

SUPPLY CHAIN PROBLEMS FACED BY SEA FOOD EXPORTERS IN TAMILNADU

Dr. P. Jasbin Bino,
Assistant Professor,
Faculty of Management Studies,
Noorul Islam Centre for Higher Education,
Kumaracoil – 629180

Abstract - Seafood is the world's major source of wild protein. Seafood is a highly perishable food that should be handled with care. India is the second largest seafood producing country in the world. Many problems are prevailing in the sea food supply chain. More market participants, uncertainty in demand and supply, inadequate market knowledge, lack of infrastructure, price fluctuations, changing quality standards by the trading countries, perishable nature of the product, high cost on storage and transportation are some of the problems. The study is done with the objective of analysing the supply chain problems prevailing among the sea food exporters of Tamilnadu. Multistage sampling method is used and the respondents are the exporting companies.

Key words: Supply Chain, Exporters, Sea food

I. INTRODUCTION:

Marine products export in India started early in 1938-39. The products like dried fishes, salted or smoke-cured fishes, aquatic animal oils, aquatic animals and a number of plant products are exported. To East Asian Countries like Singapore, Myanmar and Sri Lanka, India is the main exporter of dried fishes. Sri Lanka is the only country which exported Indian dried fishes by 1959. India exported to 22 countries in 1962 with a quantity of 3067 tonnes of dried prawns at a value of Rs. 89.43 lakh. Simultaneously it increased by 1963 to Rs. 93.24 lakh values (2808 tonnes). India is the one among the 2 fish producing country of the world. Currently seafood and seafood products have emerged as the largest group in agricultural exports of India. The sector's exports aggregated to 13.77 lakh tonnes in volume valued at US\$ 7081.55 Million in 2017-18. More than 50 different types of

seafood products are exported to 75 countries around the world.

Comparison of exports from 2016-17 to 2017-18

The export of marine products in the year 2017-18 is compared with the year 2016-17, shown in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1: Comparison of exports from 2016-17 to 2017-18

| Export details | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | Growth percent |
|---------------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| Quantity Tonnes | 1134948.00 | 1377244.00 | 21.35 |
| Value Rs. crore | 37870.90 | 45106.89 | 19.10 |
| Value US \$ Million | 5777.61 | 7081.55 | 22.56 |

Source: www.mpeda.gov.in

Exports of marine products attained an all-time high of US \$ 7081.55 million in the year 2017-18. Marine produce exports, extended all earlier records in rupee value, quantity and US \$ terms. Exports combined to 1377244 tonnes worth of Rs. 45106.89 crores and US \$ 7081.55 million. When compared to the before year, seafood exports documented a development of 21.35 percent in quantity, 19.10 percent in rupee and 22.56 percent growth in US \$ earnings correspondingly.

II. MAJOR EXPORT MARKETS:

The major markets for our marine products are Japan, United States of America, member countries of European Union, Middle East and South East Asia countries. The item wise exports from April 2016 to March 2018 is shown in Table 1.2

| Item | | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | Percent Change |
|------------|-----------------|----------|----------|----------------|
| Fr. Shrimp | Quantity in ton | 434486 | 565980 | 30.26 |
| | Value in Crore | 24711.32 | 30868.17 | 24.91 |

| | | | | |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------|----------|--------|
| | US\$ Million | 3726.38 | 4848.19 | 30.10 |
| Fr.Fin Fish | Quantity in ton | 296761.88 | 353192 | 19.01 |
| | Value in Crore | 4460.9 | 4674.03 | 4.77 |
| | US\$ Million | 672.47 | 733.17 | 9.02 |
| Fr.Cuttlefish | Quantity in ton | 63320 | 69183 | 9.25 |
| | Value in Crore | 1944.5 | 2356.46 | 21.18 |
| | US\$ Million | 292.73 | 369.88 | 26.35 |
| Fr. Squid | Quantity in ton | 99348 | 100845 | 1.50 |
| | Value in Crore | 2575.29 | 2451.87 | -4.79 |
| | US\$ Million | 388.64 | 385.01 | -0.93 |
| Dried items | Quantity in ton | 61071 | 88997 | 45.72 |
| | Value in Crore | 871.74 | 1042.37 | 19.57 |
| | US\$ Million | 199.77 | 163.53 | -18.19 |
| Live items | Quantity in ton | 6703 | 7034 | 4.93 |
| | Value in Crore | 403.75 | 286.11 | -29.13 |
| | US\$ Million | 61.05 | 45.41 | -25.61 |
| Chilled items | Quantity in ton | 31815 | 19501 | -38.70 |
| | Value in Crore | 769.81 | 647.41 | -15.90 |
| | US\$ Million | 116.02 | 101.78 | -12.27 |
| Others | Quantity in ton | 141442 | 172512 | 21.96 |
| | Value in Crore | 2133.59 | 2780.48 | 30.31 |
| | US\$ Million | 320.54 | 434.58 | 35.57 |
| Total | Quantity in ton | 1134948 | 1377244 | 21.34 |
| | Value in Crore | 37870.9 | 45106.89 | 19.10 |
| | US\$ Million | 5777.61 | 7081.55 | 22.56 |

Table 1.2: Item wise Exports April- 2016 to March- 2018

Source: www.mpeda.gov.in

Of the total US \$ earnings Frozen Shrimp prolonged to be the main export value item which accounted having a percent change of 30.26 quantity in tonnes.

Table 1.3: Market wise Exports - April- 2013 to March- 2015

| Market | | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | Percent Change |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------|----------|----------------|
| Japan | Quantity in ton | 69039 | 85651 | 24.06 |
| | Value in Crore | 2621.37 | 2846.3 | 8.58 |
| | US\$ Million | 394.5 | 445.27 | 12.86 |
| USA | Quantity in ton | 188617 | 247780 | 31.36 |
| | Value in Crore | 11482.16 | 14769.83 | 28.63 |
| | US\$ Million | 1731.81 | 2320.05 | 33.96 |
| European Union | Quantity in ton | 189833 | 190314 | 0.25 |
| | Value in Crore | 6892.19 | 7115.96 | 3.24 |
| | US\$ Million | 1038.59 | 1116.74 | 7.52 |
| China | Quantity in ton | 45443 | 49701 | 9.36 |
| | Value in Crore | 1341.94 | 1448.03 | 7.90 |
| | US\$ Million | 202.19 | 227.39 | 12.46 |
| South East Asia | Quantity in ton | 484819 | 616707 | 27.20 |
| | Value in Crore | 11461.83 | 14250.26 | 24.32 |
| | US\$ Million | 1728.19 | 2237.07 | 29.44 |
| Middle East | Quantity in ton | 52973 | 62220 | 17.45 |
| | Value in Crore | 1830.58 | 1849.1 | 1.01 |
| | US\$ Million | 275.93 | 290.46 | 5.26 |
| Others | Quantity in ton | 104224 | 124871 | 19.81 |
| | Value in Crore | 2240.83 | 2827.4 | 26.17 |
| | US\$ Million | 406.4 | 444.57 | 9.39 |
| Total | Quantity in ton | 1134948 | 1377244 | 21.34 |
| | Value in Crore | 37870.9 | 45106.89 | 19.10 |
| | US\$ Million | 5777.61 | 7081.55 | 22.56 |

Source: www.mpeda.gov.in

The market wise export from April 2016 to March 2018 is shown in Table 1.3. USA is the major purchaser of marine Indian produce. South East Asia is the second biggest export market.

Objectives:

To analyse the problems faced by exporters in sea food supply chain

Research Design

The type of this research is descriptive and analytical in nature.

Data Collection:

Both primary and secondary data are used for this study.

Sample Size:

26 exporting companies

Sampling Method:

Multi Stage Sampling Method

Sampling Design:

Only European Union approved plants from randomly selected districts are selected for this study.

Table 1.4: Sample Design

| Sl. No. | Particulars | Number of Exporting Companies |
|---------|---|-------------------------------|
| 1 | Total population of exporting companies | 309 |
| 2 | Total European Union Approved Exporting Companies | 35 |
| 3 | Total European Union approved exporting companies from the selected districts | 26 |

Source: www.mpeda.gov.in

Multi Stage Sampling:

Table 1.5: First Stage of Sampling for Exporting Companies

| Sl.No | Districts | Exporting Companies |
|-------|----------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Ramanathapuram | 1 |
| 2 | Kanyakumari | 6 |
| 3 | Nagapattinam | 59 |

| | | |
|---|-----------|-----|
| 4 | Tuticorin | 5 |
| 5 | Chennai | 176 |
| | Total | 247 |

Source: www.mpeda.gov.in

Table 1.6: Second Stage of Sampling for Exporting Companies

| Sl.No | Districts | European Union (EU) approved exporting companies |
|-------|----------------|--|
| 1 | Ramanathapuram | 3 |
| 2 | Kanyakumari | 5 |
| 3 | Tuticorin | 13 |
| 4 | Chennai | 5 |
| | Total | 26 |

Source: www.mpeda.gov.in

Tools Used:

Percentage Analysis, ANOVA

Analysis:

Percentage Analysis:

III.LOCATION OF THE CONCERN

The location of the exporting concern is based on the sample area of the study which includes Ramanathapuram district, Kanyakumari district, Tuticorin district and Chennai District, as in Table 1.7.

Table 1.7: Location of the Concern

| Sl. | Location of the | No. of | Perce |
|-----|-----------------|--------|-------|
|-----|-----------------|--------|-------|

Table 1.8: ANOVA for significant difference between area and Supply Chain Problems

| Supply Chain Problems | Area | | | | F value | P value |
|---|----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------|---------|
| | Ramanathapuram | Kanyakumari | Tuticorin | Chennai | | |
| No good approach road | 4.66 -0.57 | 3.2 -1.64 | 3.46 -1.5 | 4.2 -0.83 | 1.068 | 0.383 |
| Inadequate transport facility | 3.33 -0.57 | 4 -1 | 3.69 -1.25 | 4.8 -0.44 | 1.698 | 0.197 |
| High cost of transport | 3.33 -2.08 | 3.6 -0.89 | 3.46 -1.45 | 3.8 -0.83 | 0.104 | 0.957 |
| Inadequate buying capacity for Aluminum Containers and plastic crates | 4.66 -0.57 | 3.2 -1.64 | 3.46 -1.5 | 4.2 -0.83 | 1.068 | 0.197 |
| No proper cold storage facility | 3.33 -0.57 | 4 -1 | 3.69 -1.25 | 4.8 -0.44 | 1.698 | 0.197 |
| Delay in reaching the destination | 3.33 -2.08 | 3.6 -0.89 | 3.46 -1.45 | 3.8 -0.83 | 0.104 | 0.957 |

| No | concern | Respondents | ntage |
|----|----------------|-------------|------------|
| 1 | Ramanathapuram | 3 | 11.5 |
| 2 | Kanyakumari | 5 | 19.2 |
| 3 | Tuticorin | 13 | 50 |
| 4 | Chennai | 5 | 19.2 |
| | Total | 26 | 100 |

Source: Primary Data

Table 1.7 gives a clear picture of the location of the sample exporting companies. 50 percent of the exporting companies are located in Tuticorin district, 19.2 percent are located in Kanyakumari and Chennai district. 11.5 percent of the companies are from Ramanathapuram district.

IV ANOVA – Area and Supply Chain Problems (Exporting companies)

The relationship between area and supply chain problems of the exporting companies is analyzed using the ANOVA test. The area includes Ramanathapuram, Kanyakumari, Tuticorin and Chennai. The supply chain problems includes no good approach road, inadequate transport facility, high cost of transport, inadequate buying capacity for aluminum containers and plastic crates, no proper cold storage facility, delay in reaching the destination, over exploitation by middleman, fluctuation in price, low price offered by the buyer, delay in payment, Anti-Dumping Duty, inadequate market knowledge, poor brand image, changing quality standards by the trading countries, traceability roadblocks, competition from other firms, heterogeneity of products, increase in reefer base rates, terminal handling charges, unpredicted supply and demand, high cost, infrastructure problem, scarcity of raw materials and transportation problem.

H0: There is no significant between area and supply chain problems.

H1: There is a significant between area and supply chain problems.

| | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|-------|-------|
| Over exploitation by middleman | 4.66 -0.57 | 3.2 -1.64 | 3.46 -1.5 | 4.2 -0.83 | 1.068 | 0.383 |
| Fluctuation in price | 3.33 -2.08 | 3.6 -0.89 | 3.46 -1.45 | 3.8 -0.83 | 0.104 | 0.957 |
| Low price offered by the buyer | 4.66 -0.57 | 3.2 -1.64 | 3.46 -1.5 | 4.2 -0.83 | 1.068 | 0.383 |
| Delay in payment | 3.33 -0.57 | 4 -1 | 3.69 -1.25 | 4.8 -0.44 | 1.698 | 0.197 |
| Anti-Dumping Duty | 4.66 -0.57 | 3.2 -1.64 | 3.38 -1.44 | 4.2 -0.83 | 1.219 | 0.326 |
| Inadequate market knowledge | 3.33 -2.08 | 3.6 -0.89 | 3.46 -1.45 | 3.8 -0.83 | 0.104 | 0.957 |
| Poor brand image | 3.33 -0.57 | 4 -1 | 3.69 -1.25 | 4.8 -0.44 | 1.698 | 0.197 |
| Changing quality standards by the trading countries | 3.33 -2.08 | 3.6 -0.89 | 3.46 -1.45 | 3.8 -0.83 | 0.104 | 0.957 |
| Traceability Roadblocks | 4.66 -0.57 | 3.2 -1.64 | 3.46 -1.5 | 4.2 -0.83 | 1.068 | 0.383 |
| Competition from other firms | 3.33 -2.08 | 3.6 -0.89 | 3.46 -1.45 | 3.8 -0.83 | 0.104 | 0.957 |
| Heterogeneity of products | 3.33 -0.57 | 4 -1 | 3.69 -1.25 | 4.8 -0.44 | 1.698 | 0.197 |
| Increase in Reefer base rates | 3.33 -0.57 | 4 -1 | 3.69 -1.25 | 4.8 -0.44 | 1.698 | 0.197 |
| Terminal Handling Charges | 3.33 -2.08 | 3.6 -0.89 | 3.46 -1.45 | 3.8 -0.83 | 0.104 | 0.957 |
| Unpredicted supply and demand | 4.66 -0.57 | 3.2 -1.64 | 3.46 -1.5 | 4.2 -0.83 | 1.068 | 0.383 |
| High cost | 3.33 -2.08 | 3.6 -0.89 | 3.46 -1.45 | 3.8 -0.83 | 0.104 | 0.957 |
| Infrastructure | 4.66 -0.57 | 3.2 -1.64 | 3.46 -1.5 | 4.2 -0.83 | 1.068 | 0.383 |
| Scarcity of raw materials | 3.33 -0.57 | 4 -1 | 3.69 -1.25 | 4.8 -0.44 | 1.698 | 0.197 |
| Transportation problem | 4.66 -0.57 | 3.2 -1.64 | 3.46 -1.5 | 4.2 -0.83 | 1.068 | 0.383 |

Table 1.8 it is clear that the P value is greater than 0.01 which means, the null hypothesis is accepted and hence concluded that there is no significant relationship between area and supply chain problems.

V.CONCLUSION:

Though the sea food sector is one of the important income generating sectors, there are many supply chain problems prevailing with the exporters. Government can take steps to properly organize this sector so that the exporters and other key players involved in these activities are equally benefitted.

VI..REFERENCE:

1. Vipinkumar V.P, S. Salim Shyam, K.N. Pushkaran, N.K. Harshan, K.P.Salini, and P.V.Sunil (2014). Role of Self Help Groups on coastal indebtedness in marine fisheries sector—a case study from Kerala, South India. *Indian Journal of Fisheries*, 61(1), 36–41.
2. Ashis Kumar Panigrahi and Avijit Bakshia (2014). A study on profile of fishing community of the river side villages of river Churni, Nadia, West Bengal with special reference to socio-economic and technological appraisal of fishermen. *International Journal of Research in Applied, Natural and Social Sciences*, 2(3), 97–102.
3. Aswathy N., R. Narayanakumar, and N.K. Harshan (2014). Marketing costs, margins and efficiency of domestic marine fish marketing in Kerala. *Indian Journal of Fisheries*, 61(2), 97–102.
4. Islam Sanjida Binte and Dr. Mamun Habib (2013). Supply chain management in fishing industry: A case study. *International Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 2(2), 43–52.
5. Viswanatha B.S Ramachandra Bhatta., R.S. Biradar (2012). *Supply Chain Management in Fisheries: A Study in Bangalore Fish Markets*. Ph.D. thesis, Uuniversity of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore.

