



Species richness and invasion vectors: sampling techniques and biases

S. Gollasch^{1,*}, H. Rosenthal¹, H. Botnen², M. Crncevic³, M. Gilbert⁴, J. Hamer⁵,
N. Hülsmann⁶, C. Mauro⁷, L. McCann⁸, D. Minchin⁹, B. Öztürk¹⁰, M. Robertson¹¹,
C. Sutton¹² & M.C. Villac¹³

¹*Institut für Meereskunde, Düsternbrooker Weg 20, 24105 Kiel, Germany;* ²*Unifob, Section of Applied Environmental Research (SAM), High Technology Centre, N-5020 Bergen, Norway;* ³*The Polytechnic of Dubrovnik, Cira Carici 4, 20000 Dubrovnik, Croatia;* ⁴*Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Maurice Lamontagne Institute, P.O. Box 1000, 850 Rue de la Mer, Mont-Joli, Quebec G5H 3Z4, Canada;*

⁵*School of Ocean Sciences, University of Wales, Bangor, Menai Bridge, Anglesey, LL59 5EY, UK;*

⁶*Institut für Zoologie, Freie Universität Berlin, Königin-Luise-Str. 1-3, 14195 Berlin, Germany;* ⁷*Petroleo Brasileiro (PETROBRAS) S.A., Supply Department, Maritime Transportation Management, Av. Republica do Chile, 65, Room 2101-M, 20035-900 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil;*

⁸*Smithsonian Environmental Research Centre, P.O. Box 28, Edgewater, MD 21037, USA;* ⁹*Marine Organism Investigations, 3, Marina Village, Ballina, Killaloe, Co. Clare, Ireland;* ¹⁰*Faculty of Fisheries, University of Istanbul, Ordu Caddesi No.: 200, Leleli, Istanbul, Turkey;* ¹¹*FRS Marine Laboratory Aberdeen, P.O. Box 101, Victoria Road, Aberdeen AB11 9DB, UK;*

¹²*CSIRO Marine Research, Centre for Research on Introduced Marine Pests (CRIMP),*

GPO Box 1538, Hobart, Tasmania 7001, Australia; ¹³*Departamento de Biologia Marinha, Instituto de Biologia, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Cidade Universitaria, CCS-A, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil;*

**Author for correspondence (e-mail: SGollasch@aol.com; fax: +49-40-3603094767)*

Key words: ballast water, comparative sampling, phytoplankton, sampling techniques, ship, zooplankton

Abstract

During a European Union Concerted Action study on species introductions, an intercalibration workshop on ship ballast water sampling techniques considered various phytoplankton and zooplankton sampling methods. For the first time, all the techniques presently in use worldwide were compared using a plankton tower as a model ballast tank spiked with the brine shrimp and oyster larvae while phytoplankton samples were taken simultaneously in the field (Helgoland Harbour, Germany). Three cone-shaped and 11 non-cone shaped plankton nets of different sizes and designs were employed. Net lengths varied from 50 to 300 cm, diameters 9.7–50 cm, and mesh sizes 10–100 µm. Three pumps, a Ruttner sampler, and a bucket previously used in ballast water sampling studies were also compared. This first assessment indicates that for sampling ballast water a wide range of techniques may be needed. Each method showed different results in efficiency and it is unlikely that any of the methods will sample all taxa. Although several methods proved to be valid elements of a hypothetical ‘tool box’ of effective ship sampling techniques. The Ruttner water sampler and the pump P30 provide suitable means for the quantitative phytoplankton sampling, whereas other pumps prevailed during the qualitative trial. Pump P15 and cone-shaped nets were the best methods used for quantitative zooplankton sampling. It is recommended that a further exercise involving a wider range of taxa be examined in a larger series of mesocosms in conjunction with promising treatment measures for managing ballast water.

Introduction

It is generally believed that the long-term sustainability of fisheries and aquaculture depends to a large extent on

maintaining aquatic biodiversity. Although it is not yet fully understood which of the components of a diverse ecosystem are critical to maintain system stability, it is also agreed that globalisation of human activity does