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Preparation of this document

This document is the proceedings of a workshop organized by the Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) on assessing the feasibility and sustainability of establishing a regional shellfish hatchery for the Wider Caribbean. The workshop, held in Kingston, Jamaica, from 18 to 21 October 2011 was a direct result of the interest expressed by the Caribbean Governments in assessing the potential for this shared facility for native species. The concept was recommended in several previous regional meetings, and the current document presents a more thorough assessment of government interests, needs and culture potential for native shellfish species.

The document discusses the concept of a regional shellfish hatchery for the Wider Caribbean, provides available information on aquaculture of shellfish species native to the Region and summarizes the discussions and recommendations put forth during the workshop. It is written for the benefit of those who are interested in pursuing the establishment of such a shared facility and as a support document for the development of the aquaculture sector in the Wider Caribbean. Recommendations are given with great detail; more specifically, the preliminary 5-year plan outline provides the rationale and level of detail required for the development of a business plan, necessary to the securing of funds for the implementation of the regional facility. All recommendations were made by the representatives of the Caribbean Governments participating at the workshop and truly reflect the prioritized interests and needs of the Region.

It is hoped that this document will serve to engage governments and raise the political will required for aquaculture development in the Region, as well as provide the basis and leverage for securing financial support from international agencies and/or private donors.

This document was prepared under the supervision of Alessandro Lovatelli, Aquaculture Officer, Aquaculture Service (FIRA), Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Workshop discussions and recommendations were synthesized by Samia Sarkis, Project Coordinator (FAO consultant). The market review was completed by Helga Josupeit, Fishery Industry Officer, Products, Trade and Marketing Service (FIPM) of the FAO Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, based on a preliminary report commissioned to INFOPESCA (Montevideo, the Eastern Republic of Uruguay). The overview of shellfish species native to the Wider Caribbean was compiled by LeRoy Creswell (University of Florida Sea Grant). All technical papers were written by the experts themselves. Translations into Spanish of the abstracts for each paper and of the workshop summary were made by Nely Serrano (the Republic of Panama) and Adriana Luz Velasco (the Republic of Colombia).
Abstract

Caribbean aquaculture production accounts for less than one percent of the world’s aquaculture and culture efforts are directed mainly towards non-native species such as tilapia. This situation, where the application of foreign culture operations using exotic species predominates, may entail potentially irreversible environmental impacts. It is recognized that the growth of the aquaculture sector in the Caribbean Region is due in part to the lack of technical expertise, infrastructure, capital investment and human resources. The pooling of resources among countries is proposed through the establishment of a regional facility. For this reason, the establishment of a “regional shellfish hatchery” focusing on native species is assessed based on the interest of Caribbean countries, the culture potential of native species and the available technical knowledge on identified target species.

The engagement of the governments of the Region in the development of a regional shellfish hatchery concept was first assessed through a brief questionnaire distributed by the Aquaculture Service (FIRA), Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) to 33 countries in 2009. Responses were received from 21 countries. Of these, 11 are islands of the Caribbean, while the other ten are continental countries bordering the Caribbean Sea. Of the total number of responses received, 14 expressed a definite interest in the concept. The responses confirmed the dominance of exotic species cultured and the overall interest in investigating the culture of native molluscan species. A list of 22 target species was drawn based on responses from the countries of the Region, including gastropods, crustaceans, bivalves (scallop, clams, oyster and mussels), echinoderms (three species of sea urchins) and one cephalopod (the common octopus). Sea cucumbers were added to this list at a later date due to the strong interest expressed by a number of participants.

A first insight into the current and potential demand for targeted native species was obtained through the assessment of the market demand and supply in the island countries of the Caribbean. The annual per capita total seafood consumption for the 18 countries investigated in the market study averages 10.8 kg and mollusc consumption itself averaged 0.5 kg per capita in 2007 or 18 817 tonnes in live weight equivalent per year. It appears that, although shellfish species are not generally associated with high consumption by locals in the Caribbean at present, the trend for mollusc consumption (other than cephalopod) is positive in many countries; this, coupled with tourism consumption, suggests the potential for an increased demand in shellfish/molluscan species and a potential niche for native species.

A number of issues associated with the development of a regional hatchery facility have been identified and require careful consideration. Based on this, four main topics were discussed in details: 1) prioritizing target species as culture candidates; 2) establishing operational hatchery protocols; 3) selecting a suitable site; 4) ensuring sustainability based on a sound business plan; and 5) funding the implementation and operation of the regional hatchery. Interested Caribbean Governments gathered in Jamaica (18–21 October 2010) to address these issues; ten governments were represented from island and bordering countries discussing possibilities based on information provided by experts of the Region. Five key recommendations emerged from this workshop, providing the framework for the implementation of a regional facility. These are:
Recommendation 1 – Select culture candidates from target species identified, prioritizing candidates on the basis of culture know-how, market value, market demand and availability of broodstock. The recommended strategy is the culture of mangrove oyster and lion’s paw scallop as first candidates for culture, but market volume must be assessed prior to production. Once production and sales of both species are established, effort into pearl oyster culture and development of local culture-based fishery for the West Indian top shell, sea egg urchin and selected sea cucumbers may be initiated.

Recommendation 2 – Establish operation protocols in consideration of population level genetics, and prevention of pathogen and disease proliferation during transfers of shipment of living aquatic organisms (i.e. seed material).

Recommendation 3 – Careful thought must be given to the selection of a site for a regional hatchery facility, as it is critical to the success of aquaculture development in the Region. Site selection must be based on current and potential government support, existing infrastructure, ease of access, occurrence of targeted shellfish species, environmental health, technical support and protection from natural disasters.

Recommendation 4 – The sustainability of the regional shellfish hatchery requires consideration of its long-term profitability, by identifying key points for its sustainability and developing a minimum 5-year business plan. The operation of a regional facility needs to be treated as a business with a well-defined breakeven point and time at which it becomes financially self-sustainable and viable.

Recommendation 5 – Promote the regional hatchery concept through dissemination of information, targeting senior civil servants and politicians.

In conclusion, the governments participating at the FAO-funded feasibility Workshop were supportive of the regional hatchery concept and agreed on the objectives of such a facility. A steering group was formed, representing the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department, the Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism (CRFM) and well-respected aquaculturists, tasked with: i) promoting the concept of the regional hatchery at the ministerial level; and ii) coordinating efforts of individual countries to work towards a regional goal.

Furthermore, potential funding agencies for the implementation of a regional facility were identified and need to be approached with a business proposal for implementation of the proposed regional shellfish hatchery facility.

Lovatelli, A.; Sarkis, S.
A regional shellfish hatchery for the Wider Caribbean: Assessing its feasibility and sustainability.
FAO Regional Technical Workshop. 18–21 October 2010, Kingston, Jamaica.
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Workshop summary

WORKSHOP BACKGROUND
The feasibility study for the establishment of a regional shellfish/mollusc hatchery in the Wider Caribbean, focusing on the production of native species, was funded by the Aquaculture Service (FIRA), Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). The study addresses the need for pooling of resources among Caribbean countries to ensure the development of sustainable aquaculture in the Region. The assessment of the feasibility of developing and successfully implementing such a facility was conducted by participating Caribbean Governments and experts of the Region during a 4-day workshop held in Kingston, Jamaica, from 18 to 21 October 2010. The objectives of the workshop, aiming to achieve the overarching goal of the study, were the following:

- Presentation of the concept to governments of the Wider Caribbean Region (see map in Annex 3).
- Evaluation of the long-term aquaculture commitment by the governments in the Region.
- Assessment of the local market demand for native molluscan/shellfish species.
- Identification of potential candidate species and sites for a regional hatchery.
- Identification of criteria for a sustainable regional hatchery facility.

The proposed regional shellfish/mollusc hatchery is a response to the slow growth of the aquaculture sector in the Wider Caribbean Region. Caribbean aquaculture production accounts for less than one percent of the world’s aquaculture and culture efforts are mainly directed towards non-native species such as tilapia. This situation, where the application of culture operations using exotic species predominates, may entrain potentially irreversible environmental impacts. For this reason, the opportunities to develop the aquaculture sector in a sustainable manner by focusing on native species and pooling resources through the development of a regional hatchery are addressed. In this way, constraints in technical expertise, infrastructure, lack of capital investment and human resources for the development of aquaculture in the Region are taken into account. These limitations have been recognized by many Caribbean Governments and render difficult for any one country to establish a national hatchery facility. This had led to similar recommendations in previous workshops, as noted in the proceedings of the Latin American and Caribbean Workshop on regional bivalve aquaculture (ACUIBIVA) held in Puerto Montt, Republic of Chile, in 2007 which was promoted and organized by FAO.

A regional molluscan/shellfish hatchery would:

- Favour the development of aquaculture by centralizing specific efforts and resources.
- Support a team skilled in the culture (and research) of native/endemic species.
- Enable the distribution of certified commercial seed to interested farming parties.
- Provide technical support for farming grow-out.

It is acknowledged that there have been previous efforts to promote aquaculture in the Region, initiated in the 1980s specifically for the Small Island Developing States (SIDS) of the Lesser Antilles. This was followed by the FAO-Aquila II project
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encompassing Latin America and the Caribbean in 1993, recognizing the different potentials for aquaculture development in the Region. Subsequently, in cooperation with the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), institutional strengthening and increased cooperation among regional institutions was proposed through the Caribbean Aquaculture Development project (CARAD). Although much relevant information was obtained from these efforts, little has been implemented, due in part to funding and lack of human resources. Currently, there are few regional efforts in aquaculture, which may additionally support the concept of the current proposed facility including the Aquaculture Network for the Americas (ANA).

It is well recognized that the engagement of the Caribbean countries, including the Wider Caribbean, is critical to the success of aquaculture development and has been reported by FAO on several occasions including following a Working Group Meeting in the Bahamas (1981)\textsuperscript{2}, Saint Lucia (2003)\textsuperscript{3} and more recently in a Latin American and Caribbean Working Group Meeting in the Republic of Panama (2005)\textsuperscript{4} on the development of aquaculture and regional cooperation.

For this reason, the level of interest and long-term commitment of the Wider Caribbean Governments was assessed within the scope of the current study through a brief questionnaire. A targeted questionnaire was designed and distributed by the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department in 2009 to 33 countries in the Region along with an explanatory letter outlining the proposed regional hatchery concept. It was hoped this would provide a better understanding of the existing aquaculture activities (both commercial and research), in terms of the species cultured, the limitations in further development, the interest and constraints in culturing native species and, most importantly, the response of governments to the concept of a regional hatchery. Responses were received from 21 countries (63 percent of questionnaires sent). Of the total number of responses received, only two countries showed a lack of interest in the concept (9.5 percent), five were uncertain and required further information (23.8 percent), and 14 expressed a definite interest in the concept (66.7 percent). Additionally, three governments offered their country as the site of the future regional hatchery.

In light of the positive response obtained from a number of the Caribbean Governments, the Jamaica Workshop (18–21 October 2010) was organized, addressing the concerns and issues raised within the questionnaire, to investigate fully the feasibility of the development of a regional shellfish/mollusc hatchery.

The current report provides all the information, conclusions and recommendations compiled during the evaluation of participating Caribbean Governments, resulting in a report on the potential for the development and sustainability of a Wider Caribbean Shellfish Hatchery for native species.

**WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES AND APPROACH**

The **overarching goal** of the Workshop was to confirm the commitment of participating Caribbean countries in the development of a regional shellfish/mollusc hatchery for the Region, and to engage all participants in the implementation of this


facility by evaluating issues raised and providing solutions relating to the sustainability of such an operation. The 4-day workshop comprised presentations by experts of the Region, providing background information, followed by working group discussions on specific issues. The Agenda of the workshop appears in full in Annex 1. A total of ten Caribbean Governments attended the workshop, represented by senior fisheries and aquaculture officers listed in Annex 2.

The approach of the Workshop was to address the needs and interests put forth by the Caribbean Governments resulting from the FAO 2009 survey mentioned (Annex 4 provides the original letter and questionnaire along with a synopsis of the responses submitted to FAO). In order to enable more informed discussions by participants, relevant technical and biological background information was provided by resource persons at the onset of the workshop. This includes the following:

- Given the interest expressed for specific native species as potential culture candidates, regional knowledge was compiled and shared through presentations. More specifically, information on culture techniques, facility requirements and seed source was provided. Additionally, an overview of native molluscan species was given for the Region and a first target species list was drafted based on suggestions from Caribbean Governments. Annex 5 provides the full list of the species suggested.
- Several governments expressed interest in having their country as the site for the proposed regional hatchery; presentations by these governments on the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed sites provide the basis for further discussion on site selection.
- Conclusions and recommendations of a market study, commissioned as part of this feasibility study, were presented at the workshop. It is recognized that successful commercial aquaculture is closely linked to market demand and that knowledge of current and potential market demand is critical for the prioritizing of target species as initial culture candidates. The market study focuses on native shellfish species demand in the island countries of the Caribbean. Incorporating the bordering countries, comprising the Wider Caribbean, was beyond the available time frame. The full study is reproduced in this report as one of the contributed papers.

A compilation of the native molluscan/shellfish species of the Wider Caribbean Region indicates the occurrence of 37 species including gastropods, crustaceans, bivalves (scallops, clams, oysters and mussels), echinoderms and cephalopod (the common octopus) (see Annex 5). Of these, 22 species were identified by the Caribbean Governments as target species for aquaculture (see Annex 5). Sea cucumber was added at a later date due to the strong interest expressed by a number of participants at the Jamaica Workshop. Information for all native species on population distribution, and what is referred to as the “culture potential” specifying level of knowledge on techniques, growth rate and market demand, is given for each species.

Specific issues, raised by the Caribbean Governments, were addressed within small working groups, maximizing the input of all participants. These include the identification and prioritization of potential culture candidates, criteria for site selection and for sustainable operation of the regional facility. For each of the planned round table sessions, specific questions outlined in the terms of reference provided guidance to the working groups for discussion. Following this, a short report was produced for each session by each group. The terms of reference specific to each round table and the summary of the working group outputs are reproduced in Annexes 6 and 7, respectively, and are the basis of the recommendations made at the Workshop for the establishment of the proposed regional shellfish/mollusc hatchery.

Finally, funding needs and opportunities for implementation of a regional hatchery was addressed. The working group discussions led to the drafting of a 5-year plan
for the proposed facility; it includes a first evaluation of the time required to first production and sale, and subsequently, to ensure a sustainable production. In short, the 5-year plan presented provides the basis for a business plan and leads to a better understanding of the funding required. Representatives of the CARICOM Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism (GCFM), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and FAO were present at the Workshop to assist in exploring potential funding opportunities.

WORKSHOP RECOMMENDATIONS

A number of issues associated with the development of a regional hatchery facility have been identified and require careful consideration. Based on this, four main topics were discussed in details:

1. Prioritizing target species as culture candidates.
2. Establishing operational hatchery protocols.
3. Selecting a suitable site.
4. Ensuring sustainability based on a sound business plan.
5. Funding the implementation and operation of the regional hatchery.

All of the above issues were discussed at depth by working groups at the Workshop. The reports of all the working groups are documented and given in Annex 7 of this document. The key recommendations emerging from these reports and addressing the five issues above are given below.

Note: The following recommendations reflect the discussions of the Caribbean Government representatives at the Workshop in Jamaica and approved by the participants. They may not represent the views of all governments of the Region nor reflect final decisions with regards to the establishment of a regional shellfish/mollusc hatchery in the Wider Caribbean. These recommendations are subject to modifications as dictated by new findings, changes in government engagements and funding availability. They do not exclude recommendations made at a later date during the more comprehensive process of implementation.

Recommendation 1 – Select culture candidates from target species identified, prioritizing candidates on the basis of culture know-how, market value, market demand and availability of broodstock. The recommended strategy is the culture of mangrove oyster and lion’s paw scallop as first candidates for culture, but market volume must be assessed prior to production. Once production and sales of both species are established, effort into pearl oyster culture and development of local culture-based fishery for West Indian top shell, sea egg urchin and sea cucumber may be initiated.

A. Of immediate concern is the demonstration of success in culturing and selling native shellfish species to production volumes satisfying existing and potential market demands. There are several target species for which culture techniques are well known and ready to be adapted, especially for bivalve species (oysters and scallops). These should be the first to be considered. Furthermore, production volume is dependent on the market value and demand of each species – where some may have a low market value but a high volume demand while others a smaller volume demand but higher market value. The following target species were selected as top culture candidates for a regional hatchery:

- Mangrove oyster, \textit{Crassostrea rhizophorae} – a low market value species, but potentially commanding a high volume demand.
- Pearl oyster, \textit{Pinctada imbricata}, for pearl production – a high market value species with a smaller market niche and lower volume demand.
- Lion’s paw scallop, \textit{Nodipecten nodosus} – a high market value species, with a more specialized market niche than the mangrove oyster and possibly a lower volume demand.
• West Indian top shell, *Cittarium pica* – a traditionally fished species with a high local fishery value (both cultural and economic). Seed production for stock enhancement was recommended.

• Sea egg, *Tripneustes ventricosus* – a high value urchin species notably for the export market. Seed production for enhancing local fishery was recommended.

• Sea cucumber is considered worthy of consideration given the current exploitation levels and its demand in the Asian market.

Culture techniques for the mangrove oyster and the Lion’s paw scallop are well known and ready to be adapted. The culture techniques for the pearl oyster can be adapted from those well known of the same genus. Culture species for full market size individuals of West Indian top shell, sea egg and sea cucumber require a phase of research. It should be noted that for sea urchins, commercial-scale culture for cogenetic species exists in other regions, namely in Asia, the techniques of which can be adapted to Caribbean species.

B. Limited market demand information is currently available for several of the countries interested in the regional hatchery concept. In order to ensure sustainability of the proposed regional facility, it is imperative that it is treated as a business and is established to ensure profitability and long-term sustainability. For this reason, market studies focusing on the selected species within the partner countries are considered a requirement in order to determine the volume of production and to enable the development of an accurate business plan. More specifically, it is recommended that:

• A comprehensive market study covering the Wider Caribbean and other regional markets is conducted for the regional assessment of mangrove oyster and lion’s paw volume demand prior to development of the regional facility.

• The potential demand for regional pearl oyster production is evaluated.

• Current imports and exports, including existing regulations and potential trade constraints, of West Indian top shell and sea egg to and from the Region are assessed.

C. The identification of constraints to the culture of selected top candidates is a critical component of the strategy adopted by the regional hatchery. Although pearl oyster and sea cucumber culture are attractive and potentially lucrative species, limitations in the culture development of these species need to be addressed in the context of sustainability of the regional hatchery. The main constraints identified were as follows:

• Pearl oyster culture – lack of tradition in the Region and a subsequent lack of available skill and possibly interest in developing this type of aquaculture.

• Sea cucumber – culture techniques require further research for Caribbean species.

**Recommendation 2 – Establish operation protocols in consideration of population level genetics, and prevention of pathogen and disease proliferation during transfers of shipment of living aquatic organisms (i.e. seed material).**

A. Of immediate concern to the development of the regional facility where broodstock are collected from sources other than the hatchery itself, and spat shipped to various client countries, is the dilution of gene pool and loss of species biodiversity, along with the accidental introduction of diseases and pathogens with live shipments. Additionally, the rotation of broodstock within the hatchery needs to be considered in the long-term, to maximize the gene pool of juveniles/spat produced. Operation protocols can be established to ensure species biodiversity and prevent introduction of diseases. These must be strictly adhered to. The following are required actions for the establishment of a sustainable regional hatchery facility:
• Population level genetic study among stocks of targeted species in the Caribbean Region.
• Evaluation of “health” of stock, assessing pathogens and potential diseases.
• Broodstock for spawning at the regional hatchery is collected from population assessed as most healthy and of the same genetic make-up as that of selected grow-out sites.
• Standard guidelines based on Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) criteria should be followed for control of broodstock and spat shipped to and from the regional hatchery.
• Quarantine for incoming broodstock – its duration needs to be determined. The quarantine area should be isolated from the rest of the facility and its effluent collected and treated. A recirculating system should be established for the quarantine area.
• Diluting the gene pool in the hatchery – the extent to which this can be conducted depends on the ease of broodstock collection and availability to the hatchery.
• Broodstock conditioning – especially required if collected from a site distant from the regional hatchery.

B. The authorizing body of the regional hatchery, its goals and responsibility need to be ascertained, in order to ensure its smooth operation. Rules and regulations of the regional facility need to be in accordance with host country legislation and other relevant regional/international regulations on the production and trade of specific marine organisms. With respect to the goals of the proposed regional hatchery facility, the provision of juveniles/spat and a pool of expertise offering technical services should be supplemented with the development of research and development (R&D) and training for potential client. This would expand the role of the regional facility to that of a “business incubator for the Region”. Furthermore, the sustainability of the facility depends on the success of recipient countries in growing and selling the product. For this reason, the activities of the regional hatchery facility need to include a training component made available to recipient/partner countries. It was recommended that:

• The government of the country hosting the regional facility is the authority establishing and enforcing the regulations for the hatchery. However, certification on the health of shipments should be conducted by a laboratory or veterinarian. Criteria for certification needs to be defined and should be of international standard.
• Training of growers at the regional facility enabled by the presence of a pilot grow-out operation is an important component of the activities of the regional hatchery.
• Technical support will be provided when requested for transporting, acclimating and initiating grow-out of spat, if requested. This service will be an extra charge and revenue to the regional facility.
• The regional hatchery is responsible for providing disease-free spat, and shipping in optimal conditions, with all export documentation provided.
• It is critical that the time at which growers become responsible for spat and the regional hatchery relieved of its functions is well defined between the regional facility and recipient/partner countries.

Recommendation 3 – Careful thought must be given to the selection of a site for a regional hatchery facility, as it is critical to the success of aquaculture development in the Region. Site selection must be based on current and potential government support, existing infrastructure, ease of access, occurrence of targeted shellfish species, environmental health, technical support and protection from natural disasters.
Note: Based on the information made available at the FAO Workshop, the following recommendations are made, but do not exclude the consideration of other countries not mentioned here.

- The following countries are put forth as worthy of consideration as potential sites for the regional facility: Jamaica, the Republic of Colombia, Belize, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, the Republic of Panama, the Republic of Haiti, and the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago.
- The most promising countries from the list above are, according to working groups: Jamaica, the Republic of Colombia, and the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago.
  - Jamaica offers an undeveloped government-owned site, currently used for grow-out of mangrove oysters. The design and construction of a facility accommodating staff, visiting experts and trainees would be necessary as the location is remote. Population distribution and occurrence of target species, other than mangrove oyster, is required, as well as environmental assessment of the water column.
  - The Republic of Colombia offers a functional mollusc hatchery within the boundaries of a university. Current production focuses on native scallop species, reaching 10 mm seed in a 2.5-month cycle (100,000 units). Expansion to accommodate regional target production for selected species will be required. Approval by the university authorities and confirmation of government support will be needed for the achievement of regional hatchery goals. Assessment of proximity of human impact and future development to hatchery needs to be determined.
  - Further information and government commitment is required for the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago.
  - Belize and the Republic of Panama are worthy of consideration as government support exists and both countries have a history of aquaculture with an ease of access to the remaining countries of the Region.

Recommendation 4 – The sustainability of the regional shellfish hatchery requires consideration of its long-term profitability, by identifying key points for its sustainability and developing a minimum 5-year business plan. The operation of a regional facility needs to be treated as a business with a well-defined breakeven point and time at which it becomes financially self-sustainable and viable.

A. The sustainability of a regional shellfish/mollusc hatchery depends on strategic location of the facility, production strategy, access to markets, balancing multiple objectives, finances and engagement of the partner countries. More specifically:
  - Location of the hatchery itself should facilitate ease of movement of seed and broodstock.
  - Identification of broodstock collection sites, dependent on population level genetic assessment, are required for estimating broodstock supply costs.
  - Initial focus on a low market value/high demand species and high market value/lower volume species with well-known and well-tested culture techniques is recommended.
  - Identification of markets and marketing required for sale of product.
  - Balancing commercial production and research. Research should only be initiated once production is stable and should be supported through grant funding. Funding for research from hatchery can only be allocated if all operating costs are covered by revenue.
  - Financial contribution of participating countries is required initially and for continued research.
  - Government support at ministerial level and political will needs to be secured for engagement of partner countries.
B. Several factors will affect the outcome of the business plan; namely, the characteristics of the site selected, the extent to which infrastructure is required during the various phases of the plan, the culture characteristics of the target species and the goals of the hatchery as they evolve over time and with experience. A five-to-six-year business plan with associated budget should be developed following site selection, and can be based on a 3-month production cycle (from spawning to spat) and on a multiple objective facility (including commercial production, training of the private sector, research into new species and production for stock enhancement). The following strategy is recommended for the infrastructure and operation of a regional facility:

- A regional hatchery should be phased, following a modular concept, enabling the expansion of the facility as production increases. Pumping facility needs to be built to maximum capacity, but larval/post-larval and algal culture facilities will be added on throughout a 6-year period.
- A core staff of five is recommended for the operation of the facility (skilled aquaculturists for larvae, post-larvae and algae; casual labour for grow-out and maintenance; administration).
- Additional external but easily available expertise of veterinarian, water chemists is also required. Security staff may be a consideration dependent on site.
- Staff should be trained overseas and on-site.
- Funding of the hatchery should come from multiple sources:
  - Initial funding for the first six years is required from external agencies and partner countries.
  - Sale of product (seed and market size individuals) should start providing revenue in Year-4.
  - Technical support and services to growers will be a paid service, providing revenue starting Year-3.
  - Government subsidies and scientific grants for aquaculture development – namely research into new species and/or development of local fishery – should cover the costs of the non-commercial component of the hatchery and be partial revenue to the facility starting Year-6.

C. A 5-year plan is to be defined, based on the guidelines above, resulting in a proposal submitted to external agencies for funding in the order of USD 3–5 million. A memorandum of understanding between governments of the Region partnering on this venture is required, and commitment from the governments should include the commitment to purchase seed from the hatchery and financial support to enable aquaculture development in their country. Revenue from sale of seed, market size and from training services should be generated starting Year-3. Operational costs of hatchery should be covered by direct revenue following the initial 5-year time frame. Government subsidies should continue for research and development of new species, and assistance to local fisheries by providing spat and technical support for stock enhancement of target species. Based on this strategy, a 5-year plan consisting of the following phases is recommended:

- **Phase 1: Inception** – Details of actions required, promotion of facility, funding proposals and securing government support.
- **Phase 2: Infrastructure** – Design and construction of facility, approvals, permits and consultation and equipment purchase.
- **Phase 3: Engagement of stakeholders and securing staff and broodstock** – Establish partnership with countries for broodstock collection and shipping; developing collection protocols and assessing population level genetic for target species. Recruitment of core hatchery staff and project staff. Training of regional hatchery staff; two-way training/overseas and on-hatchery site.
Workshop summary

• **Phase 4:** *Pilot production* – Larval and post-larval culture in hatchery; preliminary grow-out; establishing seed transportation and farming protocols for interested countries; exploring the market with products.

• **Phase 5:** *Providing training product* – Full technical services to private sector for grow-out of product, including on-site hatchery training; marketing of product; increased production of seed.

• **Phase 6:** *Full production* – Expanding hatchery and increasing production of bivalves; investigating new species; assisting in development of local fishery for target species; increased grow-out for training and sale of seed and market size individuals; completing all protocols; development of coordinating office for sale, training and shipping; define and agree on future (post-project) legal status of the hatchery.

**Recommendation 5** – Promote the regional hatchery concept through dissemination of information, targeting senior civil servants and politicians.

A steering group should be formed to promote the concept, engage interested parties, outline actions required and enable their implementation. The executive summary stemming from the FAO workshop should lead to the drafting and publication of a ministerial brief for the dissemination of information to governments of the Region. A regional technical cooperation project (TCP) drafted by interested governments of the Region is recommended as an initial step for the establishment of a regional hatchery.

**RECOMMENDED CULTURE CANDIDATES**

Previous efforts to promote aquaculture in the Wider Caribbean have been numerous. First initiated in the 1980s for the Small Island Developing States (SIDS) of the Lesser Antilles, followed by the FAO-Aquila II project (Latin America and the Caribbean, 1993), and CARAD (Caribbean Aquaculture Development Project). Little implementation followed these efforts due to lack of resources and engagement of the Caribbean countries.

Based on information from the Caribbean Governments, exotic species support more commercial operations than native species. However, 32 records of investigations and experimental-scale culture on native species were made by governments of the Region, indicating an interest in pursuing this type of aquaculture development. Several native shellfish species have known culture techniques and the culture potential of recommended target species is summarized below:

**Mangrove cupped oyster** – Commercial culture of the mangrove oysters, *Crassostrea rhizophorae*, is practised in the Republic of Cuba and Jamaica. The first commercial oyster farm in the Republic of Cuba began operating in 1975. FAO statistics record 1 571 tonnes of mangrove oyster production in 2008 by the Republic of Cuba. The Government of Jamaica initiated a mangrove oyster culture project in 1977 to determine its feasibility and ensure a constant supply of oysters. This led to the establishment of the Jamaica “Oyster Culture Unit” in 1980 for the operation of pilot farms and extension services. FAO statistics record one tonne of mangrove oyster
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production in 2001, and no records since, although the Oyster Culture Unit still functions promoting mangrove oyster culture. Although not recorded in FAO statistics, commercial production of the species has also been conducted in the past in the Republic of Colombia, attaining 10 tonnes per year for a period of three years. Current production is minimal only continued by a few fishermen.

Mangrove oyster culture techniques are well known, using a low cost grow-out production system and simple techniques, relatively easy to transfer to the private sector. Due to the gregarious nature of the species, oysters can be grown in high density, facilitating culture during all stages. Time to market size is six months, and a rapid turnover from spawning makes this species advantageous for hatchery production. Its cost of production is relatively low, and processing costs are minimal as it is served on the half shell on the local market. Current market price for mangrove oysters in Jamaica is equivalent to USD 0.10/piece.

The mangrove oyster is one of the bivalves traditionally consumed in the Caribbean. Regional market demand for the species exists, reflected by sale of product in both the Republic of Cuba and Jamaica, but also by natural harvest of the species recorded in the Dominican Republic, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and the Republic of Colombia, reaching approximately 1 600 tonnes in 2008 (FAO statistics).

Finally, the regional culture of the species is facilitated by the natural occurrence of its populations throughout the Caribbean, extending south to the Federative Republic of Brazil. To date, aquaculture of the species has relied on wild spat collection, and therefore, subject to human development impacts and associated pollution. The need for hatchery-supplied seed was expressed, and would ensure a constant supply of oysters in the Region.

**Lion’s paw scallop** – Scallops in general are a highly prized seafood product and the lion’s paw scallop, *Nodipecten nodosus*, is one of the largest reaching up to 18 cm in shell length. This species has considerable culture potential due to its fast growth rate and high market value associated with a large adductor muscle, highly appreciated by consumers. Culture techniques are well known and well tested for all stages of its life cycle. Commercial culture to market size for the species was recently initiated by the private sector in Brazil, using juveniles from a government hatchery. In 2009, production in the Federative Republic of Brazil approximated 20 tonnes.

The world scallop trade concentrates on two main importing markets: the United States of America and Europe. There are no records of culture or harvest of the species in the insular Caribbean, attributed to the fact that it is not a species traditionally consumed locally. This may be attributed to its naturally occurring low-density population levels. For this reason, hatchery production for juveniles is necessary to the constant supply of this species as a seafood product. Based on these facts, it is probable that the lion’s paw scallop market in the insular Caribbean would target the tourism sector in the Region, rather than the domestic market. Based on seafood consumption and import data, the following island Caribbean countries, demonstrate a potential native scallop market demand: Antigua and Barbuda, the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, Bermuda, the Dominican Republic, Turks and Caicos and Grenada. With regards to the bordering countries of the Caribbean, the lion’s paw scallop is considered a delicacy, where market demand in higher end restaurants and hotels exists, associated with a high market price (USD 12–15/dozen in the Federative Republic of Brazil).
The regional culture of the species is facilitated by the natural occurrence of the species, recorded from North Carolina (United States of America) to the Federative Republic of Brazil, enabling collection of broodstock from various sites.

**Pearl oyster** – The pearl oysters, *Pinctada imbricata*, can be cultured for their meat and/or for the production of pearls. Traditionally not consumed in the Caribbean Region, pearls should be the main product for this type of aquaculture. Although, there is a lack of tradition in pearl culture in the Region, there is a history of pearl harvest on the Caribbean coast of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and the Republic of Colombia. It is most probable that a high market potential exists in the Caribbean Region, targeting the tourism sector. The constraints lie in the absence of a pearl producer sector and the need to create a small industry with a certain level of skill. However, pearl farming can be done on a range of economic levels, ranging from family-type business to larger commercial-scale enterprises.

This species has been cultured experimentally and culture techniques can be adapted from those known for other species. Time to pearl production is approximately 2.5 years.

The species is widely distributed in the Caribbean Region, ranging from Bermuda, North Carolina (United States of America) to the Federative Republic of Brazil, facilitating its regional culture. The species is very abundant on the northeastern coast of South America, forming dense banks in the Caribbean Sea. Harvest of pearl oysters was recorded at a maximum of 71 tonnes in 2008, targeted for its meat.

**West Indian top shell** – The culture of the West Indian top shell, *Cittarium pica*, has been conducted at the experimental level and demonstrated an ease of culture to juvenile size. Research is further required for optimizing techniques to market size. Interest is expressed by regional governments, as both its meat and shell command a relatively high price. The species is a popular food item in many of the Caribbean islands, with a reported value approximating USD 40 for approximately 2 kg of meat in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. The shell is highly prized in the Asian market with a heavy demand put on certain Wider Caribbean countries for supply. Based on this preliminary information, the culture of the West Indian top shell in this Region would result in targeting a local market for meat and an export market for the shell.

In addition, interest expressed by the insular Caribbean Governments on the transfer of hatchery-reared juveniles for enhancing natural populations and supporting the local fishery is high. Although the species has a natural distribution occurring throughout the Caribbean, from Bermuda to the South American Caribbean coast, its populations have been declining due to overexploitation. It is thought that hatchery production of juveniles would assist the re-establishment of healthy populations, which could potentially be managed and fished for supply to the local and export markets.
It is a species protected under local legislation in some of the Caribbean countries, warranting consideration for transport of broodstock and juveniles between a regional hatchery and client countries.

**Sea egg** – The sea egg urchin, *Tripneustes ventricosus*, is harvested in the Lesser Antilles for local consumption. FAO statistics report 10 tonnes of harvest per year for Martinique for sea urchins in general. There is no commercial culture operation recorded in the Caribbean, however, sea urchin culture is a well-established industry in Japan, the People’s Republic of China and other Asian countries, New Zealand, Canada, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and in several Scandinavian countries. Techniques for early life stages are well tested, but production costs for growing market size individuals are high. For this reason, the optimal strategy is the production of hatchery-reared juveniles and transfer to the natural environment for fishery enhancement. Further research is required for optimizing strategy and culture techniques for this species at a regional level.

The sea egg is distributed throughout the Caribbean Sea and along the coasts of Central and South America. However, due to a number of factors, both natural and man-made, the species is uncommon from the US Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico and Jamaica to the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. It is found mostly in the Lesser Antilles, Saint Lucia, Barbados, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. Its low population levels in some areas may be a limiting factor to obtaining wild broodstock for spawning at a regional facility. Furthermore, local legislation protecting the species may hinder transport of broodstock and/or juveniles among the regional facility and client countries.

**Four-sided sea cucumber** – The four-sided sea cucumber, *Isostichopus badionotus*, is one of the most highly commercial species of sea cucumbers in the Wider Caribbean Region; others include *Holothuria mexicana* and *Astichopus multifidus*. Sea cucumbers trigger an increasing interest in the world markets, highly prized in the Asian market as it is regarded as a tonic and luxury seafood product. It is a large species, growing to 45 cm in length. The Republic of Cuba and the United Mexican States have regulated fishing activities on *Isostichopus* species; the Republic of Panama and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela also have records of previous fishing activity. FAO records for the Cuban four-sided sea cucumber fishery indicate a decline in harvest from 3 million sea cucumbers in 1999 to <500 000 in 2003. Prices range from USD 6 per kg to USD 22 per kg in 2003, dependent on the product. The species is considered threatened, as its populations are declining due to overexploitation and lack of regulations for harvest. In some countries, a total ban on sea cucumber fishery has been put in effect and this would be a consideration to the operation of a regional facility.

The release of juvenile sea cucumbers produced in hatcheries is seen as a way of rebuilding wild stocks. Stock enhancement is already practised successfully in Japan for other species. Sea cucumber fisheries are an important source of income to coastal communities in the Region. Culture techniques are well known for more temperate species, but have not been optimized for tropical species. Successful rearing for another
species of the same genus has been reported in the United Mexican States, yet further research is most likely needed to complete the cycle for the Caribbean species.

The four-sided sea cucumber is widely distributed throughout the Caribbean Region, extending north to Bermuda, through the Caribbean Sea, the Gulf of Mexico and to the Caribbean coast of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and the Republic of Colombia.

CONCLUSIONS
In conclusion, the governments participating at the FAO-funded feasibility workshop in Kingston, Jamaica (18–21 October 2010), were supportive of the regional hatchery concept and agreed on the objectives of such a facility. A steering group was formed, representing the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department, the Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism (CRFM) and well-respected aquaculturists, tasked with: i) promoting the concept of the regional hatchery at the ministerial level; and ii) coordinating efforts of individual countries to work towards a regional goal.

Furthermore, there appears to be several opportunities for funding the implementation of a regional facility. A comprehensive business proposal is required in order to approach agencies identified during the Workshop.
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ANTECEDENTES DEL TALLER
El estudio de la viabilidad para el establecimiento de un criadero de mariscos y/o moluscos en el Gran Caribe, orientado a la producción de especies nativas fue financiado por el Servicio de Acuicultura (FIRA), el Departamento de Pesquerías y Acuicultura de la Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Alimentación y la Agricultura (FAO). El estudio aborda la necesidad de aportar recursos entre los países del Caribe para asegurar el desarrollo sostenible de la acuicultura en la región. La evaluación de la viabilidad para desarrollar e implementar con éxito dicho centro fue llevada a cabo por parte de los gobiernos participantes del Caribe y los expertos de la Región, durante un taller de cuatro días celebrado en Kingston, Jamaica, 18–21 octubre de 2010. Los objetivos del taller con el fin de alcanzar los objetivos generales del estudio fueron los siguientes.

• Presentación del concepto a los gobiernos de la Región del Gran Caribe (véase mapa en el Anexo 3);
• Evaluación del compromiso a largo plazo en acuicultura por parte de los gobiernos de la Región;
• Valoración de la demanda del mercado local para las especies de moluscos y mariscos nativos;
• Identificación de especies y sitios como candidatos potenciales para un criadero regional;
• Identificación de los criterios para la instalación de un criadero regional sostenible.

El criadero regional de mariscos y/o moluscos propuesto es una respuesta al lento crecimiento de la acuicultura en el sector de la Región del Gran Caribe. La producción por acuicultura en el Caribe representa menos del un por ciento de la acuicultura mundial y los esfuerzos de cultivo están principalmente dirigidos hacia especies no nativas como la tilapia. Esta situación, donde predomina la aplicación de operaciones de cultivo usando especies exóticas, puede acarrear impactos ambientales potencialmente irreversibles. Por esta razón, se abordan las oportunidades para desarrollar el sector de la acuicultura de una manera sostenible centrándose en especies nativas y la puesta en común de recursos a través del desarrollo de un criadero regional. De esta forma, se toman en consideración las limitaciones en experticia técnica, infraestructura, falta de capital de inversión y recursos humanos para el desarrollo de la acuicultura en la Región. Estas limitaciones han sido reconocidas por varios Gobiernos del Caribe y dificultan para cualquier país el establecimiento de un criadero nacional. Esto ha dado lugar a recomendaciones similares en talleres previos, como se menciona en las memorias del taller Latinoamericano y del Caribe sobre la Acuicultura Regional de Bivalvos (ACUIBIVA) llevado a cabo en Puerto Montt, República de Chile, en 2007, el cual fue promovido y organizado por la FAO.

Un criadero regional de moluscos o mariscos podría:
• Favorecer el desarrollo de la acuicultura mediante la centralización de los esfuerzos y recursos específicos;
• Apoyar un equipo cualificado en el cultivo (e investigación) de especies nativas o endémicas;

Permitir la distribución de semilla comercial certificada a las partes interesadas en cultivar; y
Proveer soporte técnico para el levante y engorda.

Se reconoce que ha habido esfuerzos previos para promover la acuicultura en la Región. Estos iniciaron en los años 80, específicamente para los Pequeños Estados Insulares en Desarrollo (PEID) de las Antillas Menores. Esto fue seguido por el proyecto FAO-Aquila II, que incluyó a Latinoamérica y el Caribe en 1993, el cual reconoció los diferentes potenciales para el desarrollo de la acuicultura en la Región. Posteriormente, en cooperación con la Comunidad del Caribe (CARICOM), se propuso a través del Proyecto para el Desarrollo de la Acuicultura en el Caribe (CARAD), el fortalecimiento institucional y una mayor cooperación entre las instituciones regionales. Aunque se obtuvo mucha información relevante de estos esfuerzos, poco ha sido implementado debido en parte a la falta de financiamiento y recursos humanos. En la actualidad hay algunos esfuerzos regionales de acuicultura que pueden apoyar también el concepto de la instalación actual propuesta, incluyendo la Red de Acuicultura para las Américas (ANA).

También se reconoce que el compromiso de los países del Caribe, incluyendo el Gran Caribe, es crítico para el éxito del desarrollo de la acuicultura. Esto ha sido reportado por la FAO en varias ocasiones, incluyendo la Reunión del Grupo de trabajo en Bahamas (1981)\(^2\), Santa Lucía (2003)\(^3\) y más recientemente en la Reunión del Grupo de trabajo de Latinoamérica y el Caribe en la República de Panamá (2005)\(^4\) sobre el desarrollo de la acuicultura y la cooperación regional.

Por esta razón, el nivel de interés y compromiso a largo plazo de los Gobiernos del Gran Caribe fueron valorados dentro de los alcances del estudio actual a través de un breve cuestionario. Este cuestionario específico fue diseñado y distribuido por el Departamento de Pesquerías y Acuicultura de la FAO en el 2009 a 33 países en la Región, junto con una carta explicativa, planteando la propuesta del concepto de un criadero regional. Se esperaba que esto pudiera proveer un mejor entendimiento de las actividades de acuicultura existentes (comerciales y de investigación), en términos de especies cultivadas, las limitaciones para el desarrollo ulterior, los intereses y obstáculos en el cultivo de las especies nativas y, lo más importante, la respuesta de los gobiernos al concepto del criadero regional. Se recibieron respuestas de 21 países (63% de los cuestionarios enviados). Del número total de respuestas recibidas, solo dos países mostraron falta de interés en este concepto (9,5%), cinco estaban dudosos y solicitaron información adicional (23%), y 14 expresaron un interés concreto en el concepto. Adicionalmente tres gobiernos ofrecieron sus países como sede del futuro criadero regional.

A la luz de la respuesta positiva obtenida de un número de gobiernos del Caribe, se organizó el Taller de Jamaica (entre el 18 y 21 de octubre de 2010), abordando las preocupaciones y cuestiones planteadas en el cuestionario, para investigar a fondo la factibilidad del desarrollo de un criadero regional de moluscos y/o mariscos.

El presente reporte provee toda la información, conclusiones y recomendaciones compiladas durante la evaluación de los gobiernos del Caribe participantes, dando

---


como resultado un informe sobre el potencial para el desarrollo y sostenibilidad del Criadero del Gran Caribe para especies nativas.

OBJETIVOS Y ENFOQUE DEL TALLER
El objetivo general del taller fue confirmar el compromiso de los países del Caribe participantes, en el desarrollo de un criadero de moluscos y/o mariscos para la Región, así como introducir a los participantes en la implementación de esta instalación mediante la evaluación de los aspectos planteados y proveer soluciones relacionadas con la sostenibilidad de tal operación. El Taller de cuatro días de duración incluyó presentaciones por expertos de la Región, quienes presentaron antecedentes, seguidos por discusiones grupales sobre temas específicos. La Agenda del taller se muestra de forma completa en el Anexo 1. Un total de diez Gobiernos del Caribe asistieron al Taller, representados por autoridades y oficiales en pesca y acuicultura listados en el Anexo 2.

El enfoque del taller respondió a las necesidades e intereses presentados por los Gobiernos del Caribe como resultado de la encuesta de la FAO 2009 antes mencionada (el Anexo 4 contiene el original de la carta y del cuestionario junto con un resumen de las respuestas presentadas a la FAO). Al inicio del Taller se proporcionó antecedentes técnicos y biológicos relevantes por parte de especialistas con el fin de permitir discusiones con una mayor información por parte de los participantes. Esto incluye lo siguiente:

- Dado el interés expresado por especies nativas específicas como potenciales candidatas de cultivo, el conocimiento regional fue compilado y compartido a través de presentaciones. Más específicamente, se entregó información sobre técnicas de cultivo, requerimiento de instalaciones y fuente de semilla. Adicionalmente, se presentó a la Región una visión general de las especies de moluscos nativos y se elaboró una primera lista de especies objetivo sobre la base de la sugerencia de los Gobiernos del Caribe. El anexo 5 provee la lista completa de las especies sugeridas.
- Varios gobiernos expresaron interés en tener su país como sede para el criadero regional propuesto; estos gobiernos presentaron las ventajas y desventajas de los sitios propuestos proporcionando una base para discusiones adicionales sobre la selección del sitio.
- En el Taller se presentaron las conclusiones y recomendaciones de un estudio de mercado, encargado como parte de este estudio de viabilidad. Se reconoce que el éxito de la acuicultura comercial está estrechamente vinculado a la demanda del mercado y que el conocimiento de la demanda del mercado actual y potencial es fundamental para la priorización de especies objetivo como candidatas de cultivo iniciales. El estudio de mercado se centra en la demanda de mariscos nativos en los países insulares del Caribe. La incorporación en este estudio del resto de los países, que abarca el Gran Caribe, iba más allá del marco del tiempo disponible. El estudio completo se reproduce en este informe como parte de los documentos aportados.

Una compilación de las especies nativas de moluscos y/o mariscos de la Región del Gran Caribe, indica la presencia de 37 especies, incluyendo gasterópodos, crustáceos, bivalvos (ostiones, almejas, ostras y mejillones), equinodermos y cefalópodos (pulpo común) (véase el anexo 5). De ellas, 22 especies fueron identificadas por los gobiernos del Caribe como especies objetivo para la acuicultura (véase el anexo 5). El pepino de mar se añadió en una fecha posterior debido al gran interés expresado por varios participantes en el Taller de Jamaica. Se ofrece para cada especie información sobre la distribución de la población, y lo que se conoce como el “potencial de cultivo”, especificando el nivel de conocimientos sobre las técnicas, la tasa de crecimiento y la demanda del mercado.
Las cuestiones específicas planteadas por los Gobiernos del Caribe, se abordaron dentro de pequeños grupos de trabajo, aumentando al máximo los aportes de todos los participantes. Estos incluyen la identificación y priorización de los candidatos potenciales para ser cultivados, los criterios para la selección del sitio y para el funcionamiento sostenible de las instalaciones regionales. Para cada una de las sesiones de mesa redonda planeadas, se señalaron preguntas específicas en los términos de referencia proporcionado orientación a los grupos de trabajo para la discusión. A continuación, cada grupo produjo un corto informe para cada sesión. Los términos de referencia específicos para cada mesa redonda y el resumen del grupo de trabajo se reproducen en los anexos 6 y 7, respectivamente, y son la base de las recomendaciones formuladas en el Taller para el establecimiento del criadero regional de mariscos y/o moluscos.

Por último, se trató la necesidad de financiamiento y oportunidades para la implementación de un criadero regional. Las discusiones de los grupos de trabajo se dirigieron a la elaboración de un plan de cinco años para la instalación propuesta; esta incluye una primera evaluación del tiempo necesario para la primera producción y venta, y, posteriormente, para garantizar una producción sostenible. En resumen, el plan de cinco años presentado proporciona la base para un plan de negocio y conduce a una mejor comprensión del financiamiento necesario. Los representantes del Mecanismo Regional de Pesca del Caribe (CRFM por sus siglas en inglés) de la CARICOM, el Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente (PNUMA) y la FAO estuvieron presentes en el Taller para ayudar a explorar las posibles oportunidades de financiación.

RECOMENDACIONES DEL TALLER

Una serie de asuntos relacionados con el desarrollo de un criadero regional han sido identificados y requieren de una cuidadosa consideración. Estas son:

1. priorización de las especies objetivo como candidatas de cultivo;
2. establecimiento de protocolos operativos para el criadero;
3. selección de un lugar adecuado;
4. garantizar la sostenibilidad sobre la base de un sólido plan de negocios; y
5. financiamiento de la implementación y el funcionamiento del criadero regional.

Todas estas cuestiones se debatieron en profundidad por parte de los grupos de trabajo en el Taller. Los informes de todos los grupos de trabajo están documentados y figuran en el Anexo 7 del presente documento. Las principales recomendaciones que surgieron de estos informes en los que se abordan las cinco cuestiones anteriores se indican a continuación.

Nota: Las siguientes recomendaciones reflejan las deliberaciones de los representantes gubernamentales del Caribe en el Taller en Jamaica y fueron aprobadas por todos los participantes. Pueden no representar las opiniones de todos los gobiernos de la región ni reflejar las decisiones finales con respecto a la creación de un criadero regional de mariscos y/o moluscos en el Gran Caribe. Estas recomendaciones están sujetas a modificaciones según lo dictado por nuevos descubrimientos, cambios en los compromisos del gobierno y la disponibilidad de financiación. Estas no excluyen las recomendaciones formuladas en una fecha posterior durante un proceso más amplio de implementación.

Recomendación 1 – Selección de los candidatos de cultivo de las especies objetivo identificadas, dando prioridad a los candidatos sobre la base del know-how, valor de mercado, la demanda del mercado y la disponibilidad de reproductores. La estrategia recomendada es el cultivo de la ostra de mangle y del pectíminodo león como candidatos iniciales de cultivo, pero el volumen del mercado debe ser evaluado antes de la producción. Una vez que la producción y ventas de ambas especies sean establecidas, se pueden iniciar los esfuerzos en el cultivo de ostras perlíferas y el desarrollo de una pesquería local basada en el cultivo del caracol burgao o cigua, erizo y pepinos de mar.
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A. La preocupación inmediata es la demostración de éxito en el cultivo y venta de especies nativas de mariscos a volúmenes de producción que satisfagan las demandas del mercado actual y potencial. Hay varias especies objetivo para las cuales las técnicas de cultivo son bien conocidas y están listas para ser adaptadas, en especial para las especies de bivalvos (ostras y vieiras). Estas deben ser las primeras en ser consideradas. Además el volumen de producción depende del valor de mercado y la demanda de cada especie, algunas pueden tener un valor de mercado bajo, pero una demanda de alto volumen, mientras que en otras, la demanda es de menor volumen pero tiene un mayor valor de mercado. Las especies objetivo siguientes fueron seleccionadas como las principales candidatas de cultivo para el criadero regional:

- **Ostra del mangle**, *Crassostrea rhizophorae* – una especie de bajo valor en el mercado, pero potencialmente a la cabeza de un alto volumen de demanda.
- **Ostra periófera**, *Pinctada imbricata*, para la producción de perlas – una especie de alto valor en el mercado con un nicho de mercado más pequeño y un menor volumen de demanda.
- **Vieira Mano de León**, *Nodipecten nodosus* – una especie de alto valor en el mercado, con un nicho de mercado más especializado que la ostra de mangle y, posiblemente, una menor demanda de volumen.
- **Caracol burgao o cigua**, *Cittarium pica* – una especie tradicionalmente capturada, con un alto valor en la pesca local (tanto cultural como económico). Se recomienda la producción de semilla para incrementar las poblaciones naturales.
- **Huevo de mar**, *Tripneustes ventricosus* – una especie de erizo de alto valor para el mercado de exportación. Se recomienda la producción de semilla para incrementar la pesca local.
- **Pepino de mar** se considera digno de tomar en cuenta dado los niveles de explotación actual y su demanda en el mercado asiático.

Las técnicas de cultivo para la ostra de mangle y el pectíndulo mano de león son bien conocidas y están listas para ser adaptadas. Las técnicas de cultivo de la ostra periófera pueden ser adaptadas de las técnicas ya conocidas para el mismo género. El cultivo hasta tamaño comercial para especies como el caracol burgao, erizo y pepino de mar requiere una fase de investigación. Cabe señalar que para los erizos de mar, existen cultivos a escala comercial de especies del mismo género en otras regiones, como Asia, cuyas técnicas pueden ser adaptadas a las especies del Caribe.

B. Información limitada sobre la demanda del mercado se encuentra actualmente disponible para varios de los países interesados en el concepto del criadero regional. Con el fin de garantizar la sostenibilidad del centro regional propuesto, es imprescindible que este sea tratado y establecido como un negocio para garantizar la rentabilidad y la sostenibilidad a largo plazo. Por esta razón, se considera como un requerimiento contar con estudios de mercado centrados en las especies seleccionadas dentro de los países socios, para determinar el volumen de producción y permitir el desarrollo de un plan de negocios preciso. Más específicamente, se recomienda que:

- **Se lleva a cabo un estudio de mercado exhaustivo que cubra el Gran Caribe y otros mercados regionales para la valoración del volumen de la demanda de la ostra de mangle y de la vieira Mano de León antes del desarrollo de las instalaciones regionales.**
- **Se valora la demanda potencial para la producción regional de ostras perióferas.**
- **Se valoren las importaciones y exportaciones actuales, incluyendo las regulaciones existentes y las limitaciones potenciales al comercio del caracol burgao y del erizo de mar.**

C. La identificación de limitaciones del cultivo de algunas de las especies candidatas seleccionadas es un componente crítico de la estrategia adoptada por el criadero regional. Aunque el cultivo de especies como las ostras perióferas y los pepinos de mar
es atractivo y potencialmente lucrativo, las limitaciones en el desarrollo de su cultivo necesitan ser tenidas en cuenta dentro del contexto de la sostenibilidad del criadero regional. Los principales obstáculos identificados fueron los siguientes:

- Cultivo de ostras perlíferas – falta de tradición en la región, de personal capacitado en la perlicultura, y posiblemente, de interés en desarrollar este tipo de acuicultura.
- Pepinos de mar – las técnicas de cultivo para las especies del Caribe requieren más investigación.

Recomendación 2 – Establecer protocolos de operación en consideración del nivel genético de las poblaciones, así como la prevención de la proliferación de patógenos y enfermedades durante el transporte de los organismos acuáticos vivos (por ejemplo semilla).

A. De interés inmediato para el desarrollo del centro que recibirá reproductores colectados en diferentes fuentes y enviará semilla a los países clientes, es la reducción de la reserva genética y la pérdida de la biodiversidad de especies, junto con la introducción accidental de enfermedades y patógenos con los embarques de especímenes vivos. Adicionalmente, es necesario considerar a largo plazo la rotación de los reproductores dentro del criadero, para maximizar la reserva genética de los juveniles producidos. Esto deberá respetarse estrictamente. A continuación las acciones requeridas para el establecimiento de un criadero regional sostenible:

- Un estudio a nivel genético poblacional entre las poblaciones de las especies objetivo en la Región Caribe.
- Una evaluación de la salud de las poblaciones, valorando patógenos y enfermedades potenciales.
- Los reproductores seleccionados para desovar en el criadero regional serán colectados de las poblaciones valoradas como las más saludables y de la misma estructura genética que la de las áreas de engorde.
- Deberá cumplirse la normativa estándar basada en los criterios de la Agencia de Protección Ambiental (EPA por sus siglas en inglés) para controlar los reproductores y semillas transportadas hasta y desde el criadero regional.
- Cuarentena para los reproductores entrantes - es necesario determinar su duración. El área de la cuarentena debe ser aislada del resto de las instalaciones y sus efluentes colectados y tratados. Debe establecerse un sistema de recirculación para esta área.
- Reducción de la reserva genética en el criadero – el grado en que esto puede ocurrir depende de la facilidad de colecta de reproductores y su disponibilidad para el criadero.
- Acondicionamiento de los reproductores – especialmente necesario si se han colectado de un sitio distante al criadero.

B. La organización rectora del criadero regional, sus objetivos y responsabilidades deben determinarse, con el fin de garantizar su buen funcionamiento. Las normas y regulaciones del centro regional deben estar en conformidad con la legislación del país sede, así como con las reglamentaciones regionales y/o internacionales relacionadas con la producción y el comercio de determinados organismos marinos. Con respeto a los objetivos de la instalación regional propuesta, el suministro de juveniles y/o semilla y de servicios técnicos por parte de expertos, podría ser complementada con el desarrollo de investigación y desarrollo (I&D), así como con entrenamiento de clientes potenciales. Esto permitiría expandir el rol del centro regional al de una “incubadora de empresas para la región”. Por otra parte, la sostenibilidad del centro depende del éxito de los países receptores en el cultivo y venta del producto. Por esta
razón entre las actividades del criadero regional es necesario incluir un componente de formación que esté a disposición de los países socios y/o beneficiarios. Se recomendó que:

- El gobierno del país anfitrión del centro regional es el encargado en establecer y hacer cumplir los reglamentos del criadero. Sin embargo la certificación sanitaria de los envíos debe ser conducida por un laboratorio o veterinario. Es necesario definir los criterios para la certificación y los mismos deben estar al nivel de los estándares internacionales.

- La capacitación de los productores en el centro regional facilitada mediante una operación piloto de engorda es un componente importante de las actividades del criadero regional.

- El soporte técnico se proporcionará cuando se solicite para el transporte, aclimatación e inicio del engorde de la semilla, si es necesario. Este servicio tendrá un costo adicional el cual ingresará al centro regional.

- El centro regional es responsable de proporcionar semilla libre de enfermedades y de transportarla en condiciones óptimas, con toda la documentación de exportación prevista.

- Es fundamental que esté bien definido entre el centro regional y los países socios y/o beneficiarios el momento en que los cultivadores se hacen responsables de la semilla y el criadero sea relevado de sus funciones.

**Recomendación 3** – Debe prestarse especial atención a la selección del sitio para la instalación del criadero regional, ya que esto es fundamental para el éxito del desarrollo de la acuicultura en la región. La selección del sitio debe estar basada en el apoyo actual y potencial del gobierno, existencia de infraestructura, facilidad de acceso, presencia de las especies de mariscos de interés, salud ambiental, asistencia técnica y protección contra los desastres naturales.

**Nota:** Sobre la base de la información disponible en el Taller de la FAO, se hacen las siguientes recomendaciones, pero no se excluye la consideración de otros países no mencionados aquí.

- Los siguientes países son dignos de consideración como sitios potenciales para la instalación regional: Jamaica, la República de Colombia, Belice, la República Bolivariana de Venezuela, la República de Panamá, la República de Haití, y la República de Trinidad y Tobago.

- De acuerdo a los grupos de trabajo, los países más prometedores de la lista anterior son: Jamaica, la República de Colombia y la República de Trinidad y Tobago.

  - Jamaica ofrece un sitio no desarrollado de propiedad del gobierno. Actualmente es usado para el engorde de ostras de mangle. Sería necesario el diseño y construcción del centro, incluyendo la acomodación del personal, visita de expertos y del personal en formación, ya que este sitio es apartado. Es necesaria la evaluación de la distribución y presencia de las poblaciones de las especies objetivo diferentes a la ostra de mangle, así como una valoración ambiental de la columna de agua.

  - La República de Colombia ofrece un criadero funcional de moluscos dentro de los límites de una universidad. La producción actual se centra en pectíñidos nativos, llegando a obtener semillas de 10 mm en ciclos de dos meses y medio (100 000 unidades por ciclo). Sería requerida una expansión para acomodar la producción regional objetivo de las especies seleccionadas. Se necesitará la aprobación por parte de las autoridades universitarias y la confirmación del apoyo del gobierno para el logro de los objetivos del criadero regional. Debe ser valorado el impacto de la proximidad humana y del desarrollo futuro de las necesidades del criadero.
Para la República de Trinidad y Tobago se requiere información adicional y el compromiso del gobierno.

Belice y la República de Panamá son dignos de consideración ya que existe apoyo del gobierno y ambos países tienen antecedentes en acuicultura con facilidades de acceso al resto de los países de la región.

Recomendación 4 — La sostenibilidad del criadero regional de mariscos requiere un análisis de su rentabilidad a largo plazo, mediante la identificación de los puntos clave para su sostenibilidad y el desarrollo de un plan de negocios mínimo de cinco años. La operación del centro regional debe ser tratada como un negocio con un punto de equilibrio bien definido y un tiempo en el cual se hace financieramente auto-sostenible y viable.

A. La sostenibilidad de un criadero regional de moluscos y/o mariscos depende de la ubicación de la instalación, la estrategia de producción, el acceso a los mercados, el balance de objetivos múltiples, las finanzas y el compromiso de los países socios. Más específicamente:

- La ubicación del criadero debe facilitar el movimiento de semilla y reproductores.
- Para estimar los costos del suministro de reproductores es necesaria la identificación de sitios de recolección de reproductores dependiendo de la evaluación de las poblaciones a nivel genético.
- Se recomienda un enfoque inicial en las especies con un valor de mercado bajo y alta demanda y/o aquellas con un alto valor de mercado y bajo volumen de demanda cuyas técnicas de cultivo sean bien conocidas y probadas.
- Es necesaria la identificación de mercados y técnicas de mercadeo para la venta del producto.
- El equilibrio entre la producción comercial y la investigación – la investigación sólo debe iniciarse una vez que la producción sea estable y debe ser apoyada a través de subvenciones. Sólo se podrán asignar fondos para investigación en el criadero si todos los costos de operación son cubiertos por los ingresos.
- La contribución financiera de los países participantes es necesaria inicialmente y también para la investigación permanente.
- Debe garantizarse el apoyo del gobierno a nivel ministerial y voluntad política para la participación de los países socios.

B. Varios factores afectarán los resultados del plan de negocios, entre ellos las características del sitio seleccionado, en la medida en que se requiere infraestructura en las distintas fases del plan, las características del cultivo de las especies objetivo y las metas del criadero a medida que evoluciona con el tiempo y la experiencia. Un plan de negocios cinco o seis años con su presupuesto correspondiente, debe desarrollarse tras la selección del sitio. Puede basarse en un ciclo de producción de tres meses (desde el desove hasta la semilla) y en un centro con objetivos múltiples (incluyendo la producción comercial, la capacitación al sector privado, la investigación de nuevas especies y la producción para el mejoramiento de las poblaciones). La siguiente estrategia es recomendada para la infraestructura y operación del centro regional:

- El criadero regional debe implementarse por etapas, siguiendo un concepto modular, que permita la expansión del centro a medida que aumenta la producción. La instalación del bombeo debe ser incorporada a su máxima capacidad, pero las instalaciones para el cultivo de larvas, postlarvas y algas serían ampliadas a lo largo de un periodo de seis años.
- Se recomienda una plantilla básica de cinco personas para el funcionamiento del centro (acuicultores capacitados para el cultivo de larvas, post-larvas y algas; mano de obra eventual para engorde en el mar y mantenimiento; personal administrativo).
• La experticia externa pero de fácil acceso de veterinarios y analistas químicos de agua, es necesaria también. Puede requerirse el personal de seguridad dependiendo del sitio.
• El personal debe capacitarse en el extranjero y en el sitio.
• La financiación del criadero debe provenir de múltiples fuentes:
  - Se requiere una financiación inicial por parte de agencias externas y de los países socios para los primeros seis años.
  - La venta de productos (semillas y animales de tamaño comercial) debe comenzar a proporcionar ingresos en el Año 4.
  - El apoyo y servicio técnico prestado a los productores será un servicio pagado, proporcionando ingresos a partir del Año 3.
  - Los subsidios gubernamentales y donaciones científicas para el desarrollo de la acuicultura, tales como, la investigación de nuevas especies y/o el desarrollo de la pesca local, deben cubrir los costos del componente no comercial del criadero y ser parte de los ingresos parciales del centro a partir de Año 6.

C. Un plan de cinco años ha de ser definido, basado en las directrices anteriores, dando lugar a una propuesta presentada a los organismos externos para un financiamiento por el orden de los USD 3–5 millones. Se requiere de un memorando de entendimiento entre los gobiernos de la región asociados a esta empresa. El compromiso de los gobiernos debe incluir la compra de las semillas del criadero y el apoyo financiero para permitir el desarrollo de la acuicultura en su país. Los ingresos por la venta de semillas, animales de tamaño comercial y prestación de servicios de capacitación deben generarse a partir del Año 3. Los gastos operacionales del criadero deben ser cubiertos por los ingresos directos luego del plazo inicial de cinco años. Los subsidios del gobierno deberán continuarse para llevar a cabo investigación y desarrollo con nuevas especies, así como el apoyo a la pesca local mediante la proporción de semilla y asistencia técnica para el mejoramiento de las poblaciones de las especies objetivo. Con base en esta estrategia, se recomienda un plan de cinco años que consiste en las siguientes fases:
  • **Fase 1: Inicial** – Pormenorización de las acciones necesarias, promoción del centro, propuestas para el finamiento y aseguramiento del apoyo gubernamental.
  • **Fase 2: Infraestructura** – Diseño y construcción de las instalaciones, obtención de autorizaciones y permisos, cotizaciones y compra de equipos.
  • **Fase 3: Compromiso de los interesados y aseguramiento del personal y reproductores** – El establecimiento de colaboración entre los países para la colecta de reproductores y su transporte; desarrollo de protocolos de colecta y valoración genética de las poblaciones de las especies objetivo. Contratación del personal básico del criadero y del personal del proyecto. Capacitación del personal del criadero regional en dos vías: en el extranjero y en el mismo criadero.
  • **Fase 4: Producción piloto** – cultivo larval y postlarval en el criadero; engorde; establecimiento de protocolos de transporte de semillas y cultivo para los países interesados; exploración del mercado con productos.
  • **Fase 5: Suministro de entrenamiento** – servicios técnicos completos al sector privado para el engorde del producto, incluyendo la formación en el criadero *in situ*, la comercialización del producto y el aumento en la producción de semilla.
  • **Fase 6: Producción completa** – expansión del criadero y aumento en la producción de bivalvos; investigación de nuevas especies; apoyo al desarrollo de la pesquería local de las especies objetivo; ampliación del área de engorde con fines de formación de personal, venta de semilla, así como de animales de tamaño comercial; completar todos los protocolos; desarrollo de una oficina de coordinación de ventas, capacitación y envíos; definir y acordar en el futuro (posterior al proyecto) el estatuto jurídico del criadero.
Recomendación 5 – Promover el concepto de criadero regional a través de la difusión de información, destinada a los altos funcionarios y políticos.

Debe conformarse un grupo directivo para promover el concepto, comprometer a las partes interesadas, perfilar las acciones necesarias y hacer posible su aplicación. El resumen ejecutivo derivado del Taller de la FAO debe conducir a la elaboración y publicación de un resumen ministerial para la difusión de la información a los gobiernos de la región. Como primer paso para el establecimiento de un criadero regional, se recomienda que los gobiernos interesados de la Región elaboren un proyecto regional de cooperación técnica.

ESPECIES CANDIDATAS RECOMENDADAS PARA CULTIVO

Los esfuerzos previos para promover la acuicultura en la Región del Gran Caribe han sido numerosos. En primer lugar se inició en la década de 1980 para los Pequeños Estados Insulares en Desarrollo (PEID) de las Antillas Menores, seguido por el proyecto de la FAO-Aquila II (América Latina y el Caribe, 1993), y CARAD (Proyecto para el Desarrollo de Acuicultura en el Caribe). Escasa implementación ha seguido a estos esfuerzos debido a la falta de recursos y compromiso de los países del Caribe.

Basado en información de los gobiernos del Caribe, las especies exóticas han sostenido más las operaciones comerciales que las especies nativas. Sin embargo, los gobiernos de la región han efectuado 32 registros de investigaciones y cultivos a escala experimental sobre las especies nativas, lo que indica un interés en que continúe este tipo de desarrollo de la acuicultura. Las técnicas de cultivo de varias especies de mariscos nativos son conocidas y se resume el potencial de cultivo de las especies objetivo recomendadas a continuación:

Ostra del mangle – El cultivo comercial de las ostras de mangle, *Crassostrea rhizophorae*, es practicado en la República de Cuba y Jamaica. La primera granja de ostras comerciales en la República de Cuba comenzó a funcionar en 1975. Estadísticas de la FAO indican una cifra récord de 1 571 toneladas en la producción de ostra de mangle en 2008 por la República de Cuba. El Gobierno del Jamaica inició un proyecto de cultivo de ostras de mangle en 1977 para determinar su viabilidad y garantizar un suministro constante de las ostras. Esto condujo a la creación de la “Unidad de cultivo de ostras de Jamaica” en 1980, para la operación de granjas experimentales y servicios de extensión. En las estadísticas de la FAO se tiene una cifra récord de 1 tonelada de producción de ostra de mangle en el año 2001, y no hay registros desde entonces, aunque la unidad de cultivo de ostras todavía funciona promoviendo el cultivo de la ostra de mangle. Pese a que no se registra en las estadísticas de la FAO, la República de Colombia también tuvo una producción comercial llegando a alcanzar 10 toneladas anuales por un periodo de tres años. La producción actual es mínima, y sólo ha sido continuada por unos pocos pescadores.

La tecnología de cultivo de la ostra de mangle es bien conocida, se usa un sistema de producción de bajo costo y técnicas simples, relativamente fáciles de transferir al sector privado. Debido a la naturaleza gregaria de la especie, las ostras se pueden cultivar en alta densidad, lo que facilita su cultivo en todas las etapas. El tiempo para

---

alcanzar el tamaño comercial es de seis meses, su rápido crecimiento desde el desove hace a esta especie ventajosa para la producción en criaderos. Sus costos de producción y transformación son relativamente bajos, ya que se sirven en su concha en el mercado local. El precio actual del mercado de las ostras de mangle en Jamaica es equivalente a USD 0.10 cada animal.

La ostra de mangle es uno de los bivalvos tradicionalmente consumidos en el Caribe. Existe una demanda en el mercado regional para la especie, la cual se refleja no solo en la venta del producto, tanto en la República de Cuba y Jamaica, sino también en la cosecha natural de las especies registradas en la República Dominicana, la República Bolivariana de Venezuela y la República de Colombia, llegando a aproximadamente 1 600 toneladas en 2008 (FAO).

Por último, el cultivo regional de la especie se ve facilitado por la presencia natural de sus poblaciones en todo el Caribe, se extiende hasta el sur de la República Federativa del Brasil. Hasta la fecha, el cultivo de la especie se ha basado en la captación de semilla silvestre, y por tanto está sujeta a los impactos del desarrollo humano y a la contaminación asociada. Se manifestó la necesidad de suministro de semilla de criadero, ya que podría garantizar el suministro constante de ostras en la Región.

Pectínido o vieira Mano de león – Las vieiras o pectínidos en general son mariscos muy apreciados y la vieira Mano de león, *Nodipecten nodosus*, es una de las más grandes, alcanzando hasta 18 cm de longitud. Esta especie tiene un potencial considerable de cultivo debido a su rápido crecimiento y al alto valor en el mercado asociados a un músculo aductor grande, muy apreciado por los consumidores. Las técnicas de cultivo son bien conocidas y probadas para todas las etapas de su ciclo de vida. El cultivo comercial de esta especie se inició recientemente por parte del sector privado en la República Federativa del Brasil, utilizando juveniles de un criadero del gobierno. En el 2009, la producción aproximada en la República Federativa del Brasil fue de 20 toneladas.

El comercio de vieiras en el mundo se concentra en dos principales mercados importadores: los Estados Unidos de América y Europa. No hay registros del cultivo o cosecha de la especie en el Caribe insular, aunado al hecho de que no es una especie que se consuma tradicionalmente en la región. Esto puede atribuirse a que naturalmente se encuentran en bajos niveles de densidad poblacional. Por esta razón, es necesaria la producción de juveniles en criaderos para el suministro constante de esta especie como un producto del mar. Basándose en estos hechos, es probable que el mercado de la mayor parte de la vieira Mano de león en el Caribe debiera centrarse en el sector turístico de la Región, más que al mercado interno. Sobre la base de datos de consumo de mariscos y de importación, los siguientes países insulares del Caribe muestran una demanda potencial en el mercado de ostión nativo: Antigua y Barbuda, el Commonwealth de las Bahamas, Bermudas, la República Dominicana, Islas Turcas y Caicos, y Granada. En cuanto a los países continentales del Caribe, las vieiras Mano del león son consideradas un manjar, donde existe una demanda en los restaurantes y los hoteles de alto nivel, asociada a un alto precio de mercado (USD 12–15/docena en la República Federativa del Brasil).

El cultivo regional de la especie se ve facilitado por la presencia natural de la especie, registrado desde Carolina del Norte (los Estados Unidos de América) a la República Federativa del Brasil, lo que permite la colecta de reproductores en varios sitios.
Ostra perlífera – La ostra perlífera, Pinctada imbricata, puede ser cultivada por su carne y/o para la producción de perlas. Tradicionalmente no se consume en la región del Caribe, las perlas deben ser el principal producto de este tipo de acuicultura. Aunque hay una falta de tradición en el cultivo de las perlas en la región, hay antecedentes de la colecta de perlas en el Caribe venezolano y colombiano. Es más probable que exista un alto potencial de mercado dirigiéndolo al sector turístico de la región Caribe. Las limitaciones radican en la ausencia de un sector productor de perlas y la necesidad de crear una pequeña industria con un cierto nivel de destreza. Sin embargo, el cultivo de perlas se puede llevar a cabo en sectores de diferentes niveles económicos, que van desde empresas de tipo familiar a las grandes empresas a escala comercial.

El cultivo de esta especie se ha llevado a cabo a nivel experimental y las técnicas de cultivo se pueden adaptar a las conocidas para otras especies. El tiempo para la producción de una perla es de aproximadamente dos años y medio.

La especie está ampliamente distribuida en la región del Caribe, desde las Bermudas, Carolina del Norte (los Estados Unidos de América) hasta la República Federativa del Brasil, lo que facilita su cultivo regional. La especie es muy abundante en la costa noreste de América del Sur, formando densos bancos en el Mar Caribe. La colecta de ostras se registró en un máximo de 71 toneladas en 2008, orientada específicamente a su carne.

Caracol burgao – El cultivo del burgao, Cittarium pica, se ha realizado a nivel experimental, demostrando facilidad de cultivo hasta un tamaño de juvenil. Son necesarias investigaciones adicionales para la optimización de las técnicas para obtener animales de tamaño comercial. Los gobiernos regionales expresaron gran interés, ya que tanto la carne como la concha tienen precios relativamente altos. Esta especie es un alimento popular en muchas de las islas del Caribe, con un valor de aproximadamente USD 40 por 2 kg de carne en San Vicente y las Granadinas. La concha es muy apreciada en el mercado asiático existiendo una gran demanda en determinados países proveedores del Gran Caribe. Basándose en esta información preliminar, el cultivo del caracol burgao en esta región se traduciría en la selección de un mercado local de carne y un mercado de exportación de la concha.

Además, los Gobiernos insulares del Caribe expresaron un alto interés en la transferencia de juveniles producidos en criadero para aumentar las poblaciones naturales y apoyar la pesca local. Aunque la especie tiene una distribución natural en todo el Caribe, desde las Bermudas hasta la costa Caribe de América del Sur, sus poblaciones han disminuido debido a la sobreexplotación. La producción de juveniles en criadero ayudaría el restablecimiento de la salud de las poblaciones, las cuales podrían ser potencialmente manejadas y pescadas para suplir a los mercados locales y de exportación.

Es una especie protegida por la legislación local en algunos de los países del Caribe, lo que justifica consideraciones para el transporte de reproductores y juveniles entre el criadero regional y los países clientes.
**Síntesis del taller**

**Huevo de mar** – El erizo huevo de mar, *Tripneustes ventricosus*, se captura en las Antillas Menores para el consumo local. Estadísticas de la FAO informan de 10 toneladas de captura por año en Martinica para erizos de mar en general. No hay ninguna operación de cultivo comercial registrada en el Caribe, sin embargo, el cultivo del erizo de mar es una industria bien establecida en Japón, la República Popular China y otros países de Asia, Nueva Zelanda, Canadá, el Reino Unido de Gran Bretaña e Irlanda del Norte y en varios países escandinavos. Las técnicas para las primeras etapas de vida están bien probadas, pero los costos de producción para el cultivo de los animales hasta la talla comercial son altos. Por esta razón, la estrategia óptima es la producción de juveniles en criadero y su transferencia al medio ambiente natural para el mejoramiento de la pesca. Se necesitan investigaciones adicionales para la optimización de las técnicas y la estrategia de cultivo de esta especie a nivel regional.

El huevo de mar se distribuye en todo el Mar Caribe y a lo largo de las costas de América Central y del Sur. Sin embargo, debido a una serie de factores, tanto naturales como provocadas por el hombre, la especie es poco común de las Islas Virgenes de los Estados Unidos de América, Puerto Rico y Jamaica y la República Bolivariana de Venezuela. Se encuentra principalmente en las Antillas Menores, Santa Lucía, Barbados, San Vicente y Las Granadinas. Sus bajos niveles de población en algunas zonas puede ser un factor limitante para la obtención de reproductores silvestres para el desove en un centro regional. Además, la legislación local de protección de las especies puede dificultar el transporte de reproductores y/o juveniles entre el centro regional y los países clientes.

**Pepino de mar** – El pepino de mar de cuatro lados, *Isostichopus badionotus*, es una de las especies más comerciales de pepinos de mar en la región del Gran Caribe, otros incluyen *Holothuria mexicana* y *Astichopus multifido*.

Los pepinos de mar desencadenan un creciente interés en los mercados mundiales, son muy apreciados en el mercado asiático, ya que son considerados un producto del mar tónico y lujoso. Son especies grandes, crecen hasta 45 cm de longitud. La República de Cuba y los Estados Unidos Mexicanos han regulado las actividades pesqueras sobre las especies de *Isostichopus*; la República de Panamá y la República Bolivariana de Venezuela también tienen registros de la actividad de pesca. Los registros de la FAO para la pesca del pepino de mar en la República de Cuba indican una disminución en las capturas, desde 3 millones de pepinos de mar en 1999 a menos de 500 000 en 2003. Los precios van desde USD 6 por kilo a USD 22 por kilo en 2003, dependiendo el producto.

La especie se considera amenazada, ya que sus poblaciones están disminuyendo debido a la sobreexplotación y a la falta de regulación de las capturas. En algunos países, la prohibición total de la pesca de pepinos de mar se ha hecho efectiva, lo que debe tomarse en cuenta para la operación de un centro regional.

La liberación de los pepinos de mar juveniles producidos en criadero es vista como una forma de reconstruir las poblaciones silvestres. Las repoblaciones ya se practican con éxito en Japón para otras especies. La pesca de pepinos de mar es una fuente importante de ingresos para las comunidades costeras en la Región. Las técnicas de cultivo son bien conocidas para especies de zonas subtropicales, pero no se han
optimizado para las especies tropicales. El éxito de la cría de otras especies del mismo género ha sido reportado en los Estados Unidos Mexicanos, sin embargo, lo más probable es que sean necesarias nuevas investigaciones para completar el ciclo de las especies del Caribe.

El pepino de mar de cuatro lados se encuentra ampliamente distribuido en toda la región del Caribe, que se extiende desde el norte de las Bermudas, a través del Mar Caribe, el Golfo de México y la costa caribeña de la República Bolivariana de Venezuela y la República de Colombia.

CONCLUSIONES
En conclusión, los gobiernos participantes en el taller de viabilidad para un criadero regional de moluscos y/o mariscos del Caribe, financiado por la FAO en Kingston, Jamaica (18–21 de octubre de 2010), apoyaron el concepto del criadero regional y acordaron los objetivos de dicho centro. Un grupo directivo se formó, representado por el Departamento de Pesca y Acuicultura de la FAO, el Mecanismo Regional de Pesca del Caribe (CRFM) y por acuicultores respetados. Este grupo tiene las tareas de: i) promover el concepto del criadero regional a nivel ministerial; y ii) coordinar los esfuerzos de cada país para trabajar hacia el objetivo regional.

Por otra parte, parece que hay varias oportunidades para financiar la implementación de un centro regional. Es necesaria una propuesta de negocios integral con el objeto de ser presentada a los organismos identificados durante el Taller.
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REGIONAL SHELLFISH HATCHERY FEASIBILITY WORKSHOP
Kingston, Jamaica, 18–21 October 2010

Sunday, 17 October 2010
19:00–21:00 Registration

Monday, 18 October 2010
09:00 Opening
Opening address – M. Panton, Chief Technical Director, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Jamaica
Host country representative – R.A. Russell, Fisheries, Chief Executive Officer, Fisheries Division, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Jamaica
Workshop objectives – A. Lovatelli, FAO, Aquaculture Service, Rome, Italy

CULTURING NATIVE SPECIES: A DREAM OR A REALITY?
Session moderator: A. Smikle (Jamaica)

09:45 Introduction to the regional hatchery concept: Interest and concerns raised by Caribbean countries – A. Lovatelli
10:00 Aquaculture candidate species and species of interest – S. Sarkis
10:15 Caribbean seafood market demand – A. Lovatelli

Break (10:30–11:00)

REGIONAL HATCHERY: POTENTIAL CULTURE CANDIDATES
Session moderator: J.J. Alió (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela)

11:00 The cultivation of marine invertebrates indigenous to the Wider Caribbean Region: Established culture techniques and research needs for molluscs – L. Creswell
11:20 Oyster culture in Jamaica – D. Brown
11:40 Farming native scallop species – S. Sarkis

Lunch (12:00–13:30)

13:30 The cultivation of marine invertebrates indigenous to the Wider Caribbean Region: Established culture techniques and research needs for crustaceans – L. Creswell
13:50 Commercial molluscs and shellfish from the Colombian Caribbean: Current state of knowledge and culture – L.A. Velasco
14:10 Status of shellfish fisheries and farming in Panama – N. Serrano
14:40 Developing echinoderm culture for consumption and stock enhancement in the Caribbean – L. Creswell
15:00 Presentation of terms of reference and assignment of working groups for Round Table I – S. Sarkis

Break (15:00–15:30)

ROUND TABLE I

15:30 Potential culture candidates – Main questions: How to prioritize species to be cultured for commercial production? Market demand; Culture know-how; Ease of transport of seed; Ease of adaptation of grow-out techniques to countries; Countries’ needs for employment; Source of revenue and food; How to prioritize research for new culture candidates.

16:30 Presentation by the working groups

Tuesday, 19 October 2010

REGIONAL HATCHERY: DEFINING GOALS AND OPERATIONAL PROTOCOLS
Session moderator: L. Velasco (Republic of Colombia)

09:00 Summary Round Table I – S. Sarkis / A. Lovatelli
09:25 Hatchery design considerations – S. Sarkis
09:45 Establishing operational protocols for a regional shellfish hatchery – L. Creswell
10:05 Presentation of terms of reference and assignment of working groups for Round Table II – S. Sarkis

ROUND TABLE II

10:10 Pros and cons of a regional hatchery – Putting forward solutions – Main questions: How to ensure genetic diversity among Caribbean populations and ensure a disease/parasite-free operation? Broodstock management; Quality control of seed; Shipping and acclimatization protocols; Responsible party for environmental assessment for grow-out; Transfer of techniques; Discharge of waste waters; Introduction of invasive species and/or pathogens; Impact of increased populations to natural ecosystem.

Break (11:00–11:20)

11:20 Presentation by the working groups

Lunch (12:15–13:45)

13:45 Summary Round Table II – S. Sarkis / A. Lovatelli
14:05 Cultivation of bivalve molluscs in Venezuela: diversity, potential and infrastructure for seed production – J.J. Alió
14:25 Considering Honduras as a potential site for the establishment of a Wider Caribbean regional hatchery to improve the quality of life for small-scale fishermen – L. Morales
14:45 Jamaica’s potential as a regional shellfish hatchery site – D. Brown
15:05 Overview of aquaculture in Belize – R. Quintana
Wednesday, 20 October 2010

REGIONAL HATCHERY: SITE SELECTION PROCESS
Session moderator: A. Lovatelli (FAO)

09:00 Site selection criteria – S. Sarkis
09:20 Presentation of terms of reference and assignment of working groups for Round Table III – S. Sarkis

ROUND TABLE III
09:25 Optimal site for a regional hatchery – Main questions: Ease of access; Infrastructure; Personnel available for training; Enforcement of protocols; Reliability; Exposure to natural disasters; Proposed list of countries; Availability of target species; Technical support (proximity of research institutes, university).

Break (10:30–10:50)

10:50 Presentation by the working groups

Lunch (12:00–13:00)

13:00 Field trip

Thursday, 21 October 2010

IMPLEMENTING A REGIONAL HATCHERY: DEVELOPING A PLAN AND FUNDING
Session moderator: L. Creswell (United States of America)

09:00 Summary Round Table III – S. Sarkis / A. Lovatelli
09:20 Presentation of terms of reference and assignment of working groups for Round Table IV – S. Sarkis

ROUND TABLE IV
09:25 Developing a 5-year plan – Main questions: How to ensure sustainability of a regional hatchery? Anticipated time frame of production; Selling of seed; Breakeven point; Training and continuity of skilled personnel; Reliable and continuous supply of seed; Balancing production and research.

Break (10:20–10:40)

10:40 Presentation by the working groups
11:30 Funding opportunities for implementation of regional hatchery – M. Haughton

Lunch (12:00–13:30)

13:30 Presentation of terms of reference and assignment of working groups for Round Table V – S. Sarkis
ROUND TABLE V

13:35 Funding implementation of a regional hatchery – Main questions:
How to fund building of facility, training of personnel and initial operation? How to establish and maintain a cost-effective operation?
Funding cost of production for the first five years; Cost effectiveness of purchasing seed for recipient countries; Inclusion of other agencies/proposals in the Region; Inclusion of private sector in the regional hatchery operation; Involvement and funding of research centers; Assisting investigations of new culture candidates.

14:45 Presentation by the working groups

Break (15:10-15:30)

15:30 Summary Round Table IV and V – S. Sarkis / A. Lovatelli / L. Creswell

16:00 Completion of working groups reports

17:00 Submission of working groups reports and preparation of workshop proceedings

17:15 Closing remarks – A. Smikle, Director, Aquaculture Branch, Fisheries Division, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Jamaica, and A. Lovatelli (FAO)

19:00 Closing dinner
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Annex 4 – Questionnaire and responses to the regional hatchery concept

ANNEX 4.1 – CIRCULAR LETTER ATTACHED TO THE REGIONAL HATCHERY QUESTIONNAIRE

Note: The explanatory letter below was attached to the Regional Hatchery Questionnaire, outlining in brief the background and concept of the investigation being conducted. The letters were sent in English or Spanish dependent on the official language of the recipient country. Both versions are given below.

Dear Sir/Madam,

The establishment of a Regional Shellfish/Mollusc Hatchery for the Wider Caribbean was proposed at the Aquaculture Latin American and Caribbean Bivalve Aquaculture Workshop (ACUIBIVA)\(^1\), held in the Republic of Chile in August 2007. This recommendation stemmed from previous assessments made through FAO workshops, where experts and government officials provided information on the status of aquaculture in the Caribbean (Bahamas, 1981; St Lucia, 2003; Panama, 2005). Based on these assessments, it was concluded at ACUIBIVA that although technology and scientific information is available for several shellfish species native to the Caribbean, one of the most constraining factors to aquaculture development is the limited seed supply. For this reason, hatchery production needs to be considered for a reliable production of juveniles. However, high initial capital investment for hatcheries and the requirements for basic infrastructure and skilled personnel are stumbling blocks within any one Caribbean country; this led to the Regional Hatchery Concept for the Wider Caribbean.

Given that not all countries of the Region were represented at ACUIBIVA 2007, the interest of all parties needs to be determined. Therefore, the Aquaculture Service (FIRA) of the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department in collaboration with the FAO Subregional Office in Barbados is sending out a request to all Caribbean countries to express their interest in the development of a Regional Shellfish/Mollusc Hatchery. The establishment of such a facility would address one of the most constraining factors for aquaculture development in the Wider Caribbean Region – a lack of national and regional aquaculture plan – and focuses on the core requirement of seed supply.

There are several factors which favour the development of aquaculture in the Caribbean Region, including:
- The depletion of natural populations since the late 1980s.
- Local demand for fish and fisheries products associated with the tourism industry.
- The increased reliance on imported fish products, as increased demand exceeds the supply.

Native and endemic species are considered a priority for sustainable aquaculture in the Caribbean, eliminating the environmental and ecological impacts associated with exotic species. Shellfish/Molluscs are considered as first culture candidates for several reasons: 1) shellfish and especially bivalves, although not all a traditional element in the diet of the Caribbean people, are a well-appreciated seafood product by the tourists visiting the Region, and would potentially command a high price and a substantial market; 2) shellfish production requires no feed inputs into the natural environment, and hence results in a low impact activity, facilitating growth of the industry without adversely affecting the marine ecosystem; 3) the lack of necessary feed input for the grow-out of shellfish species also results in a lower production cost than that for finfish; 4) grow-out technology can be relatively simple, as are long-line systems used for bivalves, and can be easily transferred to small-scale farmers; and 5) long-line systems can additionally be submerged, making them adaptable to less protected areas and more open waters.

A Regional Shellfish/Mollusc Hatchery would:
1. Favour the development of aquaculture by centralizing efforts and resources.
2. Support a team skilled in the culture (and investigation) of native/endemic species.
3. Become responsible for the distribution of seed to interested parties.
4. Provide technical support for grow-out.

A successful operation would provide an opportunity for employment to small-scale displaced fishermen and/or entrepreneurs and potentially benefit natural resources. The development of such a project is complex, requiring the investigation of several key factors, namely site selection, management procedures, preservation of genetic diversity, etc. However, most importantly, the success of such an operation depends on the long-term commitment of beneficiary parties. For this reason, a short questionnaire is hereby attached to assess the interest and commitment of your country. Please return the filled form to Alessandro Lovatelli (see full contact details below) preferably by 31 August 2009.

Based on the responses of the countries, FAO will evaluate the interest and commitment of all Caribbean countries in a Regional Shellfish/Mollusc Hatchery and investigate its development. The results of the survey will be summarized and returned to you when completed.

Thank you for your interest and support.
Estimado Señor(a),

El establecimiento de un Laboratorio Regional de Producción de Semilla de Mariscos y/o Moluscos para el Caribe fue propuesto en el Taller Técnico Regional (Latinoamérica y Caribe) de Acuicultura de bivalvos (ACUIBIVA) llevado a cabo en la República de Chile en agosto de 2007. Esta recomendación proviene de valoraciones realizadas a través de talleres FAO, donde expertos y oficiales gubernamentales entregaron información sobre el estatus de la acuicultura en el Caribe (Bahamas, 1981; Santa Lucía, 2003; Panamá, 2005). Basados en estos conceptos, se concluyó en ACUIBIVA que aunque la tecnología y la información científica está disponible para varias especies de mariscos nativos del Caribe, uno de los factores que más reprimen el desarrollo de la acuicultura es la limitada fuente de semilla. Por esta razón, la producción de juveniles en laboratorio necesita ser considerada para una producción confiable. Sin embargo, la alta inversión inicial en capital para los laboratorios y sus requerimientos básicos en infraestructura y personal experimentado son grandes impedimentos para cualquiera de los países del Caribe; esto ha llevado al concepto de Laboratorio Regional de Producción de Semilla de Mariscos y/o Moluscos para el Caribe.

Dado que no todos los países de la Región fueron representados en ACUIBIVA 2007, el interés de todas las partes necesita ser determinado. Así, el Servicio de Acuicultura (FIRA) del Departamento de Pesquería y Acuicultura de la FAO en colaboración con la oficina Subregional de la FAO en Barbados está enviando una solicitud a todos los países del Caribe para expresar sus intereses en el desarrollo de un Laboratorio Regional de Producción de Semilla de Mariscos y/o Moluscos. El establecimiento de tal laboratorio puede direccionar uno de los factores más importantes para el desarrollo de la acuicultura en la Región del Caribe – la falta de planes nacionales y regionales en la acuicultura – y enfocarse en el requerimiento central de un suministro de semilla.

Existen varios factores que favorecen el desarrollo de la acuicultura en la Región Caribe:

- La depleción de las poblaciones naturales desde los últimos 1980s.
- La demanda local de peces y productos pesqueros asociados con la industria del turismo.
- La incrementada confianza en los productos pesqueros importados, así como la alta demanda que excede la producción local.

Las especies nativas y endémicas son consideradas una prioridad para la acuicultura sostenible en el Caribe, eliminando los impactos ambientales y ecológicos asociados con las especies exóticas. Los mariscos y moluscos son considerados como los primeros candidatos de cultivo por varias razones: 1) los mariscos y especialmente los bivalvos, aunque no son un elemento tradicional en la dieta de la gente del Caribe, son productos de mar bien apreciados por los turistas que visitan la región, y podían potencialmente comandar un alto precio y un mercado sustancial; 2) la producción de mariscos no requiere la entrada de alimento exógeno dentro de los ambientes naturales, por lo que

---

se considera una actividad de bajo impacto que permite el crecimiento de la industria sin afectar negativamente el sistema marino, 3) la falta de entradas de alimento exógeno para el crecimiento de las especies de mariscos además, resulta en un menor costo de producción que el de los peces y camarones; 4) la tecnología para el cultivo de los juveniles puede ser relativamente simple, como lo son los sistemas de líneas largas flotantes usadas para bivalvos, y puede ser fácilmente transferida a cultivadores en pequeña escala; y 5) los sistemas de líneas largas adicionalmente pueden ser sumergidos, siendo adaptables a áreas menos protegidas y aguas más abiertas.

Un Laboratorio Regional de Producción de Semilla de Mariscos y/o Moluscos podría:
1. Favorecer el desarrollo de la acuicultura mediante la centralización de esfuerzos y recursos.
2. Apoyar un equipo experimentado en el cultivo (e investigación) de especies nativas y/o endémicas.
3. Hacerse responsable de la distribución de semilla a las partes interesadas.
4. Proveer soporte técnico para el cultivo de los juveniles.

Una operación exitosa podría proveer una oportunidad de empleo para pescadores o emprendedores desplazados a pequeña escala y potencialmente beneficiar los recursos naturales. El desarrollo de tal proyecto es complejo, requiere la investigación de varios factores clave, como la selección del sitio, los procedimientos de manejo, la preservación de la diversidad genética, etc. Sin embargo, lo más importante para el éxito de tal operación depende del compromiso a largo plazo de las partes beneficiarias. Por esta razón, un corto cuestionario ha sido anexado para determinar el interés y compromiso de su país. Por favor devuelva el formulario rellenado a Alessandro Lovatelli (ver los detalles de contacto completos abajo) preferiblemente antes del 31 de agosto de 2009.

Basado en las respuestas, FAO evaluará el interés y compromiso de todos los países del Caribe en un Laboratorio Regional de Producción de Semilla de Mariscos y/o Moluscos e investigar su desarrollo. Los resultados de esta encuesta serán procesados y devuelto a ustedes cuando sean completados.

Gracias por su interés y apoyo.
ANNEX 4 – QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESPONSES TO THE REGIONAL HATCHERY CONCEPT

Note: An English or Spanish version of the questionnaire was sent dependent on the recipient country’s official language. Both versions are provided below.

Regional Shellfish/Mollusc Hatchery Questionnaire
The information obtained in this form is to gather general information on the current aquaculture related projects in your country and to determine your need and/or interest in the development of a regional shellfish/mollusc hatchery. Species, such as queen conch, scallops, pearl oysters, West Indian top shell, as well as sea urchin, sea cucumber or any other native or endemic shellfish species which may be in demand are to be considered.

1. Ongoing aquaculture project(s) (specify research or commercial).
2. Are the cultured species exotic or native species? Please list species.
3. Are these governmental or private projects?
4. Is there interest or demand for species other than the one(s) currently cultured?
5. Is seed supply a limiting factor to the development of the project(s)?
6. Is your department interested in the prospect of a regional shellfish/mollusc hatchery in the Wider Caribbean?
7. Please give an indication (on a scale from 1 to 3, where 1 is most important and 3 least important) as to which regional hatchery activity would be most beneficial to your country:
   [ ] Reliable supply of seed
   [ ] Technical support in grow-out operations
   [ ] Investigating new culture candidate species
8. If you answered “Yes” to question 6, would you be willing to financially contribute to send one representative of your country to a feasibility workshop in the Caribbean Region, evaluating optimal hatchery site and candidate culture species?
9. If you are not willing to financially contribute, but willing to participate in the workshop, please indicate the reason from one of the choices below:
   [ ] Lack of funds
   [ ] Uncertain as to the importance of a feasibility workshop to develop the concept of a regional hatchery
   [ ] Uncertain as to country’s contribution to workshop
   [ ] Would like to receive further information before committing
10. Any general comments or concerns regarding the development of a regional hatchery?

Please note that before the establishment of such a facility, all environmental factors will be thoroughly considered and strict management protocols established.
CUESTIONARIO CRIADERO REGIONAL DE PRODUCCIÓN DE SEMILLA DE MARISCOS Y/O MOLUSCOS

La información obtenida de este formulario es para generar una información general sobre los proyectos actuales relacionados con la acuicultura en su país, y para determinar sus necesidades y/o intereses en el desarrollo de un criadero regional. Especies como el caracol pala o rosado, los pectínidos o viera, las ostras perlíferas, ostras del mangle, almejas, el caracol burgao o cigua, el erizo de mar, el pepino de mar y otras especies de mariscos endémicos o nativos que puedan tener una demanda son considerados.

1. Proyecto(s) de acuicultura en curso (especifique si son de investigación o de producción).
2. ¿Las especies cultivadas son exóticas o nativas? Por favor haga un listado de las especies.
3. ¿Estos proyectos son gubernamentales o privados?
4. ¿Hay interés o demanda por especies diferentes a las que están cultivando actualmente?
5. ¿Es el suministro de semilla un factor limitante al desarrollo de los proyectos?
6. ¿Su departamento está interesado en el prospecto de un criadero regional de producción de semilla de mariscos y/o moluscos en el Caribe?
7. Por favor de un calificativo (en una escala de 1 a 3, donde 1 es más importante y 3 menos importante) sobre cómo la actividad de un criadero regional podría ser más beneficiosa para su país:
   [ ] Confiable suministro de semilla.
   [ ] Apoyo técnico a las operaciones de cultivo de juveniles.
   [ ] Investigación de nuevas especies candidatas para cultivo.
8. Si usted ha contestado “Sí” a la pregunta 6, ¿podría estar disponible para contribuir financieramente para el envío de un representante de su país a un taller de viabilidad en la Región Caribe, para evaluar el lugar óptimo para el criadero y las especies candidatas para cultivo?
9. Si usted no puede contribuir financieramente, pero le interesaría participar en el taller, por favor encierre en un círculo la razón entre las siguientes opciones:
   [ ] Falta de fondos.
   [ ] Incertidumbre sobre la importancia del taller de viabilidad para el desarrollo de un concepto de criadero regional.
   [ ] Incertidumbre sobre la contribución de los países al taller.
   [ ] Le gustaría recibir información adicional antes de comprometerse.
10. ¿Tiene algún comentario general o sugerencia respecto al desarrollo de un criadero regional?

Por favor note que antes del establecimiento de esta infraestructura, todos los factores ambientales serán ampliamente considerados y establecidos estrictos protocolos de manejo.
ANNEX 4.3 – SYNOPSIS OF AQUACULTURE ACTIVITY AND CONSTRAINTS IN THE REGION

The FAO-designed questionnaire provides a first assessment on the engagement of the governments of the Region in the development of a regional shellfish/mollusc hatchery concept. This questionnaire was distributed to 33 countries in August 2009 (the original letter and questionnaire circulated in Spanish and English are appended above). Responses were received from 21 countries (63 percent). Of these, 11 are islands of the Caribbean, the other ten are continental countries bordering the Caribbean Sea. Of the total number of responses received, only two countries showed a lack of interest in the concept (9.5 percent), five were uncertain and required further information (23.8 percent) while the remaining 14 expressed a definite interest in the concept (66.7 percent). Furthermore, three governments offered their country as the site where to establish the future regional facility.

For the 21 countries responding to the FAO call of interest, a total of 61 aquaculture projects were reported. Of these, 29 are considered commercial and most are privately owned (20) (see Figure 1). Aquaculture research and production is conducted on both natives and exotic species with exotic species supporting more than 75 percent of commercial operations. A substantial number of investigations and experimental-scale culture (32 recorded) on native species are carried out by government departments of the Caribbean countries. There were no reports of endemic species culture.

Seed supply was identified as the limiting factor to aquaculture development by 15 of the 21 respondents. The concept of a regional hatchery was endorsed by 19 of the 21 respondents (Figure 1). As shown in Figure 2, the top priority in the development of a regional facility is the reliable supply of seed for grow-out. In addition, 52 percent of regional governments who responded indicated their interest in the development of a more sustainable aquaculture, by the will to investigate new (native) species (Figure 2).

Several species are of interest as commercial culture candidates; all require further investigations into culture techniques and commercial feasibility. Species of common interest to countries who have responded are: queen conch, mangrove oyster, spiny lobster, pearl oyster, sea urchin, West Indian top shell and scallop species.

For a more comprehensive understanding of the molluscan species available for culture, Annex 5 provides an overview of Wider Caribbean species including target species.
Annex 5 – Native Caribbean molluscan species

A compilation of the native molluscan/shellfish species of the Wider Caribbean Region indicates the occurrence of 37 species including gastropods, crustaceans, bivalves (scallops, clams, oysters and mussels), echinoderms and cephalopod (the common octopus). Of these, 22 species were identified by the Caribbean Governments as target species for aquaculture. Sea cucumber was added at a later date due to the strong interest expressed by a number of participants at the Jamaica Workshop. Information for all native species on population distribution, and what is referred to as the “culture potential” specifying level of knowledge on techniques, growth rate and market demand, is given for each species.

**BIVALVE MOLLUSCS**

**ARCIDAE – Ark shells**

*Arca zebra*  Target species

**FAO names:** En: Turkey wing; Fr: Arche zebra; Sp: Arca cebra

**Size:** to 100 mm

**Distribution/habitat:** North Carolina to Florida and Texas (United States of America), Caribbean, south to the Federative Republic of Brazil and Bermuda. Attached by byssus to the underside of rocks and coral heads. Supporting fishery of socio-economic importance to artisanal fishermen in southern part of its range (e.g. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

**Larviculture:** Conducted experimentally. Relatively hardy even during early life stages, but slow growing.

**Culture potential:** Availability of broodstock in various locations, grows in high densities, attached to one another, tolerant species ranging from intertidal zone to depths of 15 m. Local demand.

*Anadara notabilis*  Target species

**FAO names:** En: Eared ark; Fr: Arche auriculée; Sp: Arca auriculada

**Size:** to 100 mm

**Distribution/habitat:** North Carolina to eastern Florida (United States of America), Caribbean, south to the Federative Republic of Brazil. Soft bottoms (mud or sand) at shallow intertidal depths. Exploited for local consumption.

**Culture potential:** Culture techniques tested for other species of same genus, which could be adapted to *A. notabilis*. Local demand.

**Note:** Distribution and some other information provided in this annex has been obtained from the following publication:

**Scapharca brasiliana**

**FAO names:** En: Incongruous ark; Fr: Arche incongrue; Sp: Arca pepitona  
**Size:** to 78 mm  
**Distribution/habitat:** North Carolina to Florida and Texas (United States of America), Caribbean and south to the Federative Republic of Brazil. Found at subtidal depths on sand, shell rubble and seagrass beds. Exploited for consumption in the southern portion of its range.  
**Larviculture:** Arcid veligers typically reach metamorphosis in 23–35 days at a shell length approximately 250 μm shell length. They will attach to hard substrates with byssus threads and should be provided shell or fibrous materials for attachment.

**CARDIIDAE – Cockles**

**Trachycardium muricatum**  
**FAO names:** En: American yellow cockle (Yellow prickly cockle); Fr: Bucarde jaune; Sp: Berberecho Amarillo  
**Size:** to 50 mm  
**Distribution/habitat:** North Carolina to Florida and Texas (United States of America), the Caribbean to the Federative Republic of Brazil. Found in moderately shallow subtidal areas buried in sand and often associated with coral reefs. Collected by hand for local consumption.

**CORVICULIDAE – Basket clams**

**Polymesoda artacta**  
**Target species**  
**FAO names:** En: Slender marsh clam, Fr: Cyrène elancée; Sp: Guacuco de marjal esbelto  
**Size:** to 40 mm  
**Distribution/habitat:** Southern Caribbean Sea and northern shore of South America, from Belize to Gulf of Venezuela and Maracaibo Lake. Buried in mud in estuaries, mangrove swamps and coastal lagoons. Consumed locally.  
**Larviculture:** Research studies on early life stages and documentation available.  
**Culture potential:** Species of interest to Caribbean Governments.
LUCINIDAE – Lucinas

Codakia orbicularis

FAO names: En: Atlantic tiger lucine; Fr: Lucine tigrée américaine; Sp: Lucina tigre
Size: to 85 mm
Distribution/habitat: Bermuda, Florida to Texas (United States of America), the Caribbean south to the Federative Republic of Brazil, found deeply buried in sand at subtidal depths. Exploited locally for consumption.
Larviculture: Codakia sp. veligers have been reported to be lecithotrophic (not requiring algal food), reaching metamorphosis in 9–12 days at approximately 175 μm shell length. This species may be a detrital feeder or utilize chemoautotrophic bacteria in the gills for nutrition in waters with low phytoplankton production.

OSTREIDAE – Oysters

Crassostrea rhizophorae

FAO names: En: Mangrove cupped oyster; Fr: Huître creuse des Caraïbes; Sp: Ostión de mangle
Size: to 120 mm
Distribution/habitat: Caribbean to the Federative Republic of Brazil. Attached to mangrove roots, rocks or other oyster shells. Heavily exploited species. Historically, there has been aquaculture development for this species in the Region, primarily based on wild spat.
Larviculture: Larvae become eyed pediveligers in 10–12 days at around 250 μm shell length at which time they attach to oyster shells, concrete, tires and other hard surfaces or plastic sheeting. The use of ground oyster shell provides individual, cultchless, spat.
Culture potential: Known techniques for larviculture and grow-out, broodstock availability in various locations, abundance of wild seed. Local demand.

VENERIDAE – Venus clams

Macrocallista maculata

FAO names: En: Calico clam; Fr: Vénus calicot; Sp: Almeja calico
Size: to 70 mm
Distribution/habitat: Bermuda, North Carolina to Florida and Texas (United States of America), the Caribbean to the Federative Republic of Brazil. Lives in coarse sand at shallow subtidal depths, often associated with seagrass beds. Exploited for local consumption, primarily in southern half of its range.
Larviculture: Macrocallista sp. reach metamorphosis after one week at approximately 220 μm shell length. Survival through settlement is improved by providing a substrate (sand) to facilitate burrowing. Similarly, broodstock are best maintained in a substrate that allows the clams to burrow.
**Chione cancellata**

**FAO names:** En: Cross-barred venus; Fr: Vénusquadrillée; Sp: Venus cuadrilla  
**Size:** to 45 mm  
**Distribution/habitat:** From the Republic of Cuba throughout the Caribbean and from the Republic of Honduras to the southeastern Brazil (Federative Republic of). Sand in shallow subtidal environments, often associated with seagrass beds. Exploited for local consumption.  
**Larviculture:** Cross-barred venus clams reproduce sexually. Sexes are separate and fertilization is external via broadcast spawning of gametes. *C. cancellata* larvae settled out of the water column when individuals reached a size of 170–196 µm. Larval duration as typically being around 11 days from hatching to settlement.

**PECTINIDAE – Scallops**

**Argopecten gibbus**  
**Target species**  
**FAO names:** En: Calico scallop; Fr: Peigne calicot; Sp: Peine percal  
**Size:** to 65 mm  
**Distribution/habitat:** Bermuda, Florida and Texas (United States of America), the Caribbean and northern Brazil (Federative Republic of). Found in beds in shallow to moderately deep water on sandy bottoms.  
**Larviculture:** Larvae cultured in static and flow-through systems. Reach settlement in 10–14 days at 220 µm, high survival rate.  
**Culture potential:** Tested culture techniques. Reach market size in 18 months at 55 mm shell height. Relatively hardy and easy to culture; rapid growth but to small market size. Small scallop needs to be sold and consumed whole. Potential market demand high. Limitations related to availability of broodstock.

**Argopecten nucleus**  
**Target species**  
**FAO names:** Not recorded  
**Size:** to 65 mm  
**Distribution and habitat:** South Florida (United States of America), southern Gulf of Mexico, Caribbean and the Republic of Suriname. Found in sandy bottoms, co-existing at times with *Nodipecten nodosus* at 10-50 m deep.  
**Larviculture:** Early life stages culture researched and documented.  
**Culture potential:** Natural spat collection and grow-out tested. High market value.
**Euvola ziczac**  
**Target species**  
FAO names: **En**: Zigzag scallop; **Fr**: Peigne zigzag; **Sp**: Vieira zigzag  
Size: to 120 mm  
**Distribution/habitat**: Bermuda, North Carolina to Florida and Texas (United States of America), the Caribbean, south to the Federative Republic of Brazil. Gregarious subtidal species to depths of 50 m, usually buried in sand.  
**Larviculture**: Pediveligers metamorphose approximately 10–12 days post fertilization (depending on rearing factors, larval density, food ration). The eyed-larvae settle at 200–220 μm shell length. Attain 10 mm shell height in three months under nursery conditions.  
**Culture potential**: Well-tested culture techniques. Reach market size in 18–24 months. Rapid growth, but a delicate species during early life cycle to settlement. Grow-out on bottom, as species recesses in sand; labour intensive and needs to be optimized for commercial viability. High market value. Availability of broodstock low.

**Nodipecten nodosus**  
**Target species**  
FAO names: Not recorded  
Size: to 150 mm  
**Distribution and habitat**: North Carolina (United States of America) to south to the Federative Republic of Brazil. Found in rocky hard and sandy bottoms. Lives attached to hard substrate, found up to 120 m depth. Consumed locally.  
**Larviculture**: Pediveligers are competent to metamorphose approximately 10–15 days post fertilization. Attain 10 mm shell height in one month following transfer at sea.  
**Culture potential**: Well-researched techniques for early life stages and grow-out. Large-scale culture conducted in the Federative Republic of Brazil. Fast-growing species. Recorded to reach market size 80 mm in 10–12 months. High market value.

**PENNIDAE – Pen shells**

**Pinna carnea**  
**Target species**  
FAO names: Not recorded  
Size: to 300 mm  
**Distribution/habitat**: Bermuda, South Florida (United States of America) to the Federative Republic of Brazil. Buries vertically in sandy bottoms. Found subtidal to 25 m depth.  
**Larviculture**: Research studies in early life stage culture.  
**Culture potential**: Fast growing for first five months. Market size (160 mm) for meat consumption attained in 11–14 months. Grow-out techniques for pearl oysters and scallops can be adapted to species.
Atrina rigida

**FAO names:** En: Stiff pen shell; Fr: Jambonneau raide; Sp: Pina tiesa  
**Size:** to 300 mm  
**Distribution/habitat:** North Carolina to Florida (United States of America), northern Caribbean including the Commonwealth of Bahamas, Greater Antilles, the Republic of Cuba, and Yucatan (United Mexican States). Burrows in fine sands in shallow-water seagrass beds. Commercially exploited around Campeche (United Mexican States).

Atrina seminuda

**FAO names:** En: Half-naked pen shell; Fr: Jambonneau demi-lisse; Sp: Pina semislisa  
**Size:** to 230 mm  
**Distribution/habitat:** North Carolina to Florida and Texas (United States of America), and Caribbean to the Argentine Republic. Burrows in fine sands in shallow-water seagrass beds. Exploited for local markets.  
**Larviculture:** Little is known about the larval biology of the pen shells, although it is reported that they are difficult to spawn relative to other bivalve species, and noted that the teloplanic larvae (long drifting), with some species reaching over 800 μm prior to settling, suggests significant constraints to hatchery production.

PTERIIDAE – Pearl oysters

*Pinctada imbricata* **Target species**

**FAO names:** En: Atlantic pearl oysters; Fr: Huître perlière de l’Atlantique; Sp: Ostra perlera Atlántica  
**Size:** to 76 mm  
**Distribution/habitat:** Bermuda, South Carolina to Florida and Texas (United States of America) and Caribbean. Lives subtidally attached to rocks and other hard substrates. Exploited by divers for local food consumption, and historically, for the pearl market.  
**Larviculture:** Larvae are cultured in both static and flow-through culture systems. Larvae reach settlement at approximately 30–35 days at a size of 230–300 μm shell length.  
**Culture potential.** Availability of broodstock. Can be cultured for consumption, half-pearl, or pearl. Relatively hardy and tolerant species. Commercial size reached in 9–12 months depending on type of culture. Local market for consumption.
**Pteria colombus**  
**Target species**

**FAO names:** Not recorded  
**Size:** to 60 mm  
**Distribution/habitat:** Bermuda, North Carolina (United States of America) to the south of the Federative Republic of Brazil. Lives subtidally attached to rocks and other hard substrates. Exploited by divers for local food consumption, and historically, for the pearl market.  
**Larviculture:** Similar to *Pinctada imbricate.*  
**Culture potential:** Availability of broodstock. Can be cultured for consumption, half-pearl, or pearl. Commercial size reached in 9–12 months depending on type of culture.

**MYTILIDAE - Mussels**

**Perna perna**  
**Target species**

**FAO names:** En: South American rock mussel; Fr: Moule roche sudaméricaine; Sp: Mejillón de roca sudamericano  
**Size:** to 170 mm  
**Distribution/habitat:** Southern Caribbean to the Federative Republic of Brazil. Lives on hard surfaces, common in high-energy rocky coasts. Species heavily exploited commercially, stocks are dwindling. Consumed cooked and canned industrially.  
**Larviculture:** Spawning induction and larviculture of mytilids are similar to other bivalves, as are the species of phytoplankton and feeding regimes. Larvae metamorphose in 15–20 days at 250–300 μm shell length. They attached to surfaces using their byssus, and typically settled onto fibrous materials.  
**Culture potential:** Local market demand and known culture techniques for early life stages. Relatively hardy.

**Modiolus americanus**

**FAO names:** En: Tulip mussel, American horse mussel; Fr: Modiole tulpe; Sp: Mejillón tulipán  
**Size:** to 110 mm  
**Distribution/habitat:** South Carolina to Florida (United States of America), Caribbean to the Federative Republic of Brazil, and Bermuda. Lives attached to hard substrates intertidally or shallow subtidal depths in coral reefs areas.
Mytella guyanensis  
**Target species**

**FAO names:** En: Guyana swamp mussel; Fr: Moule de Guyane; Sp: Mejillón tulipán

**Size:** to 110 mm

**Distribution/habitat:** Southern Caribbean to the southeastern Brazil (Federative Republic of). Intertidal in bays and protected areas, forming clumps attached to mangrove prop roots or other hard substrates. Consumed locally (in southern part of area) in stews, boiled, grilled, or with rice.

**Larviculture:** Not well documented.

**Culture potential:** Local market demand for consumption.

PHOLADIDAE – Angel wings

*Cyrtopleura costata*

**FAO names:** En: Angel wing; Fr: Aile d’ange; Sp: Ala de ángel

**Size:** to 180 mm

**Distribution/habitat:** Massachusetts to Texas (United States of America) and Caribbean to northeastern Brazil (Federative Republic of). Found in compact mud or sand from intertidal to shallow subtidal depths. This species supports an important fishery in the United Mexican States, the Republic of Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Republic of Chile.

**Larviculture:** Hatchery methods are well documented. Eggs have a limited amount of yolk, which requires that larvae begin to feed after the first day. Larvae remain free swimming for 16–21 days before metamorphosis. Pediveliger shell length averages approximately 317 um.

GASTROPOD MOLLUSCS

STROMBIDAE – Strombid conchs

*Strombus gigas*  
**Target species**

**FAO names:** En: Queen conch; Fr: Strombe rosé, lambi; Sp: Cobo Rosado, caracol

**Size:** to 300 mm

**Distribution/habitat:** Lives on sand near seagrass beds at depths of 2–30 m. Bermuda, southeastern Florida (United States of America), the Caribbean, the United Mexican States to the Federative Republic of Brazil. Due to exploitation, stocks are severely depleted throughout most of its range. Listed in Appendix 2 of CITES.

**Larviculture:** Very well documented and tested.

**Culture potential:** Broodstock maintenance, larviculture induction and nursery culture well established. Grow-out in land-based ponds and cage structures have reared queen conch to market size (18 cm SL) in 20 months. Limitations related to high hatchery costs, low survival and slow growth. High market value.
**Strombus costatus**  
**Target species**  
**FAO names:**  
*En:* Milk conch;  
*Fr:* Strombe laiteus  
*Sp:* Cobo lechoso  
**Size:** to 160 mm  
**Distribution/habitat:** Lives on sand near seagrass beds between depths of 2–30 m. Bermuda, southern Florida (United States of America) and Gulf of Mexico, the Caribbean, the United Mexican States to the Federative Republic of Brazil. Consumed locally and exploited commercially in parts of its range.  
**Culture potential:** Techniques for queen conch can most probably be adapted. Smaller species. Availability of broodstock. Market value not as high as *Strombus gigas.*

---

**TROCHIDAE – Top shells**

**Cittarium pica**  
**Target species**  
**FAO names:**  
*En:* West Indian top shell;  
*Fr:* Trochus des Antilles;  
*Sp:* Durgado antillano  
**Size:** to 100 mm  
**Distribution/habitat:** Shallow, subtidal on rocks and shell rubble. Collected by divers commercially throughout its range Bahamas, Caribbean and the United Mexican States to the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.  
**Larviculture:** Spawning and larviculture techniques known. Conducted experimentally with purpose of restocking. Attains 2 mm in three months under controlled conditions.  
**Culture potential:** Spawning in the laboratory and larval development described for several temperate and tropical species. Exploited for its meat and shell. High market value. Reduced broodstock availability and high production cost.

---

**TURBINELLIDAE – Vase shells**

**Turbinella angulata**  
**FAO names:**  
*En:* West Indian shank;  
*Fr:* Chanque antillais;  
*Sp:* Chanque antillano  
**Size:** to 350 mm  
**Distribution/habitat:** Intertidal to shallow, subtidal on rocks and shell rubble. The Commonwealth of Bahamas, Caribbean and Yucatan (United Mexican States) to the Republic of Panama. Consumed locally, it is of the largest gastropods in the Atlantic.  
**Larval development:** West Indian shanks produce a leathery egg capsule containing an average of 30–40 larvae/capsule. The larvae undergo direct development, emerging as juveniles. This means of reproduction could have potential for managed production. Growth rate is little known.
TURBINIDAE – Turban shells

*Turbo canaliculatus*

**FAO names:** En: Channelled turban; Fr: Turban canaliculé; Sp: Turbante acanalado  
**Size:** to 75 mm  
**Distribution/habitat:** Subtidal on rocks, usually associated with seaweeds, to 120 m. Southeastern Florida (United States of America), Caribbean and Yucatan (United Mexican States) to the Federative Republic of Brazil. Consumed locally with potential economic importance.

---

*Turbo castanea*

**FAO names:** En: Chestnut turban; Fr: Turban marron; Sp: Turbante castaña  
**Size:** to 38 mm  
**Distribution/habitat:** On sand, shell and coral rubble. North Carolina through Florida to Texas (United States of America), Caribbean and Yucatan (United Mexican States) to the Federative Republic of Brazil. Consumed locally with potential economic importance.

**Larviculture:** Turbinid gastropods are broadcast spawners; larval development have been documented for other species. Females release several million eggs (220 μm diameter) which metamorphosis in as little as four days, suggesting lecithotrophy. Little is known of the larval development and hatchery potential of the Caribbean species noted above.

---

MURICIDAE – Rock shells

*Chicoreus pomum*

**FAO names:** En: Apple murex; Fr: Rocher pomme; Sp: Busano manzanero  
**Size:** to 125 mm  
**Distribution/habitat:** On soft and hard bottoms, shallow subtidal to 200 m. North Carolina through Florida (United States of America), Gulf of Mexico, the Caribbean and Yucatan (United Mexican States) to the Federative Republic of Brazil. Consumed locally, raw or boiled and spawns communally.
CRUSTACEANS

PALINURIDAE – Spiny lobsters

Panulirus argus  
Target species
FAO names: **En**: Caribbean spiny lobster; **Fr**: Langouste blanch; **Sp**: Langosta común del Caribe
Size: to 450 mm (commonly 250)
Distribution/habitat: Bermuda, North Carolina (United States of America), Caribbean to northern Brazil (Federative Republic of). Lives in shallow water to 90 m. Commercially and recreationally fished throughout its range. Considered overexploited in certain areas.
Larviculture: Reproduction and larval stages poorly understood.
Culture potential: Juvenile collection and grow-out researched. Limitations associated with lack of defined culture technology, aggressive behaviour, long larval life and grow-out period, and space requirements for culture. High demand and market value.

Panulirus guttatus
FAO names: **En**: Spotted spiny lobster; **Fr**: Langouste brésilienne; **Sp**: Langosta moteado
Size: to 150–200 mm
Distribution/habitat: Bermuda, Bahamas, southern Florida (United States of America), Belize, the Republic of Panama to the Republic of Suriname and the Federative Republic of Brazil, the Caribbean arc from the Republic of Cuba to the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, Netherland Antilles and Los Roques (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Lives in shallow rocky areas, found mainly in crevices.
Larviculture: No documented information available.
Culture potential: Not assessed for this species; knowledge on *Panulirus argus* culture may be applied.

Panulirus laevicauda
FAO names: **En**: Spotted spiny lobster; **Fr**: Langouste brésilienne; **Sp**: Langosta moteado
Size: to 200–300 mm
Distribution/habitat: Bermuda, southern Florida (United States of America), the Caribbean and the coasts of Central and South America from Yucatan (United Mexican States) to the Federative Republic of Brazil. Coastal waters to 50 m; on rock, gravel and coral substrates.
Larviculture: No documented information available.
Culture potential: Very little reported for this species; knowledge on *Panulirus argus* culture may be applied.
MAJIDAE - Spider crab

*Mithrax spinosissimus* **Target species**

**FAO name:** Not recorded

**Size:** to 133 mm

**Distribution/habitat:** Tropical Atlantic Ocean from the Carolinas, the Commonwealth of Bahamas, the Caribbean, as far south as Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Inhabits rocky outcrop and man-made canals.

**Larviculture:** Experimental reproductive studies. Larvae hatch as swimming *first zoeae* and molt within 12 hours, again in 36–48 hours; during the zoal stages the larvae are lecithotrophic. They metamorphose into feeding megalopa and within 3–4 days molt again to the first crab stage (6–8 days post hatch).

**Culture potential:** Tolerant to narrow range of environmental parameters. Aggressive and highly cannibalistic.

---

ECHINODERMS

ECHINOIDAE

*Tripneustes ventricosus* **Target species**

**FAO names:** Not recorded

**Size:** to 15 cm (spines up to 2 cm)

**Distribution/habitat:** Caribbean; inhabits seagrass beds and shallower reefs from 0–10 m.

**Larviculture:** Successfully developed for stock enhancement in Asia.

**Culture potential:** Species of interest by some Caribbean countries. Hatchery and nursery techniques known. Widely harvested throughout Lesser Antilles to satisfy demand for local consumption.

*Lytechinus variegates* **Target species**

**FAO names:** Not recorded

**Size:** to 7 cm (spines up to 2 cm)

**Distribution/habitat:** Common in the Caribbean. Typically inhabits seagrass beds; found from 1 m to 17 m depth.

**Larviculture:** Successfully developed for stock enhancement in Asia.

**Culture potential:** Species of interest by some Caribbean countries. Hatchery and nursery techniques known. Harvested and exported to Japan and other Asian countries. Roe highly valued.
**Diadema antillarum**  
**Target species**

**FAO names:** Not recorded  
**Size:** spines up to 30 cm  
**Distribution/habitat:** Tropical oceans, including Indo-Pacific region and Western Atlantic and Caribbean basin, to South America. Inhabits coral reefs and found from 1–10 m depth.  
**Larviculture:** Successfully developed for stock enhancement in Asia.  
**Culture potential:** Species of interest by some Caribbean countries. Hatchery and nursery techniques documented. Record of mass mortality due to disease.

---

**CEPHALOPODS**

**OCTOPODIDAE – Octopus**

**Octopus vulgaris**  
**Target species**

**FAO names:** En: Common octopus; Fr: Pieuvre; Sp: Pulpo común  
**Size:** to 1.3 m  
**Distribution/habitat:** Worldwide tropical and subtropical waters. Found in coastal waters and to outer edge of continental shelf (0–200 m depth). Inhabits rocky areas, coral reefs and sea grass beds. Known to migrate seasonally. Exploited for meat. Consumed locally with potential economic importance.  
**Larviculture:** Experimental reproductive studies. Relatively long brooding period 25–65 days. Known to settle 40 days after hatching at minimum size of 12 mm.  
**Culture potential:** Species of interest. Extended spawning period. More research required for optimal culture techniques.
Annex 6 – Working group – terms of reference

ROUND TABLE I – POTENTIAL CULTURE CANDIDATES
Main questions: How to prioritize species to be cultured for commercial production? Market demand; culture know-how; ease of transport of seed; ease of adaptation of grow-out techniques to countries; countries' needs for employment; source of revenue and source of food; how to prioritize research for new culture candidates.

A checklist of questions on culture candidate species – If the answer to the question is not known, identify possible information source, or data deficiency for species.

1. Make a list of four species which your group considers to be best candidates for a regional shellfish hatchery in a first instance. Choose from the target species outlined in red.
   a. For each species identify main reason for choice.
   b. List countries of the region which would benefit from culturing each of species listed.

2. List two more species outside of the target species and provided in the overview of native shellfish species as potential culture candidates.
   a. For each species identify main reason for choice.
   b. List countries of the region which would benefit from culturing each of species listed.

3. For each of species chosen, starting with target species, assess their suitability as culture candidates by considering the following:
   a. Distribution of species and availability of broodstock in Caribbean region.
   b. Natural growth rate, survival rate, reproductive cycle (continuous, well-defined spawning periods, etc.).
   c. Is species protected under international agreements or local legislation requiring permitting for culture? Specify.
   d. Is species known to be susceptible to diseases – any records of mass mortality in natural environment – specify or identify as data deficient.
   e. Any previous experience in the Region for culture of species – specify if experimental or commercial; specify if ongoing or stopped. If stopped, can limitations be overcome in future venture? (e.g. is limitation due to lack of funding, unsupportive government legislation, biological limitations).
   f. Any potential impact on environment during grow-out phase?

4. For each of the species chosen, starting with target species, further assess potential for culture by considering:
   a. Available information on known and tested culture techniques – for larvae, post-larvae, settlement, survival, grow-out. If not known for species, may be adapted from similar species? Which ones?
   b. More research required? If so, can production be initiated with already known techniques or need a few years of Research and Development?
c. Known transport techniques – for broodstock, for spat? – if unknown, easily adaptable from others? Technical support available to develop adequate techniques?
d. Ease of transfer of technology to growers.
e. Costs (identify as: high, medium, low): spat production, and grow-out – specify if unknown or estimate based on culture requirements (does species require a lot of space – grown at low densities- methods used for grow-out expensive?).

5. For each species chosen, starting with target species, assess potential for sale considering:
a. Market Demand – specify, local, export, tourism, potential increase in demand.
b. Identify strategy for sale – high market/low volume, low market price/high volume – artisanal for local consumption/tourism product/potential export.

6. For each species, write up a short report summarizing all questions above, and identify top two culture candidates for commercial purpose, and two culture candidates with high potential but requiring further research.

7. Can one hatchery accommodate commercial culture for both of these candidates? Specify.

8. Finally, this question will be followed in Round Table IV (developing a 5-year plan), but in a first instance, can a Regional hatchery accommodate commercial production AND research of candidate species?

ROUND TABLE II – PROS AND CONS OF A REGIONAL HATCHERY. PUTTING FORWARD SOLUTIONS

Main questions: How to ensure genetic diversity among Caribbean populations and ensure a disease/parasite-free operation? Broodstock management; quality control of seed; shipping and acclimatization protocols; responsible party for environmental assessment for grow-out; transfer of techniques; discharge of waste waters; introduction of invasive species and/or pathogens; impact of increased populations to natural ecosystem.

Approach this exercise as if broodstock was imported in your country (your laboratory or hatchery), and introduction of pests, diseases, pathogens and exotics in your marine environment would be disastrous to the fishing industry of your country.

1. Each working group is given one group of target species to consider: bivalves, gastropods or echinoderms.

2. For each group of target species, determine process required to import broodstock to Regional Hatchery by considering the following:
a. Determine current location of broodstock (country where found in abundant populations).
b. Assess whether population level genetic information for the species is available.
c. Is area of collection known for contaminants, and assess likelihood of broodstock carrying pathogens, diseases.
d. Can collection be planned around disease outbreak or phytoplankton bloom? How does this affect health of broodstock, and how can it be addressed? – specify, known techniques for rapid assessment, monitoring of phytoplankton occurrence in collection site, etc.
e. Draw up collection protocol, preparation for shipment, and protocol for receiving broodstock – is there the need to check broodstock for pathogens upon arrival to facility? Be specific and consider both cases if broodstock genetically different, or similar to recipient Regional hatchery location.

3. Within hatchery, identify specific quarantine requirements for target species, by considering:
   a. Is there a need for a routine protocol to assess health of broodstock during quarantine and post-spawning?
   b. Can overflowing water be easily collected for treatment before discharge? How much discharge is generated? Where should it be discharged.
   c. How can decision be taken on method for treatment of discharge; what other experts are required for this? Where effluent should be discharged (into sea, land)?
   d. If there is a disease outbreak in broodstock area, draw up a contingency plan to avoid contaminating other parts of hatchery.
   e. How long does regional hatchery keep broodstock in quarantine? How can decision be made? What is done with broodstock once spawned?

4. For target species, identify protocols for shipping of spat to various countries by considering the following:
   a. Assessing health status of spat; routine examinations prior to shipping; which groups responsible for defining protocols and ensure that they are followed (government, scientists, and regional hatchery staff?).
   b. How to ensure adequate husbandry of spat upon arrival to enhance survival – training of growers, sending a regional hatchery staff for the first shipment?
   c. What documentation required for spat received, and spat exported, if any?
   d. Where does the responsibility of the regional hatchery stops – once sent, once received – once guaranteed to be disease-free?

ROUND TABLE III – OPTIMAL SITE FOR A REGIONAL HATCHERY

Main questions: Ease of access; infrastructure; personnel available for training; enforcement of protocols, reliability, exposure to natural disasters, proposed list of countries, availability of target species, technical support (proximity of research institutes, university).

A checklist of questions on site suitability.

1. Make a list of three countries which your group considers suitable for a regional shellfish/mollusc hatchery. Select from any countries in the Wider Caribbean (not restricting yourself to countries present at the workshop).

2. For each country, list the pros and cons by considering the following:
   a. Government support in venture – specify what kind of support if any (include permit requirement).
   b. Existing infrastructure – specify, roads, buildings, land.
   c. Ease of access – proximity of airport, shipping lines, central location to potential partners – specify.

3. Within each country, make a general assessment of available locations for a Regional Shellfish Hatchery by considering the following:
   a. Is it a known shellfish area – if yes, are shellfish consumed from the area – specify species, history.
b. Disease status of the area – known to have history of fish, shellfish kills, bacterial contamination – specify.
c. Any nearby industrial outfall, domestic wastes, agricultural land? – specify and consider potential for this in long-term.
d. Any harmful chemicals or pollutants known to exist in the water – specify.
e. Water quality of the area – any data available, possibility of doing surveys – is heavy fouling and disturbance of sediment (proximity to shipping channel) a potential problem?
f. Technical support available nearby – university, laboratory, etc. – specify.
g. Exposure to natural storms and hurricanes – specify.

4. For the location of the hatchery, assess its suitability by considering the following:
   a. Availability of Broodstock for target species – specify.
   b. Natural temperature and salinity within range of most target species – constant or fluctuating- specify for which target species most suitable.
   c. Are extremes in temperature and salinity within limits of target species – specify.
   d. Land availability provides scope for expansion in the long-term.

**ROUND TABLE IV – DEVELOPING A 5-YEAR PLAN**

Main questions: How to ensure sustainability of Regional Hatchery? Anticipated time frame of production; selling of seed; breakeven point; training and continuity of skilled personnel; reliable and continuous supply of seed; balancing production and research.

Base process on a 3-month production cycle (from spawning to spat) consider two scenarios:

**Scenario 1** – No available infrastructure, i.e. virgin land and requirement for building of physical facility; and

**Scenario 2** – Availability of basic infrastructure for housing of facility/nursery complex.

1. Develop a 5-year business plan for each scenario above by considering:
   a. Number of staff (hatchery, nursery, algae).
   b. Time required for construction, optimizing techniques, training staff, etc.
   c. Construction costs to (for Scenario 1) and range of operational costs (minimum to maximum); identify main costs of operation considering all culture stages (algae, larvae, nursery, shipping, importing broodstock), including personnel and facility.
   d. Threshold for cost of spat production to be commercially viable. Estimate using numbers provided throughout presentations and build an ideal situation. Consider spat cost needs to be acceptable to recipient countries.
   e. Threshold of spat production volume to be commercially viable (per year).
   f. Number of years before breaking even, and starting to make a profit; list factors on which this is dependent and main constraints – take into account poor production cycles, broodstock availability, etc.; identify first year of sale.
   g. Commercial potential of hatchery on a yearly basis without expansion of initial facility.

2. Balancing commercial production and research
   a. Assess staff requirements for research – taken within hatchery, external, part-time consultants, and students?
b. Identify extra costs – travel, accommodation, salary, etc.
c. Develop how to prioritize time and space allocated to research without jeopardizing production.

ROUND TABLE V – FUNDING IMPLEMENTATION OF REGIONAL HATCHERY

**Main questions:** How to fund building of facility, training of personnel and initial operation? How to establish and maintain a cost-effective operation? Funding cost of production in first five years; cost effectiveness of purchasing seed for recipient countries; inclusion of other agencies/proposals in region; inclusion of private sector in the Regional Hatchery operation; involvement and funding of research centers; assisting investigations of new culture candidates.

**Note:** All the participants at the Workshop took part in this round table. Part of these questions were addressed within the development of a 5-year plan in Round Table IV.

1. Assess grand total for regional shellfish hatchery
   a. Initial costs.
   b. Operational costs.
   c. Initial capital investment – initial construction costs plus operational costs until first sale.

2. Identify funding agencies in the region – List with specific interests of agencies.

3. Identify products of regional shellfish hatchery (spat, market size, trained staff, courses, etc.) – be specific.

4. Identify potential customers and level of involvement for Regional Shellfish Hatchery products:
   a. Private sector.
   b. Local and overseas.
   c. Governmental agencies.
   d. Tourism – direct sale.
   e. Any others.

5. Identify potential partners – University, laboratories, bringing in own funds, and degree of involvement in Regional shellfish hatchery.

6. Assess external funding requirements:
   a. Number of years relying on full funding.
   b. List operational aspects likely to require partial funding on a yearly basis.
   c. Identify operational costs that sale of spat will be able to cover.
   d. Identify need for other activities – training, technical support, grow-out to market size for sale.
   e. Identify costs and potential revenue for above activities.

7. Prioritize funding agencies to be approached – identify if dependent on funding type required, several need to be approached for specific needs.
Annex 7 – Working groups – summary reports

Working Groups (WG) were given 1–1.5 hours to discuss the subject according to the terms of reference outlined for each Round Table and indicated in the Agenda (see Annex 1). A short presentation of ten minutes was given to the rest of the participants by one working group representative, and a report submitted by the end of the Workshop, summarizing the working group discussion.

Two or three working groups were formed for each Round Table, with each having at least one representative from a bordering Latin American country, an island country and a host country representative (Jamaica).

ROUND TABLE I – POTENTIAL CULTURE CANDIDATES

Main questions: How to prioritize species to be cultured for commercial production? Market demand; culture know-how; ease of transport of seed; ease of adaptation of grow-out techniques to countries; countries’ needs for employment; source of revenue and source of food; how to prioritize research for new culture candidates.

WG1: Aruba, Colombia, Belize, Jamaica
WG2: Haiti, Panama, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Jamaica
WG3: Honduras, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Jamaica

Summary

All groups selected the mangrove oyster and the pearl oyster as optimal candidates for commercial production. Both gastropods (queen conch and West Indian top shell) were selected as commercial candidates by two out of three groups. Spiny lobster and Lion’s paw scallop were considered by one of three groups as commercial candidate for culture. The latter scallop species was noted as top commercial candidate by this group.

This selection was based in great part on their local current and potential market demand, ease of culture, regional experience and wide distribution of the species in the region.

Mangrove oyster is the species for which technology is best available in the Region, easy to transfer to growers and for which there is a local demand; its major limitations are that its market size is relatively small, and is of a low market value (USD 0.10 a piece). Time to market size is six months, a rapid turnover from spawning and advantageous to hatchery production. Its cost of production is known to be relatively low and processing costs are minimal as it is served on the half shell on the local market. Larvae and spat of the species can be easily transported with minimal mortality rates among countries. Stock enhancement of natural populations is also considered as a side benefit of the commercial spat production for this species.

Pearl oyster can be grown for its meat and/or for pearl production (full pearls, half-pearls). The latter makes it a high value product. The constraints lie in the lack of tradition in pearl culture in the Region, and the need to develop and train a pearl producer sector, requiring a high level of skill. Time to pearl production from the spat phase is approximately two-and-half years. There has been experimental culture conducted on the species in the Region, and it is believed that culture techniques of other species of the same genus may be easily adapted. The species itself is relatively hardy and larvae and spat are thought to be easily transported.
Queen conch is another species with meat and shell as two end products. In addition, preliminary research on queen conch pearls indicates the potential for a third product form. It is a high market value species and one of the few shellfish traditionally consumed locally in the Region. Its culture has been conducted on a commercial-scale by a private company in the Region, and techniques are well known. Stock enhancement of natural populations is considered a side benefit to the commercial production of spat of this species. The constraints lie in its slow growth rate (two years to juveniles, and five years to adult size). A market has been successfully tested for the 2-year old product. Yet, it is questionable whether the species can be commercially cultured at profit. Additionally, the species is listed in Appendix II of CITES making trade among countries difficult and/or harvest. However, some countries have regulations which would allow the sale for 2-year old conch (namely, Jamaica).

West Indian top shell has a high local market demand in several of the islands of the Region and commands a relatively high price for its meat (reported as USD 40 for 5 lb (≈ 2.27 kg). of meat in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines). Its shell is highly prized in the Asian market (Belize reported sending two shipments to Asia in 2009). Experimental culture for spat has shown its ease of culture, however, little is known for grow-out to market size. It is thought that production costs would be high. However, it is a species worth investigating and because of its populations declining across its range due to overexploitation, stock enhancement of the species would be beneficial. Further research is required in order to complete the culture cycle.

Spiny lobster is a species of interest in the Region as it is heavily exploited for consumption across its range. Its major constraint is the long duration of its larval life (12 months), making hatchery production difficult. However, experimental culture has shown the ease of collection of pueruli juveniles, and grow-out in “casetas” in the natural environment. This enables stock enhancement of the exploited populations, which is of benefit to several governments of the Region; such work has been conducted in the Region in the past, but was discontinued due to lack of funding. Existing regulations on size limits for harvesting this species may limit product sale. This activity is slightly out of context with the goals of a regional hatchery.

Lion’s paw scallop is one of the largest scallop species of the Region, although its range is more of a southern distribution, and grow-out would be confined to those waters. This would be its major constraint. Its culture techniques are well known and work has been conducted on an experimental and commercial scale in the Federative Republic of Brazil. It is a species of high market value and could be easily marketed to the tourist sector in the Region.

Other species mentioned as of interest but definitely requiring further research were the West Indian spider crab, Mithrax Spinosissimus, mainly because of its high market value, the long-spined sea urchin, Diadema antillarum, for its importance in the ecosystem and for the aquarium trade, the sea egg Tripneustes ventricosus, for its ease of culture demonstrated experimentally and market demand in the export market, the sea cucumber for its high market value and availability of farming techniques for other species in the Pacific, and the common octopus for its market demand and high market value.

The working groups felt that a regional hatchery could easily accommodate the production of several species, as long as culture techniques were similar, requiring similar equipment and/or that production cycles can be alternated. Similarly, research on other species should be considered and balanced with production requirements, as availability of skilled staff facilitates investigations, assisting visiting scientists/students in implementing applied studies.

Finally, each country was asked to list the top two candidates for commercial culture in a first instance. The following were listed (no. of listings in bracket): mangrove oyster (6), top shell (5), sea cucumber (2), queen conch (2), sea urchin (2), lion’s paw scallop (2), and pearl oyster (2). One country did not answer.
Based on this working group session, it is recommended that a low market value, easily cultured species with well-tested techniques be selected as a first culture candidate for the regional hatchery – namely, the mangrove oyster. Its local market demand – both current and potential – needs to be assessed prior to its confirmed selection.

It is further recommended that a high value market species with well-tested techniques and an easily created high market demand be cultured commercially as a first instance – namely, the lion’s paw scallop. In a second instance, the following species should be investigated for optimizing culture techniques to market size: top shell and sea urchin.

ROUND TABLE II – PROS AND CONS OF A REGIONAL HATCHERY. PUTTING FORWARD SOLUTIONS

Main questions: How to ensure genetic diversity among Caribbean populations and ensure a disease/parasite-free operation? Broodstock management; quality control of seed; shipping and acclimatization protocols; responsible party for environmental assessment for grow-out; transfer of techniques; discharge of waste waters; introduction of invasive species and/or pathogens; impact of increased populations to natural ecosystem.

WG1: Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Colombia, Aruba, Jamaica
WG2: Haiti, Honduras, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Jamaica
WG3: Panama, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Belize, Jamaica

Each group was given a group of species to consider the requirements for culture on a regional basis.

WG1: Bivalves (namely mangrove oyster, lion’s paw and pearl oyster)
WG2: Gastropods (namely West Indian top shell and queen conch)
WG3: Echinoderms

Summary

All groups noted that population level genetics are essential for adequate collection of broodstock and preservation of biodiversity among populations of the Region. Most species (aside from lion’s paw scallop) are distributed throughout the Region and aside from queen conch, there is insufficient regional information available on the genetic make-up of the populations and their health status. The latter includes the assessment of pathogens and diseases in the broodstock by a veterinarian. Once this information is available, it is preferable that collection of broodstock is made from the population closest to or most accessible to the regional hatchery or from the “client” population.

The need for precautionary measures to avoid transfer of diseases and pathogens was stressed by all groups as was the collection for the broodstock deemed most “healthy”. A second check on pathogens, as well as a physical inspection and record of mortality was recommended upon arrival to the Regional hatchery, and any contaminated or “unfit” individual to be discarded. These measures should follow standard EPA guidelines. Certification of shipment should, therefore, be made upon collection and receipt of shipment. It was suggested by one group, that at least two collection sites should be identified in order to ensure availability of broodstock in the event of a problem at one of the sites.

Monitoring of broodstock should be conducted throughout the quarantine period. In addition, the quarantine area should be isolated from the remainder of the hatchery – receiving incoming water from the general seawater system, but treated separately with a separate discharge system; the treatment of effluent water and re-use of this water for the broodstock was recommended. Access to the quarantine area was recommended
to be for authorized staff only. A well-defined protocol for cleaning and discard was deemed necessary to avoid contamination of other parts of the hatchery. Quarantine time recommended varied among working groups, ranging from one to four weeks; this will be dependent on the species and needs to be determined within the regional hatchery protocol.

Some working groups recommended reusing the broodstock following spawning. Others suggested that this depends in part on the results of the population level genetics – should genetic make-up prove homogeneous, replenishing the broodstock would be easier. Conditioning the broodstock for spawning was recommended to enhance success. The question of limiting the gene pool within the hatchery by using the same broodstock for a number of production cycles was raised and needs to be addressed.

Most working groups felt that the government of the country hosting the regional hatchery should set the rules of the hatchery with respect to protocols followed, and certification of shipments should be made by an official authority – namely a specialized laboratory or veterinarian – according to the criteria set by the hatchery (hence, the government); should the hatchery criteria be higher than the national bodies, it is the former which will prevail.

Regarding the shipment of spat, and the allocated responsibilities, all working groups recommended that training be an important part of the package in the acclimation and reception of spat received by growers. There is the need for participating governments to commit at the onset and agree on spat transfer responsibilities and protocols. The accompaniment of a first shipment by a regional hatchery staff member was suggested, or by the previously trained “client” himself. This would come at a cost and the revenue used for the operation of the regional hatchery. The regional hatchery would be responsible for shipping pathogen-free and disease-free spat, certified by an authorized agency (e.g. the Fisheries Division), and that export documentation such as the certificate of origin, phytosanitary certification, etc., would be necessary for export. The responsibility of the regional hatchery was suggested to end upon delivery of the spat or once guaranteed to be disease-free. This latter point needs further discussion to be well-defined.

**ROUND TABLE III – OPTIMAL SITE FOR A REGIONAL HATCHERY**

**Main questions:** Ease of access; infrastructure; personnel available for training; enforcement of protocols, reliability, exposure to natural disasters, proposed list of countries, availability of target species, technical support (proximity of research institutes, university).

**WG1:** Jamaica, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Panama, Haiti

**WG2:** Jamaica, Colombia, Belize, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

**WG3:** Jamaica, Honduras, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Aruba

**Summary**

Countries mentioned as potential sites for a regional hatchery were in no specific order of priority: Jamaica, the Republic of Colombia, Belize, Puerto Rico, Florida (Miami, United States of America), the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, the Republic of Panama, the Republic of Haiti, the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago. The two countries most favoured were Jamaica and the Republic of Colombia, followed by Belize and Trinidad and Tobago. Decisions were based on current and potential government support, existing infrastructure, ease of access, occurrence of targeted shellfish species, environmental health, technical support and protection from natural disasters. It should be noted that both Jamaica and the Republic of Colombia representatives were present at the workshop and gave a presentation on potential sites within their country.
Both countries have current legislation enabling activities within the scope of a regional hatchery, facilitating permitting. In addition, Jamaica has a site owned by the government which has the potential for hosting a regional hatchery facility. The Republic of Colombia has current local government support and external funds (Japan International Cooperation Agency – JICA) to conduct pilot investigations in the culture of shellfish species until 2013. Infrastructure between the two varies greatly in that Jamaica offers a virgin site with access to available utilities, with available land for further expansion; whereas the Republic of Colombia has recently built an extensive marine laboratory for shellfish culture within the boundaries of the University. Access to international airports for shipping is doable for both sites. The Colombian site is within a small city, which may be potentially an issue should development increase. The site in Jamaica is relatively remote, but there is the possibility of nearby residential developments which may impact on environmental parameters in the long-term.

Population occurrence of native shellfish species exists at both sites; in Jamaica, mangrove oyster and queen conch broodstock would be readily available, and further field surveys would be required to assess population distribution and occurrence of other species. Broodstock could be available for most target species near the Colombian site. The areas seems not to be prone to disease, and both benefit from local technical support (Jamaica hosts the University of West Indies and resident experts at the Department of Fisheries; the Republic of Colombia also has the benefit of a University). Water quality is routinely tested at both sites and there is the capacity to do further testing. Environmental parameters seem adequate, except for large salinity fluctuations recorded in the Jamaican site due to freshwater input following floods and heavy rainfall. The island itself is prone to hurricane exposure, whereas the Colombian coast is well protected from such natural disasters. Both countries have current aquaculture industry for both local and export sectors, facilitating the shipping of spat and market size individuals, encouraging the expansion of the industry.

The Republic of Trinidad and Tobago was mentioned as a potential site for the hatchery, although there were no representatives from this country at the workshop to provide further details. This site was selected based on its existing aquaculture activity, assuming an existing legislative framework and government support. Shipping lines and airport access provide ease of spat and broodstock transport between countries. Further information is required to assess the suitability of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago as a regional hatchery site.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and the Republic of Haiti have some sites which would be suitable for culture; the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela has local expertise on shellfish culture available from the University, as well as a site earmarked for shellfish culture, well protected from natural disasters; the Venezuelan coast harbours several of the targeted shellfish species implying adequate environmental parameters for these species. The Republic of Haiti has land, but with little local expertise and highly prone to natural disasters such as hurricanes. Access to other countries of the Region is not easy for both of these countries, and visa requirements to travel to-and-from the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela are an additional obstacle to training of growers, etc.

Belize and the Republic of Panama are two central American countries mentioned as potential sites; they both have precedence in aquaculture, with existing legislative framework and government support. Technical support is available to a certain extent and shipping lines provide access to a great part of the Region. There is the potential for land becoming earmarked for a regional hatchery in both countries.

The concept of the regional hatchery as a business incubator of aquaculture development was put forward. More specifically, the regional hatchery would stimulate shellfish aquaculture in the Region by providing a pool of expertise and marketing packages of “solutions” customized for each potential client. In this way, a country’s or sub-region individual needs may be better served; this may lead to a number of
small hatcheries, which would be part of a greater whole. The regional hatchery group thus, functions as a development agency to stimulate shellfish aquaculture. Marketing know-how, stimulus packages (venture capital, loans, incentives, R&D), training, etc., should form part of the whole catering to individual needs. In this way, the regional hatchery would not concentrate on the production of seed itself, but on distributing the know-how and the technical support for producing seed. This concept needs further discussion and approval by the interested parties to be better defined.

**ROUND TABLE IV – DEVELOPING A 5-YEAR PLAN**

**Main questions:** How to ensure sustainability of regional hatchery? Anticipated time frame of production; selling of seed; breakeven point; training and continuity of skilled personnel; reliable and continuous supply of seed; balancing production and research.

**WG1:** Aruba, Honduras, Haiti, Jamaica, Panama  
**WG2:** Colombia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Jamaica, Belize, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

Two scenarios were considered while attempting to develop a preliminary 5-year plan: **Scenario 1** based on the development of an undeveloped site, requiring the construction of the physical facility, as well as the installation of hatchery equipment and seawater system, **Scenario 2** based on the use of an existing infrastructure and requiring modification for the purpose of a hatchery.

The plan was based on the following:
- A 3-month production cycle from spawning to spat; and
- Four-fold objectives: commercial production, training of the private sector, research into new species and production for stock enhancement.

In order for the regional hatchery facility to be sustainable, the following were identified as key points:
- A strategic location of the facility itself (for ease of movement of seed and broodstock).
- Focus on a low market-value/high demand species and high market value/lower volume species.
- Identify markets and marketing required for sale of product.
- Need to balance commercial production and research. Research should only be initiated once production is stable and should be supported through grant funding. Funding for research from hatchery can only be allocated if all operating costs are covered by revenue.
- Financial contribution of participating countries required initially and for continued research.
- Government support at ministerial level is a must.

**Summary**

A general plan for the implementation of a regional hatchery was developed as shown in the timeframe below, taking into consideration the input of both working groups and of the resource persons participating in the Workshop.

Breakeven point for the regional hatchery depends on whether Scenario 1 or 2 is followed. For Scenario 1, a minimum of five to six years was suggested as required for the hatchery to operate on its revenues from sales and training. For Scenario 2, where an existing infrastructure is used, a breakeven point of two to four years was given; this depends on the modifications required to the existing infrastructure and the availability of core staff.
### Description of activity

| Inception phase – Details of actions required and promotion of facility, funding proposals, securing government support. |
| Site acquisition (Scenario 1) – EIA, preparation of site (land clearing). |
| Design and construction of facility – Approvals, permits, consultation and equipment purchase. Pump house has to be built to capacity. Hatchery in modular phases. |
| Population level genetic for target species – Developing broodstock collection protocol and establishing partnerships for collection and shipping. |
| Recruitment of core hatchery staff and project staff (project operations and technical staff – five in total) – Including administration, larval culture, microalgae culture, casual labour (grow-out, and general maintenance). Veterinary and water chemistry services can be provided by external support and not as core staff. Security staff may be required depending on site (two/three in total). |
| Training of regional hatchery staff – Short training overseas for algal cultures/larvae. Two-way training/overseas and on-hatchery site. |

### Engagement of all stakeholders.

| Pilot run in hatchery (focus on bivalves known techniques). |
| Preliminary grow-out – Establishing seed transportation and farming protocols for interested countries. Two/three other sites in the Caribbean Region partnering in pilot grow-out. |
| Developing grow-out package – Identify needs and time required for training growers of the Region. |
| Initiating and exploring the market with products – Target restaurants, hotels, wholesalers (including specialized market considerations for export market requirements). |
| Providing the package – Seed/growing to market size. |
| Training – Full training programme of growers and selling of seed. On-site hatchery training/marketing of product. |
| Scaling-up production – Increased production of seed. |
| Research activities – Investigating additional species. |
| Culture-based fisheries programme – Develop fishery of West Indian top shell via production of seed and grow-out for stock enhancement. |
| Expanding hatchery facility – Adding production modules. |
| Increased production – Increase bivalve hatchery seed production. |
| Increased grow-out production – Both for training and sale of seed and market size individuals. |
| Farming and shipment protocols – Completing all protocols. |

### Funding Source

| Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 |
| External agencies/partner governments. |
| Technical services to growers. |
| Sale of seed. |
| Sale of market size product from grow-out component of hatchery. |
| Government subsidies and grant proposals for aquaculture development (i.e. research and stock enhancement). |
Recommended size of the facility: 1 250 m². Hatchery (920 m²): (tanks, pumps, filtration system, electrical, plumbing, accessories); office (28 m²); training room (84 m²); and dormitories to accommodate 15 persons (210 m²).

Funds required for the establishment of a regional hatchery were estimated to range between USD 2 to 6 million for set-up and operation costs for a 5-year period. A detailed and comprehensive budget needs to be drawn for an accurate assessment. The amount of funding required is dependent on Scenario 1 or Scenario 2. Capital investment includes: land, buildings, equipment, boat (for grow-out component), vehicle for transport and a refrigerated truck. Capital investment for Scenario 1 (clean ground) is higher than for Scenario 2. Operational costs include staff salaries (five hatchery staff, two to three security), costs incurred through broodstock collection, shipping of seed, analyses, chemical supplies, utilities and fuel costs. Operational costs of the facility were estimated to be in the range of USD 500 000/year, for a commercial spat production of approximately 30 million (mangrove oyster and lion’s paw). Operating costs will depend on the site of the regional hatchery, as well as on production volume and needs to be ascertained once a more definite plan is made.
Annex 8 – Selected photos

FIGURE 1
Adult specimen of lion's paw scallop, *Nodipecten nodosus*

FIGURE 2
Open specimen of calico scallop, *Argopecten gibbus*, with muscle and gonads visible

FIGURE 3
Adult specimen of the West Indian top shell, *Cittarium pica*

FIGURE 4
Pearl oyster, *Pinctada imbricata*, seed ready for grow-out in Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

FIGURE 5
Lion's paw scallop (*Nodipecten nodosus*) young spat

FIGURE 6
Weighing bivalve spat in a shellfish hatchery
FIGURE 13
Artisanal mussel culture in Chacopata, Araya Peninsula, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

FIGURE 14
On-growing of pearl oyster, *Pinctada imbricata*, seed in Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

FIGURE 15
Group photo of selected workshop participants during field trip

FIGURE 16
Group photo of selected workshop participants during a visit to the Oyster Culture Unit in Bowden, Jamaica
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ABSTRACT
Bivalve and gastropod molluscs have supported artisanal and commercial fisheries throughout the Caribbean for generations and they remain today an important source of protein and foreign exchange for many countries in the Region. Although fisheries for conch, top shells and bivalve molluscs have played an important historical role in the economies of the Caribbean and Latin America, commercial-scale mollusc farming has limited precedent there. This paper will briefly review the characteristics associated with mollusc farming and summarize current methods for hatchery production of selected bivalve and gastropod molluscs indigenous to the Region.

INTRODUCTION
The fundamental differences between bivalves and gastropods are associated with feeding and motility, characteristics that dictate to a great degree site selection and
farming methods during grow-out to harvest. Bivalves are filter feeders, consuming microalgae (phytoplankton) from the water column. As a result, bivalves are non-motile during their juvenile and adult stages and they thrive best in locations with high primary productivity in the form of phytoplankton standing crop (or density). In contrast, gastropod molluscs are herbivorous benthic grazers or carnivores that often have a high degree of motility. Although these characteristics will play a role in choosing appropriate locations for farming, and subsequently, the species composition and source of broodstock for a hatchery facility, most of the fundamental techniques for culturing mollusc larvae are similar. This report first will discuss the culture methods and potential for bivalves followed by a discussion of selected gastropod molluscs.

**BIVALVE MOLLUSCS**

Bivalve molluscs have been cultured for centuries throughout the world, largely because they are relatively easy to farm; as filter feeders, they consume phytoplankton from natural sources, seed can be collected from the wild, they are non-motile and typically reside in shallow coastal waters.

The Caribbean Sea is a partially enclosed extension of the North Atlantic Ocean comprised of the islands of the Greater and Lesser Antilles and the continental countries of Latin America from the United Mexican States to the Federative Republic of Brazil. The coastal shelf on most islands is small, while it is much more extensive along the continental coast. The greatest portion of the Caribbean is quite deep, usually exceeding 1 800 m. It is characterized by nutrient-poor surface waters which results in low phytoplankton productivity throughout most of the eastern Caribbean and presents a major constraint to bivalve culture. Generally, low nutrient levels limit phytoplankton productivity to less than 250 mg C/m²/day. The larger islands of the Greater Antilles have a limited capacity for bivalve cultivation in protected bays, lagoons and estuaries with phytoplankton productivity 250–500 mg C/m²/day. Nutrient inputs in the embayments are primarily from terrestrial runoff, but the areal extent of these sites is usually limited, and industrial and domestic pollution may pose public health risks associated with bivalve culture.

Nutrient-rich waters occurring in upwelling areas along the coasts of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, the Republic of Colombia, the United Mexican States, the Republic of Guyana and the Republic of Panama support the highest phytoplankton productivity in the Caribbean Sea, exceeding 500 mg C/m²/day. Enhanced by terrestrial nutrient input from rivers, many estuaries and coastal lagoons support fisheries for several species of oysters, mussels and scallops. As a result, the potential for bivalve farming in these countries has been recognized for several years; the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and the United Mexican States, in particular, have significant experience in mollusc culture.

**Hatchery production**

Hatchery production of seed for bivalve molluscs essentially is the same for most species; the major differences are related to spawning requirements (temperature/salinity), duration of the larval veliger stage, and specific requirements for settlement (burrowing into substrate vs. attaching to hard surfaces). The common requirement for hatchery production of bivalves is the provision of cultured phytoplankton as feed; it represents the most technically demanding and costly aspect of the operation. However, methods for phytoplankton culture are well documented in the literature and a relatively straight-forward component of bivalve hatchery operations (Creswell, 2010; Hoff and Snell, 2008). Several species of microalgae are well adapted to warm, tropical conditions, notably *Isochrysis galbana* (Tahitian strain, T-Iso), *Chaetoceros gracilis*, *Tetraselmis* sp., and *Nannochloropsis oculata*. Nonetheless, stock algae cultures require a cool, temperature-controlled illuminated environment that requires
cleanliness standards consistent with a microbiology laboratory (Helm, Bourne and Lovatelli, 2004).

Ripe bivalves, either collected from the wild during the appropriate season or conditioned in a hatchery broodstock system, can be induced to spawn by either temperature or salinity changes. At higher latitudes, temperature is usually the environmental factor that initiates gametogenesis, while in lower latitudes salinity serves as the environmental cue. In either case, the initiation of ripening and spawning is associated with phytoplankton productivity in the environment. Broodstock are placed on a spawning table, or individual holding containers in cool (22 °C) high salinity seawater (35‰), and gradually the temperature is raised to 30 °C and freshwater is added to reduce the salinity to 20‰). This process may be repeated for one to six hours. Adult bivalves are usually spawned on a shallow water table or trays, often with a black background to facilitate identifying eggs and sperm. Typically, the females are removed to separate containers when they begin to release eggs to avoid polyspermy (a condition when too many sperm will enter the egg and cause abnormal development). If the males fail to release sperm from temperature or salinity induction, some may be sacrificed and sperm stripped from the gonads and provided to the females. The eggs are collected on a 20–35 μm screen and rinsed to remove excess sperm and placed in a larviculture tank, typically at a density of 10–20 eggs/ml. Bivalve molluscs are highly fecund, and each female may release several million eggs during a single spawning.

The fertilized eggs develop rapidly, through a ciliated trophophore stage, and become shelled, veliger larvae within 24 hours (if not sooner). The veliger is the larval stage of all bivalve molluscs. The ciliated velar lobes filter phytoplankton as food for the developing larva and provide motility. In warm tropical waters, the larviculture water is exchanged (100 percent) each day through a drain at the bottom of the tank. The veligers are collected on fine-mesh screens, usually beginning with 35–50 μm screens, gradually increasing the mesh size to over 250 μm at the pediveliger stage (pre-settlement), depending on species. Culturists routinely grade the larvae to select the fast-growing, more robust veligers by using the screen mesh-size to remove a portion of the population that will result in a larval density of around 1/ml at the pediveliger stage (Figure 1).

Phytoplankton are fed daily, usually after the water exchange, at a density of 10 000–50 000 cells/ml depending on larval density and size. Observing and quantifying the clearance rate of phytoplankton by the veligers will help define the feeding regime as the larvae grow and their density changes. Providing more phytoplankton than necessary can result in rejection of algal cells by the larvae and bacterial contamination in culture tanks. Brightly illuminated tanks can promote algal blooms and should be avoided.

The duration of the veliger larval stage and the size at the time they are competent to metamorphose (settle) is variable. Typically bivalves will be competent to settle in one to three weeks at a size of 200–350 μm. Most larvae prior to metamorphosis develop a clearly observable umbo (called umbo-stage) followed by the pediveliger stage (a noticeable foot) and active “searching” behaviour and extension of the foot. At this juncture, the larvae are harvested and usually placed in smaller containers with
appropriate substrates for settlement. These vary considerably for different species and it represents the most significant departure in methods for culturing bivalves. In most cases, bivalve larvae do not require any chemical or environmental cues to induce settlement (as do many gastropods), however the proper substrate may be essential to post-settlement survival and it also defines how the bivalves are held in nursery systems before out planting for grow-out in natural waters.

**GASTROPOD MOLLUSCS**

The reproductive biology and larval development of gastropod molluscs are far more variable than for bivalves. Some gastropods are broadcast spawners, the eggs being fertilized externally in a similar fashion to bivalves; others are internally fertilized and produce egg masses that later hatch as veliger larvae, and some produce egg cases where larval development is completed within the capsule and benthic juveniles emerge (e.g. buscyonidae). Gastropods are commonly benthic feeders (unlike filter feeding bivalves), either herbivorous grazers (e.g. strombids, trochids and turban shells) or carnivorous predators (e.g. muricids, vase shells).

**Hatchery production**

The veliger larvae of gastropods utilize their ciliated velar lobes for motility and to filter phytoplankton in similar fashion to bivalve molluscs (although in many cases, such as the strombids, the velar lobes will bifurcate into four and then six extended lobes during the course of larval development). Gastropod larvae are usually much larger than bivalve veligers and, as a result, they are stocked at lower densities in culture tanks (approximately 50/litre for newly hatched queen conch).

Flow-through systems are considered more appropriate for these larger veligers because larger mesh screens can be used on standpipes, and the larvae are less likely to become impinged. The regular circulation is a significant improvement in water quality and bacterial contamination control over static water exchange systems.

The queen conch, _Strombus gigas_, is the most economically important gastropod mollusc in the Caribbean Region. Since the 1970s it has been the subject of study for managing the fishery, understanding its ecology and population biology and developing culture techniques (Brownell and Stevely, 1981). D’Asaro (1965) conducted early experiments related to the reproductive biology of queen conch and described their larval development. In the early 1980s, the refinement of hatchery techniques for queen conch was achieved at the University of Puerto Rico (Ballantine and Chanley, 1981; Ballantine and Appeldoorn, 1983) and at the University of Miami (Siddall, 1983; Creswell, 1984).

Most of these early efforts to produce queen conch in hatcheries was predicated on their reintroduction to enhance populations depleted by overharvesting. To date there have been no large-scale reseeding efforts with hatchery reared queen conch juveniles despite efforts by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission – FFWCC (Berg and Glazer, 1991), the University of Puerto Rico, Caribbean Marine Research Center (Stoner, 1994) and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in Belize. These studies concurred that release of small juveniles (1–2 cm) resulted in unacceptably high mortality and that released animals should be at least 7.5 cm SL and provide some degree of predator exclusion. Given the high cost of hatchery-produced conch seed (from USD 0.20 each for 2 cm seed to USD 0.75 for 7–9 cm seed), stock enhancement may not be economically feasible. A significant body of research was compiled with the 35th Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute (GCFI), held in Miami, Florida (United States of America) in 1983 (Iversen, 1983; Siddall, 1983; Davis and Hesse, 1983; Goodwin, 1983; Laughlin and Weil, 1983). A report of the “Evaluation Team on Conch Mariculture” from the 35th GCFI provided several insightful recommendations (Berg _et al._, 1983), among them:
Because hatchery-restocking programmes appear quite costly, adequate fishing data should be obtained before a commitment to an extensive restocking programme is made.

Considerable progress has been made in studies of the potential of restocking programmes, but information is needed concerning stocking densities, age at stocking and benefit of the restocking programme.

From the data presented, it appears that harvested conch products may not be sufficient to pay hatchery costs in restocking programme.

Given the present value of the resource (1983) and predicted costs for production of market-size or adult conch by any of the means discussed at these meetings, commercialization of conch aquaculture does not seem economically feasible at this time. However, changes in the price structure could change this. The present technology for conch aquaculture could be adapted to commercial scale ventures if such changes occur.

Considerable interest in queen conch culture has continued to present with studies being conducted by the Research and Advanced Studies Center of the National Polytechnic Institute of Mexico (Centro de Investigación y de Estudios Avanzados del Instituto Politécnico Nacional - CINVESTAV-IPN) (Aldana Aranda, 2003), the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (Glazer and McCarthy, 1996), the Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institute (HBOI Florida Atlantic University) (Davis, 2000), and Mote Marine Laboratory in Florida (Davis, 2005). To date, methods for maintaining broodstock, acquiring and incubating gametes, larviculture, metamorphosis induction and nursery culture and early feeding are well established. Grow-out of queen conch in land-based ponds and cage structures have successfully reared queen conch to market size (18 cm SL) in 20 months (0.15–0.20 mm/day). Davis (2005) provides a detailed review of production of half a million queen conch from egg stage to legal market size. The paper also discusses the economic potential for culturing queen conch for alternative markets, such as sub-legal juveniles for escargot and the aquarium trade, both of which would require some forms of regulatory variance.

Trochids are found in both temperate and tropical waters; reproductive development, as well as spawning in the laboratory and larval development has been described for several temperate species (Holyoak, 1988). Spawning and larval development for five tropical species from the Pacific and Red Sea (Heslinga, 1981; Heslinga and Hillmann, 1981). Bell (1992) presented a detailed study of spawning and larviculture of *Cittarium pica* and further elucidated the prospects for mariculture of the West Indian tops hell for restocking depleted populations (Bell, 1996).

The West Indian top shell, *C. pica*, is a broadcast spawner with a lecithotrophic veliger larva with short duration (3.5–4.5 days to metamorphosis). Larvae settle when exposed to algal film and the juveniles are generalist herbivores. Present constraints to successful mariculture are larval and early juvenile survival and spawning induction. Many techniques used for other gastropod molluscs, and specifically Indo-Pacific trochids could be adapted for *C. pica*, suggesting that stock enhancement of this important Caribbean gastropod from hatchery-produced seed could be feasible.
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ABSTRACT
The Fisheries Division of the Ministry of Agriculture, Jamaica, in 1976 concluded that the wild stocks of mangrove oysters (Crassostrea rhizophorea) were in an advanced state of decline. The cultivation of this oyster species was seen as a viable solution. In 1977, the Oyster Culture (Jamaica) Project commenced operations with the following aims: 1) to identify suitable culture sites; 2) to conduct research and develop a low-cost commercial method for collecting wild spat; and 3) to support the establishment of a sustainable farming industry. The project has succeeded in identifying production sites and developing commercial collection methods, however, it has failed in developing a sustainable industry. In order for Jamaica to have a commercially viable oyster culture industry, market planning and socioeconomic investigations must be key components of a targeted development plan for this industry.

INTRODUCTION
The mangrove oyster, Cassostrea rhizophorea, is extensively distributed throughout the Caribbean and is usually found in the narrow intertidal zone typically attached
to the roots of red mangrove (*Rhizophora mangle*) (Wade *et al*., 1980; Roberts, 1991). In 1976, the Fisheries Division of the Ministry of Agriculture concluded that the wild stocks of mangrove oysters around the island were in an advanced state of decline due to unsustainable exploitation practices. One solution forwarded at that time was the cultivation of the mangrove oysters. The feasibility of developing such an oyster industry was investigated through the establishment in 1977 of the Oyster Culture (Jamaica) Project (OCP), involving Ministry of Agriculture (Fisheries Division), the University of the West Indies (UWI) and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) of Canada.

The project was rolled out in three phases: **Phase 1** investigated the nature, biology and habits of the animals and suitable culture method for Jamaica; **Phase 2** aimed at launching commercial farming operations; while, **Phase 3** targeted economic research with the view of expanding the industry (Roberts, 1991). The project lasted 12 years, but failed in this period to develop a sustainable oyster industry.

**HISTORICAL BACKGROUND**

**The project years: 1977–1991**

**Phase 1** of the project lasted for three years and had two objectives. Firstly, locate and investigate viable population sites around the island. The UWI and IDRC were the lead agencies, providing funding and technical expertise. Preliminary surveys were conducted island-wide in mangrove areas which were characterized by having protected bays, consistently high seawater salinity levels and eutrophic water movement and a significant wild oyster population (Clarke, Little-Saunders and Newkirk, 1991). Eleven such sites were located, however, Bowden Bay in Saint Thomas was deemed the most favourable for collecting and grow-out purposes (See Figures 1 and 2).

![Figure 1: Eleven survey sites for oyster farming](source: from Alexander, 1991)

![Figure 2: Bowden sites in Saint Thomas](source: from Alexander, 1991)
Secondly, research was conducted, focusing on the life cycle and natural habitat of the mangrove oysters, as well as, the development of suitable culture methods under the existing conditions in Jamaica. In 1980, three years after Phase 1 was commenced, a viable methodology was introduced for collecting seed in intertidal zones.

**Phase 2** commenced in 1982 with reduced emphasis on biological research and a greater focus on establishing a self-sustaining industry. To this end, the government at the time acted on recommendations forwarded by the Oyster Culture (Jamaica) Project for an Oyster Culture Unit within the Ministry of Agriculture to be set up (Wade et al., 1981; Alexander, 1991).

The duration of this phase was marked by the establishment of Bowden site, Saint Thomas, as a major seed/spat centre and the development of technology and techniques, thereby, facilitating greater spat collection. Richards (1992) summarized the six major interventions undertaken. These were:
1. The introduction of long-lines to overcome choppy seas.
2. Reduced mortality via the movement of seeds at a size of 2.5 cm as compared to 1.5 cm.
3. Introduction of easily adjustable racks (“Slip-down Racks”) aimed at reducing the need to adjust cultch levels as a result of tidal range movement.
4. Reduction of cultch numbers from 10 to 5, thereby, allowing better fit in the lower region of intertidal zones.
5. Increased distance between spat collection spacers from 1.0 to 2.5 cm.
6. Incorporation of other stakeholders, such as the Scientific Research Council, Ministry of Health, Bureau of Standards and National Water Commission, to assist with industry development.

Alexander (1991) reported that spat catch rates increased to 60 percent within the period 1980–1985, preceding the aforementioned interventions.

**Phase 3** was the final project phase and focused on the enterprise development and the creation of appropriate institutional support structures for a sustainable oyster industry. Alexander (1991) and Richards (1992) pointed to three main outputs for this phase:
1. The development of a credit support programme in 1988 which provide financing for new and existing oyster farmers.
2. The development of governmental support, regulatory and management oversight.

**OYSTER CULTIVATION TECHNIQUES IN JAMAICA**
Cultivation of mangrove oysters involves two distinct activities: (1) spat collection; and (2) grow-out.

**Spat collection**
The collection of spat has evolved since the inception of mangrove oyster farming in 1977. Currently, it involves the use of 8 x 8 cm tire cultch with 2.5 cm spacers, hung from adjustable bamboo structures, referred to as “Hanson Racks” (Figure 3). These cultches are placed in the water, where they remain until the spat have set. When enough spat have settled, the cultches are exposed fortnightly for four to six hours to air dry. This eliminates most fouling organisms, such as barnacles. The cultches are sorted and transferred to the grow-out at the end of six weeks or when the spat have attained an average size of 2.5 mm, whichever comes first.
Grow-out
Cultches are removed and spat density assessed. Cultches with a spat density of 10–15 are considered optimum and selected for grow-out. The sorted cultch is strung with a 12.5 cm spacer (i.e. using a section of drip irrigation hose) with a maximum of eight per string. Two hundred and fifty strings are then hung on grow-out racks for the duration of the cultivation process, usually six months (Figure 4).

However, the cultivation method used in Jamaica, while taking advantage of the mangrove oyster’s ability to thrive in subtidal waters, tends to facilitate the propagation of fouling organisms. To combat this problem, aerial exposure is undertaken every two weeks for four to six hours. This process is continued for the four-month duration of the grow-out period or until a shell length of 40–70 mm is obtained.
INDUSTRY CHALLENGES

Many of the challenges associated with mangrove oyster cultivation and the failure to develop a sustainable industry can be traced back to technical and socio-economic issues.

Firstly, the technical challenges include the absence of a reliable supply of spat and this continues to be a major hindrance to the industry’s chance of recovering and developing. In Jamaica, mangrove oysters have two distinct spat periods. Hence, the production of oysters is centered on these two periods and consequently, the supply of oysters and its associated products will be seasonal. To ensure a continuous and reliable supply of spat, Jamaica must invest in the development of an oyster hatchery.

Secondly, there are socioeconomic issues related to the absence of a market-driven production strategy. Since the commencement of oyster farming, with the oyster culture project in 1977, limited attention has been paid to developing and sustaining markets. In fact, it was not until 2009 that a market study was undertaken by the Fisheries Division, aimed at developing a strategy for repositioning the industry to be more market-driven. Further compounding the problem is the fact that currently, there are no commercial oyster farmers.

Additionally, regulations governing the industry need to be developed. Currently, no laws exist to allow farmers and potential farmers to lease sea floor and its associated exclusive rights. Farmers will be unwilling to undertake major investment unless guaranteed tenure and right to protect their investment. Moreover, there are no production standards.

PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE

It is estimated that Jamaica imported some 2,000 kg of mollusc in 2007, which was comprised of clams, scallops and oysters. Oysters account for a large portion of total imports (STATIN, 2010). The hospitality industry is responsible for the majority of the importation and consumption of mollusc. However, at present, oyster cultivation is confined to the Ministry of Agriculture experimental facility in Bowden, Saint Thomas. There are no commercially-operated farms currently in Jamaica and it appears that this industry will not be re-established in the near future unless several pressing issues are resolved.

Foremost among these is marketing. In 2009, the Aquaculture Branch of the Fisheries Division commissioned a market study and a market plan for oysters and related products. The results from this study form the basis for a development plan the sole purpose of which is to provide a roadmap aimed at ensuring development and future viability in the oyster industry. This plan is composed of four objectives: (1) increase public awareness and brand identification; (2) re-enlistment of oyster farmers and development of a structured marketing apparatus; (3) development of value added products to create a market pull effect; and (4) research for the development of new product offerings.

This study highlighted some advantages such as a growing tourist industry and the potentially large uptake by locals, if product offerings were expanded. It is with this in mind that significant resources must be brought to bear on achieving these objectives, if Jamaica intends to re-establish its oyster industry.

CONCLUSION

After 33 years of oyster culture activity, Jamaica has a workable low cost mangrove oyster (Crassostrea rhizophorae) cultivation technology and a significant repository of technical information. However, it has not managed to develop a sustainable industry. In fact, there are currently no active oyster farmers/farms apart from the Bowden facility managed by the Fisheries Division.
A review of the industry has identified the following challenges: i) seasonal irregularities of spat; ii) high mortality during the grow-out periods; iii) absence of a marketing plan; iv) absence of a post harvesting facility; and v) regulatory framework for sea floor lease agreements.

If the aforementioned issues were addressed, greater success would be forthcoming in the development of the industry and Jamaica could potentially boast a sustainable oyster industry.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Formulation of a steering committee which is tasked with identifying issues and ways of restarting and enhancing oyster production, while at the same time, integrating it with the national goal of poverty alleviation.
2. Address the regulatory framework that deals with securing leasing rights to the sea floor in production localities.
3. Formation of production cooperatives to take advantage of markets and collective lobbying;
4. Improve technical competence and business practices of farmers via the design of training programmes for new farmers.
5. Formulation of marketing strategies to address the development of value added products and new product offerings.
6. Re-engage research partners, such as the University of the West Indies, to address production issues such as inconsistent spat supply and low survival of oysters during the grow-out periods.
7. Develop an incentive programme to attract new individuals to oyster farming. This could include, but would not be limited to, low-cost interest loans, moratorium on property taxes and duty free importation of related processing equipment.
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ABSTRACT
Culture techniques for two native scallop species, the sand scallop (*Euvola ziczac*) and the calico scallop (*Argopecten gibbus*) have been developed and fully-tested in Bermuda. A temporary pilot-scale custom-built facility was designed and built using insulated fiberglass containers, housing a hatchery, nursery and algal area. Both species demonstrated rapid growth rate at all stages of their life cycle, attaining market size within 12–18 months of egg fertilization. This paper describes optimal techniques for all stages of the life cycle, including grow-out methodology, species-specific constraints and estimated costs of spat production. Reproductive cycle in Bermuda’s more northern waters is well defined for both species with spawning activity occurring during the winter months. The duration of larval life is 10–14 days accelerated in the hatchery by increasing ambient temperature of 17 to 24 °C. Survival rate to settlement was higher for calico scallops (up to 55 percent) than for sand scallops (maximum of 20 percent). Similarly, the percentage of post-larvae obtained was consistently higher for calico scallops than sand scallops. Spat were reared using two different methods (mesh immersed in tanks and raceways) and size of transfer at sea was tested. Sand scallop spat benefitted from a longer nursery period, growing to 10 mm in <2 months following settlement in outdoor raceways; calico scallops demonstrate a high survival in the field when transferred at 2 mm shell height (or two to three weeks post-settlement). Suspended pearl nets were initially used for both species for grow-out, with an average growth rate ranging from 7–10 mm a month, and a survival rate >90 percent. At 25 mm shell height, sand scallops had to be grown directly on the sand for optimal growth and survival until market size. This proved labour intensive and costly, and grow-out of sand scallop requires further investigation to improve cost-efficiency of production. Calico scallops were identified as the easier culture species, being relatively hardy at all stages of its life cycle, with its only constraint being a smaller market size species.
18 meses desde la fecundación del óvulo. Este documento describe las técnicas óptimas para todas las etapas del ciclo de vida, incluyendo la metodología para la fase de engorde, las limitaciones específicas para cada especie y los costos estimados de producción de semilla. El ciclo reproductivo de ambas especies está bien definido en aguas más al norte de las Bermudas, ocurriendo actividades de desove durante los meses de invierno. La duración de la vida larvaria está entre 10 y 14 días, más rápida en el criadero mediante el aumento de la temperatura ambiental de 17 a 24 °C. La tasa de supervivencia hasta la fase de asentamiento fue mayor para las vieiras cálico (arriba de 55%) que para las vieiras de arena (máximo de 20%). Del mismo modo, el porcentaje de post-larvas obtenidas fue consistentemente más alto para las vieiras cálico que para las vieiras de arena. Las semillas fueron cultivadas usando dos métodos diferentes (mallas sumergidas en tanques y en canales de flujo rápido o raceways) y evaluando las tallas de transferencia al mar. La semilla de la vieira de arena se benefició de un mayor período en el criadero, aumentando a 10 mm en menos de dos meses luego del asentamiento en los canales de flujo rápido al aire libre; las vieiras cálico mostraron una tasa de supervivencia alta en el campo cuando se transfirieron con una altura de valva de 2 mm (dos a tres semanas posteriores al asentamiento). Se utilizaron redes perleras suspendidas para el cultivo de ambas especies en la fase de engorde, con una tasa de crecimiento promedio en el rango de 7 a 10 mm por mes y una tasa de supervivencia mayor de 90%. Para un crecimiento y supervivencia óptimos, las vieiras de arena con una altura de valva de 25 mm, tuvieron que ser cultivadas directamente en la arena hasta que alcanzaran la talla de mercado. Este trabajo resultó ser intensivo y costoso, por lo que el engorde de la vieira de arena requiere investigación adicional para mejorar la rentabilidad de su producción. Se identificó a la vieira cálico como la especie más fácil de cultivar, siendo relativamente resistente en todas las etapas de su ciclo de vida, con la única limitante de ser la especie de menor talla comercial.

INTRODUCTION
The zigzag scallop, *Euvola (Pecten) ziczac* (L.), also known as the sand scallop, is a sub-tropical and tropical species. It is similar to other pectinids in that the right (lower) valve is very convex, whereas the left (upper) valve is usually flat but has been seen to slightly convex or concave in some cases. It has been fished recreationally and/or commercially in the Federative Republic of Brazil (Pezzuto and Borzone, 1997) and along the Caribbean coast of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and the Republic of Colombia (Velez and Lodeiros, 1990) and has also been seen off Florida (USA) as a by-catch of the calico scallop fishery. Its northernmost distribution is Bermuda (Lodeiros *et al*., 1989).

In its natural state, this scallop is recessed in the sand with the rim of its outer left valve showing. It will swim when disturbed, but does not cover great distances. It has also been observed to bury completely 5–10 cm into the sand when faced with unfavourable conditions. Maximum shell height recorded in Bermuda is 130 mm (Sterrer, 1986). Its life span is thought to approximate five years. Worldwide, population numbers of *Euvola ziczac* have been reported to be low, with a decline seen in the 1990s. In Bermuda, it was known to occur in relatively large abundance during the 1940s and 1950s, and was recreationally fished until the early 1970s. It since has been recorded here and there, with no real evidence of a self-sustaining population. To our knowledge, there is currently no existing commercial hatchery in the Wider Caribbean for this species.

The calico scallop, *Argopecten gibbus* (L.), is largely restricted to the sub-temperate and tropical waters of the western north Atlantic with the major stocks distributed from Cape Hatteras, North Carolina (USA) to the Cape San Blas areas of the northeastern Gulf of Mexico (Waller, 1969). Calico scallops have also been collected from the Greater Antilles, Bermuda, and the western portions of the Gulf of Mexico.
Farming native scallop species (Waller, 1969). The commercially important stocks are located off North Carolina (USA) where it supports a small and transient fishery. The calico scallop has two convex valves, although the right is slightly more convex than the left (Sterrer, 1986). The upper valve is usually mottled with a combination of brown, red, purple, yellow and white. It is found lying on top of the seabed in sandy, rocky and grassy substrates and has been recorded in Bermuda in several inshore waters, as well as on the more exposed north shore of the island. It attains a maximum height of 70 mm in Bermuda. This species, like the sand scallop, was a commonly found bivalve in Bermuda and supported a recreational fishery at one time. Population numbers are at present very low in Bermuda (Sterrer, 1986). There is no existing commercial hatchery in the Wider Caribbean for this species.

**SPAWNING SCALLOPS UNDER CONTROLLED CONDITIONS**

The general culture cycle for these two sub-tropical scallop species resembles closely that of other pectinids. Methods for rearing early life stages were optimized in terms of temperature and diet, but were initially adapted from that used for more temperate species. Details of procedures for all aspects of culture for both species are given in Sarkis and Lovatelli (2007).

Assessment of the reproductive cycle is necessary for a hatchery operation and peak spawning activity for both species occurs during the winter months in Bermuda (December to March, with an extended spawning season to end of April for the calico scallops). Gonadic indices and spatfall have been monitored for both species in great detail (Manuel, 2000; Sarkis, Couturier and Cogswell, 2006; Blake and Moyer, 1991). Ripe scallops are characterized by a bright orange colouring of the female roe. Fecundity is similar in both species, averaging six million in *A. gibbus*, and slightly greater in *E. ziczac*, reaching ten million per female in some instances (Sarkis, unpub.). Both species are hermaphroditic.

To date, thermoregulation is agreed to be the most efficient method for inducing sperm and ova release. Protocols vary slightly for species mainly with respect to the degree of thermal shock provided and duration of shock required for release. *Euvola ziczac* is more sensitive to stress, requiring a lower thermal differential than *Argopecten gibbus*. For both species however, the strategy is the exposure to an initial cold shock, followed by an exposure to a warm shock. Both species release gametes when exposed to warmer seawater temperatures. Spawning trays are used, where water temperature is controlled and release monitored. Once release is initiated, scallops are isolated into 2-l beakers filled with twice filtered 1 µm seawater and observed closely, changing individuals to new beakers in order to maintain as pure a solution of sperm and egg as possible. In this way, self-fertilization is avoided. Eggs are fertilized with pooled solution of two to three other males, at a ratio of 1 ml sperm : 1 litre eggs. This cross-fertilization ensures chances of survival. Egg solutions are pooled, counted and

![Generalized life history of a pectinid](image)
transferred to larval tanks at densities of 10–15 larvae/ml for development into larvae. Rearing temperature for both species was 24 °C, salinity at 36 ppt (ambient) and no aeration was used in the first 24 hr of development.

Trochophore larvae are formed within 24 hr of fertilization and D-larvae are developed within two days of fertilization (refer to Figure 1 for life stages). Food is supplemented to the larval culture at the start of Day-1 (trochophore stage) and from here on, larvae are fed daily a food ration consisting of live algal species, cultured on-site. Average yields of D-larvae for calico scallops determined per spawn, range from about 29–58 percent (Sarkis and Lovatelli, 2007). On the other hand, zigzag scallop yields are generally lower and are indicative of the greater sensitivity of this species to handling and bacterial contamination. The range of D-larvae obtained from fertilized eggs was of about 1–49 percent per spawn over 4-years of operation at a Bermuda bivalve hatchery (see Sarkis and Lovatelli, 2007 for details on culture protocols for both species).

ALGAL CULTURE

The algal culture facility is a vital part of an aquaculture operation. Extreme care must be taken to ensure the production of healthy monocultures of selected algal species. Details on culturing algae are well documented and easily found in the literature. For specific techniques used in Bermuda for the scallop species, see Sarkis and Lovatelli (2007). Several types of algae were cultured as food for scallops namely, *Isochrysis galbana*, *Chaetoceros gracilis*, *Tetraselmis chuii*, *Thalassiosira pseudonana*. These were found sufficient to satisfy the growth and survival requirements of both scallop species to 2 mm spat.

Food ration for Day 1 trochophore larvae was of 7 cells.µl⁻¹, and was gradually increased to approximately 20 cells.µl⁻¹ by the end of the larval life. This was determined to be the optimal ration for both species, based on experimental studies (Sarkis and Lovatelli, 2007). Ration was substantially increased for post-larvae once fixed, resulting in a daily ration of 220 cells.µl⁻¹ for 2 mm spat. For extended nursery rearing to 10mm, the use of commercially available dry algae was necessary to supply increased volumes needed. Details on suppliers, volumes and species used are given in Sarkis and Lovatelli (2007).

LARVAL REARING

Two types of larval systems were used in Bermuda: 1) 1 000 litre insulated tanks for static systems; and 2) 200 litre conical tanks for flow-through. The latter system proved less labour intensive with similar yields of pediveligers larvae. For a new facility, such a flow-through system is recommended (see Sarkis, Helm and Hohn, 2006 for details).

Static rearing system

Water change is conducted three times a week; at this time, larvae are collected on two sieves of differing mesh size, so that faster growing larvae are separated from the slower growing or dying larvae (Figure 2). Larvae are temporarily placed in small containers (10-litre buckets, while tanks are cleaned and re-filled with treated seawater (filtered twice to 1 µm and heated to 24 °C). Any assessment of larval
Farming native scallop species

Culturing native scallop species is done during this transfer period, often larvae of similar size are pooled into one tank at suitable densities. Initial density for D-larval rearing is of 5–10 larvae/ml, decreasing to 1 larva/ml at the pediveliger stage. Beginning Day 2 after fertilization, a small supply of air is given to the larvae. Feeding is provided in a single batch at the same time each day.

Flow-through system

A description of the system developed for calico and zigzag scallops is given in Sarkis, Helm and Hohn (2006). The advantages of a flow-through system include reduced physical handling of larvae, reduced labour demand, increased tankage capacity leading to increased larval density per tank thus reducing space requirements and reduced potential of bacterial contamination. The disadvantages are that routine assessment of the larval culture is difficult.

Conical tanks are best suited to flow-through systems; in Bermuda, available tanks were modified, but it is recommended that steeper cones are used for optimal results. Two important factors to consider are the maintenance of constant seawater flow and continuous supply of food over a 24 hr period. Regarding the former, banjo filters fitted on the outflow preventing larvae from flowing out of the tank, are cleaned twice a day (morning and evening). Food ration is diluted with seawater and gravity fed from a carboy; a continuous drip system is installed for this. Results obtained in flow-through larval culture with calico scallops were promising, yielding comparable growth and survival to the pediveligers stage (Sarkis, Helm and Hohn, 2006).

Larval growth and survival

Shell growth for zigzag and calico scallops have been well documented and are comparable to that recorded for other pectinid species (Sarkis and Lovatelli, 2007). Figure 3 provides shell growth data for *Argopecten gibbus* reared in routine hatchery operation. Yields of calico scallop pediveligers ready for settlement were in the range of 17.8–55.4 percent; pediveliger yields are calculated as percentage of Day 2 D-larvae. As mentioned previously, zigzag scallops are more sensitive, reflected in lower yields ranging from 2.1–11.7 percent. Duration of larval life for both calico and sand scallop is of 10–14 days depending on batches.

Settlement and post-larval rearing

Once larvae are considered mature according to set criteria – based on behaviour, morphological development and size – setting is initiated. This usually occurs on Day-12 or Day-13 after fertilization for both calico and zigzag scallop species. Figure 4 illustrates zigzag scallop pediveligers ready for set.

Two methods for setting are used, dependent on space available, time of year and estimated time of transfer to sea.
Rapid transfer approach
Circular fiberglass tanks (450 litre) are filled with cultch made of black 3 mm polyethylene mesh, acting as substrate for pediveligers (Figure 5). This provides a large surface area for settlement of larvae. Temperature is maintained as for larval rearing (24 °C). Stocking density is around 4 larvae.ml⁻¹. The duration of the setting period, where the maximal number of pediveligers metamorphoses and becomes fixed, is determined by assessing the culture over time; usually, pediveligers are set within ten days of being provided with a substrate. Aeration and daily algal ration is provided daily. Water is exchanged three times a week as for larvae, but procedure differs in that setting larvae are not removed from the setting tanks, as they need to be continually submerged; for this reason, water level in the tank is maintained constant. Towards the end of the setting period, temperature acclimation to ambient seawater is achieved by decreasing set temperature by 1 °C every two days. Once maximal number of larvae is set, setting system is changed to an open flow seawater system, where seawater is filtered to 1 µm and supplied continually to the tanks; an air-lift driven recirculation system enhancing water exchange within the tank is initiated. Algal food supply is provided continuously over 24 hr by drip-feed. Young spat are reared in this way for a further 20 days, when they reach approximately 1.5 mm. After which, they are transferred to grow-out sites.

Raceway set
Mature pediveligers are transferred to 120 µm or 150 µm 25 cm diameter sieves, at a density of 50 000 larvae per sieve. Sieves are suspended in raceways and placed on a semi-recirculating system, with inflow of 1 µm filtered seawater at a rate of 3 litre.min⁻¹. Similarly to the rapid transfer approach, larvae are allowed to set with minimal flow and no other disruption for approximately ten days (see Sarkis and Lovatelli, 2007 for further details on raceway system). Food supply is provided from 20 litre carboys, and placed on a 24 hr drip-feed; this accounts for 50 percent of the ration. The second half of the ration is distributed in the sump tanks and distributed through the re-circulating system. Semi-recirculation ensures that all algae supplied is consumed and also allows for temperature control of seawater. As the end of the setting period approaches, post-larvae are slowly acclimated to ambient temperatures as described above. After Day-10, flow of raceways is set according to biomass and density (or biomass) per sieve is adjusted weekly, re-distributing spat in other sieves as they grow. If biomass per sieve, and per raceway system, is not controlled, slow shell growth and high mortalities will ensue.

Spat are maintained in this system up to two months, or until they reach 3.5 mm shell height. At which time, they are ready for the secondary nursery stage, i.e. transfer to the outdoor raceway for further growth to a minimum of 5 mm shell height. Figure 6 illustrates growth of calico scallops reared in a raceway system.
Secondary nursery stage
This raceway system differs from the primary nursery raceway system in the following: sieve characteristics, seawater treatment and algal food composition. Sieves used are of a greater surface area, and can accommodate a larger biomass of spat. Sieves are set on an upwelling system, rather than downwelling, reducing clogging of mesh with detritus. Finally algal food supply is provided from dry algal cultures purchased commercially (see Sarkis and Lovatelli, 2007).

The role of the outdoor raceway is to maximize growth enabling the transfer of spat directly into 3 mm pearl nets and enhance survival rate in the field. This system has proved especially beneficial for zigzag scallops, due to their increased sensitivity. It is more time consuming, hence more costly, and is not necessary for harder species, such as the calico scallop. Figure 7 illustrates the growth of zigzag scallops, from Day-10 after set in the primary nursery system, to four months after set in the secondary nursery system.

GROW-OUT OF CALICO AND ZIGZAG SCALLOPS
Grow-out methods differ slightly between the two species and depend on the size of transfer at sea.

Calico scallops
Spat set in 450 litre tanks on cultch are transferred to the field, approximately one month after set. Cultch is transferred to green collector bags and held in a container filled with ambient saltwater for transport to grow-out sites (see Sarkis and Lovatelli, 2007 for details). Bags are suspended on long-lines using scallop trays. Transfer to trays and securing trays is done quickly on grow-out site to minimize the time period in which spat are exposed to air. Trays are left for a period of six weeks in the field. At this time, spat are returned to the nursery, to remove from cultch, and distributed by weight to 3 mm pearl nets. A total of 150 spat are distributed per net, averaging at this time 7 mm shell height. Nets are suspended on long-lines (Figure 8).
Sub-samples of 150 spat are distributed per net.

Once spat are transferred to pearl nets, monthly checks are made thereafter, assessing survival and growth. During the first six months, growth is rapid and scallops are gradually transferred to 6, 9 and 12 mm pearl nets, reducing densities to 75, 40 and 30 individuals per net, respectively, during the first six months; thereafter scallops are maintained in 12 mm nets, checked for wear and tear on a monthly basis, and transferring nets if fouling is too high. Fouling was also controlled through a gentle saltwater power wash of nets and scallops on site. Scallops did not suffer any mortality following this treatment, provided that it is gentle and not too frequent.

Calico scallops are grown until market size in suspended cultures. Shell growth of calico scallops is shown in Figure 9; market size is attained within 18 months of grow-out.

Zigzag scallops are treated in a similar manner to calico scallops until 25 mm shell height. The recessive nature of this species favours bottom rather than suspended culture techniques. For this reason, at 25 mm shell height and above, juvenile zigzag scallops are reared directly on the sandy bottom, enclosed by a cage, protecting scallops from predation. This is a very labour intensive method; all labour is conducted by SCUBA.

Space requirement for optimal grow-out of zigzag is high; for 25 mm juveniles, initial density is 400 juveniles per 4 m² cage. As for calico scallops, growth is rapid in the first few months, and monthly checks are made, where density is adjusted according to growth. Juveniles are re-distributed to 200 and 100 per cage; mesh size on cage is increased from the initial 15 mm to 25 mm, in order to ensure adequate water flow. Routine cleaning of cages is necessary to control fouling. Although growth rates of zigzag are excellent using this technique (see Figure 10, where growth of animals in suspended and bottom cultures is compared), the difficulty in commercializing bottom culture lies in
developing a time efficient and cost efficient system. To the author's knowledge, such a system for large scale rearing of the sand scallop has not been developed to date. An alternative may be the use of queen conch “parks” developed in the Turks and Caicos Islands for grow-out; these are situated in shallow bays, enclosed on the sides, yet of easy access by snorkel.

**CONCLUSIONS**

A summary of the setup and running costs of the 4-year operation in Bermuda is detailed in Sarkis and Lovatelli (2007). These costs are specific to Bermuda, but the percentage contributions of each aspect of hatchery operation are relevant. The larval rearing section requires the most labour and highest running costs for spat production; this is based on static rearing system, and can be reduced by the use of flow-through systems. Nursery costs are dependent on the size required for spat at transfer to sea; the quicker spat are transferred, the less costly in the nursery. Finally, grow-out is an important component, based in great part on the time achieved to market size, and type of system used.

This work demonstrates the feasibility of large scale subtropical scallop culture; market demand can be easily created, as the final product is considered a seafood delicacy, and much appreciated in the tourism sector. The work was conducted in a module hatchery, housed in mobile containers resulting in a relatively inexpensive facility for the rearing of bivalves; in addition, due to the flexible nature of the facility, species-specific requirements can easily be accommodated, and/or expanded as production increases. Details on the installation of the hatchery itself were beyond the scope of this paper but are given in Sarkis and Lovatelli (2007).
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ABSTRACT
Crustacean fisheries in the Caribbean Region are limited primarily to spiny lobster, *Panulirus argus* (the most valuable marine fishery throughout the Region), trawl fisheries for penaeid shrimp along the continental shelf of Latin America and the Greater Antilles and some minor local fisheries for callinectid crabs. Spiny lobster is a highly valued seafood product with large existing markets and, as a result, the development of aquaculture technology for this species has met with enthusiasm over the years. Penaeid shrimp culture is well established throughout the world with captive reproduction, larval rearing and pond grow-out practiced in commercial operations globally. Penaeid shrimp farming has been attempted in several island nations in the Caribbean, but with few commercial-scale shrimp farms currently in production, while Latin America with extensive acreage of estuaries and coastal wetlands, has realized significant development of shrimp aquaculture. Another crustacean that has been the focus of aquaculture research is the West Indian red spider crab, *Mithrax spinosissimus*, also called the Caribbean king crab. This paper will review the aquaculture potential for spiny lobsters, *Mithrax spinosissimus*, and penaeid shrimp indigenous to the Caribbean Region and how they can be incorporated into a regional hatchery model.

RESUMEN
Las pesquerías de crustáceos en la Región del Caribe se limitan principalmente a la langosta espinosa, *Panulirus argus* (la pesquería marina más valiosa en toda la Región), la pesca de arrastre de camarones peneidos a lo largo de la plataforma continental de América Latina y las Antillas Mayores y en menor grado algunas pesquerías locales para cangrejos calinéctidos (jaíbas). La langosta espinosa es un producto marino altamente
valorado y con un amplio mercado y, en consecuencia, a lo largo de los años se ha generado gran interés en el desarrollo de tecnologías para el cultivo de esta especie. El cultivo de camarones peneidos está bien establecido en todo el mundo con reproducción en cautiverio, cultivo larvario y engorda en estanques que se practican en operaciones comerciales a nivel mundial. En varias naciones insulares del Caribe, se ha intentado el cultivo de camarones peneidos pero actualmente sólo unas cuantas granjas mantienen una producción a escala comercial, mientras que en América Latina se ha generado un desarrollo significativo de la camaricultura con una extensa superficie cultivada sobre estuarios y humedales costeros. Otro crustáceo que ha sido el centro de investigaciones acuícolas es el cangrejo rojo, *Mithrax spinosissimus*, también llamado cangrejo rey del Caribe. Este documento revisa el potencial acuícola para la langosta espinosa, *Mithrax spinosissimus* y camarones peneidos nativos de la Región del Caribe y cómo se puede incorporar en un modelo de criadero regional.

**INTRODUCTION**

The native species of crustaceans in the Wider Caribbean Region are discussed in the current document. A brief synopsis for each is given, providing scientific and recorded common names, maximum size, and a summary of their distribution and habitat. For each species, a schematic diagram, along with a sketch of their current area of occupancy is given. Where available, a history of culture efforts is provided as background information for the species or groups of species, as well as available culture techniques and factors to be considered for aquaculture.

**PALINURIDAE – spiny lobsters**

*Panulirus argus*

**FAO names:**

*En*: Caribbean spiny lobster;  
*Fr*: Langouste blanch;  
*Sp*: Langosta común del Caribe

**Size:** To 450 mm (commonly 250)

**Distribution/habitat:** Bermuda, North Carolina (United States of America), southward through the Gulf of Mexico, Antilles, and the coasts of Central and South America to the Federative Republic of Brazil. Lives in shallow water to 90 m; associated with coral reefs, seagrass beds as juveniles or in any habitat affording shelter.
Panulirus guttatus

**FAO names:** En: Spotted spiny lobster; Fr: Langouste brésilienne; Sp: Langosta moteado

**Size:** To 150–200 mm

**Distribution/habitat:** Bermuda, the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, southern Florida (United States of America), Belize, the Republic of Panama to the Republic of Suriname and the Federative Republic of Brazil, the Caribbean arc from the Republic of Cuba to the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, Netherland Antilles, and Los Roques (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Lives in shallow rocky areas, found mainly in crevices.

Panulirus laevicauda

**FAO names:** En: Spotted spiny lobster; Fr: Langouste brésilienne; Sp: Langosta moteado

**Size:** To 200–300 mm

**Distribution/habitat:** Bermuda, southern Florida (United States of America), the Caribbean and the coasts of Central and South America from Yucatán, (United Mexican States) to the Federative Republic of Brazil. Coastal waters to 50 m; on rock, gravel and coral substrates.

Culturing the Caribbean spiny lobster

The spiny lobster, *Panulirus argus*, is the most economically important fishery product in the Caribbean Region. Of the dozen species of tropical lobsters around the world, the available aquaculture information and strongest interest focuses on *P. argus*, but should include the congeneric palinurids indigenous to the Caribbean, *P. guttatus* and *P. laevicuda* (Ingle and Witham, 1968; Tamm, 1980; Miller, 1983; Ryther, Creswell and Alston, 1984; D’Abramo and Conklin, 1985; Ryther et al., 1988; Lellis, 1991; Lellis and Russell, 1990; Sandifer, 1991; Jeffs and Davis, 2003). The spiny lobster has an extensive natural range from North Carolina (USA) to the Federative Republic of Brazil and is found throughout the Caribbean. This paper reviews the existing research related to aquaculture of *P. argus* and identify those aspects requiring further research and development to expedite the commercial aquaculture of this lobster.

Until recently, it was generally conceded that “the potential for culture of spiny lobsters is very low” (Oesterling and Provenzano, 1985); this less than optimistic assessment was based upon: i) the lack of a hatchery technology and low probability of development in the near future; ii) difficulties in acquiring large numbers of juveniles from the wild for grow-out; iii) a long grow-out period; iv) the aggressive behaviour...
of lobsters; v) lack of suitable diets; and vi) lack of well-developed grow-out systems. However, recent work conducted by the Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institution in Florida (USA), Darden Industries in Belize and others, suggests that the potential for spiny lobster cultivation may be greater than previously believed. Some specific considerations follow.

Different populations of Caribbean spiny lobsters spawn at different times of the year, depending upon water temperature (Cobb and Wang, 1985). In very warm areas, such as around Honduras, spawning may take place year-round. The time of spawning may be related to the size of females (Cox and Hunt, 2005). One study reports that Caribbean spiny lobsters produce 1–2 million eggs per spawning (Lyons, 1981). For *Panulirus* spp., reported fecundities ranged from 50 000 to 900 000 eggs per spawning, while a more recent study found 300 000–800 000 eggs per spawning, depending on the size of the female (Bertelson and Matthews, 2001). Larger females produce considerably more eggs than smaller ones; 60 percent of eggs in the Upper Keys were produced by the largest females (85 mm carapace length or larger), which were less than 20 percent of the female population (Lyons, 1981). When the eggs are laid, they are attached to the setae (fine hairs) on the abdominal swimmerets of the females. Females carrying eggs are called “berried” because the appearance of the developing eggs is similar to that of berries. Depending on the species, the eggs are incubated in the mother’s care for a relatively short period – 18 days to three months – depending on water temperature, with warmer water being related to faster embryonic development (Lyons, 1981). While she does this, the eggs become gradually hard and black and she continually grooms the eggs while aerating them with the pumping motion of her pleopods. Once the eggs hatch, they drift away with no further maternal care.

The Caribbean spiny lobster, like most Palinurids, has a long and complex larval development (Kittaka, 2000), which proceeds through 11 or 12 larval stages and is poorly understood (Yeung and McGowan, 1991). The figure below illustrates a typical life cycle for Palinurids. For over 50 years, researchers have tried to raise the phyllosoma larvae of many species of Palinurids lobsters. The fragile, slow developing phyllosoma
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(four months to 15 months depending on species, feed, temperature and water quality) has become legendary among aquaculturists – the Mount Everest of commercial larval rearing (Robertson, 1968; Provenzano, 1968; Ingle and Witham, 1968; Moe, 1991; Booth and Kittaka, 2000). There has been some success in a number of palinurid species where the phyllosoma has been reared through its entire eleven stages to post-larvae or pueruli. However, there has been such low survival in these experiments that commercially applicable technology is yet to evolve from the experimentation.

The Japanese had some success rearing *Panulirus japonicas* and then several other species of Palinurid lobster. During their experiments over the past ten years, they have been able to reduce the larval rearing time down from 417 days to as little as 231 in one *P. japonicus* and as short as 65 days in another (Kittaka *et al*., 2001). Even with their success, they note that the phyllosoma larvae molted from 21–31 times to pass through the 11 phyllosoma stages (Sekine *et al*., 2000). In other species of crustacean larval culture, molting without morphological or stage changes can imply that the larvae are under extreme stress – usually dietary or water quality – or both (Tong *et al*., 1997). This might mean that even though this culture technique was able to contract phyllosoma larval development time nearly in half from previous efforts - it is still far from the optimum protocol, and there is much more progress that can be made in shortening the larval cycle and increasing their survival. Much progress could be made by simply examining variations among spiny lobster species, as in this case *P. guttatus* and *P. laevicauda*.

One of the alternatives to larval rearing and closing the life cycle of the spiny lobster has been the collection of pueruli from wild stocks adrift in the oceans and along coastal shores. It has been documented that a large and accessible supply of *P. argus* pueruli and early juveniles can be harvested from the wild. Unfortunately, commercial harvest of the early stages of *P. argus* for aquaculture is currently not permitted throughout most of the natural range of the species. It should be noted that such a harvest would be sustainable, as ecological research indicates that pueruli collection removes only a small portion of those available, the vast majority being lost to the fishery through natural predation (Butler and Herrnkind, 1988; Bannerot, Ryther and Clarke, 1988; Ryther *et al*., 1988; Butler and Herrnkind 1989; Forcucci, Butler and Hunt, 1994).

A variety of collection devices have been used to collect lobster post-larvae for research purposes including floating and submerged habitats, and suspended and towed nets (Witham, Ingle and Sims, 1964; Calinski and Lyons, 1983; Field and Butler, 1994; Phillips and Booth, 1994); suction dredges and bottom trawls have been shown to be ineffective methods for collecting post-larval and early juveniles lobsters (Sweat, 1968). Floating and submerged artificial habitats which provide an abundance of fine-scale structural complexity have provided reliable catches of pueruli; these include folded sheets of fibrous material (Witham, Ingle and Joyce, 1968), tassels of synthetic fibers (Gutierrez-Carbonell, Simonin-Diaz and Briones-Fourzan, 1992), and polyvinyl chloride (PVC) frames holding artificial seaweed (Cruz *et al*., 1991; Cruz, León and Puga, 1995).

Although spiny lobsters, including *P. argus*, are naturally gregarious, high tank or cage stocking rates have been shown to inhibit growth; it has been shown that in the presence of inadequate or poor quality food, high stocking rates can result in extensive cannibalism, particularly among early captive juveniles (Childress and Herrnkind, 1994; Geddes *et al*., 2001). Pardee and Foster (1992) suggest that improvements in food availability, attractiveness and nutritional quality will be necessary prerequisites for establishing high-density grow-out systems. Very rapid growth rates are achievable in culture; for example, male lobsters have been grown from first instar juveniles to 450 g in 12 months and 1.4 kg in two years (Lellis and Russell, 1990; Lellis, 1991).

Although hatchery production of spiny lobster seed for commercial aquaculture production is unlikely for the foreseeable future, optimizing techniques for collecting,
holding, and nursery culture of juvenile *P. argus* is a research and extension activity consistent with a regional facility. In particular, previous studies have indicated that development of cost-effective formulated diets is likely the single most important obstacle to large-scale commercial aquaculture development for this species (Jeffs and Hooker, 2000).

**WEST INDIAN RED SPIDER CRAB**
The West Indian red spider crab, *Mithrax spinosissimus*, is a large majid crab that inhabits coral reefs, rocky outcrops and man-made canals throughout the tropical Atlantic Ocean from the Carolinas on the East Coast of the United States of America, the Commonwealth of Bahamas, the islands of the eastern Caribbean and along the continental shelf of Latin America as far south as the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. As with most members of the family Majidae, these crabs remain in hiding during the day and venture out at night to forage on benthic algae and associated epifauna; they can be found in shallow waters of depths of 180 m. The sexes are dimorphic, the males attaining a larger mean size (133.4 mm carapace length) than females (122 mm) and typically weighing twice as much. Despite its large size, this crab is taken only occasionally by fishermen for home consumption or local markets, in large part due to their paucity and sporadic distribution. The only commercial fishery is recorded in the Republic of Panama, where they are locally abundant along the walls of the Panama Canal.

**Culturing the West Indian red spider crab**
Interest in the mariculture potential of the West Indian red spider crab began in the early 1970s in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela with initial trials conducted at a small marine laboratory in at Los Roques, with the researchers’ preliminary results published in the Journal of the World Aquaculture Society (Brownell, Provenzano and Martinez, 1977). In 1983, the Marine Systems Laboratory of the Smithsonian Institution, funded by the US Agency for International Development (USAID) began research on full-scale *Mithrax* aquaculture using low-technology in several Caribbean countries (e.g. Turks and Caicos, the Dominican Republic and Antigua) utilizing floating cages and algal turf as a food source (Adey and Steneck, 1984; Adey, 1985).

Despite substantial resources dedicated to the project, positive results were not forthcoming due to some fundamental flaws in the production concept: i) production of algal turf on floating screens was insufficient to support the biomass of crabs housed in the floating cages; ii) *Mithrax* crabs are not docile, obligatory herbivores, as the investigators purported, but rather they are omnivorous, cannibalistic and highly aggressive crustaceans; and iii) *Mithrax* crabs undergo a terminal molt at puberty, after which no additional growth occurs. Therefore, the marketable size of crabs, 1 kg (2.2 lb), used for an economic analysis by the Smithsonian (Rubino, Epler and Wilson, 1985), would be achieved by only a small fraction of the crabs that were progeny of wild-caught broodstock. Only through selective breeding over several generations would a significant proportion of the population (exclusively males) reach 1 kg prior to terminal molt.

In 1984, the Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institution (HBOI) initiated a research programme to evaluate the potential for *Mithrax* culture which included the algal turf/cage culture system, as well as alternative methods (Ryther et al., 1988). Larviculture,
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Interest in the culture of the West Indian red spider crab has waned since the late 1980s, in large part due to constraints related to the crabs aggressive behaviour. Unprotected open area systems, such as cages, raceways or ponds and simple, twodimensional structures afford little protection against aggressive behaviour and are inappropriate for large-scale production of *Mithrax* crabs. One commercial venture, West Indies Mariculture Inc. (WIM), operated in the 1990s on North Caicos, in the Turks & Caicos Islands. The project was managed by alumni from an earlier Smithsonian Institution project on Grand Turk Island and employed a hybrid of methods using algal turf screens and those developed by HBOI. WIM produced soft shell *Mithrax* crabs and marketed them directly to restaurants throughout the Turks and Caicos Islands. Research into the mariculture of the West Indian red spider crab continued at the Universidad de Oriente, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (Rengel *et al*., 2000), but to the authors’ knowledge no ongoing research or commercial production exists today.

**Culture techniques for Mithrax crabs**

Female crabs undergo terminal molt at about 75 mm CL (carapace length) and will copulate after molting – a soft shell condition is not required – and the female will produce successive egg masses for extended periods (although the number and viability of ova declines over time). Fecundity estimates vary widely from “tens of thousands” (Brownell, Provenzano and Martinez, 1977) to up to 100 000. Creswell, Tunberg and Winfree (1986) reported 18 826 ± 3.3 ova/female, each approximately 1 mm diameter. Newly fertilized eggs are deposited on the pleopods, appearing bright orange and turning red, burgundy and finally tan or grey at hatching (at 18 days). The larvae hatch as swimming *first zoeae* and molt within 12 hours, again in 36–48 hours; during the zoal stages the larvae are lecithotrophic. They then metamorphose into feeding megalopa (post-larvae), and within three to four days molt again to the first crab stage (six-eight days post hatch). Megalopa feed on benthic diatoms, epiphytes or finely blended macroalgae.

Early attempts to culture *Mithrax* larvae in fiberglass tank resulted in discouraging results (<4 percent survival to megalopa); an alternative larviculture systems, utilizing screen-bottomed floating trays resulted in 85 percent survival and could be stocked at densities of 25 000/m² (apparently the zoeae required a substrate to successfully molt to megalopa post-larvae).

Early growth for 2nd and 3rd stage crabs was 1–20 days and 25–30 days respectively, with crabs reaching a mean carapace length of 30 mm and weight 7 g in 180 days, but only about 20 percent of the crabs survived throughout the period. Small crabs consume macroalgae, but larger crabs are truly omnivorous and exhibit a strong tendency to supplement their diet with meat. They also will accept a range of commercially available dry feeds, including lobster, shrimp, tropical fish and guinea pig pellets. However, *Mithrax* crabs tolerate a narrow range of environmental parameters, a fact that has practical implications for commercial production, particularly for site and stock selection.

From post-larvae to large juveniles, *Mithrax* are aggressive and highly cannibalistic with females exhibiting more aggressive behaviour, suggesting that slower growing females should be eliminated from the population. Providing protective cover and/or complex, three-dimensional habitats may improve survival by reducing cannibalistic encounters, but it also complicates feeding, cleaning and harvesting. Systems that provide shelter and also allow for harvesting soft-shelled crabs, as well as a method to identify pre-molt crabs, may be economically viable if value-added markets can be established (similar to callinectid crabs).
PENAEIDAE – Penaeid shrimp

*Farfantepenaeus brasiliensis*
FAO names: En: Redspotted shrimp; Fr: Crevette royale rose; Sp: Camarón rosado sureño
Size: Females 250 mm; males 191 mm
Distribution/habitat: Off Cape Hatteras to Florida Keys (United States of America), off Campeche and Yucatán (United Mexican States); off Bermuda, through the Caribbean Sea and West Indies to Rio Grande do Sul (the Federative Republic of Brazil). Caught mainly with bottom trawls; juveniles are taken in estuaries and near shore waters with seines, cast nets, push nets and dip nets. Marketed mostly frozen; also fresh, dried, or canned; juveniles are mainly used as bait. This species has been farm-raised on a small scale.

*Farfantepenaeus notialis*
FAO names: En: Southern pink shrimp; Fr: Crevette rose du Sud; Sp: Camarón rosado con manchas
Size: Females 200 mm; males 175 mm
Distribution/habitat: Caribbean Sea, including the greater Antilles, the Virgin Islands, and the continental shelf from Ascension Bay, Quintana Roo, to the south; along the South American coast, it extends down to Rio de Janeiro, the Federative Republic of Brazil. Inhabits shelf areas from the coastline to depths of about 100 m, rarely to 700 m; the largest concentrations are found between 3 and 50 m. Bottom mud or sandy mud and sandy patches among rocks. Caught mainly with bottom trawls; juveniles are taken in estuaries and near-shore waters with seines, cast nets, push nets and dip nets. Marketed mostly fresh.

*Litopenaeus schmitti*
FAO names: En Southern white shrimp; Fr: Crevette ligubam du sud; Sp: Camarón blanco sureño
Size: Females 235 mm; males 175 mm
Distribution/habitat: Greater Antilles from the Republic of Cuba to the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago; Atlantic coast of Central and South America, from Belize to the Federative Republic of Brazil (from Amapá to Rio Grande do Sul). Inhabits coastal waters to depths of 47 m, most abundant between 15 and 30 m, mainly on mud and muddy sand, of considerable importance in the Republic of Cuba, Belize, the Republic of Honduras, the Republic of Nicaragua, the Republic of Colombia, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, the Republic of Guyana, the Republic of Suriname and French Guiana; outside the area all along the Brazilian coast. Consumed locally and exported. Aquaculture experiments have been undertaken in the Republic of Cuba.
Culturing penaeid shrimp

The evolution of shrimp farming began with collection of wild post-larvae from the surf zone along beaches and stocked into coastal ponds. Early hatcheries collected gravid females, or purchased them from fishermen (termed as “sourcing”) and hatched the larvae (nauplii) directly in the culture tank (Lee and Wickins, 1992; Mock and Murphy, 1971). Although most hatcheries prefer this method, gravid females are often in short supply and some operations opt for the alternative of inducing gonad development and spawning of captive shrimp. Penaeid shrimp can be grouped into two broad categories, the open-thelycum (white shrimp such as *L. setiferus* and *L. schmitti*) and closed-thelycum (brown shrimp such as *F. brasiliensis* and *F. notialis*). While the open-thelycum shrimp follow the sequence of molt-mature-mate-spawn, the closed-thelycum shrimp follow the sequence of molt-mate-mature-spawn. Females of open-thelycum species require insemination prior to each spawn and are often artificially inseminated (manual application of the sperm mass to the thelycum), but most maturation units continue to rely on natural impregnation occurring in the maturation tanks (less labour, lower mortality and more consistent fertilization rates). For a detailed description of shrimp reproduction and the design of a maturation and larval rearing facility the reader is referred to Treece and Fox (1993).

Indoor facilities are usually favoured for maturation systems since they permit greater environmental control. Temperature, light intensity and photoperiod, tank colour and design and low noise levels all influence ovarian development and spawning. The design of broodstock maturation facility, methods and diet can vary greatly between different species, and even under very controlled conditions, some species will not mature with any regularity. For many species this can be overcome through a process of surgically removing the eyestalks (call ablation) which contain a complex of glands that inhibit gonad development (Liao and Chen, 1983).

Some hatcheries prefer to purchase nauplii from outside sources, which are sometimes traded internationally and are relatively easy to transport. For example, 300,000 nauplii can be held in a 30 litre plastic bag containing 15 litre of seawater and 15 litre of oxygen for up to 24 hours at 18–24 °C (Lee and Wickins, 1992). Larvae are typically stocked at 50–200/litre with water exchanges of 50–200 percent/day to maintain water quality. Hatcheries rear shrimp through three larval sub-stages (nauplius, protozoea and mysis); the entire process may take place in a single tank (20 tonnes) or in a two-phase approach where a smaller tank (5–10 tonnes) is used for nauplius through mysis and then transferred to a larger tank (10–30 tonnes) for culture from mysis to post-larvae.

Nauplii hatch around 14 hours after fertilization and go through five stages (each for seven hours); nutrition is provided by the yolk sac. The protozoeal stage follows with three molts (each for approximately 36 hours); the larvae swim continuously and now consume phytoplankton (at 150,000 cells/ml). The final three mysis stages last approximately 24 hours each; at this stage the larvae are slightly over 3 mm shell length and now feed on *Artemia* nauplii (2–5/ml) and phytoplankton (120,000 cells/ml). There are also a variety of formulated (encapsulated) artificial diets that are used to supplement live feeds, as well as enrichment formulas used to improve the nutritional quality of the *Artemia*. Manuals and other relevant publication covering penaeid larvae culture in more detail include: McVey (1983); SEAFDEC (1985); NACA (1986); JICA (1987); Chavez (1990); Treece and Yates (1990); and Treece and Fox (1993).

Post-larvae (PL) are usually harvested at PL10 (10 days post-metamorphosis) weighing 0.5–2.5 mg; stocked at 75–100/litre and fed *Artemia* (7–9 nauplii/ml), phytoplankton (at 10,000 cells/ml) and formulated supplements. The age that post-larvae are shipped varies depending on species and individual hatchery methods; typically PL 10–25 stocked at 50–2,000/ml (depending on size) and placed in 10–20 litre plastic bags with oxygen and often ice in the shipping container. The nursery phase can be conducted in tanks, raceways,
concrete-walled or earthen ponds with sand bottoms, staked net pens and floating cages, usually stocked at 50–100 post-larvae/m². Fixed or floating cages (sometimes known as “hapas”) are made from fine mesh netting (0.5 mm) (3.7 x 2.7 x 1.3 m deep) stocked at 30 000 PLs/cage. The juveniles are transferred for on-growing after 15–25 days (Beveridge, 1987).

Grow-out techniques can be categorized into four groups, based primarily on the expected yield at harvest. These include extensive (low density, mixed species stocked in large, fertilized ponds), semi-intensive (moderate density, natural productivity supplemented by feed), intensive (high density monoculture, continuous water exchange and formulated feeds) and super-intensive (very high density monocultures in controlled environments, recirculating systems and formulated feeds) (see Lee and Wickins, 1992).

In the wake of devastating epidemics of viral diseases in outdoor, pond-based shrimp farming, some shrimp farm managers are considering switching to super-intensive, tank-based productions systems because of the additional biosecurity and reduced risks these systems provide. In addition, year-round, continuous production improves the economic potential of the enterprise through higher productivity and facilitates direct marketing to retail markets which generates higher value for the product (Van Wyk et al., 1999).

Shrimp release programmes to enhance fishery stocks have been undertaken in several Asian countries with reasonable success. In most cases, post-larvae (PL20) or juveniles are liberated in fenced enclosures, man-made lagoons and artificial tidelands (Kurata, 1981). Shrimp releases in embayments in China have been particularly successful; in the mid-1980s an estimated 350 million hatchery-reared juveniles were released in the semi-enclosed Jiaozhou Bay, increasing stocks by factors of 4.7 and 7.3 over a three year period. Estimated average survival was an impressive 32 percent (Liu, 1990). In Taiwan PC, sea ranching is used to increase the supply of gravid females, with recapture rates estimated at 15 percent (Chaing and Liao, 1985). Similar programmes, appropriately sited in the Caribbean, could contribute greatly to modest local fisheries.
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ABSTRACT

Despite the fact that there is considerable knowledge on the ecology, seed collection and culture of various native commercially important shellfish species in the Colombian Caribbean, culture of these species is only conducted at the experimental level. In this paper a description of the national production and commercialization of native shellfish is given and local knowledge on seed production and culture technologies summarized. An analysis of the advantages and problems for the culture of each species is presented and suggestions are made on the main actions considered necessary to develop marine aquaculture in the near future. Finally, the existing molluscs hatchery of the University of Magdalena is proposed as the site for the regional shellfish hatchery for the Wider Caribbean.
RESUMEN

A pesar de que existe un considerable conocimiento de la ecología, la colecta de semilla y el cultivo de diferentes especies de mariscos nativos de importancia comercial en el Caribe colombiano, el cultivo de estas especies se ha realizado únicamente a nivel experimental. En este documento se ofrece una descripción de la producción y la comercialización de mariscos a nivel nacional. Se resume el conocimiento local sobre la producción de semilla y las tecnologías de cultivo de las especies nativas. Por último, se presenta un análisis de las ventajas y la problemática para el cultivo de cada especie y se hacen sugerencias sobre las principales acciones que se consideran necesarias para el desarrollo de la acuicultura marina en un futuro próximo. Finalmente, se propone el criadero de moluscos de la Universidad del Magdalena para ser usado como el criadero regional de mariscos nativos para el Gran Caribe.

INTRODUCCIÓN

The Colombian Caribbean has a coast line of 1,937 km and territorial waters totalling 532,162 km². These waters are associated with a large biodiversity of shellfish represented by 1,090 molluscs species (Díaz, Cantera and Puyana, 1998), 530 crustacean decapods species (Ardila, Navas and Reye, 2002) and 289 echinoderms species (Benavides, pers. com.).

Between 2006 and 2008, production of shellfish in the Colombian Caribbean averaged 31,825 tonnes/year, equivalent to 75 percent of the total production of marine resources in this area (CCI, 2006, 2007, 2008). This production resulted mainly from the farming of the introduced shrimp, *Penaeus vannamei* (90 percent), and contributed to in small part by the fishing of native species (10 percent). The fishing of shellfish in the Colombian Caribbean is mostly artisanal (75 percent) and targets mainly crustaceans (70 percent); the rest of the harvest consists of molluscs (29 percent), and a minority of echinoderms (1 percent). The main species reported for capture fisheries are presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>Commercial shellfish species in the Colombian Caribbean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
<td><strong>Common name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs</td>
<td>Clam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs</td>
<td>Clam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs</td>
<td>Clam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs</td>
<td>Chipi-chipi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs</td>
<td>Chipi-chipi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs</td>
<td>Mangrove oyster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs</td>
<td>Scallops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs</td>
<td>Queen conch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs</td>
<td>West Indian top shell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs</td>
<td>Copey snail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs</td>
<td>Octopus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs</td>
<td>Squids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs</td>
<td>Squids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs</td>
<td>Squids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decapods crustaceans</td>
<td>Blue crab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decapods crustaceans</td>
<td>Swimming crab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decapods crustaceans</td>
<td>Spiny lobster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decapods crustaceans</td>
<td>White shrimp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decapods crustaceans</td>
<td>Tití shrimp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decapods crustaceans</td>
<td>Pink shrimp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinoderms</td>
<td>Sea cucumber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinoderms</td>
<td>Sea urchin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AQUACULTURE SHELLFISH PRODUCTION

Production of shellfish by aquaculture in the Colombian Caribbean has been restricted to the shrimp *Penaeus vannamei*. This species was introduced from the Pacific Ocean in 1983, with a well-developed culture technology. This sector was successful for many years (especially between 1985 and 1990), but also incurred several problems associated with the shortage and low growth of imported seed (between 1991 and 1994), as well as with the introduction of disease (white spot and taura between 1994 and 1996 and necrotizing hepatopancreatitis in 2003). Additionally, since 2008, shrimp overproduction coupled with the world economic crisis (and devaluation of the US dollar by 11 percent), led to the closure of many shrimp farms, or to their reconversion to tilapia and/or cobia production (Erazo, *pers. comm*.). As a consequence, shrimp monthly production decreased from 2,387 tonnes during 2006 and 2008, to 8 tonnes at the present time (CCI, 2010).

Production of other shellfish species by aquaculture has been restricted to projects with little or no continuity. Between 1996 and 2002 mangrove oyster production reached 6 to 18 tonnes/year (Salazar, 1999; Barreto, *pers. comm*.) and during 2002 and 2003 pearl oysters, pen shell and scallops productions averaged 80 kg/year (INVEMAR, 2003).

TRADE OF SHELLFISH IN COLOMBIA

The seafood per capita consumption in the Republic of Colombia has been 6.5 kg/year in the last ten years (ANDI, 2009). This low seafood consumption can be attributed to several factors such as low market supply, high prices, poor presentation, low sanitary quality, limited awareness on products and their preparation forms.

Between 2006 and 2008, the highest proportion of shellfish produced in the Republic of Colombia was exported leaving approximately 40 percent for the domestic consumption. This was a result of the higher prices obtained in the external market for cultured shrimp and for the bivalve *Anadara* produced in the Colombian Pacific. Although, internal shellfish demand was reduced (17,932 tonnes/year), supply from national production was not sufficient. This forced the importation of shellfish to satisfy 28 percent of the total demand (CCI, 2006; 2007; 2008). At present, shellfish exports have decreased associated with the reduced shrimp industry; current limited production is mainly for internal consumption (Zúñiga, *pers. comm*.).

The price of the shellfish in the Republic of Colombia varies according to the group, its source and presentation (Table 2). Scallops, lobster, shrimps, octopus and mussels are the most expensive shellfish, while oysters and other local clam species fetch a much lower price.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shellfish</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Product form</th>
<th>Price (USD/kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clams</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>With shell</td>
<td>1–2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Without shell</td>
<td>4.5–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imported</td>
<td>Without shell</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small clams</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Without shell</td>
<td>2.5–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mussels</td>
<td>Imported</td>
<td>With half shell</td>
<td>8.8–9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oysters</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Without shell</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scallop</td>
<td>Imported</td>
<td>Muscles</td>
<td>10–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copey snail</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Without shell</td>
<td>5.5–8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octopus</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>8.5–10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squids</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>2–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimp</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>8.5–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobster</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>20–23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TECHNOLOGY AND PERSPECTIVES OF NATIVE SHELLFISH FARMING

In the Republic of Colombia, native shellfish farming has been carried out at an experimental level for some species. At present, there are no functional aquaculture farms due to various problems, such as the availability of seed supply, adequate planning, financial viability, communities and/or enterprises support, marketing and/or commercialization. In the following sections, the technology used in the Colombian Caribbean for seed production and/or culture of nine native shellfish species is described.

MOLLUSCS

Mangrove oyster, *Crassostrea rhizophorae*

This bivalve species is distributed from the Antilles, south of the Caribbean, Suriname to the Federative Republic of Brazil (Díaz and Puyana, 1994). It can be considered a bivalve species of medium size attaining 120 mm in length. Mangrove oysters are found attached to the red mangrove roots, to other shells and to hard substrata in intertidal zones of coastal lagoons and estuarine areas (Wedler, 1998). The species is a protandric hermaphrodite, reproducing through external fecundation and without external sexual dimorphism (Vélez, 1982). First maturity occurs between two and four months old at 10–20 mm shell length (Vélez, 1982). The reproductive cycle of mangrove oysters is continuous, with a higher proportion of spawning animals in the rainy season, between April and September (Velasco *et al.*, in press). Fecundity averages 2.9 x 10⁶ oocytes/female/spawn (Velasco *et al.*, in press). This species has been traditionally used locally as food, with its populations being very abundant in some areas; however, water pollution and loss of habitat are factors currently leading to a decrease in their abundance and fishery.

Wild seed can be obtained using collectors made of asbestos plates, flexible plastic plates, rubber tires, mangrove terminal branches, aluminum wire coated by sand, lime and cement, or necklaces of oyster shells (Wedler, 1980; 1998, Arias *et al.*, 1995; Rodríguez and Lagos, 2000; Lagos-Bayona *et al.*, 2007). Collectors are suspended at depths between 0 and 50 cm under the shade of mangroves, in areas protected from currents and with natural populations. Collectors are left untouched for one or two months. Maximum settlement coincides with the rainy season between April and December. Collectors showing optimum settlement are those made of aluminum oscillate, with collection of 247 to 321 spat/collector.

Hatchery seed production has been carried out experimentally (Wedler *et al.*, 2003; Velasco *et al.*, in press). Oysters greater than 50 mm of length are collected from natural populations during the rainy season. They are induced to spawn using exposure to air at 16 °C for 1 hr, after that, they are immersed in a warm water bath of low salinity (32 °C and 25 ppt). Fertilization is not controlled, and males and females spawn freely in one tank at a ratio of 1:4. Incubation and larval rearing is conducted in cylinder-conical tanks (100 to 500 litre), at densities of 1–10 larvae/ml. Cultures are reared in micro-filtered seawater (1 µm), UV-irradiated and aerated. Temperature is maintained at 25 °C and salinity at 25 ppt. Diet consists of *Isochrysis galbana* and *Chaetoceros calcitrans* at rations between 30 and 70 cells/µl/day. Full water exchange is done every 48 hr. Pediveligers with eyespots and a creeping foot, appear 17–21 days after fertilization. Collectors made of oyster shell necklaces are submerged in the tanks at this time, and after 50 days they are transferred to sea.

Mangrove oyster culture has been carried out on the bottom and in suspension using a system of stakes (Wedler, 1980, Arias *et al.*, 1995, Rodríguez and Lagos, 2000, Lagos-Bayona *et al.*, 2007). Best results have been obtained using suspended cultures. For seed attached to aluminum collectors, densities of 250 to 350 spat prevent overcrowding and subsequent loss from the collectors. Spat can also be cultured,
unattached, inside plastic boxes (90 x 90 cm) at densities as high as 500 oysters. Oysters should be exposed weekly to sun and air for 24 hr to control competitors, predators (Thais haemastoma, Melongena melongena, Callinectes sapidus and Panopeus menippe) and fouling (bivalves, polychaetes, barnacles, tunicates and sponges). After six to eight months of culture, juveniles reach marketable sizes of 55 to 70 mm in length (23 g body weight) with a survival rate of 91–98 percent. The meat yield is about 10 percent of the total weight.

Given the low infrastructure cost required for mangrove oyster culture, and the abundance of wild seed, it is suggested that this species be produced at a small-scale to ensure food security. Although this species has a considerable market demand, its price is relatively low (Table 2); for this reason, a commercial culture with the purpose of generating employment and income is recommended only for areas with very high availability of wild seed, as the use of seed from hatchery is not economically viable. Additionally, due to environmental degradation in estuarine areas, caused by mangrove deforestation, coastal erosion and/or water pollution, the identification of suitable farming areas for this activity is necessary.

**Scallops – Argopecten nucleus and Nodipecten nodosus**

Argopecten nucleus is a small bivalve species (50 mm in length) and Nodipecten nodosus, one of the largest scallop species (150 mm in length). Both are epibenthic, but while A. nucleus is a free-living species, N. nodosus attaches to hard substrates. A. nucleus is distributed in South Florida (United States of America), southern Gulf of Mexico, the Caribbean and Suriname, while N. nodosus has a wider distribution, extending northerly to North Carolina (United States of America) and southerly to the southern reaches of the Federative Republic of Brazil (Díaz and Puyana, 1994). A. nucleus is a short-lived species (one to two years), attaining sexual maturity early (three months), while N. nodosus is longer lived (>2 years), taking six months to reach sexual maturity. Both species are simultaneous hermaphrodites, producing 0.24–47 x 10^5 oocytes/animal/spawn (Velasco, Barros and Costa, 2007). Both species coexist on sandy bottoms at depths of 10–50 m; N. nodosus can be found to 120 m depth (Díaz and Puyana, 1994). Both species have not been harvested, due to the lack of information on the location of their natural banks. Small artificial populations were generated since 1996 from wild seed collected for the purpose of research.

Wild scallop seed can be obtained using artificial collectors made with onion polypropylene bags covered by mosquito net mesh (Borrero, 1995; Urban, 1999, INVEMAR, 2003, Castellanos and Campos, 2007). These collectors are kept in suspension at depths between 5 and 25 m for ten weeks. Settlement of A. nucleus is relatively constant throughout the year, while that of N. nodosus is greater between the months of January and June. Total number of seed settled is very low, with maximum values reported between 1 and 77 spats/collector (4 and 29 spats/m²). Hatchery supplied seed is an alternative to natural collection (De la Roche et al., 2002; Velasco, Barros and Acosta, 2007; Velasco and Barros, 2008, 2009; Velasco, 2008; Gomez-Leon et al., 2009, 2010). The reproductive conditioning of completely immature animals is achieved between 16 and 77 days in A. nucleus and N. nodosus, respectively. Animals are kept in rectangular tanks (300 litre) with micro-filtered water (1 µm) at 25 °C, 35 ppt and aerated. The food is supplied through a continuous drip, maintaining food level within the tank, at constant concentrations of 40 I. galbana cells/µl. Daily, bio-deposits are siphoned and water is changed (80 percent). Changes of temperature combined with exposure to air, and high supply of microalgae, are the stimuli used to induce the spawning of mature animals. Eggs are cross-fertilized using a ratio of 50:1 or 100:1 oocytes:sperm. Zygotes are incubated at densities lower than 15 zygotes/ml using flat-bottomed conical tanks (200–2 000 litre) with micro-filtered sea water (1 µm), UV irradiated, aerated, with the same temperature and salinity used during reproductive
conditioning. Larval and post-larval rearing is carried out at densities of 1 larva/ml under the same conditions described for incubation. Larvae are fed 20 to 60 cells/litre/day of *I. galbana* and *C. calcitrans*. The water volume is fully exchanged every 24 or 48 h. Pediveliger larvae appear after 11 to 15 days of culture. For settlement, onion bag collectors are immersed into the larval rearing tanks and water temperature is reduced (20 °C x 48 hr) to induce metamorphosis. After 15 days of settlement, collectors are placed into mosquito nets bags and are transferred to sea. They remain suspended for one month, when spat reach an average of 10 mm in length.

Scallops are grown in suspension, using long lines systems (Urban, 1999; INVEMAR, 2003; Velasco, 2008; Velasco, Barros and Guerrero, 2009; Gómez-León *et al.*, 2010). Juveniles are placed in pearl or lantern nets at densities between 25 and 40 percent coverage of the bottom of the net and at depths of 5–15 m. Nets are changed each month to adjust the density and to remove predators (cimatid snails and portunid crabs) and fouling. Market size of *A. nucleus* (45 mm length; 23 g total weight) and *N. nodosus* (80 mm length; 87 g total weight) are obtained after 10 to 12 months of culture. Final survival approximates 65 percent. Muscle yield in relation to total weight is 13 percent for both species.

Due to the high price of scallops (see Table 2), preliminary financial analysis of seed production and culture of scallops, gives very encouraging results for both, with rates of return between 23 and 48 percent (Velasco, 2008; Gómez-León *et al.*, 2010). Currently, there is a pilot project for commercial production using hatchery-produced seed in order to verify economic viability. Once the production model for these species is complete, it will be necessary to seek investors and transfer the technology to the private sector, namely fishing communities and/or companies.

Pearl oysters – *Pinctada imbricata* and *Pteria colymbus*

*Pinctada imbricata* is the smaller species of the two pearl oysters attaining 50 mm in length, whereas *Pteria colymbus* can grow up to 75 mm in length (Díaz and Puyana, 1994). Both of these marine species live subtidally; *P. colymbus* is found attached to octocorals, while *P. imbricata* adheres to rocks (Borrero, Diaz and Seczon, 1996). Both species have a similar distribution, occurring in the western Atlantic, from North Carolina (United States of America) to the south of the Federative Republic of Brazil (Díaz and Puyana, 1994). They are protandrics species (Borrero, Diaz and Seczon, 1996), with a continuous reproductive cycle peaking between May and June (Urban, 1999). Pearl oysters were highly exploited for their pearls during conquest times, but their abundance decreased and collection was stopped. Currently, there is no domestic market for these species.

Wild oyster seed can be collected using onion bags (Velasco and Borrero, 1996; Urban, 1999; INVEMAR, 2003; Velasco and Barros, 2010). Collectors are suspended at depths between 5–10 m for 8–10 weeks. Maximum settlement for *P. imbricata* (292 to 583 spats/m²) is recorded between February and June, and for *P. colymbus* (58 at 333 spats/m²) between February and May, coinciding with water changes in temperature. *P. imbricata* oyster seed has been successfully produced in hatchery conditions (Hernández, 1999; Hernández and Gómez, 2000). Conditioning of 70 mm individuals is achieved with temperatures of 24 °C and a daily ration of *Chaetoceros gracilis* and *Isochrysis galbana* (60 cells/µl/d). Mature specimens are induced to spawn by thermal shock. Larval rearing is carried out in cylindrical tanks (500 litre), filled with micro-filtered seawater (1 µm), irradiated with UV, at a temperature of 27 °C and salinity of 35 ppt. Larval density is maintained at 2–6 larvae/ml, and fed a mixed diet of *I. galbana* and *C. gracilis* (50 and 60 cells/µl/d). Larvae reach the pediveligers stage 16 days after fertilization. Settlement is carried out at densities of 1 larva/ml, fed an algal ration of 100 cells/µl/d; onion bag collectors are submerged in larval rearing tanks as a settlement substrate. Seed of 10 mm are obtained in three months under hatchery conditions.
Pearl oyster are grown in both suspended and bottom cultures (Velasco and Borrero, 1996; Urban, 1999; INVEMAR, 2003; Velasco and Barros, 2010). Suspended culture technology is similar to that described above for scallops. For bottom culture, boxes are used, and oysters are grown at densities of 30 percent cover of the bottom of the net. Pearl production is feasible in both species, where a single nucleus (diameter <11 mm) is implanted in animals greater than 60 mm length. Commercial size for both species (50 mm length and 20 g for *P. imbricata*; 75 mm length and 35 g for *P. colymbus*) is reached between 9–12 months of cultivation, with approximately 50 percent survival. The yield of the meat in relation to the total weight of the animal is approximately 30 percent.

There has been pilot-scale operations carried out by fishermen’s associations and indigenous communities using wild seed. Due to the low infrastructure requirements for grow-out, results have been successful for a production used as a supplement for local food demand. These species are not recommended for large-scale aquaculture because the quantity of wild seed is too low. Hatchery-seed is required for increased production; however, this is not believed to be economically feasible given the lack of a pearl oyster domestic market (for both pearl and meat). Nevertheless, if it is possible to adapt successfully the technology for pearl production; culture of pearl oyster species could target the more lucrative pearl market and the local meat market contributing to food security.

**Pen shell, *Pinna carnea***

*Pinna carnea* is a large bivalve species (300 mm) that lives semi-buried, vertically, in soft bottoms with gravel. It inhabits shallow waters of the marine subtidal, up to 25 m depth. It is distributed along the western Atlantic from the south of Florida (United States of America) to the Federative Republic of Brazil (Díaz and Puyana, 1994). This pen shell is a simultaneous hermaphrodite species, their populations have a continuous reproductive cycle with a period of higher proportion of animals spawning between July and November (García, 1997). The small populations of this species are not currently subjected to exploitation.

Wild seed collection of pen shells has been carried using the same technology described for pearl oysters and scallops (Urban, 1999; INVEMAR; 2003; Velasco and Borrero, 2004). Maximum settlement in *P. carnea* (6–100 spats/collector or 25 to 417 spats/m² of collector) occurs between September and December, associated with an increase in water temperature. This species can be cultured using similar suspended or bottom technology described for scallops and pearl oysters (Borrero 1995; García, 1997; INVEMAR; 2003, Velasco and Borrero, 2004). Survival at the end of cultivation is typically over 55 percent. Commercial size (160 mm length and 15 g total weight) is reached in 11 months in suspended culture with approximately a survival of 57 percent and a meat yield of 30 percent total weight.

Due to the moderate availability of pen shell wild seed, the absence of a market and its low costs (see Table 2) of production, it is suggested that this species is cultured as a food complement by coastal communities; additionally, the meat of *P. carnea* could be marketed as that of oysters and/or clams. The development of hatchery-seed technology is not recommended for this species, but should be focused on *Atrina seminude*, another less abundant species of pen shell with a larger adductor muscle.

**West Indian top shell, *Cittarium pica***

The West Indian top shell, *Cittarium pica*, also known as burgao or cigua, is an archaeogastropod of large size (180 mm of width shell) (Figure 1). It lives on exposed rocky intertidal shores, with a distribution extending from Bermuda to the north coast of South America. It is nocturnal in its behaviour and feeds on macroalgae, diatoms and organic detritus (Díaz and Puyana, 1994). This is a gonocoric species,
with external fertilization and without external sexual dimorphism. The minimum size of sexual maturity is between 33–40 mm of width shell (Randall, 1964). Populations in the Republic of Colombia have a continuous reproductive cycle; with a higher percentage of animals spawning between August and October (Osorno and Díaz, 2009). Fecundity of this species ranges from 1–1.3 x 10^6 oocytes/spawn. Conservation status of the species populations are considered vulnerable due to high overexploitation (Ardila, Navas and Reye, 2002).

Hatchery seed has been experimentally produced in the Republic of Colombia. The spawning coincides with the high tides in new moon periods. Animals larger than 70 mm are exposed to air for 24 hr and thereafter, placed in tanks with a continuous open flow of 50 µm filtered and UV-irradiated seawater. Egg incubation is carried out in rectangular plastic tanks (12 litre) at densities ranging between 8–88 zygotes/ml. Seawater is filtered to 1 µm, UV-irradiated and maintained at 25 °C and 35 ppt. Cultures are kept under low illumination without air injection and changing the supernatant water every 15 minutes for the first 2 hr. Once trochophore larvae develop (7.5 hr following fertilization), dead and lethargic larvae are decanted on the bottom and eliminated; culture water is replaced entirely every 12 hr maintaining densities between 0.2–1 larva/ml. After three to four days, when competent veligers are developed (with visible tubules in the epipodial tentacles), PVC plates covered with biofilm (diatoms) are introduced in the tanks. Once settlement is verified (two days), seawater system is changed to open flow with an air supply. Spat reach a shell width of 2 mm in three months. Juveniles are cultured on biofilm plates placed in holders, inside cages suspended in outdoor raceways. Macroalgae such as Laurencia sp. and Padina gymnospora are used to complement biofilm feeding. Biofilm plates and macroalga are renewed every two days. The supply of a continuous open water flow is required to avoid ammonia reaching toxic levels (Hawkins and Velasco, 2009). Time required to attain commercial size (70 mm width shell; 170 g weight) is unknown. Meat yield for this species is 20 percent of the total weight.

The West Indian top shell has a high market demand and commands a high price (see Table 2); however, production costs are also high, due to hatchery and raceway requirements used for culture. For this reason, culture of this species for food sustenance purpose is not viable. It is necessary to optimize techniques for seed production and culture, as well as to carry out a financial evaluation of the activity assessing commercial viability or stock enhancement efforts.

**Queen conch, Strombus gigas**

The queen conch is a gastropod of large size (320 mm of length) (Figure 2). It lives in subtidal bottoms with coralline sands, algae and Thalassia, at 2–30 m depth from Bermuda to the northern shores of South America (Díaz and Puyana, 1994). They are herbivorous and detritivores (Lagos-Bayona et al., 1996), gonocorics, with internal fecundation and external sexual dimorphism marked by the presence of a conspicuous penis in the males. First maturity occurs at three/four years of age, when individuals reach lengths of 22–24 cm. They mate and spawn along the whole year, with more reproductive activity between April and November (when water temperature starts increasing). The females spawn after mating on the sand. The eggs are inside of a continuous jellied tube that can measure up to 37 m. Fecundity averages 300 000 eggs/spawn (Lagos-Bayona et al., 1996). This species has been exploited for its meat, shell and pearls. In spite of the fact that since 1991 there are restrictions on harvest (in terms of seasons, fishing areas, size and quotas), in practice, enforcement has not been efficient and conch populations are currently in a vulnerable state of conservation (Ardila, Navas and Reye, 2002).

Obtaining hatchery-produced seed has been possible through the collection of eggs masses from natural habitats (Lagos-Bayona et al., 1996) or inside marine corrals where adult animals are confined. Egg masses are gathered in polyethylene bags by
dive. These are washed with micro-filtrate water (0.5 µm) and disinfected (chlorine 0.5 percent x 60 s), and placed in upwellers systems with an open flow of filtered (0.5 µm) UV-irradiated seawater. In four days, the intracapsular veliger larvae have two velar lobes, and are ready to hatch. Egg masses are placed in a sieve inside the superior portion of cylindroconical tanks (1 000 litre), in a closed system with treated seawater. Once developed, veliger larvae are reared in this type of tanks at densities of 20–60 larvae/litre with continuous water flow. Larvae are fed with *I. galbana* at rations of 17–22 cells/µl/day. After 18 or 21 days, competent larvae appear (SEPESCA/CIQRO, 1994). In order to stimulate settlement and metamorphosis, larvae are placed on trays with open flow of filtered (5 µm) seawater, containing biofilms of *I. galbana* and hydrogen peroxide (50 µmoles x 10 hr). Juveniles are maintained in these trays or in tanks (400 litre) at densities of 15 juveniles/m². They are fed with biofilm plates and liquefied macroalgae *Dictyota* sp. Biofilms are composed of diatoms, such as *Thalassionema*, *Cylindrotheca*, *Bacillaria* and *Navicula*. Biofilm plates are changed daily and biodeposits are removed by siphoning. Young juveniles of 2 mm shell length attain 18 mm in two months, and older juveniles of 65 mm reach 100 mm in five months. These animals can be transferred to corrals in the sea or used for repopulation. In the Republic of Colombia the time of culture required to reach commercial size (200 mm length; 1 400 g weight) is unknown. Meat yield is between 6.5–9.6 percent in weight (SEPESCA/CIQRO, 1994).

Although it has been possible to produce hatchery seed of queen conch, mortality is very high, and there remain unknown aspects on culture techniques and more specifically, successful transfer to sea for stock enhancement. It is necessary to optimize technology for seed production and culture, as well as to evaluate their adaptation to the natural habitat. This species commands a high market price (see Table 2), but the production costs are high due to hatchery requirements and the long culture period to attain market size (SEPESCA/CIQRO, 1994). The authors suggest the culture of this species for repopulation and/or for production of pearls.

**CRUSTACEANS**

**Spiny lobster, Panulirus argus**

The Caribbean spiny lobster is a large decapod crustacean (180 mm of cephalothorax length and 990 g total weight). It is a benthic organism, associated with seagrass, corals and sandy bottoms at depths of up to 100 m. The species is known to undergo long migrations. Spiny lobsters are distributed from Bermuda to the Janeiro River in the Federative Republic of Brazil, embracing part of the coastal area of North America, all of Central America, the Antilles of the Great Caribbean and part of South America, being rare in the Gulf of Mexico (Cruz *et al*., 1990). This is a carnivorous and omnivorous species. They are gonocorics, with external sexual dimorphism, the females present large birramia pleopods and their gonopores are in the third base of the treadmills paws, while the males have small monorramia pleopods and their gonopores are in the fifth base of the treadmills paws. The reproductive cycle is continuous, but the largest proportion of mature individuals is found between September and November (CCI, 2006). Fecundity oscillates between 100 000 and 2 500 000 eggs/spawns (Briones *et al*., 1997). Larval life is long, lasting between 6–12 months and very complex, consisting of 11 larval stages, from the phyllosoma to the pueruli stage (Kittaka, 1994). In the Republic of Colombia, spiny lobsters have been exploited intensely; with recorded captures of 1 087 tonnes/year (Cruz *et al*., 2007). In spite of the size limits defined by capture regulations, it is common to find juvenile lobsters in the market. In the Republic of Colombia, the conservation status for this species is considered vulnerable (Ardila, Navas and Reye, 2002).

Pueruli and wild juveniles can be collected between mangrove roots (Eslava, 1986), or using artificial collectors, such as onion bags (Córdoba, 1997) and shredded
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polypropylene rope (Arango et al., 1999; Jaimes, Pinzon and Trujillo, 2004; Cruz, et al., 2007; Jaimes and Nieto, 2008). The most efficient collectors are polypropylene ropes, collecting between 14 and 251 juveniles and pueruli/collector. Collectors are suspended at depths between 1–15 m and must be checked every month to remove settled lobsters. Although there are settlements throughout the year, peak numbers are recorded between January and April and from September to November.

Juveniles have been cultured in cages placed in outdoor tanks (Córdoba, 1997) or suspended in the sea (Eslava, 1986; Jaimes et al., 2009). Best results have been obtained using floating cages (9 m³), made of four mesh levels, and with approximately ten shredded polypropylene rope collectors on each level. Grow-out density is approximately 30 animals/m³. Organisms settled on the collectors inside the floating cages serve as food to the cultured lobsters; for animals greater than 40 mm cephalothorax length, a daily supplement of fresh fish viscera and small fish from commercial fishery discards is necessary. Fouling organisms and predators (Callinectes spp., Mithrax sp. and Muraena sp.) are eliminated regularly from the cages. Juveniles with an initial cephalothorax length of 8 mm reach 60 mm in one year of culture. Culture time required to reach commercial size (70 mm cephalothorax length or 385 g total weight) is unknown. Meat yield (by weight) of the tail is 30 percent of the total weight.

Continued efforts in optimizing culture techniques for spiny lobsters are recommended; more specifically, developing artificial diets for juvenile grow-out would alleviate costs incurred on an environmental and economic scale, as compared to the current use of fresh fish. On the other hand, considering the high availability of wild juveniles and the long duration of the larval phase, continued efforts in hatchery production are not advisable. Due to the high costs of the exogenous food, culturing spiny lobster as an alternative food source for small communities is not recommended. A financial analysis on spiny lobster culture is required to determine its viability as a commercial operation, including using a portion of production for the purpose of natural population enhancement. Another alternative is to promote the wide deployment of collectors to favour natural recruitment and in parallel develop a fishery for harvest, as done in the Republic of Cuba.

COLOMBIA AS THE POTENTIAL SITE FOR A REGIONAL SHELLFISH HATCHERY FACILITY

Since the 1980s, the Colombian Government has supported the development of native shellfish culture along its Caribbean coast through the funding of several research and development projects that led to the acquisition of technical farming knowledge described above. Starting from 2005, a number of national and international entities such as the Institute on Marine and Coastal Research (Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas y Costeras – INVEMAR), the University of Magdalena, the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), the International Cooperation Agency of Chile (Agencia de Cooperación Internacional – AGCI), as well as a number of private companies (including Hidrocultivos de la Costa, Asociación de Pescadores Chinchorreros de Taganga, Coopetaganga and Genemaca Committee), have been promoting the culture of native scallops species.

Thanks to this support, the Republic of Colombia currently operates a functional shellfish hatchery at the University of Magdalena in Taganga, Santa Marta, Colombian Caribbean, and the first marine scallop farming concession of two hectares in the Bay of Taganga. The hatchery, with its total area of 400 m², has a seawater supply of 15 m³/hr and a seawater cooling system by means of a chiller. The water filtration system is made up of a sand filter (50 µm), four bag filters (25, 10, 5 and 1 µm) and a UV sterilization system (four lamps of 4 W). The entire facility can also be cooled by means of air conditioning. The hatchery includes a pump room, a water treatment room, a mollusk culture section, a microalgalae section, a dry laboratory for microscopy
and physical-chemical analysis, a material cleaning and sterilization room, an office and a meeting room. In addition, the facility has an outdoor quarantine area and a sedimentation pond for hatchery effluent waters before they are returned to the sea.

The hatchery, has access to the use and service of other facilities of the University of Magdalena such as the restaurant, communication facilities (internet access, phone), bathrooms, training facilities (classrooms, auditoriums), microbiology and water quality laboratories, as well as a small but functional fish processing facility. The area of the hatchery may allow an expansion of approximately 1 000 m². The hatchery is located in an area not affected by natural storms or hurricanes and easily accessible. Taganga is ten minutes from Santa Marta, 30 minutes from the local airport and 1.5 hr flight from Bogota. There are direct flights from Bogota to most of the countries of the Caribbean.

For the operation of the hatchery, there are five qualified professionals in molluscs reproduction, microalgae production, scallop grow-out, administration and aquaculture engineering. In addition, university students and undergraduates provide an additional helping hand when needed.

In the Colombian Caribbean, there is good broodstock availability for all the native shellfish species mentioned above. The seawater temperature and salinity are within the ranges of these species (20–22 °C; 29–37 ppt). At presence there is no evidence of the presence of harmful chemicals, diseases, toxic blooms or microbiological contamination in the local waters. The hatchery is currently producing about 8 million scallop larvae (with survivals of 30–60 percent) and 100 000 spat of 10 mm every 2.5 months (one month in the hatchery and 1.5 in the sea). However, due to the proximity of urban populations to the hatchery, a detailed study of the quality of the water in the area should be carried out.

The use of this facility as the regional hatchery for the Wider Caribbean imply financial savings, as well as savings in time and a reduced level of risks as the hatchery works well. The facility could be enlarged according to the production requirements.

**CONCLUSIONS**

At present, a wealth of knowledge exists on the culture and/or production of seed for some native species from the Colombian Caribbean; however, aquaculture production has not been conducted in a regular manner for any of these species. Based on this information, a number of actions are suggested in the short-term, in order encourage sustained production of native shellfish from the Colombian Caribbean. It is recommended for resources like the mangrove oyster, pearl oysters and pen shell whose market and price are reduced, but with a considerable availability of wild seed and low infrastructure requirements, that their cultivation be implemented to guarantee food security of the coastal populations of the Colombian Caribbean.

For scallop species, which command a high price and high production costs, but a reduced domestic market, a financial analysis of a pilot-scale operation is recommended; this would allow the development of a production model which potentially generates income and employment. On the other hand, when considering species facing ecological risk, such as the queen conch, the West Indian top shell and the spiny lobster, culture activity for the purpose of stock enhancement is an option. In addition, considering an existing substantial market demand, high price and high cost of production, continued research into culture techniques for hatchery-seed production is recommended for these three species, as well as a financial analysis assessing commercial viability. On the other hand, considering favourable prices and markets for octopus the authors suggest investigating the development and/or adaptation of culture technology for commercial purpose. Finally, considering the availability of infrastructure, equipment, qualified staff, availability and access to bivalve broodstock, the existing molluscs hatchery of the University of Magdalena could be developed into a regional facility for the benefit of all interested Caribbean countries.
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ABSTRACT

Commercial fisheries in the Republic of Panama are mostly developed on the Pacific Ocean, however, shellfish fisheries are more common in the Caribbean Sea. These extractive activities are seriously affecting the population of some commercially valuable species such as lobsters, crabs and a number of species of bivalves, gastropods and sea cucumbers. Conservation measures are applied to minimize the impact on the marine ecosystems, such as prohibiting the capture of egg-bearing lobsters and banning queen conch and sea cucumber harvest. There are currently a number of aquaculture projects on bivalve molluscs and other valuable marine species; these projects are successfully conducted in marine coastal areas and ponds. However, operational limitations due to poor infrastructure have restrained the expansion of many aquaculture activities from becoming truly commercial. It is anticipated that commercial seafood culture will develop in the near future with the collaboration of artisanal fishing communities and private investors.

RESUMEN

La pesca comercial en República de Panamá se desarrolla principalmente en el Océano Pacífico, sin embargo, la extracción de mariscos es más común en el Mar Caribe. Estas actividades extractivas están afectando seriamente a la población de algunas especies de valor comercial como langostas, caracoles, cangrejos y numerosas especies de bivalvos, gasterópodos y pepinos de mar. Para reducir al mínimo el impacto en los ecosistemas marinos se aplican medidas de conservación, tales como la prohibición de captura de langostas con huevos, veda de caracol gigante o pala y prohibición de la extracción del pepino de mar. Actualmente hay varios proyectos de cultivos de moluscos bivalvos y otras valiosas especies marinas; Estos proyectos se realizan con éxito en estanques y zonas costeras marinas. Sin embargo, las limitaciones operacionales debido a infraestructuras deficientes han restringido la expansión de muchas actividades acuícolas a niveles comerciales. Se prevé que el cultivo de mariscos comerciales se desarrollará en un futuro próximo con la colaboración de las comunidades pesqueras artesanales y los inversores privados.
INTRODUCTION
The Republic of Panama has a continental platform of 3,983 km², the majority of which is coastal (2,988 km²). Almost half of the coastal platform lies on the Caribbean side.

Most of the artisanal and industrial fishing activity (95 percent) targets tunas, sardines, herrings and shrimp and is carried out in the Pacific Ocean. The Caribbean coast supports artisanal fishing of spider crabs, bivalve molluscs, queen conch and lobster; the latter being the most important product on the east and west coasts. Industrial fishing is not developed in the Caribbean Sea and for the most part does not compete with artisanal fishing; the only exception relates to lobster fishing, where approximately five fishing boats move from the Pacific coast on a yearly basis to fish this commodity.

Lobster fishery
There are strong indications, supported by export values and reduced harvest size, that overfishing of lobster is occurring. For this reason, conservation measures have been implemented since 1981 in the Republic of Panama; namely, minimal harvest size, and prohibition on harvest of egg-bearing lobsters. In addition, the Republic of Panama has adopted the regional closure of the fishing season for the Caribbean spiny lobster (*Panulirus argus*) since 2010. This regional measure was promoted by the Organization of Fishing and Aquaculture in Central America (Organización del Sector Pesquero y Acuícola de Centroamérica – OSPESCA), advocating for lobster fishing season to be closed between 1 February and 30 June and followed by all Central American countries. Figure 1 illustrates lobster fishing areas on both the Caribbean and Pacific coasts, with the majority found on the Caribbean side.
Sea cucumber harvest
As a precautionary principle, the extraction of sea cucumber has been permanently prohibited since 2003; this was based on a study indicating the critical reduction of the species’ population in certain areas of Bocas del Toro, due to the extraction of sea cucumbers for the Asian market. Recently, the prohibition has been lifted for research purposes; this was made possible to support the interest in investigating sea cucumber culture – namely reproduction under controlled conditions – and thus, potentially reducing clandestine fishing activities.

Queen conch
In a presentation to OSPESCA, Martinez (2006) gave a preliminary statistical analysis on queen conch (Strombus gigas) landings from capture fishing. The results clearly indicate a reduction in size and quantity of the queen conch harvested (Tewfik and Guzman, 2003). This prompted action for conservation, leading to a moratorium of five years.

AQUACULTURE PERSPECTIVE
In 2009, the state policy on Panama’s Aquatic Resources was adopted in order to achieve an optimal and rational exploitation of its aquatic resources, through regulation and monitoring. This was developed in order to secure the conservation, renewal and sustainability of aquatic resources and ensure the long-term continuity of fishing and aquatic farming activities; hence, also ensuring social, environmental and economic sustainability of these activities.

This official document promotes the cultivation of aquatic organisms especially molluscs, fish and macroalgae. In order to achieve this goal, mechanisms to support such development, including the provision of low-interest loans or non-reimbursable funds for community projects and for small commercial ventures, will be established.

Furthermore, a mariculture development strategy is currently being adopted by the authorities. Its objective is to set the conditions to enable and encourage cooperation between government experts and the private sector in supporting the growth of a truly competitive seafarming in the Republic of Panama. This strategy aims at: i) establishing norms, regulations and standard procedures for the development of sea farming; ii) creating and promoting a business environment that would allow competitive production; and iii) providing specialized technical training and develop locally applicable farming technologies.

Culture trials for crustacean and molluscan species
The Province of Bocas del Toro presents favourable conditions for the cultivation of diverse sea species of a high commercial value, among them are lobsters (Panulirus sp.), spider crabs (Mithrax spinossissimus), the mangrove oysters (Crassostrea rhizophorae), the queen conch or “cambute” (S. gigas) and the pearl oyster (Pinctada imbricata).

Population structure, distribution and abundance of three commercial sea cucumbers, Holothuria mexicana, Isostichopus badionotus and Astichopus multifidus, studied by Guzmán and Guevara (2002), suggests the need for an adequate management plan for these echinoderms in order to avoid illegal extraction. The production of bivalves through aquaculture has been restricted to research and development (R&D) projects on different native species of the Pacific Ocean and on the introduced Japanese oyster species, Crassostrea gigas.

The first experiments on the culture of molluscs were conducted in the 1970s by González-Muñoz (1975); results on grow-out of Mitella speciosa and Ostrea palmula in selected areas of the Gulf of Panama were not very encouraging. At this time a number of potential areas were identified in Bocas del Toro on the Caribbean coast for the culture of the mangrove oyster, Crassostrea rhizophorae. This led to further investigation on the settlement and culture of these oysters in Bocas del Toro by Muñoz in 1979 (Morales,
Using asbestos cement collectors over a period of eight months, it was determined that peak spat settlement occurred in February, March and September. Spat grew to 68 mm in seven months.

Aside from *C. rhizophorae* in the area of Bocas del Toro, other species of commercial interest are *Anadara notabilis*, *Anadara chemnitzi*, *Nodipecten nodosus*, *Argopecten gibbus*, *Euvola ziczac* and *Arca zebra*. All of these have been recorded in the database of the Smithsonian Institute of Tropical Research (SITR).

In the past few years, collaboration has been initiated with the Mexican Northwest Biological Research Center (Centro de Investigaciones Biológicas del Noroeste – CIBNOR) on the reproduction technology of several species of Pacific bivalve molluscs. This has led to the successful reproduction of the Pacific calico scallop, *Argopecten ventricosus*, in one of the state research laboratories. Unfortunately however, due to inadequate infrastructure and facilities available, the production of this valuable species has been temporarily halted. In the meantime, the artificial reproduction of the large *Crassostrea gigas* was achieved by a private enterprise.

In 2004, in conjunction with the association of artisanal fishers, a pilot project was implemented focusing on the grow-out of *Argopecten ventricosus* (Figures 2 and 3). The technique involved a 55 x 55 x 7.5 cm mik pyramid, made of stowable plastic oyster farming baskets; these were tied with a nylon rope, forming modules of four culture baskets and one used as a cover fitted with a foam floating plate. This technique has been used in other oyster grow-out projects. Although this led to the successful growth of oysters, the technology has not been adopted by fishers, mainly due to socio-economic factors, which forces them to attend to more immediate needs and neglect grow-out operations.

In the Pacific coast, culture initiatives for *Crassostrea corteziensis* and *Crassostrea gigas* have been implemented. Seed supply was either imported from the United Mexican States or produced in the Republic of Panama. Several experiments have been carried out, including the adaptation of grow-out techniques for the Japanese oyster, *C. gigas*, in a shrimp farm reservoir. Seed, averaging 2.4 mm, was placed in mosquito bags at a density of 2 000 seed/bag. Following 56 days of growth, the experimental densities were established; oysters reached 6–7 cm in length within a period of seven to ten months.

Pilot grow-out of *C. corteziensis* oyster was conducted in an inlet of Isla Cañas in the southern part of the Peninsula de Azuero on the Pacific coast. Adequate density for culture of the species was determined at this time. In addition, the importance of frequent cleaning in order to prevent mortality caused by perforating snails (mainly of the *Cymatium* genus) and the effect of fouling on grow-out enclosures was identified. At present, the fishing community of Isla Cañas has adopted this technology, pursuing a third trial in oyster grow-out. The community’s aim is to sell cultured product to hotels in the area targeting the tourism sector.

**REPOPULATION OF OVEREXPLOITED NATURAL STOCKS**

Projects have been implemented, both in the Pacific and Atlantic coasts of the Republic of Panama, aiming towards stock enhancement of natural populations of overexploited
species. An outline is given below on the species targeted and the approach taken for each.

Culture trials for *Anadara tuberculosa* have been initiated by communities along the Pacific coast. The goal is to grow individuals to commercial size in the natural environment, allowing them to spawn prior to harvesting and removal from the population. Daily harvest is classified by size using collectors; individuals smaller than commercial size are transferred to suitable sites for further on-growing.

Three projects have been carried out with fishing communities on the Caribbean coast. Two of these are based on the cultivation and repopulation of lobster and spider crabs following experiments conducted using cages in other Caribbean countries and in the United Mexican States. The third project involves the culture of the algae *Euchema cottonii* which has been produced in the Republic of Panama on a commercial-scale for the past 50 years (Figure 4). Techniques for this type of culture have been adopted by fishing communities in part due to a short production time frame required for the algae to reach commercial size.

Trials for the grow-out of the spider crab, *Mithrax spinosissimus*, have also been initiated. Egg-bearing females were captured and kept in oxygenated recipients until the hatching of zoeae larvae. Once the first crab stage was reached (approximately four to six days after hatching), individuals were put in 3 x 1.5 m (w x h) cages at a density of 150 crabs/cage (Figure 5). This method is labour intensive, requiring routine cleaning of the cages and maintenance of density through size selection of the growing crabs.

For all of the farming trials described above, success is directly related to the interest and commitment of the fishing communities; for this reason, continuous training and technical follow-through is needed for the successful adaptation of culture techniques.

**SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS**

Based on the state policy and the national strategy, the following short-term actions are planned for the development of mariculture activities:

- Investments in mariculture R&D programmes will be increased.
- Increase training opportunities for technical staff in large-scale mollusc reproduction.
- Renovation and expansion of existing facilities for molluscs and sea cucumber reproduction.
- Establishment of pilot farm operations for *Anadara, Pinctada* and *C. rhizophorae* along the Caribbean coast.
- Reproduction of sea cucumber for farming and repopulation of natural stocks.
CONCLUSION
There are several factors favouring the development of aquaculture in the Republic of Panama. The country has a strong fishing tradition due to its strategic position, a stable economy, and its shores are relatively unaffected by the impacts of adverse weather phenomena. The country has generated basic technology for the development of commercial shellfish aquaculture and has well-trained technical staff. In addition, Panama has signed cooperation agreements with agencies such as the Smithsonian Institute of Tropical Research, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Government of the United Mexican States and is an active partner of the OSPESCA Central American Cooperation framework.

Existing strategies and policies encourage actions necessary to strengthen human resources and infrastructure aiming towards aquaculture in general. This enables the implementation of shellfish aquaculture and its sustainable management with the overarching goal of providing commercial alternatives to coastal communities.
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ABSTRACT
Echinoderm culture refers to the cultivation of both sea urchins (Echinoidea) and to a lesser extent sea cucumbers (Holothuroidea) – sea urchins are more valuable and more widely marketed than sea cucumbers. The sea egg, *Tripneustes ventricosus*, is widely harvested throughout the Lesser Antilles and is restricted from harvest in several countries. The variegated sea urchin, *Lytechinus* sp., is also harvested and exported to Japan and other Asian countries where its roe is highly valued. Echinoderms, particularly sea urchins, also occupy an important ecological niche in tropical coral reef environments. As benthic grazers of macroalgae, they mitigate the proliferation of fouling algae that occurs as nutrient loading increases (eutrophication) due to anthropogenic pollution. In the Caribbean, this problem has been exacerbated by the dramatic declines in *Tripneustes* populations due to overexploitation and the collapse of *Diadema antillarum* populations as a result of a devastating plague, unprecedented in marine history, that occurred in 1983 and affected only this species and almost wiped out these urchins that lived on the Caribbean coral reefs all the way north to Bermuda. It was the *Diadema* that grazed algae from the reefs allowing this species and other invertebrates to settle and grow and maintained the ecological balance of a healthy coral reef. Stock enhancement of natural sea urchin populations from hatchery-reared seed stock has been a well documented success in Japan, the People’s Republic of China, the Republic of the Philippines and other Asian countries. Induction of spawning, larviculture, nursery grow-out and release have been highly successful in restoring stocks decimated by overexploitation and disease. Hatchery and nursery techniques, as well as several release and on-growing methods are discussed.

RESUMEN
El cultivo de equinodermos se refiere al cultivo de erizos de mar (Echinoidea) y en menor medida al cultivo de pepinos de mar (Holothuroidea). Los erizos de mar son más valiosos y más ampliamente comercializados que los pepinos de mar. El hueve de mar, *Tripneustes ventricosus*, se extrae ampliamente a lo largo de las Antillas Menores y su colecta está
A regional shellfish hatchery for the Wider Caribbean – Assessing its feasibility and sustainability

INTRODUCTION

Echinoderm culture refers to the cultivation of both sea urchins (Echinoidea) and to a lesser extent sea cucumbers (Holothuroidea) – sea urchins are more valuable and more widely marketed than sea cucumbers. The sea egg, *Tripneustes ventricosus*, is widely harvested throughout the Lesser Antilles and is restricted from harvest in several countries (Pena et al., 2010). The variegated sea urchin, *Lytechinus* sp., is also harvested and exported to Japan and other Asian countries where its roe (“uni”) is highly valued.

Echinoderms, particularly sea urchins, also occupy an important ecological niche in tropical coral reef environments. As benthic grazers of macroalgae, they mitigate the proliferation of fouling algae that occurs as nutrient loading increases (eutrophication) due to anthropogenic pollution. It was the *Diadema antillarum*, or lime urchin, that grazed algae from the reefs and maintained the clean rock substrates that allowed corals, *Diadema* and other invertebrates to settle and grow and maintained the ecological balance of a healthy coral reef. In 1983, a pandemic disease of unknown origin decimated *Diadema* populations throughout its range with subsequent negative impacts on coral reef health.

Two species of sea urchins under consideration as target species for culture are high value seafood commodities that have been heavily exploited, and the third species (*Diadema*) is a demonstrated keystone species for Caribbean coral reef habitats. Sea urchin culture is a well-established industry in Japan, the People’s Republic of China and other Asian countries, Australia, New Zealand, Scandinavia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Canada (Pearce, 2010). In most cases sea urchin cultivation is based on spawning of wild broodstock, with the availability of mature sea urchins restricted to the annual spawning season once or perhaps twice a year (Figure 1). Nonetheless, the largest sea urchin nursery in Japan, located in southeastern Hokkaido, obtains broodstock from source populations twice annually (spring and fall) to produce over 11 million juvenile *Strongylocentrotus intermedius* per year (Saito, 1992). The factors that control reproductive maturation have been established for a few species and spawning is usually possible with well-fed broodstock cultivated in warm water and in darkness.
Mature sea urchins are induced to spawn by air exposure for two hours followed by injecting 1–2 ml of a 0.53 M KCl solution into the coelom (Liu, Zhu and Kelly, 2010). After mixing the gametes, excess sperm is rinsed off, and the fertilized eggs hatch after approximately 20 hours. After three to four days, the pluteus larvae require phytoplankton and are usually fed a combination of the diatom *Chaetoceros gracilis* and the green flagellate *Dunaliella tertiolecta* at a density of 5,000 cells/ml and increased to 50,000 cells/ml for late stage larvae (Strathmann, 1987; Chang and Gao, 2004). Continuous flow systems are employed, initially at 15 percent exchange/day, increasing to 100 percent daily exchange at time of settlement (16–30 days post-fertilization). Initial larval density is approximately 2 larvae/ml, but decreases to 0.8 ml at the time of settlement (Saito *et al.*, 1985).

Settlement is induced by introducing plates covered with benthic algae, primarily diatoms that are cultured in tanks supplied nutrient enrichment similar to that used for phytoplankton culture for the larvae. The benthic algae is a primary food source until the juveniles reach 3–4 mm test diameter, at which time they are provided soft macroalgae such as *Ulva* spp. After a few months when the juveniles have grown to 7–10 mm test diameter, they can be placed in floating cages and provided a natural diet, fed commercially available formulated feeds, or released into the environment for restocking. Some months of additional nursery cultivation produces larger juveniles (15–20 mm test diameter) and result in higher survival at recapture, 16–40 percent has been reported (Saito, 1992). *Tripneustes gratilla* reared in a hatchery in the Philippines reached sexual maturity in six to seven months; natural mortality exceeded 90 percent in unprotected sites, but survival improved to 60–87 percent in seagrass cages. It is widely viewed that the hatchery-reared urchins, provided predation control, played
a significant role in the recovery of this recruitment-limited fishery (Juinio-Meñez, Macawaris and Bangi, 1998).

Closed-cycle cultivation of sea urchins is being conducted in several countries with temperate climates and cooler water temperatures, but it is capital intensive and has high operational costs. Closed-cycle cultivation, however, may offer the opportunity for growth acceleration, improved survivorship and gonadal indices through systematic broodstock selection and breeding. Currently, development of hatchery production of juvenile sea urchins for fishery enhancement appears to be the best first step. Scheibling and Mladenov (1987) spoke to this in the Marine Fisheries Review.... “An alternative approach [in addition to fisheries management programmes] would be to artificially enhance *T. ventricosus* recruitment by aquaculture techniques. Larvae and early juvenile stages could be reared in the laboratory, and juveniles could be released in large numbers in selected natural habitats or protective enclosures in the field (e.g. cages or rafts). Techniques for rearing *T. ventricosus* larvae are being developed, and juveniles have been grown in the laboratory and in field enclosures on a variety of algal foods. Moreover, fishermen claim to have successfully restocked areas by transplanting breeding adults. Therefore, in our view, artificial stock enhancement through aquaculture presents a feasible and promising means of rehabilitating the fishery in areas where pollution and food supply are not limiting factors.” (Scheibling and Mladenov, 1987).

**CLASS ECHINOIDEA – Sea urchins**

*Tripnuestes ventricosus*

**FAO names**: En: Sea egg; Fr: Oeuf de la mer; Sp: Erizo de mar  
**Size**: To 130 mm test diameter  
**Distribution/habitat**: Uncommon throughout much of the Caribbean from US Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Jamaica to the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela; most common in the Lesser Antilles, Saint Lucia, Barbados, Grenadines (Figure 2). Lives on coral rubble, rocky areas, or sand near *T. testudinum* beds between depths of 2 and 5 m. Heavily exploited and now protected through much of the island of the eastern Caribbean.

*Lytechinus variegate*

**FAO names**: En: Variegated sea urchin; Fr: Oursins de mer panachés; Sp: Erizo de mar variegado  
**Size**: To 80 mm test diameter  
**Distribution/habitat**: North Carolina (USA) and Bermuda to Santos Brazil (Figure 3). Although it may occur on rocky bottoms or open sand, it is most commonly associated with seagrass beds (*T. testudinum*, *Halimeda* spp. and *Cymadacea manatarum*) at depths of low water to depths of 2 to 3 m. This sea urchin tends to attach shell and debris to its test, a behaviour termed “masking”, which is pronounced during high illumination, is associated with clustering within denser seagrass beds, presumably for predator avoidance.  
**Larviculture**: The variegated sea urchin is a protandrous hermaphrodite that becomes reproductively active at approximately one year of age and a test diameter of around 40 mm. Reproductive output increases exponentially as the urchins grow, with a decline in fecundity at the larger sizes (75–80 mm test diameter).
Diadema antillarum

FAO names: En: Long-spined sea urchin
Size: To 40 mm test diameter
Distribution/habitat: North Carolina (USA) and Bermuda throughout the Caribbean (Figure 4). These urchins have no commercial importance, and their presence on the reefs was usually viewed as detrimental since their long sharp spines often caused injuries to SCUBA divers and complicated the activities of lobster divers. Once they were gone, however, and algae and coral disease decimated the reefs, it seems that only the reef ecologists have connected the loss of this keystone herbivore with the rapid decline of the tropical western Atlantic coral reefs.

Larviculture: Larviculture of *D. antillarum* has been successful at several laboratories (e.g. Mote Marine Laboratory, USA) utilizing techniques described in this paper. Metamorphosis occurred in approximately 30 days at densities of 0.5–1 larvae/ml. Transition to a post-larval benthic stage required an average of seven days with over 50 percent survival (Leber et al., 2008).
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ABSTRACT
The layout of hatcheries varies from site to site, with species produced, geographic location and available funds. Considerations taken for the design of a regional molluscan hatchery are outlined and include the two basic parts of such a facility: the seawater system and the physical plant. Volume and quality of seawater supply required defines the size of pumps and diameters of pipes used. All surfaces coming into contact with seawater need to be non-toxic. A hatchery needs to have the capacity to: 1) filter parts of its system to 1µm; 2) have access to ultra violet (UV) sterilized seawater; and 3) control water temperature – chilling and/or heating – for selected parts. There are several seawater systems used in hatcheries: 1) open flow-through systems; 2) recirculating or semi-recirculating systems; and 3) storing systems. Discharge of the effluent should be controlled, especially for a regional hatchery importing broodstock from various populations across a wide geographical area. The physical plant should be designed for efficiency and flexibility, allowing the production of a range of molluscan species. It should consist of: 1) an algal culture room; 2) a broodstock quarantine area; 3) a broodstock conditioning and spawning area; 4) a larval rearing unit; 5) a post-larval rearing unit; 6) a juvenile culture unit; 7) a dry laboratory; and 8) a storage area. Various areas of the hatchery should have the capacity to operate independently and be isolated in the event of disease outbreak.

RESUMEN
El diseño de un criadero varía de un sitio a otro dependiendo de las especies producidas, ubicación geográfica y los fondos disponibles. Se describen las consideraciones adoptadas para el diseño de un criadero de moluscos regional y se incluyen las dos partes básicas de una instalación: el sistema de agua de mar y la planta física. El volumen y calidad del suministro de agua de mar requerida define el tamaño de las bombas y diámetro de las tuberías a utilizar. Todas las superficies que entren en contacto con el agua del mar no deben ser tóxicas. Un criadero debe tener la capacidad de: 1) filtrar partículas del sistema a 1 µm; 2) tener acceso a agua de mar esterilizada con luz ultravioleta (UV); y 3) controlar la temperatura del agua mediante refrigeración o calefacción para las áreas seleccionadas. Hay varios sistemas de agua de mar utilizados en un criadero: 1) sistemas de flujo abierto, 2) sistemas de recirculación o semi-recirculación; y 3) sistemas de almacenamiento. La descarga de los efluentes debe ser controlada, especialmente para un criadero regional que importará reproductores de diversas poblaciones desde una extensa área geográfica.
planta física debe estar diseñada con eficiencia y flexibilidad, de manera tal que permita la producción de una amplia gama de especies de moluscos. Esta planta deberá consistir en: 1) una sala de cultivo de algas; 2) un área de cuarentena para reproductores; 3) un área de acondicionamiento de reproductores y desove; 4) una unidad de cultivo larvario; 5) una unidad de levante de postlarvas; 6) una unidad de cultivo de organismos juveniles; 7) un laboratorio seco; y 8) un área de almacenamiento. Las diversas áreas del criadero deberán tener la capacidad para operar de forma independiente y aislada en caso de brote de una enfermedad.

INTRODUCTION
There is no rigid design for a shellfish hatchery. The layout of hatcheries varies from site to site, with species produced, geographic location and available funds. In order to avoid limitations and problems in the long-term, careful thought needs to be given to the design of the hatchery, based on well-defined long-term goals. The end result should be an efficient facility with the capacity to be flexible, allowing for changes in culture techniques and species produced. Most importantly, the design must allow for thorough cleaning of all areas and part of the system and for isolating culture areas for the various life stages is valuable in the event of disease outbreak. Good husbandry and management of stock is essential to the success of an aquaculture operation. This paper provides a broad outline of the considerations to be taken when designing a regional shellfish hatchery and summarizes the requirements for such a facility. Further details are available in two FAO technical papers, written by Sarkis and Lovatelli (2007) and Helm, Bourne and Lovatelli (2004).

HATCHERY ACTIVITIES
In order to design an efficient hatchery, it is advisable to have both short-term and long-term activities of the facility well-defined. A full hatchery cycle will consist of spawning adults under controlled conditions and rearing larvae until such time that they can be transferred to the natural environment. The size and timing at which the latter occurs varies from remote setting of mature eyed-larvae for bivalves (at least 14 days old), to the grow-out of settled juveniles or spat (at least ten days after settling or 30-days old).

The hatchery cycle is usually short relative to the grow-out phase; however, rearing larvae or young juveniles is very labour intensive, requiring technical skills, excellent husbandry protocols, and a basic understanding of the biology of the species, thus providing optimal conditions for rearing particularly in terms of water quality and nutrition.

HATCHERY COMPONENTS
There are essentially two basic parts to a bivalve hatchery: i) the seawater system; and ii) the physical plant.

Seawater system
One of the most important criteria for an efficient and productive hatchery is the access to high quality seawater. The volume of seawater supplied and the level of treatment (filtration and temperature control) is dependent on the scale of the operation and the target species produced. This defines the size of pumps and the diameter of pipes required. All materials should be selected to ensure that surfaces coming into contact with seawater are non toxic; these include most plastics, cast iron and certain grades of stainless steel. All piping must be non-toxic, usually PVC (polyvinylchloride). The diameter of the pipes depends on water demand. In most hatcheries the main distribution lines within the hatchery are 50 mm (4”) diameter or less, although the
main intake pipes may be up to 150 mm (6") diameter. Cleanliness throughout the system is critical to successful hatchery production, and thought must be given to ease of cleaning during piping installation; clean-out ports and/or unions should be located at critical points throughout the line for ease of flushing and dismantling.

Selection of the intake requires an analysis of the seawater and if an accurate assessment of the seasonal fluctuations is not possible, a good understanding is required. The equivalent of a roof drain filter should be adapted to the intake pipe, in order to avoid large animals – i.e. fish – from entering the pipe. It is advisable to install a secondary intake system in the event of clogging and/or pump failure. Seawater pumped directly from the ocean is first passed through sand filters that filter out most particulate material greater than 40 µm in size potentially fouling pipes and inhibiting larval rearing; Jacuzzi and swimming pool filters are commonly used for this first coarse filtration. Routine backwash is necessary to optimize the efficiency of the sand filter. Finer filtration (10–1 µm) is thereafter achieved through the in-line installation of cartridge or bag filters.

In-line UV (ultra-violet) or ozone sterilizing units are advisable as sterilized or disinfected seawater is required for the initial stages of algal culture, or if disease problems arise. Water must be filtered to about 1 µm prior to sterilization since UV-light is readily absorbed by particles in the water reducing the efficiency of the unit.

In most hatcheries, there needs to be the capability to heat and sometimes to chill part of the seawater supply whether it is for broodstock conditioning, increased rate of larval growth, post-larval acclimation to the natural environment, etc. The method of chilling or heating also depends on the volume of water to be treated and on the cost of electricity. For larger volumes of seawater, titanium heat exchangers or digitally controlled titanium heaters can be installed and treated seawater is pumped to the required areas. For smaller volumes, for example, as may be required for spawning induction, aquarium heaters immersed directly into the required tank, or independent chilling units may be sufficient.

There are several seawater systems which may be used in hatcheries:

Open flow-through systems – this ensures a continuous supply of well-oxygenated, filtered seawater throughout the hatchery; water is pumped in, passed through once and pumped out.

Recirculating or semi-recirculating systems – less costly than open systems, these systems are used for the entire facility if seawater is in short supply. However, a hatchery will often combine both open and semi-recirculating systems within the facility; where the latter are used for specific phases of growth, such as spat rearing. Recirculated water may be passed over biologically activated filters to remove metabolic wastes of the animals and held before it is reused. If the water has been heated or chilled it may be passed through heat exchangers to partially heat or chill incoming water and thus, reduce energy costs.

Storing system – some hatcheries pump filtered seawater to a storage tank, made of either concrete or fiberglass. Sufficient water is pumped into the storage tank so it can supply the hatchery until the tank can be refilled. The tank is located at height so that the effect of gravity maintains a sufficient water flow through the hatchery. Storage tanks are useful when water can only be obtained at a particular time, e.g. at high tide, or in areas where electrical power is unreliable to ensure a continuous supply of seawater.

For all seawater systems, discharge of the effluent must be considered carefully if broodstock are imported from other populations and countries. This is primarily to
avoid the introduction of pathogens and diseases, as well as of exotic species to the natural environment. Government regulations of the country need to be reviewed and adhered to.

Physical plant
A hatchery consists of several areas which are inter-related. These are: i) an algal culture room; ii) broodstock quarantine; iii) broodstock conditioning and spawning; iv) larval rearing; v) post-larval rearing; vi) juvenile culture; vii) a dry laboratory; and viii) a storage area. Design of the physical plant should consider the sequence of operation for culture of the species; for example, a dry laboratory area should be in proximity to the algal room in order to facilitate the counting of algae for calculating food rations; similarly, counting of eggs during spawning is at times critical for successful cross-fertilization and requires a dry lab area (see schematic diagram in Creswell “Establishing operational protocols for a regional aquaculture facility” in this publication).

Algal culture facility – Hatcheries focusing on bivalve and gastropod production rely on the successful production of algae. An ideal algal culture facility will include: 1) a separate small room, or a temperature and light controlled chamber to maintain stock or master cultures of algae apart from the larger cultures; and 2) a main algal culture area for 4 litre, 20 litre and larger 100 litre cultures of algae. Temperature control (air conditioner), or ventilation, a bank of fluorescent lamps, air supply and carbon dioxide supply are required. Ideally, an adjacent room housing an autoclave for sterilizing seawater for medium and small cultures is installed. The size of the main algal culture area depends on the number of species being cultured and the amount of algae required. This area can occupy a substantial part of the hatchery.

Large scale algal culture has been well tested and well documented. It can be conducted as batch culture, using 3–4 m diameter, 2 m deep tanks, or as semi-continuous in 100 litre cylinders (Figure 1). Temperature in the algae room is maintained between 15 and 20 °C, dependent on the algal species cultured.

In many hatcheries, considerable portions of the algae, if not all, are raised in greenhouses. These can be stand-alone structures or attached to one side of the hatchery, receiving as much sunlight as possible. The size of the greenhouse depends on the method of culture and quantities of algae that need to be produced.

Broodstock quarantine – In the case of a regional facility, where a number of cultured species will not originate locally, it is primordial that installation of a quarantine facility is planned to ensure that pests, parasites and diseases are not introduced with the exotic species or larvae accidentally escape into the natural environment. This will require a separate drainage system in the area of the hatchery designated for quarantine that empties into special holding tanks where the effluent can be sterilized with a strong hypochlorite solution. The sterilized water can be treated before discharged back into the environment (e.g. using ozone for large volumes and sodium thiosulphate for small volumes) to neutralize any residual chlorine before it is discharged back into the
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**Environment.** Quarantine facilities may require a separate room to hold condition and spawn adults. Drains from this room will also empty into the quarantine treatment tanks.

**Broodstock holding and spawning area** – The amount of space needed to hold and condition broodstock, depends in part on the number of species being held and whether some or most of the conditioning will be undertaken in the open environment rather than in the hatchery. Heated or chilled seawater may be required for this aspect of operation at certain times of the year. The ability to isolate tanks so that photoperiod can be adjusted is desirable since it has been shown that varying periods of light and dark can affect gonadal maturation.

**Larval culture area** – The larval rearing facility is a major component of the hatchery; its size is not only dependent on the scale of production, but on the culture requirements of the species (such as optimum larval density in culture tanks), duration of larval life and spawning frequency. Species with a more rapid turnover, attaining settlement in a shorter time, may be cultured in a smaller larval facility than those with a longer larval life, reared at lower densities, if the same scale of production wants to be achieved.

Optimal culture density varies greatly for bivalve larvae. Pectinid scallop species usually grow best at low densities (starting at 10 larvae/ml for Day-2 larvae, and finishing at 1 larva/ml for pediveligers); where oyster larvae in general fare well at high densities. Traditionally, larvae are reared in closed systems, where water is changed every other day; flow-through systems have been tested and yield good results for certain species (see Sarkis, Helm and Hohn, 2006 for *A. gibbus* culture in flow-through). Size of larval tanks required are dependent on optimal density range for species, and type of culture, ranging from 200 litre conical tanks for flow-through systems to 50 000 litre for static systems.

Larval rearing tanks are generally made of fibreglass or of a suitable plastic and should be thoroughly leached prior to use (Figure 2). Regardless of the size of tanks used, there should be large sunken floor drains to handle large volumes of water when the tanks are drained. A preparation area in the larvae culture room is required for washing, grading, counting and measuring larvae and for accommodating the equipment used for these purposes. This area requires cupboards and shelves for the storage of equipment when not in use.

**Post-larvae and juvenile culture area** – This “nursery” area may accommodate both larval settlement phase and rearing of post-larvae to young juvenile size (or “spat”). Settlement of larvae may be conducted in various ways dependent on the species’ requirements; settlement may occur in round fiberglass tanks similar to larval tanks or in raceways.

Spat may be reared under controlled conditions in a variety of systems, such as upwellers, downwellers, tray systems or raceways until they exceed 2 mm shell length. At this point, they are usually transferred to the natural environment, as the rearing of larger juveniles is found to be uneconomic due mainly to increased food and space requirements. The size of transfer at sea is dependent on the species; methods have
been investigated and well tested for scallop species, as well as for the transfer of eyed pediveligers (pre-settlement) from the hatchery to remote sites for the Pacific oyster (Henderson, 1982; Sarkis and Lovatelli, 2007).

**Other space requirements** – The dry laboratory is where master algal transfers can be made, chemicals weighed and mixed, microscopes kept for examining cultures, samples collected for the assessment of reproductive status, larval and post-larval growth, and all others required for monitoring of cultured animals, records maintained and scientific equipment stored.

Static machinery such as the main pumps, sand filters and pre-filters (to remove particles down to 10 µm), seawater heating/chilling units, furnaces, the air ventilation system, air blowers/compressors, a standby generator for emergency power supply, together with electrical panels and control equipment, are housed in a sound proof machinery room. Duplication of essential equipment is preferred in the event of electrical or mechanical failure. Compressed air is required in all phases of culture and carbon dioxide is required for algal culture. In many hatcheries the seawater intake pumps and sand filters are located in a separate pump house close to the point of intake and the final filtration of seawater may take place at the point of use rather than at a central, fine filtration unit.

Since storage is always an issue in a hatchery, it is useful to have a large general-purpose area that can be used for storing materials and equipment, packing seed and as a workshop. Most of the working areas should be fitted with benches and sinks. Access to freshwater at all points of the hatchery is necessary for cleaning.

In addition, as mentioned previously, it is always advantageous to have the capacity for outdoor holding tanks, and for suspending enclosures in the natural environment. This facilitates transfers of animals, holding of individuals in-between various phases of culture and for demonstration/training purposes.

Finally, assessing production level, product type and target species will guide the design of a cost-efficient hatchery.
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ABSTRACT
The establishment of a regional shellfish aquaculture facility for the Caribbean provides a unique opportunity to stimulate nascent aquaculture industries and markets to further economic development, to bring scientists of the developed and developing countries together to advance the technology resulting from aquaculture research to the point of application as an economically viable industry, and to transfer the scientific, engineering and economic knowledge to local entrepreneurs. A regional aquaculture facility (RAF) concept embraces these opportunities, as well as challenges related to biogeographic, genetic and political boundaries. An aquaculture facility that receives wild harvested broodstock and distributes cultured seed stock will be under regulatory and public scrutiny that will require the development, adoption and promotion of best management practices (BMP) or environmental codes of practice. This paper is intended to identify important environmental considerations of shellfish hatchery operations (i.e. molluscs, crustaceans and echinoderms) on the environment and to provide background information and guidance to hatchery staff and clients so that they can utilize BMP in their activities. Attentive detail to these practices will serve to minimize potential negative effects to the environment while maximizing the positive environmental effects associated with shellfish culture and enhancement. The author recommends that the Caribbean regional aquaculture facility, from the outset, drafts a document that establishes and codifies protocols for BMP that address the requirements for all stakeholder participants.
Additionally, a training programme for shellfish culturists from stakeholder countries should be implemented to ensure proper transport and handling of broodstock and seed stock and as a means to transfer hatchery technology for establishment of, if desirable, satellite facilities in participating countries.

RESUMEN
El establecimiento de un centro regional de acuicultura de mariscos para el Caribe, ofrece una oportunidad única para estimular un mayor desarrollo económico en la emergente industria acuícola y de mercados; para que los científicos de los países desarrollados y en vías de desarrollo coadyuven en el avance de tecnologías resultantes de investigaciones acuícolas hasta el punto de lograr su aplicación en una industria económicamente viable; así como para transferir conocimientos en temas de ingeniería, económicos y científicos a los empresarios locales. El concepto de un centro regional de acuicultura abarca estas oportunidades, así como los desafíos relacionados con límites biogeográficos, genéticos y políticos. Una instalación de acuicultura que reciba reproductores de origen silvestre y distribuya semilla producida en laboratorio estará bajo el escrutinio público y de los entes normativos, por lo que requerirá el desarrollo, la adopción y la promoción de buenas prácticas de manejo (BPM) o códigos de práctica ambiental. Este documento tiene la intención de identificar consideraciones ambientales importantes en las operaciones de un criadero de mariscos (moluscos, crustáceos y equinodermos) y proporcionar información de referencia y orientación para el personal del criadero, así como para los clientes para que puedan utilizar BPM en sus actividades. La atención en detalle a estas prácticas servirá para reducir al mínimo los efectos negativos al medio ambiente y elevar los efectos positivos asociados al cultivo de mariscos y su intensificación. El autor aconseja que el Centro Regional de Acuicultura para el Caribe, desde su inicio establezca y codifique protocolos para BPM y que cumplan los requerimientos de todos los países involucrados. Además, se debe implementar un programa de formación para cultivadores de mariscos de los países interesados con el objetivo de garantizar prácticas adecuadas en el transporte, manejo de reproductores y semilla así como ser un medio para la transferencia de tecnología del criadero, por si se considera establecer instalaciones satélites en los países participantes.

INTRODUCTION
An aquaculture facility that receives wild harvested broodstock and distributes cultured seed stock will be under regulatory and public scrutiny that is exacerbated by international transport and a host of agencies with different oversight responsibilities (e.g. customs, fisheries, environmental protection, agriculture); additionally, each require compliance with their specific regulatory instruments. The development, adoption and promotion of best management practices (environmental codes of practice) should provide the operational protocols for a regional shellfish aquaculture facility (PCSGA, 2002; FDACS, 2007; Creswell and McNevin, 2008). This document has identified six separate categories for consideration (Leavitt, 2004):

1. site selection;
2. water supply and discharge;
3. hatchery equipment requirements;
4. bio-secure hatchery facility requirements;
5. disease control and transfer prevention; and
6. regional transport and certification issues.

Development and construction of a regional shellfish aquaculture hatchery facility (RAF) will require thoughtful planning that addresses the environmental concerns of the host country, as well as each stakeholder nation that will take advantage of this
aquaculture production facility. It will be incumbent upon the planners to develop production and transport protocols that will comply with all environmental regulatory requirements and ensure users that seed stock from the facility is consistent with their expectations with respect to product quality and documentation.

Public perception related to the environmental impact of shellfish culture includes a desire to maintain the genetic integrity of wild populations of shellfish, avoid the introduction of undesirable species and the potential public health risks associated with shellfish consumption. With respect to farming shellfish in public waters, concerns focus on displacement of benthic aquatic vegetation, discarded nets and equipment, displeasing aesthetics associated with plot markers and working vessels/platforms, and increasing turbidity and disruption of sediments during harvesting. In contrast, there also is public recognition of the positive effects of shellfish aquaculture through water quality enhancement and its role as essential habitat for other important marine species, such as nursery grounds for commercially harvested fish. The support for a Caribbean regional shellfish aquaculture facility, and the activities that will proliferate from its operation, will be firmly based on public perception of its societal and economic benefits and its environmental sustainability.

It should be a fundamental premise that the RAF will comply with all laws and permit requirements which apply to their operations and location, as well as required statutes from donor/recipient countries. These include:

- Ensure that the RAF operations meet or exceed regulatory and environmental standards; keep current on all rules, regulations, certification and permit requirements governing shellfish aquaculture operations.
- Incorporate environmental policies into employee training and orientation.
- Become involved in local watershed and water quality improvement activities of stakeholders and support legislation and regulatory policies that promote environmental protection, especially water quality.

SITE SELECTION

Appropriate environmental conditions that ensure high-quality seawater are critical in determining the site location for a shellfish hatchery. Best management practices dictate that the site has minimal environmental and social impacts, and economic considerations, such as labour and utility costs, and distance from international transport, should be evaluated. These include:

- Water exchange and tidal currents at the RAF site should be sufficient to provide an adequate supply of high quality seawater, including appropriate depth, salinity, oxygen and water flow characteristics.
- Pumping, intake and discharge systems must be designed to avoid current-borne sedimentation, scouring, turbidity or any other damaging impacts on the surrounding habitat.
- Avoid sites with submerged aquatic vegetation and minimize erosion during construction;
- The RAF should be located so as to minimize environmental impacts, risks to public health, should not present an impediment to navigation and is aesthetically consistent with adjacent properties.
- The facility should have easy public access and within reasonable transport distance to international air and land transport services.

WATER SUPPLY AND DISCHARGE

The aquaculture facility will require a primary salt water source, as well as a freshwater source for cleaning and to provide makeup water lost to evaporation or percolation. This water source can exist as saltwater intakes, ground wells or surface waters. Well water is a desirable water source because it is virtually free from bacterial, viral
or parasitic pathogens. However, the water may have some undesirable chemical characteristics such as high hydrogen sulphide, carbon dioxide and ammonia and most likely be low in oxygen.

- The RAF should comply with all regulations and permitted water use criteria by the host government. A water or consumptive use permit may be required for a user to withdraw a specified amount of water from either a groundwater well or from an allowable surface water source.
- Water intake systems must be designed to avoid current-borne sedimentation, scouring, turbidity or any other damaging impacts on the surrounding habitat. They should not interfere with navigation and should be aesthetically benign.
- There should be no direct off-site discharge of production water. Saline water should not be discharged into freshwater environments (including well injection).
- Effluents must be treated and retained on-site or discharged to a permitted sanitary sewer system. Retention of all production unit effluent on site is considered proper management of effluent. In certain locations, where the soil is highly porous allowing for water infiltration, a treatment pond may be constructed to hold all required discharge and allow for percolation. The volume of the pond is determined by the expected quantity of discharge and the evaporation and percolation rate of the soil.

HATCHERY EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS

Although shellfish hatcheries are quite varied in size and design, they all share several key production components. These include a seawater source and pre-treatment system, and in the case of a bio-secure facility, will require isolated, recirculating systems, and effluent water treatment (Van Wyk et al., 1999). A phytoplankton (and perhaps zooplankton) culture area will also be required (Figure 1). A general list of these system components include:

- Pumps – Centrifugal, submersible, peristaltic.
- Fibreglass larviculture tanks (conical), settling troughs (upwelling systems), raceway.
• Sieves (various mesh sizes), artificial substrates.
• Plumbing supplies, standpipes and drain structures.
• Solids filtration – Sedimentation tanks, hydroclones, tube settlers, micro-screen filters, bead filters, sand filters, foam fractionators, ozone.
• Disinfection – Ultraviolet sterilization, ozonation, autoclaving, pasteurization, chlorination.
• Biofiltration – Submerged biofilters, trickling biofilters, rotating biological contactors, bead filters, sand filters, fluidized bed biofilters.
• Aeration – Regenerative blowers, venturi valves.
• Lighting – Fluorescent, metal halide, mercury vapour (phytoplankton culture).
• Illuminated, temperature controlled phytoplankton stock culture room and algae production tubes.

BIO-SECURE HATCHERY FACILITY REQUIREMENTS
Hatchery production of invertebrates (molluscs, crustaceans and echinoderms) may have fundamental differences in their larval development, environmental requirements, and dietary needs, but none of them change most of the basic hatchery facility requirements – other than perhaps the floor plan. However, the proposed RAF, by definition, will be culturing different species, from different locations and perhaps (if not likely) genetically distinct populations. Therefore, the facility will need to be designed as a bio-secure hatchery (not unlike a medical facility). Broodstock holding tanks, larviculture systems and nursery facilities should be separate and isolated from each other to minimize the likelihood of cross-contamination. The scope and complexity of the facility design will be a function of the number of species to be cultured and their biogeographic distribution. The basic requirements will include:
• A state-of-the-art phytoplankton culture that includes a temperature-controlled stock culture room and both indoor and greenhouse phytoplankton production culture facilities;
• A wet/dry laboratory equipped for microbiological analysis sufficient for culture assays, disease diagnosis and certification of seed stock in preparation for export.
• Broodstock shellfish should be handled in quarantine. Upon delivery they should be separated from all other stock in a separate holding facility, cleaned and transferred to a holding system isolated from others. All shipping materials should be immediately removed from the RAF and equipment, utensils and laboratory ware should be disinfected.
• The RAF larviculture systems should be of a modular design that precludes any transfer of veligers, bacteria or other contaminants from one culture unit to another. Although the water source and pre-treatment systems can serve the entire facility, each culture module – the tanks, sieves, containers, glassware, cleaning supplies, water-exchange containers, etc., should be specific to each module and not comingled with others.
• The RAF, as a bio-secure, quarantined facility should require either zero-discharge or extensive effluent treatment (e.g. ozonation, chlorination) prior to release into a holding reservoir.

DISEASE CONTROL AND TRANSFER PREVENTION
Over the past decades, the shellfish industry has experienced major disease outbreaks that have had significant adverse impacts on environmental quality, the value of natural resources and the economics of coastal communities. Diseases might be the result of genetic defects in the stock or infectious pathogens that prevail under stressful environmental conditions. Most genetic diseases can be avoided through broodstock selection practices, while pathogenic conditions are usually related to poor water quality, nutritional deficiencies, overcrowding or inappropriate handling procedures.
Therapeutic agents for disease control in the hatchery should be used as a last resort. Good housekeeping procedures, such as routine cleaning and sanitation of all hatchery components, are critical to maintaining quality production.

- Adhere to regulations regarding importation of broodstock or exportation of seed stock.
- Isolate the culture facility from sources of infection.
- Minimize stress through good husbandry practices.
- Prohibit wet-storage activities.
- Maintain good records and utilize them to identify potential problems when animal behaviour, poor growth or mortality exceeds pre-established limits.
- If pathogens are identified as a source of mortality in larviculture, infected animals should be moved to other areas of the facility and quarantined or discarded.
- Minimize drug and therapeutic use for disease control.

REGIONAL TRANSPORT AND CERTIFICATION ISSUES

Receiving broodstock from other countries will require a clearly defined protocol for delivery through custom authorities, as well as the appropriate agency for agriculture/fisheries/natural resources. In order to maintain the bio-security and genetic integrity of the RAF programme, a primary focus of operational protocol should be well-documented information regarding the source of broodstock, as well as all customs clearances and other required agriculture and/or environmental paperwork from the country of origin. Similarly, seed stock produced at the RAF and exported should be well documented for international transport, including health certification, customs documentation and any recipient country requirements.

- Every delivery of shell stock should have an aquaculture certificate or registration number which tracts the commodity from the point of origin that is clearly identified by tags or labels that are securely attached and clearly displayed on transport containers.
- Carefully inspect all shellfish broodstock and remove non-target species. Assure that all non-local organisms are non-viable when disposed.
- Properly quarantine or dispose of infected stock and contaminated materials.
- Do not store non-local shellfish or non-native aquatic species where there is potential for escapement into local waters (wet storage).
- Maintain detailed records of broodstock arrivals and seed stock departures. Detailed records of stock growth and survival at all stages of the production cycle, logged daily and evaluated frequently, can alert the culturist to imminent problems related to the spread of pathogens and activate further examination and immediate corrective action.
- Shellfish products shipped from the RAF should be certified by a licensed veterinarian that the stock is free of any clinical signs of disease pathogens that may pose a threat to natural shellfish populations.

CONCLUSIONS

The establishment of a regional shellfish aquaculture facility (RAF) for the Caribbean will be an evolving process, beginning with the current gathering of interested parties from throughout the islands of the Caribbean and Latin America. The objective of this paper is to provide an outline of general principles that should be considered to realize this goal. The site selection, facility design and size and a host of operational protocols will be thoughtfully determined based upon the interest and input of the stakeholders assembled at this Workshop.

Clearly, a regional approach to shellfish aquaculture development in the Caribbean can be facilitated by a centrally located production hatchery with the infrastructure, engineering and equipment and scientific expertise to provide seed stock and the
technology transfer to further a successful aquaculture industry. As importantly, this facility should provide technical training and outreach to transfer the scientific, engineering and economic knowledge to local entrepreneurs and to provide continuing resources for the solution of problems and the improvement of aquaculture methods.

REFERENCES
Cultivation of bivalve molluscs in Venezuela: diversity, potential and infrastructure for seed production

César Lodeiros
University of Oriente
Cumaná, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela
E-mail: cesarlodeirosseijo@yahoo.es

Luis Freites
University of Oriente
Cumaná, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela

César Graziani
Aquaculture Research and Development Foundation of the State of Sucre
Cumaná, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela

José Alió
National Institute of Agricultural Research
Ministry of Agriculture and Land
Cumaná, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela


**ABSTRACT**

Aquaculture has become one of the most profitable agricultural businesses in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela with a global yearly production exceeding 14 000 tonnes. Bivalve culture is considered a potential industry for mass production of marine products, particularly in the northeastern region where upwelling promotes a high primary production in coastal waters. Aquaculture in the country began in the late 1930s following the introduction of the rainbow trout, *Oncorhynchus mykiss*, in the Andes. Marine shrimp culture started in 1987 and since then has grown to more than 30 businesses with a production close to 10 500 tonnes in 2009. Bivalve aquaculture began in the 1970s in the eastern region of the country with the involvement of few companies and a production estimated around 200–300 tonnes of oysters (*Crassostrea rhizophorae* and *Crassostrea virginica*) and the South American rock mussel (*Perna perna*). This latter subsector of the industry has been facing diverse problems related to seed availability, red tides and market issues. Numerous other molluscan species have been identified as potential candidates for aquaculture. The green mussel, *Perna viridis*, and the pearl oysters, *Pteria colymbus* and *Pinctada imbricata* (both for meat and pearl production) show acceptable natural
seed abundance, as well as high growth and survival rates under culture conditions. The commercial hatchery production of scallops seed, *Euvola ziczac* and *Nodipecten nodosus*, has been demonstrated along with their culture techniques. The farming of these two scallop species (as well as of *Crassostrea rhizophorae*) could also contribute to the maintenance of wild populations since most natural banks have been overexploited. Several national institutions are involved in the promotion of bivalve aquaculture with coastal fisher communities. The use of the Turpialito Hydrobiological Station, with its 5 300 m$^2$ of infrastructure, is proposed as the regional hatchery site for large scale production and distribution of bivalve seed to the Greater Caribbean Region.

**RESUMEN**

La acuicultura se ha convertido en una de las actividades agrícolas con mayor rendimiento en la República Bolivariana de Venezuela, con una producción anual superior a 14 000 toneladas. Se considera al cultivo de bivalvos como una industria potencial para la producción masiva de productos marinos, particularmente en la región nororiental donde la surgencia promueve una alta producción primaria en las aguas costeras. La acuicultura en el país comenzó a finales de los años 30 luego que la trucha, *Oncorhynchus mykiss*, fue introducida en las tierras altas de los Andes, la cual aún persiste allí con significativos avances en la genética del cultivo. El cultivo del camarón marino comenzó en 1987 y desde entonces ha crecido hasta alcanzar más de 30 empresas con una producción anual cercana a 10 500 toneladas en 2009. La acuicultura de bivalvos comenzó en los años 70 en la región oriental en cuyo propósito se involucró un número reducido de empresas con una producción de 200–300 toneladas de ostras (*Crassostrea rhizophorae* y *Crassostrea virginica*) y un mejillón (*Perna perna*), pero enfrentó diversos problemas relacionados con la disponibilidad de semillas, mareas rojas y mercadeo, y actualmente está siendo reconstruida. Se han identificado otras especies como candidatos potenciales para ser cultivados. El mejillón verde, *Perna viridis*, las ostras perlíferas, *Pteria colombus* y *Pinctada imbricata* (tanto para consumo como para producción de perlas) muestran una abundancia aceptable de semillas en bancos naturales, así como altas tasas de crecimiento y sobrevivencia bajo condiciones de cultivo. Se ha demostrado la posibilidad de producir semillas comercialmente en laboratorios de las vieiras, *Euvola ziczac* y *Nodipecten nodosus*, así como sus técnicas de cultivo. El cultivo de estas dos especies de vieiras (y de la ostra *Crassostrea rhizophorae*) pudieran contribuir también al mantenimiento de las poblaciones naturales silvestres ya que la mayoría de los bancos naturales han sido sobreexplotados. Existe actualmente un programa permanente de monitoreo de PSP y bacterias en el agua de los principales bancos de extracción de moluscos bivalvos y áreas potenciales para la acuicultura. Diversas instituciones están actualmente asociadas a la promoción del cultivo de bivalvos entre las comunidades de pescadores en la costa. Se formula la propuesta del uso de la Estación Hidrobiológica de Turpialito, con 5 300 m$^2$ de infraestructura, como un laboratorio para la producción masiva de semillas de bivalvos que pudiera proveer semilla en la Región del Caribe.

**AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT IN VENEZUELA – 70 YEARS OF EXPERIENCE**

Aquaculture in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, like in other countries of the Americas, may have been performed by indigenous people in coastal areas since ancient times. Ponds could form in coastal areas by wave action or as a consequence of tropical storms and hurricanes, still commonly observed in the Caribbean. These ponds fill with seawater along with planktonic larvae, which can grow to consumable size if conditions in the ponds last long enough to support biomass, and eventually harvested by local people. Such a process is common in the northeastern Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, where shrimp and mullets can be observed growing under these conditions.
Commercial aquaculture started in 1937 with the introduction of the rainbow trout, *Oncorhynchus mykiss*, in the Andean high lands of the country (Martínez and Salaya, 1982). Yearly production in the last 20 years has ranged between 160 and 540 tonnes and seems to have stabilized around 230 tonnes during the last four years (INSOPESCA, 2010). Other introduced species are the Giant river prawn, *Macrobrachium rosenbergii*; tilapias *Oreochromis niloticus* and *Oreochromis aureus*; and the Pacific white shrimps, *Litopenaeus vannamei* and *Litopenaeus stylirostris*. Culture of the Giant river prawn was initiated around 1984, reaching peak production of 25 tonnes in 1991; since then, farmers lost interest in this species, finding it difficult to compete with marine shrimp species. No production of this species has been reported since 1997. Similarly, the two species of tilapias introduced in 1989, reached a peak production of 2,298 tonnes in 1998, but declined to 46 tonnes by 2009. Since, a slight increase to 111 tonnes has been recorded.

Aquaculture of marine shrimps was initiated by farming the local white shrimp, *Litopenaeus schmitti* in 1986; however, reduction of growth rate for pellet-fed animals of 10 cm and above discouraged farmers in pursuing culture operations for this species and for the other four native penaeid species. By 1987, both *L. vannamei* and *L. stylirostris* had been successfully introduced and culture rapidly expanded, particularly for the former species; by 2004 production peaked at 23,000 tonnes, more than two-fold the landings of local marine shrimp species. Today, more than 30 businesses are involved in the cultivation of these species under semintensive or intensive farming conditions, encompassing more than 7,000 hectares of ponds. However, in 2005 the first problems as a result of the Taura syndrome, reduced production and in 2009 production dropped to 10,500 tonnes.

Development of tropical fish aquaculture has been slow, in spite of having resolved by 1975 major drawbacks with the reproduction of continental species held under laboratory conditions. Pacu, *Colossoma macropomum*, and a hybrid species (*C. macropomum* x *Piaractus brachipomum*) have been successfully grown in fish farms. Production has been growing since 2004 and reached 4,000 tonnes by 2009. However, market for these species is mainly in rural communities (i.e. away from mayor cities), limiting consumption volumes. Production of other freshwater species with a better market profile, such as coporo, *Prochilodus mariae*, is increasing, but numbers have remained low at approximating 44 tonnes in 2009. The initial goal of domesticating the large South American catfishes, like the barred sorubim, *Pseudoplatystoma fasciatum*, has been elusive as a result of cannibalism. The first steps towards a full commercial aquaculture production for marine finfish were made through the installation of a laboratory for large-scale juvenile production of the paguara (*Chaetodipterus faber*), as well as the development of several artisanal farms along the Gulf of Cariaco in the eastern Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

These examples show that aquaculture in general, and mariculture in particular, of native species has not successfully developed around the Caribbean Sea. Among the several factors associated with this situation, is the lack of in-depth studies to determine the biological and economic feasibility native marine species culture in the Region and the inadequacy in existing infrastructure for training and development of culture techniques.

With respect to bivalve molluscs, in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela there have been commercial experiences with the following three species: the brown mussel, *Perna perna*; the mangrove oyster, *Crassostrea rhizophorae*; and the American oyster, *Crassostrea virginica*. At present, efforts are focused on the development of culture techniques for *P. perna*, *P. viridis* (the green mussel) and *Pinctada imbricata* (the Atlantic pearl oyster) in collaboration with local fisher communities.
The Spanish heritage of mussel rearing
In the early 1970s, technicians in the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, previously employed as mussel growers in Galicia (the Kingdom of Spain), introduced mussel cultivation technique to the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. Seed material of 2–3 cm were collected from the rocky intertidal zones in the northern State of Sucre and induced to re-attach on artificial substrates (interlaced strings of rubber from old automobile tires); this was done by engulfing seed and substrate with rayon string. The cords, thus formed were suspended in the sea, from wood rafts fixed by poles hammered into the coastal substrate; cultures were left as such, for approximately ten months, when harvest size was attained. Competition on the market with wild mussels was not an issue during the closed fishing season for mussels (i.e. during the spawning period of the species) which lasted four months and enabled the selling of the farmed product. Toxic red tides episodes were occasional at the time, but have became a major problem since, which lead to the prohibition of selling shellfish products nationwide. The national market was reopened, once the levels of Paralytic Shellfish Poisoning toxin (PSP) became acceptably low in the harvesting areas. Since 1977, the National Institute of Agricultural Research conducts permanent seawater monitoring for red tides in the main bivalve extraction zones of the State of Sucre, including bacteriological counts since 2005 in order to certify water quality. These programmes provide a better platform for the culture and commerce of bivalve molluscs in the region.

Oysters
Rafts, similar to those used in mussel culture, were used for oysters with the spat settling directly on the rubber strings hanged from the rafts. Overfixing could become a problem and limited the growth size attained by the oysters. Other artificial substrates, such as clay tiles or discarded soft-drink plastic bottles were also used for spat collection. The plastic bottles had the advantage that small oysters could be easily detached by twisting the bottles causing less damage than when removing them from the tiles. The spat were then placed in plastic containers for grow-out in the natural environment, suspended from rafts or any other suitable structure, such as mangrove roots, until the commercial size was reached. Grow-out was generally attained in about 12 months for the mangrove oyster to six months for the America oyster.

The region where the American oyster thrives is located near the Orinoco river delta, an area with generally low seawater salinity and with a high suspended organic content. This reflects on the poor taste and high bacteria content of these oysters, compared to mangrove oysters grown in the high salinity and clear waters of the Caribbean Sea. Depuration of the American oyster was tested by keeping them under a high salinity and clean seawater environment for 12 to 24 hours. Volunteers were then used to test whether they could recognize the difference in taste between untreated mangrove oysters and depurated American oysters; the test showed no significant difference in taste between these two groups of oysters.

Predation by the snail, Cymatium spp. (Gastropoda: Ranellidae), was identified as a problem within the Gulf of Cariaco for Crassostrea rhizophorae grown in permanently submerged enclosures. This snail species entered the oyster enclosures as larvae, growing and predating within the nets and potentially causing 90 percent mortality of the oysters within two months (Núñez et al., in press). However, the snail can be partly eliminated if the oyster containers are kept in the intertidal zone and become exposed to air during low tides. Exposure effectively kills the snail larvae, but not the adults. Oyster survival under this condition was higher than 90 percent.

HIGH DIVERSITY AND LOW BIOMASS
As a general rule, temperate regions are characterized by few species which, in terms of biomass, may reach high annual production. In contrast, tropical regions usually host
a large variety of species with small abundance and low production per species, as can be observed within the general Caribbean Sea environment. Primary productivity in the latter zone and the Gulf of Mexico shows intermediate to low values. This pattern is interrupted in the vicinity of large rivers and along the path of their outflow (e.g. Orinoco, Amazon, Mississippi) and in coastal areas where upwelling brings nutrients to surface waters (as in the eastern and western Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). These phenomena result in the presence of zones with very high primary production which hold major fisheries, particularly of filter feeders like bivalve molluscs and small pelagic fish (e.g. sardines).

In the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, fishery landings reached 219 000 tonnes in 2009, of which 27 percent were landed by the industrial sector (tuna and trawling vessels) and the rest by artisanal fishers. About 60 percent of the landings originate in the eastern region. A large portion of the landings is accounted for by filter feeders such as the ark shells (45 850 tonnes).

**POTENTIAL FOR BIVALVE AQUACULTURE**

The coastal geography of the eastern Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, with many protected bays and coves, along with the physical and chemical conditions of its seawater, render the environment appropriate for marine aquaculture, particularly for bivalve molluscs. The publication “Catalogue of marine molluscs of the northeastern coasts of Venezuela: Class Bivalvia” (Lodeiros, Marin and Prieto, 1999) reflects the high biodiversity of the zone, which includes over 125 species. Based on this, it is estimated that at least 35 species (28 percent) already have commercial use or have potential for it.

Bivalve molluscs have been traditionally consumed in the region. Evidence used by anthropologist to report the presence of indigenous people in coastal areas has been the finding of “concheros”, mounds of bivalve shells left behind after consumption. There are currently important local fisheries for at least 12 species of clams, mussels or scallops, while aquaculture of the green and brown mussels and of the mangrove and American oysters, remains in the growing phase. Until bivalve seed are made available in sufficient numbers and at a reasonable price, aquaculture facilities may remain at low profile, in spite of the growing interest among potential investors and artisanal fisher communities.

Seed supply can be obtained by natural fixation or by large-scale production under controlled conditions. The monthly variation of natural spat settlement has been evaluated in the southern coast of the Gulf of Cariaco at eight metres depth from the sea surface. Species that show a year-round settling occurrence are the pearl oysters, *Pteria colymbus* and *Pinctada imbricata*; while the amber pen shell, *Pinna carnea*, settles seasonally.

The pearl oysters (*P. colymbus* and *P. imbricata*), sought by the Spanish colonists, are now fished for their mother-of-pearl and meat contents. *Pinctada imbricata* is currently fished although landings are still modest with approximately 21 tonnes landed in 2009. As indicated, both species recruit abundantly during almost the year, have a high growth and survival rates (almost 100 percent) in suspended culture and suffer relatively little from fouling and adverse environmental conditions. The estimated time to reach commercial size (i.e. 50–55 mm) is six to seven months for *P. imbricata* and eight to nine months for *P. colymbus*. There have been preliminary trials for the production of “mabe pearls” (i.e. half pearls) and free pearls.

**Other potential aquaculture species**

The amber pen shell, *Pinna carnea*, has moderate and periodical recruitment of seed by natural fixation and has shown a high growth and survival rates (almost 100 percent) in suspended culture. This species, furthermore, is not much disturbed by fouling and adverse environmental factors in general, however, growth of the seed tends not to be very uniform. The estimated time for this species to reach market size (i.e. around
150 mm) is five to seven months for a whole product and 14 months for a “muscle-only” product.

The scallop, *Euvola ziczac*, has been extensively worked over in experimental suspended and bottom cultures. There have been more than 30 publications dealing with seed production; cultivation at intermediate depth; suspended and bottom cultivation; effect of environmental parameters and farming conditions on growth and survival rate; genetic improvement and energetic metabolism. Major findings from these studies indicate that there is a reduced availability of seed through natural settlement, but there are adequate techniques available for seed production under controlled conditions (hatchery-nursery). Growth and survival of the juveniles is considered adequate from a farming stand point, but in suspended cultures this species suffers from adverse environmental and biotic factors, particularly fouling and strong wave activity. These conditions lead to stress and a drastic reduction of growth and survival rates. However, the effect of these negative factors can be minimized when suspended culture takes place during periods with reduced fouling and low wave action. Alternatively, bottom culture is also a solution as it is closer to the natural conditions of this scallop species.

A proposed strategy to cultivate this scallop species would be: i) production of seed under controlled conditions (30–45 days); ii) sea transfer of hatchery-produced seed when 1–5 mm in size for grow-out on long-lines until they reach a size of 30–40 mm (four to five months); iii) further grow-out on the sea bottom until individuals attain a commercial size (an additional culture period of five to six months). The final product would be scallops of 70 mm (12–13 months).

Another scallop species with a great interest for aquaculture in the region is the *Nodipecten* (*Lyropecten*) *nodosus*. This species recruits poorly in the wild, but it is easily reproduced under controlled hatchery conditions. In suspended cultures, adverse environmental factors does not impact the growth of this species dramatically as in the *Euvola ziczac*, hence, growth and survival rates makes it an interesting farming species. In contrast, this species showed poor growth rate when cultured in the bottom. It has been estimated that production of commercial size individuals (i.e. 80 mm) can be reached in one year.

*Argopecten nucleus* is a scallop species smaller than the two previously mentioned, but has some advantages, such as its moderate to low but continuous availability of seeds by natural settlement and ease of reproduction under controlled hatchery conditions. It is a hardy species that has a reduced response to negative influence of fouling and environmental factors in general, allowing an adequate growth in suspended culture. It has been estimated that production of commercial size individuals (i.e. 45–50 mm) can be reached in eight months.

*Lima scabra*, or the flame scallop, is a beautiful bivalve that lives on rocky and coral substrates. Growth experiments lasting three to four months in suspended culture conditions with individuals of different size have shown that, despite a 100 percent survival, growth rate was insignificant. It was hypothesized that it could be a species with very low growth rate, or that it requires interaction with the natural rocky habitat in order to develop.

Finally the Asian green mussel, *Perna viridis*, is a species that invaded the southern Caribbean Sea from the Indo-Pacific Ocean some years ago. It has currently spread widely in the region and seems to be somewhat outcompeting the endemic *P. perna* from its natural banks. In experimental suspended grow-out trials, it shows a smaller initial growth rate compared to the South American rock mussel in the Gulf of Cariaco, but its growth rate is higher when cultured closer to the bottom in high silt content water. Under the latter conditions, individual *P. viridis* specimen reached 70 mm in six months, while those of *P. perna* took seven months. There is a probable negative influence of environmental factors on the growth rate of this species.
There are other 23 species of bivalves on which rearing has not been experimentally tested, but that have potential for aquaculture in the general area of the Caribbean Sea.

**Cephalopods**

There have been experimental cultivation trials conducted by the University of Oriente (Universidad de Oriente – UDO), Margarita Island, with *Octopus vulgaris, Octopus briaroaeus* and *Octopus joubini*. All species can attain relatively large sizes, grow fast and have short life spans. These cephalopods are able to spawn in captivity and development has been monitored until the juvenile stage for *O. briaroaeus* and *O. joubini* (Robaina, 1983). There have also been recent studies on the grow-out of *O. vulgaris* fed with sardines (*Sardinella aurita*) and turkey wing mussel (*Arca zebra*) with initial promising results (700–1 000 g in one month). In spite of a large amount of larvae obtained in the laboratory, juveniles have not yet been produced due in part to the lack of knowledge of a specific diet for the different stages of the animal and the limited infrastructure available for larval rearing at the University. On the other hand, juveniles of *O. joubini* were obtained in the laboratory as this species does not have a larval stage.

**Gastropods**

There have been trials to cultivate *Strombus gigas* for restocking purposes in the National Park Archipelago Los Roques, in the central Venezuelan coast, since the species has been severely exploited even though this fishery has remained closed for the past ten years. Its reproductive period expands from April until November and seems to be controlled by water temperature (Weil and Launghlin, 1984).

**Echinoderms**

A variety of sea urchin species including the *Lytechinus variegatus, Echinometra lucunter, Tripneustes ventricosus* and *Arbacia punctulata*, have been considered for a while as potential aquaculture candidates (Lawrence and Balzhin, 1998; García et al., 2005; Astudillo et al., 2006). There is also interest in the use of their ova and larvae for bioassays to check for toxic and contaminant substances in the water (Sclapés, 1999) enforcing the importance of developing reproduction techniques for these echinoderms. The cycle from spawning to juvenile has been completed in the laboratory with all these species, demonstrating the feasibility for their commercial culture in the country.

In conclusion, it is biologically feasible to culture species such as the mussel *Perna perna*, the mangrove oyster, *Crassostrea rhizophorae*, and the American oyster, *Crassostrea virginica*, in specific zones along the coast of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. However, it remains necessary to adequately define the technological packages to be recommended for use in different zones. Furthermore, technology transfer projects should be supported before physical installation of aquaculture infrastructure and prior to the promotion of cultured products for human consumption.

The availability of seed during almost the entire year and the rapid growth of the pearl oysters, *Pinctada imbricata* and *Pteria colymbus*, render these species advantageous candidates for cultivation. The possibility for pearls production is currently under evaluation. There are already established techniques for the production of seed under controlled conditions and for grow-out of *Euvola ziczac* and *Lyropecten nodosus*, which would enable large-scale production.

*Pinna carnea* and *Argopecten nucleus* can be included in cultivation activities as secondary species, due to their fast growth and moderate to small availability of seed. There is a need for in-depth studies to determine the biological feasibility of the culture of *Perna viridis* and *Lima scabra*. The culture testing of several other potential species remains a major challenge in the region.
The feasibility for the culture of several species of echinoderms has been demonstrated, but that for cephalopods and gastropods remain under evaluation.

There are currently several governmental institutions including the Foundation for the Development of Science and Technology in the State of Sucre (Fundación para el Desarrollo de la Ciencia y Tecnología del Estado Sucre – FUNDACITE Sucre), the Socialist Institute for Fisheries and Aquaculture (Instituto Socialista de Pesca y Acuicultura – INSOPESCA) and mainly the Foundation for Research and Development of Aquaculture in Sucre State (Fundación para la Investigación y Desarrollo de la Acuicultura del Estado Sucre FIDAES) which, along with the Research Group on Mollusc Biology, University of Oriente, are working on the development of small aquaculture projects with local fisher communities, particularly with the mussels, *Perna perna* and *P. viridis* and the Atlantic pearl oyster, *Pinctada imbricata* (Lodeiros, 2010).

**THE TURPIALITO HYDROBIOLOGICAL STATION - A REGIONAL FACILITY FOR LARGE-SCALE BIVALVE SEED PRODUCTION**

The Turpialito Hydrobiological Station (THS) is located in the southern coast of the Gulf of Cariaco, between the cities of Cumaná and Mariguitar (10° 26,62’ N; 64° 02,0’ W; Figure 1). It was constructed in the late 1970s and since then the station has served as a platform for diverse research activities mainly pertaining to marine aquaculture.

Research activities on biology and aquaculture techniques have involved species such as the brown mussel, *Perna perna*, the mangrove oyster, *Crassostrea rhizophorae*, the scallops, *Euvola ziczac* and *Nodipecten nodosus* and the common pampano, *Trachinotus carolinus*. The resulting knowledge from such extensive research activities, particularly that on molluscs and their environment, makes it possible to commercially exploit some of these species in a rational manner.

**FIGURE 1**

Location of the Turpialito Hydrobiological Station in the Gulf of Cariaco, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela
The station has served as a laboratory for the training of diverse professionals. Examples of the scientific achievements associated with the work done at the THS can be found in the more than 250 publications among books, chapters in books, articles in scientific journals and publications for the general reader. A paramount effort has been placed in the strong impulse given to marine aquaculture, particularly that of bivalve molluscs in Latin America. In this respect, the Latin American Program for the Development of Science and Technology (Programa Iberoamericano de Ciencia y Tecnología para el Desarrollo – CYTED) considers the station as an institution of international importance for development of aquaculture of marine bivalves.

Currently, researchers of the Oceanographic Institute and other entities of UDO, as well as those from other institutions and groups associated with marine sciences and aquaculture, show a growing interest not only in the field of marine aquaculture, but also in other economically productive areas.

In spite of the work done at the THS, its research and production infrastructure is still inadequate hence, limiting the proper execution of studies required to promote regional aquaculture development. On the other hand, the UDO and the Venezuelan Government are investing in training of its personnel, in different areas of marine sciences and aquaculture, in particular, which has lead to the availability of highly skilled professionals. However, the relatively poor infrastructure available somewhat limits the progress of applied research activities.

This situation provides a substantial case for upgrading and supporting the functioning of the THS. The station is suitably located close to the city of Cumaná (the capital of Sucre State) and its airport. It takes approximately 20 minutes to reach the airport and 30 minutes to reach the main campus of University of Oriente. The water quality in the vicinity of the station is good, since there are neither industries nor fixed sources of pollution in the vicinity and discharge of permanent rivers. Thus, salinity is high throughout the year. There is no need for antibiotics for bivalve larval production. Furthermore, the site location is geographically strategic in a protected zone within the Gulf of Cariaco, allowing rapid access to many locations in the Gulf. The land on which the facility emerges has a rocky substrate adequate for new constructions and facilities and it is serviced by the various utilities (phone, electricity and running freshwater). The site of the station is secure and minimum surveillance is required. Finally, the station is relatively well equipped with research and production equipment and operated by a number of researchers and technicians.

The THS is located on a plot of land closed to the coastline of approximately 15 060 m² owned by the University of Oriente (i.e. the Venezuelan Government). Of this area, about 5 300 m² are fully developed with 1 550 m² of covered infrastructures, a parking lot and internal roads and walking and approximately 950 m² of green space. The topography of the land together with a privileged position of the station in a protected bay with optimal environmental quality conditions provides a strong opportunity to further develop the facility and make it into a regional centre supporting shellfish aquaculture development in the Wider Caribbean.

In order to make the THS a truly regional facility, a project (and funds) will be required to recuperate the old infrastructure and existing facilities and for the construction of new laboratories, storage and external production facilities. A renovation project exists which currently includes five additional buildings each with a specific function. In 2001, the old THS station was partly demolished and the construction of new main buildings initiated, but stopped the following year and to resume only in 2006 when the National Fund for Science, Technology and Research (Fondo Nacional de Ciencia, Tecnología e Investigación – FONACIT) and the Chancellor’s Office of the University of Oriente gave an impulse to the project. At present, the station continues to receive support from the Chancellor’s Office of the UDO.
In conclusion, support is needed to complete the field station, in particular to finish the construction of the partly completed infrastructure; hiring of personnel; and for the provision of materials and equipment. A strong support on the value of the station has been given by the Research Group on Mollusc Biology of the University of Oriente, adding its voice to those of the university community as a whole and other interested institution, particularly the FUNDACITE of the State of Sucre. There have been a number of reasons for the regrettable delay in the construction process of the station during the period 2002–2005, but the local support situation has now changed. Today, it is generally hoped that a new THS will be established as a research and productive model for the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and other Latin America nations, supporting the development of aquaculture and general knowledge in marine sciences.
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ABSTRACT
The Republic of Honduras is one of the main fisheries and aquaculture countries in Central America. Together, both activities make up the third largest economic sector in the country. Annual commercial fisheries exports reach approximately 4 500 tonnes consisting mainly of lobster, shrimp, scale fish and queen conch. The United States of America is the main export market. Artisanal fishing is carried out on both the Pacific and Caribbean coasts. Artisanal fishing of molluscs on the Pacific coast target mainly the ark shells, Anadara grandis, Anadara tuberculosa, Anadara similis, the Guyana swamp mussel, Mytella guayanensis and the bean clam, Donax sp. These species are sold on the national markets. On the Caribbean coast, the fishery industry targets three species of gastropods, i.e. the Strombus gigas, Strombus pugilis and Cassis madagascariensis, the first two for export, while the latter species for the local market. The aquaculture sector is based on shrimp and tilapia farming. Commercial shrimp culture farms are located on the Pacific coast and with annual outputs of around 20 000 tonnes; this production is exported to the United States of America and markets in the European Union. Artisanal shrimp culture is also conducted on the Pacific coast. Tilapia artisanal culture is carried out in 17 departments, by individual owners or associations and production is sold on the national market. Currently, consumption of fish products in Honduras averages 3.9 kg per person/year.

RESUMEN
La República de Honduras es uno de los países de Centroamérica con mayor importancia en pesca y acuicultura. En conjunto, ambas actividades conforman el sector económico más grande en el país. Las exportaciones anuales de pesca alcanzan aproximadamente 4 500 toneladas, consistiendo principalmente de langosta, camarones, pescado de escama y caracol gigante o pala. Los Estados Unidos de América es el principal mercado de exportación. La pesca artesanal se lleva a cabo en las costas del Pacífico y el Caribe. En la costa del Pacífico la pesca artesanal de moluscos está destinada principalmente a especies como las conchas arca, Anadara grandis, Anadara tuberculosa, Anadara similis,
el mejillón de pantano de Guyana, *Mytella guayanensis* y la almeja, *Donax* sp. Estas especies se venden en los mercados locales y nacionales. En la costa caribeña, la industria de la pesca está dirigida a tres especies de gasterópodos: el *Strombus gigas*, *S. pugilis* y *Cassis madagascariensis*, las dos primeras para exportación, mientras que la última especie se destina para el mercado local. La acuicultura se basa en el cultivo de tilapia y camarón. Las granjas de cultivo comercial de camarón están ubicadas en la costa del Pacífico con exportaciones anuales cercanas a las 20 000 toneladas; esta producción se exporta a la Unión Europea y Estados Unidos de América. El cultivo artesanal de camarón también se lleva a cabo en 17 departamentos de la costa del Pacífico, por propietarios individuales o asociaciones de productores y la producción se vende en el mercado nacional. En la actualidad, el consumo de productos de la pesca en Honduras tiene un promedio de 3,9 kg por persona al año.

**INTRODUCTION**

This paper provides background information on the Republic of Honduras, relevant to the development of aquaculture for native species of shellfish. More specifically, this is relevant to the proposed establishment of a regional shellfish hatchery for the Wider Caribbean. A summary of the geography of the country, oceanic circulation, occurrence of native species and previous culture work is given within this document, for the benefit of other Caribbean Governments and to assist the decision-making process in the selection of a site for the proposed regional facility.

The Republic of Honduras is located in the middle of Central America. It has terrestrial borders with three other countries, i.e. the Republic of Guatemala, the Republic of El Salvador and the Republic of Nicaragua, and maritime borders with the following eight countries: the Republic of Guatemala, Belize, the United Mexican States, the Republic of Cuba, Grand Cayman, Jamaica, the Republic of Colombia and the Republic of Nicaragua. It has two separate coasts: 1) the Caribbean coast extending 686 km; and 2) the Pacific coast (Gulf of Fonseca) of 164 km.

Total surface area for Honduras is 112 492 km² of which approximately 1 000 km² are wetlands. A substantial portion (35 percent) is situated in the departments of Valley and Choluteca in the Gulf of Fonseca, amounting to a total area of 6 025 km² (4 360 km² in Choluteca and 1 665 km² in Valley). The department of Gracias a Dios (La Mosquitia), totalling an area of 1 229 km², comprises 115 water bodies including coastal lagoons and ponds amounting to 78 percent of the aquatic surface area of the country. This department also includes the wetlands of Caratasca, Brus Laguna, Ibans and the Platano river biosphere. During the rainy season, the Republic of Honduras is strongly hit by hurricanes and rains, which often bring floods and landslides.

**OCEANIC CHARACTERISTICS**

The Gulf of Fonseca – The majority of the fishing zones used by fishermen are at less than 10 m depth. Water depth increases to 20 m, after Amapala, on the island of Meanguera (the Republic of El Salvador) and to 30 m outside the Gulf. Ocean circulation differs seasonally in the Gulf of Fonseca. During the rainy season, movement is typical of estuaries, where surface water is of low density (low salinity and high temperature), and flows out of the mouth of the Gulf inland coastal waters as surface waters. Incoming water from the Pacific enters the inland waters as deep water. In contrast, during the dry season, a reverse circulation occurs, due to the lack of low density inland waters. Waters from the Gulf coastal area are of higher density due to evaporation and concentration of salts, becoming deeper and flowing along the bottom out in the deep waters of the Pacific Ocean; whereas, surface waters from the Pacific Ocean moves towards the coast and into the Gulf.
CLIMATE
Although the Republic of Honduras lies within the tropics, climate varies according to the geography of the various regions. Three distinct regions are identified within the country: 1) the Caribbean lowlands, with a tropical wet climate due to a fairly even distribution of rainfall throughout the year, and consistently high temperatures and humidity; 2) the Pacific lowlands, with a tropical wet and dry climate, a dry season from November to April and high temperatures; 3) the interior highlands also characterized by a distinct dry season, but with temperatures decreasing as elevation increases, typical of a tropical highland climate.

Unlike more northerly latitudes, temperatures in the tropics vary primarily with elevation rather than with the season. Areas below 1 000 m in altitude are typically referred to as “tierra caliente” (hot land); between 1 000 and 2 000 m as “tierra templada” (temperate land); and above 2 000 m as “tierra fría” (cold land). Both the Caribbean and Pacific lowlands are “tierra caliente” with daytime temperature levels averaging between 28–32 °C throughout the year. In the Pacific lowlands, the warmest temperatures are recorded in April, i.e. the last month of the dry season; during the rainy season the climate is slightly cooler. In the Caribbean lowlands, the only relief from the year-round heat and humidity comes during December or January when an occasional strong cold front from the north typically brings several days of strong northwest winds and slightly cooler temperatures.

The interior highlands range from “tierra templada” to “tierra fría”. Tegucigalpa, situated in a sheltered valley and at an elevation of 1 000 m, has a pleasant climate with an average high temperature ranging from 30 °C in April, the warmest month, to 25 °C in January, the coolest month. Above 2 000 m temperatures may fall to near freezing at night with severe frost events occurring occasionally.

Rain falls year round in the Caribbean lowlands but it is seasonal throughout the rest of the country. Amounts are copious along the north coast, especially in the Mosquitia where the average rainfall is 2 400 mm. Near San Pedro Sula rain fall levels are slightly less from November to April, but considerable precipitation is still recorded each month. The interior highlands and Pacific lowlands have a dry season, known locally as “summer” from November to April. Almost the entire rain in these regions falls during the winter months from May to September. Annual precipitation levels vary according to the regions and land topography, e.g. in Tegucigalpa, situated in a sheltered valley, annual precipitation averages 1 000 mm.

The Republic of Honduras lies within the hurricane belt, and the Caribbean coast is particularly vulnerable to hurricanes or tropical storms that travel inland from the Caribbean. Hurricane Francelia in 1969 and the tropical storm Alleta in 1982 affected thousands of people and caused extensive damage to crops. Hurricane Fifi in 1974 was the worst natural disaster in recent Honduran history; more than 8 000 people were killed and nearly the entire banana crop was destroyed. Hurricanes occasionally form over the Pacific and move north to affect southern Honduras, but Pacific storms are generally less severe.

SHELLFISH SPECIES IN THE GULF OF FONSECA
The main shellfish species occurring in the Gulf of Fonseca, are the following: Anadara sp. (ark shell), Anadara grandis (sangara ark shell), Crassostrea gigas (Portuguese oyster), Crassostrea rhizophorae (mangrove oyster), Crassostrea cortezensis (Cortez oyster), Ostrea irisdescens (stone oyster), Argopecten ventricosus (Pacific calico scallop), Mytella spp. (mussel), Mytella guyanensis (mangrove mussel), Modiolux capax (fat horse mussel), Protophaca asperrima, Pinctada mazatlanica (Calafia pearl oyster) and Tagelus peruvianos (barba de hacha).
THE GULF OF FONSECA MOLLUSC PROJECTS
The Gulf of Fonseca Mollusc Project was initiated in 1999 by a group of women in Venado Island. Growth of the sangara ark shell, *Anadara grandis*, under controlled conditions was investigated; unfortunately, only one year of sampling was completed, after which the project ceased to operate. A second initiative in 2001–2002 focused on a short research project with the collaboration of the University of Santiago de Compostela (the Kingdom of Spain) on farming the swamp or mangrove mussel, *Mytella guyanensis*. Following this, permission was granted in 2005 to establish a private project for the culture of this species; however, this has not yet led to a production level high enough for export. More recently, in 2010, a permit was given to another member of the private sector for the culture of the same species. To date the farmed species has not been exported but entirely consumed locally.

PERFORMANCE OF THE AQUACULTURE SECTOR
The aquaculture sector in the Republic of Honduras consists in the farming of two main species, i.e. shrimp and tilapia. Both species are farmed in large and small-scale facilities. Industrial aquaculture projects also operate their own hatcheries and processing plants.

The shrimp farms (both industrial and artisanal) are located on the Pacific coast and cover an overall area of approximately 16 000 hectares. The annual production from large shrimp farms averages 20 000 tonnes which is exported to the United States of America and the European Union. The annual output from smaller artisanal farms is around 500 tonnes and is sold on the national market.

Tilapia farming on the other hand has developed mainly in the central and northern regions of the country. All operation run their own hatchery and small processing plants. The annual production from large tilapia farms amounts to approximately 10 000 tonnes which is also exported to the United States of America and the European Union. Small-scale tilapia farming is conducted in 17 departments of the country by the private sector (individual owners or associations) and the production is sold on the national market. Artisanal aquaculture production of tilapia has been estimated at around 800 tonnes per year.

FUTURE PERSPECTIVE OF AQUACULTURE
According to a feasibility study on the potential of aquaculture development in the Republic of Honduras, recently commissioned by the government, the north coast of Honduras holds the highest developmental potential for this economic sector. This was deemed especially true for the region of La Mosquitia, characterized by a vast amount of water bodies, including coastal lagoons and inland waters. At present shrimp farming is carried out in this region but the current activity level is minimal compared to the estimated potential. The amount of available land for shrimp culture in the Gulf of Fonseca has been estimated at around 28 000 hectares. To date only 18 hectares have been developed.

In addition, the availability of coastal lagoons and their use for culture of bivalves, gastropods and other molluscs has not yet been exploited. The region of La Mosquitia has an extensive surface area, encompassing coastal and inland water bodies, yet no aquaculture has developed in this region to date.

There are two large commercial and two small artisanal finfish cage operations located in the Lake of Yojoa and in the dam of Francisco Morazán in El Cajon.
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ABSTRACT

The development of commercial aquaculture in Belize dates back to the early 1980s when the farming of the Pacific white shrimp (Litopenaeus vannamei) was established through commercial experimentation. The success of this endeavour during the early phases of the industry led to the rapid expansion of shrimp farming to a total of 18 farms with a total production area of 2 790 hectares in 2005. To date, seven farms remain operational with a production area of 1 247 hectares as a result of disease events and major decline in global market prices in 2000 which continues to impact the financial sustainability of these operations. By mid-2000, the species portfolio was expanded to the commercial production of tilapia (Oreochromis niloticus) and cobia (Rachycentron canadum). Other species that have been attempted in the past have been the culture of red fish (Sciaenops ocellatus), a number of African cichlids for the aquarium trade, the Australian red claw (Cherax quadricarinatus), the Caribbean spiny lobster (Panulirus argus) and the queen conch (Strombus gigas). The most successful was the production of conchs juvenile between 1987 and 1992. The primary objective of the project was to develop laboratory techniques for the cultivation of queen conch larvae in an on-shore hatchery facility.

RESUMEN

El desarrollo de la acuicultura comercial en Belice se inició desde los años 80, cuando el cultivo de camarón blanco del Pacífico (Litopenaeus vannamei) fue establecido a través de la experimentación comercial. El éxito de este esfuerzo durante las primeras fases de la industria, llevó a la rápida expansión del cultivo de camarón a un total de 18 fincas con una superficie total de producción de 2 790 hectáreas en 2005. A la fecha, quedan siete fincas camaroneras con una superficie productiva total de 1 247 hectáreas. Esta reducción es resultado de eventos de enfermedades y principalmente con las caídas del precio internacional del camarón que empezaron en al año 2000 y siguen afectando la sostenibilidad financiera de esta industria. A mediados del año 2000, el portafolio de especies se extendió a la producción comercial de tilapia (Oreochromis niloticus) y cobia (Rachycentron canadum). En el pasado se ha intentado el cultivo de otras especies como la corvina roja (Sciaenops ocellatus), cíclidos africanos, la langosta australiana (Cherax quadricarinatus), la langosta espinosa (Panulirus argus) y el caracol gigante o pala (Strombus gigas). El intento más exitoso fue la producción de juveniles del caracol gigante o pala entre 1987 y 1992. El objetivo principal del proyecto fue desarrollar técnicas de laboratorio para su cultivo larvario en las instalaciones de un criadero.
INTRODUCTION
The first commercial aquaculture trials in Belize date back to 1982, when the farming of the Pacific white shrimp (*Litopenaeus vannamei*) was established. The successful farming of Penaeid shrimp led to the rapid expansion of the sector, leading to the establishment of 18 farms amounting to a production area of 2,790 hectares in 2005. During this period, the contributions from the sector accounted to USD 45 million which became the third largest foreign exchange earner to the Belizean economy. To date, seven farms remain operational with a production area of 1,247 hectares; this decrease in production was due to disease events, compounded with a major decline in global market prices in 2000. Both of these factors continue to impact the financial sustainability of these operations. By mid-2000, the species portfolio was expanded to the commercial production of tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) and cobia (*Rachycentron canadum*). The existing aquaculture operations have been able to cope with the dwindling market prices by accessing niche markets and reducing production cost.

AQUACULTURE TRENDS
Shrimp aquaculture
Although shrimp aquaculture expanded rapidly, shrimp farming operations experienced significant economic losses in the mid-1990s and early 2000 as a result of diseases and declining market prices. The first recorded episode of a disease in Belize occurred in July 1995, with the Taura Syndrome Virus (TSV). Mortalities associated with this disease were as high as 80–90 percent in some locations. In the mid-2000 the shrimp farming sub-sector was also impacted by another viral disease, the Infectious Hypodermal and Hematopoietic Necrosis Virus (IHHN). In May 2001, the shrimp farms were again impacted by TSV (Myvett and Quintana, unpub.).

In addition to the economic losses as a direct result of diseases, there was a decline in the global market prices for farmed shrimp commodities in 2000 for the major market destinations, i.e. the United States of America, Japan and the European Union (EU) (Figure 1). Since then, prices have not been favorable for producing countries such as Belize. The decline in shrimp prices is directly associated with the larger volumes of farmed shrimp exported by the Asian countries at very low prices.

Given the various challenges in the shrimp farming sector, more than 50 percent of the production area has been out of production. In 2005, there were 18 shrimp farming operations with over 2,790 hectares in production ponds. Over the last decade, 11 shrimp farms have ceased operations. Currently (2010), there are seven operating farms with a cumulative production pond area of 1,247 hectares. Export volumes of farmed shrimp were reported at 2,280 tonnes valued at USD 9.25 million in 2009. The main market destination for shrimp commodities is the Mexican market, followed by the United States of America and the Caribbean Community (CARICOM).

Tilapia farming
Apart from shrimp farming, commercial production of tilapia was established in 2000 by one commercial farm (Fresh Catch Belize Ltd). First exports to the US market were made in mid-2004. By 2009, this tilapia farm had 121 hectares of production ponds in operation, and a total yield of 1,900 tonnes. The operation is vertically integrated

![Figure 1: Farmed shrimp export and value trends in Belize](image-url)
with a hatchery and processing plant to complement the pond production systems. It is currently being expanded by an additional 40 hectares of production ponds. It is estimated that this will increase the total annual production capacity of “Fresh Catch Belize Ltd.” to 4,000 tonnes.

The portfolio of products from ‘Fresh Catch Belize’ includes both whole eviscerated fresh fish, as well as fresh frozen fillets. The fillets are destined for the US market, while the eviscerated fish is exported to United Mexican States and the Republic of Guatemala. Fresh Catch Belize Limited is part of the “Mountain Stream Tilapia Alliance”, which is a conglomerate of fish farming companies from the Republic of Costa Rica, the Republic of Honduras and Belize exporting under one name brand.

Cobia farming
The other commercial aquaculture venture is “Marine Farms Belize Ltd”. The facility is the only commercial cobia farming operation established in Belize. The operation is based on marine cage farming using Norwegian technology. Farming is conducted near Robinson Point Cays, using cage infrastructure ranging from 5 m circumference nursery cages to 40, 60 and 100 m grow-out cages. The farm was established in 2006, and started exporting by 2007 to the US market through AQUA GOLD, a marketing company. Exported products are “bullet” cuts, where the head is removed and the fish is gutted. The production capacity during phase I and II of the operations has been projected at 2,000 tonnes per annum. In 2008, cobia whole fish production was approximately 384 tonnes.

Marine Farms Belize Ltd. has fully established a hatchery operation near Dangriga. The broodstock in the hatchery have been sourced locally and the first spawns were realized in July, 2009. The production capacity of the hatchery has been estimated at one million fingerlings per annum.

Small-scale aquaculture
The history of the early phases of small-scale inland fish farming in Belize and its socio-economic contributions remains undocumented. Rural fish farming has been practiced in Belize on an experimental basis since the early 1990s. This has been mainly in the form of backyard farming operations with a focus on locally occurring cichlids species. These species include: the bay snook (Petenia splendida), crana (Cichlasoma urophthalmus), mus-mus (Cichlasoma friedrichstali), tuba (Cichlasoma synspilum) as well as the exotic tilapia (Oreochromis niloticus). Most recently, farmers have focused their interest in the farming of the red hybrid tilapia, given the growth performance and local market demand. In 2009, there were a total of 55 farmers engaged in small-scale tilapia farming with a total area of 5.6 hectares of production units ranging from 40 to 1,000 m².

Past attempts at farming other species
In the past, there has been several trials on other species including the freshwater Australian red claw lobster (Cherax quadricarinatus), the redfish (Sciaenops ocellatus) and a number of African Rift Lake ornamental finfish species such as Haplochromis sp., Labeochromis sp., Melanochromis sp., Tropheus sp., Psuedotropheus sp., Awelenocara sp. and the local queen conch (Strombus gigas). The most successful was the production of juvenile conch between 1987 and 1992. This initiative was funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Government of Belize.

The primary objectives of the project were to: i) develop laboratory techniques for the cultivation of queen conch larvae in land-based hatchery facility; ii) restock nearby conch habitats that have traditionally sustained viable conch populations; and iii) conduct field exercises to estimate survival rates of hatchery-reared juvenile conch.
Data on husbandry aspects from broodstock to juvenile stages was obtained through the Belize queen conch project. The hatchery process included the collection of egg masses from the wild, followed by laboratory rearing up to juvenile stages. Subsequently, juveniles were stocked in the wild and survival rates were monitored during a period of eight weeks. After a few years of experimentation, project funds were insufficient, leading to the closure of the project.

**FUTURE TRENDS**

The aquaculture sector continues to have its own challenges, in terms of the sustainability of various farmed commodities due to high cost of production inputs and unstable market prices. Shrimp producers are currently taking advantage of the high end markets, as well as of the existing whole shrimp market in the United Mexican States, and other niche markets in the EU and CARICOM. For the tilapia sector, the Mexican market is also available for whole fresh fish and the US market for fresh fillets. The future expansion of cobia aquaculture has been inhibited due to limited supplies of hatchery-reared fingerlings.

In terms of diversification from the traditional aquaculture activities in Belize, there has been a growing interest by investors in marine cage farming of cobia, tilapia cage culture, sea cucumber aquaculture, as well as the farming of seaweed.

With regards to investment opportunities, the Government of Belize continues to offer various development incentives for aquaculture. The competitive advantage of Belize is its proximity to the regional markets for supplying fresh products to the US markets.

**REGIONAL COOPERATION PROJECTS IN AQUACULTURE**

Through the Organization of Fisheries and Aquaculture in Central America (Organización del Sector Pesquero y Acuícola de Centroamerica – OSPESCA), funded by Taiwan, Province of the People’s Republic of China, there are various activities, currently implemented to further strengthen sustainable development of aquaculture in the region. An aquaculture working group was established in early 2010 to coordinate various activities. Within this context, a regional forum on aquaculture, held in the Republic of Panama in April 2010, enabled member countries to present emerging trends on successful aquaculture projects. Through this initiative, some of the key issues affecting the development of aquaculture were discussed with the purpose of developing future plans, and in this way, advance the development of aquaculture in the region.

As part of their 4-year work plan, OSPESCA has a component for developing a mariculture programme for restocking depleted marine fish stocks. The project is in the process of being defined, namely for the identification of target species to be considered. Additionally, a project is currently being considered for funding to further improve the mollusc hatchery in the Republic of El Salvador; this facility would serve as a regional seedstock and training centre through cooperation from the Government of Spain.

The CARICOM Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism (CRFM) is currently finalizing a Master Plan on sustainable use of fisheries resources for coastal communities with support from the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA) (see www.caricom-fisheries.com). Within this initiative lies the implementation of various pilot projects. Results gathered during the study will be utilized in the finalization of the draft Master Plan to be completed in February 2011. One of the pilot projects, focusing on the development of low-cost feed for small-scale aquaculture, is being implemented in Belize.
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ABSTRACT
The selection of a suitable site for a regional shellfish hatchery is critical to its long-term sustainability and profitability. Costs for purchase of the site, construction, equipment and shipping if needed, utility overheads and trained staff need to be assessed. Government regulations with regards to building permit of a shellfish hatchery need to be supportive. Assessing the potential impact of the hatchery on the surrounding environment is good conduct practice. Good quality seawater is a primordial requirement to successful hatchery production; existing information or detailed sampling of water chemistry in water column needs to be understood over a 12-month period – namely, temperature, salinity and oxygen of intake water needs to be known. Areas potentially subjected to silt load and salinity fluctuations due to heavy rain falls and occurrence of algal blooms should be avoided as this may lead to reduction in survival and/or growth of larvae and juveniles. Heavy natural fouling will be problematic and cause clogging of the intake and of the seawater pipes. Impact from nearby industrial plants, agricultural lands, domestic sources of pollution are not completely understood, but are known to be extremely damaging to larvae. Potential encroachment of urbanization and exposure to natural disasters also need to be considered. Building the hatchery at sea level and close to the ocean facilitates plumbing. Alternatively, water may be supplied from a well. More general considerations are the availability of land for storage, expansion and accommodation of trainees from other countries, a supply of freshwater and a skilled labour force. The proximity of universities or laboratories is beneficial as technical support to a hatchery operation. More specific to a regional hatchery, the ease of access to a nearby airport facilitates broodstock import and shipping of spat. Local legislation needs to support the export of spat and the method of transport. Finally, a quarantine area for broodstock and proper discharge of effluent is a must to avoid introduction of pathogens and diseases and escape of exotic larvae to the natural environment.

RESUMEN
La selección de un sitio adecuado para un criadero regional de mariscos es fundamental para su sostenibilidad y rentabilidad a largo plazo. Es necesario evaluar los costos para la adquisición del sitio, construcción, equipamiento y gastos de envío si es necesario, gastos
generales de servicios públicos y de personal capacitado. Las regulaciones gubernamentales con respecto a los permisos de construcción de un criadero regional deben ser de apoyo. La evaluación del impacto potencial del criadero sobre el medio ambiente es una práctica de buena conducta. El agua de mar de buena calidad es un requisito primordial para una exitosa producción del criadero. Es necesario contar con información existente de la calidad química de la columna de agua o llevar a cabo muestras por un periodo de 12 meses (contemplando temperatura, salinidad y oxígeno de la fuente de agua). Deben evitarse las áreas que estén sometidas a fluctuaciones de la salinidad y carga de sedimentos debidas a las fuertes lluvias y a la aparición de afloraciones de algas, ya que esto puede conducir a la reducción de la supervivencia y/o el crecimiento de las larvas y juveniles. Las incrustaciones naturales serán un problema al causar la obstrucción en la toma de agua de mar y las tuberías. Los impactos de la cercanía de instalaciones industriales, tierras agrícolas y de fuentes de contaminación doméstica no se conocen con exactitud, pero se sabe que son extremadamente perjudiciales para las larvas. También es necesario considerar el potencial de ocupación de la zona por urbanización y la exposición a los desastres naturales. La construcción del criadero al nivel del mar y cerca del océano facilita la instalación de tuberías. De forma alternativa, el agua puede ser suministrada desde un pozo. Consideraciones más generales son la disponibilidad de tierras para almacenamiento, expansión y el alojamiento de alumnos de otros países, suministro de agua dulce y mano de obra calificada. La proximidad de las universidades o laboratorios es beneficiosa como apoyo técnico para el criadero. El acceso a un aeropuerto cercano específicamente para el criadero regional, facilita la importación de reproductores y envío de semilla. La legislación local tiene que facilitar la exportación de semilla y el método de transporte. Por último, es indispensable contar con una área de cuarentena para reproductores y el adecuado manejo de los efluentes para evitar la introducción de agentes patógenos, enfermedades y fuga de larvas exóticas al medio ambiente.

INTRODUCTION

Culture of marine species consists of two major phases: i) hatchery phase, which is land-based and usually conducted under controlled conditions; and ii) grow-out phase, where juveniles are reared to adult or market size; for bivalves, gastropods and crustaceans, this is conducted in the natural environment in enclosures or on the seabed. This document concerns itself with the site selection criteria for the land-based hatchery facility.

In the case of a regional facility, such as the one proposed for shellfish culture in the Wider Caribbean, site selection involves both the selection of a country, strategically located within the region, and the selection of a site within this country. This document will, therefore, outline considerations to be made for assessing a best suited country and site.

First and foremost, as Helm and Bourne (2004) note, one must recognize that the installation and operation of hatchery is costly. Considerable initial capital is required to build a hatchery and finance its first years of operations. The goal is to generate income, in order to sustain running operations and make a profit. For this reason, before deciding to build a hatchery, all aspects of building and operating a hatchery need to be examined, and the level at which a hatchery will be economically viable must be determined. Many costs need to be considered including purchase/lease of the site, construction of the hatchery, installation of the seawater system, equipment needed for all phases of production, maintenance, supplies and utility overheads, loan repayments and the need for trained staff.

The initial selection of a suitable site on which to build the hatchery is of utmost importance to subsequent success for production of seed. A supply of high-quality seawater, free from pollution and organisms causing disease is essential. Other factors
Selecting a site for a regional shellfish hatchery to be considered are land availability at reasonable cost, local availability of electricity and freshwater, a qualified or easy to train labour force and good communication to facilitate acquisition of materials and supplies.

GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS
The first consideration to be made in assessing the suitability of a country for a regional hatchery is to determine existing government regulations and political will for the development of aquaculture. Not all governments have legislation enabling and/or facilitating aquaculture; this may become a major hindrance, unless political will is strong and supports growth in this sector.

The first step is the verification of government regulations supporting permit construction of a shellfish hatchery at a desired site. Enquiries to local, state, provincial or federal authorities are critical. It is advisable to have more than one site evaluated as a potential hatchery site, and select the site most amenable to government regulations. In some cases, changing existing government regulations for hatchery construction permit may be an option, if there is government support for aquaculture development.

Many countries require a number of permits and licences to ensure compliance with local building codes and national and local environmental regulations before any construction is allowed. This can be a lengthy, costly and time consuming process. Whether it is required or not, good conduct practice should include the potential impact of the hatchery on the local environment before construction.

Some of the existing regulations in need to be in favour of aquaculture development are: i) aquaculture permit for hatchery operation; ii) duty on culture equipment and materials; iii) licensing for installing permanent structures on the seabed (seawater pipes for intake); iv) immigration laws for overseas staff/scientists; v) import of live shellfish for broodstock and export of spat; vi) licence to sell cultured species; vii) health inspection laws; viii) lease of seabed for grow-out systems; and ix) tourism and recreational regulations (potentially leading to multi-use conflicts).

ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR A REGIONAL FACILITY
In addition, a country selected for a regional facility should have sites amenable to the following considerations:

Infrastructure – Not all countries have land available suitable for the establishment of a land-based hatchery and in proximity to seawater. In some, such land may be earmarked for other residential or commercial uses. A hatchery may also be developed from an existing building suitable to required modifications. In some cases, this may prove less costly than building a hatchery on undeveloped land, depending on price of land, construction costs, etc. Countries offering a land area for a regional facility should ensure the availability of an adequate supply of electrical power to ensure smooth running of hatchery activities and access to freshwater for cleaning purposes. In addition, there should be scope for expansion at the selected site, enabling an increase in production, training, storage, etc.

Transport – The ease of access to a nearby airport is critical to facilitate broodstock import and adequate infrastructure allowing ease of shipping of spat to other countries in the region. Adequate infrastructures (e.g. roads) are needed for reliable shipments; this also includes the acquisition of materials and equipment needed for hatchery construction and operation.

The location of a hatchery may have important economic consequences for transport costs. Access to shipping lines is of major importance, as the majority of spat will be sold to other Caribbean countries; as a consequence, ready access to an efficient road system and airport offering direct and economic routes are required to ensure that the
product reaches its destination quickly and with maximal survival and health status. Survivability is influenced by a number of factors, including the level of handling before the journey starts and environmental factors such as temperature and humidity during the journey. Some species of bivalves which normally live subtidally (e.g. scallops) are particularly vulnerable to journey times of more than 24 hr. Hatchery-reared spat or juveniles are shipped as air freight to reach their destination quickly. There are methods which have been well tested and documented for some of the target species (bivalve scallops; see Sarkis et al., 2005, for specific transport techniques). However, the hatchery needs to be at a site where there is availability of shipping materials and central to potential importing countries.

Local legislation – Legislation of the country needs to be verified to ensure that transport is conducted accordingly. In some countries, legislation requires that shellfish are transported under such conditions (with regard to space, ventilation, temperature and security) and with such supply of liquid and oxygen as are appropriate for the species concerned.

Target species – The occurrence and availability of target species for regional culture in the country selected for a regional facility is advisable. It would facilitate the supply of broodstock to the hatchery, mitigating potential transport of foreign disease and pathogen to the regional hatchery.

Quarantine – For a regional facility, a quarantine system to ensure that no pathogens or diseases are transferred via the broodstock to the hatchery is a must.

Human resources – Capacity to train personnel in adhering to strict protocols ensuring disease-free facility. The need for surveillance of the facility should also be considered.

Technical support – Established collaboration with a laboratory allowing for the testing of pathogens and larvae/spat health status prior to shipping. Additionally, the proximity of a university or research centre provides technical support for some aspects of culture work (for example, water quality analyses).

Protection from natural disasters – The occurrence, frequency and type of natural disasters should be assessed prior to selection. These can include storms and hurricanes, earthquakes, but also toxic algal blooms and diseases. Avoidance of exposure to such disasters is optimal, but difficult. However, the utmost needs to be done to select a site which is relatively protected (considering both country and specific location within the country), and to ensure that precautions are taken for survival of the stock in the event of such a disaster. For example, in case of power loss due to storms or hurricanes, a generator should be put in place to ensure a supply of seawater, temperature control, and lights for algal culture, until such time that power is restored.

Additionally, in some countries insurance against such losses is possible, now that aquaculture is recognized as an insurable risk and should be considered.

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETERS

Before committing to what is considered to be a suitable location for a hatchery, it is critical to ensure that good quality seawater exists year-round at the prospective site. If a good seawater source is not available, it will be difficult to develop an efficient and profitable hatchery operation. For this reason, every effort should be made to obtain as much information as possible on water quality throughout the year at a potential site or sites. Information is required not only for surface waters but also for the entire water column, since thermoclines may develop or upwelling may occur periodically.
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Any previous data stemming from oceanographic surveys or environmental studies should be reviewed. If not, it is advised to undertake a detailed sampling of the waters at the proposed site for at least a year.

Environmental parameters of seawater that need to be examined will depend in part on geographic location and the intended species for culture. Molluscan larvae, as well as juveniles and adults have strict physiological requirements, such as water temperature, salinity and oxygen levels and these must be maintained in a hatchery operation. Although some of these can be controlled within the hatchery seawater system, it will be more reliable and less costly if environmental parameters of the incoming seawater resemble closely those required for larval rearing – namely with respect to temperature, salinity and oxygen. Dependent on the species produced, importance in range of fluctuations varies.

Other parameters, such as quantities of silt potentially increased during periods of heavy rainfall and associated runoff may lead to problems in a hatchery; these are difficult to predict and control and are best to be avoided from the onset by careful site selection. High incidence of boat traffic will entrain resuspension of sediments, increasing the need for routine maintenance of seawater filters to hatchery supply. Heavy rainfall can also cause periods of low salinity. Similarly, the occurrence of dense concentrations (blooms) of some marine algal and bacteria species may release toxic substances that may cause reductions in both the survival and growth of larvae or juveniles, or mass mortalities in extreme cases. For this reason, a site potentially exposed to such problems is not recommended. As much data should be collected prior to deciding on the suitability of a site for a shellfish hatchery. Remedial measures to improve inadequate quality seawater can be extremely costly and may adversely affect the profitability of a venture.

Areas with high levels of natural production may be problematic, as fouling of intake lines and pipes will occur more rapidly. Additionally, areas with excessive external input of nutrients can lead to increased phytoplankton blooms, causing a decrease in oxygen levels, which can potentially impact survival. It should be noted that, although a hatchery site concerns itself mostly with the land-based facility, there are times where a need arises to hold juveniles and/or adults within enclosures in the natural environment (for example, prior to transfer at sea, juveniles may be acclimated in nets off the dock; or grow-out enclosures may be tested or demonstrated). For this reason, natural seawater parameters favourable to growth of target species in proximity to the hatchery are ideal. Suitable levels of nitrate, phosphate and silicate are required for growth, as well as the presence of iron, manganese and other metals.

Locations possibly influenced by effluents discharged from industrial plants should be avoided. The lethal and sublethal effects of many industrial pollutants are not completely understood, nor are the additive effects they may exert when several industries are discharging a range of potentially toxic wastes in nearby waters. Effects of such effluents can be extremely damaging to bivalve larvae. For example, an anti-fouling ingredient added to marine paints, tributyltin (TBT) has been found to be highly lethal to bivalve larvae even at concentrations of a few parts per billion. More recently, Irgarol 1051 is also found toxic to larvae. Drawing a seawater supply from the vicinity of marinas and commercial docks needs to be avoided.

Agricultural (including forestry) and domestic sources of pollution should also be avoided. It has recently been shown that, runoff from some cultivated lands can carry concentrations of pesticides at levels deleterious to the growth and survival of bivalve larvae. Domestic pollution may not only contain pollutants that are toxic to bivalve larvae but the high organic content can cause depletion of oxygen levels and increased levels of bacteria that could also lead to reduced growth and mortalities of larvae.

Another consideration when deciding upon the location of a bivalve hatchery is that of potential impact due to adjacent development. Urbanization with its ancillary
problems is one of the main concerns in bivalve culture. If it is anticipated that the site will be encompassed by urbanization then every effort must be made to ensure that sources of potential pollution will be kept to a minimum. This will require working closely with planners and developers. Alternatively, another site should be considered.

LOCATION
The hatchery should be located close to the ocean so that the distance required to pump water is kept to a minimum. This negates the necessity of having to maintain great lengths of pipe. It should also be located as close to sea level as possible to avoid problems of pumping water any great vertical distance. Intakes for the seawater should be as short as possible and conveniently located for easy service and maintenance. If fluctuations in surface seawater temperature and salinity occur regularly, the intakes for the pipes will need to be located at depth to maintain more constant water temperature and salinity. This will also reduce the number of organisms and amount of detritus entering and fouling the system, reducing water flow into the hatchery. Intakes at depth also help to avoid major phytoplankton blooms, some of which may be toxic to larvae. If the intake is in an area where thermoclines develop, the intake should be located below the thermocline.

Depending on the nature of the geological strata, it may be possible to drill wells close to the shore to access seawater aquifers. A water source of this nature will be at a more constant temperature and salinity year-round and will already be pre-filtered by percolation through the strata, resulting in high quality seawater. Because of this, it usually requires little further filtration. It may, however, require oxygenating before use. It is recommended that a full analysis of water be conducted prior to the drilling of such a well to ensure that it will be suitable; at times, well water can also be rich in certain minerals, such as iron, which may be problematic to the filtration system. Constructing seawater wells can be expensive initially, but the high capital cost is offset by reduced operating costs. It is advisable to consult with a suitably qualified engineer, if possible, when making decisions on the best methodology and technology to procure the water supply.

Other considerations are similar to those discussed above when evaluating most suitable countries as potential sites for a regional hatchery facility: i) sufficient area available to accommodate the hatchery and ancillary buildings and also to allow for any future expansion; ii) electrical power supply; iii) freshwater supply; iv) skilled labour force; v) good communications; and vi) proximity to research/technical institutions.

Site selection is critical to successful hatchery production, even more so within the scope of a regional facility. Concerned governments need to objectively evaluate proposed sites in consideration of target species, level of production and potential markets.
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ABSTRACT
This presentation provides a brief overview of the emerging policy framework for aquaculture development and a perspective on the development of a regional shellfish/mollusc hatchery within the Caribbean Community. It argues that although the aquaculture industry is still in its embryonic stages of development in the Region, governments are nevertheless interested in accelerating the development of the industry. In this regard, governments have taken steps in recent years to elaborate a long-term regional development policy and plan for sustainable expansion of aquaculture including mariculture. The paper also explores possible international and regional partners and sources of funding, appropriate technology and expertise to support aquaculture development generally and the shellfish hatchery in particular.

RESUMEN
Esta presentación ofrece un breve resumen de marco político emergente para el desarrollo de la acuicultura y una perspectiva sobre el desarrollo de un criadero regional de moluscos y/o mariscos dentro de la comunidad del Caribe. Se argumenta que, aunque la industria de la acuicultura está todavía en su etapa embrionaria de desarrollo en la Región, los gobiernos, sin embargo, están interesados en acelerar el desarrollo de la industria. A este respecto, los gobiernos han tomado medidas en los últimos años para elaborar una política de desarrollo regional a largo plazo y un plan para la expansión sostenible de la acuicultura, incluyendo la maricultura. También se exploran posibles socios internacionales y regionales así como las fuentes de financiación, tecnología apropiada y experticia para apoyar el desarrollo de la acuicultura en general y el criadero de mariscos en particular.
POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR AQUACULTURE

There are three regional economic cooperation organizations in the Caribbean whose mandates include facilitating regional cooperation in aquaculture and fisheries, considered in this paper. These are the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), CARIFORUM and the Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism (CRFM). A brief overview of the mandates, main functions and responsibilities of these organisations is provided below. It should, however, be noted that there are several other organisations concerned with aquaculture and fisheries in the Caribbean including, *inter alia*, the University of the West Indies; the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS); the Association of Caribbean States (ACS); the Central American Integration Organisation (SICA) and its fisheries arm, OSPESCA; the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Regional Coordinating Unit; the Western Central Atlantic Fisheries Commission (WECAFC); and the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, Sub-Commission for the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions (IOCARIBE).

**Caribbean Community**

The Caribbean Community (CARICOM) is a regional economic integration organization established by the Treaty of Chaguaramas¹, 1973, comprising 15 Caribbean States. The CARICOM States are Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, the Commonwealth of Dominica, Grenada, the Republic of Guyana, the Republic of Haiti, Jamaica, Montserrat, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, the Republic of Suriname, the Commonwealth of the Bahamas and, the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago.

The CARICOM countries decided in 1989 to further integrate their economies², and in this regard prepared the Revised Treaty of Chaguaramas establishing CARICOM Single Market and Economy (CSME), which was signed in 2001³. The objectives of the Community are: to improve standards of living and work; the full employment of labour and other factors of production; accelerated, coordinated and sustained economic development and convergence; expansion of trade and economic relations with third States; enhanced levels of international competitiveness; organization for increased production and productivity; achievement of a greater measure of economic leverage and effectiveness of Member States in dealing with third States, groups of States and entities of any description and the enhanced co-ordination of Member States’ foreign and foreign economic policies and enhanced functional co-operation.

The heart of the CSME consists of a Common External Tariff regime and a liberalized single internal market and economy without barriers where nationals of the Community will have freedom of establishment, freedom to provide service, and the freedom to move capital and labour to achieve efficient, optimum production of goods and services, without discrimination based on nationality.

The Revised Treaty provides in Article 60, for the pursuit of policies and programmes to “promote the development, management and conservation of the fisheries and aquaculture resources in and among the Member States on a sustainable basis.”

**Forum of Caribbean States**

The Forum of Caribbean States (CARIFORUM) is a sub-grouping of the African, Caribbean and Pacific States which was established in October 1992. It comprises

---

² The Grand Anse declaration and work programme for the advancement of the integration movement. Caribbean Community Secretariat, Georgetown, the Republic of Guyana.
the Dominican Republic, the Republic of Cuba and 14 CARICOM States which are signatories to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement signed in Cotonou, Benin in 2000 and revised in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg on 25 June 2005. Montserrat is not a Member of CARIFORUM, whereas, the Republic of Cuba, although a member, is neither a signatory to the Cotonou Agreement nor a direct beneficiary of ACP-EU financing. The mandate of CARIFORUM is to coordinate policy dialogue between the Member States and the European Union and promote the widening and deepening of regional integration and co-operation.

CARIFORUM pursues the objective by promoting closer economic cooperation and eventual integration of the Dominican Republic and the Republic of Cuba into the Caribbean Community; coordinating the allocation of resources provided by the European Union; and managing the implementation of the Caribbean Regional Indicative Programme (RIP).

Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism
The Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism (CRFM) is a regional fisheries body established by the CARICOM States to promote sustainable use of the living marine and other aquatic resources by the development, efficient management and conservation of such resources through cooperation and consultations.

The CRFM is made up of three bodies as follows:

1. A Ministerial Council (Ministers Responsible for Fisheries of Member States) that has primary responsibility for inter alia, determining the policies of the Organisation, resource allocation, cooperative agreements, and related decision-making.

2. The Caribbean Fisheries Forum (heads of national fisheries administrations) which provide technical leadership to the Organization, including the provision of scientific advice to the Ministerial Council, and oversight to the operations of the CRFM Secretariat.

3. The technical Secretariat, which is responsible for day-to-day coordination and execution of the work programmes; collaborating with national fisheries authorities; mobilizing resources; and managing the institutional networking to ensure optimal involvement of stakeholders and efficient functioning.

There are presently 17 Member States of the CRFM. Membership is open to the CARICOM Members and Associate Members. These are: Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, the Commonwealth of Dominica, Grenada, the Republic of Guyana, the Republic of Haiti, Jamaica, Montserrat, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, the Republic of Suriname, the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago and, Turks and Caicos Islands. Although the Dominican Republic is not a member of the CRFM, there is a Memorandum of Understanding between the Dominican Government and the CRFM to promote and facilitate cooperation and collaboration in aquaculture and fisheries.

The CRFM contributes significantly to all aspects of aquaculture and fisheries development and management in its Member States, including data collection, analysis and data management, research, dissemination of scientific and technical information, preparation of national fisheries management plans, and strengthening national capacity for management. The Promotion “of aquaculture as a means of enhancing employment opportunities and food security, nationally and regionally” is a general guiding principle of the organization (Article 5(f) CRFM Agreement).

The work of the CRFM has planned and implemented a Long-Term Strategic Plan which is delivered through Medium-Term and Biennial Work Plans. Program-7

---

4 The CRFM was established in 2002 by CARICOM States. See 2002 Agreement establishing the Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism. CRFM Secretariat, Belize City.
of the CRFM Strategic Plan addresses aquaculture development. It states that “the development of this subsector will follow a two tiered strategy. The first involves the establishment of a policy framework and regulatory environment to promote commercial aquaculture ventures while the second relates to the research on aquaculture initiatives in support of strengthening the marine fisheries sector. The major elements should entail:

- A policy framework to stimulate private investment and export oriented production of aquaculture.
- Development and promotion of the required global environmental standards among operators of enterprises in aquaculture.
- Development and promotion of harmonized guidelines for regulating the subsector.
- Development and promotion of aquaculture in collaboration with the relevant agencies.
- Research and development on specific species, dictated by the needs of the marine fisheries subsector.”

The Second CRFM Medium Term Plan provides for substantive work on promoting aquaculture development in the region. Aquaculture has been identified as a specific strategic initiative for increasing the sustainable supply of fish, shellfish and other marine products for domestic consumption, and foreign exchange earnings. The following actions are currently being pursued to realize the above objective:

- Conduct an assessment on the status of aquaculture in CRFM Member States.
- Evaluate the existing enabling environment (institutional, policy and legal frameworks) in CRFM Member States for the promotion of an aquaculture industry.
- Determine the most appropriate species for aquaculture development based on marketability, available technology, sustainability and economic viability.
- Develop and implement pilot projects to test feasibility of research findings and identify appropriate technologies for small-scale aquaculture.
- Formulate Master Plan for development aquaculture with focus on small-scale aquaculture and stock enhancement.
- Develop action plans for increasing interest and promoting investment in aquaculture.
- Develop action plans for public sector support for aquaculture enterprises.
- Identify the need for and develop framework for regionalizing research and training in aquaculture.
- Develop a Regional Protocol for sustainable aquaculture development and management and corresponding Framework for Policy and Institutional Reform.

In 2008, the CRFM and the Organization for the Network of Aquaculture Centres in Asia and the Pacific (NACA), signed a Memorandum of Understanding to promote cooperation and sharing of knowledge and expertise in small-scale aquaculture development.

**CARICOM Common Fisheries Policy**

In 2003, the CARICOM Heads of Government mandated the preparation of a Common Fisheries Policy and Regime as an instrument to achieve responsible and sustainable development and conservation of the fisheries and aquaculture resources of the Member States. The Revised Treaty does not provide detailed principles, rules and arrangements for sustainable use and effective management of fisheries and aquaculture resources, especially rules regarding access to and exploitation of the

---

5 CRFM Strategic Plan 2003, CRFM Secretariat, Belize City, Belize.
6 The Second CRFM Medium Term Plan (2009–2012), CRFM Secretariat, Belize City, Belize.
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marine resources in keep with the basic principles of the CARICOM Single Market and Economy. CARICOM States have been negotiating a framework agreement to establish the Policy. The negotiations are ongoing and are expected to conclude in 2011/2012. The Draft CFP Agreement\(^7\) contains provisions for a common approach to aquaculture development. For example, one of the objectives of the Policy is “to promote the sustainable development of aquaculture, including mariculture in the Caribbean Region as a means of, *inter alia*, increasing trade and export earnings, food and nutrition security, and reducing fishing pressure on over-exploited fish stocks”.

**POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES FOR THE HATCHERY**

While aquaculture can make significantly enhanced contribution to the long-term development of the Caribbean States, access to affordable financing for research and development and capital investment is a necessary condition for further growth and expansion of the sector. However, access to funding for aquaculture and fisheries has always been and still is a major challenge for most Caribbean states and small and medium size enterprises (SME) with an interest in the sector, especially in the Small Island Developing States. But this may be changing. Growing concern regarding the impacts of climate change, rising food prices and food insecurity are forcing governments and donors alike to pay more attention to sectors such as aquaculture and fisheries given their potential for, *inter alia*, contributing to increased food production and creation of new employment opportunities.

CARICOM/CARIFORUM States are giving increasingly greater priority to aquaculture development, evidenced by the expanding policy, legal and institutional frameworks to promote aquaculture and fisheries, and growing interest of the private sector and public sector.

Bilateral and multilateral donor organizations and financial institutions are also showing renewed interest in providing support for sustainable aquaculture and fisheries development. Among the donor organizations which are active in the Wider Caribbean and have an interest in aquaculture and fisheries or related areas are the European Commission and its affiliated institutions, the Governments of Canada (Canadian International Development Agency – CIDA and the International Development Research Centre – IDRC), Japan (Japan International Cooperation Agency - JICA), and the Kingdom of Spain, the Common Fund for Commodities, World Bank, and the Caribbean Development Bank. These are potential sources of funding for the regional hatchery project or some components of it, such as the research and development component.

**European Union**

The European Union is a major source of development assistance to the CARIFORUM States with funding and technical assistance provided through multiple funding mechanisms. The European Development Fund (EDF)\(^8\) is the main instrument through which the European Union provides development assistance to the ACP States and Overseas Countries and Territories (OCTs). Each EDF is normally for a period of six years. The tenth EDF covers the period from 2008 to 2013 and provides an overall budget of EUR 22.7 billion. Of this amount, EUR 22 billion is allocated to ACP countries, EUR 286 million to OCTs and EUR 430 million to the Commission as support expenditure for programming and implementation of the EDF.

The EDF funding is allocated to ACP States under three main components: i) the national and regional indicative programme; ii) an Investment Facility managed by the

---

\(^7\) The current (May 2009) draft of the Agreement Establishing the Common Fisheries Policy. Although this provision on aquaculture has survived since its introduction in 2005/2006, the negotiations regarding the scope of the Policy are ongoing and so this could change.

European Investment Bank (EIB); and an “Inter-ACP” component managed jointly by the European Commission and the ACP Secretariat. The funding available under the CARIFORUM Regional Indicative Programme, the Investment Facility and the Inter-ACP Budget are especially relevant for present purposes.

Through the tenth EDF, the European Union has provided EUR 165 million to help finance a Caribbean Regional Indicative Programme over the period 2008 to 2013. The Programme which is based on a CARIFORUM Regional Integration and Development strategy and an EU Response Strategy provides significant support for the following:

- Establishment of an OECS Economic Union.
- CARICOM Economic Integration, including the Single Market and Economy.
- Intra-CARIFORUM Cooperation which includes the Republic of Haiti/Dominican Republic and Dominican Republic/CARICOM relations.
- Wider Caribbean Cooperation which covers CARIFORUM/Department Outre Mer, CARIFORUM/Overseas Countries and Territories relations and the European Union/Latin American and Caribbean process.
- Investing in Human Capital to provide the skills to support the priority interventions particularly in new and emerging areas, such as Competition Policy and Intellectual Property.
- Some non-focal areas including Crime and Security and Support for Civil Society/Non-State Actors.

**European Investment Bank**

The European Investment Bank (EIB) was set up in 1958 by the Treaty of Rome as the long-term lending Bank of the European Union. It is owned by the Member States of the European Union, and is a policy-driven bank supporting projects consistent with the European Union’s objectives, especially European integration and the development of economically weak regions. A branch of the European Investment Bank was opened in Fort de France, Martinique, in 2007 to serve the CARIFORUM States and other states. The stated purpose of the Martinique office is to increase the effectiveness of EIB activities in the region, particularly with the private sector, but also with regional governments, the Caribbean Development Bank and other donor agencies, and to strengthen the Bank’s identity and visibility throughout the region.

The Investment Facility managed by the EIB became effective in 2003 and supports the economic development of ACP States through private sector investments at market conditions. It also finances commercially run public sector companies, in particular those responsible for essential economic infrastructure. It provides venture capital, ordinary loans, guarantees and interest subsidies for operations considered as priorities.

The European Investment Fund (EIF), established in 1994, is an instrument for the provision of finance to small and medium-sized enterprises. The EIF provides venture capital for small firms, particularly new ones, and technology-oriented businesses. It also provides guarantees to financial institutions, such as banks, to cover their loans to SMEs. The EIF is not a lending institution: it does not grant loans or subsidies to businesses, instead, it works through existing banks and other financial intermediaries.

---


10 See information on European Union Institutions and other bodies at http://europa.eu/institutions/financial/eib/index_en.htm
The Inter-ACP budget, which is 12.3 percent of the total ACP budget (EUR 2.9 billion) under the tenth EDF, provides financing for thematic actions which are common to some or all ACP States, as well as investments in multilateral funds. In contrast to the national and regional indicative programmes, this component of the EDF promotes Intra-ACP cooperation which spans two or more geographical regions. All ACP fisheries projects have been supported under this component of the EDF over the past two decades. The recently concluded Project entitled “Strengthening Fishery Products Health Conditions in ACP/OCT countries” was financed under the eighth EDF at a cost of approximately EUR 56.7 million. Likewise, the ACP-EU Fisheries and Biodiversity Management Project which created FishBase, was an Inter-ACP Project financed under the seventh EDF; and the current EUR 30 million ACP Fish-2 Project (entitled “Strengthening Fisheries Management in ACP Countries”) is funded under the ninth EDF.

**Government of Canada**

Canada and the CARICOM Countries have had a long-standing international relationship through which the countries of the region have benefitted from Canadian development assistance over several decades. Canada’s overseas development assistance budget was approximately CAD 5.43 billion during 2008–2009. The two main Canadian organizations responsible for administering Canadian overseas development assistance are the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC).

CIDA disbursed CAD 492.1 million in development assistance in the Americas in 2007–2008. In 2007, Canada launched a CAD 600 million aid package to CARICOM to strengthen regional integration and development to be distributed over ten years. This cooperation is centered on themes of strengthening democracy, promoting freedom and human rights, facilitating economic renewal and strengthening of economic linkages and addressing security challenges.

The International Development Research Centre (IDRC), a Crown corporation, is one of the world’s leading institutions in the generation and application of new knowledge to meet the challenges of international development. IDRC’s main activity is funding applied research. At the end of 2009–2010, IDRC was supporting 1,021 research activities in 97 countries, in five themes:

- Environment and natural resource management.
- Information and communication technologies for development.
- Innovation, policy, and science.
- Research for health equity.
- Social and economic policy.

The IDRC currently supports approximately 160 active projects with partners in Latin America and the Caribbean. Recent projects in the Caribbean and Latin American have included aquaculture, fisheries and coastal and marine resource conservation and management.

**Government of Japan**

The Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA) is a governmental agency that coordinates overseas development assistance (ODA) for the Government of Japan. It is one of the largest ODA globally with an annual budget of approximately USD 9 billion. JICA provides support for:

---

- Technical assistance projects for capacity and institutional development.
- Feasibility studies and the preparation of master plans.
- Dispatch of specialists.
- Technical training programme and human resource development.
- Dispatch of Japanese volunteers.

Aquaculture and fisheries have traditionally been a priority area for Japanese ODA due presumably to their institutional capacity, expertise and interest in the sustainable use of fisheries and aquaculture. JICA has been very active in supporting national and regional aquaculture and fisheries development projects in the Latin American and Caribbean Region over the past three decades.

In November 2000, CARICOM and the Government of Japan adopted a Partnership Agreement\(^{15}\) under which Japan provides ODA in several areas of economic and social development. Japan is currently providing funding and technical assistance to CARICOM under this Agreement for a development study on fisheries and aquaculture. The study\(^{16}\) has as its main objective, the formulation of a master plan for sustainable fishery resource use and management, targeting local artisanal fishers and their communities, by addressing the following five main components:

- Pelagic resource development and management.
- Aquaculture development policy formulation.
- Regional fisheries database development.
- Support for community-based management.
- Education and training in the component fields in the CARICOM States.

A project inception mission\(^{17}\) and a baseline survey were completed in 2009, and a preliminary master plan\(^{18}\) in March 2010. Under the aquaculture component, two pilot projects, each of eighteen months duration, are being implemented, one in Belize and the other in Jamaica. In Belize, a research project is underway aimed at evaluating the cost effectiveness of using locally available low cost feed material and other low cost production techniques compared to the existing techniques which rely on the use of imported feed or commercial feed made largely from imported raw material; and determine the cost structure and profitability of small-scale tilapia farming using these low cost feed and production techniques.

In Jamaica, the feasibility of building on the existing training capabilities of the Fisheries Division to establish and operate a training centre for small-scale fish farmers and extension agents from Jamaica and other CARICOM States is being tested.

The Master Plan is expected to be completed by February 2012 after which it is hoped that Japan will continue to provide support for its implementation, or at least some components of it, under a new partnership Agreement signed on 2 September 2010 entitled “Partnership for Peace, Development and Prosperity between Japan and the Member States of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM)”.

**World Bank**

The World Bank (WB) has been giving increasing attention to aquaculture and fisheries in recent years in response to growing concern regarding the poor state of fisheries globally and the call for urgent reforms to achieve sustainable fisheries development through improved governance, management and conservation. The Bank stated policy

---

16 Scope of Work signed by JICA, CARICOM and the CRFM in December 2008.
17 Inception Report, Study on the Formulation of Master Plan on Sustainable Use of Fisheries Resources for Coastal Community Development in the Caribbean. IC NET Ltd for JICA, July 2009. 46pp.
18 Preliminary Master Plan, Study on the Formulation of Master Plan on Sustainable Use of Fisheries Resources for Coastal Community Development in the Caribbean. IC NET Ltd, JICA and the CRFM. 100pp.
is to help establish institutions, values, and practices that will safeguard the future of fish resources and the health and livelihood of communities who depend on these resources for their income, nutrition, and quality of life.

The Bank’s current efforts in fisheries concentrate on coastal management, inland fisheries, and smallholder aquaculture operations, mostly in developing countries in Africa and East Asia. However, the Bank recently established a new Global Program on Sustainable Fisheries\(^\text{19}\) (PROFISH) in association with other key donors and stakeholders aimed at strengthening and broadening its response to the current challenges in fisheries. The overall objective of PROFISH is to improve sustainable livelihoods in the fisheries sector and to make concrete progress towards achieving the fisheries goals identified in the WSSD Plan of Implementation. PROFISH will focus on policy reforms to achieve good governance, sustainable fisheries, and the implementation of effective fisheries strategies. Through PROFISH and other partnership initiatives, the Bank currently has a portfolio of over USD 1.2 billion in fisheries, aquaculture, coastal and aquatic environmental management and related projects serving coastal and fishing communities\(^\text{20}\).

The Common Fund for Commodities

The Common Fund for Commodities (CFC) is an intergovernmental financial institution established by the UN Conference on Trade and Development in 1989 with a mandate to enhance social and economic development in commodity dependent developing countries, especially in the Least Developed Countries (LDC). The CFC places emphasis on poverty alleviation while supporting projects aimed at organisational strengthening, capacity building, technology transfer; market access and development; agro-processing; product competitiveness; infrastructure; marketing and access to finance, among other related activities within the commodity sector of developing states. It also promotes multi-country projects as a suitable approach to the problems and challenges in the commodity sector in its Member Countries, which is consistent with the practice in the Caribbean and Latin American Region\(^\text{21}\).

CONCLUSION

Sustainable aquaculture in the Caribbean Region is best achieved through cooperative efforts of public and private sector actors in collaboration with donor agencies to develop the required policy, legal and institutional frameworks. Financing for research and development and for small- and medium-sized enterprises in aquaculture is a significant constraint in the region. However, several donor agencies and financial institutions are expressing renewed interest in supporting investment in aquaculture as a way of boosting food security and eradicating poverty, and are also interested in supporting regional project. The proposed regional shellfish hatchery project may benefit from such funding.
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PREPARATION OF THE DOCUMENT
The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) is evaluating the feasibility of a regional shellfish hatchery in the Caribbean. This project aims at encouraging sustainable aquaculture, focusing on native species of the Caribbean. Interest for a regional facility was expressed by 14 Caribbean countries through an FAO-designed questionnaire distributed to 33 countries of the Region in August 2009.

The present study is assessing the market demand of bivalves or univalves in 18 Caribbean countries, i.e. Antigua and Barbuda, Aruba, the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, Cayman Islands, the Republic of Cuba, the Commonwealth of Dominica, the Dominican Republic, Grenada, the Republic of Haiti, Jamaica, Netherlands Antilles, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, and Turks and Caicos Islands.

THE CARIBBEAN
The Caribbean Region has a population of some 42 million people. Fish supplies (from all sources) amount to some 400 000 tonnes per annum. The average annual fish consumption is about 10.8 kg per capita, but there is a large difference between the Greater Antilles (consuming less) and the Lesser Antilles (consuming more than the average). The average fish consumption is substantially below the world average.

In the collective imagination, the Caribbean stands for beaches, water and fish. However, the reality is quite different and availability of fish resources in the Caribbean Sea is surprisingly low. With the increasing tourist flow to the Caribbean Islands,
demand for fishery products has grown quite substantially. Most of this additional demand is satisfied by imports. In addition, some countries in the region, such as Jamaica and the Dominican Republic have a long-standing history of fish imports, mainly traditional salted cod and smoked herring, for the local population. Some of the national dishes are based on fish and seafood, such as salted cod which is the basis for many traditional recipes for breakfast dishes in many Caribbean countries.

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine fishes nei</td>
<td>11 800</td>
<td>17 900</td>
<td>24 800</td>
<td>51 908</td>
<td>46 443</td>
<td>45 754</td>
<td>35 496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver carp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 315</td>
<td>17 530</td>
<td>19 204</td>
<td>15 801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean spiny lobster</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>9 000</td>
<td>9 800</td>
<td>14 223</td>
<td>15 824</td>
<td>19 204</td>
<td>15 801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stromboid conchs nei</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>5 231</td>
<td>15 252</td>
<td>9 893</td>
<td>13 314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowfin tuna</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 120</td>
<td>5 730</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>5 455</td>
<td>7 351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipjack tuna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>460</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10 008</td>
<td>6 436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nile tilapia</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3 399</td>
<td>4 501</td>
<td>5 800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11 500</td>
<td>29 600</td>
<td>100 156</td>
<td>161 042</td>
<td>187 853</td>
<td>107 303</td>
<td>64 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>24 300</td>
<td>57 250</td>
<td>137 226</td>
<td>238 644</td>
<td>271 970</td>
<td>219 648</td>
<td>168 689</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total fish production in the Caribbean was 170 000 tonnes in 2008, of which roughly one fourth coming from aquaculture. Total capture fisheries declined sharply in the last two decades, from 270 000 tonnes in 1990 to 130 000 tonnes in 2008. This decline was mainly due to the end of the Cuban long distance fleet.

The main species caught at present are tuna, coastal finfish, small pelagic, conchs and lobster. Aquaculture production, on the other hand, remained stable at about 40 000 tonnes, of which 80 percent produced in the Republic of Cuba. The most important species is silver carp with some 20 000 tonnes, while tilapia aquaculture accounts for some 5 800 tonnes.

Imports are thus, accounting for roughly half of the fish supply to the Region. These supplies are mainly salted cod, herring, canned tuna and sardines, frozen pelagic, and in recent years, tilapia and Pangasius.

### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seafood supply and consumption (including both finfish and shellfish)</th>
<th>Total supply (tonnes)</th>
<th>Per capita consumption (kg)</th>
<th>Native population (1 000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>4 484</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aruba</td>
<td>3 084</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>10 116</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>11 064</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda</td>
<td>2 479</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayman Islands</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>95 321</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>2 055</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>105 715</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9 814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>3 813</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>39 045</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9 720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>82 401</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>2 696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands Antilles</td>
<td>3 998</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>1 569</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>6 846</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Vincent and Grenadines</td>
<td>1 770</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>19 113</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>1 328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks and Caicos Islands</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>394 165</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>36 383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² In the following, the source of tables is FISHSTAT, FAO 2010, if not otherwise stated.
Protein supply in the Region is above the daily world average amount per capita, with the exception of the Republic of Haiti (0.7 g/day/capita) and the Dominican Republic (3 g/day/capita). Fish protein supply varies between 8 percent of total animal protein (the Republic of Haiti and the Commonwealth of the Bahamas) and 23 percent (Barbados). With the exception of the Republic of Haiti all countries of the region are at or above minimal standard of food requirements (in calories and proteins).

Seafood is one of the most common Caribbean recipe delicacies in the islands due in part to their geographic location. Each island will likely have its own specialty. Some prepare lobster, while others prefer certain types of fish. Barbados is known for its “flying fish”, while the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago is known for its “casacadura” fish and crab. Almost in all countries, conch is available as part of the seafood consumption habits.

CONCLUSIONS: IS BIVALVE OR UNIVALVE AQUACULTURE PROFITABLE?
The study shows that there are some countries with a potential demand for bivalves and univalves. These include countries where conch are well liked such as Antigua, Bahamas, the Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, and Turks and Caicos Islands. The latter has an important conch aquaculture industry, which is albeit feeding the export rather than the domestic market. There are two countries in the Region which are importing scallops, namely, Aruba and Bermuda. For these two countries, a domestic bivalve culturing industry might be profitable.

The Turks and Caicos example demonstrated the feasibility of culturing and creating a market for a native shellfish species, as well as the potential for satisfying a demand through aquaculture. Therefore, any of the Caribbean countries could venture into a bivalve or univalve aquaculture ventures, even if the present domestic demand is not very good.

The tourist industry in all Caribbean countries is strong. In average, 14 million tourists visit the Caribbean Islands per year, with some ups-and-downs caused by the economic situation, but with an overall growing trend. This industry can utilize cultured bivalves and univalves in their menus, provided the quality of the live

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Crustaceans</th>
<th>Cephalopods</th>
<th>Molluscs, excl. cephalopods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aruba</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayman Islands</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands Antilles</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks and Caicos Islands</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 countries average</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FAO – FIPS.
specimens is good and that the safety of the product is guaranteed. The price the tourist restaurant is willing to pay depends on the situation in the country and on the category of the establishment. The relatively low priced “all inclusive” restaurants in the region might not be willing to pay a high price for quality seafood, while the upper end restaurants are good outlets for these type of products.

Very important with respect to potential demand is the strong presence of cruise ships in all Caribbean harbours. The chefs of these ships may be convinced of the quality and freshness of domestically produced bivalves or univalves, and could be encouraged to fill the cold storage holdings of the ships with this delicacy. Usually cruise ships do not buy from their destination ports, but from where they embark. Statistics show that cruise ships contribute very little to the local economy in terms of purchasing goods; there may be some exceptions in the islands.

Overall, there should be possibilities for a good domestic market of bivalves or univalves in countries with a huge population, such as the Republic of Cuba, the Dominican Republic and Jamaica. Given the present distribution structure, the products in the Republic of Cuba have to be frozen, which reduces the price of the product substantially. Those smaller countries where a conch or scallop consumption exists, such as Antigua, Aruba, the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, Bermuda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, and Turks and Caicos, should also guarantee a good demand. All the other countries, that is Barbados, the Cayman Islands, the Commonwealth of Dominica, Grenada, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago and the former Netherlands Antilles could be the base of a bivalve or univalve culture industry, intended for export. The Republic of Haiti has other problems at the moment and should not be included in this discussion.

**ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA**

The fisheries sector in Antigua and Barbuda is generally considered to be of little significance to the country’s overall economy; however, in recent years, there has been increasing recognition of its potential for the general economy and the role it plays in addressing issues related to balance of trade, food security, employment and poverty alleviation. In the past decade, fisheries has contributed, on average to half of the agricultural gross domestic product (GDP), or just under two percent of the national GDP based on current market prices.

The fishery sector of Antigua and Barbuda is artisanal or small-scale commercial in nature. Capture production involves mainly small fishing units targeting demersal or reef-based resources. Demersals or reef species account for at least 85 percent of capture production.

All fishery products landed in Antigua and Barbuda are marketed fresh for direct human consumption. There are currently, only two major facilities that allow processing of fisheries products for retail (Market Wharf and Point Wharf Fisheries complexes), and both only at a very limited level. Traditional salting and drying (corning) of some species still occurs at a subsistence level.

Antigua and Barbuda supplied the French overseas territories of Guadeloupe, Martinique and Saint Barthélemy with seafood for several decades. However, with the new European Union health regulations, exports to these territories plummeted.

Hotels and restaurants buy an estimated 10 percent of landed catch, while the remainder is either sold locally or exported. Domestic markets, however, have to compete with cheaper regional imports from the Republic of Guyana and the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago. Generally speaking, there is sufficient demand and enough fish for a dynamic development of the sector; however, the development of the artisanal

---

1. Tables on production, per capita consumption, imports and trade flows are given for each Caribbean country at the end of this report; for Antigua and Bermuda on pages 226–227.
fishery is hindered by the rather modest social status of the trade, tough working conditions at sea, and the availability of capital for investment.

The per capita consumption in Antigua is one of the highest in the Caribbean with 52.1 kg in 2007. While the level of consumption appears high, it has to be viewed within the context of the demands of the tourism sector, which drive imports. If the contribution of imports to food supply is ignored, per capita consumption for Antigua and Barbuda would be 13.8 kg/year, which is less than that of Europe (19.9 kg) but greater than the regional average (9.4 kg).

Antigua and Barbuda is a net importer of fish and fishery products, although domestic export of high value species (such as the spiny lobster) is slowly narrowing the trade deficit. Import levels remain high, primarily because local processors are unable to satisfy the traditional tastes for cured products (e.g. salted cod, smoked herring and pickled mackerel), as well as, the demands of the tourism sector.

Typical Antiguan recipes use cured fish products, mainly originating from Northern Europe, and combine them with tropical fruits. Salted cod is the basis for many traditional recipes. In addition, snappers are consumed fresh, in grilled or roasted form.\(^4\) Antiguan food habits are based on British habits, which leads to an important consumption of “fish-&-chips” mainly prepared from tropical fish.

Antigua and Barbuda is a net importer of fishery products, although traditional salted fish, but in recent years, has also imported fresh marine fish.

The trend of mollusc consumption through the years has been positive. This could indicate a potential market for native shellfish species, dependent on the most preferred product forms consumed. The tourist industry is an important driving force in the consumption of molluscs, as there is no real consumption habit among the local population for this type of seafood.

**ARUBA\(^5\)**

The tourist industry is the main resource for the small island, together with some offshore banking. Aruban fish production is very small and plays a very limited role in the creation of the national GDP. Total fish production is 150 tonnes. The production includes wahoo (*Acanthocybium solandri*), snappers and groupers. Several causes for

---

\(^4\) [http://uktv.co.uk/food/homepage/sid/7234](http://uktv.co.uk/food/homepage/sid/7234)

\(^5\) Statistical tables on page 228.
the low performance of the Aruba’s fisheries sector include overexploitation of coastal stocks, lack of knowledge about the potential of demersal fish stocks, and inadequate fishing equipment. Imports supply exceeds domestic production by ten times, creating a strong dependence on foreign supply. Imports include live fish, frozen flatfish, prepared and preserved fish.

Aruba’s per capita consumption of fish is relatively high at 30 kg per capita. However, a certain decline in per capita supply has been experienced in recent years, probably due to the increase in tourists in the country. Bivalves’ consumption is important, with 7.5 kg per year. The raw material is mainly coming from imports which indicate some 100 tonnes of preserved bivalves. These are mainly scallops imported from the United States of America. Most of these imports are used in the tourist industry, in return feeding American tourists.

**COMMONWEALTH OF THE BAHAMAS**

The Commonwealth of the Bahamas is one of the wealthiest Caribbean countries with an economy heavily dependent on tourism and offshore banking. Fisheries play a limited role in the global GDP, with an estimated 1.6 percent.

The most important fish species caught in the Bahamian waters include spiny lobster (*Panulirus argus*), snappers (various species), queen conch (*Strombus gigas*), Nassau grouper (*Epinephelus striatus*) and jacks (various species). Because of its abundance and high price the Caribbean spiny lobster is the foundation of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas fishing industry. It contributed USD 70 million out of the USD 80 million of landings recorded during 2007. Over 90 percent of spiny lobsters are exported.

The queen conch fishery represents a supplementary income-generating activity for fishers during the closed season for spiny lobster (the largest fishery in the archipelago), from 1 April to 31 July each year, particularly in the islands of Abaco, Grand Bahama and Andros. It is a largely artisanal activity, undertaken by small boats in shallow waters throughout the shallow banks.

The vast majority of harvested fishery resources are for human consumption. Conch and fish are mostly consumed locally, although significant exports also take place. Tourists, many from the United States of America, are an important component of the
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local market. The major markets of locally consumed products are restaurants, hotels and home consumption.

There is also a local market for conch shell jewellery and artwork and a budding market for fish scale jewelry. Neither of these markets has placed additional pressure on fishery resources as no additional conch or fish are caught to supply these markets. Fishery products are also transported from other Bahamian islands to New Providence, the main market, by approximately 23 so-called “mail boats” which assure a large part of the inter-island commerce. In some instances, fishers bring their products directly to New Providence aboard their own vessel, although their home base is located on another island.

Fish consumption in the Commonwealth of the Bahamas is quite stable at 30 kg. Seafood is the staple of the Bahamian diet. Total molluscs (not cephalopod) consumption is 2.3 kg, with conch as the main item.

In the preparation of food dishes, conch meat is scored with a knife, and lime juice and spices are sprinkled over the meat. It can also be deep-fried (called “cracked conch”), steamed, added to soups, salads and stews or made into conch chowder and conch fritters. These fritters are a very traditional Bahamian dish, and are excellent as an appetizer and finger food.

The Commonwealth of the Bahamas is one of the few Caribbean countries being a net exporter of fish in value terms, while in quantity terms imports exceed exports. This is mainly due to exports of the expensive lobster, while imports are more in the lower end category, such as canned tuna, mackerel and sardines.

The Bahamian “rock lobster” is a spiny variety without claws that is served broiled, minced or used in salads. Other delicacies include boiled or baked land crabs, which can be seen, before they are cooked, running across the roads after dark. Fresh fish also plays a major role in the cooking of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas – a popular brunch is boiled fish served with grits. Stew fish, made with celery, onions, tomatoes and various spices, is another local specialty.

The cuisine of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas is never ever bland. Spicy, subtly and uniquely flavoured with local meats and produce, more than any other cuisine in the West Indies, Bahamian cooking has been influenced by the American South. One very popular example of this influence is the “fish-&-grits” mentioned above.

---

BARBADOS

Total fish production in Barbados has increased in recent years, to reach 3,500 tonnes in 2008. Flying fish (*Hirundictys affinis*) is a delicacy, and accounts for 60 percent of the weight of all fish landed on the island. In 2008, capture of flying fish reached 2,300 tonnes. The second most important species is dolphin fish (*Coryphaena hippurus*), with 700 tonnes produced in 2008.

The national dish of Barbados is Cou-Cou and Flying Fish, which is steamed Flying Fish in gravy with Cou-Cou. Cou-cou is made out of corn meal and okra. Flying fish travel in shoals, jumping in and out of water like dolphins. As they move through the air, their long extended fins open up as wings, hence, the flying motion which gives the fish its name.

The white sea-egg (*Tripnustes esculentus lesks*) is one of the 17 species of sea urchin (*Echinoidea*) which may be found in the coastal waters of Barbados. Its shell contains the golden roes which have become a local delicacy. Found in relatively shallow waters at a depth of six metres (20 feet), especially around the south coast, the sea-eggs are picked from the sea floor by divers. On the shore they break the shells, remove and wash the roes and pack them into whole shells. The sea-eggs are then steamed and marketed by hawkers. Sea-egg picking is controlled by law to avoid depletion of the species. It has therefore, become illegal to dive or market sea-eggs during any period declared closed.

Imports of fish and shellfish into Barbados are quite important, with 9,000 tonnes being imported. The majority are frozen shrimp, mainly for the restaurants in the country. Bivalve and univalve consumption is very low at the moment, and these species are not really part of the traditional consumption patterns of the country. Thus, bivalve or univalve aquaculture would not have a ready market in Barbados.

BERMUDA

Fish production and consumption

The fisheries in Bermuda target mainly spiny lobster, grouper, snapper, tuna, and billfish. The fisheries are internally classified as artisanal but technologically advanced.
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8 Statistical tables on page 230.
10 [www.barbados.gov.bb/localrecipes.htm](http://www.barbados.gov.bb/localrecipes.htm)
11 Statistical tables on pages 231–232.
Total fish production is about 400 tonnes per year. The main species produced in 2008 was wahoo with 117 tonnes, followed by snappers and groupers. Spiny lobster plays an important role in the economy with a production of 34 tonnes in 2008.

A typical Bermudan recipe is fish chowder. It is cooked from large fish species, such as snappers and groupers. In some occasions shrimp or scallops are added to the fish soup. As in other Caribbean countries, salted codfish is used for traditional breakfast meals. Fried fish fillets are also a classical Bermudan meal.

Consumption in Bermuda is quite high at about 40 kg per capita, but slightly declining in recent years. Unidentified marine fish makes up the bulk of consumption, followed by crustaceans. Scallops form an important part of the recent consumption, mainly going to the tourist market.

The strong demand and the wealth of the country, especially prior to 2008, result in high imports of all types of seafood. In recent years, scallop imports reached a significant figure of 100 tonnes imported from the United States of America. In 2008 and 2009, probably as a reaction to the economic crisis these imports declined to 6 and 4 tonnes, respectively. Here seems to be a good occasion to replace a bivalve which used to come from imports with a locally cultured species. The United States of America is the main supplier of seafood to the Bermudan market. It is interesting to see that tilapia fillet exports from this country to Bermuda reached 140 tonnes in 2009, all re-exports of Chinese tilapia.

**CAYMAN ISLANDS**

The Cayman Islands base their existence on offshore banking. The tourist industry is aimed at the luxury market and caters mainly for visitors from North America. About 90 percent of the islands’ food and consumer goods must be imported. Fish is no exception to this, about 80 percent of the consumed fish has to be imported.

In the Cayman Islands fish production is estimated at 125 tonnes. Imports vary quite a bit, but the overall trend indicates that frozen fish fillets are the main items imported and consumed in the country. Total imports were 400 tonnes in 2008. The United States of America is the main exporting country of seafood. These imports do not contain any type of bivalves or univalves.

Per capita consumption is relatively low at 5.5 kg. The outlook for demand in the Cayman Islands for cultured bivalves and univalves is practically nil.

**REPUBLIC OF CUBA**

The economy of the Republic of Cuba is a largely state-controlled, centrally planned economy overseen by the Cuban Government, though there remains significant foreign investment and private enterprise in the Republic of Cuba. Most of the means of production are owned and run by the government, and most of the labour force is employed by the State.

Tourism in the Republic of Cuba attracts over 2 million people a year, and is one of the main sources of revenue for the island. With its favourable climate, beaches, colonial architecture and distinct cultural history, the Republic of Cuba has long been an attractive destination for tourists. Foreign investment in the Cuban tourism sector has increased steadily since the tourism drive. This has been made possible due to constitutional changes to the Republic of Cuba’s socialist command economy, to allow for the recognition of foreign held capital. Food supply to tourist hotels is considered as exports by the Cuban administration and is paid in hard currencies.

**Fish production and consumption**

The Cuban fish production declined sharply during the 1990s, when the long distance trawler fleet was phased out. In 2008, Cuban fisheries production was 60,000 tonnes, which compares to a peak of 240,000 tonnes in 1986. The main product produced at present is silver carp with 20,000 tonnes. This species is not very appreciated by the local population; however recently, a fish hamburger has been developed. This product was well accepted among the population.

The Cuban fisheries industry and fish consumption is characterized by export of high value species (lobster, shrimp) and the import of low value species, such as horse mackerel from the Republic of Chile and *Illex* squid from the Argentine Republic. The experience with this system is very positive, for each 1 kg of fishery products that the Republic of Cuba exports, they can import 5 kg of products for domestic consumption.

The Cuban domestic market of fishery products is divided into three major areas: 1) subsidized fish for the “libreta de in canasta basica”; 2) the specialized fish shops,
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selling in local currencies; and 3) local restaurants and shops that sell in convertible currencies (CUC), USD 4/kg. From January 2011, the “canasta basica” was reduced.

The Republic of Cuba shows one of the lowest rates of apparent seafood consumption among the Caribbean countries, which is mainly due to the complicated fish marketing structure in the country. The “canasta basica” guarantees about 1 pound of fish per month to each Cuban, while for certain groups of the population (pregnant women, children, and elderly people) this figure can reach six pounds per month. About 86 percent of the total Cuban seafood production derives from the canasta basica. As mentioned earlier, this basic supply is made up of very low value products, such as imported horse mackerel and squid, but also locally produced carp. This market segment would not be a suitable outlet for bivalves, as normally their price exceeds USD 0.10/kg, calculated for the “canasta basica”. In addition to this distribution to the home market, canteens also offer fish in their menus.

The specialized fish shops, called MERCOMAR, selling in local currencies, offer quite a variety of species, which could include bivalves. Some 125 fish shops exist in the country, of which 25 in the City of Havana. The average price of fish sold in these outlets is USD 1.00/kg. The variety of species offered depends on the arrivals and the overall economic situation. Generally, the products are sold out quite quickly.

 Practically all the fish consumed in the Republic of Cuba is frozen fish. This is a very distinctive feature of the Cuban fish consumption, and created by the need to store the product for longer periods. In recent years, this overall characteristic has been changing, allowing for more fresh fish sales. However, the quality control of fresh fish is more difficult, and the food quality control agencies seem to have problems in guaranteeing safe products for the market. There is no artisanal fishery in the country, only so-called subsistence fisheries which provides food for the family.

The most commonly reported marine toxin disease in the world is Ciguatera, associated with consumption of contaminated reef fish such as barracuda, grouper and snapper. Under-diagnosis and under-reporting (especially in endemic areas such as the Caribbean) makes it difficult to know the true worldwide incidence of marine toxins.

The main outlets for seafood are, however, shops selling in convertible currencies and the strong tourist industry. In the case of the Republic of Cuba, the tourist industry is considered an export market, so per capita supply does not take this part of consumption into account.
At the beginning of the 20th century, the heavy Spanish immigration made the Cuban gastronomy and cuisine even more markedly Spanish. In gastronomy, the Spaniards took up posts as cooks in restaurants and family homes. The Galician immigrants brought with them the fish recipes as well. The most characteristic feature of Cuban cuisine is this mixture where the tomato sauce with few sautéed spices or Cuban sauce takes over the rest of the ingredients. The Cuban way of cooking is natural, with very specific ingredients, scarce spices (oregano and cumin), that limits or banishes the use of pepper and other hot spices. The Cuban cooking way, that identifies its cuisine, is frying. Thus, the traditional Cuban fish recipes are fried fish fillets. It is apparent, however, that fish recipes do not figure among the typical Cuban recipes.

Cuban fish consumption went down in recent years, mainly due to decline in catches, attributed to the problems of the aging of the industrial fisheries. The long distance trawler fishery was dismantled in the nineties of the last century. At present, per capita supply is estimated at 8.5 kg, which compares to 20 kg back in the eighties. Cephalopods are an important part of the diet, especially in years when squid production in Argentina is plentiful. The freshwater fish supply is 2 kg, mainly carp.

The consumption of bivalves is very low. The Cuban domestic fish consumption will not be able to afford the purchase of bivalves from aquaculture production. However, the tourist industry looks like an excellent outlet for live bivalves from a potential domestic aquaculture industry. The tourist hotels nowadays offer clams, scallops and mussels in their buffets.

**COMMONWEALTH OF DOMINICA**

The fisheries subsector employs approximately 3 100 fishers and fish vendors and contributes about 2.0 percent to GDP. The Commonwealth of Dominica fishing industry is small-scale and of an artisanal nature. The value of fish landings is about USD 2.2 million annually and most of the fish landed is consumed locally making a significant contribution to national food security. In 2007, the industry was damaged by hurricane Dean severely affecting landing and marketing sites at Scott’s Head, San Sauveur and Fond Saint Jean.

All the fish caught is for local consumption. Catches declined quite sharply in recent years and were recorded at 700 tonnes, which compares to a peak of 1 200 tonnes at the turn of the century. Main species caught are wahoo and dolphin fish.
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**Dominica: per capita consumption**

Most fish landed in the Commonwealth of Dominica is sold directly to the public at the landing sites. Since 1997, following the completion of the Roseau Fisheries Complex (built with the assistance of the Japanese Government), fishermen have been selling their catch directly to the Complex, particularly in times of heavy glut on the market. Overall, the complex is underutilized and has partly been destroyed by hurricanes.

With the rapid decline in the major cash crop (bananas), many farmers began moving into the fishing sector. If properly managed, the returns from fishing can be considerable. The price of fish ranges from USD 1.85–2.60/lb, depending on the village where it is landed. Prices are lower for demersal fish than for pelagics. Prices are of course lower in the more rural districts.

Fish is not usually gutted when sold to the public. Very often small pelagic fish species such as flying fish, skipjack, and robin, are sold from landing sites, but blackfin tuna, yellowfin tuna, marlin, swordfish and dolphin fish are only sold in rural communities when a glut exist. The Commonwealth of Dominica imports some quantities of canned seafood, salted cod and very small amounts of frozen fish.

Because the Commonwealth of Dominica is mostly volcanic and has few beaches, development of tourism has been slow compared with that of neighbouring islands. Nevertheless, the Commonwealth of Dominica’s high, rugged mountains, rainforests, freshwater lakes, hot springs, waterfalls, and diving spots make it an attractive destination. Cruise ship stopovers have increased following the development of modern docking and waterfront facilities in the capital. Eco-tourism is also a growing industry on the island.

Due to the fact that it was under English occupation for almost two centuries and that it borders French colonies, Dominican cuisine integrates various English and French influences. The main source of protein for most inhabitants is fish such as dorado, kingfish and snapper. They also consume a large quantity of spiny lobster and octopuses. In the mountainous areas, there are crayfishes and land crabs. Main dishes include Creole fish prepared from blue marlin, dolphin, grouper, kingfish snapper and lobster in abundance.

Imports account for about one third of fish consumed in the Commonwealth of Dominica. The imports include canned mackerel, tuna and sardines, and some salted cod. The Kingdom of Thailand is an important supplier of canned tuna to the Commonwealth of Dominica market.

Consumption in the Commonwealth of Dominica concentrates on wahoo and dolphin fish, and some imported mackerel and tuna. Therefore, consumption of pelagic fish is very high at an estimated 23 kg per year.

There is at present no market for bivalves or univalves, and the outlook for these products are practically nil. In addition to the local consumers, there are only very few foreigners visiting the country, so there is no outlet for bivalves or univalves in this sector either.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Surprisingly for a country with a long coastline, the resource base for the Dominican Republic fisheries is not very ample, and production is very low. In 2008, production was 16 000 tonnes, of which the majority are unidentified marine species. The country also has a significant conch production of around 1 000 tonnes per year.

The tourist industry is ever expanding, and is also a driving force behind higher fish consumption in the country. Tourists are visiting the Dominican Republic and expect plenty of seafood, which is not the reality. So hotels and touristic restaurant have to import fish, in order to satisfy the demand. Imports account for 80 percent of the seafood consumed in the country.
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The Dominican Republic food mixes Spanish influences and the cultural and cooking practices of the native Taino Indians. Paella, the most famous Spanish dish, is now common in just about every Dominican kitchen. However, the paella is different from the traditional Spanish dish, as the Dominicans now seem to see it as a rice dish that involves whatever ingredients are available.

Compared to other Caribbean countries, food in the Dominican Republic is less spicy. Beef is not so common because it is very expensive. Dominicans consume goat and chicken as it is less expensive than fish and seafood. Tourists can enjoy fresh seafood, especially shrimp, marlin, mahi-mahi, rock lobster and Dorado.

Street food is important in the Dominican Republic, and one of the classic recipes is shrimp fritter, a mixture of shrimp, Munster cheese, and potato.17

The Dominican Republic has an important seafood market, including some traditional products such as klipfish from the Kingdom of Norway and the Republic of Iceland, and smoked herring from Canada. In 2009, the country imported some 10 280 tonnes of klipfish from the Kingdom of Norway, an impressive quantity. In the past, some of these products had been supplied through food aid, creating a good market for these products. This type of imports dates back to the 1980s, when the government at that time wanted to supply good quality protein throughout the population. The acquired taste also continues at present, and the imported klipfish and herring reach all parts of the population. There is also some unrecorded export of fish to the Republic of Haiti.

For the tourist industry, the country is importing huge quantities of cuttlefish, squid, and shrimp, all in frozen form; some limited quantities of mollusks are imported.

Overall, domestic bivalves or univalve culture should find a ready market in the Dominican Republic. The tourist industry would be interested in buying live or fresh bivalves for their buffets, and some of the present crustaceans imports could be replaced by good quality domestically produced bivalves.

GRENADA18
The tourist industry is growing in Grenada and contributes significantly to the local GDP. The contribution of fisheries to the national economy, too, has been increasing with an average annual contribution of USD 25.1 or about 2.5 percent of the GDP.
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The fishery sector in Grenada is artisanal and small-scale in nature, and in recent years the sector has been developing from subsistence to commercial operations in order to increase earnings and employment, which contribute to food security and assist in reducing poverty. A major area of growth has been in the oceanic pelagic fishery that involves targeting of yellowfin tuna mainly for exports.

Total fish production increased during the last decade to reach 2,400 tonnes. Yellowfin tuna for export is the main species caught, with 755 tonnes. Other large pelagic fish also plays an important role in the production. Tropical demersal species have a relatively lower importance, with some 120 tonnes. Wahoo and dolphin fish contribute with 200 tonnes to total fish production. Tuna is mainly exported, while on the import side, salted codfish plays an important role.

Eight fish market centres are strategically located around the islands to deliver various services, but fish is also landed at thirty-seven other landing sites. These are categorized as primary (with market and port facilities), secondary (beaches/bays without infrastructure), and tertiary (processing plants).

Marketing of fish is solely a private undertaking, and self-employed fish vendors operate within the onshore facilities provided by the government. Additionally, there are fish processing establishments operated by private partnerships, companies and fisherman’s co-operatives, primarily engaged in marketing of fresh fish for export. Local markets for fish consumption consist of households, hotels, supermarkets and restaurants, while exports are supplied through foreign wholesale agents.

Oildown, is Grenada’s national dish and consists of a stew made with salted meat, (mainly pig), breadfruit, onion, carrot, celery, dasheen (a root vegetable grown locally) and dumplings, all boiled in coconut milk until the liquid is absorbed and the mixture becomes “oily”. Conch (called “lambie”) stew is another traditional dish. Conch comes from domestic landings.

Traditional fish dishes included klipfish. The dish called saltfish-souse includes salted cod, tomatoes and eggs for breakfast dishes. The saltfish is mainly imported from Norway. In 2009, imports reached 134 tonnes, which is only half of the imports one year earlier. The Grenadian Government is considering training local fishermen to produce saltfish from the local fish, rather than receiving it from imports.

Per capita supply of fish in Grenada is high at about 40 kg per annum. Apart from conch, there is no tradition in consumption of molluscs, therefore, there seems to be little opportunity for a market for cultured bivalves or univalves. As in many other
Caribbean countries, though, the tourist industry might represent an interesting market, provided the quality and the safety of the product are guaranteed.

**REPUBLIC OF HAITI**

The Republic of Haiti is the poorest country in the Americas as per the Human Development Index. It has experienced political violence throughout its history. On 12 January 2010, a 7.0 Richter scale magnitude earthquake struck the Republic of Haiti and devastated the capital city. In recent months, a strong cholera epidemic hit the country, adding more sorrow.

The fish market in the Republic of Haiti was severely impacted by the cholera epidemic in late 2010. Because of a call to avoid raw or undercooked shellfish and fish, people in the Republic of Haiti avoided fish altogether for fear of falling ill. This has been highly detrimental for the seafood trade. Fishermen and major distributors in this sector say they have to close down, if the situation continues.

In normal years, fish production is distributed in the following way:

- High value products (lobster, shrimp) for export markets.
- Demersal fish and large-sized pelagics for the urban market.
- Second choice fish for the rural and landing areas.
- Freshwater fish for subsistence consumption.

Haitian cuisine is kréyol cuisine, a mixture of French, African, Spanish and indigenous cooking methods, ingredients and dishes. Rice and beans are a staple. Vegetable and meat stews are popular too. Goat, beef, chicken and fish are complemented with plantains, cabbage, tomatoes and peppers. Calalou, consisting of crabmeat, salted pork, spinach, onion, okra, and peppers, and pain patate, a sweetened potato, fig, and banana pudding, is a native dish to the Republic of Haiti. Overall, however, fish plays a very marginal part of the traditional Haitian cuisine. Haiti has in fact one of the lowest fish consumption in the world estimated at 4 kg per head, pelagic fish accounts for about half of this.

Imports of fishery products are not insignificant with an average of 15 000 tonnes a year, of the lowest price range, such as horse mackerel and smoked herring. In 2010, the whole supply changed as a consequence of the earthquake. Some food aid reaching the country also included fish, however, the impact of these on the supply patterns still have to be seen.
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**Haiti: per capita consumption**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Marine fish, other</th>
<th>Molluscs, excl. cephalopods</th>
<th>Demersal fish</th>
<th>Cephalopods</th>
<th>Pelagic fish</th>
<th>Crustaceans</th>
<th>Freshwater and diadromous fish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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There are, however, some positive results as a consequence of the earthquake and the global assistance resulting from this. There is some tilapia farming starting in Lake Azuei, assisted by an American non-governmental organization, which if successful, will supply tilapia to the local population.

There is definitively no local market for bivalves or univalves which will unlikely develop in the near future.

**JAMAICA**

The country continues to derive most of its foreign exchange from tourism, remittances, and bauxite/alumina. The contribution to GDP by aquaculture amounts to approximately 0.25 percent, while that of capture fisheries may be a bit higher. Apart from some small registration and licence fees, access to fishing grounds is practically free for all categories. Recent economic data on the conch and lobster fisheries are not available.

The industrial fisheries in Jamaica are mainly involved in the export of conch and lobster, but also some first quality fish is exported. Artisanal fisheries, which generally serve the domestic market, fish on the island shelf and reefs, as well as on the offshore banks, and dispose of the catch on beaches on a daily basis, or via carriers in Kingston Harbour. Industrial fishers tend to be oriented towards the export market, while the catch of artisanal fisheries is generally sold locally, either to the population or hotel chains. Shrimp is also exported, but it is not clear how much of the locally produced shrimp is sold on the domestic market, which imports a significant amount of frozen shrimp from the CARICOM area.

Artisanal fishers generally sell their catch to a vendor or sell the catch themselves on the beach. Other modes of distribution that are also used are “for own use”, and supply to a wholesaler, hotel or restaurant. Very few artisanal fishers reported supplying catch to a processor. Supermarkets tend to concentrate on the sale of imported fish, including a large amount of frozen demersal fish, typically the bycatch of shrimp trawl fisheries in CARICOM countries, in addition to salted fish, a traditional component of Jamaica’s breakfast. There are only a couple of dedicated fish markets in the country. Hygienic conditions are below standard at landing places where so-called fish cleaners operate. Large pelagics are not easily absorbed by the
local market. Hotel chains that used to buy this product are now concentrating on cheaper imported fish.

Jamaica has one of the highest fish consumption in the region with 30 kg per capita. Fish is popular in Jamaica and one can find fresh days catch on the road side or in the market at any time. A sizable demand exists for fresh fish in Jamaica. This result is manifested through:

(a) high prices of other fish in existing markets;
(b) high prices of competitive protein food products.

The head of the fish is eaten in most cases and is said to be “de bes part a de fish”. The main ways of preparation are stewing, grilling, frying and steaming, always with plenty of pepper, garlic and onions. Since ancient times, Jamaica imported dried, salted codfish from the Kingdom of Norway, and also cod heads from the Republic of Iceland. The annual import of dried salted codfish from the Kingdom of Norway is around 5,000 tonnes per year, thus, representing an important part of the fish consumption in Jamaica. In 2009, Norwegian exports of salted cod to the Jamaican market reached a record of 5,129 tonnes. Saltfish together with ackee21 a local fruit, forms a very traditional breakfast dish, widely defined as the Jamaican national dish.

Most of the marine fish not identified is probably saltfish. Bivalves and univalves (conches mainly) represent an important part of the seafood supply to the Jamaican market.

Jamaican waters contain considerable resources of fresh and saltwater fish. The chief varieties of saltwater fish are kingfish, jack mackerel, whiting, bonito, and tuna. Freshwater varieties include snook, jewfish, gray and black snapper, and mullet. There is some concern of overfishing, driven by strong demand, both from the export and from domestic markets. It is a well-established fact that near shore resources are unable to sustain fisheries at current rates of exploitation.

In April 2010, Jamaica exercised its rights under World Trade Organization (WTO) rules to suspend fish imports from South East Asia. The ban was implemented after the veterinary division of the agriculture ministry said the imports had not met sanitary and phytosanitary standards. However, on 2 November 2010, the ban was lifted, but imports of tilapia were restricted to quantities brought in before the ban. In 2009, some 250 tonnes of tilapia fillets were imported for hotels and fast food chains, while local consumers can only purchase local fish. The price of domestic produced fish is USD 5.30/lb, while the imported tilapia fillets sells at half this price.

Conch consumption is quite important in the Jamaican diet, which would indicate that there is a potential market for cultured bivalves or univalves.

FORMER NETHERLANDS ANTILLES22

The Netherlands Antilles, an autonomous Caribbean country within the Kingdom of the Netherlands, was dissolved on 10 October 2010. After the dissolution, the islands of Bonaire, Saba, and Saint Eustatius became special municipalities of the Netherlands proper, while Curacao and St Maarten became constituent countries within the Kingdom of the Netherlands, along the lines of Aruba, which had separated from the Netherlands Antilles in 1986.

The cuisine is one of the most clearly ethnically diverse parts of Curacao. Seafood is everywhere; mahi-mahi, lobster, crab, salt cod, tuna, conch, and snake are cooked in a variety of ways for many meals.

It is also interesting and amazing to see, how the Dutch culture has influenced the cuisine in Curacao. Indonesian cuisine plays an important role in Curacao’s culinary scene. Brought to the island by the Dutch after establishing colonies in Southeast Asia,
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Indonesian ingredients and cooking techniques (the so-called Padang dishes) have found their way into many favourite local recipes. One such dish is “rijistafel” (Dutch for “rice table”), a combination of rice, vegetables, meat or seafood and the hearty kick of chili peppers.

Also the Dutch home cuisine introduced cheese into the diet; stuffed cheese is in fact the national dish of Curacao.

The tourist industry is the main source of income for the St Maarten economy. Fresh seafood appears on virtually all menus in St Maarten. Stuffed crab is a very traditional dish in Saint Maarten. Conch and dumplings is the traditional dish in Saint Maarten.

Dutch food culture in the former Netherlands Antilles does not seem to include the preference for bivalves. Thus, it is most unlikely that there would be a good market for cultured bivalves in these countries.

SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS

The marine capture fisheries in the two islands are mainly artisanal. Capture fisheries are all marine – there are no inland fisheries. There are four major fisheries being monitored regularly, namely: demersal or reef/bank; coastal pelagic; ocean pelagic; and conch. The latter is the main species produced with 90 tonnes per year, or 20 percent of the total fisheries production of the country. In addition, the islands produced demersals, mainly goatfish, snappers and parrotfish.

Fish is usually sold at landing sites, direct from boats, except for the main fisheries centres in Basseterre and in Charlestown. Conch is the only fishery product that has significant exports. All other species caught are consumed locally. The national dish is stewed salt fish with dumplings, spicy plantains and breadfruit. The salted fish is mainly imported from Canada.

In addition to the domestic production, some 1 000 tonnes are imported, which include all types of fresh and frozen fish species. Conch fritters seem to be the favourite food item in Nevis. The interesting feature for this study is that the recipes claim “You might get away with this recipe by using minced clams”. This would indicate that a good market for cultured bivalves exists in those countries producing and consuming conches.

---

24 www.caribbeanamericanfoods.com/?page=recipes&recipe_ID=16
25 www.nevis1.com/conch-fritters-recipe.html
SAINT LUCIA

Total fish landings in Saint Lucia reached 1,700 tonnes in 2008, showing an overall growing trend during the years. Over 65 percent of annual fish landings comprise offshore migratory pelagics such as dolphin fish (340 tonnes), wahoo (180 tonnes) and tuna and tuna-like species (450 tonnes) captured mainly between December and June each year. Flying fish (250 tonnes) form an important but variable component of the catch, and a multitude of shallow reef and bank fish species and several coastal pelagic species are also key components of the catch.

Virtually all the catch is consumed locally. Fish landings occur at 17 coastal communities, with the largest proportion of the catch being landed at the town of Vieux Fort, the village of Dennery and the town of Gros Islet. There are now facilities at most of the landing sites offering changing rooms, a fish market, gear mending facilities and a cooperative facility for the fishermen. At five landing sites, cold storage and/

---

26 Statistical tables on pages 242–243.
or ice making facilities are also found. The main cold storage and processing facilities have been established in Vieux Fort and Castries. The Governments of Japan and of Canada have provided substantial financial and technical assistance for infrastructure development. Some vessels now use ice at sea, and fish is often transported on ice. The use of ice continues to be promoted among fishermen.

The industry provides a major portion of the fresh and frozen fish currently consumed in Saint Lucia for the local and tourism markets. The government continues to strive for self-sufficiency in fish and at present the bulk of imports are of exotic seafood (e.g. smoked salmon, shrimp, and scallops) and smoked/salted cod and herring. Imports reached 1 800 tonnes in 2008. Main imports were canned tuna and salted cod.

Throughout the history, St Lucia's cuisine has been influenced by French, West Indian and Creole food, and its most popular dishes are pepper pot stew, callaloo and fried jackfish. Shellfish and fish are a daily dish, as well as vegetables like cassava, dasheen or taro, and sweet potatoes. The national dish of St Lucia is saltfish and green fig pie\textsuperscript{27}. This dish is made with green figs, (which are not figs but bananas), salted codfish, seasonings and cheese are the pie’s filling.

Fish consumption has increased considerably, due to both expansion of the tourism sector and increased local demand for fish, partly due to the adoption of healthier lifestyles by the local population. Tourism continues to be a major focus for development, particularly with constraints facing banana on the international market.

Currently, St Lucia has the highest per capita consumption of fishery products in the region with 40 kg. It is envisaged that, given the rate of the population increase (1.6 percent) and continued growth in the tourism sector, annual demand for fish products may exceed the 4 000 tonnes mark within the next five to ten years. The government is committed to fill the gap with local produces. With the great variety of fish products already consumed in the country, and with its growing tourist industry, there seems to be a good market for cultured bivalves and univalves.

SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADES\textsuperscript{28}

The fishing industry in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines used to be predominantly small-scale and artisanal, employing traditional gear, methods and vessels. In recent years, however, a flag of convenience fishery for yellowfin tuna has started in the country. Some 3 000 tonnes of yellowfin tuna are produced every year, landed directly in foreign ports. For the daily consumption of fish in the country, this fishery does not play any role. In the following, the text concentrates on the local fisheries. Most fishers are daily operators, going out to sea in the morning and returning to land in the late afternoon or evening.

Most of the catch is sold fresh or chilled on ice. The large pelagic species are usually gutted before they are taken to the market. The larger fishing vessels, with insulated fish holds, process their catch at sea and may keep their catch on board until it is sold. Demersals are generally not processed and are sold whole to consumers. A small quantity of lobster and conch is sold live to hotels and restaurants for storage in corrals until required for use.

A small proportion of the catch is salted and dried, mainly from unsold catch and in the Grenadines. Blackfish meat is cut into strips and dried on bamboo, while the blubber is boiled to a crisp in vats to extract the oil. The crisps remaining from the blubber is sold as “blackfish crisps”. Fish is often filleted or sliced, tray packed, and sold in supermarkets. Small quantities of fish are filleted, dipped in brine, lightly smoked and vacuum packed for sale to restaurants and for export. Roasted breadfruit

\textsuperscript{27} http://uptodatestlucia.com/listing.php?id=55

\textsuperscript{28} Statistical tables on pages 243–244.
and fried jackfish is the national dish of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. This dish is often served with Golden Apple Drink, which is the national drink.

In addition to the catch destined to local consumption which is about 700 tonnes, some 600 tonnes are imported (products weight), again mainly salted cod for the traditional breakfast meals. There is no market for cultured bivalves or univalves, as the present preference for this type of food is practically nil. Conch catches account for a mere 4 tonnes per year.

**REPUBLIC OF TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO**

The inshore artisanal contributed to an estimated 75–80 percent of the landing, estimated at 13 800 tonnes in 2008. In the local domestic market, fish landed at landing sites around the country are generally purchased by processing plants or wholesalers who may resell to supermarkets, hotels, and restaurants of retail vendors.

---

29 www.tastethecaribbean.eu/reciperoastedbreadfruit.html
30 Statistical tables on pages 244–245.
In general, the infrastructure for the handling and marketing of fish at landing sites cannot be classified as well developed, since many of the sanitary requirements fall short of the established standards. There are three major wholesale markets in the Republic of Trinidad while in Tobago there are four principal purchasing areas, although they cannot be classified as markets in the true sense as those in Trinidad.

International trade in fish and fish products out of Trinidad and Tobago comprise mainly the export of shrimp, flying fish, dolphin fish, swordfish, snappers and tunas either frozen or chilled with minimal processing and little value added. All the flying fish is exported out of Tobago in the frozen form.

Imports are mainly saltfish, from Northern European and Canada. In addition, some canned tuna and sardines are imported, together with frozen marine fish.

Crab and Calalloo is a favourite dish of Trinidad and Tobago, and generally considered as a national dish. Crab and Calalloo is prepared and served on Sundays during lunchtime. This dish is traditionally made with ocean fresh land crabs.

The overall consumption patterns indicate very limited potential for cultured bivalves or univalves in the country. Compared to other Caribbean countries, the tourist industry is still very limited, which also does not help any potential demand for these species.

**TURKS AND CAICOS ISLANDS**

The Islands are home to a vast array of seafood, such as lobsters, conch and various types of seafood.

As in other Caribbean countries, Conch Chowder is an important dish. Conch is a major staple in the Turks and Caicos diet, with conch aplenty in the islands’ shallow waters and the world’s only conch farm. As the fishery sector on the islands is mostly artisanal and landings are mainly composed of conchs and other coastal species, queen conch fishing represents a source of food and income for practically all the fishers recorded in Turks and Caicos. The conch fishery in the Turks and Caicos Islands appears to be in a good state and the resource well-managed.

---

31 Callaloo: made of tender Dasheen leaves.
32 http://caribbeanpot.com/tag/trinidad-callaloo
33 Statistical tables on pages 245–246.
34 www.islands.com/article/Conch-Recipes
Local restaurants use conch provided by area divers, but the conch farm exports at least 13 000 pieces of conch meat a week to high-end restaurants in New York and Miami (United States of America). In fact, total production of conch is 5 600 tonnes per year, an outstanding figure.

Conch is quickly becoming a rising star food with top chefs from the United States of America and round the World choosing to use Turks and Caicos Conch Farmed products in their new dishes. The Conch Farm specializes in exporting the conch including Pacific Rim, Ocean Escargot and Island Princess Conch. The farm even offers tourist tours to its premises. This conch farm is a very successful example demonstrating the potential for native shellfish species and culture systems can easily be adapted by other Caribbean countries.
### Table 4
Yearly imports of fish and fishery products (USD 1,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>3,954</td>
<td>1,618</td>
<td>2,623</td>
<td>5,391</td>
<td>4,187</td>
<td>4,877</td>
<td>6,423</td>
<td>7,882</td>
<td>6,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aruba</td>
<td>9,926</td>
<td>9,640</td>
<td>10,262</td>
<td>11,546</td>
<td>12,828</td>
<td>12,190</td>
<td>13,074</td>
<td>14,164</td>
<td>14,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>14,765</td>
<td>13,725</td>
<td>14,387</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>14,638</td>
<td>16,688</td>
<td>17,990</td>
<td>17,806</td>
<td>21,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>10,886</td>
<td>12,360</td>
<td>13,346</td>
<td>13,516</td>
<td>11,673</td>
<td>17,269</td>
<td>18,750</td>
<td>18,847</td>
<td>20,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda</td>
<td>7,030</td>
<td>8,387</td>
<td>8,204</td>
<td>8,274</td>
<td>8,431</td>
<td>8,203</td>
<td>8,639</td>
<td>7,286</td>
<td>6,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayman Islands</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>2,997</td>
<td>4,005</td>
<td>2,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>43,005</td>
<td>37,387</td>
<td>29,088</td>
<td>29,165</td>
<td>31,556</td>
<td>51,413</td>
<td>39,443</td>
<td>49,188</td>
<td>66,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>1,551</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>1,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>2,556</td>
<td>2,557</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>2,676</td>
<td>2,965</td>
<td>3,919</td>
<td>4,701</td>
<td>4,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>5,949</td>
<td>7,085</td>
<td>4,694</td>
<td>7,912</td>
<td>8,628</td>
<td>9,827</td>
<td>16,511</td>
<td>17,014</td>
<td>21,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>51,608</td>
<td>59,693</td>
<td>58,193</td>
<td>59,323</td>
<td>59,737</td>
<td>76,796</td>
<td>91,110</td>
<td>94,406</td>
<td>102,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands Antilles</td>
<td>8,184</td>
<td>7,015</td>
<td>4,507</td>
<td>6,143</td>
<td>6,771</td>
<td>7,734</td>
<td>10,256</td>
<td>11,126</td>
<td>14,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>2,807</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>2,654</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>4,114</td>
<td>3,927</td>
<td>3,538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Lucia</td>
<td>4,795</td>
<td>4,147</td>
<td>4,237</td>
<td>5,065</td>
<td>5,618</td>
<td>5,988</td>
<td>6,319</td>
<td>6,810</td>
<td>8,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>1,889</td>
<td>2,033</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>2,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>7,066</td>
<td>8,726</td>
<td>11,758</td>
<td>12,063</td>
<td>13,729</td>
<td>21,990</td>
<td>20,219</td>
<td>25,655</td>
<td>26,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks and Caicos Islands</td>
<td>2,001</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>2,316</td>
<td>2,258</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>230,830</td>
<td>237,691</td>
<td>244,468</td>
<td>247,290</td>
<td>277,739</td>
<td>338,545</td>
<td>363,282</td>
<td>390,949</td>
<td>467,001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following pages, for each country the landings of the seven main species, the per capita supply and the imports are listed. For the per capita supply tables the source is FAO-FAO, for all other tables the source is FISHSTAT FAO 2010. F = FAO estimate; nei = not elsewhere identified.

### Table 5
Yearly imports of fish and fishery products (tonnes, product weight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>1,679</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>1,806</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>1,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aruba</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>2,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>4,966</td>
<td>4,080</td>
<td>3,595</td>
<td>3,694</td>
<td>3,340</td>
<td>3,496</td>
<td>3,907</td>
<td>8,788</td>
<td>9,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>3,798</td>
<td>4,343</td>
<td>4,769</td>
<td>4,853</td>
<td>4,411</td>
<td>8,168</td>
<td>9,258</td>
<td>14,676</td>
<td>9,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayman Islands</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>35,035</td>
<td>33,979</td>
<td>22,514</td>
<td>37,736</td>
<td>54,667</td>
<td>43,727</td>
<td>22,797</td>
<td>35,759</td>
<td>41,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>28,630</td>
<td>28,311</td>
<td>37,698</td>
<td>32,817</td>
<td>37,594</td>
<td>38,642</td>
<td>45,009</td>
<td>40,477</td>
<td>47,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>1,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>9,054</td>
<td>11,005</td>
<td>6,660</td>
<td>8,834</td>
<td>10,426</td>
<td>9,432</td>
<td>13,535</td>
<td>14,484</td>
<td>15,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>2553</td>
<td>2302</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>2085</td>
<td>3,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Lucia</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>1,321</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td>2,649</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>1,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>4,028</td>
<td>5,845</td>
<td>8,619</td>
<td>7,044</td>
<td>8,323</td>
<td>12,844</td>
<td>8,806</td>
<td>9,090</td>
<td>8,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks and Caicos Islands</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>120,401</td>
<td>125,349</td>
<td>121,934</td>
<td>135,242</td>
<td>159,166</td>
<td>158,810</td>
<td>148,615</td>
<td>172,325</td>
<td>176,533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34 In the following pages, for each country the landings of the seven main species, the per capita supply and the imports are listed. For the per capita supply tables the source is FAO-FIPS, for all other tables the source is FISHSTAT FAO 2010. F = FAO estimate; nei = not elsewhere identified.
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Table 6

Yearly exports of fish and fishery products (USD 1 000)
Country

Antigua and Barbuda
Aruba

2000

2001

2002

2003

2004

2005

2006

2007

2008

190

706 F

971 F

1 395 F

679 F

328

734 F

259

1 089 F

246

358

777

435

1 017

251

70

82

23

Bahamas

109 952

73 770

91 574

108 339

87 158

78 036

95 041

84 100

82 509

Barbados

1 252

1 347

928

887

878

1 440

780

993

771

Bermuda

272 F

46 F

46 F

78 F

4F

94 F

44 F

15 F

283 F

Cayman Islands

180 F

94 F

108 F

50 F

213 F

196 F

397 F

77 F

–

88 116

80 110

93 121

65 443

89 221

73 561

69 419

81 563

79 740

Cuba
Dominica
Dominican Republic
Grenada
Haiti

1

<0.5

11

21

8

37

1

6

6

2 965

2 905

3 738 F

4 286 F

3 093 F

5 308 F

6 410 F

4 882 F

4 227 F

3 408

4 052

3 863

3 258

3 086

3 517

3 734

4 115

2 957

3 969 F

3 868 F

4 449 F

4 130 F

3 586 F

4 269 F

3 818 F

5 029 F

4 875 F

Jamaica

10 001

11 817

5 531

8 177

7 411

9 545

10 820

8 447

8 241

Netherlands Antilles

5 696 F

5 952 F

5 285 F

9 168 F

9 987 F

5 261 F

6 304 F

6 172 F

21 670 F

245

131

149

267

196

45

242

422

297 F

28

47

106

40

10

1

1

<0.5

107

961

630

712

510

410

434

217

269

510

10 630

10 503

11 438

9 977

6 894

8 646

10 002

8 732

10 470

3 837

3 981

3 793

3 517

5 345

8 831 F

8 094 F

8 900 F

7 366 F

241 949

200 317

226 600

219 978

219 196

199 800

216 128

214 063

225 141

St Kitts and Nevis
St Lucia
St Vincent and the
Grenadines
Trinidad and Tobago
Turks and Caicos Islands
TOTAL

Table 7

Yearly exports of fish and fishery products (tonnes, product weight)
Country

Antigua and Barbuda
Aruba
Bahamas

2000

2001

27

F

369

2002

2003

2004

2005

F

577

113

50

129

F

2006

2007

F

36

225

2008

288

F

81

110

335

242

190

106

13

10

4

3 930

2 734

2 810

3 604

2 785

2 310

2 649

5 136

5 445

329

208

249

391

237

236

Barbados

280

Bermuda

15

F

<0.5

F

3

F

94

F

20

F

9

F

21

F

2

F

Cayman Islands

100

F

62

F

60

F

8

F

36

F

102

F

75

F

34

F

–

Cuba

7 699

6 877

8 784

6 283

10 292

6 750

7 244

7 113

6 108

<0.5

<0.5

4

3

2

4

<0.5

1

Dominican Republic

1 907

2 178

Grenada

1 143

Haiti

639

Dominica

Jamaica
Netherlands Antilles
St Kitts and Nevis
St Lucia
St Vincent and the
Grenadines
Trinidad and Tobago
Turks and Caicos Islands
TOTAL

709

F

811
7 326

F

F

634

1 352
F

7 925

73

1 884

F

624
743

F

500
6 608

43

F

35

241

2 043

F

630
616

F

904
8 320

F

135

1 493

F

1 615

455
654

F

1 454

497

F

477

1 241

F

1 601

530
553

F

1 124

1
1 206

F

436
577

F

1 249

F

11 880

F

62

95

70

F

6 069

F

F

25

5 488

F

444

1 195

F

156

9 305

F

519

F

1 467

F

169
20

4 555

2

1

15

2

1

<0.5

<0.5

<0.5

25

251

140

140

95

74

53

34

46

51

4 366

5 098

5 076

4 008

3 091

3 217

6 483

3 929

3 771

569

537

499

492

729

29 219

29 098

28 457

28 297

30 886

922

F

23 483

845

F

27 975

878

F

25 473

858

F

32 158

Table 8

Antigua and Barbuda – Landings (tonnes)
Species

1950

1960

1970

1980

1990

2000

2008

Caribbean spiny lobster

–

<0.5

100

64

97

275

165

Groupers seabasses nei

–

–

–

–

–

–

258

Grunts sweetlips nei

–

–

–

–

–

–

216

Parrotfishes nei

–

–

–

–

–

–

259

Snappers jobfishes nei

–

–

–

–

–

–

525

Stromboid conchs nei

–

–

–

–

104

315

1 357
236

Surgeonfishes nei

–

–

–

–

–

–

Other

100

600

800

1 107

684

1 164

505

Totals

100

600

900

1 171

885

1 754

3 521


### TABLE 9
**Antigua and Barbuda – Per capita consumption by species groups (kg/capita)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, other</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelagic fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs, excl. cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demersal fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater and diadromous fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 10
**Antigua and Barbuda – Trade flow, in terms of value (USD 1,000) and volume (tonnes, product weight)**

#### Export Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-export Value</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Import Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>3954</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>2623</td>
<td>5391</td>
<td>4187</td>
<td>4877</td>
<td>6423</td>
<td>7882</td>
<td>6545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 11
**Antigua and Barbuda – Yearly seafood imports by main commodities (tonnes, product weight)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, fresh or chilled, nei</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous dried fish, whether or not salted, nei</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tusk, dried, salted or in brine</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, frozen, nei</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardines, sardinellas, brisling or sprats, prep. or pres</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunas prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps and prawns, frozen, nei</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish meat, whether or not minced, frozen, nei</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saithe, dried, salted or in brine</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrings nei, smoked</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackerels nei, salted or in brine</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack and horse mackerel prep. or pres. not minced</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackerel prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squid rings, frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilapia fillets, frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squids, frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish nei, minced, prepared or preserved</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps and prawns, not cooked, frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilchards (Sardinops spp.), prep. or pres.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmonoids, frozen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swordfish meat, frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 12
**Aruba – Landings (tonnes)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic sailfish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>&lt;0–5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater fishes nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>&lt;0–5</td>
<td>&lt;0–5</td>
<td>&lt;0–5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groupers nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fishes nei</td>
<td>&lt;0–5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snappers, jobfishes nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahoo</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 13
**Aruba – Trade flow, in terms of value (USD 1 000) and volume (tonnes, product weight)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Flow (USD 1 000)</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>1 017</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Value</td>
<td>9 926</td>
<td>9 640</td>
<td>10 262</td>
<td>11 546</td>
<td>12 828</td>
<td>12 190</td>
<td>13 074</td>
<td>14 164</td>
<td>14 888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Flow (USD 1 000)</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Value</td>
<td>1 705</td>
<td>1 575</td>
<td>1 630</td>
<td>1 959</td>
<td>2 013</td>
<td>1 782</td>
<td>2 188</td>
<td>2 021</td>
<td>2 145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 14
**Aruba – Yearly seafood imports by main commodities (tonnes, product weight)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fish live, nei</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flatfishes nei, frozen</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish nei, prep. or pres. not minced</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs and other aq. invertebrates, prep. or pres.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, fresh or chilled, nei</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowfin tuna, fresh or chilled</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crab meat nei, prepared or preserved</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps, prawns, prepared or preserved, nei</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific salmon, frozen, nei</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipjack tuna, fresh or chilled</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans and molluscs, prep. or pres., nei</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 15
**Aruba – Per capita consumption by species groups (kg/capita)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, other</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs, excl. cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater and diadromous fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demersal fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelagic fish</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 16
**Bahamas – Landings (tonnes)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean spiny lobster</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1 100</td>
<td>2 894</td>
<td>5 808</td>
<td>9 023</td>
<td>6 896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groupers nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grunts sweetlips nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine shells nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau grouper</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snappers nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stromboid conchs nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1 600</td>
<td>2 100</td>
<td>4 997</td>
<td>7 541</td>
<td>11 110</td>
<td>9 187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 17
Bahamas – Per capita consumption by species groups (kg/capita)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelagic fish</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demersal fish</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, other</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs, excl. cephalopods</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater and diadromous fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic animals, others</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 18
Bahamas – Trade flow, in terms of value (USD 1 000) and volume (tonnes, product weight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Flow (USD 1 000)</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>109 952</td>
<td>73 770</td>
<td>91 574</td>
<td>108 339</td>
<td>87 158</td>
<td>78 036</td>
<td>95 041</td>
<td>84 100</td>
<td>82 509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-export Value</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1 069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Value</td>
<td>14 765</td>
<td>13 725</td>
<td>14 387</td>
<td>13 200</td>
<td>14 638</td>
<td>16 688</td>
<td>17 990</td>
<td>17 806</td>
<td>21 780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Flow (USD 1 000)</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>3 930</td>
<td>2 734</td>
<td>2 810</td>
<td>3 604</td>
<td>2 785</td>
<td>2 310</td>
<td>2 649</td>
<td>5 136</td>
<td>5 445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-export Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Value</td>
<td>4 966</td>
<td>4 080</td>
<td>3 595</td>
<td>3 694</td>
<td>3 3340</td>
<td>3 496</td>
<td>3 907</td>
<td>8 788</td>
<td>9 860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 19
Bahamas – Yearly seafood imports by main commodities (tonnes, product weight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tunas prepared or preserved, not minced</td>
<td>1 365</td>
<td>1 065</td>
<td>1 350</td>
<td>1 070</td>
<td>1 216</td>
<td>1 199</td>
<td>1 131</td>
<td>2 440</td>
<td>2 926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackerel prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>1 130</td>
<td>1 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilchards (Sardinops spp.), prep. or pres., not minced</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps and prawns, frozen, nei</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish meat, whether or not minced, frozen, nei</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish, fresh or chilled, nei</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish nei, minced, prepared or preserved</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flatfishes nei, frozen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish roes, prepared, nei</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon nei, not minced, prep. or pres.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmons, smoked</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouper, frozen</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuttlefishes, frozen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous coastal fishes fillets, nei, frozen</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crabs nei, frozen</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps and prawns, not frozen, nei</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, frozen, nei</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater fish nei, live</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous crustaceans, not frozen, nei</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiny lobsters (Panulirus spp.), nei, frozen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scallops, other than live, fresh or chilled</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps, prawns, prepared or preserved, nei</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish nei, smoked</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cods nei, dried, salted or in brine</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish live, nei</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific salmon, frozen, nei</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish, frozen, nei</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 20
**Barbados – Landings (tonnes)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common dolphin fish</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyingfishes nei</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>2354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fishes nei</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlins, sailfishes, etc.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swordfish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahoo</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowfin tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>5200</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>3735</td>
<td>3018</td>
<td>3175</td>
<td>3551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 21
**Barbados – Per capita consumption by species groups (kg/capita)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pelagic fish</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, other</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demersal fish</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater and diadromous fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs, excl. cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 22
**Barbados – Trade flow, in terms of value (USD 1 000) and volume (tonnes, product weight)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Flow (USD 1 000)</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-export Value</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Value</td>
<td>10886</td>
<td>12360</td>
<td>13346</td>
<td>13516</td>
<td>11673</td>
<td>17269</td>
<td>18750</td>
<td>18847</td>
<td>20291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Quantity</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-export Quantity</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Quantity</td>
<td>3798</td>
<td>4343</td>
<td>4769</td>
<td>4853</td>
<td>4411</td>
<td>8168</td>
<td>9258</td>
<td>14676</td>
<td>9026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 23
**Barbados – Yearly seafood imports by main commodities (tonnes, product weight)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps and prawns, frozen, nei</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2802</td>
<td>8479</td>
<td>3109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, frozen, nei</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>1308</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>2991</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>1662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuna prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>1117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cods, dressed whether or not salted</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, frozen, nei</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilchards (Sardina spp.), prep. or preserved, not minced</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous dried fish, whether or not salted, nei</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackerel prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowfin tuna, frozen, nei</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon, not minced, preserved</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous pelagic fishes fillets, frozen</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps, prawns, prepared or preserved, nei</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish meals, nei</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuttlefish and squid, other than live, fresh or chilled</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharks, frozen, nei</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish meat, whether or not minced, frozen, nei</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 24
Bermuda – Landings (tonnes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carangids nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean spiny lobster</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groupers nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fishes nei</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snappers, jobfishes nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahoo</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowfin tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,629</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>4,105</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 25
Bermuda – Per capita consumption by species groups (kg/capita)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, other</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs, excl. cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demersal fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelagic fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 26
Bermuda – Trade flow, in terms of value (USD 1 000) and volume (tonnes, product weight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Value</td>
<td>7,030</td>
<td>8,387</td>
<td>8,204</td>
<td>8,274</td>
<td>8,431</td>
<td>8,203</td>
<td>8,639</td>
<td>7,286</td>
<td>6,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export Quantity</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Quantity</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 27
Bermuda – Yearly seafood imports by main commodities (tonnes, product weight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, frozen, nei</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunas prep. or pres., in airtight containers</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish, frozen, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps and prawns, not cooked, frozen</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunas prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toothfish (Dissostichus spp.), fillets, frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater fishes nei, frozen</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish nei, smoked</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish nei, minced, prepared or preserved</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish, salted or in brine</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaithe (=Pollock), frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuttlefish and squid, other than live, fresh or chilled</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American/European lobsters (Homarus spp.), nei, frozen</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish meal fit for human consumption, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squid rings, frozen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squids (Ommastrephes sagittatus, Loligo spp.), frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scallops, other than live, fresh or chilled</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 27
Bermuda – Yearly seafood imports by main commodities (tonnes, product weight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, frozen, nei</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunas prep. or pres., in airtight containers</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish, frozen, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps and prawns, not cooked, frozen</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunas prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toothfish (Dissostichus spp.), fillets, frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater fishes nei, frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish nei, smoked</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish nei, minced, prepared or preserved</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish nei, salted or in brine</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saithe (=Pollock), frozen</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuttlefish and squid, other than live, fresh or chilled</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American/European lobsters (Homarus spp.), nei, frozen</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish meal fit for human consumption, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squid rings, frozen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squids (Ommastrephes sagittatus, Loligo spp.), frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scallops, other than live, fresh or chilled</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 28
Cayman Islands – Landings (tonnes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater fishes nei</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fishes nei</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natantian decapods nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipjack tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowfin tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1391</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 29
Cayman Islands – Trade flow, in terms of value (USD 1 000) and volume (tonnes, product weight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Flow (USD 1 000)</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Value</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>2997</td>
<td>4006</td>
<td>2796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Quantity</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Quantity</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 30
Cayman Islands – Per capita consumption by species groups (kg/capita)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, other</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demersal fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 31
**Cayman Islands – Yearly seafood imports by main commodities (tonnes, product weight)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, frozen, nei</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps, prawns, prepared or preserved, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, fresh or chilled, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouts and chars, fresh or chilled</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunas, fresh or chilled, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps and prawns, not cooked, frozen</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardines, sardinellas, brisling or sprats, frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunas prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmons, fresh or chilled, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmonoids, fresh or chilled, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish nei, salted or in brine</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octopus, frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 32
**Cuba – Landings (tonnes)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue tilapia</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5 059</td>
<td>18 663</td>
<td>3 670</td>
<td>3 464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean spiny lobster</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>8 000</td>
<td>8 000</td>
<td>10 567</td>
<td>7 957</td>
<td>7 478</td>
<td>5 725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel catfish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2 276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater fishes nei</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>10 216</td>
<td>4 501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fishes nei</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5 000</td>
<td>28 329</td>
<td>25 862</td>
<td>22 676</td>
<td>6 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver carp</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 315</td>
<td>17 530</td>
<td>20 181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteleg shrimp</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3 697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7 800</td>
<td>22 400</td>
<td>90 100</td>
<td>140 666</td>
<td>131 936</td>
<td>39 454</td>
<td>14 942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>9 800</td>
<td>30 400</td>
<td>103 300</td>
<td>185 194</td>
<td>187 117</td>
<td>101 129</td>
<td>60 895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 33
**Cuba – Yearly seafood imports by main commodities (tonnes, product weight)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fish, frozen, nei</td>
<td>5 090</td>
<td>2 733</td>
<td>10 066</td>
<td>21 790</td>
<td>49 666</td>
<td>35 516</td>
<td>13 010</td>
<td>18 119</td>
<td>20 618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuttlefish and squid, other than live, fresh or chilled</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>6 106</td>
<td>9 089</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>10 809</td>
<td>10 750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackerels nei, frozen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3 956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardines, sardinellas, brisling or sprats, prep. or pres.</td>
<td>1 490</td>
<td>2 422</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>2 496</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>1 530</td>
<td>2 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunas prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>1 210</td>
<td>7 211</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>1 448</td>
<td>2 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish meals, nei</td>
<td>3 718</td>
<td>3 064</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livers, roes, milt, smoked, dried, salted or in brine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish nei, minced, prepared or preserved</td>
<td>20 253</td>
<td>12 561</td>
<td>2 513</td>
<td>1 109</td>
<td>1 093</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hake nei, frozen</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>1 007</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mussels nei, other than live, fresh or chilled</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>2 294</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs and other aq. invertebrates, prep. or pres.</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octopus, other than live, fresh or chilled</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmons, smoked</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmonoids, frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific salmon, frozen, nei</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish waste, nei</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous molluscs, other than live, fresh or chilled</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardines, sardinellas, brisling or sprats, frozen</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunas nei, frozen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchovies, prepared or preserved, not minced</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps and prawns, frozen, nei</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10f</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crab meat nei, prepared or preserved</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oysters, live fresh or chilled, nei</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 34
**Cuba – Per capita consumption by species groups (kg/capita)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, other</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater and diadromous</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalopods</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelagic fish</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demersal fish</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs, excl. cephalopods</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 35
**Cuba – Trade flow, in terms of value (USD 1 000) and volume (tonnes, product weight)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Flow (USD 1 000)</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>87 226</td>
<td>79 431</td>
<td>92 273</td>
<td>64 578</td>
<td>88 517</td>
<td>73 097</td>
<td>68 648</td>
<td>81 000</td>
<td>79 731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-export Value</td>
<td>532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Value</td>
<td>43 005</td>
<td>37 387</td>
<td>29 088</td>
<td>36 165</td>
<td>51 556</td>
<td>51 413</td>
<td>39 443</td>
<td>49 188</td>
<td>66 390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Quantity</td>
<td>7 639</td>
<td>6 837</td>
<td>8 732</td>
<td>6 234</td>
<td>10 251</td>
<td>6 721</td>
<td>7 207</td>
<td>7 084</td>
<td>6 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-export Quantity</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Quantity</td>
<td>35 035</td>
<td>33 979</td>
<td>22 514</td>
<td>37 736</td>
<td>54 667</td>
<td>43 727</td>
<td>22 797</td>
<td>35 759</td>
<td>41 708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 36
**Dominica – Landings (tonnes)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackfin tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue marlin</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common dolphin fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fishes nei</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1 445</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipjack tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahoo</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowfin tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>600</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1 445</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>1 207</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 37
**Dominica – Per capita consumption by species groups (kg/capita)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pelagic fish</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demersal fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, other</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs, excl. cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater and diadromous</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 38
Dominica – Trade flow, in terms of value (USD 1,000) and volume (tonnes, product weight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Flow (USD 1,000)</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-export Value</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Value</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>1,551</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>1,964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Quantity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Quantity</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 39
Dominica – Yearly seafood imports by main commodities (tonnes, product weight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mackerel prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous dried fish, whether or not salted, nei</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunas prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cods, dried, salted or in brine</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilchards (Sardinops spp.), prep. or pres., not minced</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrings, smoked</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 40
Dominican Republic – Landings (tonnes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean spiny lobster</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>1,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groupers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fishes</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>2,382</td>
<td>4,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penaeus shrimps</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snappers, jobfishes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>1,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stromboid conchs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>5,120</td>
<td>1,778</td>
<td>1,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilapias</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>6,223</td>
<td>9,169</td>
<td>4,645</td>
<td>6,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>10,491</td>
<td>19,769</td>
<td>13,140</td>
<td>16,404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 41
Dominican Republic – Per capita consumption by species groups (kg/capita)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pelagic fish</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demersal fish</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, other</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs, excl. cephalopods</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater and diadromous fish</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalopods</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic animals, others</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 42
Dominican Republic – Yearly seafood imports by main commodities (tonnes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>2000 ‡</th>
<th>2001 ‡</th>
<th>2002 ‡</th>
<th>2003 ‡</th>
<th>2004 ‡</th>
<th>2005 ‡</th>
<th>2006 ‡</th>
<th>2007 ‡</th>
<th>2008 ‡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saithe, dried, salted or in brine</td>
<td>9 776</td>
<td>9 322</td>
<td>10 255</td>
<td>6 733</td>
<td>5 893</td>
<td>7 675</td>
<td>7 834</td>
<td>8 563</td>
<td>9 660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrings nei, smoked</td>
<td>7 002</td>
<td>7 310</td>
<td>9 932</td>
<td>7 240</td>
<td>5 818</td>
<td>6 979</td>
<td>5 530</td>
<td>5 578</td>
<td>5 675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, frozen, nei</td>
<td>885 1</td>
<td>1 067</td>
<td>2 695</td>
<td>2 369</td>
<td>2 857</td>
<td>4 127</td>
<td>4 554</td>
<td>2 806</td>
<td>4 632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, frozen, nei</td>
<td>762 6</td>
<td>627 7</td>
<td>763 5</td>
<td>522 4</td>
<td>542 7</td>
<td>783 1</td>
<td>1 120</td>
<td>1 043</td>
<td>3 408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardines, sardinellas, brisling or sprats, prep. or pres.</td>
<td>4 626</td>
<td>1 816</td>
<td>1 054</td>
<td>960 3</td>
<td>322 4</td>
<td>998 4</td>
<td>5 608</td>
<td>4 160</td>
<td>3 321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish nei, prepared or preserved, not minced</td>
<td>177 2</td>
<td>204 1</td>
<td>1 311</td>
<td>1 507</td>
<td>795 4</td>
<td>473 3</td>
<td>2 838</td>
<td>3 807</td>
<td>3 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunas prepared or preserved, in airtight container</td>
<td>– – –</td>
<td>– – –</td>
<td>– – –</td>
<td>– – –</td>
<td>– – –</td>
<td>– 1 468</td>
<td>– – 2 084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish meals, nei</td>
<td>228 2</td>
<td>299 121</td>
<td>81 50</td>
<td>718 1 261</td>
<td>1 719 1 459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilchards (Sardina spp.), prep. or pres., not minced</td>
<td>– 2 172</td>
<td>4 088</td>
<td>4 864</td>
<td>19 54 670</td>
<td>689 1 442</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps, prawns, prepared or preserved, nei</td>
<td>36 30</td>
<td>155 334</td>
<td>229 823</td>
<td>1 166</td>
<td>1 590 1 432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuttlefishes, frozen</td>
<td>20 19</td>
<td>342 500</td>
<td>663 884</td>
<td>1 076</td>
<td>1 035 1 389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuttlefish and squid, other than live, fresh or chilled</td>
<td>– 25 25</td>
<td>66 246</td>
<td>277 392</td>
<td>320 1 043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchovies, prepared or preserved, not minced</td>
<td>1 – –</td>
<td>– 52</td>
<td>– 38 72</td>
<td>818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific salmon, frozen, nei</td>
<td>29 32</td>
<td>56 369</td>
<td>484 811</td>
<td>825 487</td>
<td>793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, fresh or chilled, nei</td>
<td>100 138</td>
<td>492 799</td>
<td>1 107</td>
<td>2 395 2 474</td>
<td>1 278 730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunas prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>2 090 1 727</td>
<td>2 727</td>
<td>1 468</td>
<td>1 835</td>
<td>1 759 3 013</td>
<td>1 100 589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish, frozen, nei</td>
<td>– – –</td>
<td>– – –</td>
<td>– – –</td>
<td>– – –</td>
<td>– 200 526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps and prawns, frozen, nei</td>
<td>31 49</td>
<td>6 73 215</td>
<td>207 539</td>
<td>28 499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater fishes nei, frozen</td>
<td>– 0 0</td>
<td>– – –</td>
<td>– – –</td>
<td>– 111 310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish meat, whether or not minced, frozen, nei</td>
<td>– – –</td>
<td>81 25</td>
<td>60 32 70 297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs nei, prepared or preserved</td>
<td>65 16</td>
<td>8 186</td>
<td>207 301</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>658 225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackerel prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>– – 17 7 76</td>
<td>7 32 194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, dried, salted or in brine</td>
<td>34 70 138</td>
<td>36 37</td>
<td>138 58</td>
<td>121 193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish nei, minced, prepared or preserved</td>
<td>465 519</td>
<td>235 145</td>
<td>123 121</td>
<td>165 165</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 43
Dominican Republic – Trade flow, in terms of value (USD 1 000) and volume (tonnes, product weight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Flow (USD 1 000)</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>2 965</td>
<td>2 905</td>
<td>3 738 ‡</td>
<td>4 286 ‡</td>
<td>3 093 ‡</td>
<td>5 308 ‡</td>
<td>6 410 ‡</td>
<td>4 882 ‡</td>
<td>4 227 ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Value</td>
<td>52 992 ‡</td>
<td>57 099 ‡</td>
<td>71 875 ‡</td>
<td>57 377 ‡</td>
<td>67 572 ‡</td>
<td>94 992 ‡</td>
<td>108 223 ‡</td>
<td>102 195 ‡</td>
<td>140 418 ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export Quantity</td>
<td>1 907</td>
<td>2 178</td>
<td>1 884 ‡</td>
<td>2 043 ‡</td>
<td>1 493 ‡</td>
<td>1 615 ‡</td>
<td>1 454 ‡</td>
<td>1 195 ‡</td>
<td>1 206 ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Quantity</td>
<td>28 630 ‡</td>
<td>28 311 ‡</td>
<td>37 698 F</td>
<td>32 817 F</td>
<td>37 594 F</td>
<td>38 624 F</td>
<td>45 009 F</td>
<td>40 447 F</td>
<td>47 133 F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 44
Grenada – Landings (tonnes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic sailfish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfin tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common dolphin fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrotfishes nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red hind</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snappers, jobfishes nei</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowfin tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1 300</td>
<td>1 415</td>
<td>1 907</td>
<td>1 700</td>
<td>2 383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 45
Grenada – Per capita consumption by species groups (kg/capita)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pelagic fish</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, other</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demersal fish</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs, excl. cephalopods</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater and diadromous fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic animals, others</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 46
Grenada – Trade flow, in terms of value (USD 1 000) and volume (tonnes, product weight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Flow (USD 1 000)</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>3 408</td>
<td>4 052</td>
<td>3 863</td>
<td>3 258</td>
<td>3 086</td>
<td>3 517</td>
<td>3 734</td>
<td>4 115</td>
<td>2 957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-export Value</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Value</td>
<td>2 181</td>
<td>2 556</td>
<td>2 557</td>
<td>2 550</td>
<td>2 676</td>
<td>2 965</td>
<td>3 919</td>
<td>4 701</td>
<td>4 619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Quantity</td>
<td>1 143</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-export Quantity</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Quantity</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>1 228</td>
<td>1 191</td>
<td>1 310</td>
<td>1 555</td>
<td>1 406</td>
<td>1 121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 47
Grenada – Yearly seafood imports by main commodities (tonnes, product weight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous dried fish, whether or not salted, nei</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunas prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackerel prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilchards (Sardinops spp.), prep. or pres., not minced</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrings nei, smoked</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps and prawns, frozen, nei</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 48

**Haiti – Landings (tonnes)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spiny lobster</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater fishes nei</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine crabs nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fishes nei</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>2 800</td>
<td>3 600</td>
<td>4 500</td>
<td>3 500</td>
<td>4 750</td>
<td>7 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natantian decapods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stromboid conchs</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>4 000</td>
<td>5 000</td>
<td>5 150</td>
<td>6 200</td>
<td>10 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 49

**Haiti – Per capita consumption by species groups (kg/capita)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pelagic fish</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater and diadromous fish</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish. other</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demersal fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs. excl. cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 50

**Haiti – Trade flow, in terms of value (USD 1 000) and volume (tonnes, product weight)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Flow (USD 1 000)</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>3 969</td>
<td>3 868</td>
<td>4 449</td>
<td>4 130</td>
<td>3 586</td>
<td>4 269</td>
<td>3 818</td>
<td>5 029</td>
<td>4 875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Value</td>
<td>5 949</td>
<td>7 085</td>
<td>4 694</td>
<td>7 912</td>
<td>8 628</td>
<td>9 627</td>
<td>16 511</td>
<td>17 014</td>
<td>21 882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Quantity</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Quantity</td>
<td>9 054</td>
<td>11 005</td>
<td>6 660</td>
<td>8 856</td>
<td>10 426</td>
<td>9 432</td>
<td>13 535</td>
<td>14 484</td>
<td>15 079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 51
**Haiti – Yearly seafood imports by main commodities (tonnes, product weight)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>2000 †</th>
<th>2001 †</th>
<th>2002 †</th>
<th>2003 †</th>
<th>2004 †</th>
<th>2005 †</th>
<th>2006 †</th>
<th>2007 †</th>
<th>2008 †</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herrings nei, smoked</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>2887</td>
<td>3656</td>
<td>3859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack and horse mackerel, frozen</td>
<td>6134</td>
<td>6872</td>
<td>3559</td>
<td>3327</td>
<td>4349</td>
<td>2492</td>
<td>2428</td>
<td>3258</td>
<td>2580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alewife, dried, salted or in brine</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>2247</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>2104</td>
<td>2937</td>
<td>2304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish nei, prepared or preserved, not minced</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3214</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>1412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish, frozen, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackerel prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack and horse mackerel prepared or preserved</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>2392</td>
<td>2233</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, frozen, nei</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackerels nei, frozen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardines, sardinelas, brisling or sprats, prep. or pres.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack and horse mackerels, fresh or chilled</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchovies, prepared or preserved, not minced</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish roes, frozen, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic redfishes, frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red mullet, frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous dried fish, whether or not salted, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saithe, dried, salted or in brine</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, fresh or chilled, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunas prepared or preserved, in airtight container</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 52
**Jamaica – Landings (tonnes)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean spiny lobster</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater fishes nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giant river prawn</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fishes nei</td>
<td>5 000</td>
<td>8 500</td>
<td>8 500</td>
<td>9 000</td>
<td>7 000</td>
<td>4 508</td>
<td>9 475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nile tilapia</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3 364</td>
<td>4 500</td>
<td>5 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stromboid conchs nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6 000</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>3 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteleg shrimp</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>5 000</td>
<td>8 500</td>
<td>8 500</td>
<td>9 250</td>
<td>17 054</td>
<td>10 052</td>
<td>19 123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 53
**Jamaica – Per capita consumption by species groups (kg/capita)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish. other</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelagic fish</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater and diadromous fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs. excl. cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demersal fish</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic animals. others</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 54
Jamaica – Trade flow, in terms of value (USD 1 000) and volume (tonnes, product weight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Flow (USD 1 000)</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>10 001</td>
<td>11 817</td>
<td>5 531</td>
<td>8 177</td>
<td>7 411</td>
<td>9 545</td>
<td>10 820</td>
<td>8 442</td>
<td>8 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-export Value</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>1 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Value</td>
<td>51 608</td>
<td>59 693</td>
<td>58 193</td>
<td>59 323</td>
<td>59 737</td>
<td>76 796</td>
<td>81 110</td>
<td>94 406</td>
<td>102 792</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Quantity</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>1 352</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>1 241</td>
<td>1 467</td>
<td>1 601</td>
<td>1 116</td>
<td>1 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-export Quantity</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Quantity</td>
<td>23 363</td>
<td>27 672</td>
<td>28 398</td>
<td>28 886</td>
<td>28 472</td>
<td>30 633</td>
<td>32 342</td>
<td>35 605</td>
<td>30 895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 55
Jamaica – Yearly seafood imports by main commodities (tonnes, product weight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mackerel prepared or preserved, not minced</td>
<td>4 344</td>
<td>5 941</td>
<td>4 969</td>
<td>7 040</td>
<td>9 381</td>
<td>5 700</td>
<td>6 022</td>
<td>8 750</td>
<td>7 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, frozen, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5 273</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5 437</td>
<td>6 064</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5 634</td>
<td>6 702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous dried fish, whether or not salted,</td>
<td>5 443</td>
<td>5 692</td>
<td>5 541</td>
<td>5 771</td>
<td>5 752</td>
<td>5 990</td>
<td>5 814</td>
<td>5 713</td>
<td>6 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardines, sardinellas, brislng or sprats, prep. or</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 696</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 628</td>
<td>2 392</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 756</td>
<td>6 619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackerels nei, frozen</td>
<td>2 925</td>
<td>3 063</td>
<td>3 733</td>
<td>2 548</td>
<td>2 189</td>
<td>1 511</td>
<td>1 666</td>
<td>1 487</td>
<td>1 415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, frozen, nei</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>1 116</td>
<td>1 359</td>
<td>1 210</td>
<td>1 590</td>
<td>1 708</td>
<td>1 491</td>
<td>1 382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish, frozen, nei</td>
<td>4 864</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>6 517</td>
<td>6 461</td>
<td>1 547</td>
<td>1 399</td>
<td>10 980</td>
<td>5 347</td>
<td>1 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps and prawns, frozen, nei</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic mackerel, fresh or chilled</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunas prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish meals, nei</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>1 006</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish minced nei, prepared or preserved</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrings nei, smoked</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps, prawns, prepared or preserved, nei</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous marine fishes, salted or in brine</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 56
Netherlands Antilles – Landings (tonnes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bigeye tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 359</td>
<td>1 721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater fishes nei</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frigate tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 122</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fishes nei</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipjack tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10 008</td>
<td>6 436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stromboid conchs nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowfin tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5 441</td>
<td>7 351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>1 090</td>
<td>1 220</td>
<td>19 887</td>
<td>16 698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 57
**Netherlands Antilles – Per capita consumption by species groups (kg/capita)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pelagic fish</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, other</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demersal fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater and diadromous fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs, excl. cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic animals, others</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 58
**Netherlands Antilles – Trade flow, in terms of value (USD 1 000) and volume (tonnes, product weight)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Flow (USD 1 000)</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>5 693</td>
<td>5 948</td>
<td>5 278</td>
<td>9 162</td>
<td>9 987</td>
<td>5 261</td>
<td>6 260</td>
<td>6 172</td>
<td>21 670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Value</td>
<td>8 184</td>
<td>7 015</td>
<td>4 507</td>
<td>6 143</td>
<td>7 734</td>
<td>10 256</td>
<td>11 126</td>
<td>14 001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Quantity</td>
<td>7 326</td>
<td>7 924</td>
<td>6 603</td>
<td>8 319</td>
<td>9 305</td>
<td>5 488</td>
<td>5 973</td>
<td>4 553</td>
<td>11 880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Quantity</td>
<td>2 553</td>
<td>2 302</td>
<td>1 451</td>
<td>1 722</td>
<td>1 889</td>
<td>1 415</td>
<td>1 945</td>
<td>2 085</td>
<td>3 728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 59
**Netherlands Antilles – Yearly seafood imports by main commodities (tonnes, product weight)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous crustaceans, not frozen, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish meat, whether or not minced, frozen, nei</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunas prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, frozen, nei</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmonoids, fresh or chilled, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific salmon, frozen, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps and prawns, frozen, nei</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cods nei, dried whether or not salted</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish, frozen, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardines, sardinellas, brisling or sprats, prep. or pres.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, fresh or chilled, nei</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish nei, smoked</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans nei, prepared or preserved</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps, prawns, prepared or preserved, nei</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 60
**Saint Kitts and Nevis – Landings (tonnes)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean spiny lobster</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goatfishes, red mullets nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groupers nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrotfishes nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snappers nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stromboid conchs nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeonfishes nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>1 935</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>1 935</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 61
Saint Kitts and Nevis – Per capita consumption by species groups (kg/capita)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, other</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelagic fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demersal fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs, excl. cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater and diadromous fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 62
Saint Kitts and Nevis – Trade flow, in terms of value (USD 1 000) and volume (tonnes, product weight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Flow (USD 1 000)</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-export Value</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Value</td>
<td>2 807</td>
<td>2 063</td>
<td>1 946</td>
<td>1 862</td>
<td>2 654</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>4 114</td>
<td>3 927</td>
<td>3 538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Quantity</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-export Quantity</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Quantity</td>
<td>1 157</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>1 212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 63
Saint Kitts and Nevis – Yearly seafood imports by main commodities (tonnes, product weight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fish, frozen, nei</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, fresh or chilled, nei</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous dried fish, whether or not salted</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps and prawns, frozen, nei</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrings nei, frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, frozen, nei</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish meat, whether or not minced, frozen</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toothfish (Dissostichus spp.), fillets, frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadiformes, salted or in brine, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunas prepared or preserved, not minced,</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish nei, minced, prepared or preserved</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 64
Saint Lucia – Landings (tonnes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackfin tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common dolphin fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyingfishes nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fishes nei</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipjack tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahoo</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowfin tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1 419</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>1 856</td>
<td>1 713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 65
Saint Lucia – Per capita consumption by species groups (kg/capita)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pelagic fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, other</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demersal fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs, excl. cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater and diadromous fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 66
Saint Lucia – Trade flow, in terms of value (USD 1 000) and volume (tonnes, product weight)

#### Trade Flow (USD 1 000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-export Value</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Value</td>
<td>4 795</td>
<td>4 147</td>
<td>4 237</td>
<td>5 065</td>
<td>5 618</td>
<td>5 988</td>
<td>6 319</td>
<td>6 810</td>
<td>8 338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Trade Flow (tonnes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Quantity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-export Quantity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Quantity</td>
<td>1 243</td>
<td>1 134</td>
<td>1 321</td>
<td>1 515</td>
<td>1 943</td>
<td>2 649</td>
<td>1 830</td>
<td>1 844</td>
<td>1 867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 67
Saint Lucia – Yearly seafood imports by main commodities (tonnes, product weight)

#### Commodity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tunas prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous dried fish, whether or not salted, nei</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, frozen, nei</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, frozen, nei</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps and prawns, frozen, nei</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrings nei, smoked</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous marine fishes, salted or in brine, nei</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackerel prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilchard, canned</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish meat, whether or not minced, frozen, nei</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps, prawns, prepared or preserved, nei</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmons, smoked</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scallops, other than live, fresh or chilled</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mussels nei, other than live, fresh or chilled</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crabs nei, frozen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 68
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines – Landings (tonnes)

#### Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albacore</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic bonito</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigeye tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>1 216</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fishes nei</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1 158</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipjack tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuna-like fishes nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowfin tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1 989</td>
<td>2 547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 739</td>
<td>23 042</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>8 966</td>
<td>27 694</td>
<td>3 828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 69
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines – Per capita consumption by species groups (kg/capita)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pelagic fish</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, other</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demersal fish</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs, excl. cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater and diadromous fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 70
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines – Trade flow, in terms of value (USD 1 000) and volume (tonnes, product weight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-export Value</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Value</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>1,889</td>
<td>2,033</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>2,523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Quantity</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-export Quantity</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Quantity</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 71
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines – Yearly seafood imports by main commodities (tonnes, product weight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous dried fish, whether or not salted, nei</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardines, sardinellas, brislings or sprats, prep. or pres.</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunas prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps and prawns, frozen, nei</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cods, yevis, salted or in brine</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic herring, smoked</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish nei, minced, prepared or preserved</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 72
Trinidad and Tobago – Landings (in tonnes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demersal percomorphs</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>1,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacks, crevalles nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>1,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King mackerel</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fishes nei</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>7,045</td>
<td>6,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penaeus shrimps nei</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serra Spanish mackerel</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>1,722</td>
<td>1,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowfin tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>4,992</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>1,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>4,461</td>
<td>12,364</td>
<td>14,259</td>
<td>13,833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 73
**Trinidad and Tobago – Per capita consumption by species groups (kg/capita)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pelagic fish</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, other</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demersal fish</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustaceans</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater and diadromous fish</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs, excl. cephalopods</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 74
**Trinidad and Tobago – Trade flow, in terms of value (US$ 1 000) and volume (tonnes, product weight)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Flow (US$ 1 000) 2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>10 612</td>
<td>10 475</td>
<td>11 436</td>
<td>9 976</td>
<td>6 894</td>
<td>8 646</td>
<td>9 983</td>
<td>8 718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-export Value</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5 6</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Value</td>
<td>7 066</td>
<td>8 726</td>
<td>11 758</td>
<td>12 063</td>
<td>13 729</td>
<td>21 990</td>
<td>19 443</td>
<td>25 655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export Quantity</td>
<td>4 361</td>
<td>5 092</td>
<td>5 076</td>
<td>4 007</td>
<td>3 091</td>
<td>3 217</td>
<td>6 472</td>
<td>3 920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-export Quantity</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Quantity</td>
<td>4 028</td>
<td>5 845</td>
<td>8 619</td>
<td>7 044</td>
<td>8 323</td>
<td>12 844</td>
<td>8 806</td>
<td>9 090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 75
**Trinidad and Tobago – Yearly seafood imports by main commodities (tonnes, product weight)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous dried fish, whether or not salted, nei</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>2 054</td>
<td>1 636</td>
<td>1 314</td>
<td>1 386</td>
<td>1 566</td>
<td>1 539</td>
<td>1 606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish, frozen, nei</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>1 056</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>1 115</td>
<td>1 306</td>
<td>2 210</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>1 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunas prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>1 167</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1 616</td>
<td>1 137</td>
<td>1 091</td>
<td>968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardines, sardinellas, brisling or sprats, prep. or pres.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>1 134</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, frozen, nei</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albacore (=Longfin tuna), frozen, nei</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 066</td>
<td>1 139</td>
<td>4 046</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>1 564</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrings nei, smoked</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps and prawns, frozen, nei</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackeral prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps, prawns, prepared or preserved, nei</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon nei, not minced, prepared or preserved</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharks nei, frozen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackerals nei, frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fish nei, minced, prepared or preserved</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic salmon and Danube salmon, frozen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish meat, whether or not minced, frozen, nei</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, dried, salted or in brine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molluscs and other aq. invertebrates, prep. or pres.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 76
**Turks and Caicos Islands – Landings (tonnes)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue marlin</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean spiny lobster</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater fishes nei</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine crabs nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine fishes nei</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stromboid conchs nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>4 200</td>
<td>3 200</td>
<td>5 540</td>
<td>5 693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowfin tuna</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 050</td>
<td>1 450</td>
<td>4 830</td>
<td>3 710</td>
<td>5 728</td>
<td>6 133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 77
Turks and Caicos Islands – Per capita consumption by species groups (kg/capita)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Molluscs, excl. cephalopods</th>
<th>Crustaceans</th>
<th>Marine fish, other</th>
<th>Pelagic fish</th>
<th>Freshwater and diadromous fish</th>
<th>Demersal fish</th>
<th>Cephalopods</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 78
Turks and Caicos Islands – Trade flow, in terms of value (USD 1 000) and volume (tonnes, product weight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Export Value</th>
<th>Import Value</th>
<th>Trade Flow (USD 1 000)</th>
<th>Export Quantity</th>
<th>Import Quantity</th>
<th>Trade Flow (tonnes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3 825</td>
<td>2 001</td>
<td>5 826</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3 978</td>
<td>2 154</td>
<td>6 132</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3 789</td>
<td>2 120</td>
<td>5 909</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3 499</td>
<td>2 316</td>
<td>5 815</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3 265</td>
<td>2 258</td>
<td>5 523</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>8 054</td>
<td>2 316</td>
<td>10 370</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>1221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>8 369</td>
<td>2 422</td>
<td>10 791</td>
<td>2 372</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>1254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7 366</td>
<td>2 372</td>
<td>9 738</td>
<td>1 896</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>1 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7 366</td>
<td>2 372</td>
<td>9 738</td>
<td>1 896</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>1 193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 79
Turks and Caicos Islands – Yearly seafood imports by main commodities (tonnes, product weight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fish meat, whether or not minced, frozen, nei</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps, prawns, prepared or preserved, nei</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps and prawns, frozen, nei</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, prep. or pres, incl. raw, coated in batter</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunas prepared or preserved, not minced, nei</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, frozen, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crabs, not frozen</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scallop, other than live, fresh or chilled</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toothfish (Dissostichus spp.), fillets, frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squids nei, frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saithe (=Pollock), frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps and prawns, peeled, frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squids (Ommastrephes sagittatus, Loligo spp.), frozen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish fillets, fresh or chilled, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmons, fresh or chilled, nei</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A regional shellfish hatchery for
the Wider Caribbean
Assessing its feasibility and sustainability

FAO Regional Technical Workshop
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Kingston, Jamaica

It is widely recognized that the development of aquaculture in the Wider Caribbean Region is inhibited, in part, by the lack of technical expertise, infrastructure, capital investment and human resources. Furthermore, seed supply for native species relies, for the most part, on natural collection, subject to natural population abundance with wide yearly variations. This situation has led to the current trend of culturing more readily available exotic species, but with a potentially undesirable impact on the natural environment. The centralizing of resources available in the region into a shared facility has been recommended by several expert meetings over the past 20 years. The establishment of a regional hatchery facility, supporting sustainable aquaculture through the seed production of native molluscan species was discussed at the FAO workshop “Regional shellfish hatchery: A feasibility study” held in Kingston, Jamaica, in October 2010, by representatives of Caribbean Governments and experts in the field. Molluscan species are particularly targeted due to their culture potential in terms of known techniques, simple grow-out technology and low impact on surrounding environment. It is proposed that a regional molluscan hatchery would produce seed for sale and distribution to grow-out operations in the region as well as provide technical support for the research on new species. The current document summarizes the findings of the workshop and outlines four follow-up recommendations on steps required for the successful implementation of a regional facility. The positive response of participating Caribbean Governments demonstrates the current political will for sustainable aquaculture growth in the region, supported by several national plans including the Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism Strategic Plan.