

Resource Efficiency and Economic Efficiency of Fish Farms in the South East of Côte d'Ivoire



Angui Christian Dorgelès Kevin ABOUA



UNITED NATIONS
UNIVERSITY

UNU-INRA

Institute for Natural Resources in Africa



IDRC | CRDI

International Development Research Centre
Centre de recherches pour le développement international

Canada

Resource Efficiency and Economic Efficiency of Fish Farms in the South East of Côte d’Ivoire

By

Angui Christian Dorgelès Kevin ABOUA

*This work was carried out with the aid of a grant from the International Development
Research Centre, Ottawa, Canada.*



**UNITED NATIONS
UNIVERSITY**

UNU-INRA

Institute for Natural Resources in Africa



IDRC | CRDI

International Development Research Centre
Centre de recherches pour le développement international

Canada

About UNU-INRA

The United Nations University Institute for Natural Resources in Africa (UNU-INRA) is the second Research and Training Centre / Programme established by the UN University. The mandate of the Institute is to promote the sustainable management of Africa's natural resources through research, capacity development, policy advice, knowledge sharing and transfer. The Institute is headquartered in Accra, Ghana, and also has five Operating Units (OUs) in Cameroon, Ivory Coast, Namibia, Senegal and Zambia.

About UNU-INRA PhD Internship Programme

The UNU-INRA PhD Internship Programme selects researchers on a competitive basis to carry out policy-relevant research at the Institute, so as to inform natural resources management policies in Africa. This working paper is one of the outputs of UNU-INRA's project on "[*Unleashing the Potential of African Rural Economies through Green Growth*](#)", funded by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC).

About the Authors

Angui Christian Dorgelès Kevin ABOUA is at the Department of Economics and Management of the University of Felix Houphouët-Boigny, Cocody-Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire. He produced this paper as a PhD Intern of UNU-INRA.

Author's Contact

christy.aboua@yahoo.fr

UNU-INRA Contact

United Nations University Institute for Natural Resources in Africa (UNU-INRA)
2nd Floor, International House, University of Ghana Campus, Accra, Ghana
Private Mail Bag, KIA, Accra, Ghana. **Tel:** +233 302 213 850 Ext. 6318.

Email: inra@unu.edu **Website:** www.inra.unu.edu
[Facebook](#), [Twitter](#), and [LinkedIn](#)

© UNU-INRA, 2017

ISBN: 9789988633233

Cover Design: Praise Nutakor, UNU-INRA

Published by: UNU-INRA, Accra, Ghana

Disclaimer:

The views and opinions expressed in this publication are that of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the United Nations University Institute for Natural Resources in Africa (UNU-INRA).

Abstract

Fish farming is currently considered as a complement to national fish production in Côte d'Ivoire. In order to ensure a sustainable fish production, it is necessary that the resources employed in the production process are used efficiently. This study analyzes the resource efficiency and economic efficiency of 32 fish farms in the South East of Côte d'Ivoire using Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) model and Cost-Benefit Analysis. The results revealed that fish farmers showed a low performance with an average technical efficiency score of 0.738 (CRS) and 0.575 (SBM) and an average economic score of 0.553. Fish farmers using industrial feed are the most technically and economically efficient. Through DEA model scenarios (oriented-input, oriented-output and slacked-based model), the study shows that fish farmers generated excesses in resource utilization causing a shortfall in output. The scenario-3 based on slacked-based model minimizing resources simultaneously with a maximization of output indicated that a reduction of excesses in resources would have increased the output of 16.18%. Finally, the cost benefit analysis shows that, overall, fish farms achieved a positive gross and net profit margin. This study suggests that policy actors should play an important role in facilitating fish farmers' access to feed and quality fingerlings. In addition, fish farmers must be trained on good practices for sustainable production and pond management.

Key Words: Côte d'Ivoire, DEA, economic efficiency, fish farming, resource efficiency

Acknowledgements

The author greatly appreciates the financial support of the United Nations University Institute for Natural Resources in Africa (UNU-INRA). I am grateful to the Director of UNU-INRA, Dr. Elias Ayuk for this doctoral research opportunity he has given me to finalize my thesis. Finally, I would like to thank all those who contributed to the realization of this work through their comments and suggestions.

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Theoretical Framework and Literature Review	3
2.1 Concepts and measures of efficiency	3
2.2 Empirical Review on productive efficiency and profitability of fish farming	4
2.2.1 <i>Productive Efficiency</i>	4
2.2.2 Profitability	5
3. Methodology	7
3.1 Data Envelopment Analysis	7
3.2 Resource Efficiency Analysis.....	10
3.3. Area of the Study.....	11
4. Results	14
4.1 Technical and Economic Efficiencies.....	14
4.2. Resources efficiency analysis	17
4.3 Profitability analysis	18
5. Discussion	21
6. Conclusion	22
References	24

1. Introduction

Aquaculture is recognised as the sub-sector in the fisheries industry which has experienced the most rapid growth in fish production in the world. This sub-sector will contribute to a large part of fish production by 2030, marked by the doubling of tilapia production from 4.3 to 7.3 million tons per year from 2010 to 2030 (World Bank/FAO/IFPRI 2013). It is estimated that aquaculture will soon account for about half of the world fisheries production and will provide nearly 62% of fish consumption (World Bank/FAO/IFPRI 2013). To achieve these objectives, the aquaculture sector should be able to improve productivity while promoting sustainable practices (Waite et al. 2014). This means an increase in fish output relative to an efficient use of resources (land, water, feed, energy) and a minimization of water pollution, fish diseases and losses.

Côte d'Ivoire demonstrated its interest in aquaculture development as far back as the colonial era through aquaculture research. The natural asset of the country for the practice of aquaculture is characterized by its openness to the Atlantic Ocean and inland waters. Nearly 60% of its territory is served by a permanent water system (MIPRAH 2003)¹. However, the contribution of aquaculture to the national fish production is still marginal. In 2000, the total production was about 1,200 tonnes. These recent years, it is estimated to 4,500 tonnes representing 5.7% of national fisheries production (DAP 2014)². The production is dominated by tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) which account for 90%, and followed by African catfish (*Heterobranchus longifilis* and *Clarias gariepinus*) and catfish (*Chrysichthys nigrodigitatus*) (MIPRAH 2009). Despite the production increase, several constraints were identified as hindering the development of aquaculture.

The Strategic Plan for Livestock Development, Fisheries and Aquaculture (2014-2020) underlined some constraints directly related to aquaculture production. There include:

- (i) Low availability of fingerlings;
- (ii) Low availability and quality of feed
- (iii) Inappropriate water management
- (iv) Poor knowledge of aquaculture management techniques
- (v) Insufficient support of aquaculture extension services

Feed is an essential input in aquaculture production. Fish farmers use either industrial feed or reformulate feed from agricultural by-products or leftover

food. Since industrial feed has a high cost and is not accessible to all fish farmers, they reformulate the fish feed themselves. The re-formulated feed is sometimes of poor quality and this can affect productivity and result in significant economic losses related to low quality, low weight and high fish mortality. This suggests the importance of measuring the productive and economic efficiency of fish farmers in Côte d'Ivoire in order to assess their level of performance and identify the ways to improve them.

Several studies have focused on productive efficiency and profitability analysis of aquaculture in Sub-Saharan Africa at the farm level (Bukonya et al. 2013; Ougandari and Akinbogun 2010; Onumah Acquah 2010; Kareem et al. 2009; Brummett et al. 2004; Kaliba et al. 2006; Kaliba et al. 2007; Hyuha et al. 2011; Boateng et al. 2013; Ideba et al. 2013). These studies used the Stochastic Frontier Analysis (SFA) or Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) to estimate efficiency score and its determinants. In contrast to these approaches, our study analyzes the resource efficiency and economic efficiency. It aims first to identify the efficiency of the use of resources, the slacks in the resources (excesses) and output (shortfall) using DEA models. It also determines the profitability of fish farms using cost benefit analysis. We apply our methodology to 32 fish farms in the South East of Côte d'Ivoire surveyed in 2009. Indeed, in 2005, the south of the country was still the area of high fish production with 82.34% of total aquaculture production or 713.12 tonnes, followed by the central west with 14.43% or 125 tonnes and the East with 3.28% or 28 tonnes (MIPRAH 2009).

This study aims to contribute to the existing literature on the analysis of productive efficiency and profitability in aquaculture. In addition, the knowledge of the level of productive and economic performance of fish farm in Côte d'Ivoire could be useful for policy makers to develop policies that will ensure the viability and the sustainability of aquaculture.

The rest of the study is organized as following. Section 2 focuses on literature on efficiency measures and empirical studies related to productive efficiency and profitability of aquaculture. Section 3 describes the methodologies of the study. Section 4 presents data and the area of the study. Sections 5 and 6 present the results and the discussion respectively. The final section concludes the study.

2. Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

This section has two parts. The first part discusses the concepts and measures of efficiency. The second part presents the empirical work on technical efficiency and profitability of aquaculture in Sub-Saharan Africa.

2.1 Concepts and measures of efficiency

The efficiency measurement began with the work of Farrell (1957) inspired by those of Koopmans (1951) and Debreu (1951). It is intimately related to the estimation of the production frontier based on distance function. Farrell (1957) distinguished between technical efficiency and allocative efficiency.

The concept of technical efficiency refers to the ability to produce maximum output from a given set of inputs. The allocative efficiency is defined as the ability of the production unit to combine the inputs in optimal proportion, given their respective prices and the technology of production. The product of technical efficiency and allocative efficiency determines the economic efficiency or overall efficiency. It can be interpreted as the potential reduction of production costs (cost efficiency) or a potential increase in revenue (economic efficiency). Economic efficiency enables one to draw conclusions on the opportunity of a production unit to operate at the optimal or sub-optimal size.

In the microeconomic theory, the producer behaviour is generally characterized by profit maximization or cost minimization. Thus, the choice of economic efficiency measurement depends on the availability of inputs or outputs prices. Cost efficiency is defined as the ratio of observed cost and minimal cost. It is the measure of economic efficiency oriented-input proposed by Farrell (1957). Revenue efficiency is estimated as the ratio of revenue obtained and optimal revenue. It is the measure of economic efficiency oriented-outputs introduced by Färe et al. (1985). These ratios are called efficiency scores and are bounded between 0 and 1. A production unit is efficient if the calculated score is equal to 1, otherwise the production unit is inefficient. The efficiency analysis helps one to know the best level of resources to be used to achieve a maximum level of output and the level of resources and output slacks. It also allows one to analyze resources efficiency and output efficiency. Resource efficiency is a mean of sustainable production and is defined as the creation of more value with less resource.

In practice, two approaches can be used to measure efficiency: The Stochastic Frontier Analysis (parametric approach) and Data Envelopment Analysis (non-parametric approach). In presence of multiple outputs, the DEA approach proposed by Charnes et al. (1978) is the most appropriate. It allows one to calculate the efficiency scores, the input and output slack values, and to identify the production units which are fully efficient. The efficiency score are determined by optimizing DEA model either in constant returns or in variable returns. In addition DEA model can be optimize following the production unit objective's orientation. The input-oriented DEA models consider the possible (proportional) input reduction while maintaining the current levels of outputs. The output-oriented DEA models consider the possible (proportional) output augmentation while keeping the level of inputs. However these standard DEA models do not take account of slacks in the "objective function". Charnes et al. (1985) developed an additive DEA model which considers a possible input decrease as well as output increase simultaneously.

This model provides a measure of non equi-proportional efficiency scores, unlike the standard models that provide equi-proportionate efficiency scores. It identifies the efficient units of those inefficient. However, it does not measure the intensity of inefficiency, as well as standard models (Tone 2001). In these respects, Tone (2001) proposed a slack based model (SBM) that optimize the input and output slacks and provide a pure measure of efficiency.

2.2 Empirical Review on productive efficiency and profitability of fish farming

2.2.1 *Productive Efficiency*

There is a substantial empirical literature on economic analysis of fish farming in Sub-Saharan Africa, mainly focused on "tilapia". These studies evaluated the technical, allocative and economic efficiency on the one hand, and on the other hand the profitability. The studies have shown that fish farms do not reach their potential level of output, yet they are still profitable. Kareem et al. (2009) estimated the technical, allocative and economic efficiencies of 85 tilapia fish farmers using concrete and earthen pond systems in Ogun State. The results of the study revealed that the economic efficiency of concrete pond system was 76% while earthen pond system made as high as 84% economic efficiency level. Both systems almost have the same level of technical efficiency with 88% for concrete pond and 89% for earthen pond. The study also revealed that the allocative efficiency was 79% while earthen pond had

85%. Analyzing the inefficiency model, the study found that farmers experience is the only source of efficiency.

Onumah and Acquah (2010) applied the single-stage modelling Stochastic Frontier Approach to examine the technical efficiency and its determinants of 150 fish farming polyculture (tilapia, catfish and carp) in the southern of Ghana. The results of the study revealed that the technical efficiency score of fish farms ranged from 34.3% to 98.4%, with an average of 80.8%. The study found that gender and cultural system (monoculture) are the principal sources of efficiencies. By interacting variables in the inefficiency model, the study also found that older fish farmers with more experience, older fish farmers benefiting from extension service and those who received formal education and training were the more technically efficient.

Ougandari and Akinbogun (2010) modelled and estimated the technical efficiency with production risk input of 64 fish farms in Oyo State in the south western of Nigeria. The empirical findings of the study showed that mean fish output is significantly influenced by labour, fertilizer, and feed. Fertilizer and feed are found to be risk-increasing inputs, whilst labour is revealed to be a risk-reducing input. The study indicated that the technical efficiency is estimated to 92.21% without risk and 79.21% with risk, showing that efficiency score is overstated when the production technology of the fish farms is modelled without the flexible risk component. The study revealed that experience, training, market access are the factors decreasing the technical inefficiency.

Bukenya et al. (2013) used the stochastic frontier production function to examine the efficiency of resource utilization of 200 small-scale fish farming in three major districts in central Uganda. They found that small-scale farmers were inefficient in resource allocation by over-utilizing labour with allocative index of -0.94 and grossly under-utilized pond size, feeds and fingerlings with allocative efficient indices of 1.15, 1.64, 3.71, respectively. Estimating the determinants of technical efficiency, the study found that access to extension service, access to credit, possession of a farm register are the key factor to improve the technical efficiency.

2.2.2 Profitability

Brummett et al. (2004) evaluated the profitability of five-intensive aquaculture farms in peri-urban area of Cameroon using cost-benefit analysis. The study showed that the profit varies considerably among farmers. Two fish farms

made losses and the other three was profitable, with an annual net profit ranging between 0.3 million FCFA (545 USD) and 3.87 million FCFA (7036 USD). The average net profit represents 34% of the total revenue. The study indicated that fish farmers could improve the profitability if they adopt best practices in feeding and fish stocking.

Kaliba et al. (2006) examined the profitability of three systems of Nile Tilapia culture (mixed culture of tilapia, tilapia with catfish as predatory and sexed male tilapia) of 85 fish farms in Tanzania. The study used gross margin approach applied to two pond sizes (150 m² and 300 m²) and found that all cultural systems are profitable. The systems of Tilapia with catfish as predatory and sexed male tilapia showed higher profit margin estimated respectively to 0.27 and 0.47 with pond size of 150 m² and 0.23 and 0.30 with pond size of 300 m². However, mixed culture tilapia generated less profit and does not ensure a sustainable economic viability.

Kaliba et al. (2007) made the same analysis in Kenya based on 138 fish farmers operating in pond sizes of 200 m² and 634 m². They found that pond size of 634 m² generated more profit, however the profit margin is higher with pond size of 200 m² estimated in average of over 50 percent. The study also revealed that sexed male tilapia showed higher profit whatever the size of the pond, however the profit from mixed culture of tilapia was low and the economic viability is not sustainable. Hyuha et al. (2011) determined the profitability of 200 small aquaculture businesses in the central of Uganda. Through cost-benefit analysis, they showed that small aquaculture businesses are profitable, but profits remain relatively low. On average, aquaculture businesses achieved a net profit of 41 USD per pond per cycle. In addition, for each pond, 1 USD invested gives a return of 0.05 USD.

Boateng et al. (2013) evaluated the profitability of 80 fish farmers of male tilapia in the Ashanti Region of Ghana. They employed the gross margin analysis. Their results showed that the average annual profit is estimated to GH¢5282.17 (3521 USD) representing 65% of the total sales. They also found that the return on investment was 0.91 meaning that GH¢ 1 invested gives a profit of GH¢ 0.91 (0.6 USD). They also concluded that fish farming is considerably profitable in the Ashanti Region of Ghana. In addition, Ideba et al. (2013) estimated the gross margin of 36 fish farmers of tilapia and catfish in Calabar Cross Rivers State in Nigeria. The results of the study revealed that fish farmers in this region were profitable with a gross margin ranging between 400,000 Naira to 700,000 Naira per year (2500 USD to 4375 USD). They

further found that 89% of fish farmers made a profit ranging from 200,000 Naira to over 3.5 million Naira (1250 USD - 21875 USD).

Like these previous studies, the present research analyzes the resources efficiency and economic efficiency adopting a different approach. It shows in what proportions the resources should be used efficiently to increase the output level. It also evaluates the profitability of the 32 fish farms in the south-east of Côte d'Ivoire.

3. Methodology

Our methodology first used DEA approaches to estimate the technical and economic efficiency score as well as the resource efficiency through scenarios (Oriented-input, Oriented-output and slacked based Model). Afterwards, we applied cost-benefit technique to determine the profitability of fish farms of the study area.

3.1 Data Envelopment Analysis

Suppose n Decision Making Unit ($DMU_j : j = 1, 2, \dots, n$) using m inputs $x_{ij} (i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$ to produce s outputs, $y_{rj} (r = 1, 2, \dots, s)$. y_{rj} is the output r of DMU_j and x_{ij} is the input i of DMU_j . The relative efficiency h_{j_0} for the benchmarking DMU_{j_0} is determined as following (Charnes, et al., 1978):

Model 1: Standard Models (primal and dual)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Maximize } h_{j_0} &= \frac{\sum_{r=1}^s u_r y_{rj_0}}{\sum_{i=1}^m v_i x_{ij_0}} \\
 \text{S/C } &\begin{cases} \sum_{r=1}^s u_r y_{rj_0} \\ \sum_{i=1}^m v_i x_{ij_0} \end{cases} & (1) \\
 v_i \geq 0, u_r \geq 0, & \text{ avec } i = 1, 2, \dots, m \text{ et } r = 1, 2, 3, \dots, s
 \end{aligned}$$

v_i et u_r are the weights of each input and output respectively. The relative efficiency h_{j_0} is defined as the ratio of weighted output to the weighted inputs.

By introducing slacks variables s^- and s^+ , the maximization program (primal model) is transformed into minimization program (dual model). The dual model is described as following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Minimize } \theta & (2) \\ & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j x_{ij} + s_j^- \leq \theta x_{ij_0} \\ \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j y_{rj} - s_j^+ \geq y_{rj_0} \\ s^- \geq 0, s^+ \geq 0, \lambda_j > 0 \end{array} \right. \end{aligned}$$

By adding the constraint $\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j = 1$, we obtain the BCC model developed by Banker, Charnes and Cooper (Banker, et al. 1984) which allows one to take account for returns of scale. θ is the efficiency score to be estimated. s^- and s^+ are slack variables representing the excess in inputs and deficit in output. λ_j is a scalar positive vector. The optimal solution of the program above is to determine $(\theta^*, \lambda_j^*, s_j^{*-}, s_j^{*+})$. DMU_{j_0} is efficient if $\theta^* = 1$, and $s_{j_0}^{*-} = 0$, $s_{j_0}^{*+} = 0$. DMU_{j_0} is weakly efficient if $\theta^* = 1$ and $s_{j_0}^{*-} \neq 0$, $s_{j_0}^{*+} \neq 0$. If $\theta^* < 1$, DMU_{j_0} is said inefficient.

Model 2: Slack Based Model

The Slack Based Model (SBM) developed by Tone (2001) is based on the additive DEA model. It takes into account slacks (inputs and output) in the efficiency measure, unlike standard DEA models. SMB DEA model is set as following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\underset{\lambda, s^-, s^+}{\text{Min}} \quad \rho &= \frac{1 - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m s_i^- / x_{i0}}{1 + \frac{1}{s} \sum_{r=1}^s s_r^+ / y_{r0}} \quad (3) \\
\text{S/C} \quad &\begin{cases} x_{ij_0} = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j x_{ij} + s_j^- \\ y_{rj_0} = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j y_{rj} - s_j^+ \\ s^- \geq 0, s^+ \geq 0, \lambda_j > 0 \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

ρ represents the efficiency score. The ratio ρ is defined as the mean reduction rate in inputs to the mean expansion rate to output. In other words, the SBM efficiency score is interpreted as the product of output and input inefficiencies. s^- and s^+ are slack variables representing the excess in inputs and deficit in output. DMU_{j_0} is SBM-efficient if $\rho = 1$, $s^{-*} = 0$ and $s^{+*} = 0$, meaning zero slack in inputs and output.

Model 3: Economic efficiency (Revenue efficiency)

The revenue efficiency is obtained by maximizing the program below:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Maximize} \quad &\sum_{r=1}^s p_{rj_0} y_{rj_0} \quad (4) \\
\text{S/C} \quad &\begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j x_{ij} + \leq x_{ij_0} \\ \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j y_{rj} \geq y_{rj_0} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

p_{rj_0} represents the price of output r and λ_j is a positive scalar. The optimal solution of the maximization program is (y_{rj}^*, λ_j^*) . The revenue efficiency (RE) scores is the ratio of the obtained revenue to the maximum revenue.

$$RE = \frac{\sum_{r=1}^s P_{rj_0} y_{rj_0}}{\sum_{r=1}^s P_{rj_0} y_{rj_0}^*} \quad (5)$$

The revenue efficiency score is contained between 0 and 1. DMU_{j_0} is economically efficient if $RE=1$.

3.2 Resource Efficiency Analysis

The analysis of resource efficiency is based on inputs and output slacks. We estimated the slacks following three production objectives that fish farmers can set defined as scenarios:

- Scenario 1: Fish farmer minimizes the resource given a fixed level of fish output (Objective oriented-input)
- Scenario 2: Fish farmer maximizes the level of fish output given the resource (Objective oriented-output) and
- Scenario 3: Fish farmer maximizes the level of fish output while minimizing the resources [Objective oriented input-output (Slack Based Model)].

The resource efficiency analysis consists of determining the fish output surplus that can be achieved if excess were reduced.

Profitability

The budgetary technique involving the cost-benefit analysis is used to determine the profitability of fish farming in the study area. The methodology is specified as follows:

$$\text{Profit} = \text{TR} - \text{TC} \quad (9)$$

$$\text{TR} = P \cdot Q \quad (10)$$

Where TR =Total Revenue; TC = Total Cost; P = the average fish Price and Q = the quantity of fish output. In addition of the profit, the profitability can be determined with the use of the ratio analysis such as:

- *Gross Profit* = Total Revenue – Variable Cost
- *Net Profit* = Total Revenue – Total Cost
- *Gross Profit Margin* = Gross Profit / Total Revenue
- *Net Profit Margin* = Net Profit / Total Revenue
- *Return of Investment* = Net Profit / Total Cost

3.3. Area of the Study

The study is focuses on the south-east of Côte d'Ivoire. The data used is from a survey collected as part of a veterinary study³ financed and coordinated by the Swiss Centre for Scientific Research (CSRS) in Côte d'Ivoire. The data were collected using a survey questionnaire administered to an exhaustive sample of 38 fish famers in the south-east of Côte d'Ivoire during the period January-February 2009. This area was chosen based on its importance in fish production and concerned six cities: Aboisso, Agboville, Adzopé, Anyama, Bingerville and Dabou. Data of six fish farmers were excluded from the analysis due to missing data. In sum, data of 32 fish farmers were selected for the study.

The information collected were on fish output, inputs, fish farmer characteristics and the farms characteristics. We distinguish small and large farms. Fish farmers are concentrated in Abidjan (Bingerville and Anyama) and Agboville. Table 1 shows the distribution of fish farms, the number of pond, their size and the level of production.




Figure 1: Area of the study

Table 1: Distribution of fish farms, pond number and size, production

Localities	Number of Fish Farms	Pond number	Size (m ²)	Percentage (%)	Production (Kg)	Percentage (%)
Aboisso	6	88	60,535	9.50	14,304	4.00
Adzopé	4	211	437,485.7	68.10	76,139	21.12
Agboville	8	106	77,923	12.10	22,394	6.22
Bingerville	6	255	13,968	2.20	230,935	64.00
Dabou	5	184	35,917.4	5.60	8,987	2.50
Anyama	3	42	16,260	2.50	7,750	2.15
Total	32	884	642,089.1	100.00	360,509	100.00

Table 2 shows the description of the variables used in the study. Four inputs and two outputs were used to analyze the resource efficiency. *Feed* as the essential resource in fish farming is measured in kilogram. It was composed of industrial products (IVOIGRAIN and granulate) and reformulated feed from agricultural by-product such as: fish meal, rice flour, cottonseed, wheat bran and bread. On all the farms surveyed, 87.5% of farmers used conventional feed, 9% of farmers used conventional feed and natural feed and 3% of farmers used leftovers food. Among the fish farmers who used conventional feed, 47% of them used industrial feed, 44% of them reformulated the fish feed themselves and 9% of them used both type of feed.

The quantity of fingerling (measured in number). Land is the total pond size (*measured in m²*). *Water* is the amount of water used in the ponds (*measured in m³*). The two outputs are the quantity of fish produced (measured in kg) and the average fish weight (measured in grams). The fish produced is composed of 97.6% of Tilapia, 1.7% of Catfish and 0.6% of African catfish. Table 2 also shows the descriptive statistics of input costs and output price. The costs concern: feed, fingerlings, labour, equipment and other costs. Costs and price are measured in FCFA⁵. Equipment cost includes pond construction, cages,

fishings net (seines) and other equipment used by the fish farmers. The other costs included transportation cost, energy cost and bloodstocks cost.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of the variables used in the study

Variables	Mean	Max	Min	Std. Err
Resources				
Feed in Kilogram (kg)	41,170.4	407,898	14,000	89,681.3
Fingerlings (number)	82,282.3	960,000	1,290	17,996.6
Land in squared meter (m^2)	20,367.5	359,150	1,060	62,749.4
Water in cube meter (m^3)	17,262.8	69,362.5	795	47,424.9
Costs				
Feed in FCFA	66,333,388	90,000,000	0	16,300,000
Fingerlings in FCFA	138,437.5	1,750,000	0	440,403.8
Labour in FCFA	3,511,625	34,100,000	9,000	6,847,467
Equipment in FCFA	2,768,902	31,431,334	32,725	6,380,591
Other costs in FCFA	1,101,005	11,400,000	20,000	2,274,926
Outputs				
Quantity of fish (kg)	11,398.34	29,280.89	35	144,000
Fish weight (g)	341.5	450	250	51.15
Price of fish in FCFA	1,484.6	2,000	1,100	211.9

4. Results

The results of technical and economic efficiencies scores, resources efficiency and profitability are presented in this section.

4.1 Technical and Economic Efficiencies

We use Models 2, 3 and 4 to estimate the technical and economic efficiencies scores. The results in Column 1 and 2 in Table-3 are the technical efficiency scores of CCR and SBM-DEA models obtained using feed, fingerlings, water and land as inputs and fish output and fish weight as outputs. The results indicated that the average technical efficiency scores are 0.738 and 0.575 respectively. The CCR scores are lower than SBM scores. In total, 40 percent of fish farms are CCR-efficient and SBM-efficient with efficiency score equal to 1. There are farms, (Number 3 of Aboisso, Numbers. 10, 11, 13 and 17 of Agboville, Number 18 of Anyama, Number 21, 22, 23 and 25 of Bingerville and Number 29, 30 and 31 of Dabou.

The results in column 3 are economic efficiency scores and are obtained from Model 4. Fish revenue is the output and feed cost, fingerlings cost, labour cost, equipment cost and other cost are the inputs. The results show that the average economic efficiency score is estimated to 0.553. In total 25 percent of fish farmers are economically efficient. These are farms (Number 5) of Dabou, (Number 16 of Agboville, (Number 22, 23, 24 and 25 of Bingerville and Number 30 of Dabou. The results also show that only farms such as Muchtho, Adjinn, Adjinn telegraph and Dabou are both technically and economically efficient.

Table 3: Technical and Economic efficiency scores

	Regions	Locality	Technical Efficiency CCR (1)	Technical Efficiency SBM-DEA (2)	Economic Efficiency Revenue (3)
1.	Aboisso (6)	Aboisso	0.713	0.638	0.363
2.		Befe	0.696	0.100	0.061
3.		Aboisso	1	1	0.665
4.		Mafere	0.642	0.217	0.681
5.		Mafere	0.819	0.302	1
6.		Mafere	0.606	0.315	0.258
7.	Adzope (3)	Andé	0.049	0.041	0.118
8.		De la mé	0.329	0.011	0.795
9.		Bonauga	0.456	0.080	0.333
10.	Agboville (8)	Anyama	1	1	0.358
11.		Anyama	1	1	0.798
12.		Rubino	0.550	0.250	0.242
13.		Mutcho	1	1	0.843
14.		Offoumpu	0.687	0.152	0.597
15.		Azaguié	0.593	0.468	0.917
16.		Azaguié	0.589	0.536	1
17.		Azaguié	1	1	0.519
18.	Anyama (3)	Anyama	1	1	0.452
19.		Anyama	0.752	0.574	1
20.		Anyama	0.233	0.186	0.226
21.	Bingerville (7)	Adjin	1	1	0.527
22.		Adjin	1	1	1
23.		Adjintele	1	1	1
24.		Akakro	0.663	0.381	1
25.		Akakro	1	1	1
26.		Achokoi	0.568	0.027	0.180
27.		Achokoi	0.874	0.596	0.136
28.	Dabou (5)	Dabou	0.204	0.151	0.050
29.		Dabou	1	1	0.375
30.		Dabou	1	1	1
31.		Ira	1	1	0.534
32.		Mopoyem	0.278	0.367	0.105
		Average	0.738	0.575	0.553

Figure 2 examines the spatial distribution of fish farmers according to their technical and economic efficiencies levels. The figure shows a positive but low relationship between technical efficiency and economic efficiency. This result means that fish farms that produce efficiently are likely to earn maximum revenue.




Figure 2. Relationship between Technical efficiency and Economic Efficiency

The results in Table 4 compare the average efficiency scores by type of feed used. The average technical efficiency of farmers using industrial feed is higher than those who use reformulated feed. They are 0.695 and 0.589, respectively. The average economic efficiency is almost similar for both systems. They are 0.618 and 0.605, respectively. Trained fish farmers using industrial feed have an average higher technical and economic efficiencies equal to 0.739 and 0.724, followed by experienced fish farmers who use reformulated feed with efficiency score of 0.618 and 0.632, respectively. The less economic efficient are untrained fish farmers using industrial feed.

Table 4: Efficiency scores and experience by type of feed used and access to training

	Industrial feed			Reformulated feed			
Training	Technical Efficiency	Economic Efficiency	Experience in year	Training	Technical Efficiency	Economic Efficiency	Experience in year
Access (8)	0.739	0.724	4.09	Access (6)	0.560	0.597	3.16
No access (7)	0.643	0.468	6.58	No access (6)	0.618	0.632	6.18
Average	0.695 <i>(0.376)</i>	0.605 <i>(0.340)</i>		Average	0.589 <i>(0.392)</i>	0.615 <i>(0.334)</i>	

4.2. Resources efficiency analysis

The optimization of DEA models following three scenarios (Oriented-input, Oriented-output and Slacked Based Model) shows the presence of slacks (excesses in inputs and shortfall in output) in the production (Table 5). The proportion of resource slacks defined as the ratio of the amount of excesses to the total resources used are the following:

- Scenario 1: Feed (7.8%); Fingerlings (0.06%); Pond Size (46.6%) and Water (30.92%)
- Scenario 2: Feed (31.7%); Fingerlings (3.92%); Pond Size (80.06%) and Water (50.93%)
- Scenario 3: Feed (1.9%); Fingerlings (10.81%); Pond Size (52.5%) and Water (50.17%)

The results indicated that excesses in inputs are lower in Scenario 1 and higher in Scenario 2. The results also show that fish output shortfall is higher in Scenario 3 than in Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. They are respectively 54123kg, 822kg, and 2780kg equal to 16.18%, 0.77% and 0.22% of total production.

These results indicated that an efficient management of resource leading to zero slack in resource use in different scenarios will increase the fish output

of 16.18% (Scenario 3); 0.77% (Scenario 2) and 0.22% (Scenario 1). On the one hand, this analysis highlights how much excess in input and shortfall in production can be considerable depending on the objectives that a production unit can be fixed; on the other hand, it shows how a reduction of input excesses results in an increase of output.

Table 5: DEA Scenarios

All DMU	Feed s ⁻	Fingerling s ⁻	Water s ⁻	Land s ⁻	Output s ⁺	Projection Output
Total	1,317,452	2,633,034	552,410.2	651,761.1		360,509
(Scenario 1) Oriented- inputs	102,811 (7.80 %)	1,646 (0.06 %)	257,491 (46.60 %)	201,556 (30.92 %)	822	361,331 (0.22 %)
(Scenario 2) Oriented- outputs	418,560 (31.77 %)	103,424 (3.92%)	442,297 (80.06%)	331,958 (50.93%)	2,780	363,289 (0.77 %)
(Scenario 3) Slacked Based Model	25,797 (1.90%)	284,783 (10.81%)	298,089 (52.51%)	327,004.6 (50.17%)	58,361	418,870 (16.18%)

4.3 Profitability analysis

Table 6 presents the profitability analysis of the fish farms using “Cost-Benefit” approach. The results show that variable costs and fixed cost represents respectively 80.44% and 19.56% of the total production cost. The cost share of each variable input in the total cost is the following: feed (46.86%), labour (24.81%), other costs (7.8%) and fingerlings (1.21%). Similarly, the fixed inputs are: pond (7%), other equipment (6.31%), cages (5.72%) and seines (0.53%). Fish farmers make average annual total revenue of 16,926,772 FCFA. On average, the variable cost amounted to 11,384,455 FCFA. By deducting variable cost in the total revenue, fish farms obtain an average annual profit of 5,542,317 FCFA representing 32.7% of the total revenue. Gross margins vary from a positive value of FCFA 74,507,000 FCFA to a loss of 12,392,431 FCFA. Subtracting the gross margin to fixed cost, the average net profit margin is 2,760,050 FCFA representing 16.38% of the total revenue. The results also indicated that the return on investment is 0.19 meaning that 100 FCFA invested make a net profit of 19 FCFA.

Table 6: Profitability Analysis

Variables	Amount(Average) N=32	Percentage (%)	Min-Max
Output	11,398.5		35 – 144,000
Price	1,485		1,100 – 2,000
Total revenue	16,926,772.5		39,900 – 187,200, 000
Variable cost	11 ,384 ,455.1	80.44	
Fingerling cost	138,437.5	0.97	
Feed cost	6,633,387.6	46.86	
Labour	3,511,625	24.81	
Other cost	1,101,005	7.8	
Gross profit	5,542,317.4		(-) 12,392,431 – 74,507,000
Gross profit margin (%)	32.7		0 – 67.76
Fixed Cost	2,768,902	19.56	
Pond Cost	990,425.7	7	
Seines Cost	75,171.8	0.53	
Cages Cost	809,951.6	5.72	
Other Equipment	893,353	6.31	
Total Cost	14,153,358.1	100	(-) 18,727,209 – 59,667,725
Net Profit	2,773,414,4		0 – 65.42
Net profit margin (%)	16.38		
Return on investment	0.19		0-1.89

In Figures (3) and (4), we examine respectively the spatial distribution of economic efficiency and return on investment and economic efficiency and net profit margin. The figures pointed out that fish farmers who are economically efficient realize a high return on investment and high net profit margin. The farms of Adjin télégraphe, Anyama, Adjin, Akakro and Dabou showed a return of investment more than 1 and a net margin profit more than 50 %. For example, the net profit of the farm Adjin télégraphe represents 65.42% of its total revenue and 100 FCFA invested by the farm gave him a net profit of 189 FCFA.



Figure 3: Economic efficiency and return on investment




Figure 4: Economic Efficiency and Net Profit Margin

5. Discussion

The results of the efficiency analysis indicated that the average levels of technical and economic efficiencies are low. These results implied that there is a possibility of increasing the production level and the revenue if fish farmers combined efficiently the resources used (feed, fingerlings, land and water). The results also show that only four fish farmers simultaneously reach their production potential of economic potential. The average efficiency score found in this study is low comparatively to those found in other studies measuring technical efficiency of tilapia (Kareem et al. 2009; Ougandari and Akinbogun 2010; Onumah and Acquah 2010). Unlike those studies that have used the stochastic frontier, our study adopted DEA approach to consider two outputs (fish output and fish weight).

Our study compared the technical and economic efficiency depending on the type of feed. The results indicated that: (i) fish farms using industrial feed are more technically and economically efficient than fish farmers who use reformulated feed; (ii) the same economic performance is achieved regardless of the type of feed used; (iii) trained fish farmers using industrial feed are the most efficient; (iv) fish farmers who reformulate their fish feed with more experience but untrained are also efficient. These results imply that access to training and access to feed and quality fingerlings are essential to increase the fish productivity and revenue.

The results of resource optimization showed the presence of waste in production. Wastes are higher when the fish farmer aims to maximize the production level given the resources (Scenario 2). However, if fish farmers wanted to minimize the excesses in the use of resources while aiming for increased production, they would have had a production surplus of 58361 kg equivalent to 16.18% (scenario). The results imply that a production strategy aiming at a minimization of resources as well as maximization of output and with zero slacks allows for a sustainable production. According to Waite et al. (2014), to improve productivity and environmental performance of aquaculture, fish farmers must increase production in relation to the resource used, and minimize water pollution, fish diseases and losses.

The findings on profitability showed that on average fish farmers achieved gross and net profit margins of 32.7% and 16.13%, respectively and a return on investment of 0.19. These results indicated that there is a positive profit that can be derived from fish farming in the area of the study. Some studies in Ghana and Nigeria have shown that fish farming is a profitable business.

Boateng et al. (2013) found in the Ashanti Region of Ghana that fish farmers realized on average a net profit margin of 65% and a Return on Investment (ROI) of 0.91. Ideba et al. (2013) in Calabar Cross Rivers State in Nigeria found an annual profit ranging from 1250 USD to 21875 USD.

6. Conclusion

Fish farming is considered as an essential supplement to national fish production. In the production process, feed and fingerlings are combined in water pond. To make fish farming a sustainable business, it is necessary to use these resources efficiently. The objective of this study was to analyze resources efficiency and economic efficiency of fish farms in the South East of Côte d'Ivoire. We used the non-parametric approach and the cost-benefit analysis.

Our first results showed that, on average the technical and economic efficiencies of fish farmers are low. However, few of them are both technically and economically efficient. There is a productive and economic potential that can be realized if resources (feed, fingerlings, water and land) are used efficiently. The results also showed that fish farmers using industrial feed are technically more efficient than those that reformulated their fish feed themselves. However, on average, the same economic performance can be achieved regardless of the type of feed used.

Secondly, using DEA model scenarios, we found that fish farmers generate excesses in resource utilization, causing a shortfall in fish output. The excesses are higher when the objective of the fish farmer is to obtain a maximum of fish output given the resources available (Scenario 2, DEA oriented-output). Similarly, excesses are smaller when fish farmers aim to minimize resources given a fixed level of fish output (Scenario-1, DEA oriented-input). Excesses in Scenario-3 (DEA Slacked Based Model) are smaller than Scenario-2 and higher than Scenario-1. Fish output deficit caused by these excesses is higher in Scenario-3, followed by Scenario-2 and Scenario-1. A reduction of excesses of resource in Scenario-3 would have an increased fish output of 16.18%. This result indicated that a production management aiming to minimize resources simultaneously with a maximization of output is likely to ensure a sustainable aquaculture production.

Thirdly, the results of cost-benefit analysis revealed that, on average, fish farmers achieved positive gross and net margins, but these were low. However, efficient fish farms have realized high gross and net margins.

In sum, our study suggests that policy makers should play an important role in helping fish farmers to have better access to fish feed and quality fingerlings. To this end, policy actors must promote and support research in the formulation of local fish feed from agricultural by-products, which should be available in the country. In addition, fish farmers must be trained on good practices of sustainable production and pond management to reduce the slacks (excesses and shortfall) in the production process.

References

- Anoh, KP 2010, “Stratégies comparées de l’exploitation des plans d’eau lagunaire de Côte-d’Ivoire”. *Les Cahiers d’Outre-Mer*, vol. 251, pp.347-363.
- Banker, R, Charnes, A & Cooper, W, 1984, Some models for estimating technical and scale inefficiencies in data envelopment analysis. *Management Science*, vol. 30, no. 9, pp.1078–1092.
- Boateng, V, Alhassan, E, Nensom, E & Abarike -2013, “Profitability analysis of all-male Tilapia farming in Sekyere South and Bosomtwe District of Ashanti Region”. *Agriculture and Biology Journal of North America*, vol, 4, no. 5, pp. 568-575.
- Brummett, R., Gockowski, J., Bakwowi, J. & Etaba, A 2004, “Analysis of aquaculture investment in periurbain Yaoundé, Cameroon”. *Aquaculture Economics & Management*, vol. 8, no.(5-6), pp.319-328.
- Bukenya, J, Hyuha, T, Molnar, J & Twinamasiko, J 2013, “Efficiency of resource use among pond fish farmers in Central Uganda: A stochastic frontier production function approach”. *Aquaculture Economics & Management*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp.148-170.
- Charnes, A, Cooper, W & Rhodes, E 1978, “Measuring the Efficiency of Decision Making Units”. *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 2, pp.429-444.
- Crentsil, C & Essilfie, F 2014. “Measurement of technical efficiency of smallholder fish production in Ghana: A stochastic frontier approach”. *Journal of Development and Agricultural Economics*, vol.6, no. 5, pp.203-211.
- Debreu, G 1951, The coefficient of resource utilization. *Econometrica*, vol. 3, pp.273-292.
- FAO 2002, *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture*, FAO, Rome.
- FAO 2012, *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture*, FAO, Rome.
- FAO 2014, *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture*, FAO, Rome.

- Färe, R, Grosskopf, S & Lovell, C 1985, *The Measurement of Efficiency of Production*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston.
- Farrell, MJ 1957 “The measurement of productive efficiency”. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (General)*, vol. 120, no. 3, pp.253-290.
- FIRCA 2013, *A la Decouverte de la Pêche et l'Aquaculture*, Abidjan: Bulletin d'information, La Filière du Progrès - Acte 11 - Pêche et Aquaculture - Août 2013.
- Harward, B & Upto, M 1961 *Introduction to business Finance*. New York: Mc Graw Hill.
- Hem, S. et al. 1994, Aquaculture lagunaire. In: J. D. P. Durand, D. Guiral & S. Zabi, eds. *Environnement et ressources aquatiques en Côte d'Ivoire. Tome 2. Les milieux lagunaires*. Edition ORSTOM éd. Paris: pp. 455-505..
- Hishamunda, N & Ridler, NB 2006, “Farming fish for profits: A small step towards food security in Sub-saharan Africa”. *Food Policy*, vol. 31, pp.401-414.
- Hyuha, T, Bukenya, J, Twinamasiko, T & Molnar, J 2011, “Profitability analysis of small aquaculture enterprises in Central Uganda”. *International Journal of Fisheries and Aquaculture*, vol. 2, no. 15, pp.271-278.
- Ideba, E. et al., 2013, “Economic analysis of fish farming in Calabar, Cross Rivers State, Nigeria”. *Greener Journal of Agriculture Sciences*, vol.3, no 7, pp. 542-549.
- Igwe, K, Echebiri, R & Nlewadim, AAP 2011, “Application of stochastic production frontier to the measurement of technical efficiency of fish farming in Umuahia Metropolis, Abia State, Nigeria”. *Journal of Agriculture and Food Sciences* , vol. 9, no. , pp.1-8.
- Kaliba, A, Ngugi, C, Mackambo, J & Quagraine, K, 2007, “Economic profitability of Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus* L.) production in Kenya”. *Aquaculture Research*, vol. 38, pp.1129-1136.
- Kaliba, A. R. et al., 2006, Economic analysis of Nile Tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) production in Tanzania. *Journal of the World Aquaculture Society*, vol. 37, pp. 464 - 472.
- Kareem, R, Aromolaran, A & Dipeolu, A 2009, “Economic efficiency of fish farming in Ogun State, Nigeria”. *Aquaculture Economics & Management*, vol. 13, no. 10, pp. 39–52.

- Koffi, C, Oswald, M & Lazard, J 1996, “Développement rural de la pisciculture en Afrique: comment passer du mythe à la réalité”. *ICLARM Conference Proceedingd* vol. 41, pp. 556-566.
- Koopmans, T 1951, “An analysis of Production as efficient combination of activities”. In: *Activity Analysis of Production and Allocation*. Monograph (13). Cowles Commission for Research in Economics, New York:
- Lazard, J & Dabbabie, L 2002, *Freshwater aquaculture and polyculture*. In: *P. Safran, Fisheries and Aquaculture: Towards Sustainable Aquatic Living Resources Management*. Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems (EOLSS), Developed under the Auspices of the UNESCO, Eolss Publishers, Oxford, UK, 30.
- Lazard, J. Lecomte, Y, Stomal, B & Weigel, J.-Y 1991, *Pisciculture en Afrique Subsaharienne: situations et projets dans des pays francophone*: Ministère de la Cooperation et du Developpement.
- Lazard, J & Weigel, J 1996, *L'aquaculture des tilapias en Afrique Francophone subsaharienne: Bilan et Perspectives*. pp. 17-28. In: Pullin, R.V.S et al. (éds). *Le troisieme symposuim international international sur le tilapia en aquaculture*. ICLARM Conference Proceedings .(41).
- MIPARH 2003, *Bilan-diagnostic et Prospectives pour la relance du secteur pêche et aquaculture en Côte d'Ivoire*: Rapport provisoire.
- MIPRAH 2007, *Annuaire des statistiques agricoles*: Edition d'Avril 2008.
- MIPARH 2008, *Contexte actuel et proposition d'orientation strategiques pour le développement de l'aquaculture*: pp.5-7.
- MIPRAH 2009. *Plan directeur des peches et de l'aquaculture, 2010-2025*, Abidjan: Rapport après atelier.
- MIRAH 2014, *Plan Stratégique de développement de l'elevage de la pêche et de l'aquaculture en Côte d'Ivoire, 2014-2020*: Tome I : Diagnostic – Stratégie de développement – Orientations.
- Munyua, P., Kwamena, Q., Preckel, P. & Shively, G., 2013. *Technical efficiency of aquaculture in Kenya: An application of stochastic frontier analysis*. s.l., Paper presented at World Aquaculture Society Meetings 22-25 Februray, 2013.
- Mussa, R., 2006. Technical, Efficiency of smallholder farmers in Southern Malawi: A study of adopters and non-adopters of integrated aquaculture-agriculture. *Working paper, 2006(02)*.

- Ogundari, K & Akinbogun, O 2010, “Modeling technical efficiency with production risk: A study of fish farms in Nigeria”. *Marine Resource Economics*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp.295-308.
- Onumah, E & Acquah, H 2010, “Frontier analysis of aquaculture farms in the Southern sector of Ghana”. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, vol. 9, no. 7, pp.826–835.
- Osawe, O, Akinyosoye, V & Omonona, B 2008, “Technical efficiency of small scale farmers: an application of the stochastic frontier production to fish farmers in Ibadan Metropolis, Oyo state, Nigeria”. *Journal of Economics and Rural Development*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp.71-82.
- Simar, L & Wilson, P 2007, “Estimation and inference in two-stage, semi-parametric model of production processes”. *Journal of Econometrics*, vol. 136, pp. 31-64.
- Tone, K 2001, “Slacks-based measure of efficiency”. In: W. Cooper, L. Seiford & Zhu.J (ed), *Handbook on data envelopment analysis*. Springer, New York.
- Tsue, P, Lawal, W & Ayuba, V 2013, “Productivity and technical efficiency of catfish farmers in Benue State, Nigeria”. *Advanced Journal of Agricultural Research*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp.20-25.
- Tveterås, R 1999, Production risk and productivity growth: some findings for Norwegian salmon aquaculture. *Journal of Productivity Analysis*, vol. 12, pp. 161-179.
- Waite, R. et al. 2014, “Improving productivity and environmental performance of aquaculture”. *Working Paper, Installment 5 of Creating a Sustainable Food Future*.
- World Bank, FAO & IFPRI 2013, *Fish to 2030: Prospect for Fisheries and Aquaculture*, World Bank, Washington DC.
- Ziehi, A 1994, Développement et recherche aquacoles en Côte d'Ivoire. In: *Développement et recherche aquacoles en Afrique Sub-saharienne: revue nationale*, pp.1-3.

UNU-INRA Contact

United Nations University Institute for Natural Resources in Africa
(UNU-INRA)
Second Floor, International House,
Annie Jiajge Road, University of Ghana, Legon
Accra, Ghana

Private Mail Bag,
Kotoka International Airport, Accra, Ghana

Tel: +233-302- 213850. Ext. 6318

Email: inra@unu.edu

Website: www.inra.unu.edu



MATE MASIE

“What I hear, I
keep”-Symbol of
wisdom, knowledge
and understanding.



NEA ONNIMNO SUA
A, OHU

“He who does not know
can know from learning,
-Symbol of life-long
education and continued
quest for knowledge.



NYANSAPO

“Wisdom knot” – Symbol of
wisdom, ingenuity, intelligence
and patience.

ISBN: 978-9988-633-23-3



9 789988 633233