

Summary of Submissions – Overview

1. In response to the proposal to temporarily extend the southern boundary of the West Coast North Island (WCNI) Marine Mammal Sanctuary (MMS) and extend the seismic survey regulations within this area, DOC received:
 - a. 255 individual submissions:
 - i. 48 submissions from representative groups;
 - ii. 207 submissions from individuals from the general public and school students.
 - b. 300 submissions from the Green Party online submission guide.
 - c. 2 petitions:
 - iii. One of 455 signatures;
 - iv. Another of over 2000 signatories from lets-face-it-dolphins.com visual petition (2333 as at 10 May 2012).

General overview of submitters' responses

2. The Department received a significant number of submissions suggesting a range of options to support protection.
3. The Department received 177 submissions that included comment on fishing restrictions. These submissions were made available for inclusion in the Ministry for Primary Industries consultation process for the interim extension of set net restrictions to Hawera.
4. All 300 submissions from a Green Party online submission guide were in support of the extension of the southern boundary of the WCNI MMS and the seismic survey regulations but requested additional protection measures within the MMS.
5. Both of the petitions received were in support of further protection for Maui's dolphins. A total of 2788 signatures were collected.

Regional and international interest

6. Submissions were received from regions throughout New Zealand including those regions on the west coast of the North Island with a coast that borders the current and proposed MMS areas.
7. International interest was captured through a number of submissions from residents and organisations in the following countries: Australia, Canada, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, UK and USA.
8. In addition to submissions received on the proposed interim measures, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade alerted the Department to international interest in Maui's dolphin conservation from Canada. A number of emails were received by the New Zealand Consulate in Vancouver expressing concern for the recovery of the Maui's dolphin population.

List of Submitters from Representative Groups¹

Name	Representation	Support given to
Auckland Conservation Board	Conservation board	
Auckland Council	Council	
Auckland Labour Environment Network	Environmental group	

¹ The names of individuals have been removed from this document for privacy and replaced with their representative group.

	Commercial fishing	
Blue Planet Marine	Marine mammal observer	
Cawthron Institute	Scientist/research institute	
Challenger Finfisheries Mgt Co. Ltd	Commercial fishing	Seafood Industry Council and Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited
Civic Trust Auckland	Public interest group	
Compass Rose Fishing	Commercial fishing	Seafood Industry Council and Egmont Seafoods
Egmont Seafoods Limited	Commercial fishing	Seafood Industry Council and Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited
	Scientist/research institute	
Environment and Conservation Organisations of NZ Inc.	Environmental group	
Environmental Defence Society	Environmental group	
Forest and Bird NZ	Environmental group	
Friends of Taputeranga Marine Reserve	Environmental group	Forest and Bird NZ
Gardline Environmental Limited	Marine mammal observer	
	Scientist/research institute	
Irish Whale and Dolphin Group	Marine mammal observer	
Ironsands Offshore Mining Limited	Seabed mining	
	Tourism	
Joint submission by Te Ngaru Roa aa Maui, Lost Waves, Surfbreak Protection Society	Environmental group	
Kaipatiki Local Board	Local board	
	Tourism	
Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board	Local board	
Muriwai Environmental Action Community Trust	Environmental group	
Ngaruahine Iwi Authority	Iwi	
Ngati Whatua Nga Rima o Kaipara Trust	Iwi	The iwi of Taranaki
North Sea Foundation	Environmental group	
Northern Region Branch of the United Nations Association of NZ	Public interest group	
OMV New Zealand	Petroleum	
	Scientist/research institute	
Petroleum Exploration and Production Association of NZ	Petroleum	
Piha Ratepayers and Residents Association	Public interest group	
Project Jonah	Environmental group	
Puketapapa Local Board	Local board	
Rio Tinto Iron Ore	Seabed mining	
	Member of Parliament	
Sanford Limited	Commercial fishing	Seafood Industry Council
Sea Shepherd Conservation Society	Environmental group	
Seafood Industry Council	Commercial fishing	
Surfers Without Borders	Environmental group	
Taranaki Iwi Trust	Iwi	Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited
Taranaki/Whanganui Conservation Board	Conservation board	
Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited	Iwi fishing interests	
	Scientist/research institute	
Waitakere Ranges Protection Society Inc.	Environmental group	
Wellington Recreational Marine Fishers	Recreational fishing	

Association		
WWF NZ	Environmental group	

General Comments from Representative Groups

Commercial Fishing Industry (including iwi fishing interests)

9. Representatives of the commercial fishing industry, including iwi fishing interests, are in opposition of the proposal.
10. **Seafood Industry Council** states that there is no justification for extending the boundaries of the MMS and that the current boundaries already extend beyond the areas frequented by Maui's dolphins. **Challenger Finfisheries** and **Sanford Limited** are also of this view.
11. **A member of the fishing industry** states that the public is ill informed on the Maui's dolphin issue and the science undertaken to produce research data is transparent in its findings and lack of definite proposals.
12. **Compass Rose Fishing** is concerned that the Department will shut down the proposal area to fishing and not reopen it if closure was not warranted by new information.
13. **Egmont Seafoods Limited** and **Challenger Finfisheries** submit that no further protection should be implemented until the Threat Management Plan (TMP) is reviewed. **Compass Rose Fishing**, **Egmont Seafoods Limited** and **Seafood Industry Council** submit that no additional action should be taken until further research has been undertaken.
14. **Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited** submits that no additional action should be taken until further information about Maui's dolphins' range and habit use, health screening and treatment, and active intervention has been urgently collected and considered.

Recreational fishers

15. **Wellington Recreational Marine Fishers Association** does state whether they are in support or opposition of the proposal but submit that having a no netting zone is not enough protection.

Iwi

16. A range of comments were received from iwi including opposition and support for the proposal.
17. **Ngati Whatua Nga Rima o Kaipara Trust** supports the views of the iwi of Taranaki. The two iwi from the Taranaki region that made a submission had opposing views.
18. **Taranaki Iwi Trust** opposes the proposed measures as they are a premature response to a lack of information and submits that no further protection should be implemented until the TMP is reviewed.
19. **Ngaruahine Iwi Authority** supports the extension to include their takutai and is in support of any measures taken to protect Maui's dolphins from set net predation.

Conservation boards

20. Both of the submissions received from conservation boards are in support of the proposal, with one board requesting that additional protection should be considered.
21. **Taranaki/Whanganui Conservation Board** comments that there is a serious threat to the future of Maui's dolphins and supports the gazettal of notification and the completion of the TMP as a matter of urgency.
22. **Auckland Conservation Board** notes that its submission relates to activities and projects that are compatible with the board's role in advocating for conservation and the Department's responsibilities. **Auckland Conservation Board** request that additional restrictions are placed on fishing activities.

Councils

23. **Auckland Council** submits that the Maui's dolphin population has reached a tipping point. **Auckland Council** is in support of the proposal but advocates for additional restrictions on sand mining within the proposal area.

Environmental groups

24. Nearly all of the environmental groups that made a submission are in support of the proposal but advocate for additional protection measures to be put in place.
25. **North Sea Foundation** did not state whether they were in support or opposition of the proposal but attached a protection plan for harbour porpoises in the Netherlands as the New Zealand situation shows certain similarities to the Dutch situation.
26. **Sea Shepherd Conservation Society** comments that the extinction of the Maui's dolphin subspecies will be a world first for human-induced impacts directly attributable to extinction.
27. **Environmental Defence Society** submits that urgent action should be taken to minimise the risk to Maui's dolphins from human activity and that restrictions on mining should be extended over the entire sanctuary area.
28. **Environmental Defence Society** and **WWF NZ** note that despite the low abundance estimate, the population can recover with good management including protection from existing threats.
29. **Environment and Conservation Organisations of NZ Inc** submits that Maui's dolphins are susceptible to human-induced threats and that all measures should be taken to prevent additional mortalities. **Environment and Conservation Organisations of NZ Inc** advocates for additional restrictions on mining and fishing within Maui's dolphins' habitat.
30. **Forest and Bird** comments that the proposal does not go far enough to ensure survival of Maui's dolphins even in the short term while permanent protection is established. **Forest and Bird** advocates for a comprehensive MMS with complete protection across Maui's dolphins' entire range.
31. **Project Jonah, Auckland Labour Environment Network, Waitakere Ranges Protection Society Inc, Te Ngāru Roa aa Maui, Lost Waves, Surfbreak Protection Society, Surfers Without Borders, Muriwai Environmental Action Community Trust and Friends of Taputeranga Marine Reserve** advocate for additional protection measures outside what is proposed.

Marine mammal observers

32. Submissions from marine mammal observers for seismic survey activities all support the proposal.

33. **Blue Planet Marine** submits that the recent mortality in January and the home range information in the new abundance estimate paper are compelling reasons for a review of the protection measures for Maui's dolphins and an extension of the current sanctuary.
34. **Irish Whale and Dolphin Group** suggests that Passive Acoustic Monitoring (PAM) on seismic surveys within the sanctuary should be required with shutdown on detection.
35. **Gardline Environmental Limited** submits that it is important to take precautionary measures with such a sensitive population.

Scientists/research institutes

36. Representatives of the scientific community are generally in support of the proposal but recommend that additional protection should be considered.
37. **Cawthron Institute** supports the proposal if the goal of management is to assist the recovery of the population back to its historical range.
38. **GF** advocates for the protection of the area between the current WCNI MMS and the South Island for the safe movement of Hector's and Maui's dolphins between the two islands.
39. **ES** does not believe that current proposal goes far enough to ensure a sustainable Maui's dolphin population.
40. **PF** states that all practical measures should be taken to prevent further by-catch of Maui's and Hector's dolphins. **PF** commented that research should be conducted into the ecology, range and critical habitat requirements of the dolphins.
41. **TB** submits that additional fishing restriction should be considered in the proposal.

Seabed mining and petroleum industries

42. All mining and petroleum industry representative groups supported the proposed seismic survey regulations, with one suggestion of additional protection measures.
43. **Ironsands Offshore Mining Limited** submits that migration corridors for these animals must be determined and protected to assist and support Maui's dolphins' survival.
44. **Rio Tinto Iron Ore** recognise and support the Department's desire to protect Maui's dolphins from human-induced threats.
45. **Petroleum Exploration and Production Association of NZ** submits that caution must be taken not to do anything that could further reduce the size of the population.
46. **OMV New Zealand** acknowledges the need for restrictions on a range of activities within the MMS and has no objections or comments on the proposed extension.

Tourism interests

47. The two submitters who noted their affiliation with the tourism industry are in support of the proposal.
48. One comments that the effect of extinction is the opposite of the '100% Pure' image of our tourism industry, and that these dolphins have huge national, intrinsic and economic value.
49. The other submits that the new abundance estimate should be a national or international siren to set in place immediate measures and restrictions that will reverse extinction, and is in support of additional fishing restrictions.

Local boards

50. In general, local boards submit in support of the proposal but believe that the proposed measures do not go far enough to protect the dolphins from human-induced threats.
51. **Kaipatiki Local Board** and **Puketapapa Local Board** comment that the accidental by-catch and other threats to Maui's and Hector's dolphins need to be reduced to zero, and a precautionary approach to management should be adopted.
52. **Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board** submits that Maui's dolphins are at risk of becoming extinct and recommends additional protection, including fishing restrictions.

Members of Parliament

53. The submitter states that the imminent extinction of Maui's dolphins is unacceptable and New Zealand relies on its 'clean green' image to survive and requests that additional fishing restrictions should be included in the MMS regulations.

Public interest groups

54. Public interest groups were in support of the proposal, with some groups advocating for further protection.
55. **Northern Region Branch of the United Nations Association of NZ and Civic Trust Auckland** support the proposal as it would assist the management of human-induced threats to Maui's dolphins while the review of the TMP is undertaken.
56. **Northern Region Branch of the United Nations Association of NZ and Piha Ratepayers and Residents Association** suggest that additional restrictions should be implemented.

Specific Comments about the Proposal

Consultation process

57. **Petroleum Exploration and Production Association of NZ** comments that the Gazette notice should have been published at the same time the Minister of Conservation publically announced the proposal.
58. **Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited** states there has been inadequate consultation with iwi and inadequate consideration of the Treaty of Waitangi and subsequent Treaty Settlements. **Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited** states that placing a consultation document on the website and calling for submissions falls short of the required standard of consultation. **Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited** comments that they did not receive notice from the Department that the consultation document was placed on the website.
59. **Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited** and **Seafood Industry Council** submit that the consultation document does not provide sufficient relevant information for people to make informed submissions on the proposal. **Seafood Industry Council** states that the consultation document favours brevity over content.
60. **Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited** and **Seafood Industry Council** comment that the consultation document does not include previous research showing observed and confirmed Maui's dolphin sightings indicating the subspecies range. **Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited** and **Seafood Industry Council** comment that the consultation document does not include an explanation of how the Department concluded the January incident was a Maui's dolphin.

61. **Seafood Industry Council** and **Challenger Finfisheries** submit that no discussion was presented on the comparability of the previous abundance estimate to the new abundance estimate. **Seafood Industry Council** states that an assessment of risks to Maui's dolphins and how the proposal would mitigate risks was not presented in the consultation document. **Challenger Finfisheries** expressed concern that the consultation document did not propose any additional options to assist the recovery of Maui's dolphins.
62. **Seafood Industry Council** submits that the Government was reactive rather than proactive when releasing the new abundance estimate and the proposal at the same time. **Seafood Industry Council** state that this reaction was primarily in response to media pressure by environmental groups. **Seafood Industry Council** believes that, due to lack of DNA material, the press release for the January incident should have identified the dolphin's species as *Cephalorhynchus hectori* ssp. or more likely a Hector's dolphin to be consistent with available information.
63. **Seafood Industry Council** is concerned that the Department did not respond to media claims of a significant decline in the Maui's dolphin population, which encouraged political pressure to build. **Seafood Industry Council** comments that any decision on the proposal will be made in recognition of political pressure rather than full and proper consideration of available information. **Compass Rose Fishing** submits that it is the Department's responsibility to make it clear to public and protection advocates why there are vast differences between the previous abundance estimate and the new abundance estimate without criminalising the fishing industry.

Population abundance estimate

64. **Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited, Egmont Seafoods Limited, Sanford Limited** and **Seafood Industry Council** state that the recent research does not suggest there has been any significant change to the population since the previous abundance estimate. **Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited** submits that the recent research provides no conclusive evidence that the population is not declining and that the decline may simply be due to predation or natural mortality. **Seafood Industry Council** states that the apparent decline results from the different methodologies that were used in the previous and new abundance estimates that provide different point estimates. **Seafood Industry Council** comments that the confidence intervals of the new abundance estimate are within the confidence intervals of the previous abundance estimate.
65. **Seafood Industry Council** highlights that the new abundance estimate used a more limited group of dolphins than the previous abundance estimate. **Seafood Industry Council** comments that juveniles were excluded from biopsying and Hector's dolphins that were detected were excluded in the new estimate but would have been included in the previous estimate.
66. **Seafood Industry Council** requests that a further detailed review of new abundance estimate is needed to address whether the techniques used are adequate for unique and unambiguous identification of individuals, and that all animals in the population are likely to be sampled. **Seafood Industry Council** comments that survey effort was concentrated within 1 NM of shore where previous research showed dolphins concentrated in summer.
67. **Sanford Limited** comments that the population is likely to struggle to reproduce at a rate fast enough to replace natural mortality even in the absence of commercial fishing activity.
68. **A member of the fishing industry** considers that there is a lack of true data to give an honest estimate of the abundance of Maui's dolphins.
69. **Egmont Seafoods Limited** and **Seafood Industry Council** expressed the need for more information on the population including regular abundance estimates using consistent methodology and information on the dolphins' range. **Seafood Industry Council** considers that the potential to generate a series of abundance estimates over time from biopsy sampling

deserves further review and the genetic method is potentially more informative. **Egmont Seafoods Limited** suggests that satellite tags are used to collect information.

70. **Sanford Limited** submits that no link can be made between Maui's dolphin mortalities and commercial fishing activity in areas outside current set net restrictions.
71. **Environment and Conservation Organisations** submits that Maui's dolphins were once more widespread in the North Island and the subspecies recovery should not be impeded by geographically restricted measures.
72. **Forest and Bird** states that there has been a significant decline in the numbers of Maui's dolphins between the previous and new abundance estimates. **A member of the science community** states that despite a difference in methodology, when the two most current abundance estimates are compared it shows the population is still exceedingly small and previous management measures have not been sufficient to reverse the decline.
73. **Auckland Council** comments that the new abundance estimate should discuss Maui's dolphin calf counts where they exist from biopsy work as they are relevant to the public's perception of the situation.

Southern distribution

74. **Blue Planet Marine, Ironsands Offshore Mining Limited and Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited** note that no genetic samples were taken from the January incident and it is not possible to reliably tell the difference between the two subspecies without genetic analysis. **Blue Planet Marine** and **a member of the fishing industry** state that it cannot be said for sure whether the mortality was a Hector's or a Maui's dolphin.
75. **Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited, Egmont Seafoods Limited, Compass Rose Fishing, Sanford Limited and Seafood Industry Council** submit that Maui's dolphins do not frequent proposed MMS extension area, or the proposed MMS extension area is not within the known range of Maui's dolphins. **Challenger Finfisheries** submit that the proposal area has no scientific standing as being genetically discrete for Maui's dolphins and is well outside geographically designated population area for the subspecies. **Sanford Limited** comments that research surveys have found no Maui's dolphins in the proposal area. **Ironsands Offshore Mining Limited** notes that the proposed extension is based on the maximum linear migration of a single dolphin, which averaged a greater distance than her peers.
76. **Environmental Defence Society** states there is strong evidence that Maui's dolphins are sighted in the proposal area. **WWF NZ** submits that verified sightings and research supports the evidence that Taranaki and the harbours on the west coast of the North Island are part of the Maui's dolphin range. **WWF NZ** and **Forest and Bird** note that research has shown Maui's dolphins can travel up to 79 km in short periods of time. **Forest and Bird** submits that the proposed extension of the southern boundary of the MMS is appropriate given the dolphins can move up to 79 km.
77. **Environmental Defence Society** submits that the discovery that dolphins travel further than previously thought highlights the fact we do not fully understand their behaviour and distribution, and cannot confidently focus on the core areas of Maui's dolphin habitat. **A member of the science community** comments that the dolphins' range seems to be shrinking, with fewer sightings towards the southern end of their range, further indicating a decline in the population. They also submit that these areas should receive as much protection effort as places still harbouring high numbers of Maui's dolphins if the population is hoped to recover to historic levels.
78. **Challenger Finfisheries** submits that the proposal area cannot be justified as being important for Maui's dolphins for feeding, breeding and other important life history behaviours.
79. **Ironsands Offshore Mining Limited** comments that Maui's dolphins are largely confined to four main offshore areas with an average coastal distance 300 km from the January incident.

Ironsands Offshore Mining Limited comments that the January incident occurred 150 km from the nearest Hector's dolphin colony and 300 km from the main Maui's dolphin domicile. **Sanford Limited, Seafood Industry Council** and **Challenger Finfisheries** note that Maui's dolphins are located primarily in the Manukau Harbour to Port Waikato area.

80. **Seafood Industry Council** notes that the 2010 and 2011 boat based surveys did not detect Maui's dolphins south of Raglan. **Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited** also comments that there were no sightings of Maui's dolphins south of Raglan. **Seafood Industry Council** highlights there is an absence of any dolphin sightings from surveys that went south of Pariokariwa Point. **Compass Rose Fishing, Egmont Seafoods Limited, Sanford Limited** and **Seafood Industry Council** state that no Maui's dolphins have been sighted south of Mokau. **A member of the fishing industry** states that he has only seen two Hector's dolphins on the coastline from Wanganui to Tirua Point in the last 37 years.
81. **Compass Rose Fishing** and **Seafood Industry Council** state that Hector's dolphin sightings have been made around Wellington and Kapiti. **A member of the fishing industry** comments that a Hector's dolphin was found washed up at Oakura Beach north of where the January incident took place, and two other Hector's dolphins have been found washed ashore south of Cape Egmont. **Seafood Industry Council** states there are historic strandings of Hector's dolphins off Taranaki coast and raises concern that previously identified North Island Hector's cannot be assumed to be Maui's dolphins.
82. **Seafood Industry Council** states that the assumption that the January incident was a Maui's dolphin when it was 100 km south of known Maui's dolphin range is unreasonable and unrealistic. **A member of the fishing industry** and **Egmont Seafoods Limited** submit that the January incident occurred further south than the known distribution of Maui's dolphins.
83. **Sanford Limited** comments that if the Maui's dolphins' range has changed, fishers would have reported this as it is not in the interest of fishers to catch a dolphin.
84. **Seafood Industry Council** notes there is evidence that the distribution of Hector's dolphins currently and historically extends to North Island coastal waters. **Ironsands Offshore Mining Limited, Compass Rose Fishing** and **Seafood Industry Council** comment that two Hector's dolphins have been confirmed in the Maui's dolphin population that transited through the location of the January incident. **Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited** states that DNA analysis does not provide support that Maui's dolphins exist in the proposal area but does support that Hector's dolphins exist north of Raglan.
85. **Seafood Industry Council** comments that sightings of dolphins near New Plymouth cannot be distinguished as Maui's dolphins without biopsy sampling and should therefore be ignored in any analysis or should be considered Hector's dolphins. **Seafood Industry Council** state that this reinforces that Hector's dolphins do frequent Taranaki waters.
86. **Blue Planet Marine** submits that a precautionary principle must be applied and it must be concluded that the January incident most likely involved a Maui's dolphin. **Blue Planet Marine** comments that identifying the dolphin in the January incident as a Maui's dolphin was a sensible conclusion given that event occurred within the known range of Maui's dolphins and there have been only two recently documented cases of West Coast South Island to West Coast North Island movements.
87. **Ironsands Offshore Mining Limited, Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited, Compass Rose Fishing, Egmont Seafoods Limited, Seafood Industry Council** and **Challenger Finfisheries** submit that the evidence supports that the January incident was a Hector's dolphin.
88. **Cawthron Institute** comments that a female Hector's dolphin in this region may be a stronger argument for further protection and shifts the debate from whether they are found to which subspecies is present, how frequently they occur and in what quantity and what protective measures are warranted.

Offshore distribution and North Island to South Island movement

89. **Forest and Bird** and **Muriwai Environmental Action Community Trust** comment that research has found that dolphins utilise waters out to the 100m depth contour and that they display seasonal movements. **Forest and Bird** and **Environmental Action Community Trust** highlight that during winter the dolphins are generally found in deeper water and are more dispersed.
90. **A member of the science community, Environment and Conservation Organisation, a tourism representative, WWF NZ, Forest and Bird, Auckland Labour Environment Network, a member of Parliament, Kaipatiki Local Board, Puketapapa Local Board, Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board, Auckland Conservation Board and Waitakere Ranges Protection Society** all supported the extension of protection out to the 100 m depth contour.
91. **Environmental Defence Society, Cawthron Institute** and **a tourism representative** argue that the debate of whether the dolphin in the January incident was a Hector's or Maui's dolphin is not critical to the proposal. **Cawthron Institute** states the incident confirms Maui's or Hector's dolphins occur in the proposal area. **Cawthron Institute** submits that if the incident involved a Maui's dolphin then the subspecies ranges further than was previously assumed, and if the incident involved a Hector's dolphin then it suggests that this particular region may serve as a vital connective corridor between South Island and North Island populations. **Environmental Defence Society** submit that if the incident involved a Maui's dolphin, it is a significant blow to the population, and if it involved a Hector's dolphin, it could have been in a position to interbreed with Maui's dolphins.
92. **Environmental Defence Society** comments that the establishment of corridors within and between core distributions of Maui's and Hector's dolphins may be important for the survival of the Maui's dolphin population. **A member of the fishing industry** notes that there is a possibility that Hector's dolphins could interbreed with the Maui's dolphin population. **Muriwai Environmental Action Community Trust** supports the length of the protection as the area is important for Hector's dolphins travelling up the North Island that could potentially contribute to the Maui's dolphin population.
93. **Ironsands Offshore Mining Limited** submits that it is plausible but not tested that animals from the west coast of the North Island migrate to the west coast of the South Island and that urgent biopsy sampling of animals on the west coast of the North Island is needed to confirm this.
94. **Members of the science community, Ironsands Offshore Mining Limited, Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, Environmental Defence Society, Forest and Bird, Auckland Labour Environment Network, Kaipatiki Local Board, Puketapapa Local Board, Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board, Waitakere Ranges Protection Society, Piha Ratepayers and Residents Association, Surfers Without Borders, Muriwai Environmental Action Community Trust and Friends of Taputeranga Marine Reserve** all support further protection of the area between the North and South Island that could serve as a corridor between the Maui's and Hector's dolphin populations.

Vulnerability of population to human-induced threats

95. **Blue Planet Marine** comments that Potential Biological Removal (PBR) calculations are inappropriate for such a critically small population. **Blue Planet Marine** submits that PBR calculations can be instructive in reinforcing the low capacity of a population for human induced mortality but should not be used to set an allowable mortality for Maui's dolphin for fisheries.
96. **Forest and Bird** and **Friends of Taputeranga Marine Reserve** submit that the PBR indicates the importance of immediate protection as the risk of a single death from human activity in next 10-23 years is very high. **A member of the science community** notes that achieving a low level of fisheries-related mortality is not possible given the current management of Maui's dolphins.

97. **Seafood Industry Council** states that PBR estimates need to be interpreted properly. **Seafood Industry Council** comments that calculating a PBR should not require contracting independent researchers, as primary decisions for calculating PBR are policy decisions not scientific decisions.
98. **Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited, A member of the fishing industry, Egmont Seafoods Limited, Compass Rose Fishing and Sanford Limited** submit that Maui's dolphins are subject to other risks including boat strike, pollution, predation and diseases including Brucellosis, and extending the sanctuary does nothing to address these risks. **Sanford Limited** also considers other factors such as a low numbers of breeding females and slow reproduction to be important. **A member of the fishing industry** comments that these threats are the reasons for the decline in the population and commercial fishers are not to blame as they do not operate in the currently protected area. **Compass Rose Fishing** states that these other threats have a greater impact on the population than one incident in a set net in 25 years. **Egmont Seafoods Limited** notes that other threats to Maui's dolphins have not been addressed and only the removal of set nets has been considered in the past 8 years.
99. **Environmental Defence Society** submits that set nets, trawl nets, pollution, acoustic disturbance, vessel strike and benthic habitat damage from mining are serious threats to Maui's dolphins. **Northern Region Branch of the United Nations Association** additionally notes that Maui's dolphins are susceptible to threats from construction, coastal development, marine tourism, marine farming and climate change.
100. **Seafood Industry Council** states that if human-induced mortalities need to be reduced to zero, a wider range of regulations restricting activities should have been introduced. **Seafood Industry Council** provides examples of regulations such as the use of any vessels, commercial or recreational, or pollution from industrial, agricultural or residential sources in watersheds of rivers flowing into the sanctuary.
101. **Seafood Industry Council** comments that two Maui's dolphins found in Manukau Harbour in 2002 were not confirmed as set net captures.
102. **Sanford Limited** has no record of any of their fishers or contract fishers catching a Maui's dolphin despite continual fishing in Fisheries Management Area 8. **Sanford Limited** notes that since set net restrictions in 2003 there has been no verified capture of a Maui's dolphin by a commercial set net fisher.
103. **Environment and Conservation Organisation** comments that set net fishers have acknowledged they occasionally catch Maui's dolphins and have not reported them. **Friends of Taputeranga Marine Reserve** has concerns over the lack of observer coverage on vessels and the reliance on fishers for reporting of by-catch.

Translocation and captive breeding

104. **Taranaki Iwi Trust, Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited, A member of the fishing industry, Sanford Limited, Seafood Industry Council and Challenger Finfisheries** all expressed the need for further investigation into the possibility of a translocation or captive breeding programme for Maui's dolphins.

Seismic survey activities

105. **Irish Whale and Dolphin Group** submits that PAM on seismic surveys within the sanctuary should be required with shutdown on detection.
106. **Gardline Environmental Limited, a member of the science community, Auckland Labour Environment Network, Kaipatiki Local Board, Puketapapa Local Board and Piha Ratepayers and Residents Association** consider that the full extent of Maui's dolphin range should be protected with seismic survey regulations. **Project Jonah** submits that restrictions on seismic surveys should extend along the west coast of the North Island outside

of and adjoining the existing and proposed protection areas. **Kaipatiki Local Board** and **Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board** recommend a precautionary approach to seismic testing.

107. **A member of the science community** submits that the exclusion of seismic testing should be within 5 km of Maui's dolphin coastal sites and considers that the Marine Mammal Observer Guidelines are not sufficient protection for Maui's dolphins.
108. **WWF NZ** comments that there are currently minor restrictions on seismic surveys and the Code of Conduct should be used as soon as practical. **WWF NZ** submits that there is a need to impose an interim suspension on all seismic surveys within the entire WCNI MMS until a risk assessment through the TMP is conducted. **WWF NZ** submits that if seismic activity continues, then the newer more stringent guidelines should be adopted in the WCNI MMS.
109. **Forest and Bird** submits that there should be an interim suspension on all seismic surveys within the current and proposed MMS area until the completion of the TMP review. **Forest and Bird** considers that at a minimum all level 1 and 2 seismic surveys should be suspended within the MMS. **Forest and Bird** comments that current seismic restrictions in the MMS have not been updated to reflect the latest research and align with international best practice.
110. **Waitakere Ranges Protection Society** submits there should be an immediate ban on seismic surveys throughout Maui's dolphin habitat range including the harbours on the west coast of the North Island, the corridor between the North Island and the South Island and out to the 100 m depth contour. **Surfers Without Borders** considers there should be a limitation or a complete exclusion of seismic testing within Maui's dolphin range.
111. **Auckland Council** notes that underwater noise from seismic activities is very loud and travels very far. **Auckland Council** submits that the proximity of testing beyond 12 NM over 180 dB to Maui's dolphin habitat within the MMS needs serious consideration beyond the voluntary guidelines. **Auckland Council** considers there should be an assessment of actual noise effects of seismic activity on Maui's dolphin habitat in setting the 12 NM sanctuary limit. **Auckland Council** comments that resources should be made available to finalise the guidelines, which should be made mandatory not voluntary.
112. **Petroleum Exploration and Production Association of NZ** notes it is important that when the Department reviews the WCNI MMS Notice that the revised Notice reflects the technical content of the new seismic guidelines. **Petroleum Exploration and Production Association of NZ** submits that there is no reason to make rules that apply to seismic surveying in the MMS any more stringent than those outside the sanctuary since they will be international best practice.
113. **OMV New Zealand** comments that the increased mitigation measures associated with acoustic surveying within the MMS are consistent with OMV NZ standard environmental practices.
114. **Ironsands Offshore Mining Limited** submits that the high levels of seismic surveys need to be specifically defined. **Ironsands Offshore Mining Limited** comments that low power seismic devices are no worse than recreational ultrasound devices and should be permissible to use with caution.
115. **Environment and Conservation Organisation** comments that both seismic activity and petroleum activity is known to impact on marine mammals. **Environment and Conservation Organisation** submits that the MMS should include regulations on petroleum prospecting.
116. **Rio Tinto Iron Ore** would be concerned if the restrictions on seismic surveys already in place were modified to the extent that seismic surveys were no longer permissible to use within the Manukau and Mokau Blocks.
117. **Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited** submits that extending regulations into the proposed area is not justified by the available information and research.

118. **Sanford Limited** submits that seismic surveys interfere with commercial fishing operations through restrictions such as no-go trawl areas and more than likely negatively affect catch rates. **Sanford Limited** submits that despite the adverse impact on commercial fishing, they oppose restrictions on seismic exploration because the proposal is a precautionary buffer and Maui's dolphins are not found in the proposal area. **Sanford Limited** states that seismic restrictions are unnecessary, inefficient and restrictive, and fail to promote sustainable management of our resources. **Sanford Limited** considers that New Zealand needs to provide opportunities for oil and gas prospecting.
119. **Seafood Industry Council** expected the Department to introduce a wider range of regulations restricting activities in the MMS, rather than only seismic surveys, which have not been proven to lead to Maui's dolphin mortalities.

Mining activities

120. **A member of the science community, Environment and Conservation Organisations, Auckland Labour Environment Network, Kaipatiki Local Board, Puketapapa Local Board, Piha Ratepayers and Residents Association and Muriwai Environmental Action Community Trust** submit that there should be controls on seabed mining. **Project Jonah** submits that seabed mining including sand extraction should be prohibited within protection areas.
121. **Environmental Defence Society** submits that at a minimum the proposal should also include regulations to mining, and restrictions on mining should be extended over the entire sanctuary area. **Kaipatiki Local Board** and **Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board** recommend a precautionary approach to seabed mining.
122. **WWF NZ** and **Forest and Bird** express the need to impose an interim suspension on all mining within the entire WCNI MMS until a risk assessment through the TMP review is conducted. **Forest and Bird** comment that at a minimum the current mineral mining exclusion zone should be extended south to Hawera and that there is no justification not to extend this exclusion zone.
123. **Auckland Council** supports an immediate instigation of the extension with additional sand mining restrictions, including its drilling activity, equally applied within the proposal area as they exist in the current MMS. **Auckland Council** has concerns about the effects of mining on the health and welfare of Maui's dolphins from noise and other cumulative adverse effects, and on habitat, specifically benthic ecology.
124. **Waitakere Ranges Protection Society** submits there should be an immediate ban on seabed mining throughout Maui's dolphin habitat range including the harbours on the west coast of the North Island, the corridor between the North Island and the South Island and out to the 100 m depth contour. **Surfers Without Borders** submits that seabed mining should be limited or completely excluded within Maui's dolphins' range.
125. **Taranaki/Whanganui Conservation Board** comments that there is a significant interest in mining ironsand in the area. **Taranaki/Whanganui Conservation Board** states the Department needs to work with regional coastal planning authorities to ensure changes are made to regional plans to prevent activities such as mining and coastal development adversely impacting on Maui's dolphins.
126. **Rio Tinto Iron Ore** states that potential additional exploration and/or mining restrictions in the permit blocks outside of the existing mining exclusion zone have the potential to greatly hinder their ability to make decisions regarding the feasibility of mineral resources within permit areas.

Fishing activities

127. **A member of the science community, Irish Whale and Dolphin Group, Environment and Conservation Organisation, a tourism representative, Forest and Bird and Friends of**

Taputeranga Marine Reserve state that threats from fishing activities were the most important impact affecting Maui's dolphins. **Irish Whale and Dolphin Group** submits that measures aimed at reducing by-catch should be a more pressing concern. **Environment and Conservation Organisations** notes that the main human-induced threat to Maui's dolphins is fishing activity.

128. **Environment and Conservation Organisations** notes that amateur set nets are a threat and recreational effort coincides with peak inshore distribution of dolphins. **Environment and Conservation Organisations** believes the MMS should include regulations on fishing activity including set nets and trawling. **A member of the science community** notes a protected area with at least the boundaries of the current MMS is needed that ensures no fishing methods are used that are known to kill dolphins.
129. **Forest and Bird** and **a member of the science community** request a total ban on all gill nets within the MMS boundary. **Forest and Bird** submits that if the Minister for Primary Industries does not impose this ban the Department should advise the Minister of Conservation to use her statutory abilities under the Marine Mammals Protection Act 1978 to restrict all gill nets within the WCNI MMS and the harbours of the west coast of the North Island. **A member of Parliament** submits that within the proposal area there should be no gill nets or trawling as a 'specified activity'.
130. **Environment and Conservation Organisations** comments that current and additional measures have additional benefits on other species that are caught by set nets. **Surfers Without Borders** states that recreational and commercial set netting should be halted.
131. **Ngaruahine Iwi Authority** supports any measures taken to protect Maui's dolphins from set net predation. **Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, Kaipatiki Local Board, Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board, Waitakere Ranges Protection Society, Muriwai Environmental Action Community Trust** and **Friends of Taputeranga Marine Reserve** support a ban on set nets in the habitat range of Maui's and Hector's dolphins including the west coast of the North Island and between the North and South Islands.
132. **Northern Region Branch of the United Nations Association, a tourism representative, Project Jonah, Kaipatiki Local Board, Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board, Auckland Conservation Board, Waitakere Ranges Protection Society** and **Friends of Taputeranga Marine Reserve** support the ban of set nets in water less than 100 m deep in locations along the west coast of the North Island.
133. **Northern Region Branch of the United Nations Association, Project Jonah, Auckland Conservation Board** and **Waitakere Ranges Protection Society** submit that a trawl ban should extend out to the 100 m depth mark. **Muriwai Environmental Action Community Trust** considers there should be a full closure to trawling in Maui's and Hector's dolphin habitat.
134. **Northern Region Branch of the United Nations Association** and **Friends of Taputeranga Marine Reserve** comment that at a minimum the interim set net measures should extend offshore to 7 NM and at a minimum a trawl ban should extend south to Hawera and out to 2 NM.
135. **Auckland Conservation Board** supports interim and immediate extension of the set net ban along the west coast of the North Island to Hawera, out to 4 NM.
136. **Members of the science community, Project Jonah, Auckland Labour Environment Network, Kaipatiki Local Board, Puketapapa Local Board, Auckland Conservation Board, Waitakere Ranges Protection Society, Piha Ratepayers and Residents Association, Muriwai Environmental Action Community Trust, and Friends of Taputeranga Marine Reserve** submit that a complete protection from set nets within all harbours on the west coast of the North Island is needed. **Auckland Conservation Board** notes that Maui's dolphins have been seen in three of five harbours in recent years.

137. **Te Ngaru Roa aa Maui, Lost Waves and Surfbreak Protection Society** express the need for full observer coverage of any fishing vessel operating within or near the MMS, with video cameras for smaller vessels. **Environment and Conservation Organisations** submits that observer coverage for trawling and set nets is insufficient and reporting by fishers of by-catch has been historically low, reinforcing the need for dedicated observers on vessels.
138. **Northern Region Branch of the United Nations Association, Forest and Bird and Friends of Taputeranga Marine Reserve** request 100% observer coverage on all set net and trawl vessels operating outside and within the proposal area. **Project Jonah** submits that 100% observer coverage is needed on gill net or trawl vessels operating in range of Hector's and Maui's dolphins. **Members of the science community, Auckland Labour Environment Network, Kaipatiki Local Board, Puketapapa Local Board, Piha Ratepayers and Residents Association, Surfers Without Boarders, and Muriwai Environmental Action Community Trust** express the need for monitoring and enforcement with observers on commercial fishing boats within the range of Maui's and Hector's dolphins. **Auckland Conservation Board** states the need for additional fishery inspection investment and a public education plan to be implemented.
139. **A member of the science community, Auckland Labour Environment Network, Kaipatiki Local Board, Puketapapa Local Board, Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board, Piha Ratepayers and Residents Association and Muriwai Environmental Action Community Trust** express the need for education, monitoring and enforcement of recreational fishing within Maui's and Hector's dolphins' range.
140. **Wellington Recreational Marine Fishers Association, A member of the fishing industry, Compass Rose Fishing, Egmont Seafoods Limited, Sanford Limited and Seafood Industry Council** all consider that non-fishing related impacts have more of an impact on Maui's dolphins. **Wellington Recreational Marine Fishers Association** submits that having no netting zones is not enough protection for Maui's dolphins.
141. **Compass Rose Fishing** comments that the Department would shut down the entire area to fishing and not reopen it again should no sightings be made. **Compass Rose Fishing** submits that shutting down the fishing industry will not stop decline unless more research is urgently carried out.
142. **Sanford Limited** submits there is no scientific reason to widen the set net exclusion zone where Maui's dolphins are not known to reside. **Sanford Limited** comments that the existing exclusion area contains a sufficient buffer and there is no reason to assume that constraining commercial activity will have a positive effect on the long-term viability of Maui's dolphins.
143. **Seafood Industry Council** submits that fishing threats to Maui's dolphins are already mitigated by the current set net prohibitions. **A member of the fishing industry** notes that commercial fishers are not to blame for the decline in the population as they do not operate in the protected area and comments that the effects of the proposal on the fishing community and support industries are huge.
144. **Challenger Finfisheries** states that applying a MMS with full restrictions on fishing is inappropriate and contestable, and an extension of the MMS as defined in Marine Mammal Protection Act 1978 cannot be justified. **Challenger Finfisheries** notes that no impact assessment on the fishing industry is present in the Department's consultation document. **Challenger Finfisheries** considers that the need for additional extensive closures could be mitigated through a Dolphin Management Plan and Monitoring Plan approach.

Further research

145. **Taranaki Iwi Trust, Ironsands Offshore Mining Limited, Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited, a member of the fishing industry, Compass Rose Fishing, Egmont Seafoods Limited, Seafood Industry Council, Challenger Finfisheries, a member of the science**

community and **Forest and Bird** all submit that further research on Maui's dolphins is needed.

Threat management plan

146. **Taranaki Iwi Trust, Egmont Seafoods Limited** and **Challenger Finfisheries** submit that no further protection should be implemented until the TMP is reviewed.
147. **Rio Tinto Iron Ore, Challenger Finfisheries, Seafood Industry Council** and **Auckland Council** would be pleased to participate in the review of the TMP. **Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited** welcomes and intends to fully participate in the review of the TMP. **Forest and Bird** wish to be a part of the TMP working group early on.
148. **Sanford Limited** supports the development of a TMP that has well-defined conservation objectives, policies and methods for each subspecies and is location specific.
149. **Seafood Industry Council** comments that the new abundance estimate should be reviewed carefully as part of the TMP review. **Seafood Industry Council** states there is no statistical difference from the previous abundance estimate and no indication that the population has declined. **Seafood Industry Council** notes this does not provide support for increased protection in the TMP, but does support the need to gain better information on dolphins sighted in Taranaki waters.
150. **Seafood Industry Council** recommends that the TMP review needs to be deferred until there is more information on dolphins that frequent areas south of the present closure.
151. **Seafood Industry Council** submits that the risk assessment needs to import a spatial analysis to ensure any mitigation measures proposed are relative to the risks in the areas under consideration.
152. **Environmental Defence Society** submits that an extension of the MMS would provide a means for protecting dolphins moving from the South Island to the North Island and the review of the TMP should pay careful consideration to the possibility of creating protected corridors in the entire area in which dolphins travel.
153. **WWF NZ** and **Project Jonah** requests that the entire review of TMP is brought forward to 2012. **WWF NZ** notes the need for a clear plan to be developed for the species recovery in consultation with stakeholders. **Forest and Bird** notes that the review of the TMP should include Hector's and Maui's dolphins as the future survival of the subspecies depends on the connectivity with Hector's dolphins and all threats can be assessed and managed together.
154. **Forest and Bird** believes the Department should lead the TMP review and research programme so that all threats, not just fisheries, can be addressed.

New Zealand's image

155. **A tourism representative** submits that the effect of extinction is the opposite to the 100% natural image of New Zealand's tourism industry and the issue is being noticed on a global scale.
156. **A member of Parliament** submits that New Zealand relies on its 'clean green' image to survive and the international reputation would be irreparably damaged if all possible actions to save the subspecies are not taken. **Auckland Conservation Board** and **Surfers Without Borders** are of the same view.
157. **Friends of Taputeranga Marine Reserve** submits that there will be a loss of confidence in New Zealand if Maui's dolphins become extinct, which would rebound to the country's economic and political detriment.

Other comments

158. **Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited** expresses the need for a collaborative and hands-on approach to management, involving all stakeholders and tangata whenua, and involving the development of an agreed vision, objectives and goals. **Challenger Finfisheries** comments that a collaborative way forward is needed to mitigate any other potential interactions with Maui's dolphins.
159. **Cawthron Institute** submits that specific and long-term management goals need to be considered in the TMP review. **Cawthron Institute** states that if the management goal is for the population to increase to what is considered an optimal or sustainable population size the protection measures will need to be wider and take into consideration that any growth in this population may result in a larger home range and/or may only occur with connectivity to South Island populations. **Cawthron Institute** outlines further management options in its submission.
160. **Ironsands Offshore Mining Limited** notes that the evidence suggesting that Maui's dolphins reside in the waters offshore Cape Egmont is controversial; but if correct the measures to assist the continued survival and population recovery are not sufficient.
161. **Rio Tinto Iron Ore** submit that an extension to marine reserve areas within the MMS area would potentially reduce the value of any mining-related activities, if progressed. **Rio Tinto Iron Ore** would appreciate the opportunity to provide comment if any alterations were made to the current restrictions. **Rio Tinto Iron Ore** comment that its 2012 work programme will continue to explore options for assessing the distribution and abundance of Maui's dolphins along the west coast of the North Island.
162. **Compass Rose Fishing** states that the Department should have a threat recovery plan with input from the fishing industry by way of collaborative management with all parties.
163. **Seafood Industry Council** note that Taranaki set net fishers intend to employ pingers for added protection for dolphins.
164. **North Sea Foundation** provides a protection plan for harbour porpoises in the Netherlands as the New Zealand situation shows certain similarities to the Dutch situation of large amounts of set nets in the feeding grounds of cetaceans.
165. **Forest and Bird** believes that an internal investigation by the Department and the Ministry for Primary Industry into the reporting offence of the January incident should be conducted. **Auckland Council** submits that the Marine Mammals Protection Act 1978 needs assessment for how fishers can be required to bring in dead Hector's or Maui's dolphins and not discard them.
166. **Taranaki Iwi Trust** and **Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited** request to reserve the right to review and/or amend their submissions subject to the results of the tests on the dolphin found on 25 April 2012.
167. **Taranaki Iwi Trust** provided the Department with additional information on 10 May 2012 regarding the preliminary DNA results that suggested the dolphin found on 25 April 2012 was likely a Hector's dolphin. **Taranaki Iwi Trust** request to reserve an opportunity to respond further if the dolphin is in fact found to be a Maui's dolphin, but based on the results to date they reiterate that they are unable to support the proposal.
168. **Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited** request to reserve the right to amend their submission once the complete results of the microsatellite DNA analysis of the dolphin found on 25 April 2012 is available.

Summary of comments from the general public and school students

169. The Department received a number of submissions from individuals from the general public. A number of school students made written submissions that were posted to the Department of Conservation National Office.
170. Of the public submissions received, 24 were in support of the proposal. 51 submissions were in support of the proposal and requested additional protection measures. 10 submitters did not state whether they were in support or opposition of the proposal and/or believed that different protection should be considered.
171. Many of the submitters from the public believed that the proposed measures did not go far enough to protect dolphins from any human-induced threats, which is what is required if the species is to survive. Submitters noted that there was a need to reduce accidental by-catch and other threats to Maui's and Hector's dolphins to zero.
172. Submissions from school students included 1 submission that was in support of the proposal and 19 submissions that were in support of the proposal and additional protection measures. 4 submissions did not state whether they were in support or opposition of the proposal and/or requested that different protection measures were considered.
173. A large number of public and school student submissions that advocated for additional protection measures requested the following:
- a. protection out to the 100m depth contour, including protection of the corridor down the west coast of the North Island to Golden and Tasman Bays;
 - b. protection from set nets within all harbours on the west coast of the North Island;
 - c. monitoring and enforcement with observers on commercial fishing boats within Maui's and Hector's dolphin range;
 - d. controls on seismic testing and seabed mining in the dolphins' habitat;
 - e. education, monitoring and enforcement of recreational fishing;
 - f. permanent removal of the threats of gillnet and trawling fishing in Maui's dolphin habitat.
174. Other submitters noted the potential negative effect on New Zealand's international image should Maui's dolphins not be adequately protected. Some submitters highlighted the need for further research on Maui's dolphins. The need for a collaborative approach to management was also mentioned by one submitter from the public.

Green Party online submission guide

175. An online submission guide was created on the Green Party webpage [greens.org.nz](https://www.greens.org.nz). Submitters were able to modify the content of this guide before sending to the Department; however, the majority of submitters who used this guide did not alter the standard content of their submission.
176. Submitters that used the Green Party online submission guide to make a submission express concern over the most recent abundance estimate of the Maui's dolphin population and call for a precautionary approach to management.
177. Submitters agree that interim protection measures were warranted while the review of the Maui's dolphin component of the TMP was undertaken.
178. Submitters request that in addition to restricting seismic survey activities, the MMS should prohibit seabed mining and the use of set nets, trawl nets and drift nets.
179. Submitters request that the 100 m depth contour of the west coast of the North Island be used as the offshore boundary of the MMS as Maui's dolphins favour water less than 100 m deep.
180. Submitters note that the interim set net restrictions proposed by the Ministry of Primary Industries would apply to 17-58% of the WCNI MMS.

181. Submitters note the preliminary PBR estimate for Maui's dolphins as support for reducing human-induced threats.

Petitions

Petition 1 had the support of 455 signatories and notes the following:

182. That the 455 signatories call for better protection of Maui's and Hector's dolphins. It submits that she has received only overwhelming support for the necessary protection of Maui's and Hector's dolphins and that people have a good understanding of the situation and complexities of science behind the dolphin's plight.

183. That the general feeling from New Zealanders and those from overseas is that protection should be out to the 100 m depth contour, right into harbours and down to the South Island for future genetic transfer and breeding.

Petition 2 made a submission with the support of over 2000 signatories from the lets-face-it-dolphins.com visual petition (2333 as at 10 May 2012) that are in support of the protection of Maui's and Hector's dolphins and:

184. Notes that printed posters representing over one thousand persons were hand delivered to the Prime Minister, Minister for Primary Industries and the Minister of Conservation on 3 April 2012.

185. Submits there is a need to protect Maui's and Hector's dolphins within the full extent of their range.

186. Comments that this issue is a global concern. It notes that failure to act in line with obligations under the Convention on Biological Diversity's Strategic Plan for 2011-2020 will tarnish New Zealand's reputation as environmentally responsible nation.

187. Comments that public consultation causes further delays. The petition and a number of general public submitters comment that immediate measures should have been implemented under the Fisheries Act 1996.

188. Submits that management decisions and policies should be based on best available independent scientific information and should develop targets for the recovery of Hector's and Maui's dolphins.

189. Requests the following additional protection measures:

- a. implement full protection measures and testable management targets for recovery of Hector's and Maui's;
- b. full protection measures against fisheries by-catch off Kaikoura, Timaru and Taranaki;
- c. eliminate use of commercial and recreational set nets and trawling within harbours throughout the range of Hector's and Maui's dolphins;
- d. extend protection out to the 100m depth contour and the corridor to the South Island;
- e. introduce a comprehensive scientifically sound observer programme and boost policing of measure.