



Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism

ISSN: 1995 – 1132

CRFM Technical & Advisory Document Series
Number 2022 / 03

**REPORT OF THE EIGHTH MEETING OF THE
CRFM / CARICOM FISHERIES AND
AQUACULTURE PRIORITY COMMODITY
WORKING GROUP (FISHCOM WG)**

09 March 2022

CRFM Secretariat
2022

CRFM Technical & Advisory Document - Number 2022 / 03

Report of the Eighth Meeting of the CRFM/CARICOM Fisheries and Aquaculture Priority Commodity Working Group (FISHCOM WG)

www.crfm.int

www.youtube.com/TheCRFM

www.facebook.com/CarFisheries

www.twitter.com/CaribFisheries

CRFM Secretariat
Belize, 2022

CRFM TECHNICAL & ADVISORY DOCUMENT – Number 2022 / 03

Report of the Eighth Meeting of the CRFM/CARICOM Fisheries and Aquaculture Priority Commodity Working Group (FISHCOM WG)

@ CRFM 2022

All rights reserved.

Reproduction, dissemination and use of material in this publication for educational or non-commercial purposes are authorized without prior written permission of the CRFM, provided the source is fully acknowledged. No part of this publication may be reproduced, disseminated or used for any commercial purposes or resold without the prior written permission of the CRFM.

Correct Citation:

CRFM, 2022. Report of the Eighth Meeting of the CRFM/CARICOM Fisheries and Aquaculture Priority Commodity Working Group (FISHCOM WG). *CRFM Technical & Advisory Document*, No. 2022 / 03. 15pp.

ISSN: 1995-1132

ISBN: 978-976-8293-66-4

Published by the Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism Secretariat,
Belize and St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	V
1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION	1
2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA	1
3. REVIEW OF REPORT OF THE SEVENTH MEETING	1
4. REVISED MANDATE OF THE MINISTERIAL TASK FORCE ON AGRICULTURE	3
5. INVENTORY OF INITIATIVES ADDRESSING MARINE FISH AND AQUACULTURE COMMODITIES AND WORK PLAN	3
6. FISHCOM WG WORK PLAN 2022	8
7. REVIEW OF THE FISHCOM WG TERMS OF REFERENCE	10
8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.....	12
9. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING	12
Appendix 1: List of Meeting Participants	13
Appendix 2: Draft Agenda	15

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AHFS	Agricultural Health and Food Safety
BDTG	Business Development Thematic Group
CABA	Caribbean Agri-Business Association
CAHFSA	Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CARISEC	CARICOM Secretariat
CCCFP	Caribbean Community Common Fisheries Policy
CC4FISH	Climate Change Adaptation of the Eastern Caribbean Fisheries Sector project
CDB	Caribbean Development Bank
CFO	Chief Fisheries Officer
COTED	Council for Trade and Economic Development
CPSO	CARICOM Private Sector Organization
CRFM	Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism
CROSQ	CARICOM Regional Organisation for Standards and Quality
EDF	European Development Fund
FAD	Fish Aggregating Device
FISHCOM WG	CRFM/CARICOM Fisheries and Aquaculture Priority Commodity Working Group
HACCP	Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point
HoG	Heads of Government
SPS	Sanitary and Phyto-sanitary
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats
ToR	Terms of Reference
WGA	Working Group on Sustainable Aquaculture

AGENDA ITEM 1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

1. The meeting was called to order at approximately 1:35 p.m., and following welcome remarks by the CRFM Secretariat's Deputy Executive Director, Dr. Sandra Grant, and the Chief Fisheries Officer of the Fisheries Division, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Mrs. Jennifer Cruickshank-Howard, Chairperson for the Meeting, participants introduced themselves.
2. The list of the Meeting's participants follows. Fourteen participants (6 males and 8 females) representing six CRFM Member States, the CARICOM Secretariat, and the CRFM Secretariat attended the Meeting. Participants' full contact information is provided in [Appendix 1](#).
 1. Jennifer Cruickshank-Howard (Fisheries Division, St. Vincent & the Grenadines);
 2. Ranjit Soekhradj (Fisheries Department, Suriname);
 3. Nigel Durrant (CARICOM Secretariat);
 4. Kurt Hilton (Fisheries Division, Dominica);
 5. Denzil Roberts (Fisheries Department, Guyana);
 6. Sarita Williams-Peter (Department of Fisheries, Saint Lucia);
 7. Kris Isaacs (Fisheries Division, St. Vincent & the Grenadines);
 8. Candice Webb (Department of Marine Resources, The Bahamas);
 9. Ervanna Moss-Rolle (Department of Marine Resources, The Bahamas);
 10. Sandra Grant (CRFM Secretariat);
 11. Maren Headley (CRFM Secretariat);
 12. Peter A. Murray (CRFM Secretariat);
 13. Rochelle Staine (CRFM Secretariat); and
 14. Pamela Gibson (CRFM Secretariat).

AGENDA ITEM 2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

3. The Chairperson drew the Meeting's attention to the draft agenda and enquired if there were any modifications. No changes were proposed. The agenda was adopted as presented on a motion moved by S. Williams-Peter (Saint Lucia) and seconded by D. Roberts (Guyana). The agenda is given in [Appendix 2](#).

AGENDA ITEM 3. REVIEW OF REPORT OF THE SEVENTH MEETING

S. Grant gave a brief overview of the Report of the Seventh Meeting of the FISHCOM WG, which was held on 03 March 2021. She noted that coming out of the Seventh Meeting's deliberations were fifteen recommendations. Of these recommendations, numbers 7, 11 and 14 shown below were further elaborated at this Meeting¹.

¹ The remaining recommendations, not cited here, are documented in the Report of the Seventh Meeting of the FISHHCOM WG.

RECOMMENDATION	STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION
<p><i>Recommendation 7: Consideration should be given to: how to engage stakeholders on a wider basis; what sort of activities would have to be in place; and the kind of recording mechanism required to keep track of what was happening at the national level and adopt that as one of the modes by which this Working Group operate going forward.</i></p>	<p>There were several projects and initiatives taking place in the region involving various organizations and there was a need to keep track of these activities and to assess how they fed into the goal and mandate of the FISHCOM WG.</p>
<p><i>Recommendation 11: CRFM Secretariat, as the coordinator of the FISHCOM WG, would assume responsibility for the inventory of projects and would prepare a form for agencies to complete, so that the inventory could be developed. The draft form could be circulated to FISHCOM WG members for inputs, after which it would be sent to institutions for completion.</i></p>	<p>The form was distributed, and responses were received from only five Member States. The information provided by Member States, along with information gathered through one-on-one interviews and desktop reviews was compiled and analyzed and the inventory, which will be presented later in the Meeting, developed.</p>
<p><i>Recommendation 14: Ms. Dominique Lockhart (Project Lead, Seaweed Aquaculture Pilot Programme, The Bahamas) could be invited to participate in the Business Development Thematic Group. She could also liaise with Caribbean Export which should be able to provide business development information and support (regional brand/label concept).</i></p>	<p>This was still a possibility and will be discussed later.</p>

Discussion

4. Reference was made to the other recommendations not highlighted in the presentation and a query raised as to whether there was an action plan to address these. It was explained that Recommendation 1 was implemented, as the Sixth Meeting report was adopted. Recommendations 2-6 referred to the Working Group on Aquaculture (WGA); it was expected that these recommendations would be addressed at a meeting of the WGA, which would be possibly held mid to late April 2022. The final set of recommendations were in relation to sharing

information and lessons learned with a wider group of stakeholders and Ms. Lockhart's proposal², which would be discussed later in the Meeting.

Recommendation 1: *The Report of the Seventh Meeting of the FISHCOM WG was accepted as presented.*

AGENDA ITEM 4. REVISED MANDATE OF THE MINISTERIAL TASK FORCE ON AGRICULTURE

5. This item was presented by S. Grant. She reminded the Meeting that the Thirty-second Intersessional Meeting of the CARICOM Heads of Government (HoG) held in February 2021 had approved the establishment of a Special Ministerial Task Force on Food Production and Food Security to guide the transformation of the Regional Agri-Food sector. The recently concluded Thirty-third Intersessional Meeting of the HoG (01-02 March 2022), produced a document and way forward for agriculture for the region, and this was expected to guide the work of the CARICOM commodities and thematic groups. The recent HoG's directive to Member States for a 25% reduction in the regional food import bill by 2025, was highlighted.
6. In keeping with the new mandate, the FISHCOM WG was expected to focus on development of fish and fish products priority commodities in the context of reducing the regional food import bill, while giving particular attention to: SPS and trade related policies, increased production and productivity; market-driven production and intelligence, cross-border production and investments, climate smart agriculture/ fisheries; regional food and nutrition security status; coordination and governance mechanism; digitization of the sector; and de-risking and financial literacy of the regional agriculture sector. It was noted that in the document presented by the HoGs, only St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, and Guyana expressed an intent to use fish and fish products to reduce their food import bill, whether by increasing exports and decreasing imports or through value addition to reduce imports of processed fish.

AGENDA ITEM 5. INVENTORY OF INITIATIVES ADDRESSING MARINE FISH AND AQUACULTURE COMMODITIES AND WORK PLAN

7. S. Grant presented this item. She made reference to the new mandate of the thematic groups as well as the recommendation of the Seventh FISHCOM WG Meeting that the CRFM Secretariat should develop an inventory of initiatives addressing marine fish and aquaculture commodities development. A questionnaire to gather information on the various activities across Member

² Ms. Dominique Lockhart of The Bahamas presentation on developing a successful regional branding concept that was globally competitive for seaweed aquaculture development initiative.

States was developed and circulated. Five Member States responded to the questionnaire. The questionnaire responses and information gathered from one-on-one interviews were furthered augmented with desktop reviews of priority fish commodities and specific policy priorities; fisheries commodity development – value chain analysis, value addition, fisheries development for the marine and aquaculture sectors; food safety standards – food safety legislation, testing for trade, and SPS standards for fish processing establishments; and consultancy reports to inform development of the inventory (reference document – *FISHCOM WG 08-04*). S. Grant then highlighted the main points of the document.

8. The review showed that the four most valuable commodity groups being imported into the region were cereals, meat, vegetables, and fish and fish products. In terms of the trade in fish and fish products, some Member States were net exporters, but most Member States exported unprocessed fish and imported processed fish. A SWOT analysis of barriers to the trade of fish³ identified inadequate food safety standards as a weakness and by extension the level of completeness of SPS measures along the fish value chain for export/domestic markets as a threat. However, there were opportunities to promote high-value fish products and value addition; and build capacity to meet international and regional food safety standards.
9. There were five regional projects addressing fish value addition/preparation which were either ongoing or had been recently completed, but for which the reports were not yet ready. It was anticipated that these reports, when they become available, would provide a wealth of information that could help to inform the way forward for the FISHCOM WG.
10. Some strides had been made in improving food safety standards: two regional model legislation – a Draft Model Aquatic Animal Health Bill and a Draft Model Aquatic Food Safety Legislation – were being reviewed by the CARICOM Secretariat Legal Unit. A preliminary final draft of the legislation was with CRFM for review, and once CRFM's feedback was incorporated the bill would be ready for wider circulation. A Regional Policy on Animal Health and Food Safety had also been developed by CAHFSA. These policies and legislations were intended to assist Member States to move forward with animal and food safety measures. The next step, after the finalization of the legislation, would be to get Member States to adapt the legislation to their specific national situations, as only a limited number of Member States had appropriate food safety standards articulated in existing legislation.
11. In terms of testing for trade, seventeen laboratories had been identified in the CRFM region, only four of which had been accredited. Under the 11th EDF SPS project, two laboratories (one each in Grenada and Belize) have been upgraded to enable testing of fish products for export and the

³ CANARI Policy Brief 27

necessary steps to be taken towards accreditation identified. CRFM has produced one manual on testing fish products and another on laboratory quality assurance. CROSQ was also in the process of developing a regional laboratory policy for CARICOM. In terms of SPS standards for fish processing establishments, 85 processing facilities had been identified (not including Jamaica, Haiti, and Dominica) and of these only 11 were HACCP certified. CRFM has developed [six manuals](#) and one protocol on seafood safety and, as part of the 11th EDF SPS Project, was providing training/capacity building to two processing plants. An important ‘*take-away*’ from the capacity building exercise was the need to mainstream the involvement of fish processors into the dialogue on SPS.

Discussion

12. In terms of the patterns of trade, traditionally the region exported high value species (lobster, shrimp, conch, etc.) and imported lower cost products. This trend may be changing a little, as an increasing amount of high-priced and well-packaged regional fish products, with all the relevant trade and product information, was being made available to consumers. Efforts in this direction should be encouraged and sustained.
13. There was a marked difference in the preparation and presentation of products on the domestic market compared to imported products. As incomes rise and additional segments of the market opened up (including tourism), it will become necessary to match types of preparation, and presentation of fishery products, to ensure comparability with imported products. This aspect (preparation/ packaging) should be addressed if the region is to move up the value chain in fish production. The production operation has to be transformed, assuming access to capital, to adequately compete with the imported product. Reference was made to the 11th EDF SPS project and the emphasis on ensuring that the standards for products for local consumption in general should be comparable to export products. Likewise, preparation and presentation of products for the domestic market should be comparable to imported products, such that consumers are not bias towards imported products.
14. In relation to the SWOT analysis presented, it was important to highlight the inadequacy of infrastructure and/or operating space as a barrier to achieving commodity goals. Management and governance in support of the upkeep of proper infrastructure, where it existed, was also critical.
15. A query was raised regarding a way forward to reduce imports in a scenario where local production is insufficient to meet the domestic demand. By way of response, it was suggested that value addition and improved marketing of local products could serve to contribute to import substitution. Bearing in mind earlier interventions regarding infrastructure, etc., the entire value chain needs to be improved with the concomitant investment.

16. With regard to the model fisheries legislation, experience has shown a hesitancy to pass legislation unless there was a clear national policy addressing the subject (e.g., SPS) that would support the legislation and a demonstrated readiness to be able to implement the legislation. Given this reluctance to develop and pass legislation without systems being in place to facilitate implementation, consideration would need to be given to the content of the legislation and the assistance that Member States would require to implement the legislation.
17. The Meeting was advised that the COTED has given a regional policy direction in terms of SPS, but decisions made at the regional level had not necessarily been translated into national policy. The issue of readiness to implement legislation was recognized as one which needs to be considered by all stakeholders and should possibly be addressed with officials further up the CARICOM hierarchy. Member States should also be urged to ensure that the necessary structures to facilitate readiness to institute the model legislation are in place.
18. It was also suggested that a closer working relationship between the fisheries sector and the Veterinary Departments/Environmental Health Departments was needed, as there was a gap between how animal meat and fish were dealt with in terms of inspections and food safety. This need for collaboration should be articulated in country policy, so as to lift the profile of fisheries given its importance as a food source.
19. Member States may be experiencing capacity challenges in terms of the agencies/departments dealing with fisheries food safety issues. It was further noted that even at the regional level, where there was strong expertise in SPS, this was specific to plant/meat, quarantine, etc., and did not appear to address fisheries food safety issues fully. The efforts through the 10th & 11th EDF SPS projects were seeking to bridge the gap. Dialogue at the national level that could translate into action at the national level and direction at the regional level is needed.
20. Regarding the upgrading and accreditation of laboratories to enable testing of fish products for export, as well as for domestic consumption, it was noted that accreditation was extremely important, particularly for exports. All Member States should work towards having accredited laboratories, making use of opportunities for upgrading and accreditation through externally-funded projects, when and where possible. It was pointed out that the cost of upgrading and maintaining a laboratory for testing can be significant and must be assessed in terms of cost-effectiveness (per unit value). Reference was made to the ongoing 11th EDF SPS project and the recommendation of having a network of laboratories with specialized testing capacity residing in each of the laboratories, such that the entire range of required tests could be undertaken, without every Member State having the burden of maintaining individual national laboratories that each offer all the required tests.

21. Reference was made to the draft regional policy on animal health and food safety being developed and concern was expressed that fish could possibly be subsumed under animal (livestock) health, and therefore not be given the special attention it required. As such, it was suggested that consideration could be given to developing a regional policy specific to fish and fish products. It was opined that the suggestion may have merit; however, the Meeting was reminded that a Draft AHFS Policy and Action Plan, which was meant to incorporate fishery and fishery products, had been developed and was being taken through the CARICOM review process. Regarding the policy direction, the FISHCOM WG may wish to consider this some more and determine if a special case can be made for fisheries.

22. The Meeting was reminded that CRFM had prepared regional guidelines for FAD management, and these guidelines were used to develop draft national FAD policies. It was suggested that perhaps similar regional guidelines for SPS, which took account of the nuances of fisheries, could be provided that could inform drafting of national fisheries SPS policies. At the regional level, more attention should be given to fisheries and fisheries matters with regards to SPS that could help other agencies to understand the nuances of fisheries, which were not necessarily incorporated into traditional SPS products. It was pointed out that while the peculiarities of fishing were not well understood, the FISHCOM WG would need to determine if it wished to advance and defend a recommendation that was at variance to the regional policy direction. This caution was noted, however, the need for fisheries to be given special attention because of the nature of its operations, which include aquatic and terrestrial components and involve numerous actors, particularly fishers, from habitat to consumption, was reiterated. It was further noted that even if fisheries were included in an overall framework, there were certain issues that were peculiar to fish that must be highlighted in policy so that resources could be made available to support implementation of processes that would advance the interest of fisheries and ensure optimum economic benefits, as well consumer health. Based on the discussions, it was proposed that consideration be given to developing an AHFS policy specific to fisheries and aquaculture for the region, this especially given that a regional policy direction was already being enunciated. There were no objections from Member States present to this recommendation.

23. The importance of fishery sector stakeholders making themselves known to ensure that opportunities are given to make themselves heard (e.g., at COTED) was noted. Efforts should be made to ensure adequate representation of organizations along the entire value chain; this may require expansion of membership of national fisherfolk organizations to include processors and other stakeholders and not just boat owners and fishers. The challenge was getting actors (processors, etc.) further up the value chain to understand the need to be a part of this directional shift, maybe through networking of primary producers' organizations among processors, retailers, and the like. There may be need for an incremental process that could start with exchanges

between the primary producers and processors of ideas/issues that might eventually lead to the broader representation of the sector at the policy-making level.

Recommendation 2: *Consideration should be given to developing closer working relationships between the national fisheries sector and the Veterinary Departments/Environmental Health Departments and other departments and agencies responsible for Animal Health and Food Safety and this need for collaboration should be articulated in country policy, to lift the profile of fisheries given its importance as a food source.*

Recommendation 3: *Consideration be given to developing a fisheries and aquaculture specific AHFS policy for the region, mindful of the regional policy direction already being enunciated. The CRFM Secretariat, under the direction of the Deputy Executive Director, will begin to examine how the recommendation could be implemented.*

AGENDA ITEM 6. FISHCOM WG WORK PLAN 2022

24. S. Grant presented this item. In keeping with the HoG's directive of 25% reduction in the food import bill by 2025, proposed areas of focus for the FISHCOM WG in 2022 include: improve fish food standards that meet international requirements; strengthen legal and regulatory frameworks to promote commodity development; and improve collaboration and partnerships for fish commodity development. Related activities include:
 1. promote investment supportive of adding value to fish commodity;
 2. promote standardized legislation, policies, and guidelines;
 3. build awareness of marine fish and aquaculture commodities; and
 4. mobilize resources to address research and production.
25. The work of the FISHCOM WG will focus heavily on building awareness of marine fish and aquaculture commodities and to this end WG members were encouraged to study the review of the SPS roadmap developed by Nexus under the 11th EDF SPS project.
26. In terms of resource mobilization, a project proposal had been developed and submitted, through CARISEC, to Norway for funding consideration. CARISEC has advised that no feedback had been received from Norway and suggested that the proposal be submitted to Mexico's technical assistance program for consideration. The proposal was being revised to take into account the advancements made in terms of commodity development by other regional projects such as CC4FISH, prior to its submission to Mexico, as well as other possible donors.

Discussion

27. Regarding the interaction with processors, it was noted that there was need to involve persons from the industry in the dialogue on commodity development, who could speak to technical issues related to product preparation, packaging, marketing, funding, investment, etc., that could guide the FISHCOM WG interventions.

28. Reference was made to the theory of change presented which spoke to building awareness of fish and aquaculture commodities as part of the work programme and knowledge sharing and it was suggested that FISHCOM WG members and focal points (CFOs) could begin to examine how to commence that dialogue between the different stakeholder groups in-country. Perhaps as a first step to begin the dialogue, the FISHCOM WG, through the CRFM Secretariat, could try to arrange a virtual meeting with fish processors. Mindful that many processors began businesses without understanding all the requirements, regulations, resource management issues, port state requirements, etc., including them in the conversation with the primary producers as well as other actors along the value chain would provide a space for the processors' issues and concerns to be heard as well. It may be necessary to group the processors, as there were processors that were vertically integrated (owning vessels and operating processing plant) to better engage with them.

29. Regarding fisheries-specific food safety and related issues, it may be useful to have these spelt out as part of the policy framework. Given the apparent deficiencies in fisheries health and food safety matters, there needs to be a process to elaborate that and have it adopted by the region. Taking account of the COTED's direction regarding SPS, and the statement from the most recent HoGs intersessional meeting, a query was raised as to how difficult/challenging it would be getting a fisheries SPS policy through the CARICOM hierarchy and to what extent doing so would put an urgency on engagement with the other aspects of the value chain being discussed. In response, the need for the issue/problem to be documented was noted. There appeared to be some specific issues relating to health and food safety matters particularly with respect to the consumer end of the supply chain that needs to be properly spelt out; policies need to be developed and certain resources directed towards filling the gaps. If a consensus is reached at the level of the fisheries community, a proposal for the development of a policy to address the issues could be prepared. The issues/deficiencies would need to be clearly articulated and measures to address these gaps identified and set out as guidelines and standards that need to be adopted by Member States in order to help to bring the standards up to the level required on the regional and the export markets. More work needed to be done before this matter could be presented to COTED or the CRFM Ministerial Council. The Meeting was reminded that the CCCFP ([Caribbean Community Common Fisheries Policy](#)) stipulates that '*the objective is to facilitate the establishment of a regime for SPS for the fisheries sector*'; which was a clearly enunciated statement of policy direction and could be used as the basis for carrying the discussion forward.

30. The need to look at other possible funding sources for the FISHCOM WG project proposal was noted, and it was suggested that the CDB, which has recommitted to supporting agriculture, which includes fisheries, and Caribbean Export could be considered as possible sources of funding. The Meeting was also informed that the Business Development Thematic Group (BDTG) had advised that individuals/entities with proposals for investment support could direct these to the BDTG; this could also provide an opportunity for the FISHCOM WG to link with the fisheries private sector to facilitate these linkages and help to build networking capacity.

Recommendation 4: *FISHCOM WG/CRFM Secretariat to organize an engagement between primary producers, processors, retailers, etc. to discuss the issues related to fish and fishery products as a priority commodity within CARICOM, mindful of the variety of “levels” of stakeholders in the region.*

AGENDA ITEM 7. REVIEW OF THE FISHCOM WG TERMS OF REFERENCE

31. S. Grant presented this item. She drew the Meeting’s attention to sections of the FISHCOM WG Terms of Reference: 2.3.2 Terms of Reference – Bullet (6): *To provide guidance to inform revisions of the FISHCOM WG’s TOR and plan, as needed*; 2.2 Composition – 2.4.1 Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson – *The Chairperson shall be the Chairperson of the Ministerial Council. The Vice-chairperson shall be the Chairperson of the Caribbean Fisheries Forum*; and 2.4.2 Meetings – *Meetings shall be convened at least 4 times per year, and shall be electronic or site meetings, depending on schedules and funding.*
32. The Meeting was reminded that the Chairpersons of the Ministerial Council and the Forum changed annually as the chairmanship rotates among Member States. This meant that with each annual rotation, the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson of the FISHCOM WG also changed. Given that the FISHCOM WG is a technical working group requiring a certain level of flexibility to convene meetings and undertake activities and bearing in mind the challenges experienced in convening meetings chaired by the Minister, it was suggested that this section could be revised to include a list of core members of the FISHCOM WG from which a Chairperson could be selected. In terms of the number of meetings per year, a review of past FISHCOM WG meeting reports indicated a desire to reduce the number of meetings. Guidance on this was being sought from WG members.

Discussion

33. It was noted that the list of participants and members did not differ markedly from the list of core members shown in the presentation. The challenge was the rotation of the Chairmanship;

however, if the CARICOM approach was for Chairmanship of the Sub-Committee to be the same as Chairmanship at the larger level, then the FISHCOM WG would be constrained by that. With regard to the proposed list of core members, this could be justified as the current TORs made provision for the inclusion of representatives from regional organizations and industry representatives. Reference was made to Section 2.2 Composition (6) *2-4 industry representatives with experience and expertise in industry innovation*; and it was opined that this was an opportunity to bring the fish processors on board, bearing in mind the earlier discussion about engaging with them.

34. The need for private sector representation was reiterated and the inclusion of CABA (Caribbean Agri-Business Association) on the list was noted. It was suggested that the CPSO, the umbrella body for private sector organizations in the region, may be able to facilitate engagement with the private sector. Regarding chairmanship of the WG, it was opined that the arrangement was unwieldy and not necessarily conducive to the type of discussion the WG should engage in, although the FISHCOM WG could share the results of its deliberations with the Member States. It was further noted that the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson of the FISHCOM WG were the Chairperson of the Ministerial Council and the Chairperson of the Forum, which were from the same Member State. The FISHCOM WG Chairperson often delegated chairing of the meetings to the Vice-Chairperson, hence, with few exceptions the meetings of the FISHCOM WG have been chaired by the Chief Fisheries Officer/Director of Fisheries. However, rotation of the FISHCOM WG Chairperson did not allow for much continuity.
35. In terms of the number of FISHCOM WG meetings per year, it was suggested that four meetings of the full WG per year would be okay, with the understanding that meetings of a sub-committee of the WG or specialized meetings to discuss particular issues as they arise, could be convened. It was further suggested that there could be more inter-sessional meetings at the technical level and perhaps two meetings per year of the full Working Group.
36. In terms of a way forward it was proposed that FISHCOM WG request the CRFM Secretariat to, taking on board all the comments and suggestions regarding chairmanship of the WG, number of meetings per year, and FISHCOM WG membership, prepare a draft recommendation for circulation to this Meeting's participants for feedback; following which, it could be taken up the CRFM hierarchy. The suggestion was accepted. The difficulty in getting the necessary feedback sometimes was highlighted and it was pointed out that there would be ample opportunity for review as the aim should be to take the recommendation to the Special Ministerial Council Meeting in October.

Recommendation 5: *CRFM Secretariat to prepare draft recommendation, taking on board all the comments and suggestions regarding chairmanship of the WG, number of meetings per year, and*

FISHCOM WG membership, etc., for circulation to this Meeting's participants for feedback.

AGENDA ITEM 8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

37. No other business was discussed.

AGENDA ITEM 9. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

38. CRFM's Deputy Executive Director indicated that she did not have a date in mind for the next meeting but would welcome suggestions from participants. No date was proposed. The next meeting will be convened on a date to be determined. The Deputy Executive Director took the opportunity to thank everyone for their time and attention.
39. The Chairperson also thanked participants for taking the time to attend and for their useful contributions to the discussions.
40. There being no further interventions, the Chairperson wished all a good evening and adjourned the meeting at 4:08 p.m.

Appendix 1: List of Meeting Participants

Name & Designation	Address	Email Contact
Mrs. Jennifer Cruickshank-Howard Chief Fisheries Officer	Fisheries Division Bay Street, Kingstown ST. VINCENT & THE GRENADINES Tel: (784) 456-2738	fishdiv@gov.vc jencruickshankhoward@yahoo.com
Mr. Ranjit Soekhradj	Department of Fisheries Paramaribo SURINAME Tel: (597) 472-233 / 476-741	rsoekhradj@yahoo.com
Mr. Nigel Durrant Agricultural Trade Specialist	Office of Trade Negotiations (OTN) Caribbean Community (CARICOM) Secretariat Turkeyen, Georgetown GUYANA Tel: (592) 222-0001 to 75, ext 2258 / (592) 629-4275	Nigel.durrant@caricom.org Durrant.nigel@gmail.com
Mr. Kurt Hilton Fisheries Officer	Fisheries Division 2 nd Floor, Government Headquarters Dame Eugene Charles Boulevard, Roseau DOMINICA Tel: (767) 266-5291 / 266-5263	khiltonflo@gmail.com
Mr. Denzil Roberts Chief Fisheries Officer	Fisheries Department Ministry of Agriculture Regent and Vlissengen Roads Bourda, Georgetown GUYANA Tel: (592) 225-9559 / 225-9551	fisheriesguyana@gmail.com bertz99@yahoo.com
Mrs. Sarita Williams-Peter Chief Fisheries Officer	Department of Fisheries Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Physical Planning, Natural Resources and Co-operatives 5 th Floor, Sir Stanislaus James Bldg., Castries SAINT LUCIA Tel: (758) 468-4144	sarita.peter@govt.lc cfo@maff.egovt.lc chieffishslu@outlook.com smathurin@gosl.gov.lc secretary.fisheries@outlook.com
Mr. Kris Isaacs Senior Fisheries Officer	Fisheries Division Bay Street, Kingstown ST. VINCENT & THE GRENADINES Tel: (784) 456-2738	Kris.isaacs@yahoo.com
Ms. Candace Webb	Department of Marine Resources East Bay Street, Nassau THE BAHAMAS Tel: (242) 393-1777 Fax: 393-0238	candacewebb@bahamas.gov.bs
Ervanna Moss-Rolle, B.Sc Assistant Fisheries Officer	Research & Conservation Unit Department of Marine Resources East Bay Street, Nassau THE BAHAMAS Tel: (242) 393-1777 Fax: 393-0238	ervannamossrolle@bahamas.gov.bs
Dr. Sandra Grant Deputy Executive Director	CRFM Secretariat Princess Margaret Drive Belize City BELIZE Tel: (501) 223-4443	sandra.grant@crfm.int
Dr. Maren Headley Programme Manager, Fisheries Management and Development	CRFM Secretariat Top Floor, Corea's Building Halifax Street, Kingstown ST. VINCENT & THE GRENADINES Tel: (784) 457-3474	maren.headley@crfm.int

<p>Mr. Peter A. Murray Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development</p>	<p>CRFM Secretariat Princess Margaret Drive Belize City BELIZE Tel.: (501) 223-4443</p>	<p>peter.a.murray@crfm.int</p>
<p>Ms. Rochelle Staine Documentation Officer/Secretary</p>	<p>CRFM Secretariat Princess Margaret Drive Belize City BELIZE Tel.: (501) 223-4443</p>	<p>Rochelle.staine@crfm.int</p>
<p>Ms. Pamela Gibson Administrative Secretary (Meeting Rapporteur)</p>	<p>CRFM Secretariat Top Floor, Corea's Building Halifax Street, Kingstown ST. VINCENT & THE GRENADINES Tel.: (784) 457-3474</p>	<p>crfmsvg@crfm.int</p>

Appendix 2: Agenda

ITEM 1	Welcome and Introduction	1330 - 1335
ITEM 2	Adoption of Agenda	1335 - 1340
ITEM 3	Review of Report of Seventh Meeting	11340 - 1400
ITEM 4	Revised Mandate of the Ministerial Task Force on Agriculture	1400 - 1420
ITEM 5	Inventory of Initiatives Addressing Marine Fish and Aquaculture Commodities and Workplan	1420 - 1440
ITEM 6	FISHCOM WG Work Plan 2022 <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Marketing▪ Organization of the Private Sector	1440 - 1510
ITEM 7	Review of the FISHCOM WG Terms of Reference	1510 - 1530
ITEM 8	Any Other Business	1530 - 1540
ITEM 9	Date and time of next meeting	1540 - 1545

The CRFM is an inter-governmental organization whose mission is to “promote and facilitate the responsible utilization of the region’s fisheries and other aquatic resources for the economic and social benefits of the current and future population of the region”. The CRFM consists of three bodies – the Ministerial Council, the Caribbean Fisheries Forum and the CRFM Secretariat.

CRFM members are Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Montserrat, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, and the Turks and Caicos Islands.

CRFM Headquarters

secretariat@crfm.int

Tel: (501) 223-4443 - Fax: (501) 223-4446
Belize City - Belize

Eastern Caribbean Office

crfmsvg@crfm.int

Tel: (784) 457-3474 - Fax: (784) 457-3475
Kingstown - St. Vincent & the Grenadines

<https://crfm.int/>

www.youtube.com/TheCRFM

www.facebook.com/CarFisheries

www.twitter.com/CaribFisheries



Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism



www.crfm.int