Survey of SocMon-Related Sites (Sites Conducting Socioeconomic Monitoring related to the Global Socioeconomic Monitoring Initiative)

DRAFT RESULTS FOR MOMBUKA MARINE PROTECTED AREA[1] - DO NOT CITE

1. Your name and e-mail address: Carol, carol@yahoo.com
2. Title of the socioeconomic monitoring or assessment: The Socioeconomic Monitoring Program in Mombuka
3. Location: Mombuka

4. The general objectives of why you did the socioeconomic monitoring (please underline those that apply):
Determine value/significance of the resources
Assess management effectiveness/ community benefits and impacts of management strategies
Adapt management strategies to local context
Identify threats and pressures
Facilitate stakeholder participation
Establish baseline of socioeconomic information

5. Topics addressed in your socioeconomic monitoring (please underline those that apply):
Marine protected areas
Alternative livelihoods
Resource use conflicts
Economic valuation (market or non-market)
Stakeholder participation in management
Tourism issues
Fisheries issues
Traditional uses
Land-based threats
Historic/cultural resources
Poverty alleviation
Local perceptions of management

6. Management question(s) you were addressing:
The socioeconomic monitoring program was established to assess the socioeconomic impacts of no-take reserves in the Mombuka MPA on the commercial fisheries and the local economy. The program also tracks user attitudes, perceptions and beliefs regarding Mombuka regulations and strategies. It has been in existence since 1999, or two years after the Mombuka MPA was established.

7. Socioeconomic indicators you assessed:
Harvest totals, net earnings, vessel cost, gear cost.
User attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions regarding Mombuka regulations and strategies.
Spatial data regarding areas utilized by species, gear type and home port.

8. Methods you used (e.g. household interviews, key informant interviews, etc):
Field surveys and existing fishery information. Two panels of 7 to 9 fishermen were monitored to determine changes in fishing costs and earnings. The panels include: 1) fishermen who fished the no-take reserves prior to their implementation as no-take reserves in 1997; and 2); a general panel of fishermen from throughout Mombuka MPA.

[1] Mombuka is a fictional site created for the purposes of illustrating the type of information we are interested in collecting through this survey

9. Total cost of the study (optional): $50,000 per year

10. Time it took to conduct: 3-5 months per year

11. Number of people on the study team: One full-time person, 4 half-time persons

12. How the coastal managers and other stakeholders were engaged in planning, implementation and reporting results:
Fishermen were directly involved by being panel members. They provided the data on harvest totals, net earning and vessel and gear costs, which was used to determine profits.

13. *The most important results, particularly unexpected findings:
Harvest totals and net earning were found to increase or remain stable in the first three years but declined in the fourth year for all four panels of fishermen. The decline in production is reflected in the lower capital investment in vessels and decreased gear costs for the final year. Furthermore, the fishermen displaced by the no-take reserves actually showed a relative increase in net earnings compared to the general fishermen throughout MPA. Net earnings for displaced no-take reserve fishermen increased from $27,725 in 1997-1998 (pre-reserve) to an average of $37,534 over the subsequent years (1998-2001); whereas, the general fishermen's net earnings increased from $30,806 to $32,775, which indicates that the displaced fishermen actually benefited from the reserves.

Most panel members do not believe that the no-take areas have increased or replenished stocks in the region and none of the fishers believes that his group has been the primary beneficiary of the zoning strategy. Almost two thirds of the panel members do not favor the establishment of the current zoning plan, and 77% would oppose further zones in the MPA. Finally, a majority of the respondents (68%) is against the establishment of the MPA.

14. * How the socioeconomic information has been used to improve coastal management. Please be specific. This information is particularly important because it will be used to demonstrate to potential users and donor organizations the benefits of conduct socioeconomic monitoring.
The results of the study were used to demonstrate to the public and policy-makers that the fishermen displaced by the no-take reserves were not adversely affected. The data were used to demonstrate that they actually had greater increases in earnings than the average Mombuka fisherman. A series of public meetings were held, discussions were held specifically with fishermen groups, and press releases were distributed to convey the information. This was particularly important given that so many of the panel members were opposed to further zoning. In part as a result of providing this information, the Mombuka managers are beginning to receive more positive feedback from the panel members regarding the possibility of future zoning. Although it is difficult to discern the exact cause, there has also been an increase in compliance with the regulations since this information was released. Perhaps of greatest benefit to the nation, at the recent Department of the Environment meetings, the Director referenced these results as evidence of why no-take reserves should be supported and promulgated elsewhere in the state. The Department is now beginning inter-agency discussions regarding no-take reserves in other marine protected areas in the country.

15. Lead contact for further information (name, role in the socioeconomic monitoring, organization, contact e-mail & phone): Carol, lead investigator, College, carol@yahoo.com

16. Website for the project and/or socioeconomic study:
ww.marineeconomics.college.edu/SocmonMombuka.html