

**Table 2. Effectiveness of management instruments against individual criteria**

Instrument	Criteria																			
	Reduce non-target fish bycatch	Reduce marine habitats/seabed disturbance	Reduce mammal bycatch	Reduce bird bycatch	Reduce invertebrate, flora and byophyte bycatch	Reduce pollution	Protect fish habitats	Protect Maori customary rights & practices	Maintain recreationists' access to fish	Minimise net cost to commercial fishers	Effectiveness at Internalising externalities	Avoid large distributional changes	The management mechanism is cheap to administer	Necessary infrastructure is cheap and readily available	The mechanism has low information needs	Does not require highly skilled management staff	Effectiveness in non-ideal conditions	The management mechanism is easily introduced	The management mechanism is easily modified	
No take zones	2	4	3	0	2	0	2	-2	2	3	0	2	4	4	4	4	4	1	3	
Marine Reserve	2	4	2	0	2	0	2	-2	2	2	0	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0
Temporary area closure	2	1	3	3	0	2	1	3	2	2	0	1	4	4	2	4	4	2	4	4
Closed seasons	2	1	4	3	0	2	0	-1	4	2	0	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4
Size or sex selectivity	0	-2	-2	-2	-2	-1	0	4	2	3	0	3	2	4	4	4	1	4	4	4
Bycatch reduction devices	2	0	4	3	2	0	0	4	4	4	0	2	3	4	4	4	2	4	4	4
Technology ban	2	3	3	3	3	0	1	4	4	1	0	1	3	2	4	4	3	1	2	2
Input limitations (quantitative)	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	4	2	0	4	2	2	1	3	0	1	1	1
Catch limitations	2	2	2	2	2	1	0	3	2	2	0	2	2	4	3	4	3	1	1	1
Retention requirements	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	3	3	4	2	2	2	4	0	3	2	2
Tax variable inputs	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	4	4	1	3	1	1	1	0	2	0	2	0	0
Financial inducements	3	2	2	2	1	0	2	2	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0
Subsidies	3	2	2	2	1	0	2	2	4	4	4	3	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0
Environmental bonds	1	3	2	1	0	2	1	2	4	2	4	1	1	3	1	3	0	2	2	2
Property rights	3	2	3	1	1	0	4	0	2	3	4	3	3	2	0	2	0	2	0	0
Co-management	2	3	3	3	3	0	3	2	3	2	2	4	2	2	2	1	0	3	1	1
Codes of practice	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	4	4	1	4	4	2	2	4	2	4	4	4
Conservation easements	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	0	3	3	0	4	4	3	3	0	0	2	0	0
Tort law	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	4	2	2	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Publications/guides	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4	0	4	4	4	2	2	1	4	4	4
Informal regulation	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4	1	2	3	3	1	1	4	4	4	4
Accredited EMS	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	2	4	-2	4	2	0	4	3	4	4	4

Scale: Scores are anchored on a 9-point scale ranging from -4 to 4. Zero indicates no effect. 4 indicates complete effectiveness in achieving the criterion. Negative scores indicate that the instrument is counter-productive. A score of -4 indicates an extremely serious degradation of the target criterion.