# Assessing stakeholder perceptions to guide social and ecological fit of marine protected areas

**Authors:** Victor Brun1,2\*, John Roderick V. Madarcos3, Anna J. Celis2, Lota A. Creencia3, Georgina G. Gurney4, Joachim Claudet1

1National Center for Scientific Research, PSL Université Paris, CRIOBE, CNRS-EPHE-UPVD, Maison de l’Océan, 195 rue Saint-Jacques, 75005 Paris, France

2Sulubaai Environmental Foundation, Taytay, 5323 Palawan, Philippines

3College of Fisheries and Natural Sciences, Western Philippines University, Puerto Princesa City, 53000 Palawan, Philippines

4College of Arts, Society and Education, James Cook University, Townsville, Queensland 4811, Australia

\*Correspondence: victor.brun@sciencespo.fr

**Summary**

Effective social and ecological interventions that can benefit both nature and people are needed to halt the degradation of ecosystems and subsequent negative impacts on human well-being. Marine protected areas (MPAs) are commonly used to foster the sustainability of coastal social-ecological systems. However, because MPAs are often proposed and implemented by external actors, ensuring they are fit to the local social and ecological context remains a challenge. Here, we introduce a framework to identify the place-based social and ecological goals for an MPA. We use a marine conservation project in the Philippines as a case study. We assess the perceptions of local communities and decision-makers across four domains: i) marine importance, ii) environmental stressors, iii) proposed management options, and iv) MPA goals and needs. Assessing these is a way to refine marine conservation goals locally, adapt the implementation of planned interventions, and monitor their future outcomes.

## 1. Introduction

Coastal fishing communities can be highly dependent on marine ecosystem services, making them particularly vulnerable to marine environmental degradation or changes in access to resources1–4. Improving the way coastal and marine resources are used is a great challenge as ocean-based activities such as coastal tourism, infrastructure development, and fishing are developing at an increasing pace5. A variety of approaches exist to identify sustainability interventions in coastal social-ecological systems (SESs) according to their expected outcomes6 or local conditions7. However, the identification and implementation of sustainability interventions are often driven externally8, which can increase the likelihood that interventions are not fit to local contexts and fail to deliver expected positive social and ecological outcomes or even lead to negative outcomes, including increased environmental degradation, social inequities, and conflicts4,9–18. The concept of social and ecological fit represents the idea that some governance arrangements and interventions are more adequately and specifically suited to the social and ecological characteristics of the environmental problem at hand19–21. It has been applied to study the relevance of sustainability interventions in the context of marine social-ecological systems and their ability to efficiently curb ecological threats and improve human well-being20,22.

Marine protected areas (MPAs), among other area-based management tools, are commonly used to improve the sustainability of coastal social-ecological systems23. MPAs can deliver benefits to people across diverse well-being dimensions (Ban et al. 2019) and, thus, can be appealing to local communities24. However, MPAs are also often proposed, implemented and managed by external actors, including non-governmental organizations (NGOs). While these actors can support the participation of local actors in resource governance25 and enhance the financial and legal capacity of MPAs26,27, externally driven area-based conservation can create or exacerbate local vulnerabilities, for instance, when preventing fishers from accessing their fishing grounds4,14,28. Indeed, opposition to MPAs can arise when they do not meet local needs or their benefits are oversold29,30. Social and ecological fit should, therefore, be a top priority for all conservation initiatives20–22,31,32, if not a moral obligation33. As global coverage of MPAs is likely to increase at a fast pace to comply with Target 3 of the Kunming-Montréal Global Biodiversity Framework, improving the inclusivity and fit of MPAs constitutes a pillar of ocean justice and equity12,33.

Social assessments focusing on stakeholders’ perceptions have widely been used for MPA planning and evaluation. The perceptions of stakeholders can be informative to support multi-level governance arrangements, where the motivations and actions of different actors can be highly contrasted and need to be integrated34. These can help evaluate local dependencies on marine ecosystem services35, assess threats to ecosystems36, help design the MPA37, understand barriers and levers to a specific MPA feature like the level of protection38, or assess local support for conservation39. However, a framework designed to jointly study local actors' perceptions on these different domains relevant to the social and ecological fit of MPAs is still lacking.

Here, based on the literature on MPA governance and effectiveness (e.g. 4,10,27,39–41), we develop a framework designed to understand and guide the fit of MPAs to the local social and ecological context by assessing stakeholders’ perception across four domains: i) marine importance, ii) environmental stressors, iii) proposed management options, and iv) MPA goals. Assessing the perception of marine and coastal ecosystems is a way to identify what benefits MPAs aim to improve or sustain. Similarly, these communities' perceptions of environmental stressors are informative regarding threats expected to be curbed by MPAs. Proposed management options represent a portfolio of different interventions that can include but are not limited to MPAs. Finally, asking stakeholders about the specific goals they envision for MPAs is a way to dive deeper in what they are expected to achieve in relation to the three first domains.

To trial our framework, propose tentative methods for data collection and analysis, and demonstrate some of the results that can be obtained and their local relevance for management, we studied a conservation project undertaken in Palawan, Philippines, where a non-governmental organization (NGO) is promoting the creation of several community-based MPAs. We surveyed the perceptions of local resource users, researchers and decision-makers across the four perception domains and synthesized their perceptions to assess the challenges and opportunities for a local social and ecological fit of that area-based conservation project.

## 2. A framework to assess the social and ecological fit of marine protected areas

We aimed to develop a framework designed to determine the expectations of local stakeholders and the goals of a project of new community-based MPAs to guide their social and ecological fit. The survey was designed to collect perceptions in the following four domains: i) marine importance, ii) environmental stressors, iii) proposed management options, and iv) MPA goals (Table 1). It helps ensure management is more likely to be locally fit, hence aligned with local values, needs, cultural and governance systems, which means a greater likelihood of local leadership, support, compliance, trust, and therefore social and ecological outcomes22,39,44. This framework can also be informative on social and ecological interactions, which is key to understand the conditions in which management can be (in)effective 42. We believe the target audience of such assessment can be MPA managers, whether they are NGOs, government, or local community representatives. The following sections detail each domain of the framework using existing literature and provide examples of their use in the context of area-based marine conservation social and ecological fit.

**2.1. Marine importance**

The first domain we propose to explore is the perceived importance of the marine and coastal environment. The diversity of ways in which communities depend on environmental features constitutes an important part of their well-being, particularly in the context of coastal communities depending on fishing45. The framing of this dependence as ecosystem services or nature’s contributions to people has caused some debate45–48; yet these definitions hold in common the idea that disrupting ecological processes or managing ecosystems will, in turn, affect either negatively or positively human well-being. Depending on contexts, MPAs can have positive or negative social outcomes on economic and health dimensions10,49,50, but also on non-material elements such as sense of place and spirituality51. Assessing marine importance can help for social and ecological fit19, as it is informative on where and how people value, use and hence benefit from marine ecosystems. In other words, it highlights the core values and relationships between ecosystems and human well-being in all its dimensions14,52. These dependencies indeed vary between contexts and within groups and are susceptible to radical change in time53–57. Finally, it is important to note that many of the impacts of MPAs on people are direct and not mediated by changes in ecosystem services15, for example, the immediate loss of agency of local fishers linked to new fishing restrictions. These impacts can be critical motivators whether or not people support management and are important to consider when designing options to fit the social-ecological context.

**2.1. Environmental stressors**

Assessing environmental stressors can help guide the ecological fit of MPAs, defined as an “*alignment between the spatial, temporal and functional characteristics of biophysical problems and institutions*”19. After documenting how marine ecosystem services contribute to local communities' well-being, we propose assessing what stressors are thought to potentially affect this contribution. The perception of environmental stressors in marine ecosystems varies between actors, cultures and knowledge systems58–61. These stressors encompass drivers linked to climate change or various pollution sources and their impacts, as well as the root causes of these threats: more distal drivers such as urbanization or poverty. Using the ecological knowledge of local stakeholders is a way to ensure MPAs can effectively tackle the threats at play in that particular ecosystem. It is also a step forward in assessing their expected future outcomes. For instance, if stakeholders consider the main impact to be tackled to be a decrease in the population of a specific group of species, subsequent monitoring could focus on that group of species.

**2.3. Proposed options**

We refer to “proposed options” as the ideas that different stakeholders bring up in the discussion as a potential solution to curb the stressors previously identified. When an MPA is planned or already exists, asking stakeholders to discuss all potential management options is a way to verify if and how they mention MPAs (e.g., as a legitimate useful tool or as an intervention with limited potential). It also allows for a better understanding of stakeholders’ perceptions of MPAs, refining of specific MPA goals, and adaptive improvement of MPA management62,63. Leaving space for different stakeholders to make management propositions can be vital to increasing their support and legitimacy64,65. A crucial task to address this question lies in the delimitation of community members and stakeholders, for typically based on the degree and nature of their relation to local coastal and marine ecosystems66. “Stakeholders” can include actors who do not belong to the community, such as provincial government representatives in charge of managing protected areas. Defining their implication in management and their role in decision-making is important to ensure coherence in the management propositions made.

**2.4. MPA goals**

The goals of MPAs can be geared towards ecological outcomes, biodiversity outcomes, or both23. They can differ between community members and external actors67,68. Therefore, it is vital to make them explicit and as much as possible in adequacy with the underlying values of stakeholders when seeking better outcomes of area-based management. Diving deeper into how community members perceive the goals of MPAs based on their use of marine ecosystems, allows us to identify potential factors of conflict. It can also help refine what external actors initially considered initially as goals.

**2.5. Synthesis in a rationale**

The last step is to build on the four prior domains, integrate these results, and build what we call a rationale for MPA management. This rationale, in the form of a synthetic narrative, can include present goals, future ones, resources, and actors, consider potential trade-offs and conflicts, and constitute a summarized statement on how this MPA should fit into the social and ecological context. The framework we propose is exploratory and should guide subsequent decision and conflict resolution stages. The way we propose to synthesize these results is to examine alignments, unveil a shared narrative for these goals and divergences, and push for further discussions between different actors based on their potentially conflicting visions. The destination and use of this synthesis will depend on contexts, but generally, we propose that it could be useful to MPA managers, typically in the context of co-management schemes.


## 3. Case study: creating a network of MPAs in Palawan, Philippines

Using structured interviews, we investigated the perceptions of 64 local stakeholders (53 community members and 11 decision-makers in charge of environmental management) in Palawan, Philippines, on the creation of an MPA network. After content analysis, we identified 151 individual perceptions and grouped them into 25 themes across the four domains of our framework (Table 1 & Figure 1, complete list of perceptions in Supplementary Materials). This allowed us to study how local stakeholders define the potential needs for and goals of MPAs. We then proposed a synthesis of these perceptions and a rationale for local marine conservation projects in the form of a narrative integrating those elements.

**3.1. Background and study site**

The Philippines has a long history of community-based marine conservation69–72. Most of the country’s population is coastal and depends on coral reefs and associated ecosystems for their food security and livelihoods73,74. To counteract the depletion of coastal resources75, public actors and NGOs have long promoted the implementation of fishery management tools76. Among these, MPAs have been presented as particularly relevant, benefitting both coastal ecosystems and fishers 77. Such projects in the Philippines are usually initiated by NGOs and researchers in partnership with local government units and local civil society organizations76.

In the Shark Fin Bay locality, our case study site, there are about 7000 inhabitants spread around five coastal districts. Fishing and farming represent the main sources of livelihood. An NGO, Sulubaai Environmental Foundation (SEF), has been active in the area since 2011 and has promoted the development of marine conservation initiatives. What started as a private endeavor with the 2016 creation of the Pangatalan Island Marine Protected Area managed by SEF then evolved into a project involving more local communities and decision-makers from the Municipality of Taytay, in charge of decisions related to coastal and marine ecosystems. The interviews used for this study were conducted between 2019 and 2020. The relevance of this case study to trial our framework aiming to determining locally fit goals for MPAs lies in the specific management situation in which Shark Fin Bay was at the time: SEF was starting the Sea Academy project aiming at creating new community-based MPAs and shifting from a private to a collaborative governance arrangement. At that time, the objective was to better include local communities and decision-makers in MPA co-management; hence, there was a crucial need to scrutinize the range of relevant goals for these stakeholders.

**

*Figure 1. Main perceptions of different stakeholders grouped in the four perception domains proposed in our framework.*

*Table 1. List of themes identified through content analysis. Each theme is composed of several individual perceptions detailed in the Supplementary Materials. The description is a synthesis of the perceptions of respondents as aggregated in each theme.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Theme | Description |
| Marine importance | Livelihood | Marine ecosystems are valuable because people get their livelihoods and income from them. | |
| Food and nutrition | Local communities get affordable and healthy food from the sea, mostly fish but also shells, shrimps and seaweeds. | |
| Cultural services | Local communities value marine ecosystems for their contribution to local traditions, for religious reasons and as a responsibility for future generations. | |
| Other services | Other ecosystem services mentioned by respondents include coastal protection, carbon capture, and tourism. | |
| Intrinsic value | Respondents mentioned the intrinsic value of nature, biodiversity or particular species. | |
| No value identified | The respondent could not identify any ecosystem service. | |
| Environmental stressors | Destructive fishing practices | A threat to marine ecosystems is the use of destructive fishing practices such as cyanide, dynamite, small-meshed nets or compressors. | |
| Depletion of marine resources | Fishery resources have decreased, and habitats have been noticeably damaged because of the increasing number of fishers and the use of destructive practices. | |
| Deforestation | Respondents described issues such as deforestation for timber, slash-and-burn agriculture (*kaingin*), or mangrove cutting for charcoal (*uling*). | |
| Social issues | Environmental issues have root causes that can be found in social issues such as poverty, lack of education and opportunities, or demography. | |
| Pollutions | Pollutions such as plastic pollution, wastewater, solid waste, pesticides, and fertilizers are perceived to be stressors to terrestrial and marine ecosystems. | |
| Climate change and disasters | Climate change, changes in weather patterns, and disasters such as typhoons and floods are affecting ecosystems and the well-being of coastal communities. | |
| No issue identified | No environmental issue could be identified by the respondent. | |
| Land-based stressors | Some land-based stressors, such as mining, erosion, the development of infrastructure, tourism, and pearl farms, are affecting terrestrial and marine ecosystems. | |
| Agriculture and water | Pests are affecting plantations, and water appears to be more and more scarce. | |
| Marine conservation | Marine conservation, particularly MPAs, is perceived as a vulnerability factor. | |
| Proposed options | Legal instruments & enforcement | Coercive social interventions can be put in place, such as reinforcing patrolling and arresting offenders. | |
| Capacity building & alternative livelihoods | Non-coercive social interventions include the increase of education, better cooperation between stakeholders, or capacity building. | |
| Ecosystem-based interventions | Ecosystem-based interventions such as marine reserves and ecosystem restoration activities can be efficient in responding to environmental stressors. | |
| No option identified | The respondent could not identify any options for facing environmental stressors. | |
| Marine protected areas | MPAs for ecological sustainability | The role of MPAs is to improve the ecological habitats of their components, including fishes, corals, shells, and functions such as nurseries. | |
| MPAs for local actors | MPAs are made primarily to benefit neighboring communities. | |
| MPAs for fisheries & food | The primary goal of MPAs is to improve the status of fisheries and the food security of coastal communities. | |
| MPAs as coercive instruments | MPAs are seen primarily as coercive tools, guarded areas expected to expel illegal fishers, and can be a tool to apply existing fisheries regulations. | |
| MPAs for external actors | MPAs are primarily made for external actors, in particular tourists and resort owners. | |

**3.2. Perceptions of stakeholders across the four domains**

3.2.1 Marine importance

The main benefits of marine ecosystems identified by respondents were provisioning ecosystem services, particularly those related to fisheries. 83% of respondents considered that the value of marine ecosystems came from their importance for local livelihoods, and 52% emphasized their importance for food security. For instance, a respondent from Depla (farmer) said: “*The very first and original way of subsistence here is the sea, our sea*.” The idea of subsistence is usually completely linked to the tradition of fishing, a sentiment of ownership, and generational aspects: “*The ocean is very valuable, especially for the next generations. If it is damaged (…), they will not have a fishery and a beautiful environment anymore*” (respondent from Depla, civil servant). The most notable divergence between respondents lies in the identification of other ecosystem services, such as coastal protection, carbon sequestration, or tourism, mainly mentioned by the decision-makers from Taytay. Only one respondent (a farmer from Mabini) could not think of any value pertaining to marine ecosystems.

3.2.2. Environmental stressors

Dynamite and cyanide fishing and their effects on marine ecosystems were central in respondents' discourses when asked about environmental stressors: 73% of them talked about destructive fishing practices, and 70% said they observed a depletion in fish resources. “*A lot of people here are using sodium [cyanide]. It kills the small fish… I think there is no other issue here; this is what is causing damages*” (respondent from Mabini, fisher and farmer). This perspective is shared among decision-makers: “*The main issue here is illegal fishing: dynamite and cyanide fishing, using compressors*” (respondent from Taytay, decision-maker). Respondents widely agreed on the impact of illegal practices, along with the increasing number of (legal) fishers and associated fishing efforts: fish stocks are decreasing, and it is a cause of concern for food and livelihood security. Deforestation was also an important source of discussion, in particular mangrove cutting. Many respondents noted the connectivity between ecosystems and the importance of mangrove forests as nurseries for many fish species. Some underlying social issues were described by respondents, such as poverty, increasing demography, or lack of agency. Although most respondents proposed similar descriptions of the situation, there were also some differences in interpretations. Illegal fishing, for instance, was considered to be decreasing in frequency by 9% of respondents; some also said that overfishing outweighed the effect of illegal practices. 23% of respondents could not point to any environmental stressor; some respondents explained this could be interpreted as apprehension to talk about themes such as illegal fishing and potentially pointing at other members of the community, often relatives and close friends. Some simply state they had no idea what could constitute environmental stressors in the province or the area.

3.2.3. Proposed options

Respondents proposed a wide array of options to counteract the issues identified. We clustered them into three distinct groups (Table 1): legal instruments and enforcement, capacity building and alternative livelihoods, and ecosystem-based interventions. 20% of respondents did not identify any potential management option or considered there was none available. The most common one, identified by 62% of respondents, was to reinforce law enforcement in order to fight illegal activities: “*When it comes to illegal activities, there should be more law enforcement. One of the best ways is to establish MPAs*” (respondent from Taytay, decision-maker). 35% of respondents linked MPAs to more efficient law enforcement. Ecosystem-based interventions and socio-centric interventions, such as alternative livelihoods or capacity building, were more frequent among the respondents who had typically been involved in NGO and government sustainability projects: “*The solution is to give a proper livelihood to people and illegal fishers. Give them a proper job to make a living*” (respondent from Batas, fisher). Others tended to insist more on law enforcement: “*Maybe some guards could catch [illegal fishers]. The**police could also arrest them; they could be sent to jail*” (respondent from Batas, fisher).

3.2.4. MPA goals

MPAs were most commonly perceived as a tool to increase the sustainability of marine ecosystems (79% of respondents) and fish stocks (52% of respondents) to the benefit of local communities (71% of respondents), in particular fishers. A respondent from Depla (farmer and pastor) explains: “*The purpose [of MPAs] is to offer the fish a nursery ground. And of course, that will produce more fish*”, and later adds that MPAs are made for “*the people of Barangay Depla: the fishers. But not only the fishers, other people too because they will eat the catch.*” Along with this discourse, many respondents pointed out that MPAs need the capacity to be efficient, in particular, legal and financial capacity: “*We have a marine sanctuary here in Mabini. But our problem is sustaining it: we cannot sustain it because the Barangay's funds are too little*” (respondent M13, elected official). Some respondents, in particular decision-makers, pointed out the need for monitoring. Aside from this more common discourse, two divergent and more marginal definitions of MPAs should be noted. First, 3% of respondents identified MPAs as a potential threat to livelihood, such as this respondent from Silanga (elected official and fish trader): “*[Fishers] have to go far to fish now because there are protected areas.*” The example of Silanga is evocative because several nearby island resorts created private MPAs, which are now perceived by many as instruments to serve tourism rather than improve fisheries. This discourse, sometimes expressed in more neutral words, without hostility towards resort owners, was more common in Silanga, where relatively fewer people considered MPAs as dedicated to local communities. The second divergent discourse that can be noted was found in Batas and is a conception of MPAs as a way to ban fishers coming from other districts or municipalities: according to their vision, local fishers could still fish inside using a hook-and-line.A Batas (fisher) respondent explains: “*The goal of marine sanctuaries is to avoid having people from other places fishing here. For them, it is forbidden to fish here in our place.*” This discourse reveals the common perception that local communities own a resource despite the legal fact that marine resources are managed at a larger municipal scale and officially shared by different districts.

3.2.5. Synthesis of a rationale for conservation

Based on the discourses of local stakeholders, we established a rationale in the form of a simplified narrative summarizing the main results with the objective to guide further discussions pertaining to marine conservation in the area:

*In Shark Fin Bay, food security, livelihoods and local traditions depend on marine resources that are increasingly depleted. Destructive fishing practices, such as the use of dynamite and cyanide, and overfishing are to blame for this decline. Underlying social drivers like poverty and the lack of livelihood opportunities represent the root causes of these practices. Terrestrial drivers, including pollution and deforestation, should also be considered as a threat to marine ecosystems and well-being. Local stakeholders identified several management options to face that situation: legal instruments and coercive measures (e.g., improving legislation and patrolling), initiatives to improve capacity and shift to alternative livelihoods, and ecosystem-based interventions (e.g., MPAs). Some stakeholders cannot identify any particular option. The specific role of MPAs, in order to fit with the objectives of local resource-users, must be to preserve fisheries from illegal activities and help restore stocks, not only for local livelihoods but also for the food and nutrition security of local communities. Because some fishers perceive MPAs as dedicated to tourists and resort owners or as a potential threat to livelihood, any entity proposing the creation of an MPA should ensure the rights of local communities are respected and their voices heard.*

## 4. Discussion

Our framework helped us identify a strong overall convergence on the need for diverse and well-enforced management options. It provided concrete recommendations to foster the social and ecological fit of the MPA network project studied. In particular, it helped us conceptualize MPAs in Shark Fin Bay first and foremost as fishery management tools while highlighting their expected benefits for food security. It also showed that MPAs are locally considered by most respondents as a relevant tool, which is not the case for all contexts40. This is in line with other studies conducted in the same province where environmental stressors such as overfishing and illegal fishing make local communities, along with NGOs, researchers and local governments, call for better management61,78,79Our framework, structured interviews, and inductive approach in the coding process allowed the discussion to be pushed further to efficiently collect the diversity of perceptions associated with marine sustainability. The rationale derived from the interviews fed the subsequent management plan produced for the Shark Fin Bay MPA network. In particular, an explicit dual goal to improve both fishing and food security was adopted for the MPA network based on our results.

Management interventions should be tailored to local contexts 80. For MPAs, this can include the size and placement of the area to be under protection or the rules on harvesting32. These rules, linked to the ecological context, are also rooted in the socioeconomic context, and their reception can be different between individuals22,81,82. Marine conservation navigates in very complex systems and has to arbitrate between divergent voices. In our case study, divergences in perceptions did not appear to bear a high level of potential conflict, aside probably from the idea regularly expressed in Silanga that MPAs are “made for tourists.” Conflicts between tourism and fishing have already been demonstrated in Palawan83. Other case studies have shown how, generally, conflict can emerge when MPAs pay little attention to local stakes and become exclusionary to resource users40,83,84. On the other hand, in places where MPAs are considered more fair, social and ecological outcomes tend to be more positive39,57. Increasing participation and perception of positive outcomes often come with time55. When arbitration is needed, external actors should rely on existing formal and informal decision processes to ensure both legal and equitable outcomes. Most of the differences in perceptions between stakeholder groups could be attributable to their knowledge and experience. For example, decision-makers from Taytay discussed a diversity of marine ecosystem services and MPA benefits, demonstrating a familiarity with scientific concepts, while local communities focused more on provisioning services (livelihoods and food provision in particular). There were also some disparities between different communities, as exemplified by the cases of Batas and Silanga: while most community members talked about MPAs as areas where fishing is prohibited for the benefit of local fisheries, several respondents from Batas and Silanga considered that the surrounding communities should be allowed to fish with a hook-and-line within MPAs. The presence of nearby resorts, private MPAs, and a high exogenous fishing effort in Batas can explain these differences.

While this work focuses on coastal and marine ecosystems and MPAs, its approach could be transferred to other domains, for instance, to improve the fit of terrestrial protected areas also characterized by strong social and ecological interactions42 or to study other area-based management tools 43.

Our framework proved beneficial in gaining a better understanding of the different perceptions local stakeholders had on marine sustainability and MPAs in particular. While MPAs can have a wide range of positive ecological and social outcomes6,10, it clarified the specific outcomes local stakeholders were expecting in Shark Fin Bay, therefore providing locally relevant goals. Another important feature evident in our case study was how certain stakeholders' perceptions were informative on other stakeholders' experiences: for instance, many non-fishing farmers and decision-makers focused on the difficulties fishers were facing. The results from this research have effectively fueled the discussions on marine conservation in the study area, showing local NGOs and decision-makers that marine conservation initiatives should have fisheries and food security as a main focus side-to-side with biodiversity benefits, a goal included in subsequent management.

The support from external actors can offer important opportunities for marine conservation, ranging from increased capacity to improving the links between stakeholders, such as community-government collaborations26,27,85. In Shark Fin Bay, capacity building mainly consisted of the NGO and local government unit helping local Fisherfolks Associations organize (e.g., obtaining legal recognition, organizing meetings) and providing enforcement capacity (e.g., salaries, training of guards, purchase of equipment) and monitoring capacity (e.g., scuba diving training, collaboration with citizen-science networks). In the case of small-scale fisheries management, financial or social external support should target both economic and social conditions and be maintained in time to be truly efficient86. NGOs can represent a bridge between communities and governments when undertaking conservation projects and improving their social and ecological fit21. In our case study, the rest of the community was involved in discussions on the planned MPAs after the initial discussions held between NGO members and community representatives. Then, the discussion was raised at the municipal level, and subsequent public hearings involving both community and government representatives were held before a formal vote for the MPAs to be legislated. Aside from potential benefits, external interventions, particularly top-down approaches, can also carry risks. In particular, MPAs have proved to be potentially exclusionary interventions, negating local users' legal or perceived rights when improperly involving them10,12.

The marine conservation community at large will have to do better to settle how external actors should participate in managing marine resources, always keeping in mind the explicit goal of ensuring equitable management. Our framework can contribute to this by helping to identify local perceptions of marine importance, environmental threats, management options, and MPA goals and thus guide their social and ecological fit.

## 5. Limitations of the study

Our approach also showed some limitations, mostly coming from our position as researchers who are outsiders from these communities and, for some of us, not natives of the Philippines. This might have caused certain respondents to refrain from speaking about sensitive issues like illegal fishing. We tried to mitigate this by interviewing a wide array of respondents while insisting on the anonymity of their answers and, in practice, had many of them open up on these challenging themes. We also made sure to use vocabulary and concepts that are commonly used by these communities.

6. STAR METHODS

KEY RESOURCES TABLE

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| REAGENT or RESOURCE | SOURCE | IDENTIFIER |
| Deposited data | | |
| Original dataset (interviews, thematic coding) | This paper | https://github.com/victor-brun/perception-sfb |
| Software and algorithms | | |
| Rstudio version 4.3.2 | R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. (2020) | https://posit.co/download/rstudio-desktop/ |

RESOURCE AVAILABILITY

**Lead contact**

Further information and requests for resources should be directed to and fulfilled by the Lead Contact, Victor Brun ([vbrun@ocean-climate.org](mailto:vbrun@ocean-climate.org)).

**Data and code availability**

All newly created databases of this study can be found in the supplemental information, as well as on the first author’s GitHub (<https://github.com/victor-brun/perception-sfb>).

METHOD DETAIL

**Sampling**

64 respondents were selected through purposive sampling, asking for recommendations from residents, representatives of Fisherfolks Associations, and different municipal offices. The first group included 53 residents from five local districts spread around Shark Fin Bay: Batas, Depla, Mabini, Sandoval and Silanga, with about 10 individuals per district, men and women (58% and 42%), fishers (42%), farmers (14%), and people with other or mixed livelihoods (25%). Due to important social homogeneity in these districts and high flexibility in local livelihoods87, the respondents' activities at the time of the survey did not appear to affect their perceptions, which was indicated in the important similarities in their perceptions. The second group included 11 decision-makers: five district elected officials or *barangay captains* and six decision-makers from the municipality of Taytay, representatives of the Office of the Municipal Environment and Natural Resources, Office of the Municipal Agriculturist, Office of the Municipal Tourism Development and Management. Most decisions pertaining to coastal resources management are taken at the municipal scale, making these actors central to all discussions on marine sustainability. Prior informed consent was obtained from all participants before the interview started and interviews were recorded.

**Interview guide**

Structured interviews were conducted using an interview guide (available in Supplementary Materials) organized around seven sections: i) environmental stressors in the province, ii) ecosystem services, iii) local environmental stressors and links with fishing activities, iv) proposed management options to tackle environmental stressors, v) goals of MPAs and benefits expected, vi) perception of SEF and other NGOs, and vii) visions for the future. All respondents were confronted with the same set of initial questions, but precisions were asked to engage in deeper discussions on each topic. Interviews with community members were conducted in Filipino and with decision-makers in English. They lasted between 20 and 30 minutes.

**Analyses**

We transcribed and translated all interviews to English and performed a content analysis and thematic coding88. We used an inductive approach to identify individual codes (that we termed perceptions) and classified them across the four domains of our framework (Table 1, Supplementary Materials). We coded these perceptions in a matrix associating each respondent with the set of perceptions derived from their responses. For example, when a respondent talked about dynamite and cyanide fishing being an issue for coral reefs, the columns corresponding to “dynamite fishing” and “cyanide fishing” were checked. This coding was performed twice and checked in order to ensure its consistency. Individual perceptions were coded to be as specific as possible at first in order to allow for subsequent groupings in larger themes. For example, dynamite fishing and cyanide fishing were both grouped under the “destructive fishing practices” theme. The number of respondents for each theme was then summed to measure their relative importance in discourses. This data, along with the content of the interviews, allowed us to distinguish the dominant discourses from the more marginal perceptions and those potentially conflicting between stakeholders. Data manipulation and analyses were conducted in R Studio version 4.3.289.

## 6. Acknowledgments

We thank the Municipality of Taytay and the Palawan Council for Sustainable Development (PCSD) for their continuous support. We also thank the Fisherfolks Associations of Batas, Depla, Mabini, Sandoval and Silanga for their precious help. This study was funded by the French Facility for Global Environment, Blancpain Ocean Commitment, Prince Albert II of Monaco Foundation, and the Pure Ocean Foundation. JC was supported by Fondation de France (MultiNet) and Biodiversa (METRODIVER and MOVE).

## 7. References

1. Ban, N. C. Fishing communities at risk. *Nat. Clim. Change* **9**, 501–502 (2019).

2. Blythe, J. L. *et al.* Blue justice: A review of emerging scholarship and resistance movements. *Camb. Prisms Coast. Futur.* **1**, e15 (2023).

3. Cinner, J. E. *et al.* Building adaptive capacity to climate change in tropical coastal communities. *Nat. Clim. Change* **8**, 117–123 (2018).

4. Gill, D. A. *et al.* Triple exposure: Reducing negative impacts of climate change, blue growth, and conservation on coastal communities. *One Earth* **6**, 118–130 (2023).

5. Jouffray, J.-B., Blasiak, R., Norström, A. V., Österblom, H. & Nyström, M. The Blue Acceleration: The Trajectory of Human Expansion into the Ocean. *One Earth* **2**, 43–54 (2020).

6. Reimer, J. M., Devillers, R. & Claudet, J. Benefits and gaps in area-based management tools for the ocean Sustainable Development Goal. *Nat. Sustain.* **4**, 349–357 (2021).

7. Thiault, L. *et al.* Operationalizing vulnerability for social–ecological integration in conservation and natural resource management. *Conserv. Lett.* **13**, (2020).

8. Mahajan, S. L. *et al.* A theory‐based framework for understanding the establishment, persistence, and diffusion of community‐based conservation. *Conserv. Sci. Pract.* **3**, (2021).

9. Aswani, S., Albert, S. & Love, M. One size does not fit all: Critical insights for effective community-based resource management in Melanesia. *Mar. Policy* **81**, 381–391 (2017).

10. Ban, N. C. *et al.* Well-being outcomes of marine protected areas. *Nat. Sustain.* **2**, 524–532 (2019).

11. Ban, N. C., Picard, C. R. & Vincent, A. C. J. Comparing and integrating community-based and science-based approaches to prioritizing marine areas for protection. *Conserv. Biol.* **23**, 899–910 (2009).

12. Bennett, N. J. Mainstreaming Equity and Justice in the Ocean. *Front. Mar. Sci.* **9**, 873572 (2022).

13. Costello, C. *et al.* Global fishery prospects under contrasting management regimes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **113**, 5125–5129 (2016).

14. Gill, D. A. *et al.* Social Synergies, Tradeoffs, and Equity in Marine Conservation Impacts. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* **44**, 347–372 (2019).

15. Gurney, G. G. *et al.* Poverty and protected areas: An evaluation of a marine integrated conservation and development project in Indonesia. *Glob. Environ. Change* **26**, 98–107 (2014).

16. Id, S. E. *et al.* Blue justice : A survey for eliciting perceptions of environmental justice among coastal planners ’ and small-scale fishers in Northern-. 1–20 (2021) doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0251467.

17. Melnychuk, M. C. *et al.* Identifying management actions that promote sustainable fisheries. *Nat. Sustain.* **4**, 440–449 (2021).

18. Sykora-Bodie, S. T. *et al.* Methods for identifying spatially referenced conservation needs and opportunities. *Biol. Conserv.* **260**, (2021).

19. Epstein, G. *et al.* Institutional fit and the sustainability of social–ecological systems. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* **14**, 34–40 (2015).

20. Guerrero, A. M., Bodin, Ö., McAllister, R. R. J. & Wilson, K. A. Achieving social-ecological fit through bottom-up collaborative governance: an empirical investigation. *Ecol. Soc.* **20**, art41 (2015).

21. Hohbein, R. R., Nibbelink, N. P. & Cooper, R. J. Non-governmental organizations improve the social-ecological fit of institutions conserving the Andean bear in Colombia. *Ecol. Soc.* **26**, art13 (2021).

22. Turner, R. A. *et al.* Social fit of coral reef governance varies among individuals: Social fit of coral reef governance. *Conserv. Lett.* **11**, e12422 (2018).

23. Ban, N. C. *et al.* Effects of management objectives and rules on marine conservation outcomes. *Conserv. Biol.* cobi.14156 (2023) doi:10.1111/cobi.14156.

24. Teniwut, W. A., Hamid, S. K., Teniwut, R. M. K., Renhoran, M. & Pratama, C. D. Do coastal communities in small islands value marine resources through marine protected areas?: Evidence from Kei Islands Indonesia with choice modelling. *Mar. Policy* **157**, 105838 (2023).

25. Gurney, G. G. *et al.* Participation in devolved commons management: Multiscale socioeconomic factors related to individuals’ participation in community-based management of marine protected areas in Indonesia. *Environ. Sci. Policy* **61**, 212–220 (2016).

26. Andrachuk, M. *et al.* CORAL REEF GOVERNANCE: STRENGTHENING COMMUNITY AND COLLABORATIVE APPROACHES. 17 (2022).

27. Gill, D. A. *et al.* Capacity shortfalls hinder the performance of marine protected areas globally. *Nature* **543**, 665–669 (2017).

28. Cánovas‐Molina, A. & García‐Frapolli, E. A review of vulnerabilities in worldwide small‐scale fisheries. *Fish. Manag. Ecol.* fme.12538 (2022) doi:10.1111/fme.12538.

29. Chaigneau, T. & Brown, K. Challenging the win-win discourse on conservation and development: analyzing support for marine protected areas. *Ecol. Soc.* **21**, art36 (2016).

30. Hogg, K., Gray, T., Noguera-Méndez, P., Semitiel-García, M. & Young, S. Interpretations of MPA winners and losers: a case study of the Cabo De Palos- Islas Hormigas Fisheries Reserve. *Marit. Stud.* **18**, 159–171 (2019).

31. Alexander, S. M., Armitage, D., Carrington, P. J. & Bodin, Ö. Examining horizontal and vertical social ties to achieve social–ecological fit in an emerging marine reserve network. *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.* **27**, 1209–1223 (2017).

32. Cinner, J. E. Designing marine reserves to reflect local socioeconomic conditions: lessons from long-enduring customary management systems. *Coral Reefs* **26**, 1035–1045 (2007).

33. Gurney, G. G., Adams, V. M., Álvarez-Romero, J. G. & Claudet, J. Area-based conservation: Taking stock and looking ahead. *One Earth* **6**, 98–104 (2023).

34. Partelow, S. *et al.* Environmental governance theories: a review and application to coastal systems. *Ecol. Soc.* **25**, art19 (2020).

35. Mahajan, S. L. & Daw, T. Perceptions of ecosystem services and benefits to human well-being from community-based marine protected areas in Kenya. *Mar. Policy* **74**, 108–119 (2016).

36. Giglio, V. J., Pereira-Filho, G. H., Marconi, M., Rolim, F. A. & Motta, F. S. Stakeholders’ perceptions on environmental quality and threats to subtropical marine reserves. *Reg. Stud. Mar. Sci.* **56**, 102664 (2022).

37. Cárcamo, P. F., Garay-Flühmann, R., Squeo, F. A. & Gaymer, C. F. Using stakeholders’ perspective of ecosystem services and biodiversity features to plan a marine protected area. *Environ. Sci. Policy* **40**, 116–131 (2014).

38. Schultz, M. *et al.* A framework to identify barriers and levers to increase the levels of protection of marine protected areas. *One Earth* **5**, 987–999 (2022).

39. Bennett, N. J. *et al.* Local support for conservation is associated with perceptions of good governance, social impacts, and ecological effectiveness. *Conserv. Lett.* **12**, (2019).

40. Bennett, N. J. & Dearden, P. Why local people do not support conservation: Community perceptions of marine protected area livelihood impacts, governance and management in Thailand. *Mar. Policy* **44**, 107–116 (2014).

41. Edgar, G. J. *et al.* Global conservation outcomes depend on marine protected areas with five key features. *Nature* **506**, 216–220 (2014).

42. Frietsch, M., Zafra‐Calvo, N., Ghoddousi, A. & Loos, J. Advancing protected area effectiveness assessments by disentangling social‐ecological interactions: A case study from the Luangwa Valley, Zambia. *Conserv. Sci. Pract.* **5**, e12974 (2023).

43. Estradivari *et al.* Marine conservation beyond MPAs: Towards the recognition of other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) in Indonesia. *Mar. Policy* **137**, 104939 (2022).

44. Michel, A. H. *et al.* The Role of Trust in the Participatory Establishment of Protected Areas—Lessons Learnt from a Failed National Park Project in Switzerland. *Soc. Nat. Resour.* **35**, 487–505 (2022).

45. Betley, E. C. *et al.* Assessing human well-being constructs with environmental and equity aspects: A review of the landscape. *People Nat.* 1–18 (2021) doi:10.1002/pan3.10293.

46. Díaz, S. *et al.* Assessing nature’s contributions to people. *Science* **359**, 270–272 (2018).

47. Ishihara, H. Relational values from a cultural valuation perspective: how can sociology contribute to the evaluation of ecosystem services? *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* **35**, 61–68 (2018).

48. Peterson, G. D. *et al.* Welcoming different perspectives in IPBES: “Nature’s contributions to people” and “Ecosystem services”. *Ecol. Soc.* **23**, art39 (2018).

49. Nowakowski, A. J. *et al.* Co-benefits of marine protected areas for nature and people. *Nat. Sustain.* (2023) doi:10.1038/s41893-023-01150-4.

50. Costello, M. J. Evidence of economic benefits from marine protected areas. *Sci. Mar.* **88**, e080 (2024).

51. Garcia Rodrigues, J., Villasante, S. & Sousa Pinto, I. Non-material nature’s contributions to people from a marine protected area support multiple dimensions of human well-being. *Sustain. Sci.* **17**, 793–808 (2022).

52. Hicks, C. C., Graham, N. A. J. & Cinner, J. E. Synergies and tradeoffs in how managers, scientists, and fishers value coral reef ecosystem services. *Glob. Environ. Change* **23**, 1444–1453 (2013).

53. Lapointe, M., Gurney, G. G. & Cumming, G. S. Urbanization alters ecosystem service preferences in a Small Island Developing State. *Ecosyst. Serv.* **43**, 101109 (2020).

54. Lau, J. D., Cinner, J. E., Fabinyi, M., Gurney, G. G. & Hicks, C. C. Access to marine ecosystem services: Examining entanglement and legitimacy in customary institutions. *World Dev.* **126**, 104730 (2020).

55. Lau, J. D., Hicks, C. C., Gurney, G. G. & Cinner, J. E. What matters to whom and why? Understanding the importance of coastal ecosystem services in developing coastal communities. *Ecosyst. Serv.* **35**, 219–230 (2019).

56. Woodhead, A. J. *et al.* Fishers perceptions of ecosystem service change associated with climate‐disturbed coral reefs. *People Nat.* **3**, 639–657 (2021).

57. Yasué, M., Kockel, A. & Dearden, P. The psychological impacts of community‐based protected areas. *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.* **32**, 1057–1072 (2022).

58. Calandra, M. *et al.* Local perceptions of socio-ecological drivers and effects of coastal armoring: the case of Moorea, French Polynesia. *Popul. Environ.* **43**, 423–443 (2022).

59. Darling, E. S. *et al.* Social–environmental drivers inform strategic management of coral reefs in the Anthropocene. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **3**, 1341–1350 (2019).

60. Jouffray, J.-B. *et al.* Parsing human and biophysical drivers of coral reef regimes. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **286**, 20182544 (2019).

61. Madarcos, J. R. V. *et al.* Understanding Local Perceptions of the Drivers/Pressures on the Coastal Marine Environment in Palawan, Philippines. *Front. Mar. Sci.* **8**, 659699 (2021).

62. Francolini, E. M., Mann-Lang, J. B., McKinley, E., Mann, B. Q. & Abrahams, M. I. Stakeholder perspectives on socio-economic challenges and recommendations for better management of the Aliwal Shoal Marine Protected Area in South Africa. *Mar. Policy* **148**, 105470 (2023).

63. Pajaro, M. G., Mulrennan, M. E., Alder, J. & Vincent, A. C. J. Developing MPA Effectiveness Indicators: Comparison Within and Across Stakeholder Groups and Communities. *Coast. Manag.* **38**, 122–143 (2010).

64. Reimer, J. M. *et al.* Conservation ready marine spatial planning. *Mar. Policy* **153**, 105655 (2023).

65. Tranter, S. N. *et al.* The inclusion of fisheries and tourism in marine protected areas to support conservation in Indonesia. *Mar. Policy* **146**, 105301 (2022).

66. Gurney, G. G. *et al.* Redefining community based on place attachment in a connected world. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **114**, 10077–10082 (2017).

67. Bennett, N. J., Le Billon, P., Belhabib, D. & Satizábal, P. Local marine stewardship and ocean defenders. *Npj Ocean Sustain.* **1**, 3 (2022).

68. McClanahan, T. & Abunge, C. Perceptions of governance effectiveness and fisheries restriction options in a climate refugia. *Biol. Conserv.* **246**, 108585 (2020).

69. Horigue, V., Aliño, P. M., White, A. T. & Pressey, R. L. Marine protected area networks in the Philippines: Trends and challenges for establishment and governance. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* **64**, 15–26 (2012).

70. Muallil, R. N. *et al.* Effectiveness of small locally-managed marine protected areas for coral reef fisheries management in the Philippines. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* **179**, 104831 (2019).

71. Pomeroy, R. S. & Carlos, M. B. Community-based coastal resource management in the Philippines: A review and evaluation of programs and projects, 1984–1994. *Mar. Policy* **21**, 445–464 (1997).

72. Weeks, R., Russ, G. R., Alcala, A. C. & White, A. T. Effectiveness of Marine Protected Areas in the Philippines for Biodiversity Conservation. *Conserv. Biol.* **24**, 531–540 (2010).

73. Cabral, R. B. & Geronimo, R. C. How important are coral reefs to food security in the Philippines? Diving deeper than national aggregates and averages. *Mar. Policy* **91**, 136–141 (2018).

74. Fabinyi, M., Dressler, W. H. & Pido, M. D. Fish, Trade and Food Security: Moving beyond ‘Availability’ Discourse in Marine Conservation. *Hum. Ecol.* **45**, 177–188 (2017).

75. Palomares, M. L. D. & Pauly, D. Philippine marine fisheries catches: a bottom-up reconstruction, 1950 to 2010. *Fish. Cent. Res. Rep.* **22**, 176 (2014).

76. Alcala, A. C. & Russ, G. R. No-take Marine Reserves and Reef Fisheries Management in the Philippines: A New People Power Revolution. *AMBIO J. Hum. Environ.* **35**, 245–254 (2006).

77. Alcala, A. C. Community-based coastal resource management in the Philippines: a case study. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* **38**, 179–186 (1998).

78. Alcantara, L. *et al.* *Perceptions of Climate Change, Sea Level Rise and Factors Affecting the Coastal Marine Ecosystem of Palawan, Philippines*. https://ucl.scienceopen.com/hosted-document?doi=10.14324/111.444/000150.v1 (2022) doi:10.14324/111.444/000150.v1.

79. Gajardo, L. J. *et al.* Cultural values of ecosystem services from coastal marine areas: Case of Taytay Bay, Palawan, Philippines. *Environ. Sci. Policy* **142**, 12–20 (2023).

80. Johnson, S. M., Reyuw, B. M., Yalon, A., McLean, M. & Houk, P. Contextualizing the social-ecological outcomes of coral reef fisheries management. *Biol. Conserv.* **241**, 108288 (2020).

81. Leenhardt, P. *et al.* Challenges, insights and perspectives associated with using social-ecological science for marine conservation. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* **115**, 49–60 (2015).

82. Silva, M. R. O. & Lopes, P. F. M. Each fisherman is different: Taking the environmental perception of small-scale fishermen into account to manage marine protected areas. *Mar. Policy* **51**, 347–355 (2015).

83. Fabinyi, M. The Intensification of Fishing and the Rise of Tourism: Competing Coastal Livelihoods in the Calamianes Islands, Philippines. *Hum. Ecol.* **38**, 415–427 (2010).

84. Pomeroy, R. *et al.* Fish wars: Conflict and collaboration in fisheries management in Southeast Asia. *Mar. Policy* **31**, 645–656 (2007).

85. Ross, H., Adhuri, D. S., Abdurrahim, A. Y. & Phelan, A. Opportunities in community-government cooperation to maintain marine ecosystem services in the Asia-Pacific and Oceania. *Ecosyst. Serv.* **38**, 100969 (2019).

86. Schlüter, M., Lindkvist, E. & Basurto, X. The interplay between top-down interventions and bottom-up self-organization shapes opportunities for transforming self-governance in small-scale fisheries. *Mar. Policy* **128**, 104485 (2021).

87. Eder, J. F. Coastal Resource Management and Social Differences in Philippine Fishing Communities. *Hum. Ecol.* **33**, 147–169 (2005).

88. Gibbs, G. *Analyzing Qualitative Data*. (SAGE Publications, Ltd, 1 Oliver’s Yard, 55 City Road, London England EC1Y 1SP United Kingdom, 2007). doi:10.4135/9781849208574.

89. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. (2020).