J Appl Phycol (2017) 29:2363–2373
DOI 10.1007/s10811-016-1022-1

22ND INTERNATIONAL SEAWEED SYMPOSIUM, COPENHAGEN

Carbon dioxide mitigation potential of seaweed aquaculture beds (SABs)

Calvyn F. A. Sondak[1,2] · Put O. Ang Jr[3] · John Beardall[4] · Alecia Bellgrove[5,6] · Sung Min Boo[7] · Grevo S. Gerung[2] · Christopher D. Hepburn[8] · Dang Diem Hong[9] · Zhengyu Hu[10] · Hiroshi Kawai[11] · Danilo Largo[12] · Jin Ae Lee[13] · Phaik-Eem Lim[14] · Jaruwan Mayakun[15] · Wendy A. Nelson[16,17] · Jung Hyun Oak[18] · Siew-Moi Phang[14] · Dinabandhu Sahoo[19] · Yuwadee Peerapornpis[20] · Yufeng Yang[21] · Ik Kyo Chung[1,18]

Received: 11 August 2016 / Revised and accepted: 20 November 2016 / Published online: 5 December 2016

Abstract Seaweed aquaculture beds (SABs) that support the production of seaweed and their diverse products, cover extensive coastal areas, especially in the Asian-Pacific region, and provide many ecosystem services such as nutrient removal and CO_2 assimilation. The use of SABs in potential carbon dioxide (CO_2) mitigation efforts has been proposed with commercial seaweed production in China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Thailand, and Vietnam, and is at a nascent stage in Australia and New Zealand. We attempted to consider the total annual potential of SABs to drawdown and fix anthropogenic CO_2. In the last decade, seaweed production has increased tremendously in the Asian-Pacific region. In 2014, the total annual production of Asian-Pacific SABs surpassed 2.61×10^6 t dw. Total carbon accumulated annually was more than 0.78×10^6 t y^{-1}, equivalent to over 2.87×10^6 t CO_2 y^{-1}. By increasing the area available for SABs, biomass production, carbon accumulation, and CO_2 drawdown can be enhanced. The conversion of biomass to biofuel can reduce the use of fossil fuels and provide additional mitigation of CO_2 emissions. Contributions

✉ Ik Kyo Chung
ikchung@pusan.ac.kr

1 Department of Oceanography, Pusan National University, Busan 46241, South Korea

2 Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Science, Sam Ratulangi University, Manado 95115, Indonesia

3 Marine Science Laboratory, School of Life Sciences, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, N.T, Hong Kong, SAR, China

4 School of Biological Sciences, Monash University, Clayton, VIC 3800, Australia

5 Deakin University, Geelong, Australia

6 School of Life and Environmental Sciences, Centre for Integrative Ecology, Warrnambool Campus, P.O. Box 423, Warrnambool, VIC 3280, Australia

7 Chungnam National University, Daejon 305-764, South Korea

8 Department of Marine Science, University of Otago, PO Box 56, Dunedin, New Zealand

9 Institute of Biotechnology, Vietnam Academy of Science and Technology, Hanoi 10000, Vietnam

10 Institute of Hydrobiology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Wuhan 430072, China

11 Kobe University, Kobe 657-850, Japan

12 University of San Carlos, 6000 Cebu City, Philippines

13 School of Environmental Science and Engineering, Inje University, Gimhae 621-749, South Korea

14 Institute of Biological Sciences and Institute of Ocean and Earth Sciences (IOES) University of Malaya, 50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

15 Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai, Songkhla 90112, Thailand

16 National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research, Private Bag 14-901, Wellington 6241, New Zealand

17 School of Biological Sciences, University of Auckland, Private Bag 92-019, Auckland 1142, New Zealand

18 Marine Research Institute, Pusan National University, Busan 46241, South Korea

19 Marine Biotechnology Laboratory, Department of Botany, University of Delhi, Delhi 110007, India

20 Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai 50200, Thailand

21 Institute of Hydrobiology, Jinan University, Guangzhou 510632, China

of seaweeds as carbon donors to other ecosystems could be significant in global carbon sequestration. The ongoing development of SABs would not only ensure that Asian-Pacific countries will remain leaders in the global seaweed industry but may also provide an added dimension of helping to mitigate the problem of excessive CO_2 emissions.

Keywords CO_2 mitigation · Seaweed aquaculture bed (SAB) · Macroalgae · Blue carbon · Carbon donor · Asian Pacific region

Introduction

Globally, carbon emissions have been increasing at an unprecedented rate leading to many negative impacts on individual species and natural ecosystems, as well as human health, infrastructure, and economies (IPCC 2014). Maintaining and improving the ability of coastal ecosystems to assimilate and store carbon is a crucial aspect of climate change mitigation. Between 1990 and 2010, estimated world-wide emissions of all major greenhouse gases reached nearly 46 × 10^9 t, with CO_2 emissions in Asia among the fastest (EPA 2014). The United States, China, European Union (EU), and India are the top 4 emitting countries/regions, accounting for almost 61% of emissions (China—30%, the USA—15%, EU—10%, and India—6.5%) respectively (Olivier et al. 2015).

Vegetated coastal ecosystems, such as seagrass beds, mangroves, and tidal saltmarshes, make globally significant contributions to carbon storage in biomass and long-term sequestration in sediment deposition (Duarte et al. 2013). The carbon sequestered in both living and non-living biomass in the ocean and coastal habitats has been termed "blue carbon" (Nellemann et al. 2009; Vierros 2013; Howard et al. 2014). These ecosystems take CO_2 from the atmosphere via photosynthesis at the same time releasing oxygen to the air. Some carbon is released back into the atmosphere through respiration and oxidation, but a proportion of assimilated carbon remains in the form of living biomass and contributing to organic carbon stored in soils (Murray et al. 2011). The standing biomass of commercial seaweed aquaculture beds (SABs) represents additional aquatic vegetation that could enhance carbon sequestration in coastal seas. This is especially significant where SABs are located in shallow waters where the natural standing biomass of vegetation is absent or low (Mitra et al. 2014).

Seaweeds, including kelps, are important primary producers in coastal environments (Littler and Murray 1974; Smith 1981; Okuda 2008). Seaweed beds and forests, together with seagrass beds and mangrove forests, support the livelihood of millions of people and provide many ecosystem services in the coastal environments. The three-dimensional structure of natural seaweed beds/forests provides shelter to many organisms, and these beds also serve as feeding and nursery grounds for many commercially important species (Olafsson et al. 1995; Paddack and Estes 2000; Eklöf et al. 2006; Christie et al. 2009; Wattage 2011; Walsh and Watson 2011; Eklöf et al. 2012; Valderrama 2012). Natural seaweed beds/forests play very important roles in facilitating recruitment of marine organisms (Okuda 2008), absorbing excess nutrients (Fei 2004; Yang et al. 2006; Huo et al. 2012), dampening waves (Jackson 1984; Anderson et al. 1996; Lovas and Totum 2001), buffering against ocean acidification (Gao and Zheng 2010), and potentially in serving as a carbon sink for anthropogenic CO_2 (Hill et al. 2015).

Seaweed aquaculture is a key player in the world-wide aquaculture industry, providing 2.38 × 10^6 t dw of global aquaculture production by volume (FAO 2014). Seaweeds are harvested for use as food, feed for aquaculture, fertilizer for agriculture, and in industrial and pharmaceutical applications (McHugh 2003). SABs cover extensive coastal areas, especially in NE and SE Asia. They provide many of the ecosystem services provided by natural seaweed stands. For example, SABs can provide a three-dimensional habitat for epiphytic organisms as well as for fishes and invertebrates (Zemke-White and Smith 2006). On top of this, given the volume of biomass produced in SABs, the potential for SABs to drawdown and fix anthropogenic CO_2 could also be significant (N'Yeurt et al. 2012; Chung et al. 2013). This potential role of SABs, however, has not been seriously evaluated. It should be far easier to quantify the amount of carbon sequestration by SABs than that by natural seaweed beds as the latter are spatially and temporally more variable (Fei 2004; Hill et al. 2015). Furthermore, being excellent nutrient removers, farmed seaweeds like *Pyropia* (formerly *Porphyra*) can be integrated into cultivation operations for fish that produce high nutrient loadings (Chopin et al. 1999; He et al. 2008).

Some of the carbon fixed by SABs is converted to dissolved organic carbon (DOC), which is then utilized by the bacterial community, converting DOC into dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) through respiratory processes (Azam et al. 1983). Some of the CO_2 released during seaweed harvesting and processing is likely to be fixed by further uptake by newly planted sporelings/germlings. Considerable biomass can be found in wild populations of macroalgae. The contribution of wild and SAB seaweeds to carbon sinks depends on the fate of the organic material. By capturing atmospheric CO_2 through photosynthesis, plants, including seaweeds, can store large amounts of organic carbon in above- and below-ground biomass and can be used as bioenergy crops (Jansson et al. 2010). Seaweeds and seagrasses account for the assimilation of carbon ~1 Pg C y^{-1} (Chung et al. 2011). It has been estimated that seagrasses, saltmarshes, and mangroves can capture 70% of C in the marine area (Nelleman et al. 2009, Fourqurean et al. 2012). Seaweeds utilize inorganic carbon dissolved in seawater as free CO_2 that diffuses in through cellular membranes from the surrounding seawater (Turan and Neori 2011) and as bicarbonate that is actively pumped into the cell via a carbon concentrating mechanism (Giordano et al. 2005; Raven et al. 2008). Moreover, the transformation by seaweeds of DIC into organic carbon by photosynthesis can decrease the pCO_2 in seawater (Tang et al. 2011). Through these processes the carbon sequestration in seaweed biomass can be considered as a potential mitigation measure against an increase in atmospheric CO_2 (Chung et al. 2011; N'Yeurt et al. 2012; Chung et al. 2013). This, however, remains a topic of considerable debate.

When macroalgae are used for animal or human foods, the CO_2 is simply regenerated during respiration and no net uptake of carbon occurs. Some material though can be buried in sediments or transported to the deep ocean where, even if remineralization occurs, the resulting DIC can be retained in deep oceanic waters for hundreds of years (Harrold et al. 1998; Dierssen et al. 2009; Trevathan-Tackett et al. 2015). Alternatively, if macroalgal biomass is used as a substitute for fossil fuels, this could potentially mitigate the rate of global climate change by reducing our reliance on the latter (Chung et al. 2011; N'Yeurt et al. 2012). The potential net reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions could be estimated if, for example, bioethanol from seaweeds produced in SABs is used as an alternative to gasoline from fossil fuel sources; though, GHG emitted in the biofuel production chain should be taken into account. The achievable reduction in CO_2 emissions may vary, depending on the species farmed and the location and growing season of the SABs. Some SABs and seagrass beds may also take up enough CO_2 to counter, or at least ameliorate, ocean acidification at a local scale (Rodella et al. 2015). For instance, Semesi et al. (2009) have shown that seagrass beds can maintain high pH and promote calcification in the green alga *Halimeda*.

At the 5th Asian Pacific Phycological Forum held in Bangkok, Thailand, in November 2005, a working group of the Asian Pacific Phycological Association (APPA) was established—the APPA-Asia Network—to examine the roles of SABs in CO_2 mitigation, especially in the Asian-Pacific region. This is in line with the Ocean Forestry Global Plan that proposed to return the concentration of atmospheric CO_2 to 1960's levels by 2200. With environmental, climatic, economic, political, social, and energy sustainability, "Ocean-healing Seaweed Forests" form a multi-dimensional global plan to completely reverse global warming while feeding 10×10^9 people with 200 kg of fish per year per person (N'Yeurt et al. 2012).

This review is a result of extensive discussion on this topic within the network. In 2012, seaweed aquaculture production in these Asian-Pacific countries was 97.6% of total world production. This review therefore compiles the most up-to-date data for SAB production and estimated CO_2 mitigation potentials in China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Philippines, Republic of Korea, and Vietnam, where production practices are already established, as well as in Australia and New Zealand, where these concepts are just beginning to be applied. These data are then compared with estimates from natural seaweed beds and other coastal habitats, including mangroves, seagrass beds, and salt marshes to evaluate the relative significance of SABs in the mitigation of global CO_2 emission.

Materials and methods

To determine the total area used for seaweed cultivation and total annual production between 2012 and 2014, we examined data from the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) plus country reports from members of the APPA-Asian Network, collected in 2016. Estimates were based primarily on seaweed biomass, using formulae developed previously (Mann 1972; Zemke-White and Ohno 1999; Gevaert et al. 2008). Here, the wet weight of biomass for all seaweeds was first converted to dry weight values (10% of the wet weight was used as a conservative value) (Mann 1972; Gevaert et al. 2008; Chung et al. 2011; Roberts et al. 2015). Carbon content was assumed to be 30% of dry weight (Mann 1972; Zemke-White and Ohno 1999; Turan and Neori 2011; Arenas and Vaz-Pinto 2014; Roberts et al. 2015). The amount of CO_2 that could be sequestered was calculated by multiplying 'C assimilation' by the amount of CO_2 associated with 1 g of dry plant material (the 3.67 factor described above—Duarte et al. 2005; Pendleton et al. 2012; Mitra and Zaman 2014).

The percentage carbon content in harvested seaweed dry weight varies among and within species. For example, in *Kappaphycus*, the range of C content is from 20.7–43.1% (Widowati et al. 2012). Muraoka (2004) reported C contents in *Saccharina* to be 25–31%, *Ecklonia* 32–34%, *Sargassum* 33–37%, and *Gelidium* 36–40%. In other studies, the percentage C in *Saccharina* and *Undaria* was reported as 23.6%, 31.3% in *Gracilaria* (Fei 2004), and 27.3% in *Pyropia* (McVey et al. 2002). Accordingly, we have used 30% as an informed approximation for average C content, given the ranges cited above.

Estimating a globally relevant price on carbon sequestration is challenging (MacKay et al. 2015). Most studies calculated the benefits of carbon sequestration at between US$ 5 to 25 per tonne of CO_{2e} (Fankhauser and Tol 1996; Emerton and Kekulandala 2003). The actual carbon price in the EU ETC under a price commitment is achieved by the country simply setting its carbon price to a fixed rate of US$20 (Cramton et al. 2015). The level of carbon prices in the world market was approximately US$15 to 25 in the EU ETS (Murray et al. 2011). The carbon price in the afforestation and blue carbon is estimated to be in the same range (Murray et al. 2011; Jotzo 2012; Luisetti et al. 2013; Manley 2016). The annual economic value of CO_2 sequestration has been estimated at approximately US$4.0 million for coral reefs and mangroves (Cesar et al. 2000), US$8.4 million for coral reefs (Samonte-Tan and Armedilla 2004), and US$2.4 million for wild seaweed beds (Vasquez et al. 2014). As it is very complex to accurately estimate the carbon price and is beyond the scope of our study, here we simply apply a conservative value of carbon as US$ 10 per tonne of CO_{2e}.

Results

About 100 seaweed taxa have been cultivated in many areas around the globe but about 98% of seaweed production is accounted for by a smaller range of species from such genera as *Saccharina*, *Undaria*, *Pyropia*, *Eucheuma/Kappaphycus*, and *Gracilaria* (Turan and Neori 2011). Among Asian-Pacific countries, the major economically important seaweed groups have been used for food and feed (humans and animals), materials for industry, traditional medicine, biofertilizers, and as biofuel (bioethanol, biodiesel) (Hong et al. 2007; Phang et al. 2010).

Among the seaweeds used commercially until 2010, *Saccharina japonica* had the highest production by volume (60%) followed by other taxa such as species of *Pyropia, Kappaphycus, Undaria, Eucheuma*, and *Gracilaria*. *Pyropia* spp. are the most economically valuable seaweeds among a total global value of seaweed of US$ 6.4 × 10^9 (FAO 2014). Recent data showed that *Kappaphycus* + *Eucheuma* have surpassed global production of *S. japonica* with about 5.5 × 10^6 t y^{-1} (FAO, 2014).

Data for SAB production were compared among APPA Network countries, incorporating information about current harvests, C assimilation, and the potential for CO_2 sequestration. No data were available for New Zealand and Australia because neither country was active in these efforts before 2012.

SABs yields in APPA network countries are shown in Table 1. In 2014, total annual production exceeded 2.61 × 10^6 t dw y^{-1}. The highest production was in China with 1.28 × 10^6 t dw y^{-1}, while the lowest was in India, at 300 t dw y^{-1}. Overall, estimated C assimilation was about 0.78 × 10^6 t dw y^{-1} and the potential for CO_2 sequestration could be 2.87 × 10^6 t y^{-1}, valued at US$ 29 million based on the conservative value of carbon of US$ 10 per tonne of CO_{2e}. Thus carbon sequestration by SABs may provide a relatively small but significant contribution to the current world market value of seaweed aquaculture production valued at over US$ 6 × 10^9 (Table 1).

Between 2012 and 2014, the total average production of SABs was 2.31 × 10^6 t dw y^{-1}. China had the highest amount (1.11 × 10^6 t dw y^{-1}) while India had the lowest (300 t dw y^{-1}). The total C absorption was greater than 694,636 t dw y^{-1} during our survey period, and the value of potential CO_2 sequestration was estimated to be more than 2.54 × 10^6 t y^{-1} (Tables 2 and 3).

Discussion

China, Indonesia, and the Philippines are the world's top three producers and account for 91.31% of global seaweed production. Production by Seaweed Aquaculture Beds (SABs) in Asian Pacific Phycological Association (APPA) Network countries increased from 20.02 Mt in 2012 to 26.13 Mt wet wt in 2014 (FAO 2016). Our review demonstrates that 694,636 t of carbon (2.54 × 10^6 t of CO_{2e}) could be assimilated annually by SABs in the Asian Pacific region.

CO_2 sequestration by coastal ecosystems

We compare SABs' potential CO_2 sequestration to terrestrial ecosystems and other blue carbon ecosystems such as

Table 1 Estimates of algal harvests, annual carbon absorption, and potential CO_2 sequestration by SABs in 2014

	Algae harvested (t ww y^{-1})	Algae harvested value (1000 US$)	Algae harvested (t dw y^{-1})	Estimated C assimilation (t dw y^{-1})	Potential CO_2 sequestration (t dw y^{-1})	Carbon price[a] (1000 US$)
China	12,819,485	2,096,041	1,281,949	384,585	1,411,425	14,114
India	3000	98,	300	90	330	3
Indonesia	8,971,463	1,513,253	897,146	269,124	987,758	9878
Japan	343,300	706,239	34,330	10,299	37,397	374
Malaysia	245,332	63,752	24,533	7360	27,011	270
R. Korea	1,082,027	485,430	108,203	32,461	119,131	1191
Philippines	1,549,576	256,293	154,958	46,487	170,608	1706
Vietnam	14,327	1863	1433	430	1577	16
Total	26,134,039	5,122,969	2,613,404	784,021	2,877,358	28,774

Source: FAO FIGIS (2016)

[a] Carbon price is US$ 10 per tonne of CO_{2e}

Table 2 Estimates of algal harvests, annual C assimilation, and potential CO_2 sequestration by SABs, total average between 2012 and 2014

	Algae harvested (t ww y^{-1})	Algae harvested (t dw y^{-1})	C assimilation (t dw y^{-1})	CO_2 sequestration (t dw y^{-1})
China	11,138,780	1,113,878	334,163	1,226,380
India	4000	400	120	400
Indonesia	8,630,107	863,011	258,903	950,175
Japan	389,874	38,987	11,696	42,925
Malaysia	282,084	28,208	8463	31,057
R. Korea	1,076,977	107,698	32,309	118,575
Philippines	1,619,275	161,928	48,578	178,282
Vietnam	15,477	1548	464	1704
Total	23,156,574	2,315,658	694,636	2,549,498

Source: FAO FIGIS (2016)

mangroves, seagrasses and saltmarshes (Table 3). Temperate, boreal, and tropical forests are estimated to sequester 5096, 3599, and 4000 t CO_2 km^{-2}, respectively (Schlesinger 1997; Zehetner 2010). Annual range of soil CO_2 accumulation rates at saltmarshes and mangroves were 77–6287 and 73–2400 t CO_2e km^{-2} y^{-1} (Chmura et al. 2003). Salt marshes, mangroves, and seagrasses stored 554, 510, and 304 t CO_2e km^{-2}, respectively (Duarte et al., 2005). Globally, with total area about 509,170 km^2, mangroves, saltmarshes, and seagrasses altogether store about 11 × 10^9 t C or about 42 × 10^9 t CO_2 (Siikamaki et al. 2012). For example, a total of 5774 km^2 of blue carbon ecosystems (estimated at the Abu Dhabi workshop; seagrass, algal mat, mangrove and saltmarsh) potentially stored 3.9 × 10^6 t C (144.8 × 10^6 t CO_2e) (AGEDI 2013). When compared to wild seaweed beds, 49,939–124,849 km^2 of Australian temperate wild seaweed beds could store up to 109.9 Tg C (Hill et al. 2015) and 2012 km^2 of algal and seagrass beds along the coasts of Japan could store 2.7 × 10^6 t C (Muraoka 2004).

It is important to include SABs in C emission schemes as they are increasing in terms of volume of production and cultivation area, whilst other important blue carbon coastal habitats (mangrove, seagrass, and saltmarsh areas) have decreased by 340,000–980,000 ha annually as a result of human pressures on coastal ecosystems (Murray et al. 2011). In the past 10-year production of seaweeds in Asian Pacific SABs has more than doubled (FAO 2016) and is projected to continuously increase. SABs can thus play an increasingly important role in C accumulation and sequestration.

SABs in Asian Pacific countries

Despite the benefits above, SABs also have some impacts on surrounding areas such as reducing sunlight penetration, increasing siltation, and may lower seagrass biomass, shoot density, and cover area, although the impacts of SABs differ between cultivation methods.

In the Republic of Korea, SABs production from major cultivated species of *Undaria*, *Pyropia*, *Saccharina*, and *Sargassum* covered approximately 74,696 ha between 2003 and 2012, with total production of approximately 78,748 t dw y^{-1}. During that period, the total C assimilation is estimated to be 23,624 t y^{-1}, or 86,700 t CO_2 y^{-1}, and may be attributed to the regional expansion or addition of new areas of SABs, more intense cultivation, or the development of new seaweed strains for cultivation. The rise in production in Korea has become more pronounced since the 1980s because of various technical improvements, transplantation of new species of *Pyropia*, and the establishment of new grounds for cultivation (Chung 2015).

Both wild seaweed communities and SABs are important habitats that can also be considered as short-term blue carbon sinks and significant donors to long-term carbon sequestration along the coasts of all continents (Hill et al. 2015; Trevathan-Tackett et al. 2015). Countries with extensive shallow waters suitable for seaweed cultivation should be further explored for their contribution to mitigation efforts to reduce GHG emissions and existing wild seaweed beds/forests should be the focus of protection and restoration for their carbon sink mitigation potential.

Asian-Pacific countries have the capacity to increase production from SABs while improving their potential for CO_2 sequestration by increasing cultivation areas and developing new strains of cultivated seaweeds. China, Indonesia, Philippines, Republic of Korea, and Japan are already major suppliers of seaweed to the rest of the world. The Indonesian MMAF set a goal of preparing 60 clusters to stimulate the production of 10 × 10^6 t wwt of seaweed by 2014 (MMAF 2014). Finally, the 10th Malaysian Plan was launched to optimize seaweed production while the 4th National Agriculture Policy (2011–2020) was enacted in order to boost the development of seaweed aquaculture programs in that country (Kaur and Ang 2009). In the period from 2010 to 2015, 900,000 ha of natural seaweed beds with a standing crop of 60–70 × 10^5 t dw y^{-1} have

Table 3 Estimates of biomass, annual C assimilation, and potential CO_2 sequestration by other habitats

Ecosystem	Area (km^2)	C assimilation (t km^{-2})	CO_2 sequestration (t km^{-2})	References
Mangrove	139,170	139–7210	510–24,460	Duarte et al. (2005), Siikimaki et al. (2012)
Saltmarsh	22,000–400,000	≥218,180	≥800,060	Chmura et al. (2003)*
Seagrass	319,000	6270	22,988	Siikimaki et al. (2012)
Forest				
Temperate	10,400,000	n/a	5096	Schlesinger (1997), Zehetner (2010)*
Boreal	13,700,000	n/a	3599	
Tropical	19,622,846	n/a	4000	

*Adopted from Mcleod et al. (2011)

n/a not applicable

been estimated as suitable for exploitation in Vietnam (Hong et al. 2007).

Although commercial seaweed production is still limited in Australia and New Zealand, cultivating seaweed in association with ocean-based finfish farming is the focus of a new research project by the South Australia government (MISA 2011). Trials are also underway for integrated multi-trophic aquaculture in Victoria, Australia. Moreover, investigation of the palatability and nutritional value of endemic Australasian seaweeds has begun. In New Zealand in 2010, the biosecurity categorization of the introduced kelp *Undaria pinnatifida,* was changed to enable cultivation and harvesting in areas where it is currently established (Barratt-Boyes 2012). Some small-scale harvesting of *U. pinnatifida* introduced to Tasmanian and Victorian waters is also occurring in Australia.

Growth in both seaweed volumes and economic value will depend upon improved efforts by the seaweed industry. The associated increase in biomass will provide economic returns to coastal communities when harvested (Baruah et al. 2006). Our estimates indicate that annually US$ 29 million could be obtained from potential CO_2 markets plus US$5.1 × 10^9 from traditional seaweed markets. Although our estimate of the annual carbon price for sequestration by current SABs is modest, the potential for the ocean afforestation should not be neglected (Table 1).

Seaweeds and SABs capabilities in CO_2 sequestration

Seaweeds can act as effective carbon sinks because their biomass is larger, and their turnover times are relatively longer, than those of other marine organisms such as phytoplankton. They also have higher proportions of recalcitrant carbon in their tissues that are not easily broken down (Gao and McKinley 1994; Delille et al. 2009; Trevathan-Tackett et al. 2015). Seaweeds can transform DIC via photosynthesis, thereby decreasing the pCO_2 in seawater. By removing a significant amount of carbon from the ocean at harvest time (Tang et al. 2011), these life forms provide potential tools for biomass production as well as CO_2 sequestration (Duarte et al. 2005). In addition, seaweeds acting as CO_2 sinks can sequester carbon within their biomass throughout their life spans (Chung et al. 2013) and beyond (Delille et al. 2009; Trevathan-Tackett et al. 2015).

Seaweeds and SABs can potentially make effective contributions to CO_2 mitigation because some seaweeds have cell wall structures and composition that can store carbon over the long-term by becoming a carbon donor to other ecosystems (Hill et al. 2015; Trevathan-Tackett et al. 2015) and by converting the biomass into a range of bioenergy products from biogas to liquid and solid biofuels. We discuss these roles in more detail below.

We realize that the problem with seaweeds being considered effective organisms for carbon sequestration is their short turnover time. Even though the life cycles and major accumulation of C in seaweeds are relatively limited compared to trees, a lot of CO_2 can be accumulated in a short time with a high productive capacity, so seaweeds are more effective as a recycling resource for fuel in which CO_2 accumulation and retention occur over a much longer time (Muraoka, 2004; Notoya, 2011). For example, *Sargassum* sp. turnover time in the Sargasso Sea is 10 to 100 years (Ramus 1992). A more recent study has found that not all seaweeds have short turnover times and some show potential for long-term carbon sequestration because they contain compounds that are very recalcitrant and are likely to break down slowly in sediments (Trevathan-Tackett et al. 2015).

Recently, seaweeds have been considered as contributors to coastal "blue carbon" in mitigating CO_2 (Chung et al. 2011, 2013; Sondak and Chung 2015; Hill et al. 2015; Trevathan-Tacket et al. 2015) because they contribute to storage of carbon by sequestration of CO_2 from seawater through photosynthesis and use it to increase their biomass (autochthonous carbon) that can potentially be transferred and deposited to other coastal ecosystems or the deep sea benthos (allochthonous carbon). In order for seaweeds to make significant contributions to global carbon sequestration, they must either have the capacity to directly store and accumulate carbon within their own habitat or transport biomass to receiver habitats where carbon can be effectively buried and organic material prevented from undergoing microbial mineralization (Hill et al. 2015). Seaweeds and other aquatic vegetation can be highly productive and an important source of carbon for adjacent ecosystems (Hyndes et al. 2014). In addition, seaweeds, due to their high rates of production, fragmentation, and ability to be transported, would also appear to be able to make a significant contribution as carbon donors to blue carbon habitats (Hill et al. 2015; Trevathan-Tacket et al. 2015). Carbon in the coastal ecosystems can be transported or donated to other ecosystems in the form of particulate organic carbon (POC), dissolved organic carbon (DOC), and dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) (Hill et al. 2015), drifting seaweeds (Komatsu et al. 2008; Ito et al. 2009), and dislodgement of seaweed thalli (Hobday 2000; McKenzie and Bellgrove 2009).

Transport of DOC and POC from coastal vegetated intertidal habitats such as mangrove, seagrass, and seaweed can also occur via dissolved or particular matter, through migration of animals from intertidal to subtidal areas, and through a series of predator-prey interactions (trophic relay) (Kneib 1997; Bouillon and Connolly 2009). High rates of DOC loss through leaching occur rapidly following detachment of macrophyte leaves or thalli (Maie et al. 2006; Hyndes et al. 2012). POC and DOC along with nekton provide major vectors of carbon transfer across ecosystems within seascapes, and water movement plays a major role in facilitating transfer of carbon regardless of the vector (Hyndes et al. 2014).

Theories concerning the net transfer of carbon from intertidal to subtidal areas are dominated by concepts about carbon transfer among near-shore systems (Bouillon and Connolly 2009). Allochthonous materials such as macroalgae, terrestrial detritus, and marine-derived suspended sediment can be deposited in the intertidal systems through tidal exchanges and long-shore currents (Wolanski 1992; Bouillon et al. 2003; Adame et al. 2012). It was suggested that one of the main processes of carbon sequestration by seaweed beds is transfer of the drifting seaweeds (i.e., *Macrocystis*, *Durvillaea*, *Eisenia*, *Ecklonia*, and *Sargassum*) before sinking to benthic habitats and the offshore mesopelagic zone (Harrold et al. 1998; Ito et al. 2009; Fraser et al. 2011). Some species of seaweeds can be transported to new areas far from their origin (e.g., *Sargassum* in the Sargasso Sea) and can substantially increase their biomass in a free-floating stage, with a tendency to rapidly sink to the deep sea floor, which makes it much more efficient vehicle to carbon sequestration (Johnson and Richardson 1977; Smetacek and Zingone 2013). Thalli are eroded and dislodged whole kelp thalli form rafts on the ocean surface (Hobday 2000; Xu et al. 2016) and these are deposited as wrack along shorelines, inshore subtidal habitats, and canyons (Vetter and Dayton 1998; Orr et al. 2005; Wernberg et al. 2006; Crawley et al. 2009). Understanding how much of this macroalgal biomass gets deposited in areas conducive to long-term sequestration remains a key knowledge gap.

Animals also play an important role in carbon transfer within coastal and terrestrial ecosystems. For example, mesograzers such as gastropods are important in transferring kelp-derived carbon to higher level consumers in a range of marine ecosystems as well as coastal and terrestrial environment (Hyndes et al. 2014) and can therefore transport carbon from one ecosystem to another. Other offshore macrograzers such as dugongs, manatees, and green turtles consume large quantities of seagrass and seaweed, thus significantly transferring carbon when they migrate between shallow and deeper waters (Thayer et al. 1984). Moreover, various swimming, diving, and wading bird species prey significantly on nekton in shallow waters (Blaber 2000; Torres 2009) and cause transfer of carbon from sea to land (Hyndes et al. 2014).

Continued use of seaweeds as food will not achieve long-term CO_2 sequestration. Nonetheless, if some of the seaweed production can be converted to useful chemical products such as hydrocolloids/phycocolloids, alginate, agar, and carrageenan as thickening and gelling agents in food and biochemical industries, biofuels, and biochar (Turan and Neori 2011; Choi et al. 2014; Roberts et al. 2015) and thus avoid the use of fossil fuels, mitigation of CO_2 emissions can be achieved indirectly. Some reports suggest that macroalgae could be a useful source of such chemicals using techniques such as fast hydrothermal liquefaction (Bach et al. 2014). Other possible approaches include anaerobic digestion for methane production (Nkemka and Murto, 2010) or fermentation for bioethanol (Yanagisawa et al. 2013; Adams et al. 2015).

Plants can act as C sequestration agents and sinks in long term, in addition to their use as bioenergy crops, thereby reducing GHG emissions from fossil fuels (Jansson et al. 2010). Seaweeds can be classified as a bioenergy crop as they can produce renewable energy from biomass. The use of seaweeds as feedstock for biofuel is an emerging trend in biorefinery research as one approach to mitigation of atmospheric CO_2 (Bharathiraja et al. 2015). For example, *Sargassum* can be converted to biooil, biogas or biochar through pyrolysis (Kim et al. 2013b). The concept of combining bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS) has been identified as one mechanism to achieve energy production with a net negative atmospheric carbon emission (Hughes et al. 2012). The Ocean Sunrise Project in Japan has been developed with aims to combat global warming through seaweed bioethanol production by contributing an alternative energy to fossil fuel (Aizawa et al. 2007). Co-culturing macroalgae with industry flue-gas provides a holistic solution for carbon sequestration by recycling carbon and converting the biomass into a range of bioenergy products from biogas to liquid and solid biofuels (Cole et al. 2014).

Another possible solution is conversion of algal biomass into biochar that can be suitable for deep-buried storage of carbon. Long-term C sequestration can be achieved when C from above-ground biomass transfers into the soil for example as biochar or phytoliths (Jansson et al. 2010). The application of biochar to soil is proposed as a novel approach to establish a significant, long-term, sink for CO_2 (Farrelly et al. 2013). Seaweed aquaculture not only offers food production and hydrocolloids but also possibilities for production of biochar (Roberts et al. 2015). It was assumed by Bird et al. (2011) that biochar produced from algal feedstock may also be comparatively high in nutrients that may make algal biochar attractive for carbon sequestration as these might promote crop plant growth in soils supplemented with the char. Suh et al. (2014) found that *S. japonica* has potential for biochar and biofuel production. Biochar can be produced from a range of commercially cultivated seaweed such as *Gracilaria edulis*, *Eucheuma spinosum*, *Kappaphycus alvarezii*, *Sargassum* spp., *Undaria pinnatifida*, and *Saccharina japonica* biomass where 1.9 Mt dry wt can yield up to 0.33 Mt C y^{-1} (Roberts et al. 2015).

Conclusion

The ongoing development of seaweed aquaculture beds (SABs) ensures that Asian Pacific countries will remain leaders in the seaweed industry and in the achievement of carbon sequestration by seaweeds. If cultivation remains balanced, then the introduction of seaweed farming to additional areas will provide new standing stock to sequester carbon in those regions. Because SABs could provide important structure in coastal waters and may be considered as a key component in programs to combat climate change, their geographical coverage should be allowed to expand, enhancing the potential ecosystem services. SABs provide ecosystem services to adjacent ecosystems like reducing eutrophication effects caused by uncontrolled nutrient loading to coastal areas. Actions could be taken to reduce these impacts such as practicing sustainable and environmentally friendly aquaculture such as integrated multi-trophic aquaculture (IMTA).

We conclude that SABs can effectively contribute to CO_2 mitigation by becoming carbon donors to other ecosystems and converting the biomass into a range of bioenergy products from biogas to liquid and solid biofuels. This would represent a win-win strategy for coastal blue carbon ecosystems with the mitigation and adaptation measures that SABs could provide. The fate of exudation and fragments of seaweeds as a carbon sink in the deep sea should be assessed. Their strong performance to date, as described here, leads us to believe that SABs can be employed to sustain marine environments through their varied ecosystem services and provide nutrients to low-productive, adjacent coastal areas while also enhancing the economies of coastal communities.

Acknowledgements This work has been supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea, Marine Research Institute, Pusan National University (NRF-2013R1A1A2009359), and DIKTI Scholarship from the Indonesia Ministry of National Education and Culture for CFAS.

References

Adame MF, Wright SF, Grinham A, Lobb K, Reymond CE, Lovelock CE (2012) Terrestrial-marine connectivity: patterns of terrestrial soil carbon deposition in coastal sediments determined by analysis of glomalin related soil protein. Limnol Oceanogr 57:1492–1502

Adams JMM, Schmidt A, Gallagher JA (2015) The impact of sample preparation of the macroalgae Laminaria digitata on the production of the biofuels bioethanol and biomethane. J Appl Phycol 27:985–991

AGEDI (2013) Blue carbon in Abu Dhabi. Protecting our coastal heritage: The Abu Dhabi clue carbon demonstration project. Published by AGEDI. Produced by GRID-Arendal, A Centre Collaborating with UNEP, Norway

Aizawa M, Asaoka K, Atsumi M, Sakou T (2007) Seaweed bioethanol production: the ocean sunrise project. Available from: http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=andarnumber=4449162 Accessed 28 Mar 2015

Andersen KH, Mork M, Nilsen JEO (1996) Measurement of the velocity-profile in and above a forest of *Laminaria hyperborea*. Sarsia 81: 193–196

Arenas F, Vas-Pinto F (2014) Marine algae as carbon sinks and allies to combat global warming. In: Pereira L, Neto JM (eds) Marine algae: biodiversity, taxonomy, environmental assessment and biotechnology. CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp. 178–193

Azam F, Fenchel T, Field JG, Gray JS, Meyerrell LA, Thingstad F (1983) The ecological role of water-column microbes in the sea. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 10:257–263

Bach QV, Sillero MV, Tran KQ, Skjermo J (2014) Fast hydrothermal liquefaction of a Norwegian macroalga: screening test. Algal Res 6(B):271–276

Barratt-Boyes M (2012) Pest may prove a source of plenty. New Zealand Aquaculture 46:8–9

Baruah K, Norouzitallab P, Sorgeloos P (2006) Seaweed: an ideal component for wastewater treatment for use in aquaculture. Aquaculture Europe 31:3–6

Bharathiraja B, Chakravarthy M, Kumar RR, Yogendran D, Yuvaraj D, Jayamuthunagai J, Kumar RP, Palani S (2015) Aquatic biomass (algae) as a future feed stock for bio-refineries: a review on cultivation, processing and products. Renew Sust Energ Rev 47:634–653

Bird MI, Wurster CM, de Paula Silva PH, Bass AM, de Nys R (2011) Algal biochar-production and properties. Bioresource Technol 102: 1886–1891

Blaber SJM (2000) Tropical estuarine fishes: ecology, exploitation and conservation. Blackwell, Oxford

Bouillon S, Dahdouh-Guebas F, Rao AVVS, Koedam N, Dehairs F (2003) Sources of organic carbon in mangrove sediments: variability and possible ecological implications. Hydrobiologia 495:33–39

Bouillon S, Connoly RM (2009) Carbon exchange among tropical coastal ecosystems. In: Nagelkerken I (ed) Ecological connectivity among tropical ecosystems. Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 45–70

Cesar HJS, Ohman MC, Espeut B, Honkanen M (2000) An economic valuation of Portland Bright, Jamaica: an integrated terrestrial and marine protected area. Working paper 00/03, Institute for Environmental Studies, Free University, Amsterdam

Choi JH, Woo HC, Suh DJ (2014) Pyrolysis of seaweeds for bio-oil and bio-char production. Chem Eng Trans 37:121–126

Chopin T, Yarish C, Wilkes R, Belyea E, Lu S, Mathieson A (1999) A developing *Porphyra*/salmon integrated aquaculture for bioremediation and diversification of the aquaculture industry. J Appl Phycol 11:463–472
Christie H, Norderhaug KM, Fredriksen S (2009) Macrophytes as habitat for fauna. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 396:221–233
Chmura GL, Anisfield SC, Cahoon DR, Lynch JC (2003) Global carbon sequestration in tidal, saline wetlands soil. Glob Biogeochem Cycles 1111. doi:10.1029/2002GB001917
Chung IK (2015) Outlook for Korean aquaculture—seaweed aquaculture in Korea. AquaInfo magazine (English ed) 3:42–60
Chung IK, Beardall J, Mehta S, Sahoo D, Stojkovic S (2011) Using marine macroalgae for carbon sequestration: a critical appraisal. J Appl Phycol 23:877–886
Chung IK, Oak JH, Lee JA, Shin JA, Kim JG, Park KS (2013) Installing kelp forest/seaweed beds for mitigation and adaptation against global warming: Korean project overview. ICES J Mar Sci. doi:10.1093/icesjms/fss206
Cole AJ, Mata L, Paul NA, de Nys R (2014) Using CO_2 to enhance carbon capture and biomass applications of freshwater macroalgae. GCB Bioenergy 6:637–645
Cramton P, Ockenfels A, Stoft S (2015) An international carbon-price commitment promotes cooperation. Econ Energy Environ Policy 4:51–64
Crawley KR, Hyndes GA, Vanderklift MA, Revill AT, Nichols PD (2009) Allochthonous brown algae are the primary food source for consumers in a temperate, coastal environment. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 376:33–44
Delille B, Borges AV, Delille D (2009) Influence of giant kelp beds (*Macrocystis pyrifera*) on diel cycles of pCO_2 and DIC in the sub-Antarctic coastal area. Estuar Coast Shelf Sci 81:114–122
Dierssen HM, Zimmerman RC, Drake RA (2009) Burdige DJ (2009) potential export of unattached benthic macroalgae to the deep sea through wind-driven Langmuir circulation. Geophys Res Lett 36(4): L04602. doi:10.1029/2008GL036188
Duarte CM, Middelburg JJ, Caraco N (2005) Major role of marine vegetation on the oceanic carbon cycle. Biogeosciences 2:1–8
Duarte CM, Losada IJ, Hendriks IE, Mazarrasa I, Marbà N (2013) The role of coastal plant communities for climate change mitigation and adaptation. Nat Clim Chang 3:961–968
Eklöf JS, de la Torre-Castro M, Nilsson C, Rönnbäck P (2006) How do seaweed farms influence local fishery catches in a seagrass-dominated setting in Chwaka Bay. Zanzibar Aquat Living Resour 19:137–147
Eklöf JS, Msuya FE, Lyimo TJ, Buriyo AS (2012) Seaweed farming in Chwaka Bay: a sustainable alternative in aquaculture? In: de la Torre-Castro M, Lyimo TJ (eds) People, nature and research in Chwaka Bay. WIOMSA, Zanzibar, Tanzania, pp. 213–233
Emerton L, Kekulandala LDCB (2003) Assessment of economic value of Muthurajawela wetland. Occ. Pap. IUCN Sri Lanka (4): 28p. http://data.iucn.org/dbtw-wpd/edocs/2003-005.pdf
EPA (2014) Climate change indicators in the United States: Global greenhouse gas emissions. www.epa.gov/climatechange/indicators. Accessed 20 Mar 2016.
Fankhauser S, Tol RSJ (1996) Recent advancements in the economic assessment of climate change costs. Energ Policy 24:665–667
FAO (2014) The state of world fisheries and aquaculture 2012. Rome, 223 p
FAO (2016) FIGIS. Global aquaculture production 1950–2012. Food and Agriculture. Available from: http://www.fao.org/figis/servlet/TabSelector. Accessed 28 Mar 2016
Farrelly DJ, Everard CD, Fagan CC, McDonnell KP (2013) Carbon sequestration and the role of biological carbon mitigation: a review. Renew Sust Energ Rev 21:712–727
Fei XG (2004) Solving the coastal eutrophication problem by large scale seaweed cultivation. Hydrobiologia 512:145–151
Fourqurean JW, Duarte CM, Kennedy H, Marba N, Holmer M, Mateo MA, Apostolaki ET, Kendrick GA, Krause-Jensen D, McGlathery K, Serrano O (2012) Seagrass ecosystems as a globally significant carbon stock. Nat Geosci 5:505–509
Fraser CI, Nikula R, Waters JM (2011) Oceanic rafting by coastal community. Proc R Soc B 278:649–655
Gao K, McKinley KR (1994) Use of macroalgae for marine biomass production and CO_2 remediation: a review. J Appl Phycol 6:45–60
Gao K, Zheng Y (2010) Combined effects of ocean acidification and solar UV radiation on photosynthesis, growth, pigmentation and calcification of the coralline alga *Corallina sessile* (Rhodophyta). Glob Chang Biol 16:2388–2398
Gevaert F, Janguin MA, Davoult D (2008) Biometrics in *Laminaria digitata*: a useful tool to assess biomass, carbon and nitrogen contents. J Sea Res 60:215–219
Giordano M, Beardall J, Raven JA (2005) CO_2 concentrating mechanisms in algae: mechanisms, environmental modulation, and evolution. Annu Rev Plant Biol 56:99–131
Harrold C, Light K, Lisin S (1998) Organic enrichment of submarine-canyon and continental shelf benthic communities by macroalgal drift imported form nearshore kelp forests. Limnol Oceanogr 43: 669–678
He P, Xu S, Zhang H, Wen S, Day Y, Lin S, Yarish C (2008) Bioremediation efficiency in the removal of dissolved inorganic nutrients by the red seaweed, *Porphyra yezoensis*, cultivated in the open sea. Water Res 42:1281–1289
Hill R, Bellgrove A, Macreadie PI, Petrou K, Beardall J, Steven A, Ralph PJ (2015) Can macroalgae contribute to blue carbon? An Australian perspective. Limnol Oceanogr 60:1689–1706
Hobday AJ (2000) Abundance and dispersal of drifting kelp *Macrocystis pyrifera* rafts in the Southern California Bight. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 195:101–116
Hong DD, Hien MH, Son PN (2007) Seaweed from Vietnam used for functional food, medicine and biofertilizer. J Appl Phycol 19:817–826
Howard J, Hoyt J, Isensee K, Pidgeon E, Telszewski M (2014) Coastal blue carbon: methods for Conservation International, Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO, International union for conservation of nature factors in mangroves, tidal salt marshes, and seagrasses meadows. Conservation International, Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO, International union for conservation of nature. Arlington, Virginia, USA
Huo YZ, Wu HL, Chai ZY, Xu SN, Han F, Dong L, He PM (2012) Bioremediation efficiency of *Gracilaria verrucosa* for an integrated multi-trophic aquaculture system with *Pseudosciaena crocea* in Xiangshan harbor, China. Aquaculture 326-329:99–105
Hughes AD, Black KD, Campbell I, Davidson K, Kelly MS (2012) Does seaweed offer a solution for bioenergy with biological carbon capture and storage? Greenhouse Gas Sci Technol 2:402–407
Hyndes GA, Lavery PS, Doropoulos C (2012) Dual processes for cross boundaries subsidies: incorporation of nutrients from reef-derived kelp into a seagrass ecosystem. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 445:97–107
Hyndes GA, Nagelkerken I, McLeod RJ, Connolly RM, Lavery PS, Vanderklift MA (2014) Mechanisms and ecological role of carbon transfer within coastal seascapes. Biol Rev 89:232–254
IPCC (2014) Climate change 2014: synthesis report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Core Writing Team, Pachauri RK, Meyer LA (eds)] IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, 151 pp
Ito Y, Nakano Y, Matsushita S, Mikami N, Yokoyama J, Kirihara S, Notoya M (2009) Estimations of quantities of carbon storage by seaweed and seagrass beds. Japan Fish Eng 46:135–146
Jotzo F (2012) Australia's carbon price. Nat Clim Chang 2:475–476
Jackson GA (1984) Internal wave attenuation by coastal kelp stands. J Phys Oceanogr 14:1300–1306

Jansson C, Wullschleger SD, Kalluri UC, Tuskan GA (2010) Photosequestration: carbon biosequestration by plants and the prospects of genetic engineering. Bioscience 60:685–696

Johnson DL, Richardson PL (1977) On the wind-induced sinking of *Sargassum*. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 28:255–267

Kaur CR, Ang M (2009) Seaweed culture and utilization in Malaysia status, challenges and economic potential. Seminar on developing the seaweed aquaculture sector in Malaysia, (Maritime Institute in Malaysia). Presented at the Seminar on developing the seaweed aquaculture sector in Malaysia, MIMA (Maritime Institute in Malaysia), Malaysia. 27 October 2009. www:mima.gov.my

Kim SS, Ly HV, Kim J, Choi JH, Woo HC (2013) Thermogravimetric characteristics and pyrolysis kinetics of alga *Sargassum* sp. biomass. Bioresour Technol 139:242–248

Kneib RT (1997) The role of tidal marshes in the ecology of estuarine nekton. Oceanogr Mar Biol Ann Rev 35:163–220

Komatsu T, Matsunaga D, Mikami A, Sagawa T, Boisnier E, Tatsukawa K, Aoki M, Ajisaka T, Uwai S, Tanaka K, Ishida K, Tanoue H, Sugimoto T (2008) Abundance of drifting seaweeds in eastern East China Sea. J Appl Phycol 20:801–809

Littler MM, Murray SN (1974) The primary productivity of marine macrophytes from a rocky intertidal community. Mar Biol 27:131–135

Lovas SM, Totum A (2001) Effect of the kelp *Laminaria hyperborean* upon sand dune erosion and water particle velocities. Coast Eng 44: 37–63

Luisetti T, Jackson EL, Turner RK (2013) Valuing the European 'coastal blue carbon'storage benefit. Mar Pollut Bull 71:101–106

MacKay D, Cramton P, Ockenfels A, Stoft S (2015) Price carbon—I will if you will. Nature 526:315–316

Mann KH (1972) Ecological energetics of the sea-weed zone in a marine bay on the Atlantic coast of Canada. II. Productivity of the seaweeds. Mar Biol 14:199–209

Maie N, Jaffe R, Miyoshi T, Childers DL (2006) Quantitative and qualitative aspects of dissolved organic carbon leached from senescent plants in an oligotrophic wetland. Biogeochemistry 78:285–314

Manley B (2016) Afforestation responses to carbon price changes and market certainties. Report for the ministry for primary industries. http://www.mfe.govt.nz/sites/default/files/media/Climate%20Change/Afforestation%20responses

Mcleod E, Chmura GL, Bouillon S, Salm R, Björk M, Duarte CM, Lovelock CE, Schlesinger WH, Silliman BR (2011) A blueprint for blue carbon: toward an improved understanding of the role of vegetated coastal habitats in sequestering CO_2. Front Ecol Environ 9:552–560

McHugh DJ (2003) A guide to seaweed industry. Food and Agricultural Organization, Rome, 106p

McKenzie PF, Bellgrove A (2009) Dislodgment and attachment strength of the intertidal macroalga *Hormosira banksii* (Fucales, Phaeophyceae). Phycologia 48:335–343

McVey JP, Stickney R, Yarish C, Chopin T (2002) Aquatic poly-culture and balanced ecosystem management: new paradigms for seafood production. In: Stickney RR, McVey JP (eds) Responsible aquaculture. CAB International, Oxford, pp. 91–104

MMAF (Ministry of Marine Affair and Fisheries Indonesia) (2014) Available from: www.kkp.go.id. Accessed 10 Oct 2016

MISA (Marine Innovation South Australia) (2011) Seaweed farming coming soon. MISA Snapshot issue 1. Available from: http://repository.seafdec.org.ph. Accessed 4 Oct 2014

Mitra A, Zaman S, Pramanick P, Bhattacharyya SB, Raha AK (2014) Stored carbon in dominant seaweeds of Indian Sundarbans. Pertanika J Trop Agric Sci 37:263–274

Mitra A, Zaman S (2014) Carbon sequestration by coastal floral community: a ground zero observation on blue carbon. TERI, New Delhi 428p

Muraoka D (2004) Seaweed resources as a source of carbon fixation. Bull Fish Res Agen 1:59–63

Murray BC, Pendleton L, Jenkins WA, Sifleet S (2011) Green payment for blue carbon: economic incentives for protecting threatened coastal habitats. Nicholas Institute for Environment Policy Solutions Report. Durham, North Carolina, USA, p 42

Nellemann C, Corcoran E, Duarte CM, Valdes L, De Young C, Fonseca L, Grimsditch G (2009) Blue carbon. A rapid response assessment. GRID-Arendal: United Nations Environment Programme

Nkemka VN, Murto M (2010) Evaluation of biogas production from seaweed in batch tests and in UASB reactors combined with the removal of heavy metals. J Environ Manag 91:1573–1579

Notoya M (2011) Production of biofuel by macroalgae with preservation of marine resources and environment. In: Israel A, Einav R, Seckbach J (eds) Seaweed and their role in globally changing environments. Springer, New York, pp. 219–228

N'Yeurt A, Chynoweth D, Capron ME, Stewart J, Hasan M (2012) Negative carbon via ocean afforestation. Process Safe Environ Protect 90:467–474

Okuda K (2008) Coastal environment and seaweed-bed ecology in Japan. Kuroshio Science 2-1:15–20

Olafsson E, Johnstone RW, Ndaro SGM (1995) Effects of intensive seaweed farming on the meiobenthos in a tropical lagoon. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 191:101–117

Olivier JG, Janssens-Maenhout G, Muntean M, Peters JAHW (2015) Trends in global CO_2 emissions; 2015 Report, The Hague: PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency. European Commission, Joint Research Centre, Ispra

Orr M, Zimmer M, Jelinski DE, Mews M (2005) Wrack deposition on different beach types: spatial and temporal variation in the pattern of subsidy. Ecology 86:1496–1507

Paddack MJ, Estes JA (2000) Kelp forest fish population in marine reserves and adjacent exploited areas of central California. Ecol Appl 10:855–870

Pendleton L, Donato DC, Murray BC, Crooks S, Jenkins WA, Sifleet S, Craft C, Fourqurean JW, Kauffman JB, Marba N, Megonigal P, Pidgeon E, Herr D, Gordon D, Baldera A (2012) Estimating global blue carbon emission from conversion and degradation of vegetated coastal ecosystems. PLoS One 7:e43542

Phang SM, Yeong HY, Lim PE, Adibi Rahiman MN, Gan KT (2010) Commercial varieties of *Kappaphycus* and *Eucheuma* in Malaysia. Malaysian J Sci 29:214–224

Ramus J (1992) Productivity of seaweeds. In: Falkowski PG, Woodhead AD (eds) Primary productivity and biogeochemical cycles in the sea. Plenum Press, NY, pp. 239–255

Raven JA, Cockell CS, La Rocha CL (2008) The evolution of inorganic carbon concentrating mechanisms in photosynthesis. Phil Trans Roy Soc B 363:2641–2650

Roberts DA, Paul NA, Dworjanyn SA, Bird MI, de Nys R (2015) Biochar commercially cultivated seaweed for soil amelioration. Scientific Report 5:9665. doi:10.1038/srep09665

Samonte-Tan G, Armedilla MC (2004) Economic valuation of Philippine coral reefs in the South China Sea biogeographic region. Nat Coral Reef Review Ser 3:1–39

Schlesinger WH (1997) Biogeochemistry: an analysis of global change, 2nd edn. Academic Press, San Diego

Semesi S, Beer S, Bjork M (2009) Seagrass photosynthesis controls rates of calcification and photosynthesis of calcareous algae in a tropical seagrass meadow. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 382:41–47

Siikamaki J, Sanchirico JN, Jardine S, McLaughlin D, Morris DF (2012) Blue carbon: global options for reducing emissions from the degradation and development of coastal ecosystems. Resource for the Future, Washington. 70p.

Smetacek V, Zingone A (2013) Green and golden seaweed tides on the rise. Nature 504:84–88

Smith SV (1981) Marine macrophytes as a global carbon sink. Science 211:838–840

Sondak CFA, Chung IK (2015) Potential blue carbon from coastal ecosystems in the Republic of Korea. Ocean Sci J 50:1–8

Suh DJ, Choi JH, Woo HC (2014) Pyrolysis of seaweeds for bio-oil and bio-char production. Chem Eng Trans 37:121–126

Tang Q, Zhang J, Fang J (2011) Shellfish and seaweed mariculture increase atmospheric CO_2 absorption by coastal ecosystem. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 424:97–104

Thayer G, Bjorndal K, Ogden J, Williams S, Zieman J (1984) Role of larger herbivores in seagrass communities. Estuaries 7:351–376

Torres LG (2009) A kaleidoscope of mammal, bird and fish: habitat use patterns of top predators and their prey in Florida Bay. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 375:289–304

Trevathan-Tackett SM, Kelleway JJ, Macreadie PI, Beardall J, Ralph P, Bellgrove A (2015) Comparison of marine macrophytes for their contributions to blue carbon sequestration. Ecology 96:3043–3057

Turan G, Neori A (2011) Intensive seaweed aquaculture: a potent solution against global warming. In: Israel A, Einav R, Seckbach J (eds) Seaweed and their role in globally changing environments. Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 359–372

Valderrama D (2012) Social and economic dimensions of seaweed farming: a global review. 2012. IIFET, Tanzania Proceedings

Vasquez JA, Zuniga S, Tala F, Piaget N, Rondriquez DC, Alonso-Vega JM (2014) Economic valuation of kelp forests in northern Chile: values of goods and services of the ecosystem. J Appl Phycol 26: 1081–1088

Vetter EW, Dayton PK (1998) Macrofaunal communities within and adjacent to a detritus-rich submarine canyon system. Deep-Sea Res II 45:25–54

Vierros M (2013) Communities and blue carbon: the role of traditional management systems in providing benefits for carbon storage, biodiversity conservation and livelihoods. Climate Change. doi:10.1007/s10584-013-920-3

Walsh M, Watson L (2011) A market analysis towards the further development of seaweed aquaculture in Ireland. Irish Sea Fisheries Board, Dublin

Wattage P (2011) Valuation of ecosystem services in coastal ecosystems: Asian and European perspectives. Ecosystem Services Economics (ESE). Working Paper Series No. 8. The United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) Publication Series

Wernberg T, Vanderklift MA, How J, Lavery PS (2006) Export of detached macroalgae from reefs to adjacent seagrass beds. Oecologia 147:692–701

Widowati T, Pramono GH, Rusmanto A, Munajati SL (2012) Spatial analysis: the effectiveness of seaweed as a catalyst for improving ecologic and economic qualities in Takalar water area South Sulawesi. Proceedings of Global Geospatial Conference 2012 Québec City, Canada, 14–17 May 2012

Wolanski E (1992) Hydrodynamics of mangrove swamps and their coastal waters. Hydrobiologia 247:141–161

Xu M, Sakamoto S, Komatsu T (2016) Attachment strength of the subtidal seaweed *Sargassum horneri* (Turner) C. Agardh varies among development stages and depths. J Appl Phycol. doi:10.1007/s10811-016-0869-5DOI

Yanagisawa M, Kawai S, Murata K (2013) Strategies for the production of high concentrations of bioethanol from seaweed: production of high concentrations of bioethanol from seaweed. Bioengineered 4: 224–235

Yang YF, Fei XG, Song JM, Hu HY, Wang GC, Chung IK (2006) Growth of *Gracilaria lemaneiformis* under different cultivation conditions and its effects on nutrient removal in Chinese coastal waters. Aquaculture 254:248–255

Zehetner F (2010) Does organic carbon sequestration in volcanic soils offset volcanic CO_2 emissions? Quaternary Sci Rev 29:1313–1316

Zemke-White WL, Ohno M (1999) World seaweed utilization: an end-of-century summary. J Appl Phycol 11:369–376

Zemke-White WL, Smith JE (2006) Environmental impacts of seaweed farming in the tropics. In: Critchley AT, Ohno M, Largo D (eds) Seaweed resources. Expert Center for Taxonomic Identification (ETI), Univ. Amsterdam. CD-ROM World Seaweed Resources—. Version, 1