0	1	0.01	1
2020–21	0.001	1	0	1	0	1	0.04	1
2021–22	0.003	1	0	1	0	1	0.16	1
2022–23	0	1	0.002	1	0	1	0	1
2023–24	0	1	0	1	0	1	0.08	1
2024–25	0	1	0	1	0	1	0.03	1

Table 2 [Continued]:

Fishstock	PRK 8		PRK 9		TOTAL	
	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC
1990-91	0	–	0	–	11.58	–
1991-92	0	–	0	–	3.82	–
1992-93	0	–	0	–	49.12	–
1993-94	0	–	0	–	10.98	–
1994-95	0	–	0	–	0.52	–
1995-96	0	–	0	–	1.78	–
1996-97	0	–	0	–	23.13	–
1997-98	0	–	0	–	0	–
1998-99	0	–	0	–	0.19	–
1999-00	0	–	0	–	0.08	–
2000-01	0	–	0	–	0	–
2001-02	0	–	0	–	6.42	–
2002-03	0	–	0	–	29.08	–
2003-04	0	–	0	–	24.94	–
2004-05	0	–	0	–	4.40	–
2005-06	0	–	0.01	–	2.47	–
2006-07	0	–	0	–	4.73	–
2007-08	0	1	0	1	7.51	36
2008-09	0	1	0	1	1.18	36
2009-10	0	1	0	1	1.27	36
2010-11	0.01	1	0	1	4.33	36
2011-12	0	1	0	1	1.32	36
2012-13	0.01	1	0.01	1	0.90	36
2013-14	0.01	1	0.15	1	0.94	36
2014-15	0	1	0	1	1.04	36
2015-16	0.01	1	0.02	1	1.78	36
2016-17	0	1	1.26	1	3.14	36
2017-18	0	1	0	1	1.01	36
2018-19	0	1	0.01	1	0.76	36
2019-20	0	1	0	1	0.01	36
2020-21	0	1	0.02	1	0.08	36
2021-22	0	1	< 0.01	1	0.16	36
2022-23	0	1	0	1	0.29	36
2023-24	0	1	0	1	0.39	36
2024-25	0	1	0	1	0.28	36

Prawn killer could be legally discarded under Schedule 6 of the Fisheries Act (until repealed) and can now be returned to the sea under the Fisheries (Landings and Discards) Notice if likely to survive on return. It is likely that reported catches are lower than actual catches due to non-reporting.




Figure 1: Reported commercial landing and TACC for PRK 1 [Continued on next page]




Figure 1: [Continued] Reported commercial landing and TACC for PRK 2.

1.2 Recreational fisheries

Given the depths and locations at which prawn killer are found, recreational catch is likely to be negligible or non-existent.

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

Given the depths and locations at which prawn killer are found, customary catch is likely to be negligible or non-existent.

1.4 Illegal catch

No quantitative information is available on the level of illegal catch of prawn killer. Given the low value and lack of markets, illegal catches are unlikely.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

There is no quantitative information on other sources of mortality, although analysis of benthic invertebrate samples and the distribution of trawl tows in the Bay of Plenty (PRK 1) suggests that this species is negatively affected by trawling (Cryer et al. 2002).

2. BIOLOGY

Ibacus alticrenatus are a scyllarid lobster, a group of decapod crustaceans also known as slipper lobsters. They are widely distributed around the New Zealand coast, principally in depths of 80–300 m. Research and commercial trawls show that they are found around much of New Zealand but mostly in the Bay of Plenty, east coast North Island, and to a lesser extent, the Mernoo Bank and north-west Chatham Rise and the west coast South Island. They appear to be extremely rare in the Sub-Antarctic and the west coast of the North Island, and totally absent from the Southland region. Prawn killer are found on soft sediment seafloors, where they dig into the substrate and cover themselves with sediment. The phyllosoma larval stage of prawn killer lasts for several months which would suggest that there is potential for widespread dispersal of prawn killer. The apparent lack of prawn killer in more southern areas may also be due to other factors such as temperature, food availability, competition, and habitat.

There is not much information about growth and development of *I. alticrenatus* in New Zealand waters, but females are thought to mature at a carapace length of about 40 mm. Trawl surveys of the Bay of Plenty and Hawke Bay and Wairarapa regions have found maximum carapace length of 46 and 52 mm for males and females respectively. Information from Australia suggests that this species has relatively low fecundity (1700–14 800 eggs, increasing with size) and spawns annually. Larval development takes 4–6 months, an intermediate duration for a Scyllarid lobster. Females of other *Ibacus* species reach maturity about two years after settlement and longevity is suggested to be five years or more. No ageing work has been carried out on prawn killer in either New Zealand or Australia.

There are currently no estimates of natural mortality for this species or maximum age. *Ibacus peronii* is a similar species that lives in shallow waters (20–500m) around Australia. Growth models for *I. peronii*, suggest the potential for this species to live for more than 15 years. As a consequence, the Intrinsic Productivity Level is categorised as Medium for this species. As these species appear to be similar ecologically, this assumption is unlikely to give rise to great errors.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

For management purposes stock boundaries are based on those used for scampi. There is no biological information on stock structure, recruitment patterns, or other biological characteristics which might indicate stock boundaries, but there are three main fishing areas where they are caught: Bay of Plenty, and to a lesser extent Hawke Bay and Wairarapa and the northern west coast of the South Island. The lack of prawn killer bycatch in the scampi target fisheries on the Mernoo Bank (PRK 3) and around the Auckland Islands (PRK 6A) would suggest the prawn killer numbers are very low to non-existent south of the three main fishing areas.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

4.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

There are no estimates of fishery parameters or abundance for any prawn killer fishstock. Sporadic and varying catches by the scampi fleet mean that development of reliable CPUE indices is not possible.

4.2 Biomass estimates

There are no reliable biomass estimates for any prawn killer fishstock. Combined trawl and photographic surveys for scampi in the Bay of Plenty (PRK 1) and Hawke Bay and Wairarapa (PRK 2) are the only trawl surveys that catch prawn killer regularly (MacGibbon 2015). Prawn killer biomass estimates from these surveys are variable from year to year, have high coefficients of variation, and are not considered validated indices of abundance. The focus of these surveys has changed over the years to focus more on photographic work and not all strata have been surveyed in all years.

4.3 Yield estimates and projections

There are no estimates of *MCY* or *CAY* for any prawn killer fishstock.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

For all Fishstocks there is insufficient information to estimate current stock status.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Atkinson, J M; Boustead, N C (1982) The complete larval development of the scyllarid lobster *Ibacus alticrenatus* Bate, 1888 in New Zealand waters. *Crustaceana* 42: 275–287.
- Booth, J D; Webber, W R; Sekiguchi, H; Coutures, E (2005) Diverse larval recruitment strategies within the Scyllaridae. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 39: 581–592.
- Brown, D E; Holthuis, L B (1998) The Australian species of the genus *Ibacus* (Crustacea: Decapoda: Scyllaridae), with the description of a new species and addition of new records. *Zoologische Mededelingen (Leiden)* 72(10): 113–141.
- Cryer, M; Hartill, B; O'Shea, S (2002) Modification of marine benthos by trawling: toward a generalization for the deep ocean? *Ecological Applications* 12(6): 1824–1839.
- Haddy, J A; Courtney, A J; Roy, D P (2005) Aspects of the reproductive biology and growth of Balmain bugs (*Ibacus* spp.) (Scyllaridae). *Journal of Crustacean Biology* 25(2): 263–273.
- MacGibbon, D J (2015) Fishery characterisation for prawn killer, *Ibacus alticrenatus* (Spence Bate, 1888) (Scyllaridae), 1989–90 to 2012–13. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/05*. 108 p.

QUEEN SCALLOPS (QSC)

(*Zygochlamys delicatula*)



1. FISHERY SUMMARY

Queen scallops (QSC 3) were introduced into the QMS in October 2002, with a TACC (unchanged since its introduction) of 380 t and a 20 t allowance for other sources of fishing related mortality (Table 1). The fishing year runs from 1 October to 30 September and the catch is reported in greenweight.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs, and TACs (t) for queen scallop.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
QSC 3	0	0	20	380	400

1.1 Commercial fisheries

The QSC 3 fishery initially developed in the 1984–85 fishing year; it is a small-scale fishery with only a few fishing vessels involved (Michael & Cranfield 2001). Queen scallops (*Zygochlamys delicatula*) are predominantly harvested commercially off the Otago coast, in depths of 130–200 m (predominantly 150–200 m) near the edge of the continental shelf.

Reported landings from the QSC 3 fishery peaked at 711 t in the 1985–86 fishing year (not shown in the table below), before decreasing to an average of 33 t in the early 1990s. By the early 2000s landings increased to an average of 135 t, although this is more likely to be associated with economic, rather than biological, factors. The TACC was set in 2002 at a slightly higher level than recent landings but lower than the non-QMS competitive catch limit of 750 t which applied to FMA 3 from 1990–91; landings have remained well below the TACC since its introduction. Since 2010 landings have fluctuated between 1.9 and 70.5 t. The very low reported catch in 2023–24 could be explained by the fact that Southern Clams no longer fishes queen scallops. Reported landings of queen scallops are given in Table 2, and Figure 1 shows historical landings and the TACC for QSC 3.

Commercial fishers may return QSC to the waters from which they were taken if the return takes place as soon as practicable and they are likely to survive, as provided for in the Fisheries (Landing and Discard Exceptions) Notice. The Fisheries (Landing and Discard Exceptions) Notice allows the return to the sea of QSC with identical requirements and restrictions to the previous Schedule 6 regime until 30 September 2026. There is draft legislation to extend this date to 30 September 2028, with decisions expected mid-2026.




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for QSC 3 (South East Coast, Southland).

The queen scallop fishery is a trawl fishery using specialised gear (including a relatively light ‘tickler’ chain or wire to induce swimming) and the catch is sorted both mechanically and by hand (Michael & Cranfield 2001, R. Belton pers. comm.).

Table 2: Reported landings (t greenweight) of queen scallops (QSC) by FMA, QMA and fishing year by all methods (trawl and dredge) from 1989–90 until present from Quota Management Reports (QMR), Monthly Harvest Returns (MHR) and Catch Effort Landing Returns (CELR landed and CELR estimated).

Fishing year	QSC 3		FMA 3		FMA 5
	Catch (QMR/MHR)	TACC*	Estimated catch (TCEPR/CELR)		Landings (CELR/CLR)
1989–90	11.9	-	288.1		-
1990–91	61.8	-	238.3		22.9
1991–92	77.4	-	193.7		-
1992–93	0.4	-	104.7		-
1993–94	1.1	-	133.6		-
1994–95	23.6	-	146.9		-
1995–96	4.5	-	149.5		0.2
1996–97	20.9	-	118.0		6.6
1997–98	56.0	-	208.3		6.0
1998–99	85.9	-	81.7		-
1999–00	180.2	-	176.8		-
2000–01	162.2	-	162.1		-
2001–02	223.7	-	168.9		-
2002–03	139.0	380	-		-
2003–04	114.0	380	-		-
2004–05	35.1	380	-		-
2005–06	18.6	380	-		-
2006–07	6.5	380	-		-
2007–08	9.5	380	-		-
2008–09	48.7	380	-		-
2009–10	25.3	380	-		-
2010–11	2.8	380	-		-
2011–12	1.9	380	-		-
2012–13	70.5	380	-		-
2013–14	5.024	380	-		-
2014–15	1.788	380	-		-
2015–16	13.55	380	-		-
2016–17	23.13	380	-		-
2017–18	25.74	380	-		-
2018–19	12.17	380	-		-
2019–20	16.61	380	-		-
2020–21	20.35	380	-		-
2021–22	27.46	380	-		-
2022–23	12.03	380	-		-
2023–24	0.74	380	-		-
2024–25	0.65	380	-		-

* QMS introduction 1 October 2002

1.2 Recreational fisheries

There is no known recreational fishery for queen scallops.

1.3 Customary fisheries

There is no known customary harvest of queen scallops.

1.4 Illegal catch

Current levels of illegal harvest are not known.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

No quantitative estimate of other sources of mortality is available. Some grading of catch may occur (queen scallops may be returned to the sea) and an allowance of 20 t for potential mortality has been set within the current TAC.

2. BIOLOGY

The New Zealand queen scallop (*Zygochlamys delicatula*) is also known as the southern queen scallop, southern fan scallop, and gem scallop. This small pectinid species is distributed on the outer continental shelf along the east coast of the South Island, from Kaikoura down to Macquarie Island. There are nine other species in the genus, none of which have attracted commercial interest, probably because of their small size. Similar species such as *Chlamys islandica* and *Chlamys varia* support important fisheries in other countries. New Zealand queen scallops are distributed from Kaikoura to the southern islands including the Snares, Bounty, Antipodes, and Macquarie Islands. There are no records of live queen scallops being caught north of Kaikoura, or on the west coast of the South Island.

A dredge survey off Otago in October 1983 showed that queen scallops were distributed in long patches orientated along the slope of the continental shelf. They were most abundant in depths beyond 130 m, on the plateau between the Taiaroa and Papanui Canyons, and south. North of the Taiaroa Canyon catches diminished steadily towards the Karitane Canyon; few were caught north of the canyon. Only low numbers of queen scallops were caught in depths shallower than 110 m.

Juvenile queen scallops are frequently found attached to fragments of bryozoa and other biogenic debris, including the shells of other scallops and the dredge oyster. Height frequency distributions of samples show that the size composition of the population differs with area, and it is inferred that settlement probably varies spatially and temporally. The estimated 40–50 days larval life may result in queen scallop larvae being well mixed, both vertically and horizontally, in the water column. Predation of newly settled spat may also affect the pattern of recruitment and add to the variability in year class representation.

Estimates of growth for New Zealand queen scallops suggest that they become sexually mature at four years for males and five years for females. As length is slightly less than height, queen scallops are estimated to reach the minimum takeable size of 50 mm at about eight years. However, growth estimates are uncertain, with information from tagging studies suggesting that queen scallops enter the fishery much earlier, at three to five years.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

Queen scallops are distributed throughout the QSC 3 area. From harvest records the scallops inhabit waters between 130 and 200 m depth. The extent to which various beds or populations are separate reproductively or functionally is not known.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

4.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

No estimates of fishery parameters or abundance are available at present.

4.2 Biomass estimates

A trawl survey, (Jiang et al. 2005) carried out in February–April 2004, provided estimates of total and recruited biomass (shells at least 50 mm) available from the fished area of QSC 3, from Moeraki to just north of the Nuggets within the depth range 130 to 200 m, which covers 90% of the fished area within QSC 3 (Table 3). These estimates assumed that the efficiency of the survey trawl was 100%. However trawl efficiency is unlikely to be 100% and in other scallop fisheries can vary significantly depending on dredge and substrate type. Consequently estimates of current absolute biomass cannot be estimated. The Shellfish Working Group had concerns over methodology and conduct of the survey, and that the reported survey CVs may not be reliable.

Table 3: Estimated scallop biomass (recruit and pre-recruit) (t) in fished areas of QSC 3 February–April 2004.

Biomass Recruit (CV)	Biomass (CV) Pre-recruit	Total Biomass (CV)
1 950.8 (18.2)	363.6 (21.48)	2 314.4 (18.22)

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

Stock structure assumptions

QSC 3 is assumed to be a single stock.

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2004 – now considered out of date	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Medium	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2002–03	Catch: 139 t
Assessment Runs Presented	Recruited biomass (shells $\geq$ 50 mm)	
Reference Points	Target: Undefined Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: -	
Status in relation to Target	-	
Status in relation to Limits	Unknown	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status
-

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Unknown
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	Unknown
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	Landings have been less than a 10% of the TACC since 2004–05 except in 2008–09 and 2012–13.

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unknown

Assessment Methodology		
Assessment Type	-	
Assessment Method	-	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2004	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	-	
Main data inputs (rank)	-	
Data not used (rank)	-	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	-	


Qualifying Comments
Landings are thought to be declining in recent times due to economic rather than biological factors.

Fishery Interactions
-

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Jiang, W; Gibbs, M; Hatton, S (2005) Stock assessment of the queen scallop fishery in QSC3. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries project QSC2002/01. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)

Michael, K P; Cranfield, H J (2001) A summary of the fishery, commercial landings, and biology of the New Zealand queen scallop, *Zygochlamys delicatula* (Hutton, 1873). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/68*. 25p.

REDBAIT (RBT)*(Emmelichthys nitidus)***1. FISHERY SUMMARY**

TACs, allowances and TACCs are reported in Table 1.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs, and TACs (t) for redbait by Fishstock from 1 October 2025.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
RBT 1	0	0	1	19	20
RBT 3	0	0	138	2 628	2 766
RBT 7	0	0	21	400	421
RBT 10	0	0	0	0	0

1.1 Commercial fisheries

Redbait (*Emmelichthys nitidus*) was introduced to the Quota Management System on 1 October 2009, with a combined TAC of 5316 t and TACC of 5050 t. Allowances are zero for customary non-commercial or recreational fisheries. Following a period of low catch from RBT 7, the Minister decided to reduce the RBT 7 TAC to 421 t from 1 October 2022.

Redbait is mainly taken as bycatch of the jack mackerel target trawl fishery, but also widely taken as bycatch of barracouta and squid trawl tows, with some taken in the hoki fishery. A target fishery developed in the late-2000s, primarily on the Chatham Rise. Reported total landings ranged from 2184 t to 4307 t during the 2000s, but declined across all QMAs and target fisheries in 2009–10 and 2010–11 landed nearer 1000 t. Since the fishing year 2011–12 total landings have ranged between 1456 t and 2856 t and have primarily been taken in RBT 3.

RBT 3 includes the southern fisheries for squid, and fisheries for jack mackerel on the Mernoo Bank and Chatham Rise, and accounted for most of the redbait landed in each year during the 1990s. From 2002–03 to 2009–10 however, the jack mackerel fishery off the west coast expanded into north and south Taranaki bights, with landings from RBT 7 exceeding those from RBT 3. Since 2010 RBT 7 landings have declined, with RBT 3 catches once again making up the bulk of the landings. Since 2018–19 annual RBT 7 landings have been under 40 t compared with 1700 t to 2700 t in RBT 3. The TACC for RBT 3 was increased to 2628 t in October 2025. Landings of RBT 1 have been small (less than 5 t) in most years, increasing slightly in the late 2000s with the majority taken as bycatch in rubyfish target midwater trawling.

Table 2 and Figure 1 show historical landings from 2001–02 to the present, reported by QMAs.

Table 2: Reported landings (t) of redbait by Fishstock and TACCs from 1989–90 to present. Landings from 2001–02 are MHR totals, while landings from 1989–90 to 2000–01 are from CELR/CLR data (Middleton 2024).

FMA	RBT 1		RBT 3		RBT 7		RBT 10		Total	
	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC
1989–90	< 1	–	53	–	< 1	–	0	–	53	–
1990–91	< 1	–	6	–	9	–	0	–	15	–
1991–92	–	–	557	–	109	–	0	–	666	–
1992–93	< 1	–	1 770	–	46	–	0	–	1816	–
1993–94	< 1	–	1 676	–	235	–	0	–	1912	–
1994–95	< 1	–	1 966	–	550	–	0	–	2517	–
1995–96	< 1	–	1 532	–	460	–	0	–	1993	–
1996–97	< 1	–	1 194	–	608	–	0	–	1802	–
1997–98	3	–	1 485	–	518	–	0	–	2007	–
1998–99	< 1	–	1 820	–	693	–	0	–	2513	–
1999–00	1	–	2 391	–	579	–	0	–	2971	–
2000–01	< 1	–	940	–	739	–	0	–	1679	–
2001–02	< 1	–	1 638	–	1 669	–	0	–	3 308	–
2002–03	< 1	–	1 219	–	2 113	–	0	–	3 333	–
2003–04	1	–	1 535	–	2 771	–	0	–	4 307	–
2004–05	1	–	676	–	1 507	–	0	–	2 184	–
2005–06	2	–	2 016	–	1 936	–	0	–	3 955	–
2006–07	3	–	1 098	–	1 506	–	0	–	2 607	–
2007–08	5	–	560	–	2 376	–	0	–	2 941	–
2008–09	10	–	1 808	–	1 649	–	0	–	3 467	–
2009–10	18	19	886	2 190	170	2 841	0	0	1 066	5 050
2010–11	21	19	284	2 190	713	2 841	0	0	1 017	5 050
2011–12	2	19	1 229	2 190	369	2 841	0	0	1 599	5 050
2012–13	2	19	1 826	2 190	325	2 841	0	0	2 153	5 050
2013–14	4	19	2 774	2 190	78	2 841	0	0	2 856	5 050
2014–15	4	19	2 020	2 190	132	2 841	0	0	2 156	5 050
2015–16	5	19	1 068	2 190	383	2 841	0	0	1 456	5 050
2016–17	5	19	2 435	2 190	160	2 841	0	0	2 600	5 050
2017–18	2	19	1 687	2 190	75	2 841	0	0	1 764	5 050
2018–19	< 1	19	2 648	2 190	26	2 841	0	0	2 674	5 050
2019–20	2	19	2 459	2 190	22	2 841	0	0	2 483	5 050
2020–21	< 1	19	2 171	2 190	38	2 841	0	0	2 210	5 050
2021–22	3	19	1 714	2 190	21	2 841	0	0	1 738	5 050
2022–23	< 1	19	1 890	2 190	6	400	0	0	1 896	2 609
2023–24	1	19	2 762	2 190	5	400	0	0	2 767	2 609
2024–25	< 1	19	2 383	2 190	2	400	0	0	2 386	2 609




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the two main RBT stocks, RBT 3 and RBT 7.

1.2 Recreational fisheries

There is no known non-commercial fishery for redbait.

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

There is no known customary non-commercial fishery for redbait.

1.4 Illegal catch

No quantitative information is available on the level of illegal catch of redbait.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

Taylor (2009) described up to 345 t (but usually less than 200 t) of redbait reported annually as discarded between 1988–89 and 2008–09.

2. BIOLOGY

Emmelichthys nitidus is a schooling, bathypelagic species in the same family (Emmelichthyidae) as rubyfish. It is widely distributed around New Zealand in depths from 85 to 500 m.

There have been no ageing studies of redbait in New Zealand. Australian studies suggest regional differences in maximum size and age with a maximum age of 14 years off New South Wales, 7 years off South Australia (Dennis et al 2021) and 8 years off Tasmania, where the maximum reported size of redbait is 316 mm fork length (Welsford & Lyle 2003). Von Bertalanffy growth parameters of Tasmanian redbait for both sexes combined are given in Table 3.

Research data from New Zealand show that the maximum size of redbait is about 420 mm FL, which is larger than most other regions where length of this species has been recorded, except South Africa. Welsford and Lyle (2003) suggested that the much larger redbait reported from Africa could indicate that the maximum age of redbait may be greater than Australian studies, or that growth is highly variable regionally. They also noted that ageing of rubyfish (subsequently documented by Horn et al 2012) indicated some emmelichthyid species are long lived. However, the relevance of this observation to redbait is questionable: meta-analysis by Thorson et al (2017) indicates that while there is some segregation of life history parameters by family, parameters nevertheless vary by orders of magnitude variation within families and show significant overlap between families. Welsford & Lyle (2003) attempted marginal increment analysis of redbait otoliths but could not identify a clear pattern in otolith growth throughout the year. Most redbait measured by observers from New Zealand fisheries, to the nearest cm below, are over 250 mm; however modes of smaller fish at approximately 120 mm, 200 mm, and 250 mm are consistent with the expected sizes of 1, 2, and 3 year old fish from the Tasmanian growth curve (Middleton 2024).

Spawning in Tasmania extends over 2–3 months during spring, with females producing batches of eggs at three day intervals. Size at maturity varied markedly by region; sizes at 50% maturity in males were 146 mm for eastern and 244 mm for south-western fish, and 157 mm for eastern and 261 mm for south-western females (Ewing & Lyle 2009). There is some evidence that redbait in New Zealand may also spawn in spring, with most stage 4 females recorded by observers in September and October; however, some ripe fish have also been recorded in December and January (Middleton 2024). Almost all the females sampled off Southland were immature, including fish in the 300–400 mm size range. Size at 50% maturity appears to be around 240 mm on the eastern Chatham Rise, but 270 mm on the western Chatham Rise.

The Intrinsic Productivity Level is categorised as Medium for this species.

Table 3 shows estimated biological parameters for redbait.

Table 3: Estimates of biological parameters for redbait. Growth is based on Australian studies (Welsford & Lyle 2003).

Fishstock	Estimate			Source
<u>1. Weight = a (length)^{b} (Weight in g, length in cm fork length)</u>				
	Combined sexes			
RBT (All)	^{a}	^{b}		
	0.004947	3.259168		NIWA (unpub. data)
<u>2. von Bertalanffy growth parameters</u>				
	Combined sexes			
RBT (Tasmania)	L_{∞}	k	t_0	
	28.7	0.56	-0.36	Welsford & Lyle (2003)

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

Because information on redbait stock structure was lacking, management boundaries were established for redbait that mirrored those for jack mackerel. A subsequent analysis of encounter rates (Bentley et al 2014) suggested a north-south seasonal movement of redbait may occur at a spatial scale that is greater than QMAs.

Observer sampling indicates that redbait smaller than 250 mm are only encountered frequently in the Southland fishery, which has been focused in Statistical Area 028. Most redbait sampled in the southern fisheries are immature. Spawning fish have been recorded on the Chatham Rise, particularly on the Mernoo Bank, and, less frequently, off the South Island west coast. It is feasible that there is a single EEZ-wide stock of redbait, with recruiting fish entering the Southland fishery and variable movements of fish to the west coast and Chatham Rise.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

4.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

There are no estimates of spawning stock abundance for any redbait fishstock.

4.2 Biomass estimates

Catch per unit effort analyses were attempted in 2022 for the redbait fisheries in Southland, on the Chatham Rise, and off the west coast South Island/Taranaki Bight fisher-reported and observer data (Middleton 2024). Both the Chatham Rise and the west coast South Island/Taranaki Bight fisheries have variable catches and periods where the absence of any redbait catch precluded the development of CPUE indices.

The Working Group considered that the series using observer catch and effort data were the most promising. For the west coast South Island/Taranaki Bight, the CPUE index (Figure 2) confirmed that redbait abundance was significantly higher in this area in the 2000s than in the 2010s.




Figure 2: Observer event-resolution combined delta-lognormal CPUE index for the RBT 7 west coast South Island and Taranaki Bight midwater trawl fisheries targeting BAR and JMA showing approximate 95% confidence intervals.

For the Southland area, the Working Group considered that the event-resolution observer CPUE series might be regarded as index of the recruiting stock abundance. The index (Figure 3) increased from 1998 to a high point in 2002, then declined to 2008 and fluctuated without trend until 2015 before increasing steadily to 2022. Catch sampling data (Figure 4) suggested that a strong 2016 year class may have been entering the fishery from 2018 to 2020, influenced by increasing selectivity with size.




Figure 3: Observer event-resolution combined delta-lognormal CPUE index for the RBT 3 Southland midwater and bottom trawl fisheries targeting SQU, BAR, and JMA showing approximate 95% confidence intervals.

4.3 Future research considerations

- Ageing.
- Directed observer sampling focused on understanding stock structure: regular sampling of the Mernoo Bank fisheries, and verification of maturity stages in the Southland fishery.
- Spatio-temporal modelling of catch and effort data.




Figure 4: Scaled observer length-frequency distributions for red bait caught in the midwater trawl fishery, by observer region (CHA: Challenger; SOE: eastern Chatham Rise; SOU: Southland), year, and target species (E: Events sampled; n: number of measured fish).

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS


Redbait may consist of a single New Zealand biological stock. There are no estimates of reference points or current biomass for any redbait fishstock, therefore stock status cannot be determined.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Bentley, N; Kendrick, T H; MacGibbon, D J (2014) Fishery characterisation and catch-per-unit-effort analyses for redbait (*Emmelichthys nitidus*), 1989–90 to 2010–11. (Draft New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report held by Fisheries New Zealand.)
- Dennis, J D; Grammer, G; Ward, T; Smart, J; Huveneers, C (2021) Using otolith chronologies to identify extrinsic drivers of growth of 2 commercially targeted small pelagic fish species. *Fishery Bulletin* 119: 135–148.
- Ewing, G P; Lyle, J M (2009) Reproductive dynamics of redbait, *Emmelichthys nitidus* (Emmelichthyidae), from south-eastern Australia. *Fisheries Research* 97: 206–215.
- Horn, P L; Neil, H L; Paul, L J; McMillan, P J (2012) Age verification, growth and life history of rubyfish *Plagiogeneion rubiginosum*. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 46: 353–368.
- Middleton, D A J (2024) Characterisation and CPUE analyses for the redbait fisheries in RBT 1, RBT 3 and RBT 7 to 2022. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/65*. 223 p.
- Taylor, P R (2009) A summary of information on redbait *Emmelichthys nitidus*. Final Research Report for Ministry of Fisheries Project SAP2008-18. (Unpublished report held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Thorson, J T; Munch, S B; Cope, J M.; Gao, J (2017) Predicting life history parameters for all fishes worldwide. *Ecological Applications* 27: 2262–2276.
- Welsford, D C; Lyle, J M (2003) Redbait (*Emmelichthys nitidus*): a synopsis of fishery and biological data. *TAFI Technical Report Series* 20. 32 p.

RED COD (RCO)

(*Pseudophycis bachus*)
Hoka



1. FISHERY SUMMARY

Allowances, TACCs, and TACs are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs, and TACs (t) for red cod by Fishstock.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
RCO 1*	–	–	–	42	–
RCO 2	24	5	25	500	554
RCO 3	95	5	230	4 600	4 930
RCO 7*	–	–	–	3 126	–
RCO 10*	–	–	–	10	–

* allowances and TAC not set

1.1 Commercial fisheries

Red cod are targeted primarily by domestic trawlers in the depth range between 30 and 200 m and are also a bycatch of deepwater fisheries off the southeast and southwest coasts of the South Island. The domestic red cod fishery is seasonal, usually beginning in November and continuing to May or June, with peak catches around January and May. During spring and summer, red cod are caught inshore before the fishery moves into deeper water during winter. Red cod entered the QMS in 1986.

Reported annual catches by nation from 1970 to 1986–87 are given in Table 2. Foreign vessel catches declined during the 1980s and were negligible by 1987–88.

Reported landings for 1931 to 1982 are given by red cod QMAs 1, 2, 3, and 7 in Table 3. Recent reported landings and TACCs of red cod by Fishstock are shown in Table 4, and Figure 1 depicts historical landings and TACC values for the three main RCO stocks.

The bulk of reported landings are taken from RCO 3, in particular the Canterbury Bight and Banks Peninsula areas. The red cod fishery is characterised by large variations in catches between years. Research indicates that this interannual variation in catch is due to varied recruitment causing biomass fluctuations rather than a change in catchability. The RCO 3 TACC was reduced by 63% from 1 October 2007 to 4600 t, with the TAC being set at 4930 t (customary, recreational, and other sources of mortality were allocated 5 t, 95 t, and 230 t, respectively). All RCO stocks fisheries have been put on to Schedule 2 of the Fisheries Act 1996. Schedule 2 allows that for certain ‘highly

variable' stocks, the Total Annual Catch (TAC) can be increased within a fishing season. Increased commercial catch is provided for through the creation of additional 'in-season' ACE. The base TACC is not changed by this process and the 'in-season' TAC reverts to the original level at the end of each season. A Management Procedure was operated for RCO 2 and RCO 3 between 2012–13 and 2018–19. The RCO 2 TAC was increased under Schedule 2 in 2012–13 and 2016–17 and the RCO 3 TAC was increased in 2012–13 and 2013–14 (see Table 4). The 2016–17 RCO 2 increase was not authorised until late August, too late for the fishery to respond. A recommended RCO 3 commercial catch allowance increase to 6289 t in 2014–15 was not implemented because discussions with commercial operators concluded that the increase was not required for that fishing year and that management resources would be better allocated elsewhere. RCO 3 landings were below 2000 t in 2018–19, 2019–20, and 2020–21.

Table 2: Reported annual catch (t) of red cod by nation from 1970 to 1986–87.

Year	New Zealand		Foreign licensed				Combined Total
	Domestic	Chartered	Japan	Korea	USSR	Total	
1970*	760	–	995	–	–	995	1 755
1971*	393	–	2 140	–	–	2 140	2 533
1972*	301	–	2 082	–	< 100	2 182	2 483
1973*	736	–	2 747	–	< 100	2 847	3 583
1974*	1 876	–	2 950	–	< 100	3 050	4 926
1975*	721	–	2 131	–	< 100	2 231	2 952
1976*	948	–	4 001	–	600	4 601	5 549
1977*	2 690	–	8 001	1 358	\$2 200	11 559	14 249
1978–79*	5 343	124	2 560	151	51	2 762	8 229
1979–80*	5 638	883	537	259	116	912	7 433
1981–82*	3 210	387	474	70	102	646	4 243
1982–83*	4 342	406	764	675	52	1 493	6 241
1983–83†	3 751	390	149	401	3	553	4 694
1983–84†	10 189	1 764	1 364	480	49	1 893	13 846
1984–85†	14 097	2 381	978	829	7	1 814	18 292
1985–86‡	9 035	1 014	739	147	5	891	10 940
1986–87‡	2 620	1 089	197	4	59	261	3 969

Note: 1970–1977 = calendar years; 1978–79 to 1982–83 = 1 April–31 March; 1980–1981=no fishing returns processed this year; 1983–1983 = 1 April–30 September; 1983–84 to 1986–87 = 1 October–30 September; * MAF data; † FSU data; ‡ QMS data; § mainly ribaldo and red cod.

Table 3: Reported landings (t) for the main QMAs from 1931 to 1982.

Year	RCO 1	RCO 2	RCO 3	RCO 7	Year	RCO 1	RCO 2	RCO 3	RCO 7
1931–32	0	0	16	6	1957	0	5	189	6
1932–33	0	51	41	67	1958	0	8	84	6
1933–34	0	0	28	21	1959	0	15	95	23
1934–35	0	0	18	0	1960	0	16	165	46
1935–36	0	0	12	0	1961	0	16	184	41
1936–37	0	13	35	14	1962	0	48	193	60
1937–38	0	27	143	32	1963	0	27	248	46
1938–39	0	19	279	27	1964	0	29	377	49
1939–40	5	24	213	19	1965	0	65	339	120
1940–41	0	41	213	50	1966	0	91	500	234
1941–42	0	12	539	61	1967	0	54	1 358	243
1942–43	1	4	728	54	1968	0	13	1 124	87
1943–44	0	3	362	34	1969	0	35	1 645	69
1944	0	2	287	5	1970	0	34	1 536	184
1945	0	5	423	5	1971	0	8	2 453	72
1946	0	13	434	51	1972	1	10	274	19
1947	3	18	322	74	1973	1	44	475	219
1948	9	8	202	17	1974	1	37	6 788	949
1949	0	4	123	19	1975	0	37	4 798	233
1950	0	3	199	13	1976	0	20	10 960	535
1951	0	13	198	23	1977	0	242	12 379	2666
1952	0	11	133	35	1978	4	224	7 069	2296
1953	0	19	205	41	1979	5	76	7 921	1936
1954	0	59	233	48	1980	2	41	3 644	628
1955	0	28	247	37	1981	0	42	2 478	705
1956	0	11	297	18	1982	9	125	5 088	787

1. The 1931–1943 years are April–March but from 1944 onwards are calendar years.
2. Data up to 1985 are from fishing returns; data from 1986 to 1990 are from Quota Management Reports.
3. Data for the period 1931 to 1982 are based on reported landings by harbour and are likely to be underestimated as a result of under-reporting and discarding practices. Data include both foreign and domestic landings. Data were aggregated to FMA using methods and assumptions described by Francis & Paul (2013).

Table 4: Reported landings (t) and TACCs (t) for red cod by Fishstock. Source: QMR/MHR from 1986–present. No landings have been reported from RCO 10.

Fishstock FMA (s)	RCO 1 1 &		RCO 2 2 & 8		RCO 3 3, 4 & 5		RCO 7 7		Total	
	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC	Land.	TACC
1983–84*	12	–	197	–	9 357	–	3 051	–	13 848	–
1984–85*	9	–	126	–	14 751	–	1 442	–	18 292	–
1985–86*	6	–	48	–	9 346	–	408	–	10 940	–
1986–87	5	42	46	364	3 300	13 018	619	3 125	3 970	15 290
1987–88	8	42	81	364	2 880	13 018	1 609	3 125	4 506	15 571
1988–89	9	42	85	364	7 840	13 018	1 357	3 125	9 171	15 828
1989–90	8	42	105	364	6 589	13 018	800	3 125	7 502	16 537
1990–91	12	42	68	364	4 630	12 299	856	3 125	5 549	15 840
1991–92	26	42	358	364	6 517	12 299	2 222	3 125	9 104	15 840
1992–93	46	42	441	364	9 635	12 389	4 088	3 125	14 203	15 930
1993–94	44	42	477	364	7 977	12 389	2 992	3 125	11 491	15 930
1994–95	63	42	762	364	12 603	12 389	3 570	3 125	16 997	15 930
1995–96	28	42	584	500	10 983	12 389	3 712	3 125	15 350	16 066
1996–97	42	42	396	500	10 037	12 389	3 657	3 125	14 204	16 066
1997–98	22	42	192	500	9 954	12 389	2 595	3 125	12 886	16 066
1998–99	10	42	282	500	13 919	12 389	2 055	3 125	16 273	16 066
1999–00	3	42	130	500	4 824	12 389	632	3 125	5 590	16 066
2000–01	5	42	112	500	2 776	12 389	1 538	3 125	4 432	16 066
2001–02	6	42	150	500	2 857	12 396	1 410	3 126	4 427	16 067
2002–03	8	42	144	500	5 107	12 396	1 657	3 126	6 916	16 067
2003–04	11	42	225	500	7 724	12 396	2 358	3 126	10 318	16 067
2004–05	21	42	423	500	4 212	12 396	3 052	3 126	7 708	16 067
2005–06	24	42	372	500	3 223	12 396	3 061	3 126	6 679	16 067
2006–07	25	42	256	500	1 877	12 396	3 409	3 126	5 567	16 067
2007–08	12	42	225	500	3 236	4 600	2 984	3 126	6 457	8 278
2008–09	12	42	212	500	2 542	4 600	2 131	3 126	4 897	8 278
2009–10	14	42	364	500	2 994	4 600	1 868	3 126	5 236	8 278
2010–11	19	42	501	500	4 568	4 600	1 603	3 126	6 691	8 278
2011–12	8	42	549	500	5 386	4 600	1 681	3 126	7 627	8 278
2012–13	6	42	300	619 ¹	5 294	4 944 ¹	1 282	3 126	6 881	8 278
2013–14	6	42	167	500	4 410	5 391 ¹	1 272	3 126	5 855	9 069
2014–15	7	42	142	500	2 171	4 600 ²	1 482	3 126	3 804	8 278
2015–16	15	42	419	500	3 837	4 600	1 417	3 126	5 688	8 278
2016–17	20	42	385	733 ²	4 543	4 600	1 929	3 126	6 876	8 511
2017–18	21	42	151	500	2 250	4 600	945	3 126	3 367	8 278
2018–19	8	42	69	500	1 822	4 600	1 014	3 126	2 912	8 278
2019–20	5	42	30	500	1 557	4 600	758	3 126	2 349	8 278
2020–21	11	42	30	500	1 963	4 600	911	3 126	2 915	8 278
2021–22	13	42	30	500	2 435	4 600	253	3 126	2 730	8 278
2022–23	2	42	25	500	1 145	4 600	72	3 126	1 244	8 278
2023–24	1	42	18	500	569	4 600	239	3 126	827	8 278
2024–25	4	42	18	500	530	4 600	565	3 126	1 117	8 278

¹ Commercial catch allowance increased through application of in-season MP with additional ACE provided under S68 of Fisheries Act 1996. - ² Recommended commercial catch allowance increase to 6289 t consulted but not implemented. *FSU data.




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the three main RCO stocks. RCO 2 (Central East) RCO 2 shows in-season adjustments to the commercial limit [Continued on next page].




Figure 1 [Continued]: Reported commercial landings and TACC for the three main RCO stocks. RCO 3 (South East Coast) and RCO 7 (Challenger). RCO 3 shows in-season adjustments to the commercial limit.

1.2 Recreational fisheries

The first recreational harvest estimates were provided by offsite telephone-diary surveys conducted between 1991 and 2001 (Bradford 1998, Boyd & Reilly 2004, Teirney et al. 1997). These estimates are no longer considered to be reliable by the Marine Amateur Fishing Working Group (MAFWG), because the method was prone to ‘soft refusal’ bias during recruitment of potential participants and overstated catches during reporting. The recreational harvest estimates provided by the 2000 and 2001 telephone-diary surveys were also thought to be implausibly high for many species by the MAFWG.

In response to these problems and the cost and scale challenges associated with onsite methods, a national panel survey was conducted for the first time throughout the 2011–12 fishing year. The panel survey used face-to-face interviews of a random sample of 30 390 New Zealand households to recruit a panel of fishers and non-fishers for a full year (Wynne-Jones et al. 2014). The panel members were contacted regularly about their fishing activities and harvest information in standardised phone interviews. The national panel survey was repeated during the 2017–18 and 2022–23 fishing years using very similar methods to produce directly comparable results (Wynne-Jones et al. 2019; Heinemann & Gray 2024). Recreational catch estimates from the three national panel surveys are given in Table 5. Note that national panel survey estimates do not include recreational harvest taken on charter vessel trips or under s111 general approvals.

Table 5: Recreational harvest estimates for red cod stocks (Wynne-Jones et al. 2014, 2019, Heinemann & Gray 2024). Mean weights from boat ramp surveys (Hartill & Davey 2015, Davey et al. 2019, 2024).

Stock	Year	Method	Number of fish	Total weight (t)	CV
RCO 1	2011–12	Panel survey	2 511	2.7	0.36
	2017–18	Panel survey	2 148	2.3	0.36
	2022–23	Panel survey	443	0.4	0.79
RCO 2	2011–12	Panel survey	20 286	24.3	0.18
	2017–18	Panel survey	18 330	19.3	0.29
	2022–23	Panel survey	369	0.4	0.53
RCO 3	2011–12	Panel survey	7 369	8.0	0.25
	2017–18	Panel survey	6 411	6.8	0.27
	2022–23	Panel survey	860	0.8	0.58
RCO 7	2011–12	Panel survey	2 184	2.3	0.46
	2017–18	Panel survey	3 049	3.2	0.31
	2022–23	Panel survey	830	0.8	0.72

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

Quantitative estimates of the current level of customary non-commercial catch are not available.

1.4 Illegal catch

Quantitative estimates of the level of illegal catch are not available.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

Processing limits on red cod are sometimes imposed to discourage fishers from landing red cod when the species cannot be processed or when markets are poor. This practice has encouraged dumping. Processing limits are currently less of a problem than in earlier years.

2. BIOLOGY

Red cod are a fast-growing, short-lived species with few fish in the commercial fishery older than six years. Red cod grow to about 25 cm total length (TL) in the first year, followed by annual growth increments of around 15, 10, and 5 cm. Growth of sexes is similar for the first two years, after which females tend to grow faster than males and reach a larger overall length. Sexual maturity ranges from 45 to 55 cm TL with a mean value of 52 cm TL for both sexes at an age of 2–3 years. *M* has been estimated to equal 0.76 for both sexes. In 1995, ageing of red cod was validated using marginal zone analysis.

In the 1989–90 to 1992–93 fishing years, 80% of the landings in RCO 3 were 2+ and 3+ fish (50–57 cm TL). The sex ratio of the commercial catch during this period was skewed towards females during November (F:M ratio of 3.4:1) with the ratio tending to even out by May. Schools generally comprise single age cohorts rather than a mix of age classes.

Spawning in red cod varies with latitude, with spawning occurring later at higher latitudes. In the Canterbury Bight, spawning occurs from August to October. No definite spawning grounds have been identified off the southeast coast, but there is some evidence that red cod spawn in deeper water (300–750 m). Running ripe fish were caught on the Puysegur Bank in 600 m during the Southland trawl survey in February 1994. Juvenile red cod are found in offshore waters after the spawning period; however, no nursery grounds are known for this species.

Red cod are seasonally abundant, with schools appearing in the Canterbury Bight and Banks Peninsula area around November. These schools are feeding aggregations and are not found in these waters after about June. Catch data indicate that they move into deeper water after this time. Recruitment is highly variable resulting in large variations in catches between years.

Biological parameters relevant to the stock assessment are shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Estimates of biological parameters for red cod.

Fishstock				Estimate		Source
<u>1. Natural mortality (<i>M</i>)</u>						
RCO 3				0.76		Beentjes (1992)
<u>2. Weight = <i>a</i>(length)^{<i>b</i>} (Weight in g, length in cm fork length).</u>						
	Females			Males		
	<i>a</i>		<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	
RCO 3	0.0074		3.059	0.0145	2.892	Beentjes (1992)
RCO 3 combined sexes	0.009249		3.001			Beentjes (1992)
<u>3. von Bertalanffy growth parameters</u>						
	Females			Males		
	<i>L</i> _∞	<i>k</i>	<i>t</i> ₀	<i>L</i> _∞	<i>k</i>	<i>t</i> ₀
RCO 3	76.5	0.41	-0.03	68.5	0.47	0.06
RCO 7	79.6	0.49	0.20	68.2	0.53	0.22
						Horn (1995)
						Beentjes (2000)

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

The number of red cod stocks is unknown. There is no information about stock structure, recruitment patterns, or other biological characteristics that would indicate stock boundaries.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

No recent stock assessments have been carried out on any red cod stocks. Previous assessments were undertaken; however, these are now outdated. Details appear in previous versions of the Plenary report.

Trawl survey biomass estimates are available from four Southland *Tangaroa* surveys, five summer and twelve winter east coast South Island (ECSI) *Kaharoa* surveys, and fourteen west coast South Island (WCSI) autumn *Kaharoa* surveys (Table 7, Figures 2 and 3).

4.1 Biomass estimates

East coast South Island inshore trawl survey

The ECSI winter surveys from 1991 to 1996 in 30–400 m were replaced by summer trawl surveys (1996–97 to 2000–01) which also included the 10–30 m depth range; but in 2001, the Inshore WG recommended that the summer ECSI trawl survey be discontinued because of the extreme fluctuations in catchability between surveys (Francis et al. 2001). The winter surveys were reinstated in 2007 and this time included additional 10–30 m strata in an attempt to index elephantfish and red gurnard which were officially included in the list of target species in 2012. The 2007 survey and all surveys from 2012 onwards provide full coverage of the 10–30 m depth range. The winter surveys are currently conducted on a biennial cycle.

Following the resumption of the winter surveys in 2007, red cod core strata biomass was low relative to the period in the 1990s, except for large estimates in the 2012 and 2021 surveys, which were a result of a few large catches associated with inflated CVs (Figure 2, Table 7) (MacGibbon et al. 2024). The biomass in 2021 increased by 10-fold and was the highest in the time series following the lowest in 2018, although the associated CVs were very high for both of these surveys (2018 = 83%; 2021 = 69%). The biomass estimate of 95 t in 2024 (CV = 51%) was the lowest estimate in the time series at less than 5% of the 2022 value and just over 6% of the previous time series low of 1500 t in 2018 (Table 7, Figure 2) (MacGibbon et al. 2024). The relatively high biomass in 1994 and the low biomass in 2007–09 are consistent with commercial landings in RCO 3, a fishery in which cyclical fluctuating catches are characteristic. The large biomass in 2012 consisted predominantly of 1+ year fish. The proportion of pre-recruit biomass in the core strata varied greatly among surveys ranging from 6% to 59% of the total biomass and in 2024 it was 41%. The proportion of juvenile biomass (based on the length-at-50% maturity) also varied greatly among surveys, with corresponding peaks in 1994 and 2012 of about 70% juvenile; in 2024, juvenile biomass was relatively high at 61%.

The additional red cod biomass captured in the 10–30 m depth range accounted for 5% or less of the

biomass in five of the eight core plus shallow strata (10–400 m) surveys. However, in 2014 and 2022, it accounted for substantially more (44% and 34%, respectively) of the total biomass—indicative of the sporadic importance of shallow strata for red cod and the variable nature of red cod catches (Table 7, Figure 2) (MacGibbon et al. 2024). Biomass in the 10–30 m strata accounted for 12% of the total in 2024. The addition of the 10–30 m depth range had little effect on the shape of the length frequency distributions in any of the six surveys, except 2014 when the largest fish (over 60 cm) were in 10–30 m, and in 2024, when a substantial amount of 0+ fish were from the 10–30 m strata.

The spatial distribution of red cod aggregations (large catches) varied geographically among surveys and was in contrast to more frequent zero or very small catches. Overall, however, this species was consistently well represented over the entire survey area, most commonly from 30 m to about 300 m. Prior to 2024, red cod were present in 54–89% of tows in the core strata, with a declining trend of occurrence to a time series low of 35% in 2024.

West coast South Island inshore trawl survey

Total biomass estimates were relatively high and stable for the first four surveys, varying from 2 546 t to 3 169 t. There was a sharp decline in 2000 to 414 t, but biomass gradually increased to pre-decline levels by 2009. Since 2009, biomass has declined with the 2023 estimate of just 69 t the lowest in the time series (Table 7, Figure 3). The biomass estimate of 879 t in 2025 is a marked increase from 2023 but is still well below the time series mean of 1639 t.

Throughout the time series, most of the red cod biomass has come from the west coast. While estimates from Tasman Bay and Golden Bay have always been substantially lower than the west coast, estimates have been particularly low since 2011, ranging between 0.3 t (2023) and 64.8 t, compared with the Tasman Bay and Golden Bay time series mean of 177 t. The estimate of 0.3 t in 2023 was based on three individual fish, one caught from each of the core strata in Tasman Bay and Golden Bay (MacGibbon et al. 2024). The overall biomass increase seen in 2025 was almost entirely from the west coast, with just 0.5 t coming from Tasman and Golden Bay.

Juvenile (under 50 cm) biomass has consistently been greater than adult biomass throughout the time series (MacGibbon et al. 2026). Both increased in 2025. The biomass of adult red cod declined to 6 t or 9% of the total biomass in 2023 but increased to 23% of the total in 2025.




Figure 2: Red cod total biomass for east coast South Island winter surveys in core strata (30–400 m), and core plus shallow strata (10–400 m). Error bars are $\pm$ two standard deviations.




Figure 3: Biomass estimates from the west coast South Island inshore trawl survey. Error bars are $\pm$ two standard deviations.

Table 7: Relative biomass indices (t) and coefficients of variation (CV) for red cod for east coast South Island (ECSI) - summer and winter, west coast South Island (WCSI), and Southland survey areas*. Biomass estimates for ECSI in 1991 have been adjusted to allow for non-sampled strata (7 & 9 equivalent to current strata 13, 16, and 17). The sum of pre-recruit and recruited biomass values do not always match the total biomass for the earlier surveys because at several stations length frequencies were not measured, affecting the biomass calculations for length intervals. – , not measured; NA, not applicable. Recruited is defined as the size-at-recruitment to the fishery (40 cm).

Region	Fishstock	Year	Trip number	Total Biomass estimate	CV (%) 30–400m	Total Biomass estimate	CV (%) 10–400m	Pre-recruit	CV (%) 30–400m	Recruited	CV (%) 30–400m
ECSI(winter)	RCO 3	1991	KAH9105	3 760	40	–	–	1 823	45	2 054	37
		1992	KAH9205	4 527	40	–	–	2 089	50	2 438	33
		1993	KAH9306	5 601	30	–	–	1 025	51	4 469	27
		1994	KAH9406	5 637	35	–	–	3 338	40	2 299	36
		1996	KAH9606	4 619	30	–	–	590	31	4 029	34
		2007	KAH0705	1 486	25	1 552	24	190	33	1 295	25
		2008	KAH0806	1 824	49	–	–	129	36	1 695	50
		2009	KAH0905	1 871	40	–	–	833	50	1 038	41
		2012	KAH1207	11 821	79	12 032	78	7 015	97	4 806	55
		2014	KAH1402	2 096	39	3 714	41	1 038	58	1 057	23
		2016	KAH1605	2 268	54	2 360	52	597	40	1 670	61
		2018	KAH1803	1 500	83	1 584	78	137	60	1 363	86
		2021	KAH2104	15 096	69	15 177	69	896	56	14 200	73
		2022	KAH2204	1 943	25	2 951	19	212	29	1 731	27
		2024	KAH2402	95	51	108	45	39	67	56	41
ECSI(summer)	RCO 3	1996–97	KAH9618	10 634	23	–	–	4 101	23	–	–
		1997–98	KAH9704	7 536	23	–	–	4 426	24	–	–
		1998–99	KAH9809	12 823	17	–	–	3 770	15	–	–
		1999–00	KAH9917	6 690	30	–	–	2 728	41	–	–
		2000–01	KAH0014	1 402	82	–	–	1 283	89	–	–
ECNI	RCO 2	1993	KAH9304	913	52	–	–	197	31	–	–
		1994	KAH9402	1 298	50	–	–	547	52	–	–
		1995	KAH9502	469	36	–	–	47	34	–	–
WCSI	RCO 7	1992	KAH9204	2 719	13	–	–	–	–	–	–
		1994	KAH9404	3 169	18	–	–	–	–	–	–
		1995	KAH9504	3 123	15	–	–	–	–	–	–
		1997	KAH9701	2 546	23	–	–	–	–	–	–
		2000	KAH0004	414	26	–	–	–	–	–	–
		2003	KAH0304	906	24	–	–	–	–	–	–
		2005	KAH0503	2 610	18	–	–	–	–	–	–
		2007	KAH0704	1 638	19	–	–	–	–	–	–
		2009	KAH0904	2 782	25	–	–	–	–	–	–
		2011	KAH1104	2 087	28	–	–	–	–	–	–
		2013	KAH1305	1 247	38	–	–	–	–	–	–
		2015	KAH1503	989	45	–	–	–	–	–	–
		2017	KAH1703	1 247	21	–	–	–	–	–	–
		2019	KAH1902	666	23	–	–	–	–	–	–
		2021	KAH2103	768	26	–	–	–	–	–	–
		2023	KAH2302	69	71	–	–	–	–	–	–
		2025	KAH2502	879	31	–	–	–	–	–	–
Southland	RCO 3	1993	TAN9301	100	68	–	–	–	–	–	–
		1994	TAN9402	707	68	–	–	–	–	–	–
		1995	TAN9502	2 554	49	–	–	182	66	–	–
		1996	TAN9604	33 390	94	–	–	736	99	–	–

4.2 Length frequency distributions

East coast South Island inshore trawl survey

The size distributions of red cod in each of the fourteen core strata (30–400 m) ECSI surveys were similar and generally characterised by a 0+ mode (10–20 cm), 1+ mode (30–40 cm), and a less defined right-hand tail comprised predominantly of 2+ and 3+ fish (MacGibbon et al. 2024). The 1996 to 2009 surveys showed poor recruitment of 1+ fish compared with earlier surveys, followed by the strongest 1+ cohort of all surveys in 2012, and then by weak recruitment in 2014 to 2018, and again in 2022 and 2024. In 2021, the 1+ cohort was the strongest since 2012 but less distinct, merging into the older cohorts. In the 2022 and 2024 survey, all cohorts were relatively weak. Red cod off the ECSI, sampled during these surveys, were generally smaller than those from Southland, suggesting that this area may be an important nursery ground for juvenile red cod. The addition of the 10–30 m depth range had little effect on the shape of the length frequency distributions except in 2014, when the largest female fish (over 60 cm) were in less than 30 m (MacGibbon et al. 2024).

West coast South Island inshore trawl survey

In several years, 0+, 1+, and occasionally 2+ fish have been discernible in the length frequency distribution (MacGibbon et al. 2026). Strong cohorts of 1+ fish (approximately 24–35 cm) were apparent in all surveys from 2005 to 2013 but since then, have either not been seen or, when visible, such as in 2015 and 2017, were substantially weaker than those seen from 2005 to 2013. In comparison to the west coast, the length frequency distribution was indiscernible in TBGB with the last substantial cohort visible in 2009. Numbers of red cod increased in 2025 compared with 2023 but were still substantially lower than those seen earlier in the time series. In 2025, a weak 0+ cohort was seen from about 15–20 cm, and the rest of the distribution was broad, with more fish over 40 cm compared with 2023. The distribution was similar between males and females with a sex ratio that slightly favoured males at 1.03:1.

RCO 2 and RCO 3 in-season management procedure

Management procedures (MP), used to inform in-season adjustments to the RCO 2 and RCO 3 commercial catch, were developed in 2013 by Bentley & Langley (2013). These MPs were based on a predictive relationship between annual standardised CPUE for RCO 2 (or RCO 3) with the total annual RCO 2 (or RCO 3) landings which effectively estimate an average exploitation rate in either QMA (Figures 4 and 5, left panels). A standardisation model is used to predict the annual CPUE for the active fishing year based on the accumulated data to the month preceding the evaluation month. The parameters from the predictive regression are then applied to the index based on incomplete data from the final year in the standardised model, resulting in a prediction of the full-season commercial catch. The partial year in-season estimate of standardised CPUE is used as a proxy for the final annual index, with the recommended catch defined by the slope of the regression line (Figures 4 and 5) multiplied by the CPUE proxy estimate. The 2013 MP rule stipulated that:

- a) only years which were less than 90% of the full-season commercial catch allowance were used in developing the Figure 4 and Figure 5 regressions;
- b) the regression would be forced to go through the origin (i.e., estimated without a constant);
- c) only the positive catch data would be used in developing the standardised index.

Review of the RCO 2 and RCO 3 MPs

The RCO 2 and RCO 3 MPs were reviewed on a five-year cycle in 2018 (Starr & Kendrick 2019a). The basic structure of each MP was retained, with the predictive model based on the regression of total annual CPUE with the landings in the corresponding year. Total annual CPUE for the fishing year in progress was estimated from the partial year data accumulated to the end of a specified month. However, the components of the MP were individually evaluated with the following changes made:

- a) all years were included in the predictive regression (Figures 4 and 5), because no bias was detected among the residuals, even those where the catch exceeded 90% of the full-season commercial catch allowance;
- b) the regression was estimated with a constant (Figures 4 and 5). This made little difference for the RCO 3 predictive regression (because the constant in that regression is not

statistically significant) but the residuals in the RCO 2 regression were badly skewed when the regression was forced through the origin;

- c) a binomial presence/absence standardised model was also fitted and then combined with the positive catch standardised model. This was done because the SINSWG has determined that such models are more likely to capture all components of the CPUE trends.

Figures 6 and 7 show the respective operation of the RCO 2 and RCO 3 MPs up to 2017–18 and predicting the 2018–19 fishing year. These rules have moderate predictive capability as was demonstrated by a retrospective analysis which showed that the absolute relative error for CPUE ($=100 \times \text{abs}(\text{prediction} - \text{annual}) / \text{annual}$) in the predictions averaged from 32% (December) to 16% (April) (months indicate the final month in the predictive year) for RCO 2 and 24% (December) to 13% (April) for RCO 3. The WG recommended that data be accumulated up to the end of January, if possible, because the drop in absolute relative error between those two months was sufficient to justify the delay (from 32% to 28% for RCO 2 and from 24% to 20% for RCO 3).




Figure 4: Relationship between annual RCO 2 CPUE and total annual RCO 2 QMR/MHR landings from 1989–90 to 2017–18; [left panel]: regression based on TACC and declared landings for all years; [right panel]: residuals from the left panel regression.




Figure 5: Relationship between annual RCO 3 CPUE and total annual RCO 3 QMR/MHR landings from 1989–90 to 2017–18; [left panel]: regression based on TACC and declared landings for all years; [right panel]: residuals from the left panel regression.




Figure 6: Operation of the 2019 MP for RCO 2, showing the relationship of the fitted catch estimates to the observed MHR/QMR landings and the annual recommended catches for all years to 2017–18 based on the estimated standardised CPUE up to the end of January. The TACC line includes approved additional ACE for the year, if present.




Figure 7: Operation of the 2019 MP for RCO 3, showing the relationship of the fitted catch estimates to the observed MHR/QMR landings and the annual recommended catches for all years to 2017–18 based on the estimated standardised CPUE up to the end of January. The TACC line includes approved additional ACE for the year, if present.

Operation of the RCO 2 and RCO 3 MPs

The 2013 MP for RCO 2 was operated six times from 2013 up to and including 2018 (Table 8). Even though the RCO 2 MP was reviewed in 2018, the operation of the MP preceded the review and thus used the earlier procedure. Only two of the six evaluations resulted in a recommendation for a commercial catch allowance increase in RCO 2 (Table 8), with the other years coming in near to or less than the current TACC of 500 t. The operation of the revised RCO 2 MP in 2019, using data accumulated up to the end of January, resulted in no increase in the commercial catch allowance (Table 8). The MP has not been operated since 2019.

The 2013 MP for RCO 3 was operated six times from 2013 up to and including 2018 (Table 8). Even though the RCO 3 MP was reviewed in 2018, the operation of the MP preceded the review and thus used the earlier procedure. Four of the six evaluations resulted in a recommendation for a commercial catch allowance increase (Table 8), with the other two years coming in at less than the current TACC of 4600 t. The operation of the revised RCO 3 MP in 2019, using data accumulated up to the end of January, resulted in a recommendation for an increase of 712 t in the commercial catch allowance (which was declined by Industry) (Table 8). The MP has not been operated since 2019.

Establishing B_{MSY} compatible reference points for RCO 2 and RCO 3

Given the large recruitment-driven fluctuations in biomass observed for RCO, a target biomass is not meaningful. In-season adjustments are therefore based on relative fishing mortality, with increases made when this drops below the target value. F_{MSY} proxies accepted for RCO 2 and RCO 3 are the relative fishing mortality values calculated by dividing the baseline TACCs by the corresponding CPUE values on the landings: CPUE regressions shown in Figures 4 and 5, respectively.

Table 8: Results of the operation of the RCO 2 and RCO 3 MP by prediction year. NA: not available.

Prediction year	Fishing year	CPUE prediction	CPUE total year ¹	Recommended commercial allowance	Approved commercial allowance ²	Full-season catch (t)	Date of approval ²	Reference
RCO 2								
2013*	2012–13	NA ³	NA ³	NA ³	619	300	17 May 2013	– ³
2014	2013–14	NA ³	NA ³	NA ³	500	167	–	– ³
2015	2014–15	0.20	0.52	53	500	142	–	Bentley 2015
2016	2015–16	1.90	2.55	527	500	419	–	Bentley 2016a
2017*	2016–17	3.39	2.32	966	733	385	23 Aug 2017	Bentley 2017a
2018	2017–18	1.56	0.75	448	500	151	–	Starr & Bentley 2018a
2019	2018–19	0.75	NA	219	NA	NA	NA	Starr & Kendrick 2019b
RCO 3								
2013*	2012–13	NA ³	NA ³	NA ³	4 944	5 294	15 May 2013	– ³
2014*	2013–14	NA ³	NA ³	NA ³	5 391	4 410	25 July 2014	– ³
2015*	2014–15	1.19	0.81	6 289	4 600	2 171	not approved	Bentley 2015
2016	2015–16	0.48	0.71	2 405	4 600	3 837	–	Bentley 2016b
2017	2016–17	0.85	1.15	4 291	4 600	4 543	–	Bentley 2017b
2018 ⁴	2017–18	1.71	1.11	8 912	4 600	2 250	–	Starr & Bentley 2018b
2019 ⁴	2018–19	1.01	NA	5 312	NA	NA	NA	Starr & Kendrick 2019c

¹ Calculated in the year following.

² Information supplied by MPI.

³ Supporting documents are contradictory and inconsistent: requires further research.

⁴ Recommendation for increase declined by Industry.

* MP operation that resulted in a commercial catch allowance increase recommendation.


5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

Yearly fluctuations in red cod catch reflect changes in recruitment. Trawl surveys and catch sampling of red cod have shown that the fishery is based almost exclusively on two and three year old fish and is highly dependent on recruitment success. RCO 2 and 3 are presently managed using in-season adjustments based on a decision rule and associated management procedure.


- RCO 2

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2018 - now considered out of date	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2016–2017	Catch: 385 t
Assessment Runs Presented	Standardised CPUE and relative exploitation rate	
Reference Points	Target: F_{MSY} proxy Soft Limit: to be determined Hard Limit: to be determined Overfishing threshold: F_{MSY} proxy	
Status in relation to Target	About as Likely as Not (40–60%) to be at or below the target	
Status in relation to Limits	Soft limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Overfishing is About as Likely as Not (40–60%) to be occurring	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status



Combined lognormal/binomial CPUE, TACC, and total annual QMR/MHR landings for RCO 2. Fishing year designated by second year of the pair.



Fishing intensity (catch/CPUE) and a target fishing intensity calculated by dividing the base RCO 2 TACC by the CPUE associated with that base RCO 2 TACC from the catch/CPUE regression (left panel of Figure 4). Also plotted are the annual RCO 2 QMR/MHR landings.

Fishery and Stock Trends

Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Large variation in CPUE in the mid-1990s and after 2010, with no apparent trend
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	Fishing intensity has fluctuated around the target since 2007–08.
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis

Stock Projections or Prognosis	There are only two or three year classes in the fished population and the biomass is expected to fluctuate according to recruitment strength.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	About as Likely as Not (40–60%) with the implementation of the in-season adjustment rule

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation

Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Standardised CPUE series used to operate the RCO 2 in season MP	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2018	Next assessment: Unknown
	MP: latest assessment: 2019	MP: next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	- Standardised CPUE series	1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	N/A	
Changes to Model Structure and	-	


Assumptions	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	-

Qualifying Comments
-


Fishery Interactions
Red cod are landed as bycatch in barracouta, flatfish, squid, and tarakihi bottom trawl fisheries and ling, school shark, spiny dogfish, rig, tarakihi, and moki set net fisheries. Incidental captures of seabirds occur.

- RCO 3**

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication	2018 - now considered out of date	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2016–17	Catch: 4 543 t
Assessment Runs Presented	Standardised CPUE and relative exploitation rate	
Reference Points	Target: F_{MSY} proxy Soft Limit: to be determined Hard Limit: to be determined Overfishing threshold: F_{MSY} proxy	
Status in relation to Target	Fishing mortality is Likely (> 60%) to be at or below the target	
Status in relation to Limits	Soft limit: Not determined Hard Limit: Not determined	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Overfishing is Unlikely (< 40%) to be occurring	

Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status


Combined lognormal/binomial CPUE, TACC, and total annual QMR/MHR landings for RCO 3. Fishing year designated by second year of the pair.



Fishing intensity (catch/CPUE) and a target fishing intensity calculated by dividing the base RCO 3 TACC by the CPUE associated with that base RCO 3 TACC from the catch/CPUE regression (left panel of Figure 5). Also plotted are the annual RCO 3 QMR/MHR landings.

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Recent catch and survey biomass are much below the equivalent values from the early to mid-1990s. The 2024 biomass estimate was the lowest of all ECSI surveys.
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	Although variable, fishing mortality has been relatively low since 2005, exceeding the target only twice during the period: 2004–05 to 2017–18.
Other Abundance Indices	Biomass estimates from the ECSI trawl survey.
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	From 1991 to 1994 large recruitment pulses were seen in the survey catch. Recent surveys (from 2007) have not detected significant recruitment with the possible exception of the 2012 index which had a very high CV.

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	There are only two or three year classes in the fished population and the biomass is expected to fluctuate according to recruitment strength.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	About as Likely as Not (40–60%) with the implementation of the in-season adjustment rule.

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Accepted trawl survey biomass index	
Assessment Dates	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2018	Next assessment: Unknown
	MP: latest assessment: 2019	MP: next assessment: Unknown

Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality	
Main data inputs (rank)	Standardised CPUE series	1 – High Quality
Data not used (rank)	N/A	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	-	

Qualifying Comments
-


Fishery Interactions
Red cod are landed as bycatch in barracouta, flatfish, squid, and tarakihi bottom trawl fisheries and ling, school shark, spiny dogfish, rig, tarakihi, and moki setnet fisheries. Incidental captures of seabirds occur.

- RCO 7**

Stock Structure Assumptions

Stock boundaries are unknown, but, for the purpose of this summary, RCO 7 is considered to be a single management unit.

Stock Status		
Most Recent Assessment Plenary Publication Year	2026	
Intrinsic Productivity Level	Low	
Catch in most recent year of assessment	Year: 2024–25	Catch: 565 t
Reference Points	Target: <i>MSY</i> -compatible proxy based on the west coast South Island trawl survey (to be determined) Soft Limit: 50% of target Hard Limit: 25% of target Overfishing threshold: Not defined	
Status in relation to Target	Unknown	
Status in relation to Limits	Soft limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unlikely (< 40%) to be below	
Status in relation to Overfishing	Unknown	

Historical survey biomass, Catch and TACC Trajectories

Biomass estimates from the west coast South Island inshore trawl survey. Error bars are $\pm$ two standard deviations.

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Trend in Biomass or Proxy	The 2023 biomass estimate was the lowest estimate in the time series, but the 2025 estimate increased to levels slightly above 2019 and 2021. There is an overall declining trend since 2009. The vast majority of the biomass is made up of juvenile fish.
Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	Unknown
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicator or Variables	Continued low numbers of 1+ fish, low numbers of 0+ fish in 2023. Almost all of the biomass is juvenile fish. Biomass has declined throughout the survey ground but is especially low in Tasman Bay and Golden Bay.

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	The continued lack of 0+ and 1+ fish is a concern in a recruitment-driven fishery. There has been an overall declining trend in biomass since 2009 and the 2023 estimate was less than 10% of the previous estimate in 2021. In 2025 a weak 0+ (but improved on 2023) cohort was identified.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Soft Limit: Unknown Hard Limit: Unknown
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unknown

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Evaluation of survey biomass trends and length frequencies.	
Assessment Date	Latest assessment Plenary publication year: 2026	Next assessment: 2028
Overall assessment quality rank	1 – High Quality. The Southern Inshore Working Group agreed that the west coast South Island survey was a credible measure of biomass.	
Main data inputs (rank)	West coast South Island survey biomass length frequency	1 – High Quality

Data not used (rank)	N/A
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-
Major Sources of Uncertainty	-

Qualifying Comments
-

Fishery Interactions
Red cod are primarily taken in conjunction with the following QMS species: giant stargazer, red gurnard, tarakihi, and various other species in the west coast South Island target bottom trawl fishery. Smooth skates are caught as a bycatch in this fishery, and the biomass index for smooth skates in the west coast trawl survey has declined substantially since 1997. There may be similar concerns for rough skates but the evidence is less conclusive. Incidental captures of seabirds occur.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION


- Annala, J H; Sullivan, K J; O'Brien, C; Iball, S (Comps.) (1998) Report from the Fishery Assessment Plenary, May 1998: Stock assessments and yield estimates. 409 p. (Unpublished report held by ESNZ library, Wellington.)
- Beentjes, M P (1992) Assessment of red cod based on recent trawl survey and catch sampling data. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1992/16*. 41 p.
- Beentjes, M P (1995a) Inshore trawl survey of the Canterbury Bight and Pegasus Bay, May–June 1992 (KAH9205). *New Zealand Fisheries Data Report No: 55*.
- Beentjes, M P (1995b) Inshore trawl survey of the Canterbury Bight and Pegasus Bay, May–June 1993 (KAH9306). *New Zealand Fisheries Data Report No: 56*.
- Beentjes, M P (2000) Assessment of red stocks (RCO 3 and RCO 7) for 1999. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2000/25*. 78 p.
- Beentjes, M P; MacGibbon, D J; Escobar-Flores, P (2023) Inshore trawl survey of Canterbury Bight and Pegasus Bay, May–June 2022 (KAH2204). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2023/35*. 147 p.
- Beentjes, M P; MacGibbon, D J; Ladroit, Y (2022) Inshore trawl survey of Canterbury Bight and Pegasus Bay, April–June 2021 (KAH2104). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/23*. 147 p.
- Beentjes, M P; MacGibbon, D J; Parkinson, D (2016) Inshore trawl survey of Canterbury Bight and Pegasus Bay, April–June 2016 (KAH1605). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2016/61*. 135 p.
- Beentjes, M P; Renwick, J A (2001) The relationship between red cod, *Pseudophycis bachus*, recruitment and environmental variables in New Zealand. *Environmental biology of fishes*, 61(3), 315–328.
- Beentjes, M P; Wass, R (1994) Inshore trawl survey of the Canterbury Bight and Pegasus Bay, May–June 1991 (KAH9105). *New Zealand Fisheries Data Report No: 48*.
- Bentley, N (2015) Start-of-season CPUE and in-season adjustment of TACC for RCO 3 and RCO 2 in 2014/2015. Document 2015-6B. 21 p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Bentley, N (2016a) Start-of-season CPUE and in-season adjustment of TACC for RCO 2 in 2015/2016. Document 2016-10. 19 p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Bentley, N (2016b) Start-of-season CPUE and in-season adjustment of TACC for RCO 3 in 2015/2016. Document 2016-11. 20 p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Bentley, N (2017a) Start of season CPUE and in season adjustment of TACC for RCO 2: February 2017 update. Document 2017-09. 23 p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Bentley, N (2017b) Start of season CPUE and in season adjustment of TACC for RCO 3: February 2017 update. Document 2017-10. 23 p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Bentley, N; Langley, A D (2013) Development and evaluation of management procedures for red cod fisheries in RCO 2, 3, and 7. Document 2013-09. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Boyd, R O; Reilly, J L (2004) 1999/2000 National Marine Recreational Fishing Survey: harvest estimates. (Unpublished New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Report for the Ministry of Fisheries Project REC9803 held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.) 28 p.
- Bradford, E (1998) Harvest estimates from the 1996 national recreational fishing surveys. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1998/16*. 27 p.
- Cordue, P L (1998a) An evaluation of alternative stock reduction estimators of virgin biomass and the information content of various research survey scenarios. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1998/22*. 35 p.
- Cordue, P L (1998b) Designing optimal estimators for fish stock assessment. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science* 55: 376–

386.

- Davey, N; Hartill, B; Carter, M (2019) Mean weight estimates for recreational fisheries in 2017–18. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/25*. 32 p.
- Davey, N K; Johnson, K S; Maggs, J Q (2024) Mean weight estimates for recreational fisheries in 2022–23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/28*. 39 p.
- Francis, M P; Paul, L J (2013) New Zealand inshore finfish and shellfish commercial landings, 1931–82. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2013/55*. 136 p.
- Francis, R I C C (1992) Recommendations concerning the calculation of maximum constant yield (MCY) and current annual yield (CAY). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1992/8*.
- Francis, R I C C; Hurst, R J; Renwick, J A (2001) An evaluation of catchability assumptions in New Zealand stock assessments. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/1*. 37 p.
- Habib, G (1975) Aspects of biology of red cod (*Pseudophycis bachus*). (Unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of Canterbury.) 203 p.
- Hartill, B; Davey, N (2015) Mean weight estimates for recreational fisheries in 2011–12. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2015/25*. 37 p.
- Heinemann A; Gray, A. (2024) National Panel Survey of Recreational Marine Fishers 2022-23. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/51*. 116 p.
- Horn, P (1995) A validated ageing methodology, and growth parameters for red cod (*Pseudophycis bachus*) off the southeast coast of the South Island, New Zealand. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1995/6*. 15 p.
- MacGibbon, D J (2019) Inshore trawl survey of the west coast South Island and Tasman and Golden Bays, March–April 2019 (KAH1902). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/64*. 87 p.
- MacGibbon, D J; Ballara, S L; Walsh, C; Buckthought, D; Bian, R (2026) Inshore trawl survey off the west coast South Island and in Tasman Bay and Golden Bay, March–April 2025 (KAH2502). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2026/10*. 84 p.
- MacGibbon, D J; Beentjes, M P; Escobar-Flores, P (2024) Inshore trawl survey of Canterbury Bight and Pegasus Bay, April–June 2024 (KAH2402). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/87*. 150 p.
- MacGibbon, D J; Beentjes, M P; Lyon, W L; Ladroit, Y (2019) Inshore trawl survey of Canterbury Bight and Pegasus Bay, April–June 2018 (KAH1803). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/03*. 136 p.
- MacGibbon, D J; Walsh, C; Buckthought, D; Bian, R (2022) Inshore trawl survey off the west coast South Island and in Tasman Bay and Golden Bay, March–April 2021 (KAH2103). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/11*. 97 p.
- MacGibbon, D J; Walsh, C; Buckthought, D; Bian, R (2024) Inshore trawl survey off the west coast South Island and in Tasman Bay and Golden Bay, March–April 2023 (KAH2302). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2024/06*. 91 p.
- Starr, P J; Bentley, N (2018a) Prediction of 2017–18 RCO 2 CPUE and Operation Of RCO 2 Management Procedure. Report to the Southern Inshore WG SINSWG2018-07. 21 p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Starr, P J; Bentley, N (2018b) Prediction of 2017–18 RCO 3 CPUE and Operation Of RCO 3 Management Procedure. Report to the Southern Inshore WG SINSWG2018-08. 21 p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Starr, P J; Kendrick, T H (2019a) RCO 2 and RCO 3 Fishery Characterisation, CPUE and Management Procedure Review. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/05*. 138 p.
- Starr, P J; Kendrick, T H (2019b) Prediction Of 2018–19 RCO 2 CPUE and Operation of RCO 2 Management Procedure. Report to the Southern Inshore WG SINSWG2019-18b. 35 p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Starr, P J; Kendrick, T H (2019c) Prediction Of 2018–19 RCO 3 CPUE and Operation of RCO 3 Management Procedure. Report to the Southern Inshore WG SINSWG2019-19b. 33 p. (Unpublished document held by Fisheries New Zealand, Wellington.)
- Stevenson, M L (2007) Inshore trawl surveys of the west coast of the South Island and Tasman and Golden Bays, March–April 2007 (KAH0704). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 2007/41*. 64 p.
- Stevenson, M L (2012) Inshore trawl survey of the west coast South Island and Tasman and Golden Bays, March–April 2011 (KAH1104). *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2012/50*. 77 p.
- Stevenson, M L; Beentjes, M P (1999) Inshore trawl survey of the Canterbury Bight and Pegasus Bay, December 1998–January 1999 (KAH9809). *NIWA Technical Report 63*. 66 p.
- Teirney, L D; Kilner, A R; Millar, R E; Bradford, E; Bell, J D (1997) Estimation of recreational catch from 1991/92 to 1993/94. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1997/15*. 43 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Heinemann, A; Hill, L; Walton, L (2019) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2017–2018. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2019/24*. 104 p.
- Wynne-Jones, J; Gray, A; Hill, L; Heinemann, A (2014) National Panel Survey of Marine Recreational Fishers 2011–12: Harvest Estimates. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2014/67*. 139 p.

RED CRAB (CHC)

(*Chaceon bicolor*)



1. FISHERY SUMMARY

Allowances, TACCs, and TACs are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Recreational and Customary non-commercial allowances, other mortality, TACCs, and TACs (t) for red crab by Fishstock.

Fishstock	Recreational allowance	Customary non-commercial allowance	Other sources of mortality	TACC	TAC
CHC 1	0	0	0	10	10
CHC 2	0	0	0	10	10
CHC 3	0	0	0	4	4
CHC 4	0	0	0	4	4
CHC 5	0	0	0	4	4
CHC 6	0	0	0	4	4
CHC 7	0	0	0	4	4
CHC 8	0	0	0	4	4
CHC 9	0	0	0	4	4
CHC 10	0	0	0	0	0

1.1 Commercial fisheries

The red crab (*Chaceon bicolor*) was introduced into the Quota Management System on 1 April 2004 with a combined TAC and TACC of 48 t. There are no allowances for customary, recreational, or other sources of mortality.

The fishing year is from 1 April to 31 March and commercial catches are measured in greenweight. There were no reported commercial catches of this crab until 2001–02, when landings of about 1.3 t were reported. *C. bicolor*, along with several other deepwater crabs, was the focus of an exploratory fishing (potting) permit between 2000 and 2002. Exploratory fisheries have found crabs in the Bay of Plenty, east of Great Barrier Island, and east of Northland. The other region fished has been the east coast of the North Island south of East Cape, where smaller catches were periodically reported.

CHC 1 landings have been inconsistent since the introduction to the QMS. Landings reached over 5 t in 2007–08 and 2010–11 fishing years. Landings were infrequent until 2019–20, but have averaged 2.6 t between 2019–20 and 2024–25, with landings reported in all but one year. CHC 2 annual landings have been less than 0.5 t until 2019–20, when 0.85 t were reported. There has been nil or negligible

catch from the CHC 3–10 stocks, so only landings for CHC 1 and CHC 2 over time are reported in Table 2. Figure 1 shows the historical landings and TACC for CHC 1. Red crab can be returned to the sea under the Fisheries (Landings and Discards) Notice if taken using potting and likely to survive on return.

There are two species of *Chaceon* known from New Zealand waters. *C. yaldwyni* is almost indistinguishable from *C. bicolor*, but is a very rarely caught species from the eastern Chatham Rise (fewer than five specimens have ever been caught).

Table 2: TACCs and reported landings (t) of red crab for CHC 1 and CHC 2 from 2001–02 to present from CELR and CLR data. There has been nil or negligible catch from the CHC 3–10 stocks, so these are not tabulated; CHC 3–9 have TACCs of 4 t each. The fishing year is from 1 April to 31 March.

Fishstock	CHC 1		CHC 2		Total	
	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC
2001–02	1.13	–	0.07	–	1.27*	–
2002–03	0.60	–	0	–	0.60	–
2003–04	0	–	0.01	–	0.01	–
2004–05	0	10	0.22	10	0.22	48
2005–06	0.02	10	0	10	0.02	48
2006–07	0.02	10	0	10	0.02	48
2007–08	5.87	10	0.08	10	5.95	48
2008–09	0	10	0.07	10	0.07	48
2009–10	0.99	10	0.07	10	1.06	48
2010–11	5.53	10	0.42	10	5.97	48
2011–12	0	10	0.01	10	0.04	48
2012–13	0	10	0.01	10	0.01	48
2013–14	1.05	10	0.06	10	1.14	48
2014–15	0	10	0.11	10	0.11	48
2015–16	0	10	0.06	10	0.06	48
2016–17	0	10	0.06	10	0.06	48
2017–18	0	10	0	10	0.01	48
2018–19	0.02	10	0.02	10	0.04	48
2019–20	2.66	10	0.85	10	3.25	48
2020–21	0.84	10	0.01	10	0.85	48
2021–22	8.89	10	0	10	8.89	48
2022–23	0	10	< 0.01	10	< 0.01	48
2023–24	1.90	10	0.02	10	1.92	48
2024–25	1.37	10	0.06	10	1.44	48

*In 2001–02 77.5 kg were reportedly landed, but the FMA was not recorded. This amount is included in the total landings for that year.




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for CHC 1 (Auckland East) from 2001–02 to present.

1.2 Recreational fisheries

There are no known records of recreational catch of this crab.

1.3 Customary non-commercial fisheries

There are no known records of customary catch of this crab.

1.4 Illegal catch

There is no known illegal catch of this crab.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

There is no quantitative information on other sources of mortality, although very small quantities of this crab is sometimes taken as a bycatch of fisheries such as orange roughy.

2. BIOLOGY

C. bicolor is a very large, purple and tan to yellowy tan coloured crab that reaches at least 192 mm carapace width. It is found on and north of the Chatham Rise, and particularly along the east coast north of Hawke Bay to North Cape. It has been found on both hard and soft substrates, but is considered to be a burrowing crab, living in soft sediments. It has been recorded from depths between 800 m and 1100 m around New Zealand, and between 275 m and 1620 m elsewhere in the Pacific.

C. bicolor was previously referred to as *C.* (sometimes *Geryon*) *quinquedens* and belongs to the family Geryonidae which has an almost worldwide distribution. There is no information on its reproduction, age, growth, or natural mortality in New Zealand waters, which may or may not be similar to *Chaceon* species elsewhere.

Geryonid crabs such as *C. bicolor* tend to show partial sex segregation, females being in shallower water than males. Small crabs are usually found in deeper water than the adults, as a result of juvenile settlement in deep water. There can be both seasonal and ontogenetic movements between depth zones.

Females carry a single clutch of eggs during the winter, which hatch the following summer. Clutch size increases with female size, and egg numbers are of the order of 100 000 to 400 000. The eggs are small (0.5–0.6 mm diameter), suggesting a relatively long larval life, probably resulting in widespread dispersal. Off Western Australia, however, *C. bicolor* females may be ovigerous at any time of the year. One study off Western Australia found that the lengths at 50% maturity were 90.5 mm and 94 mm carapace length for females and males respectively.

There are currently no estimates of natural mortality for this species or maximum age. As with other deep sea crabs, however, it is likely that *C. bicolor* is long lived and thus has a low natural mortality and Low Intrinsic Productivity Level.

Pot catches usually yield a very biased sex ratio favouring males, which may be due to the fact that ovigerous females remain buried in the substrate during incubation.

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

For management purposes, stock boundaries are based on FMAs. There is currently no biological or fishery information that could be used to identify biological stock boundaries.

4. STOCK ASSESSMENT

4.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

There are no estimates of fishery parameters or abundance for any red crab fishstock.

4.2 Biomass estimates

There are no biomass estimates for any red crab fishstock.

4.3 Yield estimates and projections

There are no estimates of *MCY* for any red crab fishstock.

There are no estimates of *CAY* for any red crab fishstock.

5. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

For all red crab stocks there is insufficient information to estimate current stock status.

6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Dawson, E W; Webber, W R (1991) The deep-sea red crab *Chaceon* ("Geryon"): a guide to information and a reference list of the family Geryonidae. *National Museum of New Zealand Miscellaneous Series* No. 24.
- McLay, C L (1988) Brachyura and crab-like Anomura of New Zealand. *Leigh Laboratory Bulletin* No. 22. 463 p.
- Manning, R B; Dawson, E W; Webber, W R (1990) A new species of *Chaceon* from New Zealand (Crustacea: Decapoda: Geryonidae). *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington* 103: 602–607.
- Manning, R B; Holthuis, L B (1989) Two new genera and nine new species of geryonid crabs (Crustacea, Decapoda, Geryonidae). *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington* 102: 50–77.
- Melville-Smith, R (1982) A brief exploitation of the stone crab *Lithodes murrayi* (Henderson) off South West Africa, 1979/80. *Fisheries Bulletin of South Africa* 16: 45–55.
- Naylor, J R; Webber, W R; Booth, J D (2005) A guide to common offshore crabs in New Zealand waters. *New Zealand Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity Report* No. 2.
- Smith, K D; Potter, I C; Hall, N G (2004) Biological and fisheries data for managing the deep-sea crabs *Hypothalassia acerba* and *Chaceon bicolor* in Western Australia. Projects No. 1999/154 and 2001/055. FRDC Australia.
- Webber, R; Dawson, E; Stephenson, B (1989) The deep-sea red crab - a new resource? *Professional Fisherman* 3(6):10–11.