

# Submission Form

## Draft Conservation Management Strategy



### Once you have completed this form

Send by post to: CMS Submissions, Department of Conservation, Private Bag 3072, Hamilton 3240  
Or email to: [cmsnorthisland@doc.govt.nz](mailto:cmsnorthisland@doc.govt.nz)

### Submissions must be received no later than 4.30pm, Friday 15 March 2013

Anyone may make a submission, either as an individual or on behalf of an organisation. Please ensure all sections of this form are completed. You may either use this form or prepare your own but if preparing your own please use the same headings as used in this form. A word version of this form is available on the Department's website: [www.doc.govt.nz/cms](http://www.doc.govt.nz/cms)

### Submission on: Auckland CMS

#### Submitter details:

Name of submitter or contact person:	Dr Mary Livingston
Organisation name: <i>(if on behalf of an organisation)</i>	New Zealand Marine Sciences Society
Postal address:	Private Bag 2, Nelson 7042
Telephone number: <i>(the best number to contact you on)</i>	04 8194256
Email:	marylivingston448@yahoo.co.nz

- I wish to be heard in support of my submission (this means you can speak at the hearing)  
 I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission  
*(tick one box)*

Signature:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mary Livingston".

Your submission is submitted as part of a public process and once received by the Department it is subject to the provisions of the Privacy Act 1993 and the Official Information Act 1981. The Department may post your submission on its website and also make it available to departmental staff; any consultant used; the relevant

Conservation Board and the New Zealand Conservation Authority. Your submission may be made available to any member of the public following a request made under the Official Information Act 1981.

**Submission:<sup>1</sup>**

NZMSS urges the Department of Conservation to take a more active role in marine conservation. Community groups are not sufficiently well resourced to take on this responsibility. There is a need to strengthen the Department of Conservation's capacity for marine conservation work.

<b>Section:</b> <i>Identify the section, objective, outcome, policy, milestone, table or map that your submission relates to.</i>	<b>Submission:</b> <i>Explain the nature of your submission stating whether you support or oppose the approach in the CMS. Please provide brief reasons.</i>	<b>Decision sought:</b> <i>State clearly the decision sought or changes you would like to see. Please be as precise as possible. For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- if supporting: 'retain Policy X'</li><li>- if opposing: 'delete Policy X'</li><li>- if seeking changes 'reword Policy X to read (give suggested wording)</li></ul>
1.2	Long term vision Auckland 2060 - nationally representative range of marine ecosystems - should be expanded to include the west coast as well as the east coast and the EEZ	ADD the following or equivalent policies:  The naturalness of terrestrial and aquatic (freshwater and marine) ecosystems has been restored and protected across the diversity of Auckland terrestrial and aquatic environments  The majority of terrestrial and aquatic threatened species known in 2013 are flourishing
1.3	Support the significance and particular focus protection of Maui's dolphins and Bryde's whales from identified threats	RETAIN this emphasis
1.3	Support the aim to improve the number of marine protected areas in Auckland. While an inclusive and holistic approach is desirable, this must not be at the expense of actually improving the proportion of MPA to greater than 0.16% of the Auckland territorial sea. In addition, the focus should be on the implementation of no-take Marine Reserves rather than on other forms of MPA. DOC must show real leadership on this issue	RETAIN this emphasis but note that new approaches will not necessarily lead to more MPAs. This requires DOC to show considerable leadership noting that the implementation of Marine Reserves will not always be 100% supported by all sectors of the community.

---

<sup>1</sup> Further information can be appended to your submission. If you are sending this submission electronically we accept the following formats – Microsoft Word, Text, PDF and JPG. The file must not be more than 9MB.

1.4	Milestone for Tangata whenua should be after 3 years. Six years is too long a period to wait until assessing progress against this objective	REWORD Milestone 1 to read the same as Milestones 2 and 3.
1.5.1	The Hauraki Gulf Marine Park should be included in the list of key places. Also note that all the existing island sites on this list are dependent on the surrounding marine environment and that this should be reflected in the characteristic rather than just identifying them as special terrestrial environments	ADD Hauraki Gulf Marine Park as an area on the list of key places in Auckland.  ADD consideration of the importance of the surrounding marine environment to the descriptions of the terrestrial island sites in the lists
1.5.1.5	Strongly support the inclusion of Objective 1.5.1.5 but the focus should be on no-take marine reserves within the broader MPA framework	RETAIN Objective 1.5.1.5  REWORD to “Contribute to building a nationally representative network of marine protected areas, <u>with a focus on no-take marine reserves</u> , taking into account the marine ecosystems listed in Appendix 8”
1.5.1.9 & 1.5.1.11	Strongly support the inclusion of Objective 1.5.1.9 and 1.5.1.11	RETAIN both
1.5.1	Milestones-Outputs . These reporting milestones are too high level and insufficient to capture any real progress against the suite of objectives listed in this section. Noting that a work programme is underway is uninformative about what actual progress has been made as a programme may be underway but nothing has happened or it has gone backwards. Develop more meaningful milestones that capture real progress against the milestone.	ADD new milestones including:  <i>Report on the number, coverage and representativeness of new and existing Marine Reserves and other MPAs against the marine ecosystems listed in Appendix 8</i>

1.5.3	Objectives. While the focus of this section is on building and supplying public demand, there is no corresponding objective that states that increasing public participation in recreation should come with no or minimal impact to natural systems and in fact should allow natural systems to recover even though the preamble to this section talks about “protecting and restoring natural values” and “sustainable development”. This point is partly addressed in Objective 2.1.5 but should also be reflected under this section.	<p>ADD new objective:</p> <p><i>Ensure that all existing and new recreational developments are undertaken sustainably and consistent with the protection and restoration of natural values</i></p>
1.5.4.1	Strong support for this Objective, especially with the focus on the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park and for developing support for and appreciation of marine and wetland protection.	RETAIN this objective
1.6.2 and 1.6.3	Support these objectives. Consistent with 1.6.2., the best way to achieve both of these objectives is through the designation of additional Marine Reserves and increasing the size of existing Reserves within the HGMP. Given the success of Goat Island Marine Reserve, this approach would be hugely beneficial.	<p>ADD new objective:</p> <p><i>Increase the coverage and representativeness of Marine Protected Areas, with a focus on no-take Marine Reserves, within the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park to maximise the protection and recovery of marine ecosystems and also to promote recreational opportunities for the public</i></p>

2.1	<p>This section is good and the Outcome is positive. However, the fundamental flaw is that there is no objective to actually increase the number, coverage and representativeness of Marine Reserves within Auckland and there should be. For example over the last 18 years Auckland have only added two new Marine Reserves and these have covered less than 1,100 Ha. This is a sad indictment on the progress of marine protection within Auckland especially considering that only 0.16% of the territorial sea are marine reserves (excluding the Kermadecs). Given the importance of Goat Island Marine Reserve, and the public benefits of it, there should be a real push to increase protection. Closely related to the point under 1.6.2 above.</p>	<p>ADD new policy:</p> <p><i>Increase the coverage and representativeness of Marine Protected Areas to 5% of the area within the Auckland Marine Environment (excluding the Kermadecs), with a focus on no-take Marine Reserves, to maximise the protection and recovery of marine ecosystems and also to promote recreational opportunities for the public.</i></p> <p>This target is very small and is achievable over the 10 year period of the CMS. A target is necessary to provide a measureable benchmark against which to measure progress.</p>
2.1	<p>Milestones-Outputs. These are insufficient and are not informative about the state, nature or extent of marine reserves in the Auckland region. While compliance and enforcement are of course important, there are not measures of whether the biodiversity within the reserves is increasing, decreasing or stable. There must be some meaningful measures to (i) assess the biological state of existing and any new marine reserves and (ii) report against progress on increasing the number, coverage and representativeness of Marine Reserves within Auckland.</p>	<p>ADD new milestone-output for 3, 5 and 10 years:</p> <p><i>Report on the number, coverage and representativeness of new and existing Marine Reserves and other MPAs against (i) the marine ecosystems listed in Appendix 8 and (ii) the target for Marine Reserves in the Auckland CMS.</i></p>

2.2	<p>Milestones-Outputs. Given the importance of this Complex, which relies on its natural character and marine environment, there must be a meaningful measure to assess the biological state of the marine reserve and any impacts upon it. This is consistent with policies 2.2.4(a), 2.2.6, and 2.2.11(a). The reason that this is important is that visitor satisfaction could improve or be stable even though the marine environment is deteriorating and so a biologically meaningful measure is essential as a milestone.</p>	<p>ADD new milestone-output for 3, 5 and 10 years: <i>Biological monitoring shows that the natural character, health and ecosystem functioning of the marine environment of the Leigh Reserves Complex has been maintained or improved</i></p>
2.15.3 and 2.15.8	<p>Given the importance of the protection of this habitat, both marine and terrestrial, it makes excellent sense to complement the proposed protection of the terrestrial component the area as a scientific reserve with corresponding protection for the marine environment. The Society recommends that a marine reserve be implemented to allow for full protection of this iconic habitat. This is consistent and is the nature extension of policies 2.15.3 and 2.15.8.</p>	<p>ADD new policy: <i>Secure additional legal protection in the form of a marine reserve for the marine and estuarine habitat adjacent to the wetland to protect habitat and entire ecosystem values</i></p> <p>ADD corresponding new milestone-output for 2017: <i>Legal status of marine and estuarine habitat adjacent to the wetland has been reviewed and changed to a marine reserve</i></p>
2.7	<p>Kaipara Harbour – statements about Maui’s dolphin distribution are incomplete.</p>	<p>ADD “and are also known to use the harbour itself” at the end of the sentence “Maui’s dolphins are frequently seen at the mouth of the Kaipara Harbour, which is included in the West Coast North Island Marine Mammal Sanctuary”.</p>

<p>3.12.1 – 3.12.4</p>	<p>Marine Mammals. The Society supports the marine mammal tourism policies and urges DOC to add policies on other threats. Tourism is one of the least concerning threats on the west coast of the North Island. Fishing is recognised in the Maui’s dolphin Threat Management Plan as the number one threat.</p>	<p>RETAIN marine mammal tourism policies.</p> <p>ADD policies on the management of fishing, marine mining, pollution and other impacts on marine mammals, with particular focus on Maui’s dolphin. For example “Support research into and monitoring of the impacts of fishing, mining and pollution on marine mammals”, “Take a precautionary approach to the level of human impact on marine mammals, from activities such as fishing, marine mining and pollution”, “Develop a management plan, with measurable management goals, for the West Coast North Island Marine Mammal Sanctuary to ensure human impacts are reduced to sustainable levels within 5 years”.</p> <p>CLARIFY that the marine mammal sanctuary does not currently have a management plan, does not have measurable management goals, and manages some threats (incomplete protection from gillnet and trawl fisheries) but not other threats (e.g. marine mining and tidal energy generation). And INDICATE how these gaps will be addressed in the work under the CMS. As explained in our submission on the Maui’s Dolphin Threat Management Plan, protection for Maui’s dolphins needs to be extended to the 100m depth contour.</p>
<p>Appendix 4</p>	<p>This is incomplete and doesn’t include all the existing Marine Reserves and it should.</p>	<p>AMEND the Appendix to include all 6 Marine Reserves in the Auckland Islands.</p>
<p>Appendix 7</p>	<p>Maui’s dolphin should be added to the list of icon species in Auckland as they are endemic to NZ and Critically Endangered.</p>	<p>AMEND the Appendix to include Maui’s dolphins.</p>

Please continue on a separate sheet if required.