LEGAL AID ARCHITECTURE AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE UNDER THE NEW ZEALAND SEX WORK MODEL

Manjari Singh, Faculty of Law, University of Lucknow

Prof. (Dr.) Harish Chandra Ram, Faculty of Law, University of Lucknow

ABSTRACT

This paper looks into the question as to whether the efficacy of the decriminalised sex work paradigm in New Zealand can be measured by merely the lack of criminal punishments, or whether it needs a legal-aid architecture of the model where the recognised rights are implemented. The paper is an analytic exercise conducted through a doctrinal, socio-legal, and design-oriented comparative approach of the Prostitution Reform Act 2003, the Legal Services Act 2011, the rules and regulations, the official review publications, the legal needs evidence, and the chosen secondary literature. It claims that decriminalisation does not remove vulnerability but reallocates legal need in criminal, labour, civil, family, regulatory and immigration prisons. The paper reveals that legal aid is not a background service that operates neutrally but a component of the access architecture that identifies whether rights are institutionally accessible, as well as being practically viable. The remedy accessibility is determined by eligibility levels, coverage in forums, complexity of review, confidentiality, trust of service delivery, and prospective debt exposure, as well as the exclusion of immigrants. It is further stated in the analysis that formal legality is not a remedy to solve stigma, referral burdens, and migrant precarity. The paper brings forth the conclusion that decriminalisation is a pre-condition but an incomplete one to justice: right becomes actual only when legal-aid construction is such that workers can seek redress without incurring unreasonable procedural, financial or disclosure risk.

Keywords: Sex work decriminalisation; Legal aid; Access to justice; Prostitution Reform Act 2003; New Zealand; Socio-legal analysis; Rights enforcement

1. Introduction

Sex work regulation does not only establish the formal legality of a commercial sexual service. It influences who has the right of complaining, which institutions may be addressed without fear, how disagreements are categorized, and whether harms are considered as legally remediable. The access to the justice in this field should thus be examined in the framework of the legal architecture, where the rights, duties, and remedies are allocated.[1]

This paper will adopt the legal and analytical term sex work to mean that it is the commercial delivery of sexual services by adults who have given their consent, and the article will adhere to the doctrinal vocabulary of the New Zealand statute where terms are important. It also differentiates criminalisation, legalisation or licensing, end-demand regulation, and decriminalisation, since they each assign different legal risk and affect the institutions most vulnerable to listening to violence, labour, housing, immigration, and regulatory controversies.2

The main gap in scholarly literature lies in the fact that discussions on decriminalisation usually end on criminal-law reform. West of attention is given to what comes after the recognition of the rights formally: who hearkens to the disputes which ensue, whether legal assistance is available to such hearkens, and whether such routes can be availed to the poor, stigmatised or migration-vulnerable workers. This article fills that gap by considering legal aid as a component of access architecture of the regulatory model instead of neutral background service.3

The main argument of the article is not ambitious but rather significant, the decriminalisation cannot be evaluated based on the mere absence of criminal sanctions. The practical usability of rights is determined by the legal-aid architecture that decides who is eligible, the jurisdiction of the forum, the reviewability of the rights, the privacy, the provision of service, and whether workers can have access to the remedies without undue danger.

---

[1] PRA 2003, s 3 ('PRA 2003'); Report of the Prostitution Law Review Committee on the Operation of the Prostitution Reform Act 2003 (Ministry of Justice, 2008) 22–24 ('PLRC Report'); Legal Services Act 2011 (NZ) pts 2–3 ('LSA 2011').

[2] PRA 2003, s 4; ss 7–10, 12–15, 24–30, 34–40; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Access to Justice: Legal Needs Survey Final Report (2024) 127–133.

[3] PLRC Report, 45–47, 57–58, 167–168; Lynzi Armstrong, 'Rights of Migrant Sex Workers' (2017) 31 Women's Studies Journal 69, 71–72; María N Bennachie, 'The Impact of Section 19 of the Prostitution Reform Act on Migrant Sex Workers in New Zealand' (2021) Social Sciences 10(5) 179, 6, 9.

Comparative regulatory approaches to sex work are commonly described as criminalisation, legalisation or licensing, end-demand regulation, and decriminalisation. Their significance lies in how they distribute legal risk and institutional entry points. A regime may reduce exposure to prosecution and still leave workers vulnerable through fragmented forums, weak reviewability, opaque eligibility thresholds, or distrust in ordinary institutions. Access to justice therefore operates as the bridge between regulatory design and practical enforceability.4

In this regard, access to justice does not just need the formal rights. A recognised right can be rendered practically unused as a result of structural obstacles which include uncertainty about the forums, exposure to costs and repayment, referral overload, procedural illiteracy and weak trust in confidentiality. These barriers are enhanced by stigma since disclosure can impact on housing, relationships with the family, bank access, immigration security, or belief in seeking the services of public agencies. Instead, the legal system should be evaluated not just by what it perceives, but the circumstances in which rights may be mobilised.[5]

In the context of the access-to-justice theory, legal aid may be conceptualised in terms of entitlement, targeted public money, and gatekeeping. It is a right as the legislation provides a well-organized avenue through which representation can be pursued. It is targeted as the access is based on income, assets, merits, case type and forums referred to. It is gatekeeping in the sense that the said filters decide what disputes are transferred to funded claims and what are diverted into self-help, delay, attrition or abandonment.[6]

The article uses a right-based interpretation where the role of the state is never depleted by the elimination of criminal punishments. When the law acknowledges entitlements against coercion and safeguards of refusal, work-related obligations and channels of review, the state is too charged with the responsibility of preserving institutions whereby the entitlements can be achieved under non-discriminatory conditions. Equality, dignity and effective remedy herein are operational standards of determining whether legal-aid architecture helps to counteract exclusion or replicates it.[7]

---

[4] See generally PRA 2003, ss 3, 12–15, 16–23, 24–30; PLRC Report, 22–24, 45–47; LSA 2011, pts 2–3.
[5] Ministry of Justice (NZ), Access to Justice: Legal Needs Survey Final Report (2024) 127–133; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Legal Aid Practice Standards (2017) 5–6; Armstrong (2017) 71–72; Bennachie (2021) 6, 9.
[6] LSA 2011, ss 7–11, 20–21, 33–37; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Can I get criminal legal aid?; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Can I get family or civil legal aid?
[7] PRA 2003, s 3; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Legal Aid Practice Standards (2017) 5–6; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Access to Justice: Legal Needs Survey Final Report (2024) 127–133.

This analytical framework is a combination of the substantive equality, vulnerability and legal empowerment. Substantive equality focuses on patterned disadvantage and not on similar formal treatment. The overlapping precarity points out in vulnerability are poverty, stigma, volatile housing, debt, and the insecurity of immigration. Legal empowerment is concerned with the capacity of the afflicted individual to be brought to comprehend the assertion, access a court of law, receive help and follow through. Taken in combination, these ideas justify why the formally equal legal routes may not all be equally utilized.8

The New Zealand model has been assessed based on four-part matrix: rights, institutions, procedure and remedy. The former inquires what are the claims and protections that are recognised by the law. The second one would be the agencies of those claims. The third question is what procedural conditions entail entry, move, and review. The fourth question is something that whether a meaningful remedy is still practically accessible. This matrix maintains a relationship between the design of doctrines and legal-aid implications without rushing too fast between the text of the statutes and general assertions of victory or defeat.9

2. Method, Sources, and Limits

This paper follows a doctrinal and comparative method of access-to-justice. It is no comprehensive empirical causal study. Rather, it integrates strict interpretation of laws, rules, official review reports, and legal-help advice with judicious application of legal-needs evidence and chosen socio-legal research. Such a method would differentiate what is laid down in formal law, what the institutional design suggests and what the evidence of implementation supports.[10]

The Prostitution Reform Act 2003, the Legal Services Act 2011, the Legal Services Regulations 2011, and other subordinate materials used to discuss warrants, operator certification, review procedures, and practice standards form the doctrinal basis of the study. They are read along with the statutory review of the PLRC and judicial or administrative materials that are selected and where they explain the structure of forums, their reviewability or how local controls operate.[11]

[8] Ministry of Justice (NZ), Access to Justice: Legal Needs Survey Final Report (2024) 127–133; Armstrong (2017) 71–72; Bennachie (2021) 6, 9.

[9] PRA 2003, ss 3, 7–10, 12–15, 16–23, 24–30, 34–40; LSA 2011, ss 7–11, 20–21, 33–37, 51–55, 59–60.

[10] PRA 2003; LSA 2011; Legal Services Regulations 2011 (NZ); PLRC Report; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Access to Justice: Legal Needs Survey Final Report (2024) 127–133.

[11] PRA 2003; Prostitution (Operator Certificate) Regulations 2003 (NZ); Prostitution Reform (Form of Warrants)

Bounded socio-legal evidence, such as official review findings, Ministry guidance, legal-needs survey, practice standards, and migration exclusion, marginalization, and assistance-seeking empirical literature are also applied in the article. These sources are not considered to be interchangeable with text of the law. Instead, they are employed to suggest the points in which it seems that design form can be helpful in remedy, where institutions can develop attrition or distrust, and where care must be taken since the evidence of actual uptake is still incomplete.[12]

The relative aspect is design oriented and not predictive. It is not asserting that the same statutory forms can have the same social consequences in different jurisdictions. Rather, it poses the question of what features of the New Zealand model seem to play legally important roles, what barriers to access they seek to overcome, and what design aspects might only be partially transportable due to variations in administrative capacity, enforcement culture and structure of review.[13]

The article is more robust as a doctrinal and design-based analysis and less robust on coherent quantitative data of using all the available forums and providers by sex workers. It also makes it a condition of access and not an incidental social fact that privacy, confidentiality, stigma, and immigration vulnerability are. Language is employed judiciously and the socio-legal resources are perused cautiously where the formal law might fail to reflect the experiences of fear, distrust, or strategic silence.[14]

3. Decriminalisation and Legal Need under the New Zealand Model

This section does not merely describe the Prostitution Reform Act 2003. It reconstructs the legal architecture of the decriminalised model in order to assess the type, intensity, and distribution of legal need it generates. Because rights are dispersed across criminal, civil, administrative, local-government, and immigration forums, legal aid becomes a structural rather than incidental part of the model's effectiveness.

Regulations 2003 (NZ); LSA 2011; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Reviewing Legal Aid Decisions (MOJ0161-E, 2nd ed, October 2016).

[12] PLRC Report, 45–47, 57–58, 91–97, 167–168; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Legal Aid Practice Standards (2017) 5–6; Armstrong (2017) 71–72; Bennachie (2021) 6, 9.

[13] PRA 2003, ss 3, 12–15, 16–23, 24–30; PLRC Report, 91–97, 143–146; LSA 2011, ss 51–55, 59–60.

[14] Ministry of Justice (NZ), Access to Justice: Legal Needs Survey Final Report (2024) 127–133; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Legal Aid Practice Standards (2017) 5–6.

Legislative history and reform objectives

The New Zealand model is most commonly seen as a purpose-driven decriminalisation statute, the Prostitution Reform Act 2003 ("PRA") is not just about de-criminalisation; it is about creating a framework of rights, safety, public health and child protection. So, in the doctrinal sense, s 3 is not just descriptive language but serves as the interpretive fulcrum for interpreting subsequent provisions of the Act regarding lawful operation, prohibitions, inspections and certification.

The statutory review report by the PLRC echoes this rights-based approach and sees the following as key elements of the Act: decriminalisation of consensual adult prostitution, protections for sex workers, child protection measures (ab age 18), a brothel operator certification process, and local bylaw controls. Furthermore, the report notes that the legislation has decided to not endorse or morally sanction prostitution, even though it is a doctrinal point to note that it is also what explains why the PRA is a combination of what are essentially facilitative laws (contracts, certification, health rules) and yet continuing criminal rules (coercion, minors, regulated entry powers).[15]

Another feature of the PRA is the establishment of a review mechanism in the form of the Prostitution Law Review Committee (PLRC) which was established under law to review the Act within a prescribed period and report back to the Minister of Justice. That review process is significant in the context of this paper's throughline, because the framework has been developed to make sure that there is a written institutional record for the framework to review, and that can be used to assess the accessibility of the rights it contains, including access to legal aid, ex post.

Doctrinal structure

The PRA's doctrinal architecture is put together as a series of permission decisions instead of a single permission rule. It firstly establishes the regulated field (in this case, 'commercial sexual services', 'operator' and 'small owner-operated brothel'); it then legitimises the legitimacy of contracts and lastly establishes public health, labour-protective and criminal limits in this legalised field. The question of "legality" is thus not just one of whether

[15] Prostitution Reform Act 2003 (NZ) s 3 ('PRA 2003'); Report of the Prostitution Law Review Committee on the Operation of the Prostitution Reform Act 2003 (Ministry of Justice, 2008) 22–24 ('PLRC Report').

prostitution is "legal," but who is doing what (sex worker, operator, client, local authority, inspector, police), as the Act assigns different duties, permissions and offences to each of these roles.

The PRA divides four areas: (i) consensual adult service provision and contracts (legitimate); (ii) health and safety duties and powers of inspection (compliant); (iii) criminal prohibitions (coercive; under-18 involvement); and (iv) operator certification and enforcement (compliant; regulatory gateway). At the same time, the local governance layer, based on bylaws and planning/resource consent processes, is maintained, so that the legal ownership of the PRA does not override any other planning/resource consent processes for signage and site location of brothels at local level.

This layered design determines forum and consequence. A given dispute may therefore move to different institutions depending on the legal trigger: inspectors and health authorities for safer-sex compliance under ss 8–9, Police and criminal courts for coercion or under-18 offences, District Court registry/judicial processes for certification and waiver decisions, and territorial authorities for bylaws and planning controls. The doctrinal significance for later sections is that legal need is embedded in the architecture itself: rights exist, but they are fragmented across forums with distinct procedures and thresholds.[16]

The importance of these multiple decision points for legal-aid analysis is right there. Every new forum presents its own set of entry barriers – different paths through the system for filing, its procedures, the evidence required, and the institutional language – all of which need to be traversed before a right can be made use of. The legal-literacy burden is accordingly cumulative as claims get passed from inspector to court, local authority, District Court, and immigration decision makers and the risk of delay, attrition and self-representation grows with it. Instead of being removed, legal need is redistributed in a more complex field of procedural access issues and therefore legal aid should be considered as part of the model, and not some sort of later intervention, or 'after-thought'.

Rights and duties

The PRA is more of a framework of rights and duties than just a decriminalisation measure.

[16] PRA 2003, ss 8–9, 12–15, 24–30, 35–40; PLRC Report, 46–47; Prostitution (Operator Certificate) Regulations 2003 (NZ) regs 4–8 sch 1 ('Operator Certificate Regulations').

Most importantly, s 16 criminalises inducement or compulsion through threats, including those based on immigration status, criminal accusation or misuse of authority, and s 17 ensures an express protection for a person's right to refuse or discontinue commercial sexual services, which are not contractually required, but are still legal under contract, and s 18 ensures an explicit protection for social security and injury compensation entitlements in the event of refusal of sex work. The legal issues are unequivocal: if the conduct is coercive, it is criminal; if it is refusal, it is legally sound; and refusal cannot lawfully be a basis to remove the welfare/injury frameworks of statutory entitlements.

It imposes similarly tight child-protection limits. The sections (20-22) make it illegal to cause, facilitate, contract for and receive commercial sexual services of a person under 18; and s 23 makes it illegal to break into a criminal offence, with a potential prison sentence of up to 7 years, and expressly excludes legal/health advice from criminalisation and prevents that under-18 person from being charged as a party to the offence. The institutional approach here is a traditional criminal enforcement, that is, police investigation and prosecution, and the decisions of liability and sentence handed down by the criminal courts.

The following information in this report is important for understanding how these formal protections work in practice: the PLRC's observations on implementation. It found evidence that pre-PRA there was greater awareness of the ability to turn away clients and that this did not change following the PRA, and that there was ongoing reports of pressure and a need for better complaints processes and building relationships with authorities, particularly Police. From a doctrinal point of view it does not weaken the statutory rule; on the contrary, it highlights the ‘gap' between the formal rights (ss 16-18) and effective enforcement of rights that emerges in the legal-aid question in the next Section.[17]

Labour and workplace standards

The PRA's labour dimension is legally relevant and essentially indirect. Sec 7 validates contracts for providing (or arranging) commercial sexual services, sec 10 confirms that a sex worker is "at work" for the purpose of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015, and ss 8-9 impose duties on operators, sex workers and clients to provide safer sex and risk minimisation, with offence provisions and fines. That is, not whether there are obligations to fulfil (there are),

[17] PRA 2003, ss 16–18, 20–23; PLRC Report, 45–47.

but who fulfilled which obligation (and in what forum it is to be fulfilled) for PRA offences, and whether and in what forum they are to be fulfilled for any other employment disputes that are not PRA offences (for which there may be obligations under ss 8-9, but no PRA obligations).

The operator certification scheme is also a labour-governance mechanism since it determines who is allowed to legally run a business, thus impacting workplace control and accountability. A non-company operator must be a holder of certificate (ss 34–40); applications for certificate are received by Registrar in prescribed form; applications for waiver of certificate are made to a District Court Judge and are subject to a Police report; a non-company operator is committing offences if he or she is not a holder of a certificate or cannot produce a certificate; a non-company operator commits an offence and is liable to a fine if he or she does not hold a certificate, or is unable to produce a certificate. This is upheld by the Operator Certificate Regulations, which detail the form of the application and process of identity/photo validation and the certificate form that turn eligibility and traceability into manageable legal requirements.

Even post decriminalisation, PLRC's review suggests that there are areas of vulnerability in the workplace which may exist despite this framework, such as exploitative working conditions and the withholding or deduction of earnings. The recommendations of the report on accessible complaints systems and enhanced inter-agency co-ordination are thus also applicable to the labour dimension; the statutory framework prescribes enforceable standards, but the extent to which they can be enforced will depend on the extent to which workers are able to start to raise complaints through an accessible complaints system, and can co-ordinate their action with other agencies (Police, inspectors, courts, and general civil/employment fora).[18]

Criminal boundaries, migration, and institutions

In a decriminalised approach the PRA has a clear criminal edge against exploitation. The heart of the anti-coercion section is section 16, and there are strict criminal prohibitions, with imprisonment sanctions, in section 20-23, relating to persons under 18. The important doctrinal principle is that the transition from doctrinal to legal is immediate from decriminalisation to Police enforcement and criminal adjudication when allegations of compulsion or exploitation

[18] PRA 2003, ss 7–10, 34–40; Operator Certificate Regulations, regs 4–8 sch 1; PLRC Report, 46–47, 159–161, 167–168.

of minors or prohibited operator conduct occur.

The enforcement architecture reflects this distinction. For health-and-safety inspection, ss 24–29 authorise inspector entry and inspection powers (including seizure in relation to ss 8–9 offences), with warrant-backed entry to homes under s 27 and a prescribed warrant form under the Form of Warrants Regulations (Schedule 1). By contrast, s 30 provides a Police warrant route for entering a place where there is suspected offending under s 23 (under-18 offences) or s 34 (operating without a certificate), and the current warrant regime must be read with care because the former Schedule 2 warrant form in the Form of Warrants Regulations is expressly revoked in the reprint. The consequence is an important doctrinal clarification: enforcement authority remains, but the source of form and procedure differs depending on whether the power is inspector-based (s 27 + Schedule 1) or Police/search-based (s 30 as updated and linked to the Search and Surveillance framework).

On trafficking-related risks, the PLRC's chapter on trafficking is doctrinally useful because it distinguishes trafficking debates from the PRA's direct criminal controls and records the Committee's finding that, on the material before it, it did not identify a link between the New Zealand sex industry and human trafficking in the period reviewed. At the same time, the report expressly notes continuing concern about coercion, under-18 protection, and the vulnerability of persons working outside lawful immigration status, which underscores that the criminal-law boundary in New Zealand is built more around coercion/exploitation prohibitions and immigration conditions than around a general criminalisation of adult sex work.[19]

Immigration-related exclusions

Section 19 is a major structural limit within the decriminalised model. It bars visa grants based on sex work/operation/investment, imposes a condition on temporary entry class visas prohibiting provision of commercial sexual services or operation/investment in a prostitution business, and authorises deportation liability decisions (for temporary and resident visa contexts) by the Minister of Immigration or immigration officers upon the statutory thresholds being met. The doctrinal decision points are therefore immigration-status based, not consent or labour based: the same activity that may be lawful under the PRA for citizens/residents can

[19] PRA 2003, ss 16, 19, 20–23, 24–30; Prostitution Reform (Form of Warrants) Regulations 2003 (NZ) reg 3(1) sch 1 and reg 3(2) [revoked] sch 2 [revoked]; PLRC Report (chapter on trafficking).

trigger immigration consequences for non-residents under s 19.

The PLRC was explicit about the legal consequence of this exclusion. While not endorsing unlawful work in breach of immigration status, the Committee recorded concern that sex workers in that position are not protected under the PRA and may be vulnerable to exploitation. That observation is a core interpretive qualification to the PRA's rights framework: s 3 sets out a rights-and-safety purpose, but s 19 creates a category of persons who sit at the edge of (or outside) the practical protection structure, with direct implications for reporting, enforcement cooperation, and access to remedies.

For present purposes, the legal significance is institutional as much as substantive. Where immigration consequences are in play, the relevant forum is no longer only Police, inspector, or local authority; immigration decision-makers and specialist adjudicative pathways become central, and the risk of deportation liability may deter engagement with otherwise available protective mechanisms under the PRA. This is one of the clearest examples of how the decriminalised framework generates differentiated legal need across categories of workers, which section 4 addresses through the legal-aid lens.[20]

Institutions and governance

The PRA's governance design is institutionally plural. Territorial authorities may regulate signage advertising commercial sexual services (s 12), must follow prescribed bylaw procedure (s 13), may regulate brothel location through bylaw powers (s 14), and may consider nuisance/offence/compatibility factors when deciding resource consents under s 15. The legal consequence is that local governance can significantly shape the geography and visibility of lawful businesses, even where the underlying activity is decriminalised under national law.

The Act provides for a separate track in the form of a health-inspection track and a Police enforcement track. Local Medical Officers of Health and appointed inspectors are the key statutory parties in relation to compliance for ss 8-9, while the powers of entry, inspection, information-gathering, seizure and procedural duties on entry relate to the statutory powers of the Medical Officers of Health (ss 24-29), and the powers of Police are linked to warrant execution powers for specified offences (s 30) and certificate-production checks (s 40). The Form of Warrants Regulations flesh out this design by setting out the form of warrant that must

[20] PRA 2003, ss 3, 19(1)–(4); PLRC Report, 167–168.

be issued under s 27 to inspectors and the procedure for certification through the District Court registry is standardised by the operator-certificate regulations.

The multi-agency model has both been successful and has limitations, as evidenced by PLRC's implementation findings. It cited that the certification system has helped to increase transparency, but also found that there was limited ongoing monitoring, irregular monitoring and that there was a need to strengthen communication between Police and Immigration and between Police and relevant agencies; it also noted that local authority responses were variable and there was a lack of clarity over the scope of the bylaws, leading to litigation. So the governance issue is not whether institutions are in place – they are – but whether they are sufficiently coordinated, open to procedures and subject to review to ensure the rights and duties they are given under the statute are practically exercised.[21]

Interpretive trends and legal need

Within the source set provided, the clearest judicial trend emerges through the PLRC's account of bylaw litigation. The Committee records that local-control disputes reached the High Court and Court of Appeal (including the Auckland and Hamilton bylaw challenges), and notes that the courts addressed these disputes on legal/administrative grounds rather than moral approval or disapproval of sex work. That is doctrinally important: it aligns adjudication with the PRA's design choice in s 3—decriminalisation without moral endorsement—and channels dispute resolution into ordinary public-law reasoning on power, procedure, and proportionality.

The principal administrative trend is similar. The PLRC identifies the practical importance of regularised inter-agency governance (Police, Immigration, and other actors), while the statutory and regulatory materials show a continued differentiation between inspector-led compliance mechanisms and Police/search-based criminal enforcement routes. The revocation of the former Schedule 2 form under the Form of Warrants Regulations, read with the amended structure of s 30, reinforces the need for careful source-based analysis of current warrant practice rather than reliance on earlier procedural assumptions.

Taken together, the judicial and administrative materials suggest an interpretive pattern of regulated legality: consensual adult sex work is governed through ordinary public, health, and

[21] PRA 2003, ss 12–15, 24–30, 40; Form of Warrants Regulations, reg 3 sch 1; Operator Certificate Regulations, regs 4–8 sch 1; PLRC Report, 91–97.

criminal law techniques, but the effectiveness of that governance depends on whether affected persons can actually invoke those institutions without prohibitive procedural or social cost. That institutional accessibility question is the immediate bridge to legal aid.

The doctrinal structure of the PRA therefore does not eliminate legal vulnerability; it redistributes it across multiple procedural pathways controlled by Police, inspectors, District Court registry and judges, territorial authorities, and immigration authorities. The effectiveness of decriminalisation must therefore be measured not only by the existence of rights, but by the accessibility of the legal system through which those rights are enforced. Because New Zealand legal aid remains forum-specific and threshold-based, the next section tests whether that legal-aid architecture can convert formally available rights into practically usable remedies.[22]

4. Legal Aid Architecture and Access to Justice

Statutory architecture

The New Zealand legal-aid framework is not a single discretionary scheme; it is a statutory system with defined institutional roles, decision pathways, and provider controls. That structure matters differently in a decriminalised model because the Prostitution Reform Act disperses legal need across criminal, civil, regulatory, local-government, and immigration pathways. The access question is therefore not simply whether aid exists, but how this legal-aid system allocates decisions, funds representation, and supervises providers across the forums the decriminalised model actually uses.

The Legal Services Act 2011 creates the architecture in two linked parts: Part 2 governs grants of legal aid (including eligibility, conditions, and debt), while Part 3 structures administration and provider regulation. Within Part 3, the Secretary for Justice retains system-level functions (including contracting and policy administration), while the Legal Services Commissioner is assigned decision-making and operational legal-aid functions, including grant administration and provider approval/oversight. This separation is doctrinally important because it distinguishes individual grant decisions from the broader governance of legal-aid delivery. For sex workers, that institutional split matters because access problems may arise not only at the

[22] PLRC Report, 91–97; PRA 2003, ss 12–15, 19, 24–30, 34–40; Form of Warrants Regulations, reg 3(2), sch 2 ; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Can I get criminal legal aid? (webpage, last updated 1 January 2023); Ministry of Justice (NZ), Can I get family or civil legal aid?; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Reviewing Legal Aid Decisions.

grant stage, but also through provider availability, administrative processing, and debt management across the wider set of forums opened by decriminalisation.[23]

Eligibility and merits

The Act and Regulations together create a threshold-based eligibility model: the legal rule is statutory eligibility plus financial and merits screening, and the decision point is grant/refusal (or grant on conditions). The primary decision-maker is Legal Aid Services under the Commissioner's statutory authority, with the legal consequence being a grant, refusal, or conditional grant that may include repayment obligations. For sex workers, the threshold question is therefore not simply whether legal aid exists in principle, but whether entry into the scheme can be navigated without turning the application process itself into a barrier.

For criminal matters, the Act ties eligibility to offence seriousness (including imprisonment thresholds) and, separately, to whether the interests of justice require funding. For family and civil matters, the Act adds a merits screen, including reasonable grounds, prospects of success, and proportionality between likely cost and likely benefit. The Legal Services Regulations then operationalise the financial thresholds by prescribing maximum annual gross income, maximum disposable capital, and the method for calculating those amounts, including treatment of partner income and dependent children. The Ministry's public legal-aid pages reflect this same structure in plain terms (income, assets, merits, and case type), and the Grants Handbook shows how the statutory criteria are translated into grants-office practice (eligibility checks, required documents, and debt/repayment administration). Applied to sex workers, several access pressures follow. Irregular earnings may sit uneasily with annual threshold calculations; cash-based or intermittently recorded work may complicate proof-of-means requirements; and the inclusion of partner income or household financial detail may discourage full disclosure where applicants fear stigma or exposure of work arrangements. The same is true at the merits stage: claims involving harassment, withheld earnings, coercion-linked disputes, or small administrative decisions may be legally important but economically modest, which creates the possibility that proportionality reasoning will under-value claims that matter acutely to a precarious worker.

A grant is not the end of the legal position. The Act permits conditions on the grant and creates

[23] Legal Services Act 2011 (NZ) pts 2–3, ss 68–69, 71 ('LSA 2011').

a legal-aid debt framework, including repayment and security over property, so the legal consequence of receiving aid can include an ongoing financial liability managed by Legal Aid Services and enforced through statutory debt mechanisms. That debt architecture matters analytically for sex workers because formal eligibility does not remove the possibility of financial deterrence. Conditional grants, interim contributions, repayment exposure, or security over property may discourage applications in advance, especially where income is unstable, assets are minimal, or the underlying dispute concerns a small but urgent problem rather than a high-value claim. The framework therefore appears formally open, but its loan-like features may create a chilling effect even before merits are assessed to conclusion.[24]

Coverage and forums

The coverage question is doctrinally central because legal aid is forum-specific: the same person may be eligible in one forum and excluded in another. The Act therefore creates a jurisdictional decision point before any merits assessment-whether the proceeding falls within criminal legal aid, civil or family legal aid, or a specified proceeding. That question must be read against the earlier decriminalisation analysis, which showed that legal need is redistributed across criminal, employment, immigration, local-government, and public-law channels.

Part 2 of the Act defines the relevant categories (criminal matters and civil matters, including specified proceedings), and the Ministry guidance clarifies the practical map: criminal legal aid for qualifying criminal proceedings and some appeals/parole matters; family legal aid for court-based family matters; and civil legal aid for court and tribunal proceedings, including listed specialist tribunals (such as the Employment Court/Authority, Human Rights Tribunal, Immigration and Protection Tribunal, and Legal Aid Tribunal). The same Ministry guidance also identifies exclusions (for example, certain immigration matters and Disputes Tribunal matters), which is legally significant because those exclusions directly shape where a sex worker can secure funded representation and where they may need other support routes. Applied concretely to the preceding decriminalisation analysis, the coverage map is uneven. Criminal defence remains the clearest covered route; employment or labour claims may fall within eligible civil or employment forums; human-rights and discrimination complaints

[24] LSA 2011, ss 8, 10–11, 18, 20–21, 33–37; Legal Services Regulations 2011 (NZ) rr 5–9 ('LSR 2011'); Ministry of Justice (NZ), Can I get family or civil legal aid? (archived Ministry webpage PDF, last updated 22 February 2024) 1–4 (including partner finances); Ministry of Justice (NZ), Grants Handbook (Version 4.92, 23 January 2024) 8–9, 22–27, 32–37, 139–146; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Do you need to pay back your legal aid? 1–2; PLRC Report, 52.

appear capable of entering the Human Rights Tribunal pathway; and local bylaw or regulatory disputes may be fundable if they proceed in an eligible court or tribunal. By contrast, some immigration matters and lower-value disputes channelled into excluded forums create residual gaps, so a sex worker's access to legal aid depends not only on the existence of a grievance but on how that grievance is legally characterised and where it must be filed.25

Reviewability

The Legal Services Act establishes a structured, staged control mechanism over legal-aid decision-making rather than leaving grant/refusal decisions to unreviewable administrative discretion. The doctrinal sequence is clear: an initial decision by Legal Aid Services may be followed by reconsideration, then review before the Legal Aid Tribunal, and thereafter an appeal on a question of law to the High Court (with further appellate steps in appropriate cases). This statutory design is significant for the present paper because it creates a formal legality pathway through which grant, refusal, repayment, or condition decisions may be tested. For sex workers, the significance of that staged design is that the refusal or conditioning of aid can itself become part of the access-to-justice problem, rather than merely an administrative preliminary.

The review threshold is also legally important. Under the Act, Tribunal review does not operate as a general rehearing on facts; the applicant must challenge the reconsidered decision within the statutory time period and demonstrate the statutory review standard. The Ministry's review guidance mirrors this architecture and procedural sequencing, including the requirement to seek reconsideration first and the route to the Tribunal thereafter. In practical terms, this means procedural literacy (deadlines, forms, grounds) becomes part of effective access to legal aid. For a low-income, stigmatised worker, however, those procedural requirements may be difficult to use without assistance: identifying reviewable error, gathering updated financial material, and meeting filing deadlines can be demanding where the applicant is already managing unstable work, violence, housing insecurity, or immigration fear.

An administrative-law lens remains relevant even within this statutory appeal structure. In Legal Services Commissioner v Fawcett, the Court of Appeal records argument concerning the

[25] LSA 2011, ss 6–7; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Can I get criminal legal aid? 1–2; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Can I get family or civil legal aid? 1–4 (listed forums and exclusions, including the Human Rights Tribunal, Immigration and Protection Tribunal, and Disputes Tribunal); PRA 2003, ss 12–15, 16–23, 19.

scope of the High Court's powers on appeal under the High Court Rules and notes the submission that those powers may, in substance, be coextensive with judicial review powers in appropriate cases. For present purposes, the narrower doctrinal point is sufficient: legal-aid decisions are not merely internal administrative acts; they are embedded within a legally supervised review-and-appeal framework that can engage broader public-law principles of legality, reasoned decision-making, and lawful exercise of statutory power. This raises a further accessibility concern. A formally available review route may still go unused if the applicant expects to proceed without representation, fears further disclosure, or concludes that challenging refusal or conditions is not worth the risk of contribution liability or legal-aid debt. The review structure is therefore doctrinally robust, but its practical uptake by precarious workers may remain uneven.[26]

Confidentiality and privacy

In sex-work related matters, confidentiality and privacy are not peripheral ethics issues; they are access conditions. The legal significance is that clients may not seek or sustain representation unless the legal-aid system protects confidentiality, controls disclosure, and requires communication practices suited to vulnerable or stigmatised contexts. Stigma heightens the cost of disclosure because unwanted exposure may affect family relationships, housing, banking, future employment, or engagement with public agencies. Means-testing may also require applicants to disclose income sources, partner finances, or living arrangements, which can make the aid application itself feel risky for workers who rely on privacy to manage everyday safety.

The statutory foundation is s 81 of the Legal Services Act, which preserves ordinary professional obligations (including conduct rules and privilege-related duties) within legal-aid practice. The Legal Aid Practice Standards then make this operational: they require privacy-sensitive handling of personal information, client-tailored communication, advice on legal-aid obligations/liabilities, and an express prohibition on public statements about a client's affairs without specific consent. The Ministry Complaints Management Policy reinforces this at the administrative level by treating complaint processes as confidential (including privacy considerations) and regulating when participant information may be disclosed, including where

[26] LSA 2011, ss 20–21, 33–37, 51–55, 59–60; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Reviewing Legal Aid Decisions (MOJ0161-E, 2nd ed, October 2016) 1–2; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Do you need to pay back your legal aid? 1–2; Legal Services Commissioner v Fawcett [2025] NZCA 63, [127]–[128].

third parties complain on a participant's behalf. The point is especially sharp for migrant or immigration-vulnerable workers. Even if legal-aid files are formally protected, applicants may fear that disclosure of work arrangements or household details could travel beyond the immediate grant decision, particularly in a broader regulatory environment where immigration status already conditions access to protection. This does not negate the confidentiality rules; rather, it suggests that formal privacy safeguards and practical trust are not necessarily the same thing.[27]

Service delivery and access infrastructure

The legal-aid framework under the Act is operationally wider than the grant decision itself. Section 69 of the Legal Services Act permits legal services to be delivered through multiple channels, including private practitioners, salaried lawyers, and community law centres, thereby recognising that access to representation depends on service infrastructure as well as funding rules. This is especially relevant in stigmatised or high-risk matters, where the first point of contact may determine whether a person enters the legal system at all. For sex workers, that makes the first-contact question particularly important: the relevant issue is not only whether a provider exists on paper, but whether the institution is trusted enough to be approached in the first place.

The Ministry's legal-aid materials and practice standards support this institutional view of access. The criminal legal-aid guidance identifies the duty lawyer pathway as an immediate source of representation in minor criminal matters, while the Legal Aid Tribunal guidance expressly directs applicants to lawyers, Community Law Centres, and Citizens Advice Bureaux for assistance and information. The Legal Aid Practice Standards reinforce this by requiring legal-aid lawyers to advise clients about legal-aid processes and, where not acting, to direct them to the Ministry, Community Law Centre, or Citizens Advice Bureau as appropriate. The doctrinal design therefore recognises referral, but it does not by itself show that sex workers use ordinary entry-point institutions evenly or confidently.

The Ministry's legal-needs survey further supports inclusion of NGOs within this service-

[27] LSA 2011, s 81; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Legal Aid Practice Standards (February 2017) 4–6; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Complaints Management Policy (source pack PDF) 4, 14–15, 28; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Can I get family or civil legal aid? 4 (partner finances); PLRC Report, 52; Lynzi Armstrong, 'Rights of Migrant Sex Workers' (2017) 31 Women's Studies Journal 69, 71–72; María N Bennachie, 'The Impact of Section 19 of the Prostitution Reform Act on Migrant Sex Workers in New Zealand' (2021) Social Sciences 10(5) 179, 6, 9.

delivery analysis, albeit as part of the wider access-to-justice ecosystem rather than as a formal legal-aid decision-maker. The report identifies CAB/Community Law Centres and social-service or NGO channels as recurring sources of assistance and referral for people navigating legal problems, including where legal and non-legal needs overlap. In doctrinal terms, therefore, service delivery should be understood as a layered access infrastructure: statutory legal aid (grant/representation) sits alongside referral and support institutions that often determine whether statutory remedies are practically reachable. For sex workers, the current source set does not establish consistent quantitative use of Community Law Centres in practice, but it does suggest that ordinary legal-aid entry points may coexist with sex-worker-led or community intermediaries rather than replace them. The PLRC expressly contemplated advocacy support from Community Law Centres, and the wider New Zealand materials indicate a continuing role for NZPC in outreach, information, and trust-based engagement with workers. This raises the possibility that referral gaps, information gaps, or institutional distrust may interrupt access even where formal legal-aid coverage exists.[28]

Taken together, the New Zealand legal-aid system does not formally exclude sex workers. Its significance lies elsewhere: eligibility thresholds, forum-specific coverage, review complexity, confidentiality concerns, service-delivery dependence, and debt-conditioned grants can redistribute access burdens across the very pathways that decriminalisation opens. In that sense, the scheme is not merely a neutral funding background to the PRA. It is part of the access architecture itself, and its threshold-based, forum-specific, administratively filtered, and debt-conditioned design may weigh most heavily on workers who are stigmatised, economically precarious, or vulnerable to immigration consequences.

5. Findings and Analytical Implications

Core proposition

This section proceeds from a central proposition: decriminalisation expands the legal recognisability of sex workers' claims, but access to remedy remains filtered by forum

[28] LSA 2011, s 69; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Can I get criminal legal aid? (archived webpage PDF in source pack) 1; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Reviewing Legal Aid Decisions (MOJ0161-E, 2nd ed, October 2016) 2; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Legal Aid Practice Standards (February 2017) 5–6; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Access to Justice: Legal Needs Survey Final Report (October 2024) 15–16, 65, 127–133; PLRC Report, 18, 160; Lynzi Armstrong, 'Rights of Migrant Sex Workers' (2017) 31 Women's Studies Journal 69–76, 69–70; María N Bennachie, 'The Impact of Section 19 of the Prostitution Reform Act on Migrant Sex Workers in New Zealand' (2021) Social Sciences 10(5) 179, 5.

coverage, legal-aid thresholds, service-delivery trust, and immigration-linked exclusion. Access to justice is therefore treated as an institutional question about whether the access architecture makes those claims practically usable once they move into ordinary legal forums.

The analysis adopts a doctrinal and comparative-access method rather than a full empirical causal study. It distinguishes between what is established by statutory text and formal legal-aid rules, what is inferred from institutional design and forum structure, and what is supported by review reports, Ministry guidance, legal-needs materials, and secondary scholarship. On that basis, the section identifies legally supported pathways and plausible barriers to remedy without claiming complete quantitative proof of uptake or outcomes.

The New Zealand model improves legal justiciability for sex workers by moving core harms (coercion, refusal, under-18 protections) into a rights-regulated framework, but it does not by itself guarantee effective remedies. The Prostitution Reform Act creates legally recognisable pathways; the Legal Services Act 2011 and Ministry of Justice legal-aid system determine whether those pathways are practically usable through funded representation, review, and service delivery. PLRC findings support this bounded account: the report records improved ability to refuse clients and some improved engagement with police, but it does not establish uniform remedy access across all workers or regions.29

Violence, protection, and criminal process

In violence and coercion cases, the PRA's ss 16–18 make refusal, coercion, and related harms legible to ordinary legal institutions rather than treating them as inevitable features of an unlawful market. The relevant forums are primarily Police and the criminal courts, with Family Court protection pathways available in some circumstances. Legal aid matters here as the converting mechanism: criminal aid depends on seriousness and the interests of justice, while family aid depends on means and merits, and the practical barriers remain stigma, fear of disclosure, confidentiality concerns, and the difficulty of sustaining process over time.[30]

The central finding is that decriminalisation is a necessary legal condition for this pathway, but legal aid still determines whether the pathway can be used effectively. Where aid is

[29] LSA 2011, pts 2–3; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Can I get criminal legal aid?; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Can I get family or civil legal aid?; PLRC Report, 45–47, 57–58.
[30] PRA 2003, ss 16–18, 20–23; LSA 2011, ss 8, 10–11; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Can I get criminal legal aid?; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Can I get family or civil legal aid?; PLRC Report, 45–47.

unavailable, delayed, or practically difficult to obtain, the existence of PRA rights does not reliably translate into enforceable relief.

Labour and workplace disputes

Labour and workplace disputes present a different access pattern. The PRA validates contracts, recognises workplace duties, and supports claims concerning withheld earnings, unsafe conditions, pressure not to refuse clients, or exploitative deductions, but those claims must still fit covered employment, civil, or tribunal forums under the Legal Services Act. The practical difficulty is not only legal merit; it is forum fit, evidentiary burden, repayment anxiety, and referral attrition, especially where lower-value disputes fall into excluded or weakly supported channels.

The migrant-exclusion evidence sharpens this point. Bennachie's study records cases of exploitation and withheld income where workers did not use police or dispute processes because of deportation fears tied to PRA s 19. The narrower conclusion is therefore that decriminalisation improves enforceability for some, but the legal system still produces non-remedy zones where immigration risk or forum exclusion suppresses claims.[31]

Civil, family, housing, and discrimination claims

Many serious harms experienced by sex workers arise outside 'sex-work law' as such and instead enter ordinary civil, family, housing, debt, or discrimination pathways. Those forums may in principle be covered by legal aid, but access is still filtered by means, assets, merits, possible repayment obligations, privacy concerns, and repeated referrals before a claimant reaches an appropriate provider. The significance of the LSA framework here is that rights become meaningful only if those ordinary forums remain procedurally and financially usable.

The Legal Needs Survey supports this institutional reading by showing referral-heavy help-seeking patterns and uneven resolution outcomes across legal problems. While not sex-worker-specific proof, it reinforces the point that service navigation and provider access are independent determinants of remedy use even where formal legal routes exist.[32]

---

[31] LSA 2011, ss 7, 10–11; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Can I get family or civil legal aid? (including covered forums and exclusions); María N Bennachie, 'The Impact of Section 19 of the Prostitution Reform Act on Migrant Sex Workers in New Zealand' (2021) Social Sciences 10(5) 179, 6, 9; PRA 2003, s 19.

[32] LSA 2011, ss 7, 10–11, 20–21, 33–37; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Do you need to pay back your legal aid?;

Persistent structural limitations

The strongest structural limitation remains PRA s 19. It creates an immigration-based exclusion that can convert legal help-seeking itself into risk exposure, especially for temporary visa holders. Armstrong and Bennachie both support the same core point: migrant sex workers may be less likely to seek police or formal remedies because disclosure can trigger immigration consequences, reducing the practical value of decriminalisation's protections for that group.

A second limitation is informal coercion. The PRA criminalises coercion and protects refusal, but some exploitation appears as financial control, dependency, or threat structures that do not easily become single-event legal claims. Where those harms fall into low-value, informal, or excluded forums, legal aid's practical utility is reduced.[33]

Evaluation criteria

Using only the provided materials, this section applies an operational evaluation framework: (i) whether pathways exist in law (PRA/LSA); (ii) whether legal aid covers the relevant forum; (iii) whether means, merits, and repayment settings make aid usable; (iv) whether privacy-sensitive, stigma-aware service delivery exists; and (v) whether migrants are structurally excluded from practical remedy. The WHO key-populations guidance and the 2024 human-rights guide support using accessibility, stigma, and non-discrimination as practical indicators; the Legal Needs Survey supports measuring referral burden and perceived problem resolution.

Analytical implications and evidentiary limits

The article's governing proposition is borne out only in qualified form. Decriminalisation improves the legal recognisability of sex workers' claims by moving violence, labour, family, housing, and discrimination harms into ordinary legal pathways, but it does not itself secure equal access to remedy. Practical usability remains filtered by forum coverage, legal-aid eligibility thresholds, review complexity, confidentiality conditions, service-delivery trust, and immigration-linked exclusion.

Ministry of Justice (NZ), Can I get family or civil legal aid?; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Access to Justice: Legal Needs Survey Final Report (2024) 127–133.

[33] PRA 2003, ss 16–18, 19(1)–(4); Lynzi Armstrong, 'Rights of Migrant Sex Workers' (2017) 31 Women's Studies Journal 69, 71–72; María N Bennachie, 'The Impact of Section 19 of the Prostitution Reform Act on Migrant Sex Workers in New Zealand' (2021) Social Sciences 10(5) 179, 6, 9.

The present materials therefore support a structured but limited conclusion: decriminalisation supplies the legal precondition for remedy, while the access architecture determines how far that precondition can be used in practice. Where coverage is fragmented, eligibility is restrictive, review is procedurally demanding, confidentiality is fragile, or immigration risk attaches to disclosure, formal rights remain institutionally accessible only unevenly and their practical usability is correspondingly unequal.[34]

A final limits-of-evidence point must be stated expressly. The source set does not establish a consistent quantitative record of sex workers' use of Community Law Centres, funded lawyers, or review mechanisms across all dispute categories. Some access barriers identified here are therefore best understood as plausible institutional constraints rather than directly measured uptake patterns, and caution is required when moving from formal legal structure to claims about the practical frequency or uniformity of use.

6. Comparative and Reform Significance

Comparative regulatory models

his comparative part is doctrinal and designing, not the statement that the same statutory models have the same social outcomes in different jurisdictions. Its use is to determine what aspects of the New Zealand access architecture seem to be legally important, what issues those aspects deal with, and what aspects can be moved, modified in part, or fail when transplanted to other institutional contexts.

The general categories of comparative regulatory approaches in sex work include criminalisation, legalisation or licensing, end-demand regulation and decriminalisation. It is not the label itself that is significant to this article, but the access bottleneck of each model. In criminalisation systems, the deterrent barrier is most frequently imposed by exposure to the police and criminal courts; in legalisation or licensing systems, the administrative exclusion in the form of zoning, licensing, or documentation may be imposed; and in models based on end-demand, the police-centred enforcement may indirectly influence working conditions even when the workers are not criminalised.

[34] PRA 2003, ss 3, 16–23; LSA 2011, pt 2, ss 7–11, 20–21, 33–37; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Can I get criminal legal aid?; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Can I get family or civil legal aid?; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Access to Justice: Legal Needs Survey Final Report (2024) 127–133; PLRC Report, 45–47, 57–58.

The decriminalised model used in New Zealand is different as the consensual sex work involving adults in the country is decriminalised but forced sex and sex work under the age of 18 are still criminalised. The main access-to-justice limitation is thus no longer the general liability to crime, but the institutional accessibility: whether or not the legal assistance makes it to the arenas that now adjudicate labour, regulatory, protective, discrimination, and immigration-related conflict.

It is in that point of comparison, and not in its place, that that of core New Zealand is conformed. The issue raised by the article is not to prioritize all the models of regulation within the abstract, but to demonstrate that after the criminal penalties have been removed, the key question is whether or not the architecture of access around the recognised rights has turned into a practical usage. This case of New Zealand is hence a useful comparative one in that it demonstrates that the next-order legal issue of decriminalisation is dispersed legal need, differentiated forums, and reliance of remedy on funding, reviewability, confidentiality, and entry gates of trust.[35]

Transferability criteria

According to the materials available in New Zealand, statutory replication is not enough. The above analysis leads to the development of four criteria, including institutional capacity, enforcement culture, rights basis, and reviewability.

First, there is institutional capacity that is central. The regulatory and enforcement roles on the part of the police, inspectors, local authorities, courts, and registrars are shared by the PRA. In the absence of similar administrative infrastructure and available entry points, the transplanted rights can be formally proclaimed but practically unachievable.

Second, enforcement culture is the usability of rights. The PRA gives the power of inspection and warrants, but it should be applied in a manner that is in line with the protective nature of the Act. Both enhanced claim to refusal rights and persistent tensions of enforcement dealings are reflected in the Prostitution Law Review Committee (PLRC) Report, which highlights how implementation conditions mediate remedy access.

[35] PRA 2003, ss 3, 12–15, 16–23, 24–30; LSA 2011, pts 2–3; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Can I get criminal legal aid?; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Can I get family or civil legal aid?

Third, there is the rights baseline issue. PRA section 3 specifically models the legislation with the protection of human rights and anti-exploitative protection, health and safety and discouraging participation of persons below 18 years of age. This purpose clause is used as an interpretive anchor which helps to frame enforcement and adjudication. A transplant that does not have such normative clarity can undermine doctrinal coherence.

Fourth, decisions made based on legal aid must be reviewable. The Legal Services Act 2011 (LSA) offers reconsideration, a review of the Legal Aid Tribunal and appeal on law matters, hence, introducing control in the decision-making process of funding. In circumstances where an insulation against review of legal aid refusal exists, there may be substantive rights unrealistically enforced.[36]

Transferable legal-aid design features

Some of the design features of legal aid that have been defined in the materials of New Zealand are transposable to regulatory models due to their focus on access infrastructure and not ideological orientation.

The professional standards that are sensitive to confidentiality are basic. Legal Aid Practice Standards have privacy, consent and client-sensitive communication responsibilities most especially on the case of stigmatised claimants. These standards enhance trust and involvement regardless of the regulatory model that is embraced.

The transferability of clarity and transparency in review mechanisms is also possible. The LSA and the related guidance outlines a well-developed route, namely reconsideration, Tribunal review and appeal on law, that encourages accountability and predictability. Review Ladders Transparent Review Ladders maintain the certainty of arbitrariness and that funding decisions are legally subject to challenge.

Access is also increased through integrated referral pathways. Legal Aid Tribunal publications and Practice Standards redirect referrals to Community Law Centres and Citizens Advice Bureau, as examples of how the legal aid operates in a wider service network.

The Legal Needs Survey also reveals how such referral structures are important in defining

[36] PRA 2003, ss 3, 12–15, 24–30, 34–40; PLRC Report, 45–47, 91–97; LSA 2011, ss 51–55, 59–60.

perceived problem resolution. These results dispute the argument that legal aid is neutral and in no way connected with regulatory design. Although the requirements of legal aid might be model-neutral in form, experience in New Zealand indicates the funding thresholds, coverage of fora, protection of confidentiality, and reviewability are the factors that define the practical viability of the statutory protections. Legal architecture therefore functions as structural intermediary between regulative design and remedial lived results.[37]

Risky or non-transferable features

The New Zealand framework has two aspects that should be taken as caution in transplantation. The former is regarding local controls. The signage and brothel location bylaws are authorised under the PRA. Bylaw scope and proportionality controversy and litigation are recorded by the PLRC. The broad local regulatory authority can pose a threat of indirect exclusion in other jurisdictions where the provisions of procedural protection and review are ineffective.

The second is migrant exclusion. Section 19 of the PRA correlates visa status with prohibition of the commercial sexual services and sets up immigration aftermathes to violation. The literature of the source materials shows that the risk of deportation could be one of the factors that discourage reporting and formal dispute involvement among migrant workers. Similar to an existing system of decriminalisation, which transplants structural access deficits regardless of official legality.

Indirect criminalisation may re-emerge too when the licensing burden, discretion in enforcement, or immigration regulations have deterrent effects that are not commensurate to the protective intent of the statute. Experience in New Zealand indicates that doctrinal legality does not mean that a person is not vulnerable unless institutional protection and review are effective.

Reform significance

Combined, the above chapters demonstrate that the evaluation of reform cannot be conducted in the abstract through decriminalisation. In Chapter 3, legal need is shown to be redistributed among various forums instead of abolished, in Chapter 4 legal aid is forum-specific, threshold-

[37] Ministry of Justice (NZ), Legal Aid Practice Standards (2017) 5–6; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Reviewing Legal Aid Decisions (2016) 2; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Access to Justice: Legal Needs Survey Final Report (2024) 127–133; LSA 2011, ss 51–55, 59–60; PRA 2003, s 3.

dependent and filtered by an administrative layer, and in Chapter 5 remedy is shown to be conditional on the institutional availability of these pathways and the possibility of their practical utilization. The comparison should thus be done using access architecture and not statutory label.

In that light, a rights-framing purpose provision, explicit protection of coercion and refusal, and explicitly limited enforcement authority are important since they bring the legal nature of claims in criminal, labour, regulatory, and protective courts under a measure of stabilisation. Those features lessen the danger of taking serious harms as an informal or extra-legal conflict, and facilitate the determination of which procedures ought to be seeking funded representation, review rights, or judicial regulation. The legal-aid analysis also demonstrates why the congruency in the substantive rights and funding design is important. When the bodies that actually adjudicate wage, discrimination, immigration, or local-regulatory conflicts are not covered by forums, or when there are thresholds and review processes so demanding as to navigate, dispersed legal need is relegated to the self-representation or referral attrition or non-use. The design of coverage, eligibility and review thus define whether the rights that are opened by decriminalisation can be executed by the institutions that adjudicate them.

The last institutional condition is the access-to-justice analysis. Sensitivity of confidentiality in service provision, trusted intermediate, and opposition to immigration-related rejection are important since access is not only based on formal right but also on the ability of a claimant to reveal, continue, and demand review without disproportionate risk. It is those features that are likely to travel best which lessen the burden of referral, maintain confidentiality and keep more ordinary remedies institutionally available across the various forums into which the legal need is redistributed through decriminalisation.

Implementation and monitoring implications

The New Zealand structure does not necessitate wholesale redesign to enhance access to justice by sex workers; however, it demands more congruence of substantive and legal-aid provision. Means assessment must be more responsive to non-regular income and unstable records, confidentiality should be an access requirement and not a secondary professional culture, and facilitated-access routes via Community Law Centres and other reputable middlemen should be enhanced.[38]

The New Zealand experience as regards the reforms propositions that decriminalisation is not to be transplanted as a criminal-law change in isolation. Even a rights-based model would involve coercion and refusal protection guaranteed clearly, legal-aid decisions reviewed effectively, coverage to courts most likely to hear labour, discrimination, family, local-regulatory and immigration-related disputes, and delivery of its services in a confidential manner.[39]

Improved tracking is still required as one of the most evident boundaries in the current source base is the lack of a regular journal of the way sex workers circulate under the assistance of funded representation, Community Law Centre support, legal-aid scrutiny, and the various classes of forum. Greater accountability is therefore hinged on information that is privatized about applications, grants, refusals, reconsiderations, debts, referral pathways, and where confidentiality issues or immigration risk break the control.[40]

7. Conclusion

This paper has demonstrated that the decriminalised framework in New Zealand does not remove the need to law but shifts it to new criminal, labour, civil, family, regulatory and immigration channels. Even the official elimination of criminal sanctions is important, yet it does not automatically make remedies equally applicable.[41]

The main theoretical input of the article is the redefinition of legal aid in the framework of the regulatory model instead of a separation of legal aid that is not based on regulation. A combination of the Prostitution Reform Act 2003 and the Legal Services Act 2011 and related guidance will reveal that it is not possible to derive the practical sense of decriminalisation through substantive reform of criminal law in isolation. Its legal implication is in the connection of rights, institutions, procedures and remedies.[42]

[38] LSA 2011, ss 7–11, 20–21, 33–37, 81; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Legal Aid Practice Standards (2017) 4–6; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Do you need to pay back your legal aid?

[39] PRA 2003, ss 3, 16–18, 19, 24–30; LSA 2011, ss 7–11, 51–55, 59–60; PLRC Report, 91–97, 143–146.

[40] Ministry of Justice (NZ), Access to Justice: Legal Needs Survey Final Report (2024) 127–133; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Reviewing Legal Aid Decisions (2016) 1–2; Bennachie (2021) 6, 9.

[41] PRA 2003, ss 3, 12–15, 16–23, 24–30, 34–40; LSA 2011, ss 7–11, 20–21, 33–37, 51–55, 59–60; PLRC Report, 45–47, 57–58, 167–168.

[42] PRA 2003, s 3; LSA 2011, pts 2–3; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Can I get criminal legal aid?; Ministry of Justice

The article is also relevant on the institutional level because it identifies the reasons why the eligibility design, coverage alignment, the practice of confidentiality, reviewability, debt exposure, and trusted referral pathways are important to decriminalisation success. The more limited and solid understanding is that right-based reform is effective only insofar as its access structure renders these rights institutionally accessible.[43]

The source set is not a comprehensive quantitative account of how sex workers utilize all of the appropriate forums, providers, and review mechanisms, and the comparative section does not assert that legal transplantation will produce the same kind of impact in dissimilar institutional settings. Despite such limitations, the main contribution of the article is obvious: the legal meaning of decriminalisation cannot be estimated with references only to the criminal-law reform as the rights become real only in case the legal-aid architecture renders them institutionally accessible and practically applicable.[44]

(NZ), Can I get family or civil legal aid?

[43] LSA 2011, ss 20–21, 33–37, 51–55, 59–60, 81; Ministry of Justice (NZ), Legal Aid Practice Standards (2017) 5–6.

[44] Ministry of Justice (NZ), Access to Justice: Legal Needs Survey Final Report (2024) 127–133; Armstrong (2017) 71–72; Bennachie (2021) 6, 9.

References

[1] *Prostitution Reform Act 2003* (N.Z.). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2003/0028/latest/whole.html

[2] *Legal Services Act 2011* (N.Z.). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2011/0004/latest/whole.html

[3] *Legal Services Regulations 2011* (N.Z.). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/regulation/public/2011/0161/latest/whole.html

[4] *Legal Services Quality Assurance Regulations 2011* (N.Z.).

[5] https://www.legislation.govt.nz/regulation/public/2011/0162/latest/whole.html

[6] *Prostitution (Operator Certificate) Regulations 2003* (N.Z.).

https://www.legislation.govt.nz/regulation/public/2003/0267/latest/whole.html

[7] *Prostitution Reform (Form of Warrants) Regulations 2003* (N.Z.).

https://www.legislation.govt.nz/regulation/public/2003/0250/latest/whole.html

[8] *Health and Safety at Work Act 2015* (N.Z.). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2015/0070/latest/whole.html

[9] *Immigration Act 2009* (N.Z.). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2009/0051/latest/whole.html

[10] *Search and Surveillance Act 2012* (N.Z.). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2012/0024/latest/whole.html

[11] *Human Rights Act 1993* (N.Z.). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1993/0082/latest/whole.html

[12] *Employment Relations Act 2000* (N.Z.). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2000/0024/latest/whole.html

[13] *Accident Compensation Act 2001* (N.Z.). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2001/0049/latest/whole.html

[14] *Social Security Act 2018* (N.Z.). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2018/0032/latest/whole.html

[15] *New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990* (N.Z.). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1990/0109/latest/whole.html

[16] *Family Violence Act 2018* (N.Z.). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2018/0046/latest/whole.html

[17] *Care of Children Act 2004* (N.Z.). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2004/0090/latest/whole.html

[18] *Local Government Act 2002* (N.Z.). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2002/0084/latest/whole.html

[19] *Resource Management Act 1991* (N.Z.). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1991/0069/latest/whole.html

[20] *Crimes Act 1961* (N.Z.). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1961/0043/latest/whole.html

[21] *Privacy Act 2020* (N.Z.). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2020/0031/latest/whole.html

[22] Ministry of Justice (N.Z.), *Report of the Prostitution Law Review Committee on the Operation of the Prostitution Reform Act 2003* (2008). Report of the Prostitution Law Review Committee on the Operation of the Prostitution Reform Act 2003 | Eldis

[23] Ministry of Justice (N.Z.), *Occupational Regulation: Prostitution Reform Act 2003 Review Material*. https://www.justice.govt.nz/justice-sector-policy/regulatory-stewardship/regulatory-systems/occupational-regulation/

[24] Ministry of Justice (N.Z.), *Improving Access to Civil Justice*. https://www.justice.govt.nz/justice-sector-policy/key-initiatives/access-to-civil-justice/

[25] Ministry of Justice (N.Z.), *Frequently Asked Questions: Legal Needs Survey*. Access to Justice Legal Needs Survey General Report https://www.justice.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Publications/Access-to-Justice-Legal-Needs-Survey-Final-Report-October-2024.pdf

[26] Ministry of Justice (N.Z.), *Legal Aid Practice Standards*. https://www.justice.govt.nz/about/lawyers-and-service-providers/legal-aid-lawyers/quality-assurance-framework/legal-aid-practice-standards/

[27] Ministry of Justice (N.Z.), *Ask for a Review of a Legal Aid Decision*. https://www.justice.govt.nz/courts/going-to-court/legal-aid/ask-for-a-review-of-a-legal-aid-decision/

[28] Ministry of Justice (N.Z.), *Grants Handbook*. https://www.justice.govt.nz/about/lawyers-and-service-providers/legal-aid-lawyers/legal-aid-provider-manuals/grants-handbook/

[29] Ministry of Justice (N.Z.), *Legal Aid Complaints Management Policy*. Complaints management | New Zealand Ministry of Justice

[30] Ministry of Justice (N.Z.), *Can I Get Criminal Legal Aid?* https://www.justice.govt.nz/courts/going-to-court/legal-aid/get-legal-aid/can-i-get-criminal-legal-aid/

[31] Ministry of Justice (N.Z.), *Can I Get Family or Civil Legal Aid?* https://www.justice.govt.nz/courts/going-to-court/legal-aid/get-legal-aid/can-i-get-family-or-civil-legal-aid/

[32] Ministry of Justice (N.Z.), *Do You Need to Pay Back Your Legal Aid?* https://www.justice.govt.nz/courts/going-to-court/legal-aid/do-you-need-to-pay-back-your-legal-aid/

[33] Ministry of Justice (N.Z.), *Legal Aid Tribunal*. https://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/legal-aid/legal-aid-tribunal/

[34] New Zealand Prostitutes' Collective, *Decriminalisation of Sex Work in New Zealand*. https://www.nzpc.org.nz/The-New-Zealand-Model

[35] World Health Organization, *Consolidated Guidelines on HIV, Viral Hepatitis and STI Prevention, Diagnosis, Treatment and Care for Key Populations* (2022). https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240052390

[36] World Health Organization, United Nations Population Fund, Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS, Global Network of Sex Work Projects & The World Bank, *Implementing Comprehensive HIV/STI Programmes with Sex Workers: Practical Approaches from Collaborative Interventions* (2013). https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241506182

[37] Amnesty International, *Policy on State Obligations to Respect, Protect and Fulfil the Human Rights of Sex Workers* (2016). Amnesty International policy on state obligations to respect, protect and fulfil the human rights of sex workers - Amnesty International

[38] Open Society Foundations, *Understanding Sex Work in an Open Society* (2016). Understanding Sex Work in an Open Society - Open Society Foundations

[39] Abel, Gillian, Fitzgerald, Lisa & Healy, Catherine (eds.), *Taking the Crime out of Sex Work: New Zealand Sex Workers' Fight for Decriminalisation* (Policy Press, Bristol, 2010).

https://bristoluniversitypressdigital.com/edcollbook/book/9781847423351/9781847423351.xml

[40] Armstrong, Lynzi & Abel, Gillian (eds.), *Sex Work and the New Zealand Model: Decriminalisation and Social Change* (Policy Press, Bristol, 2020). https://bristoluniversitypressdigital.com/edcollbook/book/9781529205770/9781529205770.xml

[41] Weinhold, Claire, *Sex as Work: Decriminalisation and the Management of Brothels in New Zealand* (Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, 2022). https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-031-19260-9

[42] Wahab, Stéphanie & Abel, Gillian, "The Prostitution Reform Act (2003) and Social Work in Aotearoa/New Zealand" 31(4) *Affilia* 418–433 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1177/0886109916647764

[43] Healy, Catherine, Wi-Hongi, Ahi & Hati, Chanel, "It's Work, It's Working: The Integration of Sex Workers and Sex Work in Aotearoa/New Zealand" 31(2) *Women's Studies Journal* 50–60 (2017). https://www.wsanz.org.nz/journal/docs/WSJNZ312HealyWiHongiHati50-60.pdf

[44] Sweetman, Bridie, "The Judicial System and Sex Work in New Zealand" 31(2) *Women's Studies Journal* 61–68 (2017). https://www.wsanz.org.nz/journal/docs/WSJNZ312Sweetman61-68.pdf

[45] Aroney, Eurydice, "Changing Minds and Changing Laws: How New Zealand Sex Workers and Their Allies Shaped Decriminalisation in New Zealand" 18(4) *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 952–967 (2021). https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7987116/

[46] Abel, Gillian M., Fitzgerald, Lisa J. & Brunton, Cheryl, "The Impact of Decriminalisation on the Number of Sex Workers in New Zealand" 38(3) *Journal of Social Policy* 515–531 (2009). https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-social-policy/article/impact-of-decriminalisation-on-the-number-of-sex-workers-in-new-zealand/E5240A985923A0884B2B620973E7410C

[47] Abel, Gillian M., "A Decade of Decriminalization: Sex Work 'Down Under' but Not Underground" 14(5) *Criminology & Criminal Justice* 580–592 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895814523024

[48] Armstrong, Lynzi, "Screening Clients in a Decriminalised Street-Based Sex Industry: Insights into the Experiences of New Zealand Sex Workers" 47(2) *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 207–222 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1177/0004865813510921

[49] Armstrong, Lynzi, "Decriminalisation and the Rights of Migrant Sex Workers in Aotearoa/New Zealand: Making a Case for Change" 31(2) *Women's Studies Journal* 69–76 (2017). https://www.wsanz.org.nz/journal/docs/WSJNZ312Armstrong69-76.pdf

[50] Bennachie, Calum, Pickering, Annah, Lee, Jenny, Macioti, P.G., Mai, Nicola, Fehrenbacher, Anne E., Giametta, Calogero, Hoefinger, Heidi & Musto, Jennifer, "Unfinished Decriminalization: The Impact of Section 19 of the Prostitution Reform Act 2003 on Migrant Sex Workers' Rights and Lives in Aotearoa New Zealand" 10(5) *Social Sciences* 179 (2021). https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci10050179

[51] Armstrong, Lynzi, "Stigma, Decriminalisation, and Violence against Street-Based Sex Workers: Changing the Narrative" 22(7-8) *Sexualities* 1288–1308 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460718780216

[52] Armstrong, Lynzi, "Decriminalisation of Sex Work in the Post-Truth Era? Strategic Storytelling in Neo-Abolitionist Accounts of the New Zealand Model" 21(3) *Criminology & Criminal Justice* 369–386 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895820918898

[53] New Zealand Law Society, *Legal Aid*. NZLS | Common legal issues

[54] Community Law, *Legal Aid*. https://communitylaw.org.nz/community-law-manual/test/legal-aid/

[55] Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, *Sex Workers*. A guide on the human rights of sex workers | OHCHR