



# ZONING IN: South Australian Aquaculture Report, 2023/24

17 February 2026



**Government  
of South Australia**

Department of Primary  
Industries and Regions

# ZONING IN: South Australian Aquaculture Report, 2023/24

Information current as of 17 February 2026

© Government of South Australia 2026

## Disclaimer

The Department of Primary Industries and Regions (PIRSA) and its employees do not warrant or make any representation regarding the use, or results of the use, of the information contained herein as regards to its correctness, accuracy, reliability and currency or otherwise. The Department of Primary Industries and Regions and its employees expressly disclaim all liability or responsibility to any person using the information or advice.

*Cover photo courtesy of Mark Andrews*

## All enquiries

Department of Primary Industries and Regions  
2 Hamra Avenue, West Beach SA 5024  
GPO Box 1671, Adelaide SA 5001  
T 08 8207 5332  
E [pirsa.aquaculture@sa.gov.au](mailto:pirsa.aquaculture@sa.gov.au)

## Key industry sector contacts

Australian Abalone Growers Association  
E: [eo@aaqai.com.au](mailto:eo@aaqai.com.au)

Australian Southern Bluefin Tuna Industry Association  
E: [daniel@absbtia.org](mailto:daniel@absbtia.org)

South Australian Oyster Growers Association  
E: [chairman@oysterssa.com.au](mailto:chairman@oysterssa.com.au)

Australian Sustainable Seaweed Alliance  
E: [info@seaweedalliance.org.au](mailto:info@seaweedalliance.org.au)

# Foreword

Aquaculture is an increasingly important part of Australia's seafood production and contributes to the rising global demand for seafood. South Australia exhibits a unique and one of the most robust legislative frameworks for aquaculture in Australia, shaping it to be a world leader in the ecologically sustainable development of aquaculture. This framework is designed to ensure the efficient and effective regulation of the aquaculture industry to protect and develop aquatic resources. The Department of Primary Industries and Regions (PIRSA) is the State Government agency responsible for regulating and monitoring the aquaculture industry, ensuring South Australian seafood meets high environmental standards through science-based policies, risk assessments for sustainable development, environmental monitoring, aquatic animal health programs and marine spatial planning. PIRSA's mandate also now includes marine-based tourism developments in aquaculture zones which promote or provide a benefit to the aquaculture industry.

Key commercial aquaculture species farmed in South Australia include Southern Bluefin Tuna, Yellowtail Kingfish, Barramundi, Oysters, Mussels and Abalone. In 2023/24, aquaculture's total contribution to Gross State Product (GSP) of \$328.4 million represented 0.22 per cent of the total GSP for South Australia (\$148.7 billion in 2023/24). Approximately 76 per cent of the contribution to GSP was generated in regional South Australia. Numerous secondary industries have grown alongside aquaculture, further boosting economic and employment opportunities, particularly in these regional communities. The emerging Marine Algae (seaweed) sector also shows promise, offering further potential benefits for the State including the environment. Integrating seaweed aquaculture and bivalve aquaculture (e.g. Mussels, Oysters) adjacent to finfish and tuna farms also has the potential to provide broader environmental benefits and help improve water quality around farm sites and is an exciting area for further investigation.

The Government of South Australia invests heavily in research and innovation in the aquaculture industry. The South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI) is a global leader in seafood and aquatic species research, collaborating closely with industry to develop and commercialise new projects. The Fisheries Research and Development Corporation (FRDC) is a key co-funder of strategic research aimed at improving aquaculture management practices through enhanced environmental and planning knowledge, processes and technologies.

This annual report provides a thorough profile of South Australia's vital aquaculture industry during the 2023-24 reporting period, covering production and value, current practices, management requirements, sector activities and environmental monitoring. It supports the Government's commitment to transparency and accountability in reporting on aquaculture activities.



Hon Clare Scriven MLC

**Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development**

**Minister for Forest Industries**

**17/02/2026**

# Contents

Foreword.....	3
Purpose.....	7
Background.....	7
Scope.....	8
Regulatory framework.....	8
National Aquaculture Strategy .....	17
Seafood Growth Strategy for South Australia 2021-2031 .....	18
<b>Aquaculture activity in South Australia .....</b>	<b>18</b>
Socio-economic data .....	18
Industry licence holders .....	24
Aquaculture applications processed by PIRSA.....	25
<b>Aquaculture policies .....</b>	<b>25</b>
Summary of aquaculture zone policies in South Australia.....	25
Zone policy development and review .....	27
Public call for aquaculture tenure within zones .....	28
Aquaculture zone policy tenure allocation.....	30
Aquaculture outside of zones .....	30
<i>Aquaculture (Standard Lease and Licence Conditions) Policy 2022</i> .....	30
Changes to the <i>Aquaculture Act 2001</i> .....	31
<b>Tuna.....</b>	<b>32</b>
Overview of the industry .....	32
Environment.....	34
Aquatic animal health management.....	35
<b>Marine Finfish.....</b>	<b>36</b>
Overview of the industry .....	36
Environment.....	37
Aquatic animal health management.....	40
<b>Marine Abalone.....</b>	<b>41</b>

Overview of the industry .....	41
Environment.....	42
Aquatic animal health management.....	42
<b>Mussels .....</b>	<b>43</b>
Overview of the industry .....	43
Environment.....	44
Aquatic animal health management.....	45
<b>Oysters .....</b>	<b>46</b>
Overview of the industry .....	46
Environment.....	47
Aquatic animal health management.....	49
<b>Landbased.....</b>	<b>50</b>
Overview of the industry .....	50
Environment.....	51
Aquatic animal health management.....	52
<b>Marine algae (seaweed) .....</b>	<b>53</b>
Overview of the industry .....	53
Environment.....	55
Aquatic health management.....	56
<b>Aquaculture tourism and education .....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>Compliance outcomes .....</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>Aquatic animal health and biosecurity .....</b>	<b>60</b>
Fish kill and fish health investigations .....	60
<b>Industry initiatives.....</b>	<b>60</b>
Marine debris.....	60
Oyster Hub project.....	61
Oyster basket recycling.....	62
Seafood certification.....	62
<b>Research .....</b>	<b>64</b>
Current research .....	65

External factors or events affecting the aquaculture industry during 2023-24 .....	66
Tuna quota .....	66
References .....	67
Glossary .....	70
Appendix 1 - Aquaculture licences by industry sector during the 2023-24 reporting period.....	71
Appendix 2 - Aquaculture zone policy areas (zones and sectors) and unallocated tenure as at November 2025 .....	72

# Purpose

This report provides a summary of aquaculture production and management in South Australia during the 2023-24 reporting period. The report broadly covers aquaculture regulation and management, aquatic animal health regulation and management, production trends, environmental monitoring, socio-economic impacts, key research activities that underpin management, broad sector trends (including species farmed) and challenges. The report presents information in such a way to address components of the Global Sustainable Seafood Initiative, grouped into two broad categories: environmental monitoring and aquatic animal health. The information presented in this report is for the general public, key stakeholders of the aquatic environment and the seafood industry.

# Background

Global demand for seafood is increasing and with wild caught fisheries close to their production limits, aquaculture will play a crucial role in future seafood production (FAO 2024). On an international scale, 51% of total aquatic animal production was from aquaculture in 2022—a record high—and global seafood production reached around 223.2 million tonnes, underscoring aquaculture’s key role (FAO 2024). Worldwide expectations are that by 2032, aquaculture will produce 54% of global aquatic animal output, growing from 51% in 2022 (FAO 2024). Australia’s fishery and aquaculture industry is a minor global player, producing around 0.11 % of global fisheries and aquaculture supply by volume and contributing well under 1% of world seafood trade by value (FAO, 2024; ABARES, 2024). However, the Australian industry exports a range of high unit value fishery and aquaculture products, and is a major contributor to regional communities.

In line with the global rise in aquaculture production since the early 2000s, Australia’s aquaculture sector has been steadily increasing its real value and proportional share of fisheries and aquaculture production volume and Gross Value of Production (GVP: ABARES 2025). In 2022–23, aquaculture GVP rose by 11% to A\$2.26 billion, contributing 64% of total fisheries and aquaculture production value in Australia (total GVP ~\$3.56 billion). In 2023-24, aquaculture GVP decreased by 3.3%, amounting to \$2.16 billion. This decline in GVP was mainly due to a fall in the value of aquaculture product (ABARES 2025). Despite the change in momentum, aquaculture continues to dominate Australian fisheries and aquaculture production, contributing to around 60% of annual value, rising from around 40% a decade ago (ABARES 2025).

South Australia is considered to be one of Australia’s most valuable aquaculture producing states, worth \$209.68 million in 2023-24 (BDO EconSearch 2025). South Australian aquaculture has a reputation for producing safe, sustainable, high quality and high value seafood products within an internationally recognised, and advanced, regulatory framework. Further advantages for aquaculture in South Australia include the availability of relatively inexpensive land, pristine environment, and freedom from many known aquatic diseases that can impact aquaculture. These characteristics create significant opportunities for growth in aquaculture activity in South Australia, including through expanding export markets, growth in trade and attracting investment to the State.

Seafood sustainability standards help ensure consistency and confidence in seafood production. There are multiple environmental and sustainability standards in the seafood industry including the Aquaculture Stewardship Council, Friend of the Sea or the Global Aquaculture Alliance. In South Australia, some seafood producers, including aquaculture operators, have already applied for and received third party certification in accordance with one or more of these standards. The Global Sustainable Seafood Initiative (GSSI) has developed a benchmark for seafood standards so that a seafood supplier can (a) know which standards meet the benchmark and (b) select one that best fits their requirements, therefore

avoiding the need for dual or multiple certifications. The GSSI has the backing of the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and many countries including Australia, through the FRDC. For more information see [www.ourgssi.org](http://www.ourgssi.org) and [www.frdc.com.au](http://www.frdc.com.au).

This South Australian Aquaculture report provides a summary of the seafood certification programs achieved by the South Australian aquaculture industry. The report also provides some of the regulatory information that industry and third-party accreditors may require for assessment against the GSSI benchmark.

South Australian aquaculture comprises a wide range of species farmed in both landbased and marine environments. They predominately include Abalone, Barramundi, Marron, Yabbies, Silver Perch, Trout, Microalgae, Murray Cod, Mussels, Oysters, Southern Bluefin Tuna, Yellowtail Kingfish and more recently seaweed.

## Scope

The South Australian Aquaculture Report, 2023/24 (the report) provides an overview of marine and landbased aquaculture in South Australia within the 2023-24 reporting period, using the most recent data available. The report provides information directly related to each aquaculture sector (Tuna, Finfish, Abalone, Mussels, Oysters, Landbased, Tourism, and recently, Marine Algae).

Data sources used for this report include the following:

- 2023-24 BDO EconSearch Pty Ltd production and economic data (BDO Econsearch 2025)
- 2023-24 Environmental Monitoring Program (EMP) data
- 2023-24 PIRSA Fisheries and Aquaculture management activities, industry trends and external factors.

## Regulatory framework

### General aquaculture regulation

South Australia strives to be at the forefront of aquaculture development and planning, and the [Aquaculture Act 2001](#) is currently the only dedicated aquaculture legislation of its kind in Australia. The Department of Primary Industries and Regions (PIRSA) is the State Government agency responsible for the regulation and management of the State's aquaculture industry.

South Australia has taken a strategic approach to regulation and seeks to proactively plan for the future growth and expansion of the industry. While competition for, and access to, South Australia's natural resources is increasing, the government is supporting the efficient and effective use of these resources through sound policies and planning and a one-stop-shop approach to aquaculture administration which involves PIRSA coordinating referrals and consultation with other government departments, key stakeholders and the community.

The [Aquaculture Act 2001](#) establishes the broad framework for the regulation of aquaculture in South Australia by:

- Defining aquaculture as the farming of aquatic organisms for the purposes of trade, business or research
- Authorising aquaculture by setting the parameters within which it can occur

- Enshrining the principle of ecologically sustainable development (ESD)
- Providing for marine spatial planning for the future of the aquaculture industry through the development/review of aquaculture zone policies
- Maintaining requirements for aquaculture leases and licences.

The objects of the [Aquaculture Act 2001](#) are:

- To promote ecologically sustainable development of marine and inland aquaculture
- To maximise the benefits to the community from the state's aquaculture resources
- To ensure the efficient and effective regulation of the aquaculture industry.

Under the [Aquaculture Act 2001](#), aquaculture development is ecologically sustainable if it is managed to ensure that communities provide for their economic, social and physical well-being while—

- (a) natural and physical resources are maintained to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and
- (b) biological diversity and ecological processes and systems are protected; and
- (c) adverse effects on the environment are avoided, remedied or mitigated.

Further, in making decisions as to whether development is ecologically sustainable or to ensure that development is ecologically sustainable—

- (a) long-term and short-term economic, environmental, social and equity considerations should be effectively integrated; and
- (b) if there are threats of serious or irreversible environmental harm, lack of full scientific certainty should not be taken to justify the postponement of decisions or measures to prevent the environmental harm.

## **Leasing and licensing**

The [Aquaculture Act 2001](#) provides that a person may not conduct aquaculture in South Australia unless authorised to do so by an aquaculture licence. There are two types of aquaculture that occur in South Australia, namely marine aquaculture (aquaculture occurring in State waters) and landbased aquaculture.

For marine aquaculture, an aquaculture lease is required for access to specific areas of State waters and a corresponding aquaculture licence authorises the nature of the activity conducted (e.g. species to be farmed, farming method, amount of stock permitted). For landbased aquaculture, only an aquaculture licence is required.

In South Australia, assessment of individual aquaculture licence applications follow strict guidelines. A semi-quantitative risk assessment, based on a national best practice Ecological Sustainable Development (ESD) risk assessment framework (Fletcher et al., 2004) is applied to determine the sustainability and outcome of each individual application. The integrity of the assessment process relies on understanding both the nature of the environment in which the intended aquaculture operation occurs and the way it interacts with or changes the environment that surrounds it.

As part of the assessment process, up to 36 possible risk events that are directly relevant to potential aquaculture influences, are considered and applied to both site and regional levels.

Risk events are assessed for the construction phase and ongoing activities. Some of the risks that are assessed include impacts to sensitive habitats, erosion, sedimentation, access by public, escape, disease management, chemical use, water flow, water quality, nutrient discharge, and interaction with threatened and migratory species.

PIRSA also applies general guidelines to minimise environmental harm, for example aquaculture activities are not to be placed over sensitive habits (e.g. seagrass or reef) unless the appropriate mitigating strategies are in place to minimise potential environmental harm. Aquaculture activity is excluded in buffer zones around areas of conservation and heritage significance such as seal colonies, aquatic reserves, shipwrecks and national parks, unless the appropriate approval from relevant authorities is secured.

All applications for aquaculture licences are reviewed for environmental issues and referred to the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) for assessment to ensure the proposal meets the objectives of the [Environment Protection Act 1993](#) and associated Environment Protection Policies (EPPs). Environmental issues of interest to the EPA include protection of water quality, management of noise and air quality, solid waste management and disposal, storage, use and disposal of hazardous substances and ecological impacts from pollution. Further information on the application assessment process can be accessed here:

[Leasing and licensing - Department of Primary Industries and Regions South Australia - PIRSA](#)

[Lease and licence variation application assessment process - Department of Primary Industries and Regions South Australia - PIRSA](#)

It is important to note that PIRSA's ESD risk assessment process currently does not consider the positive impacts of an aquaculture activity, including ecosystem services, which are more recently being documented in the literature (Zhu et al., 2020; Naylor et al., 2021; Alleway et al., 2022; Jones et al., 2022). These positive aspects of aquaculture are increasingly being considered by regulators and the community, which better support social licence to operate. Social licence for aquaculture has been a challenge elsewhere in Australia and overseas. Achieving and maintaining social licence in aquaculture is important and requires good science-based governance, as well as adequate consultation, communication and awareness (Alexander, 2022).

## **Annual environmental reporting**

Under the [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#), all aquaculture licence holders are required to provide annual reporting on general environmental matters for each licensed site, through submission of Environmental Monitoring Program (EMP) reports to PIRSA. The information collected varies for each sector but each provides key information on how a licence holder has been using a site, which is vital to the continued sustainable management of the aquaculture industry. Generally, the information collected includes:

- Site development and productivity (all sectors)
- Species farmed (all sectors)
- Amount of stock held on site per month (all marine)
- Feed and chemical inputs (all sectors)
- Water usage and discharge (landbased)

- Interactions with site infrastructure and marine vertebrates (all marine)
- Escape of stock (all sectors)
- Disease incidents (all sectors)
- Debris incidents (all marine)
- Waste and refuse disposal (all sectors).

## **Lower Eyre regional aquaculture environmental monitoring program (AEMP)**

In 2015, a new regional aquaculture environmental monitoring program (AEMP) was developed for the Finfish and Tuna aquaculture sectors in the Lower Eyre Peninsula. The program was designed over a four-year cycle with a review during the final year to inform the design of the next four-year cycle. The purpose of the AEMP is to describe the overall health of the region with respect to cumulative aquaculture impacts rather than monitoring at the site or lease scale. This was in recognition of the majority of nutrient waste from Finfish and Tuna licensed sites being dissolved in the water column and likely carried offsite. Results from the program will also inform the development of suitable environmental triggers and management actions to reduce any negative impacts documented, and assessment of aquaculture development applications in the region. The monitoring program was developed in consultation with the Tuna and Finfish aquaculture industries, PIRSA (including SARDI) and the EPA.

The program was divided into a pelagic (oceanographic) component and a benthic (seafloor) component. Information collected and analysed for the first four-year regional program (2015-2019) included water quality, oceanography, nutrients, bacteria and benthic infauna (animals living under the seafloor) assemblages, all of which contribute to understanding impacts of aquaculture at a regional and zone scale and help validate existing hydrodynamic and biogeochemical modelling for the Lower Spencer Gulf. A copy of the report can be found here:

[www.pir.sa.gov.au/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0007/360592/Aquaculture Environmental Monitoring Program 2015-2019.pdf](http://www.pir.sa.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0007/360592/Aquaculture_Environmental_Monitoring_Program_2015-2019.pdf)

In summary, results from the 2015-2019 regional AEMP found:

- Significant spatial and temporal variations in the physical environment, circulation, water quality and planktonic ecosystem composition, including:
  - Inshore sites within Boston and Louth Bay's differ significantly from offshore sites and the trends observed are consistent with impacts expected from anthropogenic nutrient enrichment, of which there are a number of sources in the area including aquaculture. The results also provide a baseline and a set of multiple, complementary indicators for explaining future changes, natural or anthropogenic.
- Both spatial and temporal variation were detected in the infaunal assemblages in the Boston Bay and Lincoln (inner) aquaculture zones, but there was no indication that aquaculture has a significant impact on infauna.

Given the pelagic and oceanographic results from the 2015-2019 AEMP indicated that aquaculture may be having an impact on the pelagic ecosystem of the inshore regions of Boston and Louth Bay, the second 4-year AEMP (2019–2023) undertook more detailed investigations into the fate and consequences of the nutrients being added to the system. This program was also divided into a pelagic (oceanographic) component and a benthic (seafloor) component. However, given 15 years of infauna monitoring failed to demonstrate an impact from aquaculture, the benthic component switched from infauna to seagrasses. A copy of the report can be found here:

In summary, results from the 2019-2023 regional AEMP found:

- Significant spatial and temporal variations in the physical, chemical and biological parameters investigated:
  - Trends for several plankton-based indicators of eutrophication suggest that the trophic status of the inshore waters of Louth Bay and Boston Bay are different from offshore waters and may be changing from mesotrophic to slightly eutrophic. The environmental drivers responsible for the changes observed in the plankton and phytoplankton communities at the inshore sites included temperature, flushing timescales and, to a reduced extent, nutrients.
  - Collectively, these findings are consistent with nutrient observations and oceanographic modelling results and suggest the enrichment of inshore waters with nutrients sourced from aquaculture is likely to be in part responsible for the observed changes in the trophic state, particularly during cooler autumn periods.
  - Of note, it is not clear to what extent variability in the supply of nutrients from other sources in the region may also contribute to the differences in water quality and the composition of the plankton community observed at the inshore sites.
- Extensive spatial and temporal variation in the seagrass parameters investigated:
  - The only significant impact of aquaculture found on seagrass was on the amino acid composition of epiphytes.
  - Of note, seagrass sampling only began several decades after the commencement of aquaculture and that it is not possible to detect historical impacts with the methods that were used.
  - A general decline in epiphyte cover, however, biomass was more variable.
  - A general decline in seagrass, with a substantial decline at a control site in Tumby Bay.

The third 4-year AEMP (2023-2027) is based on the outcomes from the previous two AEMPs and will provide long-term monitoring required to assess key water-column and benthic ecosystem groups to better understand the localised and cumulative impacts of dissolved nutrients from Finfish aquaculture. Recent EPA data highlights several sites of concern in the Port Lincoln region and the locations are consistent with the modelled circulation which demonstrates connectivity between nutrient waste streams associated with aquaculture and areas of seagrass decline. This program will therefore include modelling nutrients at sites inside and outside of aquaculture zones in the Port Lincoln region as well as the status of seagrasses.

Changes to this AEMP relative to the previous two are a reduction in the number of sites monitored (from 5 to 4) due to their similarity with other sites and extending the current summer and autumn sampling events to include winter and spring. The additional seasonal sampling will close knowledge gaps regarding the annual cycle of water quality and pelagic ecosystems structure and function. Other changes include genomic sequencing of the bacterial community to improve information on presence of pathogens, indicators of eutrophication and shifts in over-all ecosystem state. Finally, historical imagery will be utilised to map changes in the distribution of nearshore seagrasses in the Port Lincoln area over time. Where suitable data is available, any losses will be investigated to determine if a correlation exists

with the distribution of Tuna/Finfish aquaculture operations, as well as any other pertinent environmental data.

Results of these AEMPs will also be important to assist quantifying the benefits of the emerging seaweed aquaculture industry in terms of nutrient offsets and integrated multi-trophic aquaculture (IMTA), discussed later in this report.

## **Aquaculture farming structure construction, waste disposal and general storage**

Under regulation 25 of the [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#), aquaculture farming structures and general infrastructure are required to be maintained in such a condition that will prevent pollution, either at construction or during ongoing operations. At the decommissioning of a site, operators of marine leases are required to remove all structures and stock and rehabilitate the site to a condition to the satisfaction of the Minister.

Requirements for waste disposal and appropriate storage of chemicals, feed materials and general farm waste are legislated under the [Environment Protection Act 1993](#), and associated EPPs. The EPA has also developed specific codes of practice for the [Oyster](#) and [Abalone](#) industry that highlight the environmental issues in relation to these industries and provide recommendations to assist farmers to meet their legislative requirements under the [Environment Protection Act 1993](#).

## **Impacts on habitat and biodiversity**

Minimising the impacts to the seafloor from marine aquaculture activities is important for ecological sustainable development. To achieve this, marine aquaculture activities involving feed addition (e.g. Tuna, Finfish and Subtidal Abalone) are not to occur over sensitive habitats (e.g. seagrass or reef) unless appropriate mitigating strategies are in place to minimise risk and monitor the seafloor over time. In addition, regulation 25 of the [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#) requires that floating culture units in subtidal waters are kept at least 3 metres (m) above the seafloor at all times to prevent scouring, rubbing or shading of the seafloor unless the licence holder has authorisation to do otherwise.

There are multiple areas in South Australia where aquaculture is restricted and requires appropriate approvals. For example, around parks declared under the [National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972](#), historic shipwrecks declared under the [Historic Shipwrecks Act 1981](#), and within some zones of marine parks ([Marine Parks Act 2007](#)) which further protect sensitive areas. PIRSA also applies an aquaculture exclusion buffer around Australian Sea Lion (ASL) breeding and haul-out areas.

To ensure aquaculture activities have minimal impact on Threatened, Endangered and Protected Species (TEPS), PIRSA undertake an ESD risk assessment prior to the approval of an aquaculture licence which includes an assessment of the potential impacts to TEPS (e.g. sharks, dolphins, whales, seals, seabirds) likely to occur in the area. All aquaculture licence holders are also required to submit an aquaculture strategy to the Minister on how they will avoid or minimise and respond to adverse impacts on, or adverse interactions with large marine vertebrates (e.g. TEPS, sharks) or seabirds (under regulation 18 of the [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#)). The aquaculture strategy can be either sector-based (as already exists for the [Mussels sector](#)) or apply on an individual (licensee) basis and must be approved by the Minister (under regulation 19 or 20 of the [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#)). A sector-based strategy is currently being drafted for the Oyster sector. Licence holders are bound by law to comply with the strategy. If an interaction does occur, licence holders are required (under regulation 27 of the [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#)) to report the incident as soon as they become aware of the interaction, and work with PIRSA and relevant agencies (e.g. the Department for Environment and Water - DEW) to resolve the incident, and where required, undertake a review of mitigation strategies.

## Interactions with sharks

A study conducted on the movement and residence of White Sharks (*Carcharodon carcharias*) and Bronze Whalers (*Carcharhinus brachyurus*) in southern Spencer Gulf (Rogers and Drew, 2018) identified that there is negligible overlap between sharks and Tuna/Finfish aquaculture activities in Spencer Gulf, suggesting that Tuna/Finfish aquaculture does not lead to aggregations of sharks to an area (for more information see [Research section](#)). For the rare event when sharks become trapped inside a Tuna/Finfish pontoon, the study also developed industry guidelines for the safe removal and release of pelagic sharks from aquaculture pontoons. The guidelines provided an improvement on individual aquaculture strategies to mitigate shark interactions with Tuna/Finfish aquaculture (pursuant to regulation 18 and 20 of the [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#)).

More recently, a separate study monitoring White Shark and Bronze Whaler movements and residency adjacent to an aquaculture tourism lease containing Tuna/Finfish species in South Australia also did not find any evidence of the operation affecting the behaviour of these shark species (Huvneers et al., 2022).

It is noteworthy that husbandry practices of aquaculture operators have improved as the business of aquaculture has evolved and become more commercially focused. Some of these husbandry practices include increased frequency of diver removal of deceased fish from sea-cages, checking for holes in nets and introducing false bottoms to nets to increase the distance from the bottom of sea-cages to fish outside the cages – this decreases the opportunity for predators to reach dead fish in sea-cages.

## Impacts on water resources

Nutrients (including faeces and un-utilised feed) released from aquaculture activities can have impacts on water quality and benthic environments. To address this, aquaculture zone policies limit the biomass (and by association the amount of feed that is used) that can be farmed in an area. To further understand the impact of aquaculture on water quality, a regional monitoring program was implemented for Lower Spencer Gulf in 2015, in which water quality is a major component (see Tuna and [Error! Reference source not found.](#) sections). For landbased operators, water usage may be legislated by DEW.

Requirements for the protection of water quality are legislated under the [Environment Protection Act 1993](#) and the [Environment Protection \(Water Quality\) Policy 2015](#) which are administered by the South Australian EPA. All aquaculture licensees must comply with EPA legislation and not cause environmental harm.

## Species selection and escapes

The escape of aquaculture stock can have serious implications for wild populations. Therefore, it is important to establish and maintain appropriate containment controls for stock to prevent an escape. There are however situations beyond the control of a licence holder where an escape can occur. To minimise the escape impact, PIRSA has multiple regulatory controls. The stock genetics are considered during the initial assessment of an application to farm and all licence holders must keep a stock register that outlines stock movements to and from the aquaculture site along with other matters (regulation 15 of the [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#)). In addition, all aquaculture licence holders are required to submit a strategy to the Minister on how they will minimise stock escapes, including infrastructure maintenance and staff training. The strategy must be approved by the Minister and the licence holder is bound by law to comply with the strategy. If an escape does occur, licence holders are required (under regulation 26 of the [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#)) to report the incident within 4 hours and to rectify the cause of escape to prevent further escapes.

## Compliance

Planning and compliance inspections are central to a well-established and contemporary industry. To ensure compliance with lease/licence conditions and relevant legislation, PIRSA authorised officers conduct routine field inspections and data audits for each aquaculture sector. Issues such as navigation, location of farming structures, species farmed, impacts to benthic habitats and discharge of water are among those variables that are investigated. Aquaculture site evaluations may also be conducted during the initial assessment of an application, in response to public concern or feedback received during consultation, and are an integral part of the risk assessment process for the licence application or as part of an audit program.

## Aquatic animal health regulation

South Australia's freedom from many significant aquatic diseases provides competitive advantages in seafood production and market access. PIRSA maintains a dedicated aquatic animal health program, which aims to safeguard South Australia's fisheries and aquaculture resources from the impact of aquatic diseases. Aquatic Animal Health is regulated under the [Aquaculture Act 2001](#), the [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#), the [Fisheries Management Act 2007](#), the [Livestock Act 1997](#) and Notices under the [Livestock Act 1997](#).

## Veterinary medicine use

Veterinary medicines are important disease management tools. When used correctly, veterinary medicines play a valuable role in ensuring animal welfare and maximising the quality and yield of primary produce. Aquaculture farmers must endeavor to use veterinary medicines that are registered under the [Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals Code Act 1994](#) (Agvet Code) through the Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA). However, for veterinary medicines that are not permitted or registered with the APVMA, the South Australian [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#) (regulation 10) provides a mechanism for off-label use (unregistered with the APVMA) under prescription from a registered veterinarian. Reasons for off-label use include new emergent diseases in aquaculture (a comparably young primary industry), emergencies and experimental treatments to facilitate data collection for APVMA minor use permits or registration.

For off-label veterinary medicine use under the [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#), PIRSA requires a veterinary prescription and information on the product, disease diagnosis, species to be treated, efficacy, host safety and environmental risk (including environmental toxicity). Risk assessment, calculation of environmental trigger values and predicted residue calculations are included in the assessment process agreed to by the EPA. The EPA is consulted with for applications that include discharge to the environment. Requests for use of antibiotics are considered in line with the World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH) Aquatic Animal Health Code and in line with Australia's National Antimicrobial Resistance Strategy (AMR); that is, treatments for a diagnosed disease are considered (but not prophylactic treatment). For further information, see [www.pir.sa.gov.au/aquaculture/aquatic animal health/veterinary medicine use in aquaculture](http://www.pir.sa.gov.au/aquaculture/aquatic%20animal%20health/veterinary%20medicine%20use%20in%20aquaculture)

## Livestock translocations

Aquatic livestock translocations are regulated under both the [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#) and the [Livestock Act 1997](#) primarily for the purpose of reducing the risk of disease introduction and spread. Wild stock caught or collected for the purpose of aquaculture (i.e. seedstock and broodstock) may require approval under the [Fisheries Management Act 2007](#). Legislative restrictions are in place to mitigate high risk movements of aquaculture livestock, including movements of livestock within South Australia, wild caught/collected stock brought onto a farm, and importing stock into South Australia.

Assessment of livestock translocation requests may include requirements for veterinary stock inspection, batch testing to rule out notifiable and infectious disease, health certification and requirements for hatchery biosecurity in line with national guidelines: <https://www.agriculture.gov.au/agriculture-land/animal/aquatic>.

For further information on aquatic diseases

see [www.pir.sa.gov.au/biosecurity/aquatics/aquatic\\_diseases](http://www.pir.sa.gov.au/biosecurity/aquatics/aquatic_diseases) and for moving or importing aquatic animals see [www.pir.sa.gov.au/biosecurity/aquatics/moving\\_aquatic\\_animals](http://www.pir.sa.gov.au/biosecurity/aquatics/moving_aquatic_animals)

## Disease management and surveillance

Disease management includes requirements to report disease (including notifiable diseases), report unusually high and unexplained mortality events, and requirements to maintain stock records (i.e. stock movement, mortality rate). These requirements are for aquaculture licence holders as prescribed under the [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#). In addition to batch testing for livestock translocations, these requirements provide for disease surveillance (passive), and early disease detection that can trigger investigations (e.g. aquaculture mortality or fish kill reports) to rule out disease (to support trade and market access, as well as provide for rapid disease response). Disease management also now includes zoning, for example Mollusc Disease Management Areas based on FRDC 2018-090 project (Roberts et al., 2020), which are now adopted in PIRSA's Emergency Response Plans. Emergency disease response protocols are in line with the WOA Aquatic Animal Health Code and Australia's Aquavetplan series of emergency disease response guidelines: [www.agriculture.gov.au/animal/aquatic/aquavetplan](http://www.agriculture.gov.au/animal/aquatic/aquavetplan)

Active surveillance is also undertaken by PIRSA as required to confirm disease status or freedom from disease for the purpose of emergency response, to support policy (e.g. livestock translocation) or to support trade and market access requirements. Previous active surveillance in South Australia has occurred, including for Abalone Viral Ganglioneuritis (AVG), Withering Syndrome and *Perkinsus* (for Abalone), *Bonamia* (for Native Oysters), various notifiable prawn diseases (including White Spot Syndrome Virus, WSSV) and for Pacific Oyster Mortality Syndrome (POMS).

Disease management in aquaculture can also include farm biosecurity which may be a requirement for State livestock translocation approvals or a requirement of importing jurisdictions / countries. [National guidelines](#) now exist for aquaculture farm biosecurity including:

- Generic farm biosecurity guidelines, or
- Sector specific farm biosecurity guidelines.

PIRSA respond to wild fish kills and suspected disease in aquaculture (see Fish kill and fish health investigations section) to primarily rule out infectious and notifiable disease (PIRSA is the hazard leader for animal disease responses). If disease is detected, mitigation may include eradication, containment or control measures. If disease is ruled out and a chemical spill, oil spill or pollutant are determined to be a possible cause, then the appropriate government department are notified to investigate (e.g. the EPA or Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT)).

Fish kills are a global phenomenon and can be attributed to natural oceanographic cycles, disease outbreaks, harmful algal blooms (HABs), coastal pollution, marine heatwaves or climate change (Roberts et al., 2019; Smith et al., 2023). In South Australia, many small scale fish kills investigated have been attributed to shallow, unprotected waters that are greatly influenced by extreme weather conditions including temperature (i.e. peak summer and peak winter), low or minimal tides, anoxia (low dissolved oxygen), HABs, 'blackwater' events in freshwater systems (flooding and associated anoxic water from high organic loads) and acid sulphate soil disturbance. Susceptible species are generally those in shallow water environments (including juveniles of economically important species), particularly benthic

and intertidal species. Common species associated with natural fish kill events include Bony Bream, Carp, Mullet, Garfish, Crabs and various Molluscs (including Abalone). Furthermore, causes of individual fish kill events can often remain unknown due mostly to the mortality not being observed and reported until fish wash ashore, which impedes appropriate sample collection and analyses. Investigations sometimes rely on anecdotal evidence and climatic weather observations as the basis for attributing “likely causes”, with the situation closely monitored.

## South Australian Shellfish Quality Assurance Program

The South Australia Shellfish Quality Assurance Program (SASQAP) is part of PIRSA’s Biosecurity Division within the Food Safety Program. PIRSA is the principal government agency charged with monitoring and maintaining shellfish food safety in South Australia.



SASQAP is a regulatory testing body that provides consumer protection and ensures development of domestic and international markets through the monitoring and testing of shellfish and water in shellfish growing areas in South Australia. Bivalve molluscs such as Oysters, Mussels, Cockles and PIPIS are filter feeders that have the ability to concentrate bacteria, parasites, viruses, toxins and heavy metals. Shellfish are often consumed raw and, in this form, may be a vector of microbes or toxins that cause shellfish associated illnesses.

If adverse conditions are likely to arise in a shellfish harvesting area, for example as a result of heavy rainfall events causing runoff from the land into the marine environment, SASQAP acts to close these areas as a precautionary measure to prevent contamination of the shellfish in the area. This serves to ensure only safe product reaches the market.

There are currently 28 classified shellfish harvesting areas in South Australia ([Maps and GPS boundaries of harvesting areas - PIRSA](#)), the majority of which are located on the west coast of the Eyre Peninsula. There are also some other areas within Spencer Gulf, Gulf St Vincent and on the coast of Kangaroo Island.

## National Aquaculture Strategy

In October 2017, the then Federal Department of Agriculture and Water Resources (DAWR) released a National Aquaculture Strategy, which was developed with, and supported by state and territory jurisdictions and industry. A link to the strategy is provided below:

[www.agriculture.gov.au/sites/default/files/sitecollectiondocuments/fisheries/aquaculture/national-aquaculture-strategy.pdf](http://www.agriculture.gov.au/sites/default/files/sitecollectiondocuments/fisheries/aquaculture/national-aquaculture-strategy.pdf).

The strategy is a national document designed to complement policy priorities and activities underway in jurisdictions aimed at supporting sustainable aquaculture growth. The strategy aimed to increase the value of Australia’s aquaculture industry to \$2.21 billion per year by 2028-29. However, the value of Australia’s aquaculture industry rose above this value for the first time in 2022-23 (BDO Econsearch 2025) and as a result the strategy is currently under review.

The strategy aims to streamline regulatory frameworks and enhance research, development and extension for aquaculture in Australia. Further, this strategy supports aquaculture by promoting opportunities for Aboriginal communities and integrated multi-trophic aquaculture (IMTA). South Australia has been applying the principles of the strategy in aquaculture management, including through development of sector-based aquaculture strategies as a means to simplify the regulatory environment, as well as provide opportunities for IMTA in the Lower Eyre Peninsula and other areas of the State.

## Seafood Growth Strategy for South Australia 2021-2031

In 2020, the state government established the Seafood Advisory Forum to bring together the different sectors of the seafood industry: recreational fishers, commercial fishers, seafood processors, aquaculture, charter fishers, the restaurant sector and Aboriginal traditional fishers. The Forum has developed a 10-year strategic plan that aims to drive growth and opportunities for a sustainable, productive and profitable seafood sector in South Australia.



The Seafood Growth Strategy is underpinned by several key pillars that will support the State Government's Growth State plan, which aims to achieve a primary industries revenue of \$23 billion by 2030. More information on the Seafood Growth Strategy for South Australia can be found here: [www.pir.sa.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0017/401480/seafood-growth-strategy-sa.pdf](http://www.pir.sa.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0017/401480/seafood-growth-strategy-sa.pdf)

A key initiative under this Strategy was to establish a seafood advocacy body in South Australia. In 2024, Seafood Industry South Australia Incorporated (SISA) was created to provide a voice that represents the common interest of all seafood sectors, including wild catch, aquaculture, fish process and retailers within South Australia. This peak body is industry led and independent and works with the State Government and stakeholders to represent the needs and interest of our state's seafood industry. Access to the SISA website can be found here: [www.seafoodindustrysa.com.au](http://www.seafoodindustrysa.com.au)

## Aquaculture activity in South Australia

### Socio-economic data

South Australia's total aquaculture production in 2023/24 was 18,801 tonnes, with a direct (landed) value of \$209.68 million. The overall value of the industry declined by 21% (or \$54.76 million) compared to 2022/23, driven by a 9% decrease in production volume (1,872 tonnes) and a 13% drop in the average per-unit price (Figure 1). Despite this decline, the long-term economic outlook for aquaculture remains strong, underpinned by high-value species such as Southern Bluefin Tuna, Yellowtail Kingfish, Oysters, and Mussels. These premium products continue to make a significant contribution to South Australia's seafood economy and regional development. Figures 2 and 3 provide a breakdown of production volumes and economic contributions by sector, highlighting the industry's diversity and resilience.

The aquaculture industry in South Australia has developed significantly since the Oyster sector first began commercial production in the 1980s. South Australia is now home to the most diverse range of aquaculture sectors in Australia. The largest single sector in the State's aquaculture industry is Tuna (Figure 3), which accounted for \$76.97 million of South Australia's gross value of aquaculture production in 2023-24 (Table ES-1, BDO EconSearch 2025). The other main sectors were Oysters (\$54.82 million),

Kingfish (\$52.08 million), and Abalone (\$12.28 million) (Figure 3, Table 1). In addition, for the first time the emerging Macroalgae or seaweed sector recorded production and sales.

A large proportion of the South Australian aquaculture production, particularly Tuna, is considered a premium high value product, and is exported overseas to high-end markets. Because of this, the value of the Australian dollar can have a significant impact on the economic performance of the industry. Significant changes in the value of the Australian dollar also have the potential to influence the demand for Australian aquaculture exports. The Australian dollar depreciated slightly overall between 2022/23 (US\$0.67) and 2023/24 (US\$0.66) (2 per cent), making Australian exports marginally more competitive in foreign markets (BDO EconSearch 2025).

Table 1: South Australia aquaculture production and value for the years 2022-23 and 2023-24 (BDO EconSearch 2025)

	Weight ('000kg)			Value (\$m)		
	2022/23	2023/24	Change	2022/23	2023/24	Change
Southern Bluefin Tuna	8,000	7,261	-9%	120.00	76.97	-36%
Yellowtail Kingfish	3,354	3,141	-6%	59.90	52.08	-13%
Oysters						
adult <sup>a</sup>	5,748	5,207	-9%	58.84	54.82	-7%
on-grown <sup>b</sup>	724	761	5%	2.62	2.87	10%
spat <sup>c</sup>	-	-	-	6.43	7.84	22%
Mussels	2,318	2,007	-13%	5.10	4.62	-9%
Abalone <sup>d</sup>	382	345	-10%	11.18	12.28	10%
Freshwater Finfish	292	297	2%	4.93	4.72	-4%
Marron and Yabbies	3.0	2.4	-20%	0.15	0.14	-11%
Macroalgae <sup>e</sup>	-	0.2	-	-	0.01	-
Other <sup>f</sup>	577	541	-6%	4.33	4.05	-6%
<b>Total<sup>g</sup></b>	<b>20,673</b>	<b>18,801</b>	<b>-9%</b>	<b>264.44</b>	<b>209.68</b>	<b>-21%</b>

<sup>a</sup> The weight for adult Oysters is an approximation on the basis that a dozen Oysters weighs one kilogram.

<sup>b</sup> The volume of production for on-grown Oysters is shown in '000s of dozens. The volume and value of juvenile Oysters sold for on- growing are excluded from the total volume and value of aquaculture as it is considered an input to production for the final sales of adult Oysters.

<sup>c</sup> The value of spat is also excluded from the total. All spat grown in SA was sold in SA (i.e. no spat grown in SA was exported to other states) and is considered an input to production for the final sales of adult Oysters.

<sup>d</sup> Abalone produced from marine and land-based aquaculture sites, i.e. the data represent species not class of licence.

<sup>e</sup> Includes both land-based and marine production.

<sup>f</sup> Other aquaculture production in 2022/23 and 2023/24 was mostly comprised of land-based Microalgae and Goldfish production.

<sup>g</sup> Totals may not sum due to rounding.




Figure 1: South Australian aquaculture production (tonnes) and value (\$Million) in 2023-24.

Production by sector 2023/24 (Tonnes)




Figure 2: Contribution of each sector to the total production (tonnes) of aquaculture in South Australia during 2023-24

### Value by sector in 2023/24 (\$Million)




Figure 3: Contribution of each sector to the total value (\$million) of aquaculture in South Australia during 2023-24.

The overall decrease in total value of aquaculture production was driven by Tuna (-36%), Oysters (-7%), Kingfish (-13%), and Mussel (-9%) aquaculture sectors (Table 1, BDO EconSearch 2025). For detailed information on the change in total value of aquaculture production between 2022/23 and 2023/24 see [The Economic Contribution of Aquaculture in the South Australian State and Regional Economies, 2022-23](https://pir.sa.gov.au) (pir.sa.gov.au)

In 2023/24, aquaculture's total contribution to gross state product (GSP) of \$328.4 million represented 0.22 per cent of the total GSP for South Australia (\$148.7 billion in 2023/24). GSP includes all direct and down/stream activities (e.g. processing, transport). Around 76 per cent of the contribution to GSP was generated in regional South Australia. Direct employment was estimated to be 1,139 FTE (788 on-farm and 351 in downstream activities) in 2023/24 with 1,182 flow-on jobs, giving total employment of 2,321 FTE. Around 74 per cent of these jobs were generated in regional South Australia. Direct household income was estimated to be approximately \$70.0 million in 2023/24 and flow-on income approximately \$112.1m, giving a total household income contribution of around \$182.1 million. Around 71 per cent of the household income contribution was generated in regional South Australia. In regional areas, the contribution of the aquaculture industry in 2023/24 was concentrated in the Eyre Peninsula region, reflecting the dominance of Tuna, Kingfish, Mussels, and Oyster farming and most of the production of Other aquaculture farming (BDO EconSearch, 2025).



Figure 4: Distribution of aquaculture sectors in South Australia, predominantly located in the regions

In addition to producing [The Economic Contribution of Aquaculture in the South Australian State and Regional Economies, 2023-24 \(pir.sa.gov.au\)](https://pir.sa.gov.au), BDO EconSearch has developed South Australia Aquaculture Economic Indicators Dashboards for 2023-24, which summarise the key economic indicators (production, value, household income, employment, contribution to GSP) and associated trends for each aquaculture sector (see [Tuna](#), [Kingfish](#), [Mussels](#), [Oysters](#), [Abalone](#), [Freshwater Finfish](#), [Marron and Yabbies](#), and [Other](#)). For an overview of South Australian aquaculture; see [Summary economic indicators dashboard 2023-24 \(pir.sa.gov.au\)](#)

Values for South Australian aquaculture production, and value of production between 1999-2000 and 2023-2024 is shown in Figure 5. Factors that have historically influenced aquaculture production and value in South Australia include:

- Market and economic conditions.
- Fluctuating Australian dollar against the Japanese yen which impacts the price received for Tuna when exported to Japan. The impact of the falling yen is demonstrated in the decrease in aquaculture value of production in 2013-14 (see Figure 5).
- Southern Bluefin Tuna quota allocation.
- Reduction in Oyster spat availability due to the occurrence of POMS in Tasmania which is demonstrated in the decrease in aquaculture value of production in 2016-17 and 2017-18 (see Figure 5). To assist with the recovery of the Oyster sector, fees were waived for the period 1 January 2018 to 30 June 2020.
- Innovation and expansion of other aquaculture sectors such as the fluctuating production of Microalgae in recent years.
- Significant bushfires from November 2019 to January 2020 in four regions of South Australia, including the South-east, Yorke Peninsula, Kangaroo Island (KI) and the Adelaide Hills. A large proportion (70%) of the bushfire damage (300,000 hectares) occurred on KI, resulting in 60% of the total primary production area being damaged (187,000 hectares). A total of 19 properties licensed to conduct aquaculture on KI were affected by the bushfires. This was either through loss of stock, damage to aquaculture infrastructure (e.g. netting, fences), or access to processing facilities/local purchasers. Fires within the other regions of the State did not come in contact with registered aquaculture licences.
- Coronavirus (COVID-19) was declared a global pandemic in March 2020 which resulted in the closure of restaurants and food outlets, and a reduction or loss in access to domestic and export markets for South Australian seafood industries. Despite this, the value of production in the aquaculture industry increased by 8% in 2019-20 from the previous year. The majority of aquaculture sectors, however, reported negative impacts to their businesses from the pandemic, in particular the Mussel industry which reported significant impacts to the value of their production as a result of COVID-19 restrictions decreasing access to export markets and dampening of domestic food service consumption. To assist the recovery of the South Australia aquaculture industry from the impacts of COVID-19, the collection of 2021-22 aquaculture sector fees were deferred for six months and any outstanding 2019-20 fees were also deferred. The next round of fees were not collected until January 2021.





Figure 5: South Australia aquaculture production (tonnes) and value (\$million) from 1999-00 to 2023-24.

## Industry licence holders


The total number of active aquaculture licences in South Australia during 2023-24 reporting period was 484 comprising 428 marine sites and 56 landbased sites (Figure 6). Included in these numbers are 6 marine maintenance sites operated by the Tuna sector for the purpose of holding and maintaining empty sea-cages. A full list of the aquaculture licences for which this report relates is provided in Appendix 1.

Figure 6: A summary of South Australian marine and landbased aquaculture licences 2023-24

Number of marine aquaculture licences



Number of landbased aquaculture licences



## Aquaculture applications processed by PIRSA

PIRSA processes a range of applications each year, which are requested from the aquaculture industry to improve/change the activities of their business. Lease and licence changes managed by PIRSA can include, for example, assessments for new licences, movements of leases, variations of leases/licences (e.g. species additions, divisions and amalgamations, infrastructure changes), transfers, renewals and surrenders. Table 2 represents the number (total 149) and type of application completed by PIRSA in 2023-24.

Table 2: Summary of aquaculture-related applications completed in 2023-2024

Application type	Amount
New lease and licence	0
Lease and licence movement	10
Licence variation	7
Lease and/or licence division	1
Lease and/or licence amalgamation	0
Lease and/or licence transfer	106
Lease renewal	36
Lease/ licence surrender	1
Change of specified person/s	0

## Aquaculture policies

### Summary of aquaculture zone policies in South Australia

Aquaculture zone policies set out considerations for aquaculture that are specific to the environmental, sociological or geographical characteristics of the zone area. Aquaculture zones prescribe the maximum hectares (ha) that may be leased and the class of species permitted for the purposes of aquaculture. Dependent on the species considered, a maximum biomass (tonnage) may also be prescribed. The prescribed criteria are determined by the physical and biological characteristics of the zone and the biological requirements and typical farming infrastructure of the species being considered for the zone. An aquaculture zone identifies a general area in which aquaculture has been deemed suitable, noting that any specific application to undertake aquaculture within a zone is still assessed on its merits and for the specific location.

There are 12 statutory aquaculture zone policies prescribed in South Australia which occupy approximately 425 024 ha, or 7% of State waters (Appendix 2). Of these zone policies, ten are located off the coast of the Eyre Peninsula, one off the western side of the Yorke Peninsula, and one in the State's southeast (Figure 7). Each prescribe areas (zones) where aquaculture is either excluded or permitted, noting more than half (52%) of the area allocated to aquaculture zone policies in South Australia is comprised of aquaculture exclusion zones (where no aquaculture activity is permitted).



Figure 7: A map showing the general areas (not actual size) of aquaculture zone policies in South Australia (current and proposed)



Exclusion zones generally include sensitive habitats or areas that have been identified as important for other users of the marine environment (e.g. commercial and recreational fishers). The remaining 48% is set aside to allow aquaculture production to occur and are known as aquaculture zones. In general, between 5-15% of the area within an aquaculture zone is allocated for aquaculture at any one time. This equates to approximately 0.2% of State waters currently available for aquaculture.

The prescribed classes of aquaculture considered for an aquaculture zone can include:

- The farming of aquatic animals (other than specified animals) in a manner that involves regular feeding (i.e. prescribed wild-caught Tuna, Marine Finfish, Abalone or any other species requiring supplementary feed);
- The farming of molluscs (i.e. Abalone and filter feeding organisms such as Oysters, Mussels, scallops);
- The farming of bivalve/filter feeding molluscs (i.e. filter feeding organisms such as Oysters, Mussels, Scallops); and
- The farming of Algae.

## Zone policy development and review

Aquaculture zone policy reviews are conducted to support the ecologically sustainable growth of both established and emerging sectors. Established sectors include Tuna, Kingfish, Oysters, Mussels, and Abalone, while emerging sectors encompass marine algae, echinoderms, and aquaculture-related tourism. These reviews also ensure that policies remain relevant and aligned with the latest scientific research and industry developments.

In 2019, a review of the *Aquaculture (Zones – Lower Eyre Peninsula) Policy 2013* (Figure 6) commenced. The review ensured the Zone Policy continued to maximise the use of marine resources for the purpose of aquaculture and provided sustainable industry growth. An Advisory Committee was established, including members from the Tuna, Finfish and Mussel aquaculture sectors, EPA, former Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) and PIRSA (including the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI)) to inform the review. Other agencies were consulted during the review, including DEW. A new Draft *Aquaculture (Zones – Lower Eyre Peninsula) Policy 2023* and supporting report was developed and underwent public consultation between late 2022 and early 2023, with finalisation and approval occurring on 2 November 2023 as per the requirements of the [Aquaculture Act 2001](#). The new Policy includes greater capacity for bivalve and seaweed aquaculture and increases Tuna and Finfish biomass in areas further from shore, which was based on published carrying capacity modelling. Conservative measures were used to determine biomass limits, which importantly result in average nutrient concentrations reaching background levels in receiving environments at the boundary of the respective zones/sectors.

Two other zone policies are currently in draft status. These are the draft [Franklin Harbor and Ceduna zone policies of 2015](#) which seek to primarily consolidate existing aquaculture activities within these growing regions. In 2024, PIRSA re-commenced the draft zone policy development process for Franklin Harbor following prioritisation by the Oyster sector. Preliminary consultation on the framework for the draft Franklin Harbor zone policy has occurred during 2024 and 2025, with preparation of the draft policy for statutory consultation planned to occur during 2025-26 financial year.

## Public call for aquaculture tenure within zones

Once an aquaculture zone policy is legislated after the aquaculture zoning process, an aquaculture lease and corresponding licence are required to undertake farming activities within the zone. It is important to distinguish between aquaculture zoning and individual site allocation and management. Aquaculture zone policies provide a broad overview of the ecological environment and establish areas in which aquaculture is deemed appropriate to occur, while controls relating to the performance of farm operations are applied through conditions of marine aquaculture leases, corresponding licences and the requirements of authority holders under the [Aquaculture Act 2001](#) and [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#).

Applications for lease tenure within an aquaculture zone are referred to the Aquaculture Tenure Allocation Board (ATAB). If a zone is prescribed as a public call area within an aquaculture zone policy, a public call is made inviting applicants to submit their proposal on the required application form. There are three aquaculture zones which do not require a public call to be made: Lincoln (inner) sector of the Lincoln aquaculture zone (only for Tuna as this zone is primarily for Tuna farming and holders of Commonwealth Tuna quota); Point Pearce (east) intertidal aquaculture zone; and Point Pearce (west) intertidal aquaculture zone (as these two zones are intended to allow for aquaculture activity that is in the interest of the local Aboriginal community). Table 3 outlines lease tenure allocation for public and non-public call areas between 2018 and 2025. There were no public calls made during 2023-24; however this report includes the latest information as of 2025 which incorporates a public call process conducted in the *Aquaculture (Zones – Lower Eyre Peninsula) Policy 2023*.

Lease applications are assessed by the ATAB who then make a recommendation to the Minister responsible for the administration of the [Aquaculture Act 2001](#) on which applications should proceed. The successful applicant will be invited to submit an aquaculture licence application, which will be subject to a comprehensive ESD risk assessment conducted by PIRSA and provision to mandatory referral agencies for comment. Applications for pilot leases outside an aquaculture zone are not subject to a competitive allocation process. The competitive allocation process ensures a fair and efficient means of allocating the State's marine aquaculture resources. The allocation process is used to determine which applicant will use the public resource at an optimum level in terms of the quality and quantity of output relative to the capacity of the environment.

Table 3: Lease tenure allocation for public and non-public calls within aquaculture zones between 2018 and 2025.

Year	Zone Policy	Aquaculture Zone	Hectares released	Hectares allocated
2018	<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Fitzgerald Bay) Policy 2008</i>	Fitzgerald Bay	123	123
2018	<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Streaky Bay) Policy 2011</i>	Haslam (north bank)	8.481	6
2018	<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Streaky Bay) Policy 2011</i>	Point Gibson	10	10
2018	<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Lower Eyre Peninsula) Policy 2013</i>	Lincoln (inner sector)	NA*	125
2020	<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Lower Eyre Peninsula) Policy 2013</i>	Louth Bay	51	51
2020	<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Lower Eyre Peninsula) Policy 2013</i>	Boston Bay (Boston Bay and Boston Island east sectors)	19	19
2020	<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Lower Eyre Peninsula) Policy 2013</i>	Lincoln (outer sector)	5000	0
2020	<i>Aquaculture (Zones - Anxious Bay) Policy 2007</i>	Anxious Bay	120	120
2020	<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Tumby Bay) Policy 2015</i>	Tumby Bay	1295	0
2020	<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Coffin Bay) Policy 2008</i>	Kellidie Bay	3	3
2020	<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Streaky Bay) Policy 2011</i>	Streaky Bay	40	0
2020	<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Streaky Bay) Policy 2011</i>	Blanche Port	37.5	0
2020	<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Eastern Spencer Gulf) Policy 2005</i>	Point Peace (east) intertidal	NA*	20
2025	<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Lower Eyre Peninsula) Policy 2023</i>	Louth Bay	420.9	405.8
2025	<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Lower Eyre Peninsula) Policy 2023</i>	Boston Bay and Bicker Isles sectors	59.7	0**
2025	<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Lower Eyre Peninsula) Policy 2023</i>	Point Boston (south) sector	43.9	3.9
2025	<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Lower Eyre Peninsula) Policy 2023</i>	Proper Bay (east and west) sectors	40.7	40.7
2025	<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Lower Eyre Peninsula) Policy 2023</i>	Murray Point	2	0**
2025	<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Lower Eyre Peninsula) Policy 2023</i>	Tod River	30	4

\* Hectares released not applicable as aquaculture zone not designated as a public call area.

\*\*Hectares allocated pending

## **Aquaculture zone policy tenure allocation**

PIRSA monitors the tenure (leasable hectares) and biomass allocated to leases and their corresponding licences against limits prescribed within each zone policy to ensure allocations are within limits prescribed for each policy. An indication of the tenure available for each of the zone policies is listed in Appendix 2.

## **Aquaculture outside of zones**

Aquaculture can take place inside or outside designated aquaculture zones. The advantage of applying for aquaculture activities within an aquaculture zone is that prior regulatory and general assessment processes have already been undertaken and therefore the application assessment and approval process is streamlined. For instance, several legislated referrals to other agencies and technical investigations to provide environmental information are conducted when a zone is being developed and are not required to be duplicated for applications inside a zone. In particular, the requirement for proponents of individual aquaculture proposals to seek development approval from the relevant planning authority. For aquaculture activities located outside existing aquaculture zone policy areas in South Australia (e.g. Kangaroo Island, Yorke Peninsula, Ceduna, Smoky Bay and Cowell), the application assessment and approval process is not as streamlined due to the lack of prior technical investigations/consultation and the need for additional approvals (e.g. development approval). Aquaculture that is approved outside of an aquaculture zone must initially operate under an aquaculture pilot lease and corresponding licence, and after a period of three years, can be converted into a production lease.

## ***Aquaculture (Standard Lease and Licence Conditions) Policy 2022***

On 16 February 2022, the [\*Aquaculture \(Standard Lease and Licence Conditions\) Policy 2022\*](#) (the Policy) was approved and came into operation on 18 August 2022. The Policy standardises aquaculture lease and licence conditions which will encourage aquaculture development and improve investor confidence by simplifying the regulatory environment, including reducing 'red tape', for aquaculture operators.

Conditions contained within the Policy constitute conditions of an aquaculture lease and licence and, are to be read as forming part of a lease and licence holder's obligations. Individual lease and licence certificates containing conditions still remain, however, the Policy replaces the majority of these conditions, irrespective of when a lease/licence was issued. The Policy provides flexibility to allow certain conditions within the Policy to be overridden by specific conditions on an individual aquaculture lease and licence certificate where appropriate.

From 18 August 2022, aquaculture lease and licence holders are required to abide by conditions contained within the Policy and also individual lease and licence certificates. Between 2022-23, implementation of the SLLC Policy commenced, including the process to reissue lease and licence certificates to reflect the standardised conditions of that policy, with only conditions specific to the activity being undertaken on a lease or licence remaining. Most conditions contained within the Policy are existing conditions of aquaculture leases and licences with their intent maintained, so impacts to aquaculture obligations are minimal. An education and awareness campaign was, and continues to be undertaken as part of implementation of the Policy. This includes compliance inspections by Fisheries Officers to ensure the conditions are being adhered to.

On 14 March 2024, clause 42(5) of the Policy, relating to Oyster perpendicular farming method licence conditions, was amended at the request of the Oyster industry. The amendment provides further equity

to Oyster growers in terms of maximum biomass limits between different farming methods and growing regions. Further information regarding the Policy, including the development and implementation process, and copies of supporting documentation (i.e. the supporting report and document responding to submissions received on the Policy) can be found on the [PIRSA Fisheries and Aquaculture website](#).

## **Changes to the *Aquaculture Act 2001***

During 2021, PIRSA led the development of the Aquaculture (Tourism Development) Amendment Bill 2021 to amend the [Aquaculture Act 2001](#) and its passage through the Parliament of South Australia. In December 2021, the Parliament of South Australia passed the Bill, and thereafter the [Aquaculture \(Tourism Development\) Amendment Act 2021](#) received Royal assent from the Governor. The provisions of the [Aquaculture \(Tourism Development\) Amendment Act 2021](#) came into effect on the second anniversary of the date of assent on 9 December 2023. The amendments streamline the assessment and approval process for proponents of marine-based tourism developments located within aquaculture zones, which complement, promote, or are of benefit to aquaculture undertaken within respective aquaculture zones. Stakeholders are no longer required to separately seek development consent and an authority to use the seabed from multiple government authorities under other legislation but can come directly to PIRSA to assess and approve their proposals under the [Aquaculture Act 2001](#). PIRSA is currently undertaking a review of all administrative processes required to support the implementation of the amendments and ensure the assessment of aquaculture tourism development activities can be undertaken consistent with the objects of the [Aquaculture Act 2001](#). Once these administrative processes have been completed, PIRSA will advise stakeholders of 'application ready' status which permits prospective aquaculture tourism development proponents to apply to PIRSA for assessment of their proposals.

# Tuna



## Fast Facts

Total Production: 7,261 tonnes

Direct Value: \$76.97 Million

Employment FTE: 250 direct and 642 flow-on

Photo courtesy of Ian Gordon

## Overview of the industry

The Tuna aquaculture sector is well established, with significant growth in production since its initiation in the 1990s. The species targeted by this sector is the Southern Bluefin Tuna (SBT) (*Thunnus maccoyii*).

SBT farming (or ranching) represents a high performing sector of the South Australian aquaculture industry. In 2023-24, there were seven Tuna licences which occupied 1543.52 ha of water and six Miscellaneous licences which occupied 55 hectares. Tuna aquaculture licences and Miscellaneous sites are listed in Appendix 1.

The industry is based on the wild capture of juvenile SBT between December and March each season. The amount of Tuna caught is restricted by an annual quota determined by the international management body, the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT). Over 85% of Australia's SBT quota is used for farming in South Australia, with the remaining quota fished by longline and allocated for charter/recreational catch. The global and Australian quota has continued to increase from 2012 when the CCSBT adopted a Harvest Strategy that uses a scientific model to determine what is a sustainable global catch. Based on the global total allocation, each individual member country has an allocated quota that is a proportion of that global total. Since 2012, Australia's quota has increased gradually from 4 015 t in 2011 to 6,238 t per annum for 2021-2023. The quota for 2024-2026 is 7,295 t which is due to a 17% increase in quota which is likely to further increase starting 2027 (EconSearch 2025). According to the most recent FRDC status of Australian Fish Stocks report (2021), the sustainability rating for SBT has moved to sustainable, demonstrating that consistent, scientifically sound management can bring back stocks that had previously been overfished. For more information see [www.fish.gov.au/report/391-Southern-Bluefin-Tuna-2020](http://www.fish.gov.au/report/391-Southern-Bluefin-Tuna-2020). Note that 95% of the Australian SBT quota is automatically allocated by legislation to the commercial sector (farming and wild-caught) and 5% for catch by the charter/recreational sector.

Juvenile SBT are moved from their natural wild migratory path through the Great Australian Bight into off-shore sea-pontoons (40-45 m diameter) located near Port Lincoln, where they are on-grown to a larger market size and condition. SBT are held in sea-pontoons for a grow-out period of approximately

six months during which time they can double their whole weight. During grow-out Tuna are typically fed their natural diet which is wild caught fresh sardines. Sardines in SA are sustainably caught under strict catch quota limits, which are set annually/biannually by a scientific assessment of the sardine population. In 2018, the South Australian Sardine Fishery (SASF) was certified by the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC). The SASF received the highest ever score for a first-time certified fishery in the world, from over 400 fisheries certified worldwide by the MSC. In addition, the Tuna Purse Seine Fishery received MSC certification in March 2025. For a summary of production and value, and other key economic indicators and trends for the Tuna aquaculture sector, see [Tuna farming economic indicators dashboard 2023-24 \(pir.sa.gov.au\)](https://pir.sa.gov.au/tuna-farming-economic-indicators-dashboard-2023-24).

Farmed Tuna are South Australia's largest aquaculture export. Historically, exports were largely sent to Japan, however, in recent years exports to other countries within South-East Asia, including China and Korea have grown to be up to 10% of the total harvest. In addition, the Australian domestic market has grown quickly, including development of new value-added products.

The environmental impact of sea cage aquaculture has been well described and can include impacts associated with dissolved nutrients from fish metabolism, and solid waste from faeces and un-utilised feed (note: feed wastage is avoided as it is economically unviable). For Tuna, these are predominantly dispersed in the water column (~85%), with the remainder deposited on the underlying seafloor (Fernandes et al., 2007a and 2007b, Tanner and Volkman 2009). Recently, PIRSA approved the farming of seaweed (as biofouling) on a Tuna aquaculture licence which will assist with nutrient offsets for the industry.

To ensure the impacts are minimal and managed to an acceptable level, a carrying capacity model developed by SARDI is used to set precautionary biomass limits for both individual sites and across the entire Tuna farming zone. These biomass limits are based on published models to ensure minimal impacts to the environment, with water quality maintained below water quality values of the Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council (ANZECC) guidelines. Zone policies are developed to protect the environment from significant ecological impacts that the Tuna sector may have within their growing regions, and to ensure husbandry standards are enforced. The environmental monitoring program (EMP) process provides ongoing environmental monitoring information required to identify and control the occurrence of any impacts the Tuna sector may present on both an individual site level and a whole of sector level. In addition, it is a legislative requirement for licence holders to fallow or move sea-pontoons each year to provide the seafloor time to recover. This is in addition to the Tuna farming cycle that allows the seafloor 6 months to fallow between the end of harvest (July/August) and restocking from January the following year.

The wider ecological benefit of Tuna farming is that in the wild the SBT age-groups captured for farming have a high annual natural mortality of 20-30% from predators and periods of starvation. They are also believed to have a relatively poor feed conversion ratio (FCR) in the wild because of the high energy used in escaping predators and in annual migrations from the Indian Ocean to the Great Australian Bight. In contrast, in farms the natural mortality is less than 1% in the grow-out period and much more of the energy from feed goes into growth rather than escaping predators and migration. In addition, Tuna farming maximises the seasonal grow-out (summer) and the quality (fat) content in autumn/winter before harvest.

## Environment

### Regional Aquaculture Environmental Monitoring Program (AEMP)

During 2023-24, the Tuna aquaculture sector contributed to the 2023-2027 AEMP through a Service Level Agreement for cost recovery of the program. See [Lower Eyre regional aquaculture environmental monitoring program \(AEMP\)](#) for further information and results.

#### Annual environmental monitoring reports

In the 2023-24 reporting period, EMPs were submitted for all 13 (100%) Tuna (n = seven) and Miscellaneous (n = six) licences with 73.92% of these being received on time. PIRSA follow up all late or non-submitted EMP reports with licence holders. Education about the importance of the information for regulating the aquaculture industry is promoted. However, failure to submit an EMP report where required may result in the matter being referred to the PIRSA Compliance Unit for further action. Note: the reporting period for the Tuna sector is 1 December 2023 to 30 November 2024, aligning with the Tuna production cycle.

#### Development

During the 2023-24 reporting period, six of the seven Tuna licences reported having stock as well as farming structures on site (one Tuna licence was not operational during this reporting period). Sea-cages were used for growing SBT within the Lincoln Inner Sector on all six Tuna licences and Contained Longlines were also used on one licence for growing macroalgae species. One Maintenance licence reported having farming structures (sea cages) on site. None of the six Maintenance licences reported having stock on site in accordance with their licence conditions.

#### Biomass

Wild caught juvenile SBT were moved to off-shore sea-pontoons between January and March 2024 at an average whole weight of 11.81 kilograms (kg). Harvesting of SBT largely occurred six months after stocking during July 2024. The average whole weight of farmed SBT (per fish) at harvest in July 2024 was 22.13 kg.

Standard licence conditions state that the maximum biomass of SBT held on an aquaculture site at any one time cannot exceed 6 t of stock per ha. In 2023-24, PIRSA and EPA approved two SBT licences to farm 8 t of stock per ha with a maximum biomass across all licences not to exceed the aquaculture zone biomass limit of 16,955 t. To ensure the zone biomass limit was not exceeded during the 2023-24 farming season, licensees were required to report total biomass (in tonnes) monthly. The maximum stocking density for each licence was not reached (highest recorded was 4.4 t per ha during June 2024) and the zone biomass limit was not exceeded. The maximum biomass of farmed SBT across all sites was recorded in July 2024, totalling approximately 6,110 t (representing an average of 4.01 t per ha).

#### Feed inputs

Farmed SBT are fed their natural diet of small whole baitfish, which is largely sourced locally from the commercial sardine fishery which operates in Spencer Gulf, Kangaroo Island and along South Australia's West Coast. This fishery is sustainably managed under the SASF Management Plan and is MSC certified. An approximate total of 54,215 t feed (baitfish) was used by the SBT industry in 2023-24. Any imported baitfish are managed under strict biosecurity conditions stipulated by the Commonwealth Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry. Feed conversion ratios are better than their wild counterparts due to farmed SBT not having to use high energy to escape predators or migrate.

## Reported interactions and escapes

As part of marine licence EMP reporting requirements, licence holders are required to submit information regarding interactions with seabirds and large marine vertebrates that occurred on their licensed site during each reporting year. During the 2023-24 reporting period, one licensed Tuna aquaculture site reported an interaction with a White Shark in a tuna cage. The shark was released unharmed and alive in under 24 hours. The licence holder reported the interaction to PIRSA, as required under regulation 27 of the [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#). For more information see Impacts on habitat and biodiversity.

The Tuna sector uses three-metre high seal jump fences, which are considered by industry to be effective in minimising interactions with Long-nosed fur seals and Australian sea-lions. Daily removal of any dead or sick SBT also contributes to a low level of interactions in the Tuna sector. There were no reported interactions with any seal species on licensed Tuna aquaculture sites during 2023-24 reporting period.

Licence holders are also required to submit information regarding any stock escape events that occurred on their licensed sites (see Species selection and escapes). There were no escape events reported by the Tuna sector in 2023-24.

## **Aquatic animal health management**

### **Veterinary medicine use**

#### Off-label approvals

No off-label (outside approved label or permit) chemical approvals (under [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#)) were requested by the Tuna sector during the 2023-2024 reporting period.

#### Reported use of APVMA permitted products

All six licence holders in the Tuna sector reported permitted product use (use in accordance with APVMA approved agricultural or veterinary chemical labels or permits) during the 2023-2024 reporting period. Permitted products included Praziquantel (PER92045 and PER88128) to treat parasite (blood fluke) infections.

### **Livestock translocations**

No livestock translocation approvals were requested by the Tuna sector during the 2023-24 reporting period.

### **Disease management and surveillance**

No unusually high or unexplained mortalities, nor suspected or confirmed notifiable diseases were reported to PIRSA during the 2023-24 period for the marine Tuna sector. No disease investigations or emergency disease responses were required for the sector during this period.

# Marine Finfish



## Overview of the industry

The Marine Finfish aquaculture sector is well established, with significant growth in production over the years. The species farmed by this sector is the Yellowtail Kingfish (*Seriola lalandi*).

Marine Finfish farming represents a high performing sector of the South Australian aquaculture industry. In 2023-24, there were 19 Finfish farms licensed by PIRSA, occupying 638 ha of water and operated by one company. Finfish licences were located in waters along the west coast of Spencer Gulf at Fitzgerald Bay, Arno Bay, and Louth Bay and Boston Bay near Port Lincoln. Individual Finfish aquaculture licences are listed in Appendix 1, noting licence areas are managed as a single site when abutting.

The industry is based on the growout of hatchery-reared Yellowtail Kingfish (YTK) fingerlings from broodstock originally taken in South Australian waters in accordance with the *Fisheries Management Act 2007*. Fingerlings are transferred to marine sea-pontoons (40 to 45 m in diameter) at ~30 g, fed on specially formulated manufactured diets, and grown out at sea for ~28 months until they are harvested at 4.2 kg. For a summary of production and value, and other key economic indicators and trends for the Kingfish aquaculture sector, see [Kingfish economic indicators dashboard 2023-24 \(pir.sa.gov.au\)](https://pir.sa.gov.au/kingfish-economic-indicators-dashboard-2023-24)

Environmental impacts of sea-pontoon Finfish farming have been investigated, including potential impacts on biogeochemical processes, seagrasses and benthic communities (Tanner and Bryars, 2007, Tanner et al., 2007). It has been summarised that YTK farming has minimal impact to the benthos, with detectable changes associated with dissolved nutrients from fish metabolism and solid waste from faeces and excess feed which are predominantly dispersed into the water column (~85%), and the remainder deposited on the underlying seafloor (Tanner and Bryars, 2007, Tanner et al., 2007).

Biomass limits for individual site and aquaculture zone levels are developed to minimise the effects the Finfish aquaculture industry may have on the environment of different growing regions. The periodic EMP process provides ongoing environmental monitoring data to identify and manage the occurrence of potential impacts the Finfish sector may have on an individual or zone level. In addition to environmental monitoring, it is a legislative requirement for licence holders to fallow or move sea-pontoons each year to provide the seafloor time to recover unless otherwise approved by the Minister.

## Environment

### Site-specific environmental monitoring programs

The holders of Finfish aquaculture licences are required to undertake site specific periodic EMPs. These EMPs are designed by PIRSA and the EPA and are tailored to suit specific locations and environmental characteristics. However, the overall aim is to monitor changes in the environment that may reflect an impact from Finfish aquaculture. In addition to site-specific EMPs, Finfish aquaculture licensees are required to provide monthly reporting for each site detailing total biomass, feed added and number of fish per cage.

The site level component of the EMPs comprise of benthic video to monitor the benthic habitat at and near the sea cages for accumulation of debris, waste feed, build-up of harmful algal mats, and changes to the quantity and health of seagrass. The broadscale (regional) component of the EMPs – introduced in 2020-21 – comprise of benthic video and are designed to specifically monitor changes to the quantity, condition and health of seagrasses that are in the flow direction modelled for Finfish nutrients. Regional EMPs are also designed to reflect methodology utilised in the regional aquaculture environmental monitoring program (AEMP) described below, to help build the dataset collected for the AEMP.

A Boston Bay EMP has been in place since 2016, and results to date demonstrate no significant impact of Finfish farming at the site level. In 2021, the EMP was amended to increase the focus on off-site locations and seagrass health, while maintaining site specific monitoring. A Louth Bay EMP was implemented in October 2017 when the site was first used to hold stock, comprising benthic video on the site. This Louth Bay EMP was revised in April 2020 in response to higher biomass held on the site. The new program includes site benthic video and regional benthic video that focusses on seagrass condition and density. Data from these programs continue to contribute to the regional AEMP detailed below.

An Arno Bay EMP was originally designed in 2019 to use benthic video footage to monitor the presence of, and changes to, unidentified benthic mats (noting benthic algal mats are an environmental signal of nutrient enrichment) and changes to the small amount of seagrass that occur within the Arno Bay aquaculture zone. Two years of data collection confirmed the unidentified mats were Mussel shell accumulation and not benthic algal mats, which led to a revision of the Arno Bay EMP in 2021 to focus on site level video and areas where seagrass was previously identified. Site level video is designed to monitor for the accumulation of debris, waste feed, potential build-up of harmful algal mats, and changes to the quantity and health of seagrasses at and near sea-cages.

Finfish were reintroduced to Fitzgerald Bay aquaculture sites in September 2021, so a Fitzgerald Bay EMP was implemented and comprised of site and regional monitoring through benthic video footage. The benthic habitat beneath Fitzgerald Bay sites comprises predominantly sand. However, there are significant seagrass meadows nearby. Site level video components of the Fitzgerald Bay EMP is designed to monitor the benthic habitat at and near the sea-cages for accumulation of debris, waste feed and potential build-up of harmful algal mats. The regional level component of the EMP contributes to a research project being undertaken by SARDI with respect to potential impacts of Finfish nutrients on seagrasses. The four-year research project, developed by SARDI, PIRSA, Clean Seas Seafood Limited and the EPA, was approved by the FRDC and commenced in July 2019, with the first sampling undertaken in May 2020 (representing a baseline dataset). The next round of sampling was to be undertaken in May 2023 about two years after Finfish farming commenced in Fitzgerald Bay, however, farming ceased in this region in November 2022.

The final sampling for the research project was undertaken in January 2023. Using benthic video, changes to the seagrass density, health and condition were monitored. For more information on EMPs,

see the following links:

[www.pir.sa.gov.au/primary\\_industry/aquaculture/marine\\_aquaculture/finfish\\_fitzgerald\\_bay](http://www.pir.sa.gov.au/primary_industry/aquaculture/marine_aquaculture/finfish_fitzgerald_bay) and [www.frdc.com.au/project/2018-186](http://www.frdc.com.au/project/2018-186).

## **Regional Aquaculture Environmental Monitoring Program (AEMP)**

During 2023-24, the Finfish aquaculture sector contributed to the 2023–2027 AEMP through a Service Level Agreement for cost recovery of the program. In addition, the Finfish aquaculture sector collected remote video transects under the site-specific EMPs, to assist in the seagrass monitoring component of the AEMP and provide greater temporal context. See Lower Eyre regional aquaculture environmental monitoring program (AEMP) for further information and results.

## **Annual environmental monitoring reports**

In the 2023-24 reporting period, EMPs were submitted for all 19 (100%) Finfish licences with 100% of these being received on time. Note: the reporting period for the Finfish sector is 1 December 2023 to 30 November 2024.

### Development

Of the 19 reports submitted for the 2023-24 EMP reporting period, 14 licences had farming structures (sea-cages) on site, five (5) licences reported to be actively farming YTK and one site was used for maintenance of sea-cages.

### Biomass

The maximum amount of YTK farmed across all sites within the marine Finfish sector was recorded in March (3,153 t) during the 2023-24 reporting period. Of note, the three licences located in Fitzgerald Bay were not actively farmed and therefore not stocked during 2023-24.

Subject to any licence specific conditions providing otherwise, standardised licence conditions state that the maximum biomass of Finfish held on an aquaculture site at any one time must not exceed 15 t per licensed ha. To ensure biomass limits are not exceeded during a reporting period, licensees of the Finfish sector are required to provide monthly reporting on total biomass (in tonnes). No zone biomass limits were exceeded during the 2023-24 reporting period.

During 2023-24, seven of the eight Finfish licences in Boston Bay aquaculture zone were licensed to farm above 15 t per licensed ha; 20 t for five licences in the Boston Bay sector and 41.25 t for two licences in the Bickers Island sector. A maximum biomass of 1,646 t in April 2024 was recorded across sites within the Boston Bay aquaculture zone, below the relevant zone biomass limit of 1,696 t. However, monthly biomass reports did on four occasions exceed the maximum (individual) stocking rate permitted across two harvesting areas in the Boston Bay sector comprising four licences (44 ha) and two licences (21 ha) respectively. Key reasons for exceeding the biomass included consolidation of farming activities to Port Lincoln and due to unforeseen circumstances (e.g. vessel sinking). In all instances, no further compliance action was taken, but the licensee was reminded of their obligation to ensure biomass held on a site remain within licensed limits and were requested to advise what measures are in place to ensure this does not occur again.

During 2023-24, the Finfish licence located in Louth Bay was licensed to farm 40 t per ha with a maximum biomass of 1,487 t recorded in May 2024, below the relevant zone biomass limit of 7,953 t.

During 2023-24, the six Finfish licences located in Arno Bay (inner sector) were licensed to farm 15 t per ha with a maximum biomass of 544 t recorded across the sites in March 2024, below the relevant sector biomass limit of 2,900 t.

### Feed Inputs

Farmed YTK are fed commercially manufactured, pelletised feed. A total of approximately 6,944 t of manufactured feed was used across all sites within the marine Finfish sector during the 2023-24 reporting period. Farmed sites located within the Arno Bay and Lower Eyre Peninsula aquaculture zone policy areas reported a total of 1,466 t and 5,478 t of manufactured feed, respectively.

### Reported Interactions and escapes

As part of annual EMP reporting requirements for marine licences, licence holders are required to submit information regarding any adverse interactions with seabirds and large marine vertebrates that occurred on their licensed site during each reporting year (see Impacts on habitat and biodiversity [section](#)). In addition to annual reporting, the Finfish sector is required to submit monthly reports on all interactions (considered 'routine interactions') at each licensed site. Reporting by industry has been very conservative with a total of 139 'routine interactions' involving 212 Long-nosed fur seals (maximum of 8 seals per day, primarily making holes in cage netting or swimming within pontoon cages) on licensed sites in the Boston Bay and Louth Bay aquaculture zones. The seals were released from the Finfish cages unharmed and therefore there were no 'adverse interactions' reported on a licensed Finfish aquaculture site during 2023-24.

Separate to routine interactions, four other interactions were reported by the Finfish licence holders. One whale entanglement in anchor rope was reported on 7 December 2023, with the whale immediately freed from the entanglement by divers and reported to have swum away free of injury and rope fragments. On 15 January 2024, a Great White Shark was found swimming within a sea cage. It was suspected the shark created the entrance hole into the sea cage. The shark was released unharmed and the hole was repaired. On 22 July 2024, a dead pelican was reported to be floating within the cage, with cause of death unknown. The Pelican was removed and disposed of through an approved waste facility. On 5 September 2024 and in accordance with a licensee's aquaculture strategy one extended confinement (more than three days) of a sealion within a sea cage was reported. Multiple daily release attempts were conducted until the sealion was released unharmed.


Licence holders are also required to submit information regarding any stock escape events that occurred on their licensed sites (see Species selection and escapes [section](#)). During the 2023-2024 reporting period, five escapes were reported for the Finfish sector. On 22 December 2024, an escape event of 150 YTK (estimated biomass 570 kg) was reported, due to minor sea cage net damage (20 small holes) from towing and entanglement with their own sites' Saint Andrews Cross. In association with the Great White Shark interaction described above, on 15 January 2024, 20 YTK (estimated biomass 81 kg) were reported to have escaped when the sea cage was lowered to allow for the successful and unharmed release of the shark. On 10 February 2024, 350 YTK (estimated biomass 14 kg) were reported to have escaped from holes in the sea cage net. On 16 April 2024 and 18 November 2024, 1000-2000 YTK (estimated biomass 1,081 kg) and 500 YTK (estimated biomass 1,200 kg) were reported as escaped from either towing sea cages or holes in the sea cage (from sharks), respectively. Of escape events, 10 fish were reported to be re-captured from the escape event occurring on 16 April 2024. An up-to-date summary of Finfish escape events can be found at [www://pir.sa.gov.au/aquaculture/monitoring\\_and\\_assessment/register - finfish escape](http://www.pir.sa.gov.au/aquaculture/monitoring_and_assessment/register_-_finfish_escape).

# Aquatic animal health management

## Veterinary medicine use

### Off-label approvals

Eight off-label (use outside approved label or permit) chemical approvals (under [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#)) were issued for the Finfish sector during the 2023-2024 reporting period. Of these, there were two praziquantel approvals, and six Sed8 and AQUI-S® approvals. All approvals were issued for use on YTK stock. Sed8 and AQUI-S® approvals were for use of an anaesthetic during routine stock monitoring and general husbandry. Praziquantel was for treatment of parasite infections.



### Reported use of APVMA permitted products

Nine licences in the Finfish sector reported permitted product use (use in accordance with APVMA approved agricultural or veterinary chemical labels or permits) during the 2023-2024 reporting period. Permitted products used included Oxytetracycline (PER91309) and Praziquantel (PER87833) to treat bacterial and parasite infections, respectively in YTK stock.

## Livestock translocations

The Finfish sector supplies their own fingerlings from a purpose-built hatchery located at Arno Bay. As such, no livestock translocation approvals were requested by the Finfish sector during the 2023-24 reporting period.

## Disease management and surveillance

Two unusually high and unexplained mortality event was reported to PIRSA during the 2023-24 period for the Finfish sector. No notifiable diseases were detected. From one investigation, low levels of harmful algae (*Karenia papilionacea* and *Karenia mikimotoi*) were observed in water samples through laboratory testing in a Point Boston site. An aquabirnavirus (Victorian Trout Aquabirnavirus [VTAB]) was detected from the other investigation. The role of VTAB in the mortality is not clear.

No disease investigations or emergency disease responses were required for the sector during this period.

# Marine Abalone



## Overview of the industry

The sector is typically based on the grow-out of hatchery reared Greenlip Abalone (*Haliotis laevis*) spat, which are moved to concrete benthic structures ('abitats') where they are grown out to market size.

In 2023-24, there were two marine Abalone sites licensed by PIRSA which occupied 149 ha of water. Both sites reported to have no farming structures on site. Individual marine Abalone aquaculture licences are listed in Appendix 1.

The marine Abalone sector is still trialling suitable benthic farming methods, and production by this sector in 2023-24 was nil. It is anticipated Abalone would be held for a grow-out period of approximately three years and typically fed naturally occurring marine algae that drifts past the abalone. Note that there is also land-based abalone aquaculture which occurs within South Australia (see Landbased section below for further information).

Biomass limits for both individual sites and zone policies are developed to protect the environment from any ecological impacts that the marine Abalone sector may have. To protect the benthic environment, licence conditions on existing marine Abalone sites require the placement of benthic concrete structures to be at least 3 m from seagrass or sensitive habitat.

Site-specific monitoring programs are in place for the marine Abalone sector, however, as there is no commercial-scale production, these have not yet been implemented. The monitoring programs are comprised of benthic video and will provide ongoing environmental monitoring information required to adaptively identify and manage any impacts Abalone aquaculture may have. Specifically, monitoring is designed to assess any impacts to nearby seagrass species from feed inputs.

## Environment

### Annual environmental monitoring reports

Both licences for the marine Abalone sector submitted an EMP in 2023-24 and both were submitted on time. Education about the importance of the information for regulating the aquaculture industry is promoted. However, failure to submit an EMP report where required may result in the matter being referred to the PIRSA Compliance Unit for further action.

#### Development

No Abalone licences reported having farming structures on site during the 2023-24 reporting period.

#### Biomass

During the 2023-24 reporting period, both sites remained unstocked due to waiting on approval of patent for artificial reef design and/or the approval of a translocation permit.

#### Feed Inputs

Farmed Abalone can be fed commercially produced manufactured pellets or naturally occurring drift algae. No feed was used during 2023-24.

#### Reported Interactions and escapes

No interaction or escape events were reported by the marine Abalone sector during 2023-24.

## Aquatic animal health management

### Veterinary medicine use

#### Off-label approvals

No off-label (outside approved label or permit) chemical approvals (under [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#)) were requested by the Marine Abalone sector during the 2023-24 reporting period.

#### Reported use of APVMA permitted products

No permitted product use (in accordance with APVMA approved agricultural or veterinary chemical labels or permits) was reported by the Marine Abalone sector during the 2023-24 reporting period.

### Livestock translocations

One livestock translocation approval was requested by the marine Abalone sector during the 2023-24 reporting period. Hatchery reared Greenlip Abalone from a South Australian Landbased site to a South Australian sea-based site. However, EMP reports have verified that the translocation did not occur as no stock or farming infrastructure were on site.

### Disease management and surveillance

On 21 February 2024, the virus that causes Abalone Viral Ganglioneuritis (AVG) was detected in wild abalone at Breaksea Reef off Port MacDonnell. PIRSA formed an Incident Management Team (IMT) to monitor the situation in the Southeast, implement a Control Area, Buffer Zone and several other restrictions to limit the spread of the disease. The response transitioned to management on the 28 of March 2024, however legislated and non-legislated restrictions in the Southern Zone are still in place.

# Mussels



## Fast Facts

Total Production: 2,007 tonnes

Direct Value: \$4.62 Million

Employment FTE: 32 direct and 35 flow-on

## Overview of the industry

The Mussel sector is well established with 35 licenced sites in 2023-24. The waters of Boston Bay and Point Boston cover 330 ha, Louth Bay 10 ha, Wallaroo 170 ha and Proper Bay 59 ha. Of these licences, 22 farmed during the 2023-24 reporting period. Individual Mussel aquaculture licences are listed in Appendix 1. The primary species farmed by this sector is the Blue Mussel (*Mytilus galloprovincialis*), and trials have been undertaken for cultivating red algae (*Asparagopsis armata*) on mussel sites also. Blue Mussels are grown using long-line culture. Long-lining involves a system of horizontal ropes with buoys to provide flotation, to which vertical droppers are attached every 1–4 m, depending on site conditions. Long-lines are used for spat collection, as well as for on-growing juvenile Mussels to market size.

Currently, Blue Mussel spat are collected from the wild on spat collectors, which are fibrous, ‘hairy’ looking ropes hung from long-lines during the peak spawning season (June to September) in areas known to have good Mussel ‘spatfall’. After ~6 months, juveniles (12 millimetres (mm) long) are transferred from the spat collectors to grow-out long-lines. The juvenile Mussels are separated from each other by passing them through a Mussel de-clumping machine and then feeding them through a funnel onto a grow-out rope. A cotton stocking, known as a ‘mussock’, is placed around the grow-out rope to hold the juvenile Mussels against the rope. As the Mussels grow, they re-attach themselves to the ropes. In time, the biodegradable mussock disintegrates leaving the Mussels to grow for a further 8–12 months. Mussels are generally harvested after a period of 18 months at ~10–11 centimetre (cm) length. For a summary of production and value, and other key economic indicators and trends for the Mussel aquaculture sector, see [Mussel farming Economic Indicators Dashboard 2023-24](#).

Blue Mussel spat collection from the wild can be unreliable and inconsistent, and in poor collection seasons can impact the industry significantly. Many factors influence the number of spat collected, including water currents, climatic variations or bio-fouling on the ropes, which can all prevent spat from settling. On rare occasions and with the appropriate approvals, Blue Mussel spat can be brought in from interstate hatcheries to support spat supply for the SA sector.

## Sector-based aquaculture strategy

A sector-based aquaculture strategy has been developed for subtidal mussel farming to support the future growth and prosperity of the industry in an ecologically sustainable way. Approved on 9 September 2022, it is the first sector-based aquaculture strategy approved under regulation 19 of the

[Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#) and replaces the requirement for licence holders to submit (and have approved) individual aquaculture strategies. Because of this, all current and future aquaculture licence holders of the mussel sector must adopt the sector-based aquaculture strategy and make sure activities undertaken adhere to it. For further information and a copy of the sector-based strategy which is in place, see [Sector-based aquaculture strategy - subtidal mussels \(pir.sa.gov.au\)](#)

## Environment

### Annual environmental monitoring reports

Submission rates for EMPs for the Mussel sector were 100% in 2023-24 and 94.1% were submitted on time.

#### Development

Of the 35 reports received for the 2023-24 EMP reporting period, 26 or 76.5% of the Mussel licences reported having farming structures and 22 or 64.7% with stock on the site. One licenced site trialled growing *Ecklonia radiata* seedlings on a single longline, however this was unsuccessful. All active farming occurred within the Port Lincoln region.

#### Biomass

Standard licence conditions limiting the amount of Mussels farmed on a site relate to infrastructure not biomass, and state that the total length of backbone (the supporting structure on the surface for all underwater lines on which the Mussels are attached) held on site does not exceed 560 m per ha with no more than 15 m of submerged line per metre of backbone (unless otherwise approved by the Minister).

During the 2023-24 EMP reporting period, all licensees reported being within the total allowable length of backbone and submerged line on the site. On average, the length of backbone infrastructure across all farmed sites within the region during the 2023-24 reporting period was approximately 234 m of backbone per ha, and 5.7 m of submerged line per metre of backbone. The maximum length of backbone on an individual licence was 495 m per ha.

#### Feed Inputs

Mussels are filter feeders and do not require supplementary feed.

#### Reported Interactions and escapes

No interaction or escape events were reported during the 2023-24 reporting period.

#### Loss of equipment

There were no reports of lost equipment (mussel floats and corner marks) during the 2023-24 reporting period.

#### Benthic Video

No additional reporting on the aquatic environment was required for the 2023-24 reporting period for the Mussel sector.

## Aquatic animal health management

### Veterinary medicine use

#### Off-label approvals

No off-label (outside approved label or permit) chemical approvals (under [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#)) were requested by the Mussel sector during the 2023-2024 reporting period.

#### Reported use of APVMA permitted products

No permitted product use (in accordance with APVMA approved agricultural or veterinary chemical labels or permits) was reported by the Mussel sector during the 2023-2024 reporting period.

### Livestock translocations

No livestock translocation approvals were requested by the Mussel sector during the 2023-24 reporting period.

### Disease management and surveillance

No unusually high or unexplained mortalities, nor suspected or confirmed notifiable diseases were reported to PIRSA during the 2023-24 reporting period for the Mussel sector.

No disease investigations or emergency disease responses were required for the sector during this period.



*Image courtesy of Andy Dyer*

# Oysters



## Fast Facts

Total Production: 5,207 tonnes

Direct Value: \$54.82 Million

Employment FTE: 504 direct and 256 flow-on

## Overview of the industry

The Oyster sector is well established in South Australia. The majority of farmed Oysters are Pacific Oysters (*Magallana gigas*) with some farmers trialling Native Oysters (*Ostrea angasi*) and Razorfish (*Pinna bicolor*). Oysters are farmed in South Australia in seven main growing regions (Coffin Bay, Streaky Bay, Smoky Bay, Cowell, Denial Bay/Ceduna, Kangaroo Island, Yorke Peninsula) with 355 licensed oyster sites (including 1 razorfish site) covering approximately 958 ha in 2023-24. Individual Oyster aquaculture licences are listed in Appendix 1.

Up until January 2016, the majority (80%) of Pacific Oyster spat were sourced from Tasmania. However, an outbreak of POMS in Tasmania in January 2016 resulted in South Australia implementing a ban of Oyster imports from Tasmania (see [Error! Reference source not found.](#) for more detail) as a biosecurity measure to protect South Australian Oyster stocks. Since then, the South Australian Government, Tasmanian Oyster hatcheries and South Australian Oyster farmers have developed or expanded their own hatcheries in South Australia to be able to provide locally grown stock. To facilitate this, the South Australian Government provided grants to two local South Australian Oyster hatcheries, increased capacity at SARDI to produce spat for the industry, and fast tracked two new Oyster hatchery developments.

South Australian Oysters are traditionally grown intertidally using a rack and rail system, a long-line system or a combination of both. Fixed 'rack and rail' culture systems have been shown to cause localised impacts to some seagrass species, as the racks and baskets are stationary and can shade the seagrass beneath.

Now Oyster farmers largely use the Baker-Schutz-Turner (BST) long-line system developed by the Turner family of Cowell, to allow Oyster growers to alter the height of the free-swinging Oyster baskets in the water column to reduce exposure to storm events, high air temperatures and mudworm. This system creates minimal shading effect on seagrass.

Innovative new methods of farming Oysters have been tested in South Australia for use in subtidal waters (>2 m deep). Floating Oyster mesh bags and grow out tumblers attached to longlines are new farming methods developed by Zapco Aquaculture. The Oyster mesh bags expose Oysters to nutrient and oxygen rich surface water which enables the Oysters to grow much faster than traditional intertidal

Oyster farming methods. The grow out tumblers rotate with the tide, promoting faster spat growth and allowing Oysters to develop a uniform shape. Floating BST baskets is also a new longline system that involves the use of detachable floating injection-moulded BST oyster baskets paired along the length of surface longlines. The system provides the ability for one basket to sit on top of another, as well as for baskets to be flipped to either side of the longline, thereby increasing the overall exposure of sunlight to the benthic habitat and decreasing the level of biofouling on culture units. Similarly, Flip Farm Systems have developed a basket system attached to a single longline that is extremely robust and efficient. The rotation system uses a mechanical action device mounted to the side of a boat to flip baskets as the boat moves along the line. These new farming methods are less labour intensive and rely on less infrastructure (e.g. posts) in comparison to traditional systems. A reduced number of posts means less physical disturbance to the benthic environment and associated sedimentation effects on surrounding habitats. The long-lines also move with the tide which reduces the effect of prolonged shading from Oyster baskets or bags on seagrass habitat.

Typically, Oyster spat are placed into baskets at ~5-15 (mm) shell length and on-grown for ~12-24 months. During this time, Oysters are removed from the baskets and graded several times before they are sold. Grading the Oysters minimises shell fouling and helps the development of optimal shell quality for marketing. Since 2016 until 2020-21, the local hatcheries were having difficulty in producing spat larger than 3 mm for on-growing which has had longer term issues with survivability of the spat and overall production of mature Oysters. Local hatcheries have now improved spat survivability by on-growing small spat on protected oyster leases to achieve larger sizes prior to being grown on more exposed commercial leases.

Oyster growers across various regions are actively involved in community projects that support the environment. For example, several growers were involved in installing artificial nest platforms for the endangered Osprey and Kangaroo Island Shellfish were involved in deploying artificial reef modules near Kingscote and American river (Kangaroo Island) to restore reef habitat for the native flat Oyster. For more information see: [Friends of Osprey Sth Aus | Facebook](#) and [Landscape South Australia - Kangaroo Island | Kangaroo Island Oyster...](#)

## **Sector-based aquaculture strategy**

PIRSA is currently developing a sector-based aquaculture strategy with the Oyster sector. Once approved the strategy will supersede individual aquaculture strategies and a licensee who belongs to the Oyster sector must adopt this sector-based aquaculture strategy and ensure activities undertaken under their individual aquaculture licence area(s) conform with it.

## **Environment**

### **Annual environmental monitoring reports**

Submission rates for EMPs for the Oyster sector were 95.5% in 2023-24; however, 16.2% of these were up to 3 months late and 2 licences failed to submit. PIRSA follows up all late or non-submitted EMP reports with licence holders. Education about the importance of the information for regulating the aquaculture industry is promoted. However, failure to submit an EMP report where required may result in the matter being referred to the PIRSA Compliance Unit for further action.

### Development

Of the reports received for the 2023-24 EMP reporting period, 310 (91.4%) reported having farming structures and 291 (85.8%) reported having stock (Pacific Oyster and/or Native Oysters, Razorfish) on the site.

### Biomass

Standard licence conditions limiting the amount of Oysters farmed on a site relate to infrastructure (which in turn limit biomass), and state that the licence holder must ensure that the structures used to farm Oysters on a site does not exceed a specified amount per ha (e.g. does not exceed 3 km of longline per ha and/or 1 km of baskets on racking per ha).

Of the reports received for the 2023-24 EMP reporting period, 29 licence holders (or 8.8%) reported having exceeded the total allowable length of line and/or racking on the site. While this does not necessarily translate to an environmental impact, PIRSA has been working with the South Australian Oyster Growers Association (SAOGA) to address the issue and have developed the [Standard Lease and Licence Condition Policy](#) (see page 28 for more information) that addresses new biomass limits for some of the Oyster growing regions, based on historical use and previous research undertaken by SARDI to determine carrying capacity (biomass) in Oyster growing regions.

### Feed Inputs

Oysters are filter feeders and do not require supplementary feed.

### Reported Interactions and Escapes

During the 2023-24 reporting period, no adverse interactions with large marine vertebrates (e.g. sharks, whales, dolphins, seals) or seabirds were reported.

### Feral Oysters

Of the reports received for the 2023-24 EMP reporting period, 37 (10.9%) intertidal licences stated feral Oysters (wild Pacific Oysters) were found in the lease area. All feral Oysters were reported to have been removed from the area and disposed of at landbased facilities. Feral Oyster populations within, and adjacent to, growing regions pose a potential POMS risk to the Oyster industry. To reduce this potential risk of disease, the growing regions participate in a feral Oyster monitoring and management program. Led by SAOGA, feral Oyster knock down events (see image below) are organised as needed to reduce feral Oyster numbers in the growing region.

# Aquatic animal health management

## Veterinary medicine use

### Off-label approvals

No off-label (outside approved label or permit) chemical approvals (under [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#)) were requested by the Oyster sector during the 2023-2024 reporting period.

### Reported use of APVMA permitted products

No permitted product use (in accordance with APVMA approved agricultural or veterinary chemical labels or permits) was reported by the Oyster sector during the 2023-2024 reporting period.


## Livestock translocations

There was one translocation approval requested by the Oyster sector for the 2023-24 reporting period. Pacific oysters were translocated from the Australian Seafood Industries (ASI) hatchery (Tasmania) to a lease site in Smoky Bay.

## Disease management and surveillance

Two unusually high and unexplained mortalities in the Oyster sector were reported to PIRSA during the 2023-24 period. PIRSA investigated these events. No notifiable or infectious diseases or harmful algae were detected during the 2023-24 period.

In 2017, PIRSA developed a surveillance strategy for POMS to enhance early detection and rapid response to the disease. Since this time, Oysters have been regularly submitted to the South Australian veterinary laboratory for testing as part of the state-wide early detection of POMS. In 2023-24, 2838 to 4488 Oysters from across South Australia (hatcheries, nurseries, grow-out and feral Oysters in growing regions) ( $n = 726$  samples) were processed and tested negative for OsHV-1 (microvariant, which is the virus that causes POMS). For further information on the Tasmanian outbreak of POMS and the indirect effect on South Australia's Oyster industry, see [External factors or events affecting the aquaculture industry in South Australia](#).



Photos courtesy of oysterssa.com.au



# Landbased



## Overview of the industry

The landbased sector is the most diverse of the South Australian aquaculture industry in terms of farming systems and culture species (see below for species farmed). In 2023-24, there were 56 landbased aquaculture licences in South Australia, comprising of Category A (19), B (21), C (9) and D (7). Licences include private businesses, hatcheries (abalone, oysters and finfish), microalgae production, macroalgae production (seaweed), educational and research facilities, as well as tourism and hobby farm businesses. Individual landbased aquaculture licences are listed in Appendix 1.

The landbased abalone, oyster and finfish hatcheries contribute significantly to regional economies, creating the majority of the 129 direct jobs in 2023-24, and producing the spat and/or juvenile stock used for other landbased operators and marine based aquaculture activities. For a summary of production and value, and other key economic indicators and trends for the landbased aquaculture sector, see the 2023-24 Economic Indicators Dashboards for [Abalone](#), [Freshwater Finfish](#), [Marron and Yabby](#), and [Other](#) farming.

Landbased aquaculture licences are located all over South Australia including the Eyre Peninsula, Yorke Peninsula, Kangaroo Island, Adelaide Hills, Murraylands, Fleurieu Peninsula and the South East. A number of production systems are used by the landbased aquaculture sector. The most popular systems are pond culture, recirculating aquaculture systems and flow-through systems.

PIRSA regulate the landbased sector by categorising each licence based on the level of effort involved in the administration and enforcement of the [Aquaculture Act 2001](#) and associated [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#) in relation to the aquaculture authorised by the licence. Indicative criteria for each landbased licence category are listed below:

- **Category A:** Small scale operators, which do not discharge wastewater off site, and require minimal aquatic animal health legislation requirements and environmental monitoring (e.g. yabbies and marron).
- **Category B:** Small scale operators, which may potentially discharge some wastewater off-site, or farm a species with applicable aquatic animal health legislation (e.g. native finfish).

- **Category C:** Intensive and/or large-scale operators with wastewater discharge off-site and/or farm a species with applicable aquatic animal health legislation (e.g. oyster hatcheries).
- **Category D:** Intensive and/or large-scale operators with wastewater discharge off-site into the marine environment and/or farm a species with applicable aquatic animal health legislation (e.g. abalone farms.)

## Environment

### Annual environmental monitoring reports

In the 2023-24 reporting period, EMPs were submitted for 50 (89.3%) of the 56 landbased aquaculture licences with 74% of these being received on time. PIRSA follow up all late or non-submitted EMP reports with licence holders. Education about the importance of the information for regulating the aquaculture industry is promoted. However, failure to submit an EMP report where required may result in the matter being referred to the PIRSA Compliance Unit for further action.

#### Development

Of the reports received for the 2023-24 EMP reporting period, 38 (76%) reported having stock at the facility.

#### Species farmed

In 2023-24, the aquatic species farmed by the landbased sector included:

Barramundi ( <i>Lates calcarifer</i> )	Yabbies ( <i>Cherax destructor</i> )
Brown Trout ( <i>Salmo trutta</i> )	Yellowtail Kingfish ( <i>Seriola lalandi</i> )
Golden Perch ( <i>Macquaria ambigua</i> )	Macroalgae ( <i>Asparagopsis armata</i> , <i>A. taxiformis</i> )
Greenlip Abalone ( <i>Haliotis laevigata</i> )	Razorfish ( <i>Pinna bicolor</i> )
Hairy Marron ( <i>Cherax tenuimanus</i> ),	Microalgae ( <i>Dunaliella salina</i> )
Smooth Marron ( <i>Cherax cainii</i> )	Pacific Oyster ( <i>Magallana gigas</i> )
Eel-tailed Catfish ( <i>Tandanus tandanus</i> )	Rainbow Trout ( <i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i> )
Murray Cod ( <i>Maccullochella peelii peelii</i> )	Silver Perch ( <i>Bidyanus bidyanus</i> )

#### Feed Inputs

Species were provided with either manufactured or natural aquaculture feeds.

#### Reported escapes

No escape events were reported during the 2023-24 reporting period.

# Aquatic animal health management

## Veterinary medicine use

### Off-label approvals

Six off-label (outside approved label or permit) chemical approvals (under [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#)) were requested by the Landbased sector during the 2022-2023 reporting period. One of these requests were for the use of AQUI-S as an anaesthetic during routine stock monitoring and general husbandry in finfish hatcheries and the other was for the use of AQUI-S and Sed-8. The remaining four requests were for the use of praziquantel. There were three licences whereby non-compliant use of isoeugenol products occurred. In all instances of non-compliance, licensees were provided a caution notice and reminded that off-label veterinary medicine use must be in accordance with regulation 10 of the *Aquaculture Regulations 2016*.

### Reported use of APVMA permitted products

Ten licence holders in the Landbased sector reported permitted product use (use in accordance with APVMA approved agricultural or veterinary chemical labels or minor use permits) during the 2023-2024 reporting period. Permitted products included Abamectin (PER88497), Benzocaine (PER92731), Autogenous Streptococcus Vaccine (PER14534), Ovaprim (PER13800), Magnesium Sulphate (PER86963), Magnesium Chloride (PER83238), Sodium Hypochlorite (PER92725, PER14029), 2-Phenoxyethanol (PER83233), Epinephrine Bitartrate (PER80085) and LHRHa (PER13069).

## Livestock translocations

Nine livestock translocations were requested by the Landbased sector and approved during the 2023-2024 reporting period. Species included Barramundi, Brown Trout (ova), Rainbow Trout (ova), and algae species (*Asparagopsis taxiformis*).

## Disease management and surveillance

There were two licensees that were aware of disease or mortality events occurring in the 2023/2024 reporting period.

Two mortality events were reported to PIRSA in the Landbased sector during the 2023-24 period. PIRSA investigated one of the mortality events and detected Betanodavirus, also referred to as Nervous Necrosis Virus (NNV). Betanodavirus is a notifiable disease under the *Livestock Act 1997* and endemic in most regions of the world (including South Australia). The licence holder has received guidance from their veterinary consultant, including decontamination and methods to reduce outbreaks in future batches.

In 2014, the abalone health accreditation program (AHAP) was established to enable the abalone aquaculture industry to demonstrate compartment freedom from infection with HaHV-1 and promote safe translocation of abalone between jurisdictions. In the 2023-2024 reporting year, both Yumbah Port Lincoln and Kangaroo Island satisfied the requirements for health accreditation under the AHAP.



# Marine algae (seaweed)




Photo courtesy of J. Huisman

## Fast Facts

No production, sales or employment

## Overview of the industry

Seaweed is an emerging sector within the South Australian aquaculture industry. During 2023-24, there were 4 marine algae aquaculture licences (79 ha in total) located in Port Lincoln (39 ha) and Port Victoria (40 ha). Individual marine algae aquaculture licences are listed in Appendix 1. As seaweed farming is still predominantly under trial, commercial production on all sites is yet to commence and therefore no production results are available. Individual is also cultivated at landbased facilities in South Australia (see [Landbased](#) section).

There is a significant global demand for seaweed for a diverse range of uses including food, fertiliser, nutraceuticals, pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, carbon sequestration, nutrient offset, livestock and aquafeeds, bioremediation, biofuels, bio-plastics and bio-polymers. A recent paper suggests seaweed aquaculture has the potential to address several United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (Spillias et al., 2022). The Australian Seaweed Industry Blueprint outlines the extensive economic, social, and environmental benefits that could be realised through developing an Australian seaweed industry. The blueprint also identifies the various opportunities, barriers and research needed to grow such an industry (see [The Official Blueprint for Seaweed in Australia — Australian Seaweed Institute](#)). An Australian seaweed industry peak body has been formed which includes a number of seaweed companies (for more information see [Australian Sustainable Seaweed Alliance](#)).

The development of a South Australian seaweed industry has been viewed as advantageous for some time and recent research has brought South Australia closer to realising the environmental and economic benefits of such an industry. Sustainable wild harvest of seaweed at the required levels is unlikely but aquaculture can further this industry. South Australia is uniquely positioned to take advantage of the growing international interest in seaweed aquaculture as the State has:

- Seaweed endemic to our waters,
- Marine areas and coastal land available for farming,
- A world class regulatory framework for aquaculture development,
- International reputation for high-quality seafood, and
- State of the art research and development capabilities.

A key benefit of seaweed aquaculture in South Australian waters is the reduction in coastal anthropogenic dissolved nitrogen (via absorption by the culture stock), including from waste products produced by aquaculture stock. Farming seaweed adjacent to Tuna and Finfish farms will allow excess nutrients to be taken up by the algae and reduce the overall nutrient load from the sectors. In addition to improving water quality, seaweed aquaculture provides a range of other positive ecosystem services such as provision of habitat, restorative strategies and practices (e.g. coastal protection, siting farming to provide additional water filtration and denitrification, stock genetics) and climate mitigation (e.g. reduced ocean acidification, carbon capture and storage resulting in a reduction of atmospheric carbon dioxide) and increased water oxygenation (Alleway et al., 2018; Weitzman 2019; Gentry et al., 2020; Zhu et al., 2020; Duarte et al., 2021; Naylor et al., 2021; Xiao et al., 2021). By linking seafood from aquaculture to broader environmental benefits supports the development of climate-friendly aquaculture practices that in turn generate sustainable ecological, social (i.e. climate friendly seafood) and economic outcomes (Tlusty et al., 2019).

Integrating bivalve aquaculture (e.g. Mussels, Oysters) with seaweed aquaculture also provides additional environmental benefits. Bivalves and seaweeds are extractive species, meaning they use the organic and inorganic materials and by-products from other species (e.g. Tuna and Kingfish farms), from different levels of the food chain, for their own growth. This increases the cycling and uptake of excess, anthropogenic nutrients from the water (Rose et al., 2014). Otherwise known as “Integrated Multi-trophic Aquaculture (IMTA)”, the development of such systems will provide a more sustainable whole of region aquaculture ecosystem and reduce the industry’s environmental ‘footprint’ in South Australia.

To date, PIRSA has approved the addition of seaweed (primarily *Asparagopsis*) to 68 existing marine licences across various growing regions (e.g. Eyre peninsula, Kangaroo Island, Yorke Peninsula). PIRSA has also approved a Tuna licence holder to collect naturally occurring seaweed (biofouling) on floating longlines (similar farming structures to the Mussel sector) located adjacent to Tuna cages for on-growing and harvesting (see image below). Cultivating seaweed next to Tuna or Finfish farms can provide significant environmental benefit through the assimilation of nitrogen, carbon, and phosphorus that is produced from these farms. The seaweed will be made into fertiliser and a natural pigment, with the remaining solids formulated into chicken feed.



## Macroalgae Management Areas

PIRSA supports the sustainable growth of the emerging seaweed aquaculture industry. Risk assessments completed for new licences – or for the variation of existing licences – to culture seaweed have identified potential risks related to seaweed biosecurity (pest and disease) and population genetics, primarily through stock translocation if they were to occur.

These risks have highlighted the need to control seaweed translocations into and within South Australia to protect the industry and the marine environment. In response, PIRSA has developed specified Macroalgae Management Areas (MMAs) to ensure seaweed seedstock or broodstock collection (see [Broodstock and seedstock collection permits - PIRSA](#)) is undertaken in a manner where aquatic ecosystems and genetic diversity are maintained. Based on the State's marine bioregions and biounits (Edyvane, 1999) and scientific advice, the management areas broadly represent the key habitat distributions along the coast of South Australia and the likely growing areas for seaweed species, and therefore provide a suitable foundation for delineating areas for managing activities relating to seaweed collection for aquaculture and the movement of stock between licences. This includes ensuring seaweed stock originates from the same MMA as the licensed area (or discharge point for landbased aquaculture sites). A map of the MMAs along with location descriptions for each management area is available on the PIRSA website through the below link.

[www.pir.sa.gov.au/primary\\_industry/aquaculture/marine\\_aquaculture](http://www.pir.sa.gov.au/primary_industry/aquaculture/marine_aquaculture).

To complement the MMAs, aquaculture licences permitted to culture seaweed have conditions applied for managing the potential biosecurity and genetic risks. The need for conservative management of disease and genetic risks for the rapidly developing seaweed industry is common across Australian jurisdictions, as identified by the national Seaweed Aquaculture Working Group (under the national Aquaculture Committee), until further research is available. There are a number of research projects occurring around the country to address key knowledge gaps to inform policy and regulation. In South Australia, SARDI has been awarded funding from FRDC to undertake a project to develop biomass assessment approaches, harvest methodologies and biosecurity knowledge for wild-harvest of seaweeds. For further information on this project and other research being undertaken by SARDI to support the development of a seaweed industry (through production and processing of a variety of species), see [Research](#) section of this report.

## Environment

### Annual environmental monitoring reports

All four licences for the Marine Algae sector submitted an EMP for the 2023-24 reporting period.

#### Development

None of the four Marine Algae licences reported having farming structures on site during the 2023-24 reporting period.

#### Biomass

The amount of seaweed that can be farmed on a marine site relates to infrastructure not biomass, as per individual licence conditions. For example, the total length of backbone (i.e. longline on the surface supporting vertical lines which seaweed is attached) per ha or contained and/or uncontained longline per ha. If a combination of farming methods is used, to prevent overstocking the length of each farming

method (expressed as a percentage of the maximum permitted length) must be equal to or less than 100 at all times.

During the 2023-24 reporting period, all sites remained unstocked due to being either non-operational or recently acquired and undeveloped.

#### Feed inputs

Seaweed farmed in the marine environment absorb natural light and nutrients for photosynthesis and growth and does not require supplementary feed.

#### Reported interactions and escapes

No escape events or interactions were reported during the 2023-24 reporting period.

## **Aquatic health management**

### **Veterinary medicine use**

#### Off-label approvals

No off-label (outside approved label or permit) chemical approvals (under [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#)) were requested by the Marine Algae sector during the 2023-2024 reporting period.

#### Reported use of APVMA permitted products

No permitted product use (in accordance with APVMA approved agricultural or veterinary chemical labels or permits) was reported by the Marine Algae sector during the 2023-2024 reporting period.

### **Livestock translocations**

No livestock translocation approvals were requested by the Marine Algae sector during the 2023-24 reporting period.

### **Disease management and surveillance**

No unusually high or unexplained mortalities were reported to PIRSA during the 2023-24 period for the Marine Algae sector. No disease investigations or emergency disease responses were required for the sector during this period.

# Aquaculture tourism and education

Aquaculture, as well as a primary food source, has an important role in tourism and education. Aquaculture facilities provide opportunity for students and the public to learn directly about the industry and marine and freshwater aquatic environments through a hands-on approach. The Cowell Area School has a current aquaculture program comprising an operating Oyster farm and associated Landbased facilities. There are also a number of other licensed schools and educational facilities (Port Lincoln, Ceduna, Kingston, Lucindale and Kangaroo Island Community Education) that include aquaculture in their curriculum.



Photo courtesy of Oceanic Victor.

In 2023-24, there was one marine aquaculture tourism licence however the site was non-operational. The tourism site was previously located in Victor Harbor and provided the opportunity for people to view, swim with and learn about various marine species within the safe confines of a sea-cage and floating pontoon equipped with touch tanks. Species included those found locally in South Australian waters, such as Tuna, Abalone, Snapper, Rock Lobster and Yellowtail Kingfish.




Photo courtesy of SA Premium Oyster Farm Tours

In recent years, there has been growing demand for local tourism experiences as a result of an increase in local travel. This has led to some Oyster farmers developing floating pontoons or fixed platforms on their sites for tourists to visit, and experience aquaculture produce and learn about how they are farmed. The [Aquaculture \(Tourism Development\) Amendment Act 2021](#) will streamline the assessment and approval process for these types of developments (see the "[Changes to the Aquaculture Act 2001](#)" section for further information).



Photo courtesy of Oyster farm tours – Coffin Bay

## Compliance outcomes

PIRSA staff monitor and investigate potential breaches of the [Aquaculture Act 2001](#), [Aquaculture Regulations 2016](#) or other relevant legislation (e.g. environmental) based on random and targeted inspections. Actions are based on a variety of information sources and include reports received by the public (e.g Fishwatch), other government agencies and other stakeholders (including recreational marine resource users), PIRSA aims to work in an efficient and timely manner in collaboration with the industry to address and rectify issues that arise. Subject to the circumstances of any reported non-compliance, PIRSA will apply the most appropriate measures such as education of licence holders, consider changes in licence conditions where appropriate, issuing directions to carry out work on a lease and or licence, or further enforcement actions if required.



Fisheries Officers continued to educate oyster growers in relation to the requirements of the [Aquaculture \(Standard Lease and Licence Conditions\) Policy 2022](#), which came into effect August 2022.

During 2023 – 2024, Fisheries Officers inspected finfish sites at Boston Bay and Proper Bay, oyster sites at Streaky Bay, Point Longnose, Dutton Bay, Kellidie Bay, Streaky Bay, Western Cove (KI) and Todd River, mussel sites at Boston Bay, southern bluefin tuna sites at Boston Bay, a land-based marron site on Kangaroo Island, an abalone site at Point Bolingbroke and algae sites at Louth Bay and Boston Bay.

Fisheries Officers also inspected a number of oyster sites in Coffin Bay to confirm each had been rehabilitated as required. A high proportion of sites were found to be non-compliant with this requirement, with further enforcement action taken. Enforcement action was also taken in relation to a number of dilapidated sites located across several zones.

Where appropriate, Compliance provided lease and licence holders with advance notice of site inspections, usually via their Bay or Sector representative. Sites were inspected to determine compliance with lease and licence requirements, with particular focus on compliance with navigational requirements (marine), condition of leases (requirement to be in good working order), rehabilitation of unused sites (marine), species farmed (landbased) and following up information and reports attributed to farming operations.

Compliance with requirements was mixed, with a large number of sites not meeting site marking requirements (i.e. presence of compliant crosses, location of crosses, marking of sites and aquaculture farming structures within the boundaries of the licensed site area). Within the oyster sector, a number of sites were detected with line length on site greater than the maximum permitted.

Where there was evidence of non-compliance, lease and licence holders were contacted, areas requiring attention identified and appropriate enforcement action taken.

Fisheries Officers continued to collect feral Pacific Oyster samples from sites including Ceduna, Thevenard, Coffin Bay, Franklin Harbor, Kingscote Jetty, Shoal Bay and Lucky Bay and other areas across the State as part of the POMS surveillance program. Several recreational fishers were detected with oysters in POMS sensitive areas and appropriate enforcement action taken.

Furthermore, Fisheries Officers—

- Responded to a grower initiated report of escaped of Finfish near Bickers Island, Port Lincoln.
- Responded to two (2) grower initiated reports of Great White Sharks being trapped inside farms at Port Lincoln and Boston Bay.
- Liaised with the Southern Bluefin Tuna sector in relation to the retrieval of a loose ring floating near Marion Bay.
- Liaised with a grower in relation to stocking limits being exceeded across two (2) sites. The grower took the appropriate action to rectify.
- Assisted several growers with submission of EMP and Production Reports via the new MyPIRSA electronic lodgment platform. Fisheries officers also followed up several growers in relation to outstanding EMP and Production Reports from 2022 - 2023.
- Responded to reports provided by growers and the public of alleged non-compliance of other sites in their area.
- Responded to numerous ad hoc requests for information from oyster growers and members of the public relating to lease and licence related requirements (mostly line length and farming methods).

# Aquatic animal health and biosecurity

## Fish kill and fish health investigations

This section provides a comparison between aquaculture mortality or disease investigations (reported above) and wild fish kill or wild fish health investigations conducted by PIRSA.

For 2023-24, there were four aquaculture related mortality events investigated and 25 wild fish kill investigations reported and investigated (Figure 17). Aquaculture related mortality events and wild fish mortality events were primarily due to environmental or natural occurrences (e.g. high rainfall, salinity or water quality). Some mortality events were due to disease (including HaHV-1 (the virus that causes AVG) and Betanodavirus (NNV)).




Figure 8: A summary of South Australian fish kill (mortality) and fish health (disease) investigations in wild fish and the aquaculture industry from 2011-12 to 2023-24.

## Industry initiatives

### Marine debris

#### Adopt-a-beach program

A need for a collaborative approach to the regular collection of debris from local beaches on the Eyre Peninsula was identified in 2011 and the local aquaculture industry agreed to undertake marine debris beach clean ups.

The Adopt-a-Beach Program is a debris clean-up program that covers a coastal area of approximately 160 km located in the Lower Spencer Gulf region, from MacLaren Point to Cape Euler. It includes a

number of islands within the Boston Bay area and Spilsby Island (Sir Joseph Banks Group), with the area divided into 15 individual zones which are assigned to/adopted by individual Tuna, Kingfish and Mussel companies. Adopted areas range from 6 to 19 km (see [www.pir.sa.gov.au/aquaculture/monitoring\\_and\\_assessment/adopt\\_a\\_beach\\_program](http://www.pir.sa.gov.au/aquaculture/monitoring_and_assessment/adopt_a_beach_program)).

The Adopt-a-Beach Program was previously led by the Australian Southern Bluefin Tuna Industry Association (ASBTIA) for a number of years. The program is now (since 2024) led by Clean Seas Seafood Limited (Kingfish industry) and supported by the Tuna, seaweed and Mussel industries.

Beach clean ups are undertaken a minimum of four times a year, with clean-up data collected and submitted to Clean Seas Seafood Limited for collation and reporting to PIRSA. Information collected for each "beach" includes the five most common types of items, unusual items and total weight. Debris collected predominantly consists of rope, plastic, drink containers, household rubbish and buoys/floats. While some debris, such as ropes and some plastics may be attributed to aquaculture, it is clear that debris originated from a range of sources including commercial and recreational fishing, landbased operations, commercial shipping and the general public. The program also encompasses the collection of this non-aquaculture related debris and its disposal in a responsible manner.

#### SAOGA coastline debris recovery program

To address legislative requirements, the South Australian Oyster industry cleans up debris from the coastline near farming sites. This has been an ad hoc process with little documentation of what has been achieved. A number of these clean-ups have been coordinated and carried out with the Department for Environment and Water (DEW) staff. The clean-ups are somewhat targeted with some sites identified from DEW marine debris surveys and mapping.

A need for a more collaborative, coordinated, documented and efficient approach to regular debris collection from the local coastline was identified. In September 2015, SAOGA developed a clean-up program called the 'Coastline Debris Recovery Program' in collaboration with PIRSA and DEW. This program was again reviewed in 2022.

This Coastline Debris Recovery Program involves clean-ups in eight different regions between Coffin Bay and Denial Bay, South Australia. Hot spots were identified through DEW staff and Oyster growers, specifically Coffin Bay, Ceduna and Smoky Bay. Coordinated clean-ups are to occur approximately two times per year. Recent clean ups have occurred at Coffin Bay by growers and National Parks and Wildlife. In addition, growers in Streaky Bay and Cowell regularly walk the local beaches to collect debris. While some of the items recently collected can be attributed to aquaculture, many of them originate from a variety of sources including commercial and recreational fishing, landbased activities and the general public. The Yorke Peninsula farming area covers a small section of the coast between Port Vincent and Stansbury and growers regularly monitor for debris during their farming activities.

Kangaroo Island growers also regularly monitor beaches for debris and have recently undertaken an extensive beach patrol, but no documentation is available on what debris (if any) was collected.

This program is the responsibility of SAOGA, as well as oyster farmers, and will be supported and monitored by the South Australian Government to achieve its desired outcomes.

## **Oyster Hub project**

The Oyster Hub project was developed to provide a web-based tool for the effective management of Oyster stock such as grow-out, conditioning, mortality and translocation. It provides a framework for farmers to record key information for better decision making and dissemination to maximise production efficiency through improved husbandry methods.

The Oyster Hub project is now complete with miShell managing the system, which is being used by many growers in South Australia and interstate. MiShell has since provided a number of updates to the program and has recently been awarded a grant to support the implementation of a traceability program that will be linked to stock management to trace stock once it has left the farm.

## Oyster basket recycling

In 2013, the EPA, working collaboratively with the [South Australian Oyster sector](#), [Regional Development Australia Whyalla and Eyre Peninsula](#), and the former Department for Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy, undertook a [feasibility study](#) into the recycling of plastic Oyster baskets .

The aim of the [feasibility study](#) was to 'identify cost-effective Oyster basket recycling options that will value add to the efficient operation of the industry as a whole'. The Oyster industry uses 2.5 million baskets annually. Each year about 5-10%, or 150-200 t, of these plastic baskets reach their end of life and must be disposed. Instead of sending the baskets to landfill, many Oyster growers have been stockpiling them on their properties until more environmentally sustainable disposal by recycling option becomes available.

The Oyster industry developed an Expression of Interest to identify recycling companies that would be interested in taking the baskets at zero cost to industry. One company was identified and commenced a trial of collecting, mulching and recycling the baskets at the agreed zero cost. However, China changed its policy on taking recycled waste in 2018 and it was not financially viable for that company to continue. The industry continued for a while to recycle plastic baskets by using a portable plastic shredder on the back of a truck but it came with a cost to growers. This is the preferred option to dumping the plastic at a landfill facility. The method of shredding is also very labour intensive as all baskets need to be free of any contaminants (i.e. metals and non-shredding plastics). Next Gen Waste Co, located at Wharminda on Eyre Peninsula, developed a business model to recycle plastics from agriculture and aquaculture farms. With the old plastic shredder currently not in use, there was a gap identified by QMechanical, located in Port Lincoln, to build a new plastic shredding machine. Trials of this machine were to commence late 2024. SAOGA, Next Gen Waste Co and QMechanical are collaborating to combat the issue of oyster basket waste.

## Seafood certification

Third-party aquaculture certification schemes not only provide consumers assurance that their seafood is sustainably and ethically produced, but also encourages producers to implement and maintain responsible farming practices throughout their operations, whilst in some instances providing them with greater market access. Globally, there are multiple certification programs available to aquaculture with robust, reputable and recognised assessments.

Friend of the Sea Sustainable Aquaculture certification provides independent assurance to markets that the product has been produced in a healthy, safe and sustainable environment. It involves a rigorous environmental sustainability performance assessment that assesses the whole supply chain from the catch in the wild, through the value adding aquaculture process to final harvesting; see [www.friendofthesea.org/](http://www.friendofthesea.org/) for information about this certification and those certified.

The Aquaculture Stewardship Council (ASC) is an independent, global, non-profit organisation whose role is to recognise, via a certification program, responsibly farmed seafood and to harness consumer preference for seafood products bearing the ASC label of approval. Successful certified aquaculture companies are audited annually to ensure they maintain the ecological sustainable standards of the

ASC. For more information on this certification and certified aquaculture producers see: <https://asc-aqua.org/>

Best Aquaculture Practice (BAP) ensure aquaculture is done responsibly through its third-party certification program. It is part of the Global Seafood Alliance, which is an international nonprofit trade association dedicated to advancing responsible seafood practices through education, advocacy and third-party assurances. BAP is a seafood specific certification program that addresses the four key areas of responsible seafood, including environmental, social, food safety and animal health and welfare at each stage of the production chain. For more information on this certification and certified aquaculture producers see: <https://www.bapcertification.org/Home>



## Research

As part of the commitment to support industry growth through an adaptive resource management framework, PIRSA plays a key role in a number of strategic research initiatives. Many of these projects are led and conducted by SARDI, the research division of PIRSA which offers an integrated research and development (R&D) capability to sustainably create, nurture and grow the aquaculture industry.

SARDI and PIRSA work closely with the aquaculture sectors to produce meaningful research outcomes. SARDI's aquaculture research program is uniquely set up to provide support across the whole spectrum of industry research needs, including:

- Developing novel species aquaculture.
- Aquaculture site selection and suitability assessment.
- Environmental assessment, monitoring, oceanography and carrying capacity modelling.
- Improving hatchery technology for optimizing success in spawning, larval and juvenile rearing and growout of commercially important finfish and shellfish species.
- Novel molecular and biotechnological tools and techniques to augment aquaculture production.
- Developing and evaluating improved, cost-effective and sustainable feeds.
- Providing advice and support on selective breeding programs and aligned molecular and cellular technologies.
- Optimisation of grow-out systems and husbandry practices in aquaculture farms.
- Enhancing algal production and systems to produce biomass for a diverse range of bioproducts and environmental services.
- Addressing disease and pest issues, through support with chemical registration, monitoring and surveillance, evaluation of therapeutics and development of improved husbandry practices.
- Pre- and post-harvest product safety and quality, including developing novel products, value addition and packaging.
- Circular economy and sustainability in aquaculture production systems.

- Restorative aquaculture.
- Extractive aquaculture and Integrated Multi-Trophic Aquaculture.
- Trade and market access.

The outcomes of such initiatives are integrated into decision making processes such as those associated with aquaculture zoning, disease control, managing interactions with protected wildlife species and environmental assessment and management. A large number of aquaculture related research projects have been undertaken over the years, most of which can be found at:

[www.pir.sa.gov.au/research/research\\_specialties/aquatic\\_sciences](http://www.pir.sa.gov.au/research/research_specialties/aquatic_sciences), [www.frdc.com.au/](http://www.frdc.com.au/), and <https://www.frdc.com.au/seaweed-aquaculture-australia>

## Current research

### Aquatic Animal Health

In 2021, PIRSA's AAH Program commenced project FRDC 2020-094 "Improving the availability of safe and effective veterinary medicines for Australia's seafood industry". This three-year project aims to document a safe and effective process for off-label use of agricultural or veterinary (agvet) chemical products, facilitate progress of priority agvet products in aquaculture, determine options for future coordination and develop and implement a communication and awareness strategy for safe and effective agvet product use. Two articles have been published on the project (see [www.frdc.com.au/streamlined-process-improves-access-aquaculture-medicines](http://www.frdc.com.au/streamlined-process-improves-access-aquaculture-medicines) and <https://www.frdc.com.au/expanding-aquaculture-access-vital-medicines>).

More information on the project can be found at [www.frdc.com.au/project/2020-094](http://www.frdc.com.au/project/2020-094).

### Finfish

During 2019-2022, an FRDC project assessing the capacity for sustainable Finfish aquaculture in the vicinity of seagrasses was undertaken. The project was prompted by the re-establishment of Yellowtail Kingfish aquaculture in Fitzgerald Bay. The outcomes of the project aimed to assess the influence of Finfish aquaculture derived nutrients on seagrasses, develop a predictive modelling ability to estimate carrying capacity and allow scenario analysis of future aquaculture developments and how it might affect seagrasses and develop a range of cost-effective indicators for monitoring the effects of aquaculture on adjacent seagrass beds. The unexpected cessation of Finfish aquaculture in Fitzgerald Bay in November 2022 meant that the final sampling in Autumn 2023 did not capture the period of high feed inputs expected. A final report is yet to be compiled. More information can be found at [www.frdc.com.au/project/2018-186](http://www.frdc.com.au/project/2018-186).

### Integrated multitrophic aquaculture (IMTA)

PIRSA and SARDI, in affiliation with Flinders University, have secured funding from FRDC for project 2023-051, *Ecologically sustainable aquaculture growth through Integrated Multitrophic Aquaculture (IMTA) – Incorporating IMTA nutrient modelling into regulatory frameworks*. Financial support for the project is also provided by the Blue Economy CRC. IMTA is an aquaculture approach that involves the deliberate co-cultivation of organisms from more than one trophic level, so that by-products from one species serve as inputs (nutrients or energy) for another, creating a more balanced and sustainable system.

A literature review aiming to synthesise publicly available information on IMTA systems in Australia and internationally is underway. Field monitoring, research trials, and the development of ocean biogeochemical models in support of IMTA will commence in 2026. The \$1.5 million, three-year project will result in the development of a national IMTA policy guideline to inform regulatory frameworks that promote ecological sustainable growth in Australian aquaculture. <https://www.frdc.com.au/project/2023-051>

## External factors or events affecting the aquaculture industry during 2023-24

### Tuna quota

Southern Bluefin Tuna (SBT) are a highly migratory species found in several parts of the Southern Ocean, including the Great Australian Bight in South Australia and Western Australia. SBT migratory patterns mean international agreements are required to ensure sustainable global management of this species throughout its full range of distribution. The Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT) manages SBT stock levels under an international agreement. Its objective is to ensure, through appropriate management, the conservation and optimum utilisation of SBT. CCSBT members include Australia, South Africa, Indonesia, Japan, Republic of Korea, New Zealand, the Fishing Entity of Taiwan and the European Union. The CCSBT's primary management tool is a global total allowable catch that is allocated to members following recommendations from an independent Scientific Committee. For more information about the CCSBT see [www.ccsbt.org/en](http://www.ccsbt.org/en)

Following recommendations from the independent Scientific Committee, the CCSBT set the Australian Total Allowable Catch (TAC) allocation at 7,295 t per annum for 2024 to 2026.

The Commonwealth Government, through the Australian Fisheries Management Authority, has responsibility for all catch of SBT and is leading the development of a national approach to resource sharing. The approach is aimed at ensuring all catch is covered by Australia's allocation from CCSBT and will involve state and federal government collaboration. To achieve this the Commonwealth Government legislated in 2020 that 5% of Australia's TAC will be allocated to manage recreational catch for the long term.

# References

- Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics and Sciences. (2024). *Fisheries and aquaculture statistics 2022–23*. Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry. <https://www.agriculture.gov.au/abares/research-topics/fisheries/fisheries-and-aquaculture-statistics>
- Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics and Sciences. (2025). *Australian fisheries and aquaculture statistics 2024*. Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry. [https://daff.ent.sirsidynix.net.au/client/en\\_AU/search/asset/1037341/0/ v1.0.0.pdf](https://daff.ent.sirsidynix.net.au/client/en_AU/search/asset/1037341/0/ v1.0.0.pdf)
- Alleway, H.K., Jones, A.R., Theuerkauf, S.J., and Jones, R.C. (2022). A global and regional view of the opportunity for climate-smart mariculture. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 377 (1854) <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/rstb/article/377/1854/20210128/108891/A-global-and-regional-view-of-the-opportunity-for>
- Alleway, H.K., Waters, T.J., Brummett, R., Cai, J., Cao, L., Cayten, M.R., Costa-Pierce, B.A., Dong, Y.-W., Brandstrup Hansen, S.C., Liu, S., Liu, Q., Shelley, C., Theuerkauf, S. J., Tucker, L., Wang, Y., and Jones, R. C. (2023). Global principles for restorative aquaculture to foster aquaculture practices that benefit the environment. *Conservation Science and Practice*, 5 (8), e12982. <https://doi.org/10.1111/csp2.12982>
- BDO EconSearch (2025). *The Economic Contribution of Aquaculture in the South Australian State and Regional Economies, 2023/24*. A report prepared for PIRSA Fisheries and Aquaculture. [SA Aquaculture Economic Report 2023 24.pdf](https://www.pirsa.gov.au/SA-Aquaculture-Economic-Report-2023-24.pdf)
- Duarte, C. M., Bruhn, A., & Krause-Jensen, D. (2021). A seaweed aquaculture imperative to meet global sustainability targets. *Nature Sustainability*, 5, 185–193.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2024). *The state of world fisheries and aquaculture 2024: Blue transformation in action*. Rome: FAO. <https://www.fao.org/publications/fao-flagship-publications/the-state-of-world-fisheries-and-aquaculture/en>
- Fernandes, M., Lauer, P., Cheshire, A., and Angove, M. (2007a). Preliminary model of nitrogen loads from southern bluefin tuna aquaculture. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 54 (2007): 1321-1332.
- Fernandes, M., Lauer, P., Cheshire, A., Svane, I., Putro, S., Mount, G., Angove, M., Sedawie, T., Tanner, J., Fairweather, P., Barnett, J., and Doonan, A. (2007b). Aquafin CRC – Southern Bluefin Tuna Aquaculture Subprogram: Tuna Environment Subproject – Evaluation of Waste Composition and Waste Mitigation. Technical report, Aquafin CRC Project 4.3.2, FRDC Project 2001/103. SARDI Publication No. RD03/0037-9. SARDI Research Report Series No. 207 (Ed. M. Fernandes). Aquafin CRC, Fisheries Research & Development Corporation and South Australian Research & Development Institute (Aquatic Sciences), Adelaide. 289 pp.
- Edyvane, K.S. (1999). *Conserving marine biodiversity in South Australia, part 1, Background, status and review of approach to marine biodiversity conservation in South Australia, report 38*, South Australian Research and Development Institute (Aquatic Sciences), Adelaide.
- Fletcher, W., Chesson, J., Fisher, M., Sainsbury, K. and Hundloe, T. (2004). *National ESD Reporting Framework: The “How To” Guide for Aquaculture*. Version 1.1 FRDC, Canberra, Australia 88 pp.
- Gentry, R. R., Alleway, H. K., Bishop, M. J., Gillies, C. L., Waters, T., & Jones, R. (2020). Exploring the potential for marine aquaculture to contribute to ecosystem services. *Reviews in Aquaculture*, 12(2), 499–512.
- Huveneers, C., Niella, Y., Drew, M., Dennis, J., Clarke, T. M., Wright, A., Bryars, S., Braccini, M., Dowling, C., Newman, S. J., Butcher, P., and Dalton, S. (2022). Are sharks attracted to caged fish and associated infrastructure? *Marine and Freshwater Research*. 73 (11) 1404-1410.

- Jones A.R., Alleway, H.K., McAfee, D., Reis-Santos, P., Theuerkauf, S.J, Jones, R.C (2022). Climate-Friendly Seafood: The Potential for Emissions Reduction and Carbon Capture in Marine Aquaculture. *Bioscience*. 25;72(2):123-143.
- Naylor, R. L., Hardy R.W., Buschmann, A.H., Bush, S.R., Cao, L., Klinger, D.H., Little, D.C., Lubchenco, J., Shumway, SE., Troell, M. (2021). A 20-year retrospective review of global aquaculture. *Nature* 591, 551–563.
- Roberts, S.D., Van Ruth, P.D., Wilkinson, C., Bastianello, S.B., Bansemer, M.S. (2019) Marine heatwave, harmful algae blooms and an extensive fish kill event during 2013 in South Australia. *Frontiers in Marine Science - Impact of Ocean Warming and Acidification on Marine Fish Health Special Edition. Front. Mar. Sci.* 6:610. doi: 10.3389/fmars.2019.00610 .
- Roberts, S., James, C., Bansemer, M., Colberg, F., Aijaz, S., Jakaitis, K., Schulz E., Middleton J. (2020). Improving early detection surveillance and emergency disease response to Ostreid herpesvirus using a hydrodynamic dispersion model: updating disease management areas for the South Australian Oyster industry. FRDC Project No 2018-090. PIRSA, Adelaide, 86pp.
- Rogers, P. and Drew, M. (2018). Movement, residency and habits use of pelagic sharks in Spencer Gulf: resolving overlaps with marine industries and community activities. South Australian Research and Development Institute (Aquatic Sciences), Adelaide. FRDC project 2014/020.
- Rose, J. M., Bricker, S. B., Tedesco, M. A., & Wikfors, G. H. (2014). A role for shellfish aquaculture in coastal nitrogen management. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 48(5), 2519–2525. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es4041336>.
- Smith, K.E., Burrows, M.T., Hobday, A.J., King, N.G., Moore, P.J., Gupta, A.S., Thomsen, M.S., Wernberg, T. and Smale, D.A (2023). *Annual Review of Marine Science*. 15:119-45.
- Spillias, S., Cottrell, R.S., Kelly, R., O'Brien, K.R, Adams, J., Bellgrove, A., Kelly, B., Kilpatrick, C., Layton, C., Macleod, C., Roberts, S., Stringer, D., McDonald-Madden, E. (2022). Expert perceptions of seaweed farming for sustainable development. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 368:1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.133052>
- Tanner, J.E. Clark, T.D., Fernandes, M. and Fitzgibbon, Q. (2007). Innovative Solutions for Aquaculture: Spatial Impacts and Carrying Capacity – Further Developing, Refining and Validating Existing Models of Environmental Effects of Finfish Farming. South Australian Research and Development Institute (Aquatic Sciences), Adelaide, 126 pp.
- Tanner, J.E. and Bryars, S. (2007). Innovative Solutions for Aquaculture Planning and Management – Project 5, Environmental Audit of Marine aquaculture Developments in South Australia. FRDC Project 2003/223. Fisheries Research and Development Corporation and South Australian Research and Development Institute (Aquatic Sciences, Adelaide, SARDI Research Report No.190.
- Tanner, J.E. and Volkman, J. (2009). Aquafin CRC – Southern Bluefin Tuna Aquaculture Subprogram: Risk and Response – Understanding the Tuna Farming Environment. Technical Report, Aquafin CRC Project 4.6, FRDC Project 2005/059. Aquafin CRC, Fisheries Research and Development Corporation and South Australian Research and Development Institute (Aquatic Sciences, Adelaide, SARDI Research Report Series No.344, 287 pp.
- Tlusty, M.F., Tyedmers, P., Bailey., M., Ziegler., F. (2019). Reframing the sustainable seafood narrative. *Global Environmental Change*. 59: 101991.
- Weitzman, J. (2019). Applying the ecosystem services concept to aquaculture: A review of approaches, definitions, and uses. *Ecosystem Services*, 35, 194–206.
- Xiao, X., Agustí, S., Yu, Y., Huang, Y., Chen, W., Hu, J., Li, C., Li, K., Wei, F., Lu, Y., Xu, C., Chen, Z., Liu, S., Zeng, J., Wu, J., & Duarte, C. M. (2021). Seaweed farms provide refugia from ocean

acidification. *Science of the Total Environment*, 776, 145192.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145192>

Zhu, L., Huguenard, K., Zou, Q.-P., Fredriksson, D.W., and Xie, D. (2020). Aquaculture farms as nature-based coastal protection: Random wave attenuation by suspended and submerged canopies. *Coastal Engineering* 160, 103737. 10.1016/j.coastaleng.2020.103737



# Glossary

AMR	Antimicrobial Resistance Strategy
ASCRC	Australian Seafood Cooperative Research Centre
APVMA	Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority
ASBTIA	Australian Southern Bluefin Tuna Industry Association
ATAB	Aquaculture Tenure Allocation Board
AVG	Abalone Viral Ganglioneuritis
BST	Baker-Schutz-Turner
CCSBT	Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna
DEW	Department for Environment and Water
DIT	Department for Infrastructure and Transport
DPTI	Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure
EBGF	Economic and Business Growth Fund
EMP	Environmental Monitoring Program
EPA	Environment Protection Authority
EPPs	Environment Protection Policies
ESD	Ecologically Sustainable Development
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FCR	Food Conversion Ratio
FRDC	Fisheries Research and Development Corporation
FTE	Full Time Equivalent
GSSI	Global Sustainable Seafood Initiative
HABs	Harmful Algal Blooms
IMTA	Integrated Multitrophic Aquaculture
MMA	Macroalgae Management Areas
OsHV-1	Oyster Herpesvirus-1 microvariant
PIRSA	Primary Industries and Regions South Australia
POMS	Pacific Oyster Mortality Syndrome
SAOGA	South Australian Oyster Growers Association
SAORC	South Australian Oyster Research Council
SARDI	South Australian Research and Development Institute Aquatic Sciences
SASQAP	South Australia Shellfish Quality Assurance Program
SBT	Southern Bluefin Tuna
TEPS	Threatened, Endangered and Protected Species
UV	Ultra-violet
WOAH	World Organisation for Animal Health
YTK	Yellowtail Kingfish

## Appendix 1 - Aquaculture licences by industry sector during the 2023-24 reporting period

Industry sector	Licence category	Number of licences	Licence numbers
Tuna	N/A	7	AQ00030, AQ00047, AQ00057, AQ00060, AQ00315, AQ00495, FB00079
Finfish	N/A	19	AQ00015, AQ00016, AQ00017, AQ00018, AQ00139, AQ00140, AQ00214, AQ00234, AQ00235, AQ00255, AQ00292, AQ00302, AQ00396, AQ00397, FB00078, FF00037, FF00085, FF00090, FH00003
Marine Abalone	N/A	2	AQ00290, AQ00467
Marine Algae	N/A	4	AQ00463, AQ00464, AQ00473, AQ00474
Mussels	N/A	34	AQ00067, AQ00101, AQ00108, AQ00109, AQ00141, AQ00190, AQ00192, AQ00193, AQ00209, AQ00215, AQ00470, AQ00471, FS00011, FS00012, FS00013, FS00014, FS00015, FS00016, FS00019, FS00020, FS00021, FS00022, FS00023, FS00029, FS00038, FS00042, FS00071, FS00072, FS00073, FS00082, FS00084, FS00095, FS00097, FS00102
Landbased	Category A	19	AQ00132, AQ00211, AQ00248, AQ00260, AQ00305, AQ00462, FT00014, FT00133, FT00166, FT00323, FT00372, FT00487, FT00493, FT00502, FT00505, FT00523, FT00685, FT00701, FT00738
	Category B	21	AQ00246, AQ00270, AQ00280, AQ00361, AQ00364, AQ00408, AQ00482, AQ00483, FT00007, FT00013, FT00069, FT00185, FT00365, FT00459, FT00464, FT00604, FT00611, FT00633, FT00687, FT00735, FT00745
	Category C	9	AQ00131, AQ00353, AQ00409, FT00036, FT00040, FT00135, FT00158, FT00676, FT00736
	Category D	7	AQ00485, FT00423, FT00558, FT00560, FT00620, FT00634, FT00702
Tourism	N/A	1	AQ00315
Miscellaneous	Maintenance	6	FH00001, AQ00114, AQ00116, AQ00118, AQ00120, AQ00271
Oysters	Subtidal	16	AQ00034, AQ00035, AQ00036, AQ00041, AQ00043, AQ00068, AQ00103, AQ00198, AQ00322, AQ00393, AQ00465, AQ00466, FM00075; FS00079, FS00080, FS00085
	Intertidal	324	AQ00009, AQ00012, AQ00039, AQ00071, AQ00091, AQ00094, AQ00099, AQ00100, AQ00102, AQ00105, AQ00106, AQ00107, AQ00127, AQ00133, AQ00137, AQ00145, AQ00146, AQ00147, AQ00148, AQ00149, AQ00150, AQ00152, AQ00153, AQ00155, AQ00156, AQ00157, AQ00158, AQ00159, AQ00160, AQ00161, AQ00162, AQ00163, AQ00164, AQ00165, AQ00167, AQ00168, AQ00172, AQ00173, AQ00175, AQ00176, AQ00177, AQ00178, AQ00180, AQ00186, AQ00188, AQ00197, AQ00199, AQ00220, AQ00221, AQ00222, AQ00223, AQ00243, AQ00244, AQ00256, AQ00257, AQ00263, AQ00277, AQ00278, AQ00282, AQ00284, AQ00295, AQ00297, AQ00312, AQ00313, AQ00317, AQ00329, AQ00335, AQ00350, AQ00351, AQ00366, AQ00367, AQ00368, AQ00369, AQ00378, AQ00380, AQ00381, AQ00383, AQ00386, AQ00387, AQ00388, AQ00389, AQ00390, AQ00391, AQ00392, AQ00399, AQ00401, AQ00402, AQ00403, AQ00405, AQ00410, AQ00411, AQ00412, AQ00413, AQ00416, AQ00417, AQ00418, AQ00419, AQ00420, AQ00421, AQ00422, AQ00423, AQ00424, AQ00425, AQ00426, AQ00427, AQ00428, AQ00430, AQ00431, AQ00432, AQ00433, AQ00435, AQ00436, AQ00437, AQ00438, AQ00439, AQ00440, AQ00441, AQ00442, AQ00443, AQ00448, AQ00449, AQ00450, AQ00451, AQ00452, AQ00455, AQ00456, AQ00458, AQ00459, AQ00460, AQ00461, AQ00462, AQ00463, AQ00464, AQ00465, AQ00466, AQ00467, AQ00475, AQ00476, AQ00477, AQ00478, AQ00479, AQ00480, AQ00481, AQ00487, AQ00492, AQ00493, AQ00494, AQ00496, AQ00497, AQ00498, FH00002, FM00015, FM00017, FM00018, FM00019, FM00023, FM00024, FM00025, FM00027, FM00028, FM00031, FM00032, FM00033, FM00034, FM00035, FM00036, FM00038, FM00039, FM00040, FM00044, FM00046, FM00060, FM00064, FM00065, FM00068, FM00069, FM00072, FM00076, FM00082, FM00088, FM00094, FM00095, FM00099, FM00101, FM00117, FM00139, FM00140, FM00144, FM00145, FM00146, FM00149, FM00151, FM00153, FM00154, FM00155, FM00156, FM00160, FM00162, FM00163, FM00165, FM00166, FM00167, FM00170, FM00171, FM00173, FM00177, FM00178, FM00212, FM00217, FM00221, FM00307, FM00309, FM00315, FM00316, FM00324, FM00325, FM00326, FM00328, FM00329, FM00330, FM00331, FM00332, FM00335, FM00336, FM00346, FM00347, FM00348, FM00349, FM00351, FM00352, FM00353, FM00355, FM00358, FM00366, FM00373, FM00374, FM00375, FM00376, FM00377, FM00380, FM00382, FM00384, FM00385, FM00387, FM00389, FM00391, FM00392, FM00393, FM00400, FM00401, FM00402, FM00403, FM00404, FM00405, FM00406, FM00407, FM00410, FM00416, FM00417, FM00420, FM00422, FM00423, FM00424, FM00425, FM00426, FM00427, FM00428, FM00432, FM00434, FM00436, FM00437, FM00439, FM00440, FM00441, FM00443, FM00450, FM00451, FM00452, FM00453, FM00454, FM00455, FM00456, FM00457, FM00458, FM00459, FM00461, FM00462, FM00463, FM00464, FM00465, FM00466, FM00467, FM00468, FM00471, FM00474, FM00476, FM00477, FM00478, FM00479, FM00480, FM00482, FM00484, FM00485, FM00498, FM00500, FM00504, FM00510, FM00514, FM00515, FM00517, FM00518, FM00519, FM00520, FM00521, FM00524, FM00525, FM00531, FM00532, FM00539, FM00542, FM00543, FM00544, FM00546, FM00547, FM00550, FM00552, FM00553, FM00554, FM00555, FM00556
Razorfish	N/A	1	AQ00453

NOTE: Licence numbers included in this table excludes licences subject to amalgamations in the 2023/2024 financial year

## Appendix 2 - Aquaculture zone policy areas (zones and sectors) and unallocated tenure as at November 2025

Policy	Zone	Sector	Total area (ha)*	Area Limit (ha)**	Unallocated area (ha)***	Permitted species or class of aquaculture
<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Cape D'Estrees) Policy 2006</i>	Cape D'Estrees (inner) subtidal aquaculture zone	NA	145	60	60	Molluscs (other than filter feeding molluscs) and algae
	Cape D'Estrees (middle) subtidal aquaculture zone	NA	198	60	60	Molluscs (other than filter feeding molluscs) and algae
	Cape D'Estrees (outer) subtidal aquaculture zone	NA	392	60	60	Molluscs (other than filter feeding molluscs) and algae
<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Smoky Bay) Policy 2007</i>	Eyre Island intertidal aquaculture zone	NA	81	21	0	Bivalve Molluscs (other than mussels) and research
	Missiesey intertidal aquaculture zone	NA	108	24	0	Bivalve Molluscs (other than mussels) and research
	Saddle Peak intertidal aquaculture zone	NA	62	21	0	Bivalve Molluscs (other than mussels) and research
	Smoky Bay (holding) intertidal aquaculture zone	NA	4	0.35	0	Holding Bivalve Molluscs (other than mussels)
	Smoky Bay intertidal aquaculture zone	NA	73	20.9	0	Bivalve Molluscs (other than mussels) and research
	Smoky Bay north subtidal aquaculture zone	NA	2 166	40	40	Bivalve Molluscs (other than mussels)
	Smoky Bay south subtidal aquaculture zone	NA	1 621	40	0	Bivalve Molluscs (other than mussels)
	Vinya intertidal aquaculture zone	NA	180	62	0	Bivalve Molluscs (other than mussels) and research
<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Streaky Bay) Policy 2011</i>	Blanche Port aquaculture zone	NA	2 799	77.5	37.5	Bivalve molluscs (other than mussels)
	Haslam (north bank) aquaculture zone	NA	342	50	2.5	Bivalve molluscs (other than mussels)
	Perlubie (south bank) aquaculture zone	NA	224	40	24	Bivalve molluscs (other than mussels)
	Point Gibson aquaculture zone	NA	265	70	0.2	Bivalve molluscs (other than mussels)
	Streaky Bay aquaculture zone	NA	45 334	40	40	Bivalve molluscs (other than mussels) and Abalone
<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Anxious Bay) Policy 2007</i>	Anxious Bay aquaculture zone	NA	452	120	0	Molluscs (other than mussels or oysters) and algae
<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Coffin Bay) Policy 2008</i>	Frenchman Bluff aquaculture zone	NA	388	90	90	Supplementary fed organisms (other than finfish) that involves regular feeding, algae and research
	Kellidie Bay aquaculture zone	NA	732	23	0	Bivalve molluscs (other than mussels), storage and research
	Mount Dutton Bay aquaculture zone	NA	601	32	0	Bivalve molluscs (other than mussels) and research
	Point Longnose aquaculture zone	NA	379	63	2	Bivalve molluscs (other than mussels) (61), algae and research (2)
	Port Douglas (central) aquaculture zone	NA	446	50	0	Bivalve molluscs (other than mussels) and research

Policy	Zone	Sector	Total area (ha)*	Area Limit (ha)**	Unallocated area (ha)***	Permitted species or class of aquaculture
	Port Douglas (east) aquaculture zone	NA	34	4	0	Bivalve molluscs (other than mussels) and research
	Port Douglas (west) aquaculture zone	NA	90	10	0	Bivalve molluscs (other than mussels) and research
<i>Aquaculture (Zones - Lower Eyre Peninsula) Policy 2023</i>		Bicker Isle	243	80	0	All aquatic organisms (excluding prescribed wild caught tuna)
	Boston Bay aquaculture zone	Boston Bay	2 755	273	0	All aquatic organisms, prescribed wild caught tuna (research, education, tourism only)
		Boston Bay (outer)	15 316	2 000	2000	All aquatic organisms (excluding prescribed wild caught tuna)
	Lincoln aquaculture zone	Lincoln (inner)	17 883	2 100	577.73	Prescribed wild-caught tuna and algae # The Lincoln (inner south) sector is not active and can only be activated at a future time if deemed appropriate by Gazette notice
		Lincoln (outer)	20 061	3 500	3500	
		Lincoln (inner south)#	2 540	375	N/A	
	Louth Bay aquaculture zone	NA	7 465	530	15.1	All aquatic organisms (excluding prescribed wild caught tuna)
	Murray Point aquaculture zone	NA	72	4	0	Bivalve molluscs (excluding mussels) and algae
	Proper Bay aquaculture zone	Proper Bay (east)	970	60	0	Bivalve molluscs and algae
		Proper Bay (west)	1 378	40	0	
	Tod River aquaculture zone	NA	743	38	26	Bivalve molluscs (excluding mussels; biosecurity prescribed criteria applies)
	Point Boston aquaculture zone	Point Boston (north)	1 415	161	56	All aquatic organisms (excluding prescribed wild caught tuna and finfish)
		Point Boston (south)	1 512	100	40	
<i>Aquaculture (Zones - Tumby Bay) Policy 2015</i>	Tumby Bay aquaculture zone	NA	10 324	1 300	1300	Supplementary fed organisms (other than wild-caught tuna), bivalve molluscs (i.e. mussels), algae and research
<i>Aquaculture (Zones - Port Neill) Policy 2008</i>	Port Neill aquaculture zone	NA	4 913	565	565	Prescribed wild-caught tuna broodstock, supplementary fed organisms (other than wild-caught tuna), bivalve molluscs, research and algae
<i>Aquaculture (Zones - Arno Bay) Policy 2011</i>	Arno Bay aquaculture zone	Arno Bay (outer)	2 209	80	80	Prescribed wild-caught tuna broodstock and supplementary fed organisms (other than wild-caught tuna)
		Arno Bay (inner)	3 494	200	0	Supplementary fed organisms (other than wild-caught tuna)

Policy	Zone	Sector	Total area (ha)*	Area Limit (ha)**	Unallocated area (ha)***	Permitted species or class of aquaculture
<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Fitzgerald Bay) Policy 2008</i>	Fitzgerald Bay aquaculture zone	Eastern Fitzgerald	2 849	550	267	Supplementary fed organisms (other than wild-caught tuna), bivalve molluscs and algae
		Western Fitzgerald	1 705		0	
	Fitzgerald Bay (north) aquaculture zone	NA	10	10	10	Bivalve molluscs and algae
<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Eastern Spencer Gulf) Amendment Policy 2017</i>	Hardwicke Bay (inner) subtidal aquaculture zone	NA	420	60	60	Molluscs and algae
	Hardwicke Bay (middle) subtidal aquaculture zone	NA	1 053	60	60	Molluscs and algae
	Hardwicke Bay (outer) subtidal aquaculture zone	NA	1 402	60	60	Molluscs and algae
	Port Broughton intertidal aquaculture zone	NA	356	65	65	Bivalve molluscs and algae
	Tickera intertidal aquaculture zone	NA	512	45	45	Bivalve molluscs and algae
	Tickera subtidal aquaculture zone	NA	2 398	60	60	Bivalve molluscs and algae
	Wallaroo (East) aquaculture zone	NA	1 394	350	200	Supplementary fed organisms (other than tuna) that involves regular feeding, algae, filter feeding bivalve molluscs and algae
	Wallaroo (West) aquaculture zone	NA	500	50	50	Bivalve molluscs and algae
	Point Pearce (East) intertidal aquaculture zone	NA	135	20	0	Bivalve molluscs and algae
	Point Pearce (West) intertidal aquaculture zone	NA	365	40	0	Supplementary fed organisms (other than finfish and abalone) that involves regular feeding, filter feeding bivalve molluscs and algae
<i>Aquaculture (Zones – Lacepede Bay) Policy 2012</i>	Cape Jaffa aquaculture zone	NA	1 316	40	40	Supplementary fed organisms (other than wild-caught tuna and abalone)
	Kingston aquaculture zone	Kingston (holding)	416	5	5	Supplementary fed organisms (other than wild-caught tuna and abalone)
		Kingston (inner)	25 560	80	80	Supplementary fed organisms (other than wild-caught tuna and abalone)
		Kingston (outer)	14 899	200	200	Supplementary fed organisms (other than wild-caught tuna and abalone)

\*Total area = overall total size (ha) of an aquaculture zone or sector

\*\*Area limit = amount (ha) of the total area permitted for aquaculture

\*\*\*Unallocated area = amount (ha) of the area limit available for aquaculture (i.e. not already allocated to existing aquaculture sites)



**Government  
of South Australia**  
Department of Primary  
Industries and Regions