



Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism

ISSN: 1995 – 1132

CRFM Technical & Advisory Document Series  
Number 2020 / 05

---

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

23 April 2020

---

CRFM Secretariat  
2020

# CRFM Technical & Advisory Document - Number 2020 / 05

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

[www.crfm.int](http://www.crfm.int)

[www.youtube.com/TheCRFM](https://www.youtube.com/TheCRFM)

[www.facebook.com/CarFisheries](https://www.facebook.com/CarFisheries)

[www.twitter.com/CaribFisheries](https://www.twitter.com/CaribFisheries)

CRFM Secretariat  
Belize, 2020

# **CRFM TECHNICAL & ADVISORY DOCUMENT – Number 2020 / 05**

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

*Copyright © CRFM 2020*

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, 2020. Report of the Fifth Meeting of the CRFM/CARICOM Fisheries and Aquaculture Priority Commodity Working Group (FISHCOM WG). *CRFM Technical & Advisory Document*, No. 2020 / 05. 21pp.

**ISSN: 1995-1132**

**ISBN: 978-976-8293-25-1**

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

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACP	African, Caribbean and Pacific states
BC	Business Cluster
BE:CLME+	Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities Through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus
CABA	Caribbean Agri-Business Association
CAF	Development Bank of Latin America
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CARISEC	CARICOM Secretariat
CDB	Caribbean Development Bank
CC4FISH	Climate Change Adaptation of the Eastern Caribbean Fisheries Sector Project
CFF	Caribbean Fisheries Forum
CFTDI	Caribbean Fisheries Training Institute
CLME+	Catalysing implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the sustainable management of shared Living Marine Resources in the Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystems
CNFO	Caribbean Network of Fisherfolk Organizations
COTED	Council for Trade and Economic Development
CRFM	Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism
CROSQ	Caribbean Regional Organisation for Standards and Quality
DOALAS	Division of Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea
EAF	Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries
EBM	Ecosystem Based Management
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FISHCOM WG	CRFM/CARICOM Fisheries and Aquaculture Priority Commodity Working Group
Fish4ACP	Intra ACP Blue Growth Program for sustainable fisheries and aquaculture value chains
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographic Information System
ICCAT	International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas
IICA	Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture
IMA	Institute of Marine Affairs
IW:LEARN	International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network
MCS	Monitoring, Control and Surveillance
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSC	Marine Stewardship Council
MSME	Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise
MSP	Marine Spatial Planning
NCD	Non-Communicable Disease
PPP	Public Private Partnership
RC	Research Cluster
R&D	Research and Development
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
SPS	Sanitary and Phyto-sanitary
SVG	St. Vincent and the Grenadines
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats
TOR	Terms of Reference

UNCTAD  
UNESCO-FTP

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development  
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization – Fisheries  
Training Programme

US  
UWI

United States  
University of the West Indies

## CONTENTS

<b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>1. CALL TO ORDER AND PRAYER .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. REGISTRATION OF ATTENDANCE &amp; INTRODUCTIONS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4. REVIEW OF MEETING DOCUMENTS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>5. REPORT OF FOURTH MEETING .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>6. COTED (AGRICULTURE) MEETING DECISIONS ON FISHCOM WG REPORT .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>7. REVIEW OF FISHERIES AND AQUACULTURE COMMODITY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES BEING PLANNED AND IN PROGRESS IN THE CARICOM REGION .....</b>	<b>6</b>
7(A) REPORT FROM CARICOM SECRETARIAT .....	6
a. <i>SPS Model Fisheries Legislation</i> .....	6
b. <i>Project proposal on regional and national industry assessment, strategic and implementation plans</i> .....	6
7(B) REPORTS FROM CRFM .....	6
a. <i>CRFM Working Group to Promote Sustainable Aquaculture Development</i> .....	6
b. <i>SPS Follow-up project (11<sup>th</sup> EDF SPS Project - Component 3 – Strengthening SPS capacity in the fisheries sector)</i> .....	8
c. <i>GEF Blue Growth project</i> .....	10
7(C) REPORTS FROM FAO .....	12
a. <i>FISH4ACP Project</i> .....	12
<b>8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING AND ADJOURNMENT .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2: ANNOTATED AGENDA .....</b>	<b>21</b>

## **1. CALL TO ORDER AND PRAYER**

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Marc Williams, Director, Department of Marine Resources, St. Kitts and Nevis, who served as Chairperson for the Meeting. S. Singh-Renton (CRFM Secretariat) led the Meeting in an opening prayer.

## **2. REGISTRATION OF ATTENDANCE & INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chairperson welcomed all to the meeting, introduced himself and offered apologies on behalf of his Minister, Hon. Eugene Hamilton, Chairperson of the CRFM Ministerial Council and Chairperson of the FISHCOM WG, who was unable to participate in the meeting. The Chairperson then invited participants to introduce themselves. The list of the Meeting's participants follows. Participants' full contact information is provided in Appendix 1.

1. Marc Williams (Director, Department of Marine Resources, St. Kitts & Nevis);
2. Thomas Nelson (Officer-in-Charge, Department of Fisheries, Saint Lucia);
3. Sharon Hutchinson (UWI);
4. Allister Glean (IICA);
5. Vassel Stewart (CABA);
6. Adrian LaRoda (CNFO);
7. Mauro Gongora (Belize) – Observer;
8. Denzil Roberts (Guyana) – Observer;
9. Courtney Cole (Jamaica) – Observer;
10. Avery Smikle (Jamaica) – Observer;
11. Alwyn Ponteen (Montserrat) – Observer;
12. Jennifer Cruickshank-Howard (St. Vincent & the Grenadines) - Observer
13. Elizabeth Mohammed (Trinidad & Tobago) – Observer;
14. Harnarine Lalla (Trinidad & Tobago) – Observer;
15. Keegan Slinger (Trinidad & Tobago) – Observer;
16. Kathy Lockhart (Turks & Caicos Islands) – Observer;
17. Yvette Diei Ouadi (FAO);
18. Iris Monnereau (FAO);
19. Susan Singh-Renton (CRFM Secretariat);
20. Peter A. Murray (CRFM Secretariat);
21. Pamela Gibson (CRFM Secretariat) – Rapporteur.

Following the introductions, S. Singh-Renton also welcomed all to the meeting and noted that this was the largest FISHCOM WG meeting to date. She said that the membership of the FISHCOM WG was fixed, but Member States' requests to participate were usually accommodated. She noted that several Member States had requested to participate in today's meeting. S. Singh-Renton then went through the Membership of the FISHCOM WG, noting that the Working Group was comprised of the Chair of the CRFM Ministerial Council (St. Kitts & Nevis); the Chair (St. Kitts & Nevis) and Deputy Chair (St. Lucia) of the Caribbean Fisheries Forum; the Chair of the CRFM Resource Mobilization Committee (Trinidad & Tobago); CRFM Senior Management Committee (Susan Singh-Renton & Peter A. Murray); UWI (Sharon Hutchinson); IICA (Allister Glean); CABA (Vassel Stewart). FAO was also represented at this meeting and the CNFO was also usually invited to participate so that there was industry representation at the meetings. Additional experts were also invited as needed.

### **3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

The Chairperson drew the meeting's attention to the draft annotated agenda and enquired if there were any proposed changes. No changes were proposed. A motion for the adoption of the agenda was moved by S. Singh-Renton (CRFM Secretariat) and seconded by T. Nelson (CFF/St. Lucia). The agenda is given at Appendix 2.

### **4. REVIEW OF MEETING DOCUMENTS**

The Chairperson presented the list of meeting documents, which included the:

- Meeting's Information Note (FISHCOM 05/01)
- Draft Annotated Agenda (FISHCOM 05/02)
- Approved FISHCOM WG TORs (FISHCOM 05/03)
- Report of the Fourth FISHCOM WG Meeting (FISHCOM 05/04)
- FISHCOM WG Report to COTED (FISHCOM 05/05)
- Report of CRFM Working Group to Promote Sustainable Aquaculture Development (FISHCOM 05/06)
- Report – 11<sup>th</sup> EDF SPS Project – Component 3.- Strengthening SPS Capacity on the Fisheries Sector (FISHCOM 05/07)
- Report on GEF Blue Growth Project – Promoting National Blue Economy Priorities through Marine Spatial Planning in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Plus (BE: CLME+) (FISHCOM 05/08)
- Logical Framework for Fish and Aquaculture Commodity Development (FISHCOM 05/09)
- Update – Sustainable Improvements in Caribbean Tuna Value Chains (FISHCOM 05/10).

### **5. REPORT OF FOURTH MEETING**

S. Singh-Renton presented this item. She referred to the relevant document (*FISHCOM 05/04*), and gave an overview of the report. S. Singh-Renton said that the fourth meeting of the FISHCOM WG took place on 03 July 2019. The usual membership was in attendance with the exception of CABA and the CNFO. The Working Group had been struggling to complete a few tasks in the inter-sessional period. The first of these tasks, which the Fourth Meeting had reviewed, was the preparation of a project proposal for Policy Framework(s) for Fisheries and Aquaculture Industries. The project proposal was finalized and submitted to CARISEC in March 2019 and the FISHCOM WG was apprised of this. The FISHCOM WG also considered and agreed to the publication of the Preliminary Industry Analysis as a CRFM Research Document. The CRFM Secretariat was working with Sharon Hutchinson, who had done the analysis, to have the document formatted for publication in keeping with CRFM Publication Guidelines. The WG had also agreed to consider options for the publication of the Preliminary Industry Analysis in another format suitable for wider circulation. This task remained to be done.

Commodity development briefs had been developed by national agencies and at least two regional agencies UWI (St. Augustine) and CABA had agreed to provide assistance in business planning support to CFTDI and St. Vincent and the Grenadines (SVG) in development of their priority commodities proposals. Due to various challenges, limited progress had been made, and this continues to be the case. S. Singh-Renton opined that given the difficulties, perhaps this idea should not be pursued at this time, since both CFTDI and SVG appeared to have moved on to other sources for support. The FAO representative at the time had suggested sharing of best practices and lessons learned from these efforts at the regional level when they became available. However, there had not been much progress with these national level initiatives. The Fourth Meeting also agreed that as several members were not present, the Report of the Third FISHCOM WG Meeting would be circulated for review and adoption by email.



The main business of the Fourth Meeting was to consider the establishment of two clusters – a Research Cluster and a Business Cluster. The Meeting considered background and rationale for these two clusters. The rationale for the clusters had been informed by two activities: the preliminary industry analysis undertaken by the FISHCOM WG and prepared by S. Hutchinson in 2018, and a CRFM Climate Change Impact Assessment Study completed in 2019. The rationale for the Research Cluster (RC) was based on the recognition that value chain research was not being undertaken in a sustainable way in the region. The main regional research institutions were not specializing in this type of research, hence there was a research gap in value chain research in the region. As a short-term measure, it was recognized that this research cluster could begin to engage with extra-regional experts. The aim of the RC was to manage a network where regional institutions could host extra-regional experts and conduct joint research projects. Several regional institutions had indicated their interest in being members of the RC. A follow-up meeting was planned for August 2019 and there was also a recommendation that CROSQ be invited to join the RC. Certain revisions to the concept note for the Research Cluster were also agreed to. Similarly, the need for the establishment of a Business Cluster (BC) was considered. Changing demands in the global markets as emphasized in the Preliminary Industry Analysis and the need to develop new business opportunities, principally because of a diminishing marine resource base (confirmed by the Climate Change Impact Assessment Study), pointed to the need for a network of experts with expertise in research, entrepreneurship, management of the sector, investment, and finance. As with the Research Cluster, the Business Cluster was expected to convene a follow-up meeting in August 2019, and revisions to the Business Cluster concept note were also agreed to.

S. Singh-Renton requested the Chairperson’s permission to present Item 6, noting that much of what was discussed at the Fourth FISHCOM WG Meeting was reported to COTED and hence the items could be taken together and then there could be discussions. The Chairperson agreed to this.

## **6. COTED (AGRICULTURE) MEETING DECISIONS ON FISHCOM WG REPORT**

S. Singh-Renton drew the Meeting’s attention to the document *FISHCOM 05/05* and said that the report had two sections that were closely related in their content. The first part was the report prepared for presentation to the Officials who met before the COTED. The Officials considered the report and then prepared a condensed version for presentation to the COTED. S. Singh-Renton then gave a short presentation of the first part of the report. She said that the FISHCOM WG was expected to report to COTED, and did so in October 2019. COTED was advised of three main activities undertaken by the FISHCOM WG during the year. These were: (i) continued support for value creation and/or value addition initiatives in early developmental stage at Member State level; (ii) external donor support for a detailed industry analysis to inform strategy(ies) and implementation plan(s) and to strengthen capacity for development of the marine fish and aquaculture industries; and (iii) establishment of Business and Research Clusters to advance inter-agency networking. Some details were provided to the Officials Meeting under each of these three activities: mention was made of the national initiatives in two Member States and the support being provided by CABA and UWI; explanations were provided regarding development of the project proposal and submission of the proposal to CARICOM Secretariat in March 2019; and the rationale for establishment of the Research and Business clusters was provided.

In keeping with the structure/template of the reports to COTED, key considerations for COTED were identified. Through the Preliminary Industry Analysis, the FISHCOM WG had recognized that health and safety standards for the fisheries and aquaculture sector were very important; and recalled that the SPS Project had developed model legislation and also had recommendations on coordinating mechanisms to ensure a suitable enabling environment for fish and aquaculture commodity and industry development, which were very important if there was to be any forward movement in marketing and trade. Hence, the WG reminded COTED of this and identified it as a key consideration for COTED. The WG also drew

COTED's attention to other key conclusions and recommendations of the Preliminary Industry Analysis, specifically: aquaculture development required attention, as this was the area of greatest potential development in the seafood business; the importance of developing high value products, paying particular attention to fish meal and fish oil, using under-utilized and low-value species preferably; and also the need to develop the capacity to maintain international food safety standards and maximize opportunities for developing products carrying fair trade and environmentally-friendly labels for higher prices on the market. The COTED was invited to: reaffirm the recommendation for Members States to adopt and implement the SPS Project recommendations, particularly with regard to legislation and coordinating mechanisms; to confirm support for the project proposal; and to reaffirm the call to regional agencies for support for the national-level commodity development initiatives, and for participation in the research and business clusters. COTED accepted all the decisions presented.

### Discussions

In the discussions which followed the presentation of items 5 and 6, the Meeting was informed that with regard the business development plans with CFTDI and St. Vincent, the challenge was the inability to get an agreement signed with CFTDI. CFTDI had, at the time, indicated that they did not have the necessary resources to do the MOU with UWI as they were changing management and operational arrangements. The MOU was important in order to protect both entities (CFTDI and UWI) in terms of use of the data, especially given that such detailed business planning information was very sensitive. Once the new management and operational arrangements were in place at CFTDI, UWI would be willing to re-engage if CFTDI was still interested. The CFTDI representative confirmed that the new management and operational arrangements were in place and undertook to bring the issue to management's attention and provide feedback to UWI. A query was raised as to whether any business planning support had been provided to SVG and the meeting was advised that UWI had not engaged in any discussions with St. Vincent. Given the time lag and the possible involvement of additional parties, UWI would require further guidance at this time. The need for a signed agreement (MOU) to protect the rights of the entities involved to generate and use the data/information was reiterated. It was noted that both CFTDI and SVG were aware of the offers of support available through UWI and CABA, but the parties needed to connect and engage in dialogue directly. CRFM can facilitate this process, if necessary. The Meeting also learned that CABA held at least two meetings with CFTDI and had discussed CFTDI's product development ideas, production capacity and machinery requirements; and had identified the products to be prioritized; had also identified some potential markets, and had discussed the development of samples for market testing. This work had stalled, but once the current management/operational challenges at CFTDI were resolved, CABA would be willing to re-engage with CFTDI. UWI's and CABA's ongoing commitment and support for the national commodity development initiatives were gratefully acknowledged.

There was a query regarding research and it was pointed out that there were pockets of research, and these should be documented and published formally so that they were available to all, but the Cluster recognized that there was no sustained research effort in value chain, and this was what was desired.

The Meeting was informed that it will receive reports on some work that CRFM and FAO were conducting on value chains and how these efforts were contributing to fulfillment of the FISHCOM WG TORs. The Meeting was also reminded that IICA (Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture) led the CARICOM Business Development Thematic Group and it was very important for the FISHCOM WG to hear what the Business Group was doing. To this end, it was proposed that for the next FISHCOM WG meeting, to invite members of the business and research clusters and to ask IICA (Business Development Thematic Group) and CABA (Herbs and Spices Priority Commodity Group) to consider among their activities issues that might be of interest to the fisheries and aquaculture group, as well as to share some of their important ideas with the FISHCOM WG. It might be that this could help to expand the networking (herbs and spices, fisheries and aquaculture, marketing and trade and business development/management) that was ongoing in terms of the food business. This idea was being proposed as, so far, the FISHCOM WG

had been struggling with implementation of its ideas and there was need to find ways to promote the activities of these groups through closer networking. Feedback on this proposal was sought from the IICA and CABA representatives at the Meeting.

The IICA representative indicated that he had no difficulty sharing what the Business Development Thematic Group was doing, but noted that with the current circumstances work had slowed. He however undertook to discuss with the other members of the Business Development Thematic Group, of which CABA was a member, to determine how best fisheries and aquaculture issues could be considered in the Business Development Thematic Group's deliberations and provide feedback to the FISHCOM WG.

The CABA representative said that the discussions with CFTDI had revolved around developing a number of value-added products. Fish sausages and fish patties were agreed to and it was also agreed to incorporate a number of medicinal herbs and spices into these products for product differentiation and to make them more relevant to the issue of NCDs (non-communicable diseases). So, there was a strategic framework within which the herbs and spices commodity group's activities could be integrated into the fisheries and aquaculture development programme. Part of the challenge however in advancing these products was the supply of raw materials. While CFTDI had an issue with the size of the machine for commercial production, the bigger issue was in the sourcing of raw materials in sufficient quantities, even to produce enough for initial testing on the commercial market. The discussions with CFTDI had also looked at the possibility of using cassava as a binder in the fish patties instead of the traditional imported starches. CABA was fully on board with the idea of promoting the linkages between the various commodity development groups in a sustainable way and will continue to support this.

The Meeting was also reminded that when the Research and Business Clusters were established it was envisioned that colleagues in Iceland would support this effort and would allow experts to be posted in the region for short pieces of research. However, it appeared that this was not possible, and so it was necessary to broaden the scope and connect with other tertiary institutions and perhaps work with students instead of experts. It was therefore proposed that the FISHCOM WG look at options for engaging with other tertiary-level institutions to build this research specialization (value chain research) and research network that was envisioned. If university PhD students, whose area of research specialization included value chain research, could be identified this would be ideal, more so if the PhD candidate was a CARICOM national as this may be one way of ensuring ongoing research in this area in the region. The proposal to engage with other tertiary-level institutions was accepted.

It was pointed out that if university students were engaged there would be need to also engage with their supervisors to provide guidance on methodology and to ensure a validated process. It would be necessary to engage with faculty staff as well as the students to get support for student supervision and also to ensure quality control. The need for an MOU with each academic institution was noted and it was suggested that a generic MOU could be drafted that could be used for these types of arrangements, as necessary. The CRFM Secretariat will draft the generic MOU.

#### Conclusions/Recommendations:

1. The WG adopted the Report of the Fourth Meeting of the FISHCOM WG as presented. The motion for adoption was moved by Saint Lucia and seconded by IICA.
2. The WG agreed that members of the Business and Research Clusters should be invited to the next FISHCOM WG meeting; and that IICA (Business Development Thematic Group) and CABA (Herbs and Spices Priority Commodity Group) be asked to consider among their activities issues that might be of interest to the fisheries and aquaculture group and to share some of their important ideas with the FISHCOM WG at its next meeting.
3. The WG agreed to look at options for engaging with other tertiary-level institutions to build this research specialization (value chain research) and research network that was envisioned. To guide

these arrangements, it was also agreed that the CRFM Secretariat would draft a generic MOU to be used as needed.

## **7. REVIEW OF FISHERIES AND AQUACULTURE COMMODITY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES BEING PLANNED AND IN PROGRESS IN THE CARICOM REGION**

### **7(a) Report from CARICOM Secretariat**

S. Singh-Renton advised the Meeting that Nigel Durrant and Shaun Baugh, who normally participated on behalf of CARICOM Secretariat, had been following up on the Model SPS Legislation and the Project Proposal submitted by the FISHCOM WG last year. An update on the SPS legislation had been received by CRFM Secretariat, and was provided to the Meeting.

#### **a. SPS Model Fisheries Legislation**

In her presentation, S. Singh-Renton said that the update indicated essentially that CARICOM Secretariat's (CARISEC's) lawyers were still working on the model SPS legislation. Notwithstanding the involvement of Ms. Melanie French and Mr. George Kirnon of the CARICOM Secretariat in activities that informed drafting of the model legislation, CARISEC indicated that there have been formidable legislative drafting challenges. There were four pieces of legislation with overlapping subject matters, which the lawyers have consolidated into two model pieces of legislation. It had been expected that the draft legislation would have been completed several months ago, but work was still ongoing. CARISEC confirmed that the model SPS legislation remained a priority for them. CARISEC also acknowledged the need to provide an end-date and would look to provide this shortly.

#### **b. Project proposal on regional and national industry assessment, strategic and implementation plans**

With regard to the project proposal, the CRFM Secretariat, with the permission of the FISHCOM WG, will continue to follow-up with CARISEC to get an update on the project proposal. Upon receipt of the update, it will be shared with the WG as well as the participants of this Meeting.

### **7(b) Reports from CRFM**

#### **a. CRFM Working Group to Promote Sustainable Aquaculture Development**

P. A. Murray gave a PowerPoint presentation on this item. He said that in 2015 the WGA had developed a 5-year work plan that was endorsed by the Caribbean Fisheries Forum (CFF) and approved by the CRFM Ministerial Council. A review of work plan activities in 2019 revealed that most of the activities had not yet commenced. It was recommended that the plan be updated and rescheduled to commence in PY 2019/2020, and this recommendation was endorsed by the CFF and approved by the Ministerial Council. The work plan was reformatted, using a logical framework template, which provided details on the various work plan outcomes, outputs, activities, and indicators. In terms of strategies for investments, outputs included improved market support and improved human capacities, with activities such as feasibility studies on indigenous and locally produced species, and ornamental fish culture; and development of curricula for basic skills training; and support to training. Indicators included: number of feasibility assessments; number of curricula developed and number of programmes facilitated/supported. It was felt that this was one area of the work plan that would help engender and support the enabling environment. Another aspect in support of the enabling environment was the promotion of public/private sector partnerships, with a proposed activity being the hosting of an aquaculture conference and trade fair. Another output was improved disaster preparedness through the generation of disaster preparedness plans for the sector. Regarding the stakeholders, a number of things in the plan spoke to the issue of public sector stakeholder involvement and participation, with the following coming to the fore: strengthening governance frameworks, improving research, and strengthening data management and knowledge sharing systems. In terms of strengthening

governance frameworks, work plan activities included preparation or revision of national aquaculture plans and policies, and revision or preparation of national legislation. With regard to improved research and development base, work plan activities included: cage culture technology and tropical aquaculture research; development of national GIS based surveys of factors to assess aquaculture potentials; institutional research on reproductive biology; and low trophic level studies. For strengthening data management and knowledge sharing, equipping Fisheries Departments with computer facilities for data collection and management was proposed as it was felt that one challenge was the unavailability of data from Fisheries Departments, hence the need to equip the Fisheries Department to collect the required data.

In terms of private sector stakeholder involvement, key outcomes included: (i) improved investment and finance through improved access to credit, specifically through access to soft loans through Credit Unions to on-lend to fish farmers; and access to soft loans to on-lend directly to farmers to start-up fish farms; (ii) strong research-supported business and market strategies through an improved research and development base achieved through activities such as industry research on local feed material substitution for small scale fish farming; and (iii) good practices of education, outreach and advocacy through strengthened data management and knowledge sharing systems for aquaculture resulting from equipping fish farmers associations and SME (Small and Medium Enterprises) with computer facilities for data collection and management.

The CRFM Secretariat was in the process of carrying out a survey to determine the status of implementation of the 5-year work plan and achievements to date. Seven Member States had responded so far, and preliminary results indicated that development and/or revision of plans and policies have received the most attention; followed by revision/development of legislation; and most aspects of implementation of the workplan have not yet commenced (or are considered not applicable at this time). In fact, most of the 28 activities identified in the work plan had not been implemented. Factors affecting the implementation of work plan activities were considered and one factor noted was the inadequacy of the human capacity. A number of Fisheries Departments in the region did not have aquaculture-focused staff to drive the process forward. Another factor was inappropriate approaches to aquaculture management and development, as most Fisheries Departments' development was centered around marine capture fisheries management, and the approaches to marine capture fisheries management were not the same as the approaches required for aquaculture management and development. Limitations in availability of land and water resources in appropriate quantities for terrestrial aquaculture development was another factor limiting growth in this sector, especially in the smaller Member States, as there was competition for other uses: human habitation, agriculture, etc.

The issue of land/water availability, as well as other factors, pointed to the need to view aquaculture as a business and focus on the business development and investment aspects in a manner that was more akin to management in agriculture, than marine capture fisheries. Hence, aquaculture research and development should focus on supporting investments and partnerships between the public and private sectors. Based on these preliminary survey results, the following broad recommendation was advanced: "Where appropriate consider reorienting approaches to aquaculture development with the focus on supporting investments in SME partnership(s) between the public and private sectors, and in collaboration with financial/credit institutions".

### Discussions

In the discussions that followed the presentation, the issue of whether there was any available information on evidence of successes in the aquaculture sector was raised. Particular reference was made to: the Jamaica experience in tilapia production by a major private sector company; the Belize experience with different types of aquaculture production, especially shrimp production for export; and to the work done by the public and private sectors in aquaculture in Trinidad. It was queried whether there was objective evidence-based data from these experiences that could be reviewed in seeking to determine the way forward. It was noted

that while it was important to encourage investment in the sector, it was useful to know what had been the experiences of others who would have made such investments - what led to successes where they occurred, and what contributed to failures where observed, so that the FISHCOM WG's recommendations could be based against the background of that type of empirical data. For example, in Trinidad at one time there was strong promotion of the aquaculture sector; there was an aquaculture association that attracted public sector funding, and a number of private entities entered the industry; however, the sector has since declined significantly. Where there was still production, there were issues relating to markets. There have also been developments that have led to a movement away from tilapia production to exploring production of other species, particularly catfish species. There may have also been developments in saltwater production. A review of those experiences would be very useful to the FISHCOM WG in determining how best to advocate for increased investment in the aquaculture industry.

It was pointed out that a study on the Potential of Fish Farming in the region had been undertaken and this study provided much of the background for the 5-year aquaculture work plan. In the case of Belize, aquaculture was mostly private sector driven, however issues with disease and increasing costs of inputs have brought shrimp production to a standstill. For many of the small island states, the main issue was the availability of land and water resources as there was competition for these resources. It was hoped that the survey being conducted by the CRFM would help to provide a status update on the sector and contribute to the type of empirical data referred to earlier in the meeting. The opportunity was used to remind countries to complete and submit the survey.

In the case of Jamaica, for a number of years the aquaculture initiative was more or less private sector driven, with one major virtually integrated company with contract farming and also with contracts to export to the US and UK. Due to the recession in 2007, increasing input costs, and competition on the export market, the company pulled out. However, local farmers have continued to fill the gap, and more recently another major entity entered the industry and has been doing quite well in tilapia production. The thrust for aquaculture development still existed. In 2018, Jamaica passed a Fisheries Act that facilitates registration and licensing of fish farmers. Policy on aquaculture development had been developed, and an aquaculture development plan had also been considered. Constraints to aquaculture development in Jamaica at present included: brood stock development; seed stock availability; issues with irrigation and water distribution, which may be compounded by the Jamaica climate change experience (in some instances prime lands for aquaculture production did not have sufficient water); access to credit particularly by smaller farmers; and availability of quality feed. There was some need for focused research and development, as well as capacity building, and the strengthening of the business enterprises. In summary, since 2007, there was a decline in production as a result of the withdrawal of the virtual integrated company, but over the last 3 or so years there has been a slight increase in production. Jamaica was a fish importing country and there was a high demand for fish and fish products and it was felt that strengthening the aquaculture programme could serve to fill this gap.

Reference was made to the summary remarks about Jamaica's aquaculture industry, and how these related to the broad recommendation presented in the report, and it was pointed out that aquaculture must be treated as any other business and developed similarly. There were lessons in the region already, but this recommendation was a fundamental one, as Member States have been struggling to move forward in aquaculture development and part of the reason was that a business-oriented approach was not applied in a comprehensive manner. It was also noted that the wording of the recommendation was fairly general, but more specific recommendations could arise from this general recommendation, when the best practices and lessons from these past experiences have been examined.

b. SPS Follow-up project (11<sup>th</sup> EDF SPS Project - Component 3 – Strengthening SPS capacity in the fisheries sector)

At the Chairperson's invitation P. A. Murray presented this item. He said that this project (11<sup>th</sup> EDF SPS project) was a follow-up to the 10<sup>th</sup> EDF SPS project that was implemented by IICA, with implementation

of the fisheries component supported by the CRFM Secretariat. A number of protocols and guidelines related to good fish and fishery products hygiene practices were developed under the 10<sup>th</sup> EDF SPS project. Under the 11<sup>th</sup> EDF project, CRFM, in collaboration with IICA, will implement three main technical activities, specifically: develop roadmap for implementation, intended to strengthen regional coordination framework for fisheries sector; build food safety capacity for the fisheries sector; and provide technical assistance to improve laboratory testing capacity for the fisheries sector. The project officially commenced in February 2020 and had 6-month pre- and post- implementation phases and a 2-year implementation period.

There were essentially two directions in terms of developing the enabling environment: strategic investment in the support services; and effective mechanisms for public education. The output in relation to strategic investment in the support services was improved regional coordination of implementation of health and food safety guidelines for fisheries and aquaculture subsector through the following activities: review/refinement of existing stakeholder linkages; identify/develop roadmap for implementation of regional coordinating mechanisms; in-country support for regionally-coordinated implementation of guidelines provided; and develop mini-documentaries on successful implementation of food safety guidelines in private sector companies, as if persons were more aware of these successes they would be more willing to invest in the sector. With regard to public education, the output was improved basis for public education, outreach and advocacy achieved through implementation of the same activities as listed for strategic investment. In relation to stakeholders, in terms of the public sector, the intervention by the public sector (rather than an intervention to the public sector) to strengthen laboratories (most were public sector) to review monitoring/testing capabilities, and to upgrade these laboratories to perform tests that can contribute to improved trade of fisheries products. The indicator in this instance would be the number of laboratories with capacity to conduct these tests. For the private sector, the two primary interventions were governance and management, and advocacy. One of the outputs in terms of governance was the improved implementation of food safety guidelines, regionally. Thorough review of existing stakeholder linkages, development of the roadmap, and provision of support directly to private sector entities and the laboratories, would in large measure, be the interventions that would provide for effective management.

A major part of this would be the provision of support directly to the laboratories in terms of their ability to undertake the necessary tests, both in terms of human capacity and furniture and equipment. Year 1 will focus on determining clearly the way forward and how to build on the baseline established by the previous project, while full implementation of project activities - procurement of services, expertise, and provision of equipment within in the context of the limited budget would be done in Year 2. In terms of recommendations it was suggested that (i) member countries provide every support to ensure the successful implementation of this project; and (ii) the FISHCOM WG should call on COTED to again advise Member Countries to establish the standards, guidelines and regulations developed under the 10<sup>th</sup> EDF SPS project. It was very important that the outputs (guidelines, standards, etc.) from the previous project be promulgated and become the basis for moving forward in this project.

### Discussions

In the ensuing discussions, it was observed that some countries were perhaps a little more advanced than others in terms of SPS. It was also noted that aquaculture considered both fish for consumption and live fish (brood fish and ornamental fish) and it was queried if the WG had considered also looking at bio-security arrangements for aquatic animal health protocols, especially for live fish. By way of response it was pointed out that the 5-year Aquaculture Development Plan spoke to the issue of ornamental fish and research on ornamental fish, and the SPS presentation, as part of the way forward in terms of health and safety issues and guidelines, this was across the board for all potential products.

In terms of the capacity development and educational activities, a query was raised as to whether consideration was being given to the possibility of sustaining these regional efforts; how to add the

knowledge, skills, educational capacity, etc., being developed - perhaps a regional platform or network; were there avenues within the project for this. It was indicated that the presentation dealt specifically with the fisheries component of the wider \$10 million 11<sup>th</sup> EDF Project. The other aspects capacity building, visibility, education, etc., queried about were envisaged as part of the bigger project and would be handled by the implementation agency, IICA and would be across the board for all components of the entire 11<sup>th</sup> EDF Project, including the fisheries component.

Confirmation was sought as to whether there was agreement on the recommendations advanced in the presentations on Aquaculture and the SPS project. There was general agreement.

c. GEF Blue Growth project

This agenda item was presented by P. A. Murray. In his PowerPoint presentation, he informed the Meeting that the project was based on work done under the CLME+ project, while not an extension of the CLME+, but was a separate project that would focus on development of blue economy. The project objective was to promote blue economy development in the CLME+ area through marine spatial planning and marine protected areas and the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF). Barbados, Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Lucia and Panama were the countries directly involved in the project however, it was expected that lessons learnt would redound to all members countries of the Community. The Development Bank of Latin America (CAF) was the lead implementing agency. FAO was co-implementing agency and CRFM was the executing agency.

At present, the project was being developed and coming out of the consultant's work on the proposal the following three technical components have been indicated: cross-sectoral marine spatial planning, inclusive sustainable value chains, and regional coordination, project management and knowledge management. A fourth component was project monitoring and evaluation. GEF will provide USD 6.2 million grant funding, with USD 40.1 million expected to be co-financed, mostly through in-kind contributions. In terms of development of the enabling environment, it was envisioned that outputs would include: governments and key stakeholder enabled to support the sustainable use of fisheries and key marine habitats; strengthened regional BE cooperation and coordination; and increased governance capacity to adopt ecosystem-based fisheries management practices.

The activities would centre around national marine spatial planning – national marine spatial plans for project countries; national blue economy strategies designed and validated; sustainable financing strategies in the context of Blue Economy designed and validated; national decision-support system developed and implemented for sustainable fisheries management; assessment and compilation of existing MSP planning in CLME+ to improve regional EBM of key fisheries; develop regional MSP for ecosystem-based fisheries; and creating partnerships to foster cooperation on ecosystem-based fisheries management and the development of seafood value chains. With regard to distribution, nutrition security, etc., expected outputs include new and strengthened national and regional seafood value chains supporting realization of blue economy opportunities and sustainable development goals. The related activities include: national policy recommendations developed for promoting enabling environment; and regional and national fisheries authorities and other trained in analysis of seafood value chains. In terms of public sector involvement for effective governance and management, the expected output was protection of critical fish habitats established/expanded through enhanced marine protected area management capacity in the selected countries.

With regard to business and marketing strategies, the expected output was new and strengthened national and regional seafood value chains supporting realization of blue economy opportunities and sustainable development goals; activities would be including national policy recommendations developed for promoting enabling environment; and regional and national fisheries authorities and other trained in seafood value chain analysis and development within the context of blue economy. For education, outreach and advocacy,



the expected output was knowledge shared between Caribbean countries and organizations and GEF IW projects in partnership with IW:LEARN. Related activities were expected to include: development and dissemination of manuals on ecosystem-based management of fisheries informed by MSP; and establishment of knowledge management and information platform. The level of engagement in IW:LEARN through participation and delivery of key outputs would be an indicator of how successful these actions have been.

Regarding private sector involvement, the intervention proposed will be geared towards strong research-supported business and marketing strategies, with the major output being new and strengthened national and regional seafood value chains supporting realization of the blue economy opportunities and sustainable development goals. The following recommendations were proposed, cognizant that the project was still in the development stage: (i) provide support for successful further development and implementation of the project; (ii) identify national sectoral teams/mechanisms, utilizing inter-sectoral mechanisms that already exist wherever possible; and (iii) ensure that discussions involve teams comprised of the key participating Ministries.

### Discussions

A query was raised as to whether CRFM had looked at the need for a commercial-based R&D (research and development) facility, partnering either with the public or the private sector. Although the recommendations fully endorse this, and the role that CRFM must play in terms of policy, advocacy, information, matters related to quality standards, etc., was absolutely critical, the institution would have a better chance of facilitating change and attracting investors in the sector if it were directly involved with a commercial operation either through an MOU or as an equity stakeholder. For example, the IMA had developed a commercial-based R&D facility and had done a lot of work in developing production protocols and generating data that would inform commercial investment, but for policy reasons this was discontinued. However, if CRFM was able to identify such a partner and to seek initial grant funding for its investment, it would be better positioned to advise the public and private sectors on investment and even from the perspective of CRFM's own long-term sustainability. Whether the forgoing had been considered was reiterated, or was it something that could be considered as part of the way forward.

By way of response, it was noted that while the proposed intervention had not been considered, the recommendation went across all three CRFM presentations. There were aspects implicit in what had been recommended that had been looked at and considered in the aquaculture workplan and also considered in the SPS project, particularly in relation to regional coordination in terms of the SPS. The suggestion should be an overarching recommendation in relation to the three presentations, and not linked to a particular project. It was further agreed that the suggested recommendation was an important one and may also be timely given that CRFM was undertaking a strategic review and considering how to reposition itself. The suggestion was also important in the context of the work being done (evidenced by the reports presented); CRFM was doing a lot of good work, but was not engaging with the private sector sufficiently, hence several projects came to an end, without completely reaching the desired end-point, as a result of not engaging with the private sector from inception. With regard to the presentations, guidelines for preparation of the reports/presentations had been provided. The reports were to be set up in a log frame. The guidelines took into account a number of constraints identified under the Jagdeo Initiative, and also included some of the outcomes identified in the Draft Strategy for Commodity Development, as well as indicators that the presenters were expected to address in their reports. Indicators which the presenters were asked to consider included: by how much was the import bill reduced; by how much was investment increased; what was the level of diversification for livelihoods, etc. The efforts of the presenters in preparing for the meeting, in keeping with the guidelines provided, was commended. The Meeting was also advised that COTED was looking for these messages; COTED wanted to hear how the work of the FISHCOW WG was contributing to increasing employment, increasing foreign exchange earnings, reducing the import bill, etc. The commercial R&D and the linkages with the private sector - involving private sector in the projects - will

help the WG to achieve that goal. It was suggested that some wording for the recommendation that could be reflected in the record of the meeting be provided. The following was proposed:

*CRFM to establish commercial aquaculture and mariculture production research innovation and training venture(s) in partnership with existing/new appropriate private or public sector parties as a fundamental strategy for development of this sub-sector and for CRFM's own sustainability. CRFM's equity to be sourced from international development agencies and philanthropic entities.*

Following further discussion on the recommendation, it was suggested that the wording be revised so that the recommendation was applicable not just to the culture sub-sector. There was general agreement on this and it was suggested, in the interest of time, that the CRFM Secretariat and CABA work on revising the wording in keeping with the sentiments expressed and circulate it to the Working Group for inclusion in the records. This recommendation was accepted, and the more general recommendation developed subsequently with CABA is shown below:

*In order to support its sustainability and effective technology transfer, and as a fundamental strategy for marine fish and aquaculture commodity and associated industry development, CRFM should establish a commercial Research and Innovation Centre to undertake partnership ventures with existing/new appropriate private or public sector parties. CRFM's equity in the Centre should be obtained from various sources including government, international development agencies and philanthropic entities.*

The recommendation included in this presentation on the Blue Economy project were also accepted.

## **7(c) Reports from FAO**

### **a. FISH4ACP Project**

Y. Diei Ouadi, FAO, gave a PowerPoint presentation on this item. In her presentation Y. Diei Ouadi said that the FISH4ACP project was an inter-regional project, which was actually part of a global initiative of ACP countries that started in 2017. ACP Fisheries and Aquaculture Ministries recognized the need to enhance their fisheries value chains and endorsed an action document. This project built on these previous communications and negotiations between ACP countries and the EU. The project was a joint initiative of ACP countries and the EU, with FAO being the lead implementing agency for the 40 million Euro project, which included several countries in Africa, the Pacific and the Caribbean. In the Caribbean region, Guyana and Dominican Republic had two different value chains to be supported. The 40 million euro will be distributed through the different value chains, and activities were being developed at present to determine the exact share for each value chain. The project was aimed at enhancing fish value chain productivity and competitiveness, while ensuring long-term sustainability and social inclusiveness. Sustainability in this case, included the economic, social and environmental elements for sustainability.

The issues that led to this project included: low contribution of fisheries and aquaculture sector to GDP; low exports and slow growth; missed opportunities in terms of product diversification and value adding (jobs) and market access; and low investments in the sector. The project will focus on helping stakeholders to better understand and improve their value chains. This will include value chain analysis and will involve a comprehensive methodology, which will combine FAO food value chain methodology with EU value chain methodology for value chain development. This understanding of the value chain will assist in the crafting of an upgrading strategy which will improve working conditions for stakeholders; open up new markets and access to sources of finance, while addressing the bottom-line elements (economic, social and environmental) of sustainability that were important to the project. Project components included: develop plans to upgrade value chains; increase economic performance of MSME; more inclusive and socially sustainable value chains; environmentally sustainable value chains; and improved MSMEs access to finance and investment, which was key to the development of small and medium sized enterprises.

Regarding Guyana's value chain, at present the process to inform development of the detailed activities was ongoing. The value chain that was selected was adding value to the broken seabob and white belly shrimp. This value chain was selected based on certain criteria such as the presence of strong public-private partnership. This value chain had MSC certification and this was important to note in terms of sustainability of the value chain. Other criteria included: value chain plan ensures local and regional food security through direct and indirect avenues; and the project will raise the profile of small established processing plants.

The value chain upgrading strategy included the following elements: creating value added products from broken seabob and by-catch (white belly shrimp); promoting entrepreneurship; introducing new sustainable techniques and technologies, not just in processing, but also in harvesting which was the production section, as all these dimensions must be taken on board; developing and adaptive training model, which is specific to needs of stakeholder; result guided implementation, extensive research through collaboration with local and regional universities and public sector; establish core business models for small scale fishers and vulnerable groups; aggressive and diversified market schemes; and public awareness campaign on food security through the fisheries sector to secondary and tertiary institutions, financial institutions and public sector. As stated before, the detailed activities were currently being developed with Guyana's partners. A meeting was held recently to begin discussing the value chain mapping and the broad range of stakeholders. It was hoped that implementation of the project will see the full engagement of this broad range of stakeholders from public sector, to private sector, and academia, whether in Guyana or in the region; the University of the West Indies at St. Augustine (UWI) in Trinidad and Tobago will be engaged. The aim was to use the knowledge, skills and experiences from implementation of the Guyana value chain project to inform other projects in the sub-region, such as the Blue Economy project reported on earlier in the Meeting, as well as other pipeline projects with value chain components.

### Discussion

In the discussions that followed the presentation it was remarked that the project provided a real opportunity for connection with the private sector. In moving forward, it was important to consider monitoring and evaluation in a way that would yield the type of information that would allow progress to be measured in the way that governments wanted progress to be measured. The project presented an excellent opportunity for engaging with the private sector and for development of real value-added products that should result in new opportunities for market and trade. A query was raised regarding funding of the other value chains presented, but not selected, at the workshop in St. Vincent in 2019. The Meeting was advised that FAO was currently in discussions with Korean cooperation and the Barbados value chain will be supported. FAO was also engaged in discussions with the CDB regarding a fishery improvement project assessment for the pelagic fishery in Dominica. Discussions were advanced and hopefully the assessment will lead to follow-up activity, as the South Korean funding was based on the assessment done in Barbados as well as the proposal prepared for the ACP.

#### b. Grenada initiative on enabling impact investments and trade improvements for fisheries

I. Monnereau, FAO, presented this item. She said that the presentation was on sustainable improvements in Caribbean tuna value chains, with a particular focus on Grenada, but mention would also be made of other countries where similar work was being done. There was a high demand in the US for sushi and sashimi and much of the tuna, particularly yellowfin tuna, used for these products was coming from Caribbean fisheries. One of the reasons work on improving these value chains was being undertaken by the CC4FISH project was because climate change impacts were anticipated on the pelagic fisheries in terms of distribution, recruitment and overall sustainability. This could affect the availability of these species (tunas and other pelagic species) for countries in the region, as it could become more difficult to obtain the same level of catches, which would have impacts for food security, livelihoods and employment and foreign exchange earnings for national governments. While it was not intended to increase capitalization of the fishery, the project was looking at ways to improve the benefits for fisherfolk and the processing sector and even ways to improve the income for governments by making improvements in the value chains in the fishery sector.

In many of the countries, as in Grenada, tunas were caught using mostly long-lines. Upon return of the boats to shore, the tunas were placed in coffin-like structures and exported as headed and gutted tunas. However, there were some issues: the fishery was considered overfished, there were limitations with data collection systems, and there was also risk involved. Often the tunas exported were downgraded leading to losses to the fisherfolk and processors in the region. Also, a lot of the profits were made outside the region as the tuna were exported only as headed and gutted tuna and the value addition, for example loining, etc., was done in the US where a lot of the profit was made.

The project has been looking at how, through development of these PPPs, a system could be set up whereby more profits flow back to the fisherfolk, processors and governments in the region. This can be done by setting up a loining facility rather than exporting headed and gutted tunas, and also providing the enabling environment in terms of environmental, economic and social sustainability of the fishery at the same time. In terms of environmental sustainability, for example, the activity would support moving from using J-hooks to using circle hooks to reduce by-catch, and trying to improve data collection with improved traceability and connection to the market in real time. For the economic benefit, the idea was to set up a public/private partnership, ideally between the fisherfolk, fishing cooperatives, the government and the private sector (investment company), so that the profits for all stakeholders will improve. At the same time, government would also have a stake in the partnership; as in the case of Grenada, where the government had 5% equity in the loining facility, so that 5% of the net revenues would flow back to the government to be used for improved MCS and improved data collection, to enhance the sustainability of the sector. Streamlining and improved transparency in the supply chain, and also as a result of entering into a C-FIP, can improve access to higher-end markets. FAO had funded MSC pre-assessment in Grenada, which was enough to be able to enter high-end markets in the US, although Grenada was not aiming for full MCS certification at this time.

With regard to social sustainability, one benefit was the increased profits for fishers and fisherfolk organisations. The three Fisherfolk Organizations in Grenada had signed up for the public/private partnership and would share profits, in different ratios as there were different levels of investment/involvement. Fisherfolk and their organizations were more organized in the C-FIP to carry out more managerial functions. There will also be more improved training for the fisherfolk for example in the use of circle hooks instead of J-hooks (trials with circle hooks were already carried out under the Billfish project). Also, with improved data collection at the national level that can be directly distributed to ICCAT, then fishers could have access to individual data at the individual level (e.g. to access loans or insurance). The process started with an assessment to look at the Fisheries Performance Indicators and undertake SWOT analysis; identify gaps - how can the fishery be improved and where can value be added; and to develop action plans that detail what needs to be done and the related cost for implementation and also the benefits. For example, in the case of Grenada, the investment was US\$1.4 million, while gross revenue was estimated at US\$1.5 million, a half million in net revenue. A similar assessment was also done for the tuna long-line fishery in Barbados and the numbers were similar, in that a US\$1.2 million investment in the fishery would yield revenue of approximately US\$1 million per year.

Following the assessment would be structuring of the Public Private Partnership (PPP) and then implementation. The assessment, which was referring to the FPI, (120 assessments conducted globally) was a known assessment tool. FAO had financed assessments for Grenada and SVG and the assessment showed that if implemented there would be high benefits for the fishery in SVG. The Barbados' assessment was paid for by FAO/UNCTAD/DOALAS; and there were advanced, ongoing discussions with CDB about doing the assessments for Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica and Bahamas, depending on the interest of the countries – Antigua and Barbuda had already expressed their interest and for Dominica it was a follow-up to their ACP proposal. The structuring phase was a long process of continuous discussions on the level of investment, profit margin/sharing, roles and responsibilities, etc., among the parties, until the MOU was signed. In the case of Grenada, the structuring phase took about 16 months, and Barbados was now entering

this phase. The structuring phase was often financed by forgivable loans, e.g. a forgivable loan was ready from the Walton Foundation in the case of Barbados; while in Grenada, the structuring phase was partly funded by the consultancy company that did the assessment, as they were also investors. Grenada now had a signed MOU, but commencement of the work had been delayed due to the COVID-19. After the structuring, the fishery entered into a C-FIP and full implementation based on the shared agreement.

Building the loining facility and moving into the other aspects of implementation required further financing, which could be financed by venture capitalists and also by development banks. FAO will continue to provide support in grant funding (training or improved legislation). In terms of the Grenada overview, the FAO Billfish project paid for the Assessment in 2018, after which they entered into the structuring phase, when the assessment showed that large profits could be made and the fishery could be improved in all three aspects of sustainability. It took 16 months to complete the PPP and get the MOU signed (3 coops, government and private partner). Fishers who were not members of the fishing cooperatives would still be able to sell their catch to the loining facility and so benefit from higher prices (10% more). Annual gross revenue was estimated at USD 1.5 M, with USD 0.5 M in net revenue to be shared in keeping with the agreed scheme.

Financing will come from for-profit partner One Skip, forgivable loans and venture capitalist such as Sustainable Ocean Fund. Also, approaching the Grenada Development Bank for a loan was being considered. These types of blended finance models (loans/ grants/forgivable loans) were necessary to bring down the interest and have a better revenue model. FAO will continue to support improvements in data collection systems, moving to more sustainable fishing gear, MSC pre-assessment, and supporting the enabling environment (improving legislation, developing management plans, etc.). As mentioned before, construction of the loining facility was postponed due to COVID-19. At present, no fishing was taking place in Grenada nor Barbados because there was no export market for headed and gutted tunas (hotels and restaurants). However, there was demand for loined tuna in the supermarkets, so if the loining facility was already in place there would be a great demand for its products, which shows clearly what a good investment this was. FAO was working not only with Grenada, but also with Barbados and possibly SVG and other countries and it was intended that this work would lead to improved collaboration and participation in ICCAT.

### Discussions

Clarification was sought about the overall budget for building the loining facility, what was the estimated capital outlay to build the facility and commence operation. It was indicated that this cost may differ depending on the country, however, in the case of Grenada, the overall project was estimated at USD 1.4M, which included about USD 0.5M in grant funding from FAO for the assessment, training, review of legislation, etc. Barbados had a similar outlook (USD 1.2M), with about USD 250,000 from FAO for the assessment phase, another USD 200,000 for the PPP structuring, and the remainder for the building/restructuring of the facility.

A query was also raised as to whether this kind of facility was multi-functional and would include processing of species other than tunas. In response, it was indicated that tuna was the focus because these were the exports, however, other species would also be processed, and all fish would be bar-coded according to all the different species. It was remarked that the project was a really good step in the right direction in terms of bringing profits closer to home, as loining was the area where the bulk of the profits were in this market.

It was also expressed that perhaps colleagues in Iceland could be approached to provide some specific technical support in the operationalization of the loining facility, as this was one area in which Iceland had competencies. The project involved high level management, very technical operations, and the advances were happening quickly, even the loining operations, so some additional support from Iceland would be good. The Meeting learnt that One Skip, the private sector company involved in the PPP in Grenada, was owned by three partners, one of whom lived and operated a loining facility on Hawaii, and a number of

Grenadian processing workers had already received training in loining and grading at this facility in Hawaii. Notwithstanding One Skip efforts to provide training by bringing the Grenadians to Hawaii, additional support from Iceland would be appreciated. One Skip's involvement was commended, and it was opined that the project was a good initiative in commodity development and one the WG should pay attention to. With regard to the involvement of the Iceland colleagues, it was pointed out that the Icelanders were restricted to working only with the public sector. The support they might be able to offer may be to look at existing government systems and how these can continue to support this initiative in the future, and also perhaps to provide an opportunity for other countries to learn from the exercise, although it had been indicated earlier that FAO was exploring other fisheries improvement project ideas as well. However, it may be worth connecting the parties and if there was opportunity for Iceland to have an input, then this would be good. It was pointed out that while One Skip was a for-profit company, the PPP in Grenada, which had a board, included the fishing cooperatives and the government, as well as One Skip; and it was noted that maybe if the Icelanders worked directly with the PPP rather than One Skip this could open up different types of opportunities.

#### Conclusions and recommendations

1. The CRFM Secretariat will continue to follow-up with CARICOM Secretariat to get an update on the Project Proposal and to share the update with the FISHCOM WG and this Meeting's participants.
2. In relation to the Aquaculture project, the WG agreed with the broad recommendation presented, "Where appropriate consider reorienting approaches to aquaculture development with the focus on supporting investments in SME partnership(s) between the public and private sectors, and in collaboration with financial/credit institutions".
3. The WG agreed with the following recommendations in relation to the 11<sup>th</sup> EDF SPS Project: (i) member countries provide every support to ensure the successful implementation of this project; and (ii) the FISHCOM WG should call on COTED to again advise Member Countries to establish the standards, guidelines and regulations developed under the 10<sup>th</sup> EDF SPS project.
4. The WG accepted the following recommendations presented as part of the update on the Blue Economy project: (i) provide support for successful further development and implementation of the project; (ii) identify national sectoral teams/mechanisms, utilizing inter-sectoral mechanisms that already exist wherever possible; and (iii) ensure that discussions involve teams comprised of the key participating Ministries.
5. The WG agreed that CRFM Secretariat and CABA should work to revise the wording of the recommendation advanced by CABA, so that the recommendation was applicable to not just the culture sub-sector. As agreed, the more general recommendation that CRFM and CABA formulated subsequently follows: *In order to support its sustainability and effective technology transfer, and as a fundamental strategy for marine fish and aquaculture commodity and associated industry development, CRFM should establish a commercial Research and Innovation Centre to undertake partnership ventures with existing/new appropriate private or public sector parties. CRFM's equity in the Centre should be obtained from various sources including government, international development agencies and philanthropic entities.*
6. The WG should keep under review the progress of the initiatives presented, and to share the information on the Grenada initiative with UNESCO-FTP in Iceland to inform their ongoing collaboration with regional partners.

#### **8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING AND ADJOURNMENT**

S. Singh-Renton referred to Agenda Item 6 and the proposal that the FISHCOM WG meet again in June. At that meeting, IICA (Business Development Thematic Group) and CABA (Herbs and Spices Priority Commodity Development Group) would be requested to share with the FISHCOM WG some of the work

they were doing that was relevant to fisheries and aquaculture commodity development, and for them also to identify areas for greater collaboration. Some challenges might be common such as developing business strategies and networking with the other food groups, and sharing the information can also open up opportunities where the groups can network in research and business opportunities. It was proposed that IICA and CABA give these presentations at the next FISHCOM WG Meeting and also that members of the Research and Business Clusters be invited to the next WG meeting. It was then proposed that the next meeting be held in June 2020. Following some brief discussions on possible dates, it was agreed that the date of the next FISHCOM WG meeting be tentatively set for 11 June 2020.

S. Singh-Renton thanked the Chairperson for guiding the meeting and the presenters for their informative presentations. S. Singh-Renton also thanked all the participants for their attention. She added that it was good to have so many interested parties listening, and she hoped they found the presentations informative. In closing the meeting, the Chairman thanked all for their participation and wished all a good day. The meeting was adjourned at 12:47 p.m.

## APPENDIX 1: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Name & Designation	Address	Email Contact
Marc Williams Director of Marine Resources	Ministry of Agriculture and Marine Resources Church Street, Basseterre <b>SAINT KITTS &amp; NEVIS</b> Tel: (869) 465-8045 / 466-8739 / 668-1188	<a href="mailto:dmrskn@gmail.com">dmrskn@gmail.com</a> <a href="mailto:marcwill3@aol.com">marcwill3@aol.com</a>
Thomas Nelson Officer in Charge	Department of Fisheries Ministry of Agriculture, Food Production, Fisheries, Co-operatives and Rural Development Point Seraphine Road, Castries <b>SAINT LUCIA</b> Tel: (758) 468-4136 / 468-4143/ 725-1667	<a href="mailto:thomas.nelson@govt.lc">thomas.nelson@govt.lc</a> <a href="mailto:tomfinch90@hotmail.com">tomfinch90@hotmail.com</a>
Sharon Hutchinson Lecturer, Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension	Faculty of Food and Agriculture, The University of the West Indies St. Augustine <b>TRINIDAD &amp; TOBAGO</b> Tel: (868) 684-4432	<a href="mailto:Sharon.Hutchinson@sta.uwi.edu">Sharon.Hutchinson@sta.uwi.edu</a>
Allister Glean Int'l Specialist in Agribusiness & Value Chains	IICA Office at Saint Lucia 4 <sup>th</sup> Floor, Sir Stanislaus James Bldg. Waterfront, Castries <b>SAINT LUCIA</b> Tel: (758) 451-6760 / 451-6761	<a href="mailto:allister.glean@iica.int">allister.glean@iica.int</a>
Vassel Stewart President	Caribbean Agri-Business Association #2 Uquire Road Extension, Freeport <b>TRINIDAD &amp; TOBAGO</b> Tel: (868) 360-3717 / 365-1103 / 383-6108	<a href="mailto:vasstew@hotmail.com">vasstew@hotmail.com</a>
Adrian La Roda Vice Chair	Caribbean Network of Fisherfolk Organizations Nassau, New Providence <b>THE BAHAMAS</b> Tel: (242) 427 2441	<a href="mailto:alarodabahafish@gmail.com">alarodabahafish@gmail.com</a>
Mauro Gongora Fisheries Officer	Fisheries Department Princess Margaret Drive, P.O. Box 148, Belize City <b>BELIZE</b> Tel: (501) 223-2623 / 224-4552 / 223-2187	<a href="mailto:megongora2@gmail.com">megongora2@gmail.com</a>
Denzil Roberts Chief Fisheries Officer	Department of Fisheries Ministry of Agriculture Regent and Vlissengen Roads, Bourda, Georgetown <b>GUYANA</b> Tel: (592) 225-9559 / 225-9551 / 641-9331	<a href="mailto:fisheriesguyana@gmail.com">fisheriesguyana@gmail.com</a> <a href="mailto:d_robertsapcu@yahoo.com">d_robertsapcu@yahoo.com</a> <a href="mailto:bertz99@yahoo.com">bertz99@yahoo.com</a>



Courtney Cole Chief Executive Officer (ag.)	National Fisheries Authority Ministry of Industry, Commerce, Agriculture and Fisheries P.O. Box 470 Marcus Garvey Drive, Kingston 13 <b>JAMAICA</b> Tel: (876) 923-8811 / 923-8812 / 923-8813	<a href="mailto:tdo@micaf.gov.jm">tdo@micaf.gov.jm</a> <a href="mailto:cbcole@micaf.gov.jm">cbcole@micaf.gov.jm</a>
Avery Smikle Director, Aquaculture Branch	Fisheries Division P.O. Box 470 Marcus Garvey Drive, Kingston 13 <b>JAMAICA</b> Tel: (876) 923-8811 / 923-8812 / 923-8813	<a href="mailto:adsmikle@micaf.gov.jm">adsmikle@micaf.gov.jm</a>
Alwyn Ponteen Chief Fisheries & Ocean Governance Officer	Department of Fisheries Ministry of Agriculture, Trade, Lands, Housing and the Environment P.O. Box 272, Brades <b>MONTSERRAT</b> Tel: (664) 491-2075 / 2546 / 496-1996 (cell)	<a href="mailto:malhe@gov.ms">malhe@gov.ms</a> <a href="mailto:ponteena@gov.ms">ponteena@gov.ms</a> <a href="mailto:aprohan@hotmail.com">aprohan@hotmail.com</a> <a href="mailto:alwyn.ponteen@myport.ac.uk">alwyn.ponteen@myport.ac.uk</a> <a href="mailto:up669929@myport.ac.uk">up669929@myport.ac.uk</a>
Jennifer Cruickshank-Howard Chief Fisheries Officer	Fisheries Division Bay Street, Kingstown <b>ST. VINCENT &amp; THE GRENADINES</b> Tel: (784) 456-2738 / 456-1178	<a href="mailto:fishdiv@gov.vc">fishdiv@gov.vc</a> <a href="mailto:jencruickshankhoward@yahoo.com">jencruickshankhoward@yahoo.com</a>
Elizabeth Mohammed Senior Fisheries Officer	Fisheries Division Ministry of Agriculture, Land and Fisheries #35 Cipriani Boulevard Newtown, Port of Spain <b>TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO</b> Tel: (868) 623-8525/ 623-6028 / 625 9358	<a href="mailto:emohammed.2fdtt@gmail.com">emohammed.2fdtt@gmail.com</a> <a href="mailto:emohammed@gov.tt">emohammed@gov.tt</a>
Harnarine Lalla	Fisheries Division Ministry of Agriculture, Land and Fisheries 35 Cipriani Boulevard Newtown, Port of Spain <b>TRINIDAD and TOBAGO</b> Tel: (868) 623-8525	<a href="mailto:H_lalla@hotmail.com">H_lalla@hotmail.com</a>
Keegan Slinger Product Development Manager	Caribbean Fisheries Training and Development Institute P.O Box 1150, Western Main Road, Chaguaramas, Port of Spain, <b>TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO</b> Tel: (868) 634-4276/1635	<a href="mailto:keegan.slinger@gmail.com">keegan.slinger@gmail.com</a>
Kathy Lockhart	Department of Environment and Coastal Resources Ministry of Environment and Home Affairs Lower Bight Road, Providenciales	<a href="mailto:klockhart@gov.tc">klockhart@gov.tc</a>

	<b>TURKS and CAICOS ISLANDS</b> Tel: (649) 946-2801 / 941-5122	
Dr. Yvette Diei Ouadi Fishery and Aquaculture Officer Secretary of WECAFC	Food and Agriculture Organization 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor United Nations House Balmoral Gap, Marine Gardens Christ Church <b>BARBADOS</b>	<a href="mailto:Yvette.DieiOuadi@fao.org">Yvette.DieiOuadi@fao.org</a>
Iris Monnereau Regional Project Coordinator CC4FISH, FAO-SLC	Food and Agriculture Organization 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor United Nations House Balmoral Gap, Marine Gardens Christ Church <b>BARBADOS</b>	<a href="mailto:Iris.Monnereau@fao.org">Iris.Monnereau@fao.org</a>
Susan Singh-Renton Deputy Executive Director	CRFM Secretariat Top Floor, Corea's Building Halifax Street, Kingstown <b>ST. VINCENT &amp; THE GRENADINES</b> Tel: (784) 457-3474	<a href="mailto:susan.singhrenton@crfm.net">susan.singhrenton@crfm.net</a>
Peter A. Murray Advisor, Fisheries Management and Development	CRFM Secretariat Princess Margaret Drive Belize City <b>BELIZE</b> Tel: (501) 223-4443	<a href="mailto:peter.a.murray@crfm.int">peter.a.murray@crfm.int</a>
Ms. Pamela Gibson Administrative Secretary	CRFM Secretariat Top Floor, Corea's Building Halifax Street, Kingstown <b>ST. VINCENT &amp; THE GRENADINES</b> Tel: (784) 457-3474	<a href="mailto:crfmsvg@crfm.int">crfmsvg@crfm.int</a>

## APPENDIX 2: ANNOTATED AGENDA

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

23 April 2020

#### DRAFT ANNOTATED AGENDA

ITEM 1	<b>Call to order and prayer</b> <i>The Chairperson will call the meeting to order, and a prayer will be offered.</i>	1000 - 1010
ITEM 2	<b>Registration of Attendance &amp; Introductions</b> <i>The Chairperson will confirm the persons in attendance and invite them to introduce themselves.</i>	
ITEM 3	<b>Adoption of Agenda</b> <i>The Chairperson will seek feedback to inform adoption of the Meeting Agenda.</i>	
ITEM 4	<b>Review of meeting documents</b> <i>The meeting will register its working documents:</i>	1010 - 1015
ITEM 5	<b>Report of Fourth Meeting</b> <i>The Chairperson will facilitate review and adoption of report, as well as discussion of any matters arising.</i>	1015 - 1030
ITEM 6	<b>COTED (Agriculture) Meeting decisions on FISHCOM WG Report</b> <i>The Chairperson will facilitate review and discussion of the COTED decisions on FISHCOM WG Report for 2019, and determine the way forward.</i>	1030 - 1045
ITEM 7	<b>Review of fisheries and aquaculture commodity development initiatives being planned and in progress in the CARICOM region</b> <i>The Chairperson will facilitate review and discussion of reports by those parties engaged in fisheries and aquaculture commodity development initiatives:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(a) Report from CARICOM Secretariat on:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. SPS Model Fisheries Legislation</li><li>b. Project proposal on regional and national industry assessments, strategic and implementation plans</li></ul></li><li>(b) Report from CRFM on:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Working Group on Aquaculture;</li><li>b. SPS follow-up project;</li><li>c. GEF Blue Growth project.</li></ul></li><li>(c) Report from FAO on:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. FISH4ACP project;</li><li>b. Grenada initiative on enabling impact investments and trade improvements for fisheries;</li></ul></li></ul> <i>The meeting will agree on the way forward.</i>	1045 - 1230
ITEM 8	<b>Date of next meeting and adjournment</b> <i>The Chairperson will invite the Group to agree on the date of its next meeting. This will be followed by adjournment</i>	1230 - 1240

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](mailto:secretariat@crfm.int)

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

### **Eastern Caribbean Office**

[crfmsvg@crfm.int](mailto:crfmsvg@crfm.int)

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

[www.crfm.int](http://www.crfm.int)

[www.youtube.com/TheCRFM](http://www.youtube.com/TheCRFM)

[www.facebook.com/CarFisheries](http://www.facebook.com/CarFisheries)

[www.twitter.com/CaribFisheries](http://www.twitter.com/CaribFisheries)

