



HAL
open science

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

Victor Brun, John Roderick V. Madarcos, Anna Celis, Lota Creencia,
Georgina Gurney, Joachim Claudet

► **To cite this version:**

Victor Brun, John Roderick V. Madarcos, Anna Celis, Lota Creencia, Georgina Gurney, et al.. Assessing stakeholder perceptions to guide social and ecological fit of marine protected areas. *iScience*, 2024, 27 (10), pp.110952. 10.1016/j.isci.2024.110952 . hal-04724071

HAL Id: hal-04724071

<https://hal.science/hal-04724071v1>

Submitted on 7 Oct 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 Assessing stakeholder perceptions to guide social and ecological fit of 2 marine protected areas

3

4 **Authors:** Victor Brun^{1,2*}, John Roderick V. Madarcos³, Anna J. Celis², Lota A. Creencia³,
5 Georgina G. Gurney⁴, Joachim Claudet¹

6 ¹National Center for Scientific Research, PSL Université Paris, CRIOBE, CNRS-EPHE-UPVD, Maison de l'Océan,
7 195 rue Saint-Jacques, 75005 Paris, France

8 ²Sulubaa Environmental Foundation, Taytay, 5323 Palawan, Philippines

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

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

12

13 *Lead contact: vbrun@ocean-climate.org

14

15 **Summary**

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

28 1. Introduction

29 Coastal fishing communities can be highly dependent on marine ecosystem services, making
30 them particularly vulnerable to marine environmental degradation or changes in access to
31 resources¹⁻⁴. Improving the way coastal and marine resources are used is a great challenge as
32 ocean-based activities such as coastal tourism, infrastructure development, and fishing are
33 developing at an increasing pace⁵. A variety of approaches exist to identify sustainability
34 interventions in coastal social-ecological systems (SESs) according to their expected
35 outcomes⁶ or local conditions⁷. However, the identification and implementation of
36 sustainability interventions are often driven externally⁸, which can increase the likelihood that
37 interventions are not fit to local contexts and fail to deliver expected positive social and
38 ecological outcomes, or even lead to negative outcomes, including increased environmental
39 degradation, social inequities, and conflicts^{4,9-18}. The concept of social and ecological fit
40 represents the idea that some governance arrangements and interventions are more
41 adequately and specifically suited to the social and ecological characteristics of the
42 environmental problem at hand¹⁹⁻²¹. It has been applied to study the relevance of
43 sustainability interventions in the context of marine social-ecological systems and their ability
44 to efficiently curb ecological threats and improve human well-being^{20,22}.

45 Marine protected areas (MPAs), among other area-based management tools, are commonly
46 used to improve the sustainability of coastal social-ecological systems²³. MPAs can deliver
47 benefits to people across diverse well-being dimensions (Ban et al. 2019) and, thus, can be
48 appealing to local communities²⁴. However, MPAs are also often proposed, implemented and
49 managed by external actors, including non-governmental organizations (NGOs). While these
50 actors can support the participation of local actors in resource governance²⁵ and enhance the
51 financial and legal capacity of MPAs^{26,27}, externally driven area-based conservation can create
52 or exacerbate local vulnerabilities, for instance, when preventing fishers from accessing their
53 fishing grounds^{4,14,28}. Indeed, opposition to MPAs can arise when they do not meet local needs
54 or their benefits are oversold^{29,30}. Social and ecological fit should, therefore, be a top priority
55 for all conservation initiatives^{20-22,31,32}, if not a moral obligation³³. As global coverage of MPAs
56 is likely to increase at a fast pace to comply with Target 3 of the Kunming-Montréal Global
57 Biodiversity Framework, improving the inclusivity and fit of MPAs constitutes a pillar of ocean
58 justice and equity^{12,33}.

59 Social assessments focusing on stakeholders' perceptions have widely been used for MPA
60 planning and evaluation. The perceptions of stakeholders can be informative to support
61 multi-level governance arrangements, where the motivations and actions of different actors
62 can be highly contrasted and need to be integrated³⁴. These can help evaluate local
63 dependencies on marine ecosystem services³⁵, assess threats to ecosystems³⁶, help design
64 the MPA³⁷, understand barriers and levers to a specific MPA attribute such as the level of
65 protection³⁸, or assess local support for conservation³⁹. However, a framework designed to
66 jointly study local actors' perceptions on these different aspects that are of relevance to the
67 social and ecological fit of MPAs is still lacking.

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

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

87 2. Results

88 2.1. A framework to assess the social and ecological fit of marine protected areas

89 We aimed to develop a framework designed to survey the expectations of local stakeholders
90 and the goals for a project of new community-based MPAs to guide their social and ecological
91 fit. The survey was designed to collect perceptions in the following four categories: i) marine
92 importance, ii) environmental stressors, iii) proposed management options, and iv) MPA goals
93 (Table 1). The results are intended to help ensure management is more likely to be locally fit,
94 hence aligned with local values, needs, cultural and governance systems, which means a
95 greater likelihood of local leadership, support, compliance, trust, and therefore social and
96 ecological outcomes^{22,39,44}. This framework can also be informative on social and ecological
97 interactions, which is key to understand the conditions in which management can be
98 (in)effective⁴². We believe the target audience of such assessment can be MPA managers,
99 whether they are NGOs, government, or local community representatives. The following
100 sections detail each category of the framework using existing literature, and provide examples
101 of their use in the context of area-based marine conservation and its social and ecological fit.

102 **2.1.1. Marine importance**

103 The first category we propose to explore is the perceived importance of the marine and
104 coastal environment. The diversity of ways in which communities depend on environmental
105 features constitutes an important part of their well-being, particularly in the context of
106 coastal communities depending on fishing⁴⁵. The framing of this dependence as ecosystem
107 services or nature's contributions to people has caused some debate⁴⁵⁻⁴⁸; yet these
108 definitions hold in common the idea that disrupting ecological processes or managing
109 ecosystems will, in turn, affect human well-being either negatively or positively. Depending
110 on contexts, MPAs can have positive or negative social outcomes on economic and health
111 dimensions^{10,49,50}, but also on non-material elements such as sense of place and spirituality⁵¹.
112 Assessing marine importance can help for social and ecological fit¹⁹, as it is informative on
113 where and how people value, use and hence benefit from marine ecosystems. In other words,
114 it highlights the core values and relationships between ecosystems and human well-being in
115 all its dimensions^{14,52}. These dependencies indeed vary between contexts and within groups
116 and are susceptible to radical change in time⁵³⁻⁵⁷. Finally, it is important to note that many of

117 the impacts of MPAs on people are direct and not mediated by changes in ecosystem
118 services¹⁵, for example, the immediate loss of agency of local fishers linked to new fishing
119 restrictions. These impacts can be critical motivators whether or not people support
120 management and are important to consider when designing options to fit the social-
121 ecological context.

122 **2.1.2. Environmental stressors**

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

136 **2.1.3. Proposed management options**

137 We refer to “proposed management options” as the ideas that different stakeholders bring
138 up in the discussion as a potential solution to curb the stressors previously identified. When
139 an MPA is planned or already exists, asking stakeholders to discuss all potential management
140 options is a way to verify whether and in what context they mention MPAs (e.g., as a
141 legitimate useful tool or as an intervention with limited potential). It also allows for a better
142 understanding of stakeholders’ perceptions of MPAs, refining of specific MPA goals, and
143 adaptive improvement of MPA management^{62,63}. Leaving space for different stakeholders to
144 make management propositions can be vital to increasing their support and legitimacy^{64,65}. A
145 crucial task to address this question lies in the delimitation of who community members and
146 stakeholders are, which is typically done based on the degree and nature of their relation to
147 local coastal and marine ecosystems⁶⁶. “Stakeholders” can include actors who do not belong

148 to the community, such as provincial government representatives in charge of managing
149 protected areas. Defining their roles in management and their role in decision-making is
150 important to ensure coherence in the management propositions made.

151 **2.1.4. MPA goals**

152 The goals of MPAs can be geared towards ecological outcomes, biodiversity outcomes, or
153 both²³. They can differ between community members and external actors^{67,68}. Therefore, it is
154 vital to make them explicit, and align them as well as possible with the underlying values of
155 stakeholder, in the interests of achieving better outcomes from area-based management.
156 Diving deeper into how community members perceive the goals of MPAs based on their use
157 of marine ecosystems, allows us to identify potential issues of conflict. It can also help refine
158 goals that were initially put forward by external actors.

159 **2.1.5. Synthesis and rationale**

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

171 2.2. Case study: creating a network of MPAs in Palawan, Philippines

172 Using structured interviews, we investigated the perceptions of 64 local stakeholders (53
173 community members and 11 decision-makers in charge of environmental management) in
174 Palawan, Philippines, on the creation of an MPA network. After content analysis, we identified
175 151 individual perceptions and grouped them into 25 themes across the four categories of
176 our framework (Table 1 & Figure 1). This allowed us to study how local stakeholders define
177 the potential needs for and goals of MPAs. We then proposed a synthesis of these perceptions
178 and a rationale for local marine conservation projects in the form of a narrative integrating
179 those elements.

180

181 2.2.1. Background and study site

182 The Philippines has a long history of community-based marine conservation⁶⁹⁻⁷². Most of the
183 country's population is coastal and depends on coral reefs and associated ecosystems for
184 their food security and livelihoods^{73,74}. To counteract the depletion of coastal resources⁷⁵,
185 public actors and NGOs have long promoted the implementation of fishery management
186 tools⁷⁶. Among these, MPAs have been presented as particularly relevant, benefitting both
187 coastal ecosystems and fishers⁷⁷. Such projects in the Philippines are usually initiated by
188 NGOs and researchers in partnership with local government units and local civil society
189 organizations⁷⁶.

190 In the Shark Fin Bay locality, our case study site, there are about 7000 inhabitants spread
191 around five coastal districts. Fishing and farming represent the main sources of livelihood. An
192 NGO, Sulubaai Environmental Foundation (SEF), has been active in the area since 2011 and
193 has promoted the development of marine conservation initiatives. What started as a private
194 endeavor with the 2016 creation of the Pangatalan Island Marine Protected Area managed
195 by SEF then evolved into a project involving more local communities and decision-makers
196 from the Municipality of Taytay, in charge of decisions related to coastal and marine
197 ecosystems. The interviews used for this study were conducted between 2019 and 2020. The
198 relevance of this case study to trial our framework aiming to determining locally fit goals for
199 MPAs lies in the specific management situation in which Shark Fin Bay was at the time: SEF
200 was starting the Sea Academy project aiming at creating new community-based MPAs and

201 shifting from a private to a collaborative governance arrangement. At that time, the objective
 202 was to better include local communities and decision-makers in MPA co-management; hence,
 203 there was a crucial need to scrutinize the range of relevant goals for these stakeholders.
 204

Category	Theme	Description
Marine importance	Livelihood	Marine ecosystems are valuable because people get their livelihoods and income from them.
Marine importance	Food and nutrition	Local communities get affordable and healthy food from the sea, mostly fish but also shells, shrimps and seaweeds.
Marine importance	Cultural services	Local communities value marine ecosystems for their contribution to local traditions, for religious reasons and as a responsibility for future generations.
Marine importance	Other services	Other ecosystem services mentioned by respondents include coastal protection, carbon capture, and tourism.
Marine importance	Intrinsic value	Respondents mentioned the intrinsic value of nature, biodiversity or particular species.
Marine importance	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.
Environmental stressors	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.
Environmental stressors	Deforestation	Respondents described issues such as deforestation for timber, slash-and-burn agriculture (<i>kaingin</i>), or mangrove cutting for charcoal (<i>uling</i>).
Environmental stressors	Social issues	Environmental issues have root causes that can be found in social issues such as poverty, lack of education and opportunities, or demography.
Environmental stressors	Pollutions	Pollutions such as plastic pollution, wastewater, solid waste, pesticides, and fertilizers are perceived to be stressors to terrestrial and marine ecosystems.
Environmental stressors	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.
Environmental stressors	No issue identified	No environmental issue could be identified by the respondent.
Environmental stressors	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.
Environmental stressors	Agriculture and water	Pests are affecting plantations, and water appears to be more and more scarce.
Environmental stressors	Marine conservation	Marine conservation, particularly MPAs, is perceived as a vulnerability factor.
Proposed management options	Legal instruments & enforcement	Coercive social interventions can be put in place, such as reinforcing patrolling and arresting offenders.
Proposed management options	Capacity building & alternative livelihoods	Non-coercive social interventions include the increase of education, better cooperation between stakeholders, or capacity building.
Proposed management options	Ecosystem-based interventions	Ecosystem-based interventions such as marine reserves and ecosystem restoration activities can be efficient in responding to environmental stressors.
Proposed management options	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.
Marine protected areas	MPAs for local actors	MPAs are made primarily to benefit neighboring communities.
Marine protected areas	MPAs for fisheries & food	The primary goal of MPAs is to improve the status of fisheries and the food security of coastal communities.
Marine protected areas	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.

Marine protected areas	MPAs for external actors	MPAs are primarily made for external actors, in particular tourists and resort owners.
------------------------	--------------------------	--

205

206 **2.2.2. Perceptions of stakeholders across the four categories**

207 2.2.2.1 Marine importance

208 The main benefits of marine ecosystems identified by respondents were provisioning
 209 ecosystem services, particularly those related to fisheries. 83% of respondents considered
 210 that the value of marine ecosystems came from their importance for local livelihoods, and
 211 52% emphasized their importance for food security. For instance, a respondent from Depla
 212 (farmer) said: *“The very first and original way of subsistence here is the sea, our sea.”* The idea
 213 of subsistence is usually completely linked to the tradition of fishing, a sentiment of
 214 ownership, and generational aspects: *“The ocean is very valuable, especially for the next
 215 generations. If it is damaged (...), they will not have a fishery and a beautiful environment
 216 anymore”* (respondent from Depla, civil servant). The most notable divergence between
 217 respondents lies in the identification of other ecosystem services, such as coastal protection,
 218 carbon sequestration, or tourism, mainly mentioned by the decision-makers from Taytay.
 219 Only one respondent (a farmer from Mabini) could not think of any value pertaining to marine
 220 ecosystems.

221 2.2.2.2. Environmental stressors

222 Dynamite and cyanide fishing and their effects on marine ecosystems were central in
 223 respondents' discourses when asked about environmental stressors: 73% of them talked
 224 about destructive fishing practices, and 70% said they observed a depletion in fish resources.
 225 *“A lot of people here are using sodium [cyanide]. It kills the small fish... I think there is no other
 226 issue here; this is what is causing damages”* (respondent from Mabini, fisher and farmer). This
 227 perspective is shared among decision-makers: *“The main issue here is illegal fishing: dynamite
 228 and cyanide fishing, using compressors”* (respondent from Taytay, decision-maker).
 229 Respondents widely agreed on the impact of illegal practices, along with the increasing
 230 number of (legal) fishers and associated fishing efforts: fish stocks are decreasing, and it is a
 231 cause of concern for food and livelihood security. Deforestation was also an important source
 232 of discussion, in particular mangrove cutting. Many respondents noted the connectivity
 233 between ecosystems and the importance of mangrove forests as nurseries for many fish

234 species. Some underlying social issues were described by respondents, such as poverty,
235 increasing demography, or lack of agency. Although most respondents proposed similar
236 descriptions of the situation, there were also some differences in interpretations. Illegal
237 fishing, for instance, was considered to be decreasing in frequency by 9% of respondents;
238 some also said that overfishing outweighed the effect of illegal practices. 23% of respondents
239 could not point to any environmental stressor; some respondents explained this could be
240 interpreted as apprehension to talk about themes such as illegal fishing and potentially
241 pointing at other members of the community, often relatives and close friends. Some simply
242 state they had no idea what could constitute environmental stressors in the province or the
243 area.

244 2.2.2.3. Proposed management options

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

260 2.2.2.4. MPA goals

261 MPAs were most commonly perceived as a tool to increase the sustainability of marine
262 ecosystems (79% of respondents) and fish stocks (52% of respondents) to the benefit of local
263 communities (71% of respondents), in particular fishers. A respondent from Depla (farmer
264 and pastor) explains: *“The purpose [of MPAs] is to offer the fish a nursery ground. And of*

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

287 2.2.2.5. Synthesis of a rationale for conservation

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

291 *In Shark Fin Bay, food security, livelihoods and local traditions depend on marine resources*
292 *that are increasingly depleted. Destructive fishing practices, such as the use of dynamite and*
293 *cyanide, and overfishing are to blame for this decline. Underlying social drivers like poverty*
294 *and the lack of livelihood opportunities represent the root causes of these practices. Terrestrial*
295 *drivers, including pollution and deforestation, should also be considered as a threat to marine*

296 *ecosystems and well-being. Local stakeholders identified several management options to face*
297 *that situation: legal instruments and coercive measures (e.g., improving legislation and*
298 *patrolling), initiatives to improve capacity and shift to alternative livelihoods, and ecosystem-*
299 *based interventions (e.g., MPAs). Some stakeholders cannot identify any particular option. The*
300 *specific role of MPAs, in order to fit with the objectives of local resource-users, must be to*
301 *preserve fisheries from illegal activities and help restore stocks, not only for local livelihoods*
302 *but also for the food and nutrition security of local communities. Because some fishers*
303 *perceive MPAs as dedicated to tourists and resort owners or as a potential threat to livelihood,*
304 *any entity proposing the creation of an MPA should ensure the rights of local communities are*
305 *respected and their voices heard.*

306 3. Discussion

307 Our framework helped us identify a strong overall convergence on the need for diverse and
308 well-enforced management options. It provided concrete recommendations to foster the
309 social and ecological fit of the MPA network project studied. In particular, it helped us
310 conceptualize MPAs in Shark Fin Bay first and foremost as fishery management tools while
311 highlighting their expected benefits for food security. It also showed that MPAs are locally
312 considered by most respondents as a relevant tool, which is not the case for all contexts⁴⁰.
313 This is in line with other studies conducted in the same province where environmental
314 stressors such as overfishing and illegal fishing make local communities, along with NGOs,
315 researchers and local governments, call for better management^{61,78,79}Our framework,
316 structured interviews, and inductive approach in the coding process allowed the discussion
317 to be pushed further to efficiently collect the diversity of perceptions associated with marine
318 sustainability. The rationale derived from the interviews fed the subsequent management
319 plan produced for the Shark Fin Bay MPA network. In particular, an explicit dual goal to
320 improve both fishing and food security was adopted for the MPA network based on our
321 results.

322 As shown by Johnson et al. (2020), management interventions should be tailored to local
323 contexts⁸⁰. For MPAs, this can include the size and placement of the area to be under
324 protection or the rules on harvesting³². These rules, linked to the ecological context, are also
325 rooted in the socioeconomic context, and their reception can be different between
326 individuals^{22,81,82}. Marine conservation navigates in very complex systems and has to arbitrate
327 between divergent voices. In our case study, divergences in perceptions did not appear to
328 bear a high level of potential conflict, aside probably from the idea regularly expressed in
329 Silanga that MPAs are “made for tourists.” Conflicts between tourism and fishing have already
330 been demonstrated in Palawan⁸³. Other case studies have shown how, generally, conflict can
331 emerge when MPAs pay little attention to local stakes and become exclusionary to resource
332 users^{40,83,84}. On the other hand, in places where MPAs are considered more fair, social and
333 ecological outcomes tend to be more positive^{39,57}. Increasing participation and perception of
334 positive outcomes often come with time⁵⁵. When arbitration is needed, external actors should
335 rely on existing formal and informal decision processes to ensure both legal and equitable
336 outcomes. Most of the differences in perceptions between stakeholder groups could be

337 attributable to their knowledge and experience. For example, decision-makers from Taytay
338 discussed a diversity of marine ecosystem services and MPA benefits, demonstrating a
339 familiarity with scientific concepts, while local communities focused more on provisioning
340 services (livelihoods and food provision in particular). There were also some disparities
341 between different communities, as exemplified by the cases of Batas and Silanga: while most
342 community members talked about MPAs as areas where fishing is prohibited for the benefit
343 of local fisheries, several respondents from Batas and Silanga considered that the surrounding
344 communities should be allowed to fish with a hook-and-line within MPAs. The presence of
345 nearby resorts, private MPAs, and a high exogenous fishing effort in Batas can explain these
346 differences.

347 Our framework proved beneficial in gaining a better understanding of the different
348 perceptions local stakeholders had on marine sustainability and MPAs in particular. While
349 MPAs can have a wide range of positive ecological and social outcomes^{6,10}, it clarified the
350 specific outcomes local stakeholders were expecting in Shark Fin Bay, therefore providing
351 locally relevant goals. Another important feature evident in our case study was how certain
352 stakeholders' perceptions were informative on other stakeholders' experiences: for instance,
353 many non-fishing farmers and decision-makers focused on the difficulties fishers were facing.
354 The results from this research have effectively fueled the discussions on marine conservation
355 in the study area, showing local NGOs and decision-makers that marine conservation
356 initiatives should have fisheries and food security as a main focus along with biodiversity
357 benefits, and should be included as a goal in subsequent management.

358 The support from external actors can offer important opportunities for marine conservation,
359 ranging from increased capacity to improving the links between stakeholders, such as
360 community-government collaborations^{26,27,85}. In Shark Fin Bay, capacity building mainly
361 consisted of the NGO and local government unit helping local Fisherfolks Associations
362 organize (e.g., obtaining legal recognition, organizing meetings) and providing enforcement
363 capacity (e.g., salaries, training of guards, purchase of equipment) and monitoring capacity
364 (e.g., scuba diving training, collaboration with citizen-science networks). In the case of small-
365 scale fisheries management, financial or social external support should target both economic
366 and social conditions and be maintained in time to be truly efficient⁸⁶. NGOs can represent a
367 bridge between communities and governments when undertaking conservation projects and

368 improving their social and ecological fit²¹. In our case study, the rest of the community was
369 involved in discussions on the planned MPAs after the initial discussions held between NGO
370 members and community representatives. Then, the discussion was raised at the municipal
371 level, and subsequent public hearings involving both community and government
372 representatives were held before a formal vote for the MPAs to be legislated. Aside from
373 potential benefits, external interventions, particularly top-down approaches, can also carry
374 risks. In particular, MPAs have proved to be potentially exclusionary interventions, negating
375 local users' legal or perceived rights when improperly involving them^{10,12}.

376 The marine conservation community at large will have to do better to settle how external
377 actors should participate in managing marine resources, always keeping in mind the explicit
378 goal of ensuring equitable management. Our framework can contribute to this by helping to
379 identify local perceptions of marine importance, environmental threats, management
380 options, and MPA goals and thus guide their social and ecological fit. While this work focuses
381 on coastal and marine ecosystems and MPAs, its approach could be transferred to other
382 domains, for instance, to improve the fit of terrestrial protected areas also characterized by
383 strong social and ecological interactions⁴² or to study other area-based management tools⁴³.

384

385 4. Limitations of the study

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

393 5. STAR METHODS

394

395 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/

396

397 RESOURCE AVAILABILITY

398

399 **Lead contact**

400 Further information and requests for resources should be directed to and fulfilled by the Lead

401 Contact, Victor Brun (vbrun@ocean-climate.org).

402

403 **Materials availability**

404 This study did not generate new unique reagents.

405

406 **Data and code availability**

- 407 • Data is available in the “*data*” folder in supplemental items (Data S1).
- 408 • Code is available in the “*R*” folder in supplemental items (Data S1).
- 409 • Both data and code are also available on the first author’s GitHub
- 410 (<https://github.com/victor-brun/perception-sfb>).

411

412 EXPERIMENTAL MODEL AND STUDY PARTICIPANT DETAILS

413 Participants were respondents to the semi-structured interviews. Prior informed consent was
414 obtained from all participants. The influence of gender on responses was analyzed as part of
415 the results, and no significant difference was found through the study. 64 respondents were
416 selected through purposive sampling, asking for recommendations from residents,
417 representatives of Fisherfolks Associations, and different municipal offices.

418

419 METHOD DETAILS

420

421 **Sampling**

422 64 respondents were selected through purposive sampling, asking for recommendations from
423 residents, representatives of Fisherfolks Associations, and different municipal offices. The
424 first group included 53 residents from five local districts spread around Shark Fin Bay: Batas,
425 Depla, Mabini, Sandoval and Silanga, with about 10 individuals per district, men and women
426 (58% and 42%), fishers (42%), farmers (14%), and people with other or mixed livelihoods
427 (25%). Due to important social homogeneity in these districts and high flexibility in local
428 livelihoods⁸⁷, the respondents' activities at the time of the survey did not appear to affect
429 their perceptions, which was indicated in the important similarities in their perceptions. The
430 second group included 11 decision-makers: five district elected officials or *barangay captains*
431 and six decision-makers from the municipality of Taytay, representatives of the Office of the
432 Municipal Environment and Natural Resources, Office of the Municipal Agriculturist, Office of
433 the Municipal Tourism Development and Management. Most decisions pertaining to coastal
434 resources management are taken at the municipal scale, making these actors central to all

435 discussions on marine sustainability. Prior informed consent was obtained from all
436 participants before the interview started and interviews were recorded.

437

438 **Interview guide**

439 Structured interviews were conducted using an interview guide (available in supplemental
440 items) organized around seven sections: i) environmental stressors in the province, ii)
441 ecosystem services, iii) local environmental stressors and links with fishing activities, iv)
442 proposed management options to tackle environmental stressors, v) goals of MPAs and
443 benefits expected, vi) perception of SEF and other NGOs, and vii) visions for the future. All
444 respondents were confronted with the same set of initial questions, but precisions were
445 asked to engage in deeper discussions on each topic. Interviews with community members
446 were conducted in Filipino and with decision-makers in English. They lasted between 20 and
447 30 minutes.

448

449 **Analyses**

450 We transcribed and translated all interviews to English and performed a content analysis and
451 thematic coding⁸⁸. We used an inductive approach to identify individual codes (that we
452 termed perceptions) and classified them across the four categories of our framework (Table
453 S1, supplemental items). We coded these perceptions in a matrix associating each respondent
454 with the set of perceptions derived from their responses. For example, when a respondent
455 talked about dynamite and cyanide fishing being an issue for coral reefs, the columns
456 corresponding to “dynamite fishing” and “cyanide fishing” were checked. This coding was
457 performed twice and checked in order to ensure its consistency. Individual perceptions were
458 coded to be as specific as possible at first in order to allow for subsequent groupings in larger
459 themes. For example, dynamite fishing and cyanide fishing were both grouped under the
460 “destructive fishing practices” theme. The number of respondents for each theme was then
461 summed to measure their relative importance in discourses. These data, along with the
462 content of the interviews, allowed us to distinguish the dominant discourses from the more
463 marginal perceptions and those potentially conflicting between stakeholders. Data
464 manipulation and analyses were conducted in R Studio version 4.3.2⁸⁹.

465

466 QUANTIFICATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSES

467 This study relied on qualitative data and no statistical test was conducted. Quantitative
468 analyses only included a measure of the frequency of themes discussed based on the thematic
469 coding of interview transcripts conducted.

470 6. Supplemental items

471

472 DATA S1: R code used and data analyzed to produce Figure 1.

473 7. Author contributions

474 V.B. and J.C. conceived the project. V.B. collected and analyzed the data. V.B., J.R.V.M.,
475 A.J.C, L.A.C., G.G.G., and J.C. identified relevant literature and participated in the
476 development of the conceptual framework. V.B. wrote the initial manuscript, and J.R.V.M.,
477 A.J.C, L.A.C., G.G.G., and J.C. reviewed and edited it.

478 **8. Acknowledgments**

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

485 9. Declaration of interests

486 The authors declare no competing interests.

487 10. Legends

488

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

491

492 *Table 1. List of themes identified through content analysis. Each theme is composed of several individual*
493 *perceptions detailed in the data provided in Supplemental items. The description is a synthesis of the*
494 *perceptions of respondents as aggregated in each theme.*

495 11. References

496

- 497 1. Ban, N. C. Fishing communities at risk. *Nat. Clim. Change* **9**, 501–502 (2019).
- 498 2. Blythe, J. L. *et al.* Blue justice: A review of emerging scholarship and resistance
499 movements. *Camb. Prisms Coast. Futur.* **1**, e15 (2023).
- 500 3. Cinner, J. E. *et al.* Building adaptive capacity to climate change in tropical coastal
501 communities. *Nat. Clim. Change* **8**, 117–123 (2018).
- 502 4. Gill, D. A. *et al.* Triple exposure: Reducing negative impacts of climate change, blue
503 growth, and conservation on coastal communities. *One Earth* **6**, 118–130 (2023).
- 504 5. Jouffray, J.-B., Blasiak, R., Norström, A. V., Österblom, H. & Nyström, M. The Blue
505 Acceleration: The Trajectory of Human Expansion into the Ocean. *One Earth* **2**, 43–54
506 (2020).
- 507 6. Reimer, J. M., Devillers, R. & Claudet, J. Benefits and gaps in area-based management
508 tools for the ocean Sustainable Development Goal. *Nat. Sustain.* **4**, 349–357 (2021).
- 509 7. Thiault, L. *et al.* Operationalizing vulnerability for social–ecological integration in
510 conservation and natural resource management. *Conserv. Lett.* **13**, (2020).
- 511 8. Mahajan, S. L. *et al.* A theory-based framework for understanding the establishment,
512 persistence, and diffusion of community-based conservation. *Conserv. Sci. Pract.* **3**,
513 (2021).
- 514 9. Aswani, S., Albert, S. & Love, M. One size does not fit all: Critical insights for effective
515 community-based resource management in Melanesia. *Mar. Policy* **81**, 381–391 (2017).

- 516 10. Ban, N. C. *et al.* Well-being outcomes of marine protected areas. *Nat. Sustain.* **2**, 524–532
517 (2019).
- 518 11. Ban, N. C., Picard, C. R. & Vincent, A. C. J. Comparing and integrating community-based
519 and science-based approaches to prioritizing marine areas for protection. *Conserv. Biol.*
520 **23**, 899–910 (2009).
- 521 12. Bennett, N. J. Mainstreaming Equity and Justice in the Ocean. *Front. Mar. Sci.* **9**, 873572
522 (2022).
- 523 13. Costello, C. *et al.* Global fishery prospects under contrasting management regimes. *Proc.*
524 *Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **113**, 5125–5129 (2016).
- 525 14. Gill, D. A. *et al.* Social Synergies, Tradeoffs, and Equity in Marine Conservation Impacts.
526 *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* **44**, 347–372 (2019).
- 527 15. Gurney, G. G. *et al.* Poverty and protected areas: An evaluation of a marine integrated
528 conservation and development project in Indonesia. *Glob. Environ. Change* **26**, 98–107
529 (2014).
- 530 16. Id, S. E. *et al.* Blue justice : A survey for eliciting perceptions of environmental justice
531 among coastal planners ' and small-scale fishers in Northern-. 1–20 (2021)
532 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0251467.
- 533 17. Melnychuk, M. C. *et al.* Identifying management actions that promote sustainable
534 fisheries. *Nat. Sustain.* **4**, 440–449 (2021).
- 535 18. Sykora-Bodie, S. T. *et al.* Methods for identifying spatially referenced conservation needs
536 and opportunities. *Biol. Conserv.* **260**, (2021).

- 537 19. Epstein, G. *et al.* Institutional fit and the sustainability of social–ecological systems. *Curr.*
538 *Opin. Environ. Sustain.* **14**, 34–40 (2015).
- 539 20. Guerrero, A. M., Bodin, Ö., McAllister, R. R. J. & Wilson, K. A. Achieving social-ecological
540 fit through bottom-up collaborative governance: an empirical investigation. *Ecol. Soc.* **20**,
541 art41 (2015).
- 542 21. Hohbein, R. R., Nibbelink, N. P. & Cooper, R. J. Non-governmental organizations improve
543 the social-ecological fit of institutions conserving the Andean bear in Colombia. *Ecol. Soc.*
544 **26**, art13 (2021).
- 545 22. Turner, R. A. *et al.* Social fit of coral reef governance varies among individuals: Social fit of
546 coral reef governance. *Conserv. Lett.* **11**, e12422 (2018).
- 547 23. Ban, N. C. *et al.* Effects of management objectives and rules on marine conservation
548 outcomes. *Conserv. Biol.* **cobi.14156** (2023) doi:10.1111/cobi.14156.
- 549 24. Teniwut, W. A., Hamid, S. K., Teniwut, R. M. K., Renhoran, M. & Pratama, C. D. Do coastal
550 communities in small islands value marine resources through marine protected areas?:
551 Evidence from Kei Islands Indonesia with choice modelling. *Mar. Policy* **157**, 105838
552 (2023).
- 553 25. Gurney, G. G. *et al.* Participation in devolved commons management: Multiscale
554 socioeconomic factors related to individuals' participation in community-based
555 management of marine protected areas in Indonesia. *Environ. Sci. Policy* **61**, 212–220
556 (2016).
- 557 26. Andrachuk, M. *et al.* CORAL REEF GOVERNANCE: STRENGTHENING COMMUNITY AND
558 COLLABORATIVE APPROACHES. **17** (2022).

- 559 27. Gill, D. A. *et al.* Capacity shortfalls hinder the performance of marine protected areas
560 globally. *Nature* **543**, 665–669 (2017).
- 561 28. Cánovas-Molina, A. & García-Frapolli, E. A review of vulnerabilities in worldwide small-
562 scale fisheries. *Fish. Manag. Ecol.* fme.12538 (2022) doi:10.1111/fme.12538.
- 563 29. Chaigneau, T. & Brown, K. Challenging the win-win discourse on conservation and
564 development: analyzing support for marine protected areas. *Ecol. Soc.* **21**, art36 (2016).
- 565 30. Hogg, K., Gray, T., Noguera-Méndez, P., Semitiel-García, M. & Young, S. Interpretations of
566 MPA winners and losers: a case study of the Cabo De Palos- Islas Hormigas Fisheries
567 Reserve. *Marit. Stud.* **18**, 159–171 (2019).
- 568 31. Alexander, S. M., Armitage, D., Carrington, P. J. & Bodin, Ö. Examining horizontal and
569 vertical social ties to achieve social–ecological fit in an emerging marine reserve network.
570 *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.* **27**, 1209–1223 (2017).
- 571 32. Cinner, J. E. Designing marine reserves to reflect local socioeconomic conditions: lessons
572 from long-enduring customary management systems. *Coral Reefs* **26**, 1035–1045 (2007).
- 573 33. Gurney, G. G., Adams, V. M., Álvarez-Romero, J. G. & Claudet, J. Area-based conservation:
574 Taking stock and looking ahead. *One Earth* **6**, 98–104 (2023).
- 575 34. Partelow, S. *et al.* Environmental governance theories: a review and application to coastal
576 systems. *Ecol. Soc.* **25**, art19 (2020).
- 577 35. Mahajan, S. L. & Daw, T. Perceptions of ecosystem services and benefits to human well-
578 being from community-based marine protected areas in Kenya. *Mar. Policy* **74**, 108–119
579 (2016).

- 580 36. Giglio, V. J., Pereira-Filho, G. H., Marconi, M., Rolim, F. A. & Motta, F. S. Stakeholders'
581 perceptions on environmental quality and threats to subtropical marine reserves. *Reg.*
582 *Stud. Mar. Sci.* **56**, 102664 (2022).
- 583 37. Cárcamo, P. F., Garay-Flühmann, R., Squeo, F. A. & Gaymer, C. F. Using stakeholders'
584 perspective of ecosystem services and biodiversity features to plan a marine protected
585 area. *Environ. Sci. Policy* **40**, 116–131 (2014).
- 586 38. Schultz, M. *et al.* A framework to identify barriers and levers to increase the levels of
587 protection of marine protected areas. *One Earth* **5**, 987–999 (2022).
- 588 39. Bennett, N. J. *et al.* Local support for conservation is associated with perceptions of good
589 governance, social impacts, and ecological effectiveness. *Conserv. Lett.* **12**, (2019).
- 590 40. Bennett, N. J. & Dearden, P. Why local people do not support conservation: Community
591 perceptions of marine protected area livelihood impacts, governance and management
592 in Thailand. *Mar. Policy* **44**, 107–116 (2014).
- 593 41. Edgar, G. J. *et al.* Global conservation outcomes depend on marine protected areas with
594 five key features. *Nature* **506**, 216–220 (2014).
- 595 42. Frietsch, M., Zafra-Calvo, N., Ghoddousi, A. & Loos, J. Advancing protected area
596 effectiveness assessments by disentangling social-ecological interactions: A case study
597 from the Luangwa Valley, Zambia. *Conserv. Sci. Pract.* **5**, e12974 (2023).
- 598 43. Estradivari *et al.* Marine conservation beyond MPAs: Towards the recognition of other
599 effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) in Indonesia. *Mar. Policy* **137**,
600 104939 (2022).

- 601 44. Michel, A. H. *et al.* The Role of Trust in the Participatory Establishment of Protected
602 Areas—Lessons Learnt from a Failed National Park Project in Switzerland. *Soc. Nat.*
603 *Resour.* **35**, 487–505 (2022).
- 604 45. Betley, E. C. *et al.* Assessing human well-being constructs with environmental and equity
605 aspects: A review of the landscape. *People Nat.* 1–18 (2021) doi:10.1002/pan3.10293.
- 606 46. Díaz, S. *et al.* Assessing nature’s contributions to people. *Science* **359**, 270–272 (2018).
- 607 47. Ishihara, H. Relational values from a cultural valuation perspective: how can sociology
608 contribute to the evaluation of ecosystem services? *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* **35**, 61–
609 68 (2018).
- 610 48. Peterson, G. D. *et al.* Welcoming different perspectives in IPBES: “Nature’s contributions
611 to people” and “Ecosystem services”. *Ecol. Soc.* **23**, art39 (2018).
- 612 49. Nowakowski, A. J. *et al.* Co-benefits of marine protected areas for nature and people. *Nat.*
613 *Sustain.* (2023) doi:10.1038/s41893-023-01150-4.
- 614 50. Costello, M. J. Evidence of economic benefits from marine protected areas. *Sci. Mar.* **88**,
615 e080 (2024).
- 616 51. Garcia Rodrigues, J., Villasante, S. & Sousa Pinto, I. Non-material nature’s contributions to
617 people from a marine protected area support multiple dimensions of human well-being.
618 *Sustain. Sci.* **17**, 793–808 (2022).
- 619 52. Hicks, C. C., Graham, N. A. J. & Cinner, J. E. Synergies and tradeoffs in how managers,
620 scientists, and fishers value coral reef ecosystem services. *Glob. Environ. Change* **23**,
621 1444–1453 (2013).

- 622 53. Lapointe, M., Gurney, G. G. & Cumming, G. S. Urbanization alters ecosystem service
623 preferences in a Small Island Developing State. *Ecosyst. Serv.* **43**, 101109 (2020).
- 624 54. Lau, J. D., Cinner, J. E., Fabinyi, M., Gurney, G. G. & Hicks, C. C. Access to marine ecosystem
625 services: Examining entanglement and legitimacy in customary institutions. *World Dev.*
626 **126**, 104730 (2020).
- 627 55. Lau, J. D., Hicks, C. C., Gurney, G. G. & Cinner, J. E. What matters to whom and why?
628 Understanding the importance of coastal ecosystem services in developing coastal
629 communities. *Ecosyst. Serv.* **35**, 219–230 (2019).
- 630 56. Woodhead, A. J. *et al.* Fishers perceptions of ecosystem service change associated with
631 climate-disturbed coral reefs. *People Nat.* **3**, 639–657 (2021).
- 632 57. Yasué, M., Kockel, A. & Dearden, P. The psychological impacts of community-based
633 protected areas. *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.* **32**, 1057–1072 (2022).
- 634 58. Calandra, M. *et al.* Local perceptions of socio-ecological drivers and effects of coastal
635 armoring: the case of Moorea, French Polynesia. *Popul. Environ.* **43**, 423–443 (2022).
- 636 59. Darling, E. S. *et al.* Social–environmental drivers inform strategic management of coral
637 reefs in the Anthropocene. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **3**, 1341–1350 (2019).
- 638 60. Jouffray, J.-B. *et al.* Parsing human and biophysical drivers of coral reef regimes. *Proc. R.*
639 *Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **286**, 20182544 (2019).
- 640 61. Madarcos, J. R. V. *et al.* Understanding Local Perceptions of the Drivers/Pressures on the
641 Coastal Marine Environment in Palawan, Philippines. *Front. Mar. Sci.* **8**, 659699 (2021).
- 642 62. Francolini, E. M., Mann-Lang, J. B., McKinley, E., Mann, B. Q. & Abrahams, M. I.
643 Stakeholder perspectives on socio-economic challenges and recommendations for better

- 644 management of the Aliwal Shoal Marine Protected Area in South Africa. *Mar. Policy* **148**,
645 105470 (2023).
- 646 63. Pajaro, M. G., Mulrennan, M. E., Alder, J. & Vincent, A. C. J. Developing MPA Effectiveness
647 Indicators: Comparison Within and Across Stakeholder Groups and Communities. *Coast.*
648 *Manag.* **38**, 122–143 (2010).
- 649 64. Reimer, J. M. *et al.* Conservation ready marine spatial planning. *Mar. Policy* **153**, 105655
650 (2023).
- 651 65. Tranter, S. N. *et al.* The inclusion of fisheries and tourism in marine protected areas to
652 support conservation in Indonesia. *Mar. Policy* **146**, 105301 (2022).
- 653 66. Gurney, G. G. *et al.* Redefining community based on place attachment in a connected
654 world. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **114**, 10077–10082 (2017).
- 655 67. Bennett, N. J., Le Billon, P., Belhabib, D. & Satizábal, P. Local marine stewardship and
656 ocean defenders. *Npj Ocean Sustain.* **1**, 3 (2022).
- 657 68. McClanahan, T. & Abunge, C. Perceptions of governance effectiveness and fisheries
658 restriction options in a climate refugia. *Biol. Conserv.* **246**, 108585 (2020).
- 659 69. Horigue, V., Aliño, P. M., White, A. T. & Pressey, R. L. Marine protected area networks in
660 the Philippines: Trends and challenges for establishment and governance. *Ocean Coast.*
661 *Manag.* **64**, 15–26 (2012).
- 662 70. Muallil, R. N. *et al.* Effectiveness of small locally-managed marine protected areas for coral
663 reef fisheries management in the Philippines. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* **179**, 104831 (2019).

- 664 71. Pomeroy, R. S. & Carlos, M. B. Community-based coastal resource management in the
665 Philippines: A review and evaluation of programs and projects, 1984–1994. *Mar. Policy*
666 **21**, 445–464 (1997).
- 667 72. Weeks, R., Russ, G. R., Alcala, A. C. & White, A. T. Effectiveness of Marine Protected Areas
668 in the Philippines for Biodiversity Conservation. *Conserv. Biol.* **24**, 531–540 (2010).
- 669 73. Cabral, R. B. & Geronimo, R. C. How important are coral reefs to food security in the
670 Philippines? Diving deeper than national aggregates and averages. *Mar. Policy* **91**, 136–
671 141 (2018).
- 672 74. Fabinyi, M., Dressler, W. H. & Pido, M. D. Fish, Trade and Food Security: Moving beyond
673 ‘Availability’ Discourse in Marine Conservation. *Hum. Ecol.* **45**, 177–188 (2017).
- 674 75. Palomares, M. L. D. & Pauly, D. Philippine marine fisheries catches: a bottom-up
675 reconstruction, 1950 to 2010. *Fish. Cent. Res. Rep.* **22**, 176 (2014).
- 676 76. Alcala, A. C. & Russ, G. R. No-take Marine Reserves and Reef Fisheries Management in the
677 Philippines: A New People Power Revolution. *AMBIO J. Hum. Environ.* **35**, 245–254 (2006).
- 678 77. Alcala, A. C. Community-based coastal resource management in the Philippines: a case
679 study. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* **38**, 179–186 (1998).
- 680 78. Alcantara, L. *et al.* *Perceptions of Climate Change, Sea Level Rise and Factors Affecting the*
681 *Coastal Marine Ecosystem of Palawan, Philippines*. [https://ucl.scienceopen.com/hosted-](https://ucl.scienceopen.com/hosted-document?doi=10.14324/111.444/000150.v1)
682 [document?doi=10.14324/111.444/000150.v1](https://ucl.scienceopen.com/hosted-document?doi=10.14324/111.444/000150.v1) (2022) doi:10.14324/111.444/000150.v1.
- 683 79. Gajardo, L. J. *et al.* Cultural values of ecosystem services from coastal marine areas: Case
684 of Taytay Bay, Palawan, Philippines. *Environ. Sci. Policy* **142**, 12–20 (2023).

- 685 80. Johnson, S. M., Reyuw, B. M., Yalon, A., McLean, M. & Houk, P. Contextualizing the social-
686 ecological outcomes of coral reef fisheries management. *Biol. Conserv.* **241**, 108288
687 (2020).
- 688 81. Leenhardt, P. *et al.* Challenges, insights and perspectives associated with using social-
689 ecological science for marine conservation. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* **115**, 49–60 (2015).
- 690 82. Silva, M. R. O. & Lopes, P. F. M. Each fisherman is different: Taking the environmental
691 perception of small-scale fishermen into account to manage marine protected areas. *Mar.*
692 *Policy* **51**, 347–355 (2015).
- 693 83. Fabinyi, M. The Intensification of Fishing and the Rise of Tourism: Competing Coastal
694 Livelihoods in the Calamianes Islands, Philippines. *Hum. Ecol.* **38**, 415–427 (2010).
- 695 84. Pomeroy, R. *et al.* Fish wars: Conflict and collaboration in fisheries management in
696 Southeast Asia. *Mar. Policy* **31**, 645–656 (2007).
- 697 85. Ross, H., Adhuri, D. S., Abdurrahim, A. Y. & Phelan, A. Opportunities in community-
698 government cooperation to maintain marine ecosystem services in the Asia-Pacific and
699 Oceania. *Ecosyst. Serv.* **38**, 100969 (2019).
- 700 86. Schlüter, M., Lindkvist, E. & Basurto, X. The interplay between top-down interventions
701 and bottom-up self-organization shapes opportunities for transforming self-governance
702 in small-scale fisheries. *Mar. Policy* **128**, 104485 (2021).
- 703 87. Eder, J. F. Coastal Resource Management and Social Differences in Philippine Fishing
704 Communities. *Hum. Ecol.* **33**, 147–169 (2005).
- 705 88. Gibbs, G. *Analyzing Qualitative Data*. (SAGE Publications, Ltd, 1 Oliver’s Yard, 55 City
706 Road, London England EC1Y 1SP United Kingdom, 2007). doi:10.4135/9781849208574.

707 89. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for

708 Statistical Computing. (2020).

709