



International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF)

MEL4SSF Piloting

Philippines

Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework in support of the implementation of
the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries
in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication

International
Collective
in Support of
Fishworkers



International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF)

MEL4SSF Piloting

Philippines

Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework in support of the implementation of
the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries
in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication



Contents

List of Acronyms	6
Executive Summary	9
1 / Scope of the Piloting Process	11
2 / Design and Methodology	13
3 / Country and Small-Scale Fisheries Background	17
3.1. Philippine Governance Structure	17
3.2. Philippine Small-Scale Fisheries	18
3.3. Policy and Program Development	19
3.4. Fisheries Program Implementation	21
3.5. Monitoring and Evaluation Process	22
3.6. Data Collection and Management	23
4 / Results and Analysis (Document Review and Key Informants Interviews)	27
4.1. Policies and Programs	27
4.2. Key informant interviews	37
4.3. Introduction of the MEL4SSF	56
5 / Recommendations	59
5.1. SSF Guidelines and the MEL4SSF	60
5.2. MEL4SSF Handbook	60
5.3. Result and Progress Indicators	61
5.4. Country-Level Adoption of the MEL4SSF	63
5.5. Digitalization of the MEL4SSF	64
6 / Conclusion	67
7 / Annexes	69
Annex A	69
Annex B	74
Annexes footnotes	100
Annex C	102
Annex D	103

List of Acronyms

AIP	Annual Investment Plan		
BFAR	Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources		
BoatR	Boat Registration		
CBO	Community-Based Organization		
CCVAs	Climate Change Vulnerability Assessments		
CDA	Cooperative Development Authority		
CFLC	Community Fish Landing Center		
CNFIDP	Comprehensive National Fisheries Industry Development Plan		
COA	Commission on Audit		
CSO	Civil Society Organization		
DA	Department of Agriculture		
DBM	Department of Budget and Management		
DENR	Department of Environment and Natural Resources		
DILG	Department of the Interior and Local Government		
DOST	Department of Science and Technology		
DRRMO	Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office		
DSWD	Department of Social Welfare and Development		
DTI	Department of Trade and Industry		
eCDTS	Electronic Catch Documentation And Traceability System		
FFO	Fisherfolks Organization		
FishR	Fisherfolks Registration		
FMA	Fisheries Management Area		
GAA	General Appropriations Act		
HDPRC	Human Development Poverty Reduction Cluster		
IATF	Inter-Agency Task Force		
IRA	Internal Revenue Allotment		
LCE	Local Chief Executive		
LDF	Local Development Fund		
LGC	Local Government Code		
LGU	Local Government Unit (Provincial/Municipal/Barangay)		
MAO	Municipal Agriculture Office/Officer		
MCW	Magna Carta of Women		
MENRO	Municipal Environment and Natural Resources Office		
MFDP	Municipal Fisheries Development Plan		
		MFO	Municipal Fisheries Ordinance
		M/I/N/FARMC	Municipal/Integrated/National Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Management Council
		MPDO	Municipal Planning and Development Office
		NAPC	National Anti-Poverty Commission
		NEDA	National Economic and Development Authority
		NFRDI	National Fisheries Research and Development Institute
		NGA	National Government Agency
		NGO	Non-Government Organization
		NHTS	National Household Targeting System
		NSAP	National Stock Assessment Program
		ODA-GAD Network	Official Development Assistance Gender and Development Network
		PCAF	Philippine Council for Agriculture and Fisheries
		PCW	Philippine Commission on Women
		PPA	Projects, Programs, and Activities
		PO	People's Organization
		PSA	Philippine Statistics Authority
		RSBSA	Registry System for Basic Sectors in Agriculture
		SRA	Social Reform Agenda
		SRC	Social Reform Council
		SSF	Small-Scale Fisheries
		TWG	Technical Working Group
		UP-MSI	University of the Philippines – Marine Science Institute
		VMM	Vessel Monitoring Mechanisms
		WMA	Women Managed Areas

Executive Summary

At its 31st session, the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) through its Committee on Fisheries (COFI) adopted the *Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication* (SSF Guidelines) in June 2014. The overriding goal of the SSF Guidelines is to promote a human rights-based approach to address the aspirations, needs and challenges of small-scale fishers and fish workers across the value chain. With a view to promote further SSF Guidelines implementation and sharing of experiences, the FAO is developing a Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework (MEL4SSF).

As a signatory and participant to the development of the SSF Guidelines, the Philippines was selected to pilot the proposed draft MEL4SSF. The piloting process examined the framework in a real-world setting through document review, key informant interviews and surveys with relevant actors in the small-scale fisheries sector, and the findings will inform the finalization of the framework.

The introduction of the MEL4SSF took into consideration the Philippines governance context, characterized by a more decentralized and devolved governance structure. The piloting process uncovered possible impacts and opportunities on the implementation of SSF Guidelines initiatives, as well as in monitoring and evaluation of initiatives under the SSF Guidelines. The process contextualized the prioritization of identified key indicators of relevance from the stakeholders' perspective and offered useful lessons and recommendations for improving the framework.

Given that SSF's domain is at the municipal level in the Philippines, local government units (LGUs) play a key role in directly engaging the SSF stakeholders in the country. The critical role of local development councils and non-government organizations (NGOs) in the promotion of the SSF Guidelines and the MEL4SSF is of major importance in designing and developing strategies for local adoption.

The adoption and effective use of the MEL4SSF and its Handbook will require increasing awareness-raising about the SSF Guidelines among local SSF stakeholders, as well as the development SSF Guidelines implementation plans that are adapted to and address the local context.

1 / Scope of the Piloting Process



To give a more in-depth picture of how the MEL4SSF can be adopted in a highly decentralized and devolved form of governance, the piloting examined national SSF initiatives and how they are reflected in, or are reflections of, the local communities (municipal) in Quezon Province, Luzon.

National documents and key informants from the SSF stakeholders, at both national and local levels, were included in the piloting process. The three (3) coastal LGUs of Mulanay, Macalelon and Agdangan were selected to:

- Introduce the MEL4SSF to relevant SSF policy and regulatory bodies, fisheries development councils, fisherfolk organizations (FFOs), non-government organizations (NGOs), local government units (LGUs);
- Identify the key indicators of relevance to stakeholders within the SSF subsectors, with special focus on vulnerable and marginalized groups;
- Contextualize and prioritize the identified key indicators of relevance from the stakeholders' perspective, covering

governance and tenure, social development; value chains, post-harvest, and trade; gender equality; disaster risks and climate change issues;

- Discuss and identify options for effective implementation of the MEL4SSF; and
- Define the local data management environment to support monitoring, evaluation, and learning.

The Municipality of Mulanay is a 1st municipality¹, while the Municipalities of Agdangan and Macalelon are 5th and 4th class municipality, respectively. Accordingly, the observation from the piloting process revealed similar limited capacity to support their local SSF communities.

Based on the observed homogeneity of institutional structures and participatory arrangements within the country, the learnings from Luzon are expected to be replicable for the island clusters of Visayas and Mindanao.

* * *

1. Income class classification. Compared to city classification, municipalities have lower overall income and are largely dependent on their share from the national Internal Revenue Allotment.

2 / Design and Methodology

Using the MEL4SSF indicator list and handbook as a guide, primary data were collected from document review and key informant interviews. Administration of the short questionnaire were conducted with select key informants from national government agencies, development councils, sectoral representatives, NGOs, and LGUs. These entities are considered critical to the Philippine fisheries' participatory governance structure. Representatives of FFOs, NGOs (represented at the Fisheries Management Areas and in local projects on SSF), and LGUs were interviewed to provide context on participatory monitoring, evaluation, and learning.

Conducting document review

- Philippine Fisheries Code (RA 8550 and Amended RA 10654)
- Local Government Code of 1992
- Department of Agriculture-Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Programs and Services
- Department Order 156-16 s. 2016 on Rules and Regulations Governing the Working and

Living Conditions of Fishers on Board Fishing Vessels Engaged in Commercial Fishing Operation

- Magna Carta of Women
- Katipunan ng mga Kilusan ng mga Artisanong Mangangisda sa Pilipinas (KKAMPI) 10-point Philippine Blue Agenda (2022)
- PaNaGaT SSF Survey of Fisheries and Fisherfolks Issues
- Municipal Fisheries Ordinance of Mulanay LGU
- Municipal Fisheries Ordinance of Macalelon LGU
- Municipal Fisheries Ordinance of Agdangan LGU
- LGU Mulanay Municipal Fisheries Development Activities
- LGU Macalelon Fisheries Development Plan
- LGU Agdangan Integrated Coastal and Fisheries Management Cum Sustainability Plan (2018-2022)

*

Conducting interviews and survey

Due to time and resource constraint, only selected respondents were interviewed. The post-election transition also prevented the consultant from engaging many government agencies. Due to the changes in key leadership positions and personnel among agencies, targeted interviews were not pursued especially for newly onboarded personnel who are new to the fisheries sector. Document review was conducted in place of the interviews to ensure that the priorities—manifested through their priority and banner programs for SSF—of these agencies are reflected in the piloting.

A. Fisherfolk Representatives

National Representations

- 1. **Ruperto “Ka Uper” Alleroza:** National Anti-Poverty Commission Vice Chair for Basic Sectors; Artisanal Fisherfolks Sectoral Council Representative; Luzon Fisherfolk Representative; Chairperson of the Pambansang Katipunan ng mga Samahan sa Kanayunan (PKSK).
- 2. **Venerando “Ka Ven” Carbon:** Visayas Fisherfolk Representative to the National Alliance of Fisherfolks (KKAMPi); Chairperson of the Tañon Strait Fisherfolks Federation (TSFF).
- 3. **Mr. Roberto Ballon:** Mindanao Fisherfolk Representative; Chairperson of Coalition of Municipal Fishers Associations (COMFAS) of Zamboanga Sibugay; Chairperson of Katipunan ng mga Kilusan ng Artisanong Mangingisda sa Pilipinas (KKAMPi)

Local Representations

- 1. **Ms. Solidad Dillera:** Chairperson of the Samahan ng mga Mangingisdang Kababaihan

- ng Macalelon (Women’s Fisherfolks Organization)
- 2. **Mr. Jonathan Decena:** Fisher, Manager of the Oyster Aquaculture (SCI2SOS Project) in Macalelon, Member of the Samahan ng Maliliit na Mangingisda ng Macalelon
- 3. **Mr. Roilan Rodel:** Fisher, Board of Directors Member of the Bisig Mangingisda ng Sildora (BMS) (Fisherfolks Organization) engaged in capture fisheries and community-based aquaculture (crab and milkfish production)

B. Local Non-government Organization representatives

- 1. **Ms. Eva Garibay-Rivera:** Tayabas Fisherfolks Cooperative representative (community organizer-community development); non-government organization (NGO) representative to the Fisheries Management Area No. 7; NGO representative to the Municipal Fisheries and Aquatic Resource Management Council (MFARMC) of Mulanay LGU
- 2. **Mr. Jerick Dillera:** SCI2SOS Project Community Development-Community Organizer (Oyster Aquaculture Project in Macalelon – A partnership project implemented by the Department of Science and Technology (Government Agency), UP-Marine Science Institute (Academe), Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Region 4A (Government Agency), Tambuyog Development Center (Non-government organizations), Agriculture Sustainability Initiatives for Nature (Private Sector) and LGU of Macalelon (Local Government)

- 1. **Mr. Jorge Umali:** Technical Working

Group Member (NGO Representative/ Coordinator for Academe in Quezon Province) of the Fisheries Management Area 12 (FMA-12)

*

C. SSF Development Council Representatives

- 1. **Mr. Fausto Genio:** Municipal Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Management Council of Macalelon LGU, Chairperson of the Samahan ng mga Mangigisda sa Macalelon (Fisherfolks Organization)
- 2. **Mr. Noñeto Clet:** President of the Bantay Dagat of Agdangan (Fish Wardens deputized by the LGU of Agdangan) under the Municipal Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Management Council of Agdangan; Chairperson of the Silayan Fisherfolks Association of Binagbag (SFAB) (Fisherfolks Organization)

*

D. Local Government Unit Representatives

- 1. **Ms. Gracielle R. Decena:** Municipal Agriculture Officer (MAO) of the Local Government Unit of Mulanay, Quezon Province.
- 2. **Mr. Jomar Salagubang:** Municipal Agriculture Officer (MAO) of the Local Government Unit of Agdangan, Quezon Province.

*

E. Government Agency

- 1. **Ms. Laarni Jadloc:** Focal Person of the National Anti-Poverty Commission’s Human Development Poverty Reduction Cluster, Inter-Agency Convergence (Technical Working Group with members from different agencies with poverty reduction program)

* * *

3 / Country and Small-Scale Fisheries Background

3.1. Philippine Governance Structure

The Philippine governance structure is characterized by decentralization. At the government administration, the powers of the state are shared among the executive department, legislative department, and judiciary department. Further, development interventions are devolved to provincial, city, municipal, and barangay local government units (LGUs)² which have local autonomy vested under the Constitution and guided by the Philippine Local Government Code of 1992. Similarly, the local government units mirror the national government's decentralization of its power to its executive branch (mayor's office led by the local chief executive), legislative branch (*sangguniang panlalawigan*/bayan/barangay for local legislations) and judiciary branch (*lupong tagapamayapa* for local justice system). The national executive department's structure is similarly mirrored at the local level under different offices. This includes, among others, the provincial and municipal agriculture and fisheries office (local counterpart of the

Department of Agriculture and Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources), environment and natural resources office (local counterpart of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources), municipal health office and social welfare and development office (local counterpart of the Department of Health and Department of Social Welfare and Development), gender and development office, economic enterprise and development office (similar functions to the National Economic Development Authority and the Department of Trade and Industry), office for the development of cooperatives/cooperatives development office (local counterpart of the Cooperative Development Authority), disaster risk reduction and management office (a localization of the National DRRM).

The governance structure can also be characterized by a *strong society and a weak state*³ observed in the proliferation of civil society organizations (CSOs) in all areas of the

2. Article X, Local Government

3. As defined by Migdal in Migdal, Joel S. *Strong Societies and Weak States: State-Society Relations and State Capabilities in the Third World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Philippine society. To an extent, a large portion of traditional government domains have been taken over by CSOs. Non-government organizations (NGOs) are present from policy making to program implementation in all sectors and offers services that overlap with government services from provision of basic utilities, to poverty reduction programs. CSOs, both non-government organizations and faith-based organizations, have been an active counterpart of the government in organizing communities from the fourteen (14) basic sectors.⁴

The role of CSOs (mainly NGOs and People's Organizations) in the country's development was in part cemented legally through the Social Reform Agenda⁵ (SRA) of 1996, which "sets the framework and direction for the efforts of all sectors of Philippine Society to improve access to quality basic services, accelerate asset reform and sustainable development of productive resources and allow greater access to economic opportunities, and strengthen institution-building and participation in governance of Basic Sectors nationwide". This remains consistent with the country's declaration that the Philippines "is a democratic and republican State. Sovereignty resides in the people and all government authority emanates from them".⁶ NGO accreditation is practiced by National Government Agencies (NGAs) and Local Government Units (LGUs), particularly for those with program implementation at the local level. NGOs serve as a conduit between the NGAs, LGUs, and

community-based organizations (CBOs). CSOs affect both policy-making and program development in the country.

✱

3.2. Philippine Small-Scale Fisheries

Small-scale fisheries (SSF) in the Philippines refer mainly to *the municipal fisherfolks* sector "who are directly or indirectly engaged in municipal fishing and other related fishing activities".⁷ The domain of SSF in the country is defined by the municipal waters, which "include not only streams, lakes, inland bodies of water and tidal waters within the municipality which are not included within the protected areas as defined under Republic Act No. 7586 (The NIPAS Law), public forest, timber lands, forest reserves or fisheries reserves, but also marine waters included between two (2) lines drawn perpendicular to the general coastline from points where the boundary lines of the municipality touch the sea at low tide and a third line parallel with the general coastline including offshore islands and fifteen (15) kilometers from such coastline. Where two (2) municipalities are so situated on opposite shores that there is less than thirty (30) kilometers of marine waters between them, the third line shall be equally distant from opposite shore of the respective municipalities".⁸ Under current legislation, the SSF or municipal fishing operations in the Philippines is limited to "fishing vessels of three (3) gross tons or less, or fishing not

requiring the use of fishing vessels".⁹

The municipal waters being a jurisdiction of the municipal or city local government unit means that development of small-scale fisheries also hinges on LGUs. The local autonomy given to the LGUs under the Philippine Constitution of 1987 and the Local Government Code (LGC) of 1992 allows it to champion the development of SSF through its different offices and in partnership with key NGAs.

✱

3.3. Policy and Program Development

All laws in the Philippines emanates from its Constitution.¹⁰ State policies are instituted to "promote a just and dynamic social order that will ensure the prosperity and independence of the nation and free the people from poverty through policies that provide adequate social services, promote full employment, a rising standard of living, and an improved quality of life for all".¹¹ All policies and regulations, national and local, must remain consistent with the fundamental principles stated in the Constitution.

Policies on small-scale fisheries must be guided by and must recognize "the role of women in nation-building and shall ensure the fundamental equality before the law of

women and men"¹² and "the rights of indigenous cultural communities within the framework of national unity and development",¹³ within the context of protecting and advancing "the right of the people to a balanced and healthful ecology in accord with the rhythm and harmony of nature".¹⁴

Additionally, SSF development should "affirm labor as a primary social economic force... protect the rights of workers and promote their welfare"¹⁵ and "promote comprehensive rural development and agrarian reform".¹⁶ In the development and implementation of policies and programs, the State also "recognizes the indispensable role of the private sector, encourages private enterprise, and provides incentives to needed investments"¹⁷ and encourages "non-governmental, community-based, or sectoral organizations that promote the welfare of the nation".¹⁸ To support monitoring and guide policy and program implementation, the Constitution also puts emphasis on the vital role of communication and information.¹⁹

National policy development is primarily undertaken by the Legislative Department through the Senate and a House of Representatives.²⁰ On the other hand, implementation of policies and programs is primarily undertaken by the Executive Department under the President who has "control of all the executive departments,

4. Farmer-peasant, Artisanal fisherfolks, Workers in the formal sector and migrant workers, Workers in the informal sector, Indigenous peoples and cultural communities, Women, Differently-abled persons, Senior citizens, Victims of calamities and disasters, Youth and students, Children, Urban poor, Cooperatives, and Non-government organizations

5. Administrative Order No. 291, s. 1996. Office of the President of the Philippines. (1996). [Administrative Order Nos.: 201 – 300]. Manila: Malacañang Records Office.

6. Philippine Constitution of 1987, Article II, Section 1.

7. The Philippine Fisheries Code of 1998.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid.

10. Philippine Constitution (1987). CDAAsia.

11. Section 9, State Policies, Philippine Constitution, (1987).

12. Section 14, State Policies, Philippine Constitution, (1987).

13. Section 22, State Policies, Philippine Constitution, (1987).

14. Section 16, State Policies, Philippine Constitution, (1987).

15. Section 18, State Policies, Philippine Constitution, (1987).

16. Section 21, State Policies, Philippine Constitution, (1987).

17. Section 20, State Policies, Philippine Constitution, (1987).

18. Section 23, State Policies, Philippine Constitution, (1987).

19. Section 24, State Policies, Philippine Constitution, (1987).

20. Article VI, Section 1, Philippine Constitution, (1987).

bureaus, and offices”.²¹ Specific laws, policies and regulations, and programs are developed and proposed under each executive department, bureau, and offices under the Executive Department.

At the national level, the primary departments concerned with the SSF sector’s development objectives include the Department of Agriculture (DA) and its attached agencies—particularly the Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR)—for fisheries regulation and production development, the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) for the protection and conservation of the coastal and marine resources that overlaps with the jurisdiction of the LGUs, the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) for the regulation of both national and local fisheries trade, the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE) responsible for the protection and promotion of the welfare of workers in fisheries, the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) for social services provision to marginalized members of the fisheries sector, the Department of Science and Technology (DOST) for the development of technologies on post-harvest facilities, livelihood and enterprise activities through research and development, and the National Anti-Poverty Commission (NAPC) for promotion of participation of the basic sectors in policy-making and program development and interfacing with the different national government agencies with poverty-reduction programs.

To facilitate development of policies and programs that takes into consideration the

local situation and context, the Constitution also provides for the autonomy of local governments.²² The powers, duties and responsibilities, and resource allocations of Local Government Units (LGUs) are then defined under the Local Government Code of the 1992. The LGUs are given the local autonomy over the direction of development of its fisheries and those engaged by the sector through creation of local polices, programs and regulations consistent with national policies, regulation of the activities within the municipal fisheries industry, promotion of fisherfolks cooperatives and associations, development, and implementation of programs with preferential treatment given to marginalized fishers.

At the local level, participatory policy development is promoted through the establishment of municipal/city and barangay Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Management Councils (FARMCs).²³ The Fisheries Administrative Order (FAO) on Guidelines on the Creation and Implementation of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Management Council (FARMCs) institutionalizes the participation of fisherfolks through representation in the council as organized fishers in the preparation of the municipal fisheries development plan, preparation of recommendation on required ordinances and their implementation, and assistance in the enforcement of fisheries laws and regulation concerning the municipal waters.

✱

3.4. Fisheries Program Implementation

As the primary agency tasked with the development of the fisheries sector, the Department of Agriculture-Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (DA-BFAR) works with the Local Government Units (LGUs) to implement its programs and services for municipal fisherfolks.

Fisheries policy and program implementation under the BFAR are guided by the Philippine Fisheries Code of 1998 which guides the “utilization, management, development, conservation and protection of fisheries resources in order to provide the food needs of the population”²⁴ in the context of food security.

The Department of Agriculture (DA) consistently receives the 8th highest budget allocation.²⁵ For the year 2022, the proposed budget for the department was PHP103.5 Billion which is 2.1% of the proposed PHP5.024 Trillion national budget. Its 2021 General Appropriations Act²⁶ (GAA) was PHP71 Billion (1.6% of the PHP4.506 Trillion budget for the year). As an attached agency, the BFAR GAA for 2021 accounts for only PHP4.737 Billion which is 6.7% of the department’s budget.

- As its mandate, the BFAR is tasked under the Philippine Fisheries Code to institute policies and programs to advance:
- Conservation, protection and sustained management of the country’s fisheries and aquatic resources;

- Poverty alleviation and the provision of supplementary livelihood among municipal fisherfolks;
- Improvement of productivity of aquaculture within ecological limits;
- Optimal utilization of offshore and deep-sea resources; and
- Upgrading of post-harvest technology.²⁷

In its 2020 GAA for fiscal year of 2021, the BFAR’s main priorities are reflected in its budget allocations with the Fisheries Development Program (capture fisheries and aquaculture development) receiving PHP1.9 billion (40%) of its PHP4.736 billion budget. The Fisheries Regulatory and Law Enforcement Program accounted for 37.1% (PHP1.5 billion) of its agency budget.

The overall development of the fisheries industry is further guided by the Comprehensive National Fisheries Industry Development Plan (CNFIDP). Consistent with the structure of the DA-BFAR, municipal fisheries policy and programs are implemented through the Municipal Agriculture Office/Office of the Municipal Agriculture (MAO/OMA). The MAO is primarily tasked with both the local agriculture and fisheries sector development. Implementation of interventions are guided by its Municipal Fisheries Ordinance (MFO) and Municipal Fisheries Development Plan (MFDP). Each coastal municipality or municipalities with coastal barangays are expected to coordinate with their respective B/MFARMCs on development of policies and programs and in

21. Article VII, Section 17, Philippine Constitution, (1987).
22. Article X, Section 25, Philippine Constitution, (1987)
23. Fisheries Administrative Order No. 196, s. 2000. Guidelines on the Creation and Implementation of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Management Council (FARMCs)

24. Section 2a, Philippine Fisheries Code of 1998, Republic Act 8550
25. Out of 22 departments
26. Approved budget.
27. Section 2, Philippine Fisheries Code of 1998

their implementation.

The budget allocation of all LGUs comes from 40%²⁸ of the national internal revenue collection of the Bureau of Internal Revenue (BIR). The LGUs, under the local government code (LGC 1998), its corporate structure allows it to raise revenues through LGU enterprises and levy of taxes and fees in addition to its IRA. With 1,488 municipalities the budget allocation of LGUs from IRA averages to PHP158.9 (of the total IRA share of LGUs at PHP236.47) million in 2021. According to the Senate Report in IRA utilization among LGUs from 2009 to 2018 data, IRA and locally generated revenues were spent on “general public services (46%), social services (21%), and economic services (15%), with capital outlays lagging behind at roughly 12 percent”.²⁹ Compared to cities, municipalities are often very dependent on their share from IRA and accounts for 90% of the LGUs total budget.

There is currently no legislation that provides for the required or prescriptive budget allocation percentage for the local fisheries under the LGUs. Nonetheless, the LGC, Section 287 on Local Development Projects, mandates LGUs “appropriate in its annual budget no less than twenty percent (20%) of its annual internal revenue allotment for development projects”. This is commonly known as Local Development Fund (LDF) targeted for financing priority projects of LGUs reflected in its municipal development plans and activities included in their Annual Investment Programs (AIP). However, allocations under the LDF are still dependent

on the identified priority programs of the locality. If the local fisheries contributions are not recognized by the LGU, then minimal allocations are expected.

Additionally, Mandanas-Garcia Ruling of 2022 is expected to increase the share of LGUs from the IRA to approximately 27.61%.³⁰ This is particularly beneficial to coastal municipalities which mainly belongs to 2nd-4th income class. The additional budget allocation will further increase the power and highlights the role of LGUs in local fisheries development. However, this will still depend on whether the locality recognizes the contributions of the sector to its local economy.

✱

3.5. Monitoring and Evaluation Process

National agencies and local government units have internal monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems and dedicated sub-units. The M&E systems of departments follows from their respective projects, programs, and activities (PPA) defined within its mandate. At the LGU level, an M&E system is integrated within the work of the Municipal Planning and Development Office (MPDO) with the MAO—and other offices—serving as a support unit in data collection.

✱

3.6. Data Collection and Management

At the national level, the Philippine Statistic Authority (PSA) is the primary responsible agency in the “production of official statistics, general purpose statistics, civil registration services and inclusive identification system” as well as the conduct of “national censuses and surveys, sectoral statistics, community-based statistics, consolidation of selected administrative recording systems, and compilation of national accounts”.³¹ It is therefore the central statistical authority of the country for primary data collection. The databases of the PSA are accessible to the public through the OpenStat³² platform. These are however limited to selected aggregated data for which regular data collection are in place and for sectors that belong to the formal sector. This limits the data on SSF and its subsectors which are under the informal sector economy. Available data include demographic and social statistics (data on population and migration, labor and employment, and income and consumption), economic statistics (data on economic accounts, services, agriculture, forestry, fisheries, international and domestic trade, prices of monitored commodities, tourism, energy, mining, manufacturing and construction, and labor cost), and environment and multi-domain statistics (data on environment, child poverty, information society, sustainable development goals, and decent work). The available data on fisheries are limited to production data.

Each department also maintains their respective databases of their sector. Datasets relevant to SSF are maintained by five (5) key agencies. The Department of Agriculture

maintains the Registry System for Basic Sectors in Agriculture (RSBSA) which is only accessible to internal technical personnel. The Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources maintains the databases on Fisherfolks Registration (FishR) and Boat Registration (BoatR) which are only accessible to internal technical personnel. Its aggregated production data are accessible and are also reflected in the PSA database on fisheries. In addition to the two databases, the BFAR through its National Stock Assessment Program (NSAP) maintains sampled data on fish catch as part of the bureau documentation of landed seafoods in select areas—mainly fish ports. Access to the data is also limited to technical personnel within the BFAR. Data shared to the public are only summary of aggregated data for each province/region. The Department of Social Welfare and Development maintains the Listahanan or the National Household Targeting System covering poor households from all sectors. With the farmers and fishers consistently the two basic sectors with the highest poverty incidence, this database has significant overlap with both the RSBSA and FishR. Access to Listahanan is also limited due to the inherently personal information included in the database. There is currently no centralize registry system for these overlapping datasets. Moreover, monitoring of IUUF violations (and list of violators) is decentralized and are often housed within the provincial or regional offices of the BFAR. Cross referencing is often a major challenge for tracking repeat offenders. The Department of Environment and Natural Resources maintains data on land, coastal and marine resources. The available data in the department are often accessible upon request but are often too technical for

28. Supreme Court Ruling, Section 284 of Republic Act (RA) No. 7160 or the Local Government Code (LGC) of 1991.
29. Sicat et al. 2020a, 12-13 as cited by Senate Economic Planning Office (2022). IRA in 2022 At A Glance. SEPO. Available at: https://legacy.senate.gov.ph/publications/SEPO/AAG%20IRA%20in%202022_21March2022.pdf
30. DILG. (April 29,2022). DILG-NCR starts discussions on Mandanas-Garcia ruling implementation. Available at: <https://ncr.dilg.gov.ph/dilg-ncr-starts-discussions-on-mandanas-garcia-ruling-implementation/>

31. PSA Mandate according to Republic Act (RA) 10625, R.A. 11055, and R.A. 11315.
32. PSA OpenStat: <https://openstat.psa.gov.ph/>

utilization of SSF communities. Lastly, the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office maintains databases on disaster and climate. These are often in collaboration with other organizations working on disaster and climate change.

Local government units, particularly municipal LGUs, often do not have their own database management systems. Low-income class municipalities often do not have enough budget to support database management and hiring of information and technology (IT) personnel. LGUs mainly contributes to the data collection for the FishR and BoatR. Only select LGUs maintain catch documentation data.

Non-government organizations (NGOs) and community-based organizations (CBOs) generates and maintains their own datasets based on programs and projects different localities. These datasets are not often made public and used mainly for internal review and program development. With each NGO/ CBO engaged in separate initiatives and only rarely conducting partnership programs or projects with other organizations, datasets are highly compartmentalized.

* * *

4 / Results and Analysis

Document Review and Key Informants Interviews

4.1. Policies and Programs

The contents of the SSF Guidelines, and the MEL4SSF indicators are already reflected in many policies, programs documents, and social contract documents used as reference by responsible government agencies and SSF stakeholders.

Governance of Tenure (Chapter 5a)

Governance of tenure among SSF stakeholders is predicated on the recognition of the legal entity of the concerned subset of the population. Laws on the preferential and exclusive rights over the municipal waters and the coastal resources within the jurisdiction of the local government unit recognizes municipal fisherfolks as the primary rights holder. Philippine Fisheries Code of 1998 (RA 8550 amended by RA 10654) defined *fisherfolks* as “people directly or personally and physically engaged in taking and/or culturing and processing fisheries and/or aquatic resources” and *fishworkers* as “a person regularly or not regularly employed in commercial fishing and related industries, whose income is either in wage, profit-sharing or stratified sharing basis, including those working in fish pens, fish cages, fish corrals/traps, fishponds, prawn farms, sea farms, salt beds, fish ports, fishing boat or trawlers, or fish processing and/or packing plants” and excludes

administrators, security guards and overseers”. The state therefore provides them with preferential rights over access and utilization of the municipal waters and the coastal resources of the locality. The provisions under RA 8550 as amended by RA 10654 are also adopted at the local government unit level to harmonize local policies with national laws. The Municipal Fisheries Ordinance (MFO) is the localization of the Philippine Fisheries Code.

The municipal waters, as defined under the Philippine Fisheries Code, which covers up to fifteen (15) kilometers from the coastline are dedicated for the preferential use of municipal fisherfolks. Without additional provisions through issuance of ordinances, the municipal water is therefore reserve only for “fishing vessels of three (3) gross tons or less, or fishing not requiring the use of fishing vessels”. Moreover, the MFOs mandates the provision of docking areas and the coastal habitats for the benefit of municipal fisherfolks.

Additionally, for SSF communities engaged in or who would like to engage in aquaculture, RA

8550 also states that “FLAs [Fishpond Lease Agreement] shall be granted to any Filipino citizen *with preference, primarily to qualified fisherfolks cooperatives/associations [emphasis added]* as well as small and medium enterprises”.³³ Municipal fishers, should they choose to engage in aquaculture will be able to utilize designated areas for a period of twenty-five (25) years, and these can be renewed for another twenty-five (25) years.

According to *Katipunan ng mga Kilusan ng mga Artisanong Mangingisda sa Pilipinas* (KKAMPI), the national coalition of fisherfolks organized in February 2022, the SSF sector recognizes the need to *delineate the tenurial status of municipal waters*.³⁴ Under the agenda, the coalition continues to lobby the government to delineate the municipal waters to protect it against destructive commercial fishing and illegal, unregulated, and unreported fishing (IUUF). Additionally, the SSF coalition believes that the archipelagic principle should be the basis of the delineation of municipal waters with offshore islands to preserve the marine and coastal ecosystem and implementation the coastal use zoning. Lastly, encouraging registration of fishers under the fisherfolks registration and licensing system of LGUs will aid in the identification and development of interventions for SSF communities as rights-holders.

✱

Responsible Resource Management (Chapter 5b)

Participatory fisheries management is enshrined in the laws of the country. Although absolute ownership remains with the State, the natural resources of the country shall be

co-managed by the government and the sectors with claim over the resources. The participation of local SSF stakeholders, particularly fisherfolk organizations, is further defined under the amended law such that “the Department [DA], in consultation with the LGUs, local FARMCs and NFARMC, shall issue fisheries administrative orders or regulations for the conservation, preservation, management and sustainable development of fisheries and aquatic resources”³⁵.

To support the operationalization of this indicator, the amendment also mandates the establishment of a Fisheries Management Fund for monitoring, control and surveillance, litigation expenses, capacity building of National FAMC, Integrated FARMC and City/ Municipal/Barangay FARMC to aid in enforcement, upgrading of facilities and equipment, research and development, capacity building and deputization of enforcement agencies and volunteers, scholarship for fisherfolks families, livelihood programs, and establishment of shared facilities.

Section 2 of RA 8550, the State shall ensure the attainment of the following objectives of the fisheries sector:

- Conservation, protection and sustained management of the country’s fisheries and aquatic resources;
- Improvement of productivity of aquaculture within ecological limits;
- Optimal utilization of offshore and deep-sea resources.

The amendments to RA 8550 under RA 10654

included additional provisions to “prevent, deter, and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing”. In particular, the amendment to the Fisheries Code puts emphasis on strengthening of policies of the state to “ensure the rational and sustainable development, management and conservation of the fisheries and aquatic resources in Philippine waters including the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) and in the adjacent high seas, consistent with the primordial objective of maintaining a sound ecological balance, protecting and enhancing the quality of the environment”.³⁶

Under the Fisheries Resources and Law Enforcement Program of the DA-BFAR, allocations are provided for Monitoring Control and Surveillance initiatives, which focus on increasing capacity of the agency’s seaborne patrol and field operations, monitoring and surveillance of IUUF fishing hotspots, and maintenance of the report of the IUU Fishing index and threat assessment tool.

Moreover, under its Coastal Resource Management, the BFAR promotes partnerships with local SSF stakeholders through the Malinis at Masaganang Karagatan (MMK) to promote good practices in fisheries management, Balik Sigla sa Ilog at Lawa (BASIL) to revive critical river systems and lakes, environmental monitoring, establishment of Fisheries Management Areas (FMAs) with the aim of introducing an ecosystem-based approach to participatory fisheries management. The FMA is a co-management body with representation from different stakeholders, including but not limited to, Fisherfolk organizations through the FARMCs, LGUs, academia, private

organizations and NGOs.

Key fisheries policies and studies being pursued by the BFAR include: the Fisheries Administrative Order (FAO); Rules and Regulation on Coral Conservation; Protection, Propagation and Farming; FAO on the Guidelines for the Establishment of Municipal Catch Documentation and Traceability System for LGUs to Manage Fisheries Resources; and Good Aquaculture Practice (GAqP).

Another program being pursued to improve coastal and marine resource management is the Integrated Marine Environment Monitoring System (IMEMS), which aims to enhance effective monitoring and control of the national fisheries and the marine environment. Target activities include tracking and identification of oceanic, municipal, and artisanal vessels, monitoring of vessel ownership, monitoring vessel activities, status, fish catches & landings, automation of detection and enforcement concerning illegal activities, monitoring, and modelling of aquatic environment dynamics, enhancing effective policy & regulation development and enforcement, and compliance with international, regional, and local regulations on fisheries.

Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing (IUUF) remains a major source of distress among SSF communities. Accordingly, the Coastal Resource Center 2021 report revealed significant losses because of IUUF. The table below shows the estimates of the impact of IUUF in the municipal and commercial fisheries of the country.

✱

33. Section 45 Philippine Fisheries Code, Republic Act 8550
34. Agenda 1, KKAMPI (2022). 10-Point Philippine Blue Agenda.
35. Section 128, Philippine Fisheries Code, Republic Act 10654

36. Section 2, Philippine Fisheries Code, Republic Act 10654

National Estimates of Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing in the Philippines³⁷

Sector	Illegal	Unregistered	Unreported
Municipal	257,000-402,000 MT/ year Php24.1-37.8 billion	80,000-125,000 unregistered municipal fishing vessels	309,000-485,000 MT/ year Php29.0-45.6 billion
Commercial	259,000-364,000 MT/ year Php17.7-8 billion	1,600-2,700 unregistered or incorrectly registered commercial fishing vessels	274,000-422,000 MT/ year Php18.7-28.7 billion
Total	516,000-766,000 MT/ year Php41.8-62.6 billion	81,600-127,000 unregistered fishing vessels	583,000-907,000 MT/ year Php47.7-74.3 billion

Three of the priority agendas of the KKAMPI supports the SSF Guidelines on responsible resource management. Under agenda 3 on strengthening of fisherfolks management of the fishing ground,³⁸ the SSF advocates for the:

- Establishment of a Municipal Fisheries Office or similar instruments at each municipality to lead the implementation of the Municipal Fisheries Development Plan/Coastal Resources Management and improve the communication of BFAR Provincial and Regional Offices;
- Assessment of the FARMCs to determine its capacity and other needs to help them improve;
- Development of the capacity of the Bantay Dagat in paralegal, case documentation, evidence gathering/preservation, etc.;
- Establishment/Revival of the IFARMCs to

unite the plans and initiatives of neighboring municipalities;

- Strengthening and ensuring representation of FARMC in FMA Management Bodies (MBs);
- Creation of an effective mechanism for communication and coordination, ensure regular dialogues and feedbacking between and among M/C/IFARMCs, NFARMCs, DA-BFAR and FMA MBs; and
- Supporting the establishment of DOFAR (Department of Fisheries) to harmonize the laws and functions in fisheries management.
- Under agenda 4 on *ratification of monitoring, control, and surveillance mechanisms for fisheries*,³⁹ SSF community advocates for the:
- Implementation of catch documentation and traceability guidelines to ensure

seafood are caught legally and sustainably;

- Inclusion of the community fish landing centers (CFLCs) in the catch documentation and traceability system;
- Provision of access and developing the capacities of fishers on technologies that will aid in monitoring, control and surveillance like vessel monitoring mechanisms (VMM) and electronic catch documentation and traceability system (eCDTS); and
- Creation and implementation of work standards for the protection of children working or helping in fisheries production.

Under agenda 9 on *Protection from displacement due to coastal development (reclamation, seabed quarrying, offshore mining, etc.)*,⁴⁰ SSF communities advocate for the:

- Consultation with affected communities and provision of proper support;
- Taking into consideration the integrity of coastal and marine environments; and
- Prioritization of the development of coastal communities and marine natural resources.

✱

Social Development, Employment and Decent Work (Chapter 6)

Coastal SSF communities are often targets of resettlement programs. Resettlement is not only an issue of housing for SSF communities.

Their claim to the nearshore area through tenurial security over their housing extends to their claim to their fishing ground. However, coastal communities are also more vulnerable to extreme weather events and their houses are often located in what the government has deemed danger zones which are not fit for permanent human settlement. The Philippine Fisheries Code of 1998 mandates the Department of Agriculture to “establish and create fisherfolks settlement areas. To enhance the effective implementation of the provisions under Section 108 on Fisherfolks Settlement Area, House Bill 6876 entitled “An Act Mandating the Establishment of Fisherfolks Resettlement Areas by the Department of Agriculture, Department of Human Settlements and Urban Development, and the Local Government Units” was proposed.

The Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE) Department Order (DO) 156-16 is a landmark legislation promoting the welfare of fishworkers. The legislation covers the regulations and defines the relationship of SSF stakeholders in the commercial fishing operations and recognizes the rights of labour to “share in the fruits of production and right of the enterprise to reasonable returns on investment and to expansion and growth”.⁴¹ The DO 156-16 also protects the rights of fishworkers to form unions or form organizations to engage in collective bargaining. Moreover, the law also provides guidelines on the working conditions on board fishing vessels by ensuring that the vessels follow safety and health standards, provide safety and life-saving equipment. This should also include provision of social protection benefits to fishworkers who are under contract or with an employer-employee

37. Coastal Resources Center. (2021). Quantifying the Prevalence and Impact of Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing in the Philippines Workshop Report. USAID Fish Right Program. Narragansett, RI: Coastal Resources Center, Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island. 32 pp.
38. Agenda 3, KKAMPI 10-Point Philippine Blue Agenda
39. Agenda 4, , KKAMPI 10-Point Philippine Blue Agenda

40. Agenda 9, KKAMPI 10-Point Philippine Blue Agenda
41. Section 1, DO 156-16 s. 2016. Rules and Regulations Governing the Working and Living Conditions of Fishers on Board Fishing Vessels Engaged in Commercial Fishing Operation

relationship with the fishing vessel operator.

DO 156-16 was passed into law in 2016, its adoption is still in the early stages due to the resistance from the commercial fishing operators—particularly small and medium-scale commercial fishing operations—who cites that the full compliance will require more resources from the operators which they cannot yet afford.

The Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA), in compliance with the 2008 ILO Declaration on Social Justice for Fair Globalization, maintains the Decent Work Statistics (DeWS) to track 11 decent work indicators. The indicators include:

1. Economic and social context for decent work,
2. Employment opportunities,
3. Adequate earnings and productive work,
4. Decent hours,
5. Combining work family and personal life,
6. Work that should be abolished,
7. Stability and security for work,
8. Equal opportunity and treatment in employment,
9. Safe work environment,
10. Social security, and
11. Social dialogue, worker’s and employee’s representation.

The datasets available and accessible data include the fisheries sector for the period 1995 to 2018—with some data not available for certain periods.

The KKAMPi priority agenda 2 on providing social protection for fishers⁴² advocates for the:

- Improvement in the profiling of municipal fisherfolks to identify appropriate insurance

42. Agenda 2, KKAMPi 10-Point Philippine Blue Agenda

43. Section 2, RA 8550

assistance and allowances, especially for the Bantay Dagat [fish warden] (e.g., PhilHealth, hazard allowance, etc.),

- Ensuring safe fisherfolks settlement/housing program,
- Provision of free legal services to Bantay Dagat, and
- Expanding the conditional cash transfer program for families of fishers.

✱

Value Chains, Post-Harvest and Trade (Chapter 7)

Consistent with provisions supporting Chapter 5b of the SSF guidelines, RA 8550 specifies the pursuit of “poverty alleviation and the provision of supplementary livelihood among municipal fisherfolks” and “[u]pgrading of post-harvest technology”.⁴³ The DA-BFAR’s priorities on value chains, post-harvest and trade are reflected in their banner programs on:

1. Fisheries Development Program:

- a. Aquaculture Development projects include support on provision of fry sufficiency program, seaweed development programs.
- b. Capture Fisheries Development Program includes fabrication and distribution of reinforced plastic boats to support fisherfolks, lambaklad development, payao development

2. Post-Harvest Technology Development Program with the community fish landing

center (CFLC) development as its primary project.

3. Market Development: Seafood Kadiwa ni Ani at Kita on Wheels in coordination with barangay local government units to facilitate transport of fish commodities to the trading venues in the locality.

These are supplemented by policies and studies on fisheries development. Among the policies/studies of interest being pursued by the agency are its National Fisheries Extension Program, Formulation of Policy Regulation of Trader and Middlemen in the Domestic Fish Distribution, Upgrading of Technology Outreach Stations, Urban Aquaculture, Business Plan on the Intensive Polyculture of Milkfish with Mudcrab, National Broodstock Development Program, Good Aquaculture Practice (GAqP), and Establishment of seaweed nursery.

The BFAR, through its extension program also pursue technology demonstration and verification for aquaculture technologies like aquaponics. Its FishCORAL project aims to address key issues that contribute to the high incidence of poverty among fishers through sustainable management of coastal fisheries and implementation of community-based enterprises in 1,098 communities of target 11 bays/gulfs. The BFAR-SAAD program offers provision of support services for freshwater, brackish water, and marine water aquaculture livelihoods. Based on its latest report, a total of 4,873 individuals and 259 aquaculture groups engaged in aquaculture were assisted through the establishment of local hatcheries, fingerlings and feeds distribution, and establishment of fish cages.

Under the KKAMPi priority agenda 6 on strengthening the economy and sustainable

44. Agenda 6, KKAMPi, 10-point Philippine Blue Agenda

finance mechanisms for fisherfolks,⁴⁴ SSF communities advocate for the:

- Examination of the policy on importation;
- Provision of financial literacy and business management trainings for fishers and fisherfolks cooperatives;
- Reduction of post-harvest losses through provision of equipment in CFLCs like ice making machines, reefer vans, etc.;
- Provision of transportation support to products to reduce the influence of traders/consolidators with much higher margins than fishers;
- Strengthening of small to medium social enterprises through development of business models and provision of access to technologies like digital platforms for marketing of products;
- Allocation of funds for the Bantay Dagat, FARMCs at FMAs from the additional funding that LGUs will get from the implementation of the Mandanas Ruling;
- Development of the capacity of M/C/IFARMCs in planning and budgeting for Fisheries Development Plans;
- Provision of incentives for fishers engaged in sustainable and good fishing practices;
- Creation of inter-agency collaborations to increase the chances of fishers in accessing funds for fisheries development from multilateral agencies;
- Adoption of the Blue Financing Framework.

Gender Equality (Chapter 8)

The programs of the Bureau of Fisheries are largely gender blind/neutral. The BFAR Gender and Development (GAD) Unit, under the Office for Special Concerns, oversees the mainstreaming of GAD in all fisheries programs. Nonetheless, based on current and previous programs of the Bureau, there are no targeted interventions addressing the needs of SSF women. Programs targeted toward capture fisheries—which remains a male-dominated subsector—often fails to include women’s needs at the pre- and post-harvest chain. At the implementation level, participants in skills development programs are mainly women. This is primarily due to the relative availability of women (particularly those married to fishermen) who are engaged in activities in the nearshore area.

Representation at the National Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Management Council (NFARMC) does not provide specific guidelines on women’s representation. Although there are women representatives within the NFARMC, it is more a product of the leadership of the organizations represented in the council. The same applies to representation at the Municipal FARMCs.

Republic Act 9710, the Magna Carta of Women (MCW) landmark legislation for the protection and promotion of welfare of women. The agency of the government responsible in leading the implementation of MCW is the Philippine Commission on Women (PCW). The PCW is mandated to “[i]nstitute the gender responsiveness of national development plans and coordinate the preparation, assessment and updating of the National Plan for Women, ensure its implementation and monitor the

performance of government agencies in the implementation of the Plan at all levels, [u]ndertake continuing advocacy to promote economic, social and political empowerment of women and provide technical assistance in the setting-up and strengthening of mechanisms on gender mainstreaming, and [e]nsure that the gains achieved by Filipino women due to Philippine culture and tradition shall be preserved and enhanced in the process of modernization”.⁴⁵ The Harmonized GAD Guidelines developed by the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA), Philippine Commission on Women (PCW), and the Official Development Assistance Gender and Development Network (ODA-GAD Network) serves as the reference material for mainstreaming of GAD framework in program implementation, and monitoring and evaluation.

According to the PCW, women in rural areas and those that form part of the Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (AFF) sector—where the highest poverty incidence among the basis sectors—face *multiple economic vulnerabilities* due to their lower earnings and irregular employment engagements. SSF women also face multiple burdens arising from their traditional roles in caring for their families as part of their reproductive and productive work. As value chain actors, SSF women, who when responsible for pre- and post-harvest activities, must contend with multiple unmet strategic needs on responding to high production/input costs, low farm-gate prices, persistent household debt, natural risks, and movement restriction (particularly among households with small children and women with no stable source of income). Lastly, existing multiple social barriers that limit the opportunities for women to access financial services and programs which require

ownership of resources (e.g., land for collateral or fishing boats for production). Under the National Anti-Poverty Commission (NAPC) Basic Sector, the Women Council interfaces with the different agencies to promote the development of policies and programs for women. Although a separate council for Artisanal Fisherfolks exist, the advocacies for SSF women are subsumed under the overall policy and program development interest of the sector.

Strengthen the capacity of fisherfolk women in fisheries and household management.

- Support the establishment of women-managed areas.
- Encourage registration of fisherfolk women under the fisherfolks registration system of LGUs.
- Ensure representation of women in FARMCs and local and national councils.

- Ensure safe workplace for fisherfolk women in formal and informal economies.
- Equitable and just compensation for women engaged in fisheries and aquaculture value chains.

✱

Disaster and Climate Change (Chapter 9)

Current programs on disaster and climate change for SSF communities are limited to the local Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) which mainly focuses on emergency response and evacuation of residents located in danger zones. Although each LGU is mandated to create and implement their respective Local Climate Change Action Plan (LCCAP), the majority of coastal LGUs also do not have the necessary resources to develop resilient SSF communities on their own.

Typhoon Name	Year	Total Cost of Damage in the Agriculture Sector (PHP)	Total Cost of Damage in Fisheries Sector (PHP)
TY Odette	2022	11.1 B	3.0 B
TY Vicky	2020	111.01	163,000
TY Ulysses	2020	6.72 B	1.36 B (20%)
Super TY Rolly	2020	5.79 B	341.32 M
TY Quinta	2020	2.66 B	82.82 M
TY Ursula	2019	3.05 B	2.17 B (78%)
TY Tisoy	2019	3.70 B	2.18 M
TY Rosita	2018	2.89 B	79.88 M
TY Ompong	2018	26.77 B	2.35 M
STY Lawin	2016	10.2 B	85.8 M

45. Mandates and Functions, Philippine Commission on Women (PCW). <https://pcw.gov.ph/mission-and-vision/>

46. Report from KKAMPi Presentation on SSF Context and the 10-point Philippine Agenda and updated based on the DA-DRRM Operations Center 2022 report.

SSF communities are highly vulnerable to extreme weather events. The Department of Agriculture’s DRRM Operations Center reported a total of PHP7.12 billion in damages to the fisheries sector from 2016 to 2022.⁴⁶

The *Katipunan ng mga Kilusan ng mga Artisanong Mangangisda sa Pilipinas* (KKAMPI), a national coalition of fisherfolks organized in February 2022, laid out its 10-Point Philippine Blue Agenda to include:

Strengthening climate and disaster resilience of communities in island and coastal municipalities by:

- Including climate and disaster resilience, especially ecosystem-based adaptation, in policies and programs on fisheries and aquaculture;
- Conducting climate change vulnerability assessments (CCVAs) to provide recommendations for the CNFIDP and adaptation plans for FMAs and coastal LGUs;
- Implementing resource enhancement programs and nature-based solutions like establishment of coastal greenbelts to provide protection from storm surges and strong typhoons;
- Monitoring the effects of climate change to the sea (e.g., rise of sea temperature, rise in seawater level, etc.);
- Providing climate services like early warning systems during typhoons, storms surges, harmful algal, etc., to fishers;
- Discovering climate-resilient livelihoods for fishers through research and development;
- Reducing carbon footprint of supply chains through improvement of local fish

distribution system;

- Providing access to renewable energy technologies to communities in coastal and small island ecosystems;
- Creating and implementing credit assistance programs and risk transfer mechanisms like indemnity and parametric insurance for fishers.
- Responding to the effects of COVID-19 pandemic in the fisheries by:
- Implementing strategies to address supply chain barriers caused by the pandemic (e.g., improvements in post-harvest facilities and online marketing for selling of products).
- Addressing the marine plastic pollution program through:
- A national policy banning single use plastic
- Providing incentives to local government units implementing good solid waste management
- Evaluating the performance of factories, especially those situated near rivers, lakes, and the sea, and shutdown operations that contribute to pollution.

* * *

4.2. Key informant interviews

Key informant interviews uncovered priority issues and targets of SSF stakeholders as rights-holders and government agencies as duty bearers.

Considering the observed lack of knowledge of key SSF stakeholders—municipal fishers, fisherfolk councils, and local government units—on the SSF Guidelines, exploration of the key thematic themes was favoured over the exploration of the specifics of the MEL4SSF progress indicators. To properly introduce and explore the 295 combined progress indicators, further discussions and workshops are preferred by the respondents.

Based on the short discussions, the respondents showed interest and expressed recognition of the value of both the results and progress indicators. However, there is also a consensus among the respondents on the disadvantages of the comprehensiveness of the progress indicators for would-be users of the Handbook who are not already versed in monitoring and evaluation process.

Governance of Tenure (Chapter 5a)

Governance of tenure issues and target indicators are considered top priority of the Mindanao Fisherfolk Representative and chairperson of KKAMPI—the national coalition of small-scale fisherfolk organization, the Community-based aquaculture manager of Macalelon Quezon, and the Municipal Agriculture Officer of Agdangan.

SSF Community:

According to SSF organization leaders, the formalization of claims of municipal fisherfolks should be at the top priority of the government. The formalization also includes ratification of the definition of “katubigan” [municipal waters] to include both inland and marine water resources and designate these areas as preferential SSF aquaculture areas. At present, municipal fishers are only expected to engage in capture fishing. However, the need to reduce pressure on their fishing

ground and the rise of aquaculture opportunities in some areas also opened the possibility for community-owned and operated aquaculture. Although the law mandates that the municipal coastal areas designated for aquaculture should first be offered to municipal fisherfolks, majority of the fishponds—including foreshore leases for resorts developments—are under private operators. Currently, on abandoned fishponds are being offered back to municipal fishers. However, lack of capital hinders development of these areas by SSF communities.

As part of the claim-making process, the institutionalization of mechanisms for the protection of the preferential rights of SSF to the municipal waters and nearshore resources should be combined with proper support on development of these resources. Without these supports, SSF communities cannot fully realize their claims and the security of tenure embedded in both local and national



Tenure in SSF communities extends from the coastlines to the municipal waters.

communities is hindered by the encroachment of tourism industry development in nearshore areas and resources. Combating encroachment is a common sentiment for SSF stakeholders who faces challenges to their claims to both the marine and nearshore resources in their municipality.

Within capture fisheries, the exemption of SSF particularly subsistence fishing from the establishment of close season must be clarified. The provision of subsidy during close season or off season (typhoon season) will also serve as a form of protection of fisher's tenurial rights. Consistent with the above, SSF communities' ability to maximize access and utilization of recognized tenure hinges on their

legislation.

A key strategy proposed by the SSF community includes the promotion and establishment of Women Managed Areas (WMA) to protect coastal resources primarily accessed by women and other members of SSF communities. As members of the community, women's activities are largely in nearshore areas—i.e., seagrass and mangrove areas—where both subsistence and livelihood shell-gleaning, as well as resource management happens.

The utilization of nearshore areas by SSF

economic situation. Municipal fisherfolks largely depend on daily income from fishing. Consecutive losses due to bad weather condition often forces fishers to take breaks from fishing. And, with weak enforcement fishers have to the one to go out at sea and protect their fishing ground from encroachment of illegal fishing operations.

According, SSF stakeholders aware of the new Mandanas-Garcia Ruling as a legislation to further empower and enforce the devolved powers to the LGUs will provide a more effective environment for pursuing their tenurial rights. The ruling is expected

increases the funding of LGUs and therefore their capacity to provide technical and financial support to their respective SSF communities.

Fisherfolk Council

The primary concern of the Municipal Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Management Councils, as a key partner of LGUs in fisheries development, in the pilot sites revolves around the enforcement of the laws on municipal waters to protect the rights of SSF communities to the municipal waters. In line with this objective, the councils are working closely with their respective LGUs and with national NGOs on the promotion of support and deputization of Bantay Dagat (fish wardens) from the rank of municipal fisherfolks.

Local Government Units

Although coastal LGUs have very limited resources, the localities are cognizant of the need for recognition of the rights of municipal fisherfolks to the municipal water particularly in terms of access and utilization of its resources. To support this objective, the LGUs prioritizes enforcement of legislation protecting the rights of fishers to the municipal waters and nearshore areas.

This also include recognition of the need to protect coastal areas from conversion into resorts/privatization for tourism development. However, the lack of capital SSF communities often forces them to sell their land to wealthy tourist or private resort operators. To reduce its impact on SSF, LGUs are engaging in the development of infrastructure and allocation of spaces for docking of boats. The Community Fish Landing Centers (CFLCs) form part of this strategy.

Additionally, the LGUs believe that allocation of areas for fisherfolks settlement which are strategic and supports continuity of livelihoods of SSF community members is a needed. However, clear allocation of resources under the Mandanas-Garcia Ruling for agriculture and fisheries sector do not include provisions for minimum allocation similar to Gender and Development (GAD) budget allocation.⁴⁷ Although the Municipal Agriculture Officers of Mulanay and Agdangan recognized the opportunities under the new ruling, there is no security that their units and the sector they are serving will automatically receive the increase share in resources. Current policies need to be reformed to align them with the new ruling. Similarly, the recognition of the importance and contributions of their local fisheries depends on local chief executives and changes in leadership can often upset the continuity of supports given to SSF communities.

Local Non-Government Organizations

Non-government organizations (NGOs) working directly with SSF communities puts emphasis on the implementation of laws and regulations on municipal waters to address both gear-use conflict between and among SSF stakeholders and encroachment of illegal commercial fishing operations through legislation and enforcement of zonation and delineation of the municipal waters.

Consistent with the local community concerns, local NGOs are also working towards addressing increasing privatization of coastal areas. However, with their limited resources the is a need for expansion of support for NGOs as community facilitators and conduits for resources to SSF communities. Local NGOs are in a strategic position to protect and promote the rights of

47. Mandated by law to account for 5% of the locality's budget.

fishers. This is primarily due to their established partnership with both the local government unit and the SSF community.

Government Agency

The National Anti-Poverty Commission, as the agency of the government tasked with tracking and consolidating poverty initiatives for the 14 basic sectors, is constantly pushing for the facilitation of policymaking based on the experience of the SSF community to address weak implementation of existing laws. Its mandate also places it in a strategic position to convene the Technical Working Groups participated by key agencies with interventions to the SSF outside of the BFAR. Considering that the SSF concerns on tenure is often outside the domain of the BFAR, other agencies like the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) need to be coordinated particularly in matters concerning fisherfolks settlement in nearshore areas—which fall within the jurisdiction of the DENR. However, the practice of “turfig” where each agency of the government makes explicit the boundaries of what they can do based on mandate limits coordination and cooperation among key agencies.

Although there is a recognition on the role of SSF communities in fisheries management, there is a need to reduce the dependence of the government to the Bantay Dagat (fish warden) in the enforcement of regulation and protection of the rights of fishers. Enforcement is the primary function of the government. This includes the adoption of a more proactive approach in the implementation of existing laws on fisherfolks’ preferential rights to their fishing grounds.

According to the observations of the agency, information and education on fishers’ rights and available venues for participation are not

often accessed due to lack of knowledge. There is a need to make the programs of the BFAR and other agencies more visible and accessible to SSF communities.

Responsible Resource Management (Chapter 5b)

Participatory resource management is a top priority for the Visayas Fisherfolk representative, the Municipal Agriculture Officer of Mulanay, MFARMC Chair of Macalelon, and two community-based aquaculture managers (Macalelon and Agdangan), 2 local non-government organizations representatives to the fisheries management area body. Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing (IUUF) and resource degradation serve as common critical issues for SSF communities.

SSF Community

Securing tenurial rights for SSF communities goes beyond legislation. Municipal fisherfolks are generally aware of their rights over the municipal waters. Combatting IUUF, particularly the intrusion of commercial fishing operations inside the municipal waters remains a major issue in the pilot municipalities and neighbouring localities. Enhanced enforcement of IUUF regulations and increase awareness of local communities on policies and laws will allow fishers to focus on resource management and capture the benefits from sustainable management of their municipal waters. Among the mechanisms that SSF communities want to push for include the adoption of Vessel Monitoring Measures (VMM) to track commercial fishing operations within the municipal waters dedicated to SSF communities.

Inclusion of the SSF representatives in the National Task Force on IUUF. The Task Force is

currently only comprised of the DA, Department of Justice, and Senate Committee on Agriculture. Similarly, inclusion of the SSF representatives in the BFAR Adjudication Board will allow coordination of anti-IUUF initiatives of fisherfolk organizations in different municipalities. Due to the relative compartmentalization of initiatives, tracking repeat offenders is a major problem in monitoring of violators. Moreover, SSF organizations advocates establishment of policies and financial measures supporting the functions of the Municipal FARMCs and provision of the legal assistance to Bantay Dagat (community fish wardens) volunteers.

At the municipal level, allocation for dedicated Fisheries Officers under the Municipal Agriculture Office (MAO) of the LGUs will better facilitate the coordination of activities and interventions for SSF. Similarly, there is a need to insulate Municipal FARMCs from political appointments. Election transition impacts on continuity of CSO and SSF representations in the FARMCs as well as increasing representation at Agriculture and Fisheries Council⁴⁸ to separate representation for fishers and farmers allow the councils to perform their function more effectively. Adoption of holistic approach in the



SSF community-operated mangrove forest park

implementation of laws defining fisherfolks as those in pre- to post-harvest fisheries sector will also broaden the scope of SSF stakeholders who should be represented in the councils. Adoption of tripartite approach, LGU-FFO-NGO partnership, will facilitate the consolidation of initiatives towards SSF development.

At the provincial and regional level, the establishment and operationalization of the FMAs following proper local consultation and

48. A sectoral council under the DA-Philippine Council for Agriculture and Fisheries (PCAF).

representations from fisherfolks (SSF organizations and FARMCs) will allow the SSF to address issues that transcends the boundaries of the municipal waters. In combination with organizing of a national coalition of SSF organizations to participate in decision-making and program development for SSF communities, inclusion of the 14 Basic Sectors in the Regional Development Councils (RDCs)—which currently only includes the private sector representatives—and coordination with NEDA, DILG, and LGUs will ensure convergence of initiatives.

SSF organizations are also cognizant of the need to address overfishing due to increase pressure on the fishing grounds. This includes the reduction of highly efficient gears to lower the pressure on the already declining stocks and the fishing grounds. Provision of support to SSF to engage in aquaculture to reduce pressure on fishing grounds by adopting a convergence approach through partnership and coordination between and among the CDA, DOLE, DSWD, and DOST. Similarly, compensation for SSF-initiated resource management activities (e.g., coastal clean-ups, mangrove reforestation/rehabilitation) can be done through direct partnership with the DSWD.

Moreover, organizing of SSFs into cooperatives need to be promoted among SSF communities. This should be followed by capacity building on accessing and generating their own financial resources, particularly for organizations engaged in environmental protection and conservation. Mangrove rehabilitation through partnership between SSF organizations and non-government organizations will improve the capacity of SSF community to access resources to support their resource management activities. This can also be extended to plastic pollution affecting mangroves and habitat protection and rehabilitation in partnership with LGUs.

Fisherfolk Council

Combatting IUUF is a consistent advocacy among MFARMCs. In particular, prevention of encroachment of commercial fishing operations and destructive fishing, as well as protection and conservation of critical fish species is a common policy and program development direction for the councils.

Although the LGU coordinates with MFARMCs and SSF organizations as beneficiaries of its projects, conduct of regular consultation is a critical step in ensuring that LGUs recognize the councils are partners in fisheries development.

Local Government Units

The pilot LGUs are one with the SSF communities in its fight against encroachment of illegal commercial fishing operations from other municipalities. The LGUs are therefore pushing for increase budget allocation for local law enforcement to, at minimum, increase the visibility of law enforcement at sea. This will help in strengthening of enforcement against illegal and destructive fishing operations in each municipality.

Implementation of the Fisheries Development Plan (FDP) of the locality focusing on coastal resource management, ordinance enhancement in coordination with the Sangguniang Bayan (legislative branch of the LGU), enforcement of IUUF laws and regulations through deputization of fish wardens (Bantay Dagat) with training and honorarium support are the forms part of the strategy adopted by each LGU. The LGU also recognizes the role of SSF communities through provision of support to fishers as fish wardens through assistance from BFAR and the local PNP.

Engagement of the SSF community through the Municipal FARMCs in policymaking and project implementation allows the LGUs is

also expected to ensure that programs match the need of fishers. Moreover, LGUs form partnership with SSF organizations to promote Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) management through provision of funding, initiatives for improvement in stocks, equipment and training.

Local Non-Government Organizations

Local NGOs are constantly working on strengthening partner SSF communities to increase participation in management and decision-making bodies. This is done through organizing of SSF stakeholders to increase their bargaining power. This also extends to strengthening of the Municipal FARMCs as key players in data collection and monitoring, community representation, and policymaking. Local NGOs are also engaged in lobbying for increased financial and capacity building support for Municipal FARMCs and fisherfolk organizations from their respective LGUs and BFAR. This will allow SSF communities to activate engage in fisheries management and promotion of Marine Protected Areas as a key strategy in improving the local stocks.

Adoption of a more dialogue-driven implementation of IUUF regulation in combination with the formation and strengthening of Task Force on IUUF will allow facilitate a more constructive engagement of the private sector. By providing venues for multi-stakeholder discussions on addressing IUUF issues, other industry stakeholders will be given an opportunity to share the responsibility on fisheries management. Operationalization of the Fisheries Management Areas (FMAs) as a regional venue for stakeholders in fisheries is a step in the right direction. However, local NGOs recognizes that the implementation of fisheries management initiative still falls under each LGUs. It is therefore important to capacitate coastal LGUs.

Government Agency

The NAPC, through the Human Development Poverty Reduction Cluster, recognizes the need to redefine the treatment of SSF communities from beneficiaries to partners in fisheries development. Inclusion of the SSF communities in the process of designing interventions, monitoring, evaluation, and learning will enhance their participation in identifying issues on tenurial rights and how to manage them responsibly. This can be done by promoting government-supported platforms for participation, i.e., FARMCs. Moreover, programs at the local level are more contextualized and should be the basis for designing of interventions.

* * *

Social Development, Employment and Decent Work (Chapter 6)

Discussion on social development, employment and decent work were primarily focused on fisherfolks settlement. With fishworkers on board fishing vessel largely disorganized, representation of the subsector remains limited. Similarly, municipal fisherfolks engagement in aquaculture—outside of seaweed farming—as producers is a relatively new trend. Privately operated fishponds do hire SSF community members but are also not often organized. For the selected pilot sites, no data was collected on fishpond workers due to the combination of scheduling conflict and time and resource constraint. Nonetheless, the fisherfolks leaders interviewed believes that their advocacies are inclusive of the issues and needs of fishworkers who belong to SSF communities.



Community-led oyster aquaculture production employing SSF households

SSF Community

SSF communities recognize the vulnerability of their areas to disaster and climate change impacts and are often willing to relocate provided that government settlement projects are designed with not as housing but as a complete intervention guided by the Resettlement Act for SSF. This requires coordinated actions among the key agencies of the government, namely the National Housing Authority (NHA), National Electrification Administration (NEA), Local Water Utilities Administration (LWUA), Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG)-Local Government Units (LGUs), Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), and the BFAR to ensure

provision of the basic services including but not limited to: access to their market, utilities, transportation, livelihoods and other basic needs. At present, many of the settlement projects are not being supported by SSF communities due to lack of access to basic utilities and social services. The resettlement sites are often too far from the coastal area where the livelihoods of SSF communities are located.

In addition to settlement programs beyond housing projects, improvement in social safety net for SSF communities and strengthening of implementation of existing social protection services being accessed by fisherfolks households (e.g., PhilHealth—which is implemented at the local

government unit level) will increase their household’s resiliency. At present, SSF organizations are engaged in community-based social safety net development (e.g., community-based savings and loan associations) as an additional layer of protection for members during economic shocks.

Although not yet applicable to SSF fishing operations and not yet adopted by small and medium commercial fishing operations, SSF organizations are pushing for the implementation of the DO 196-16 with focus on just compensation and protection of the rights and welfare of fishworkers on board commercial fishing vessels.

Fisherfolk Council

Although recognized as a possible extension of the council’s work, there are currently no targeted activities or policy development initiatives on social protection, employment and decent work within the pilot municipalities.

Local Government Units

LGUs are currently pushing for the provision of insurance coverage (boat and life) through partnership development with the Philippine Crop Insurance Corporation (PCIC) to develop insurance for SSF communities. At present, there is a need to amend existing LGU policies which does not support or allow provision of insurance support for SSF.

LGUs are also pursuing partnerships with local NGOs in community organizing to facilitate accessing of LGU services and provision of programs for SSF organizations and facilitation of access to loan services through micro-financing institutions.

Local Non-Government Organizations

Local NGOs mainly advocates for security of SSF settlement areas and through their projects which integrate development community-based savings and loan programs, some members of SSF communities are able to access these services as a form of social safety net.

Connecting partner SSF organizations with social protection providers and increasing awareness on how to access them requires the support of NGOs and LGUs. At present, social protection programs are limited for the SSF sector. Insurance schemes to support SSF production need to be developed.

Government Agency

Development of policies based on issues faced by SSF communities will better inform social protection programs. Current programs

must be redesigned based on the current vulnerabilities of SSF communities to disaster and economic shocks. Social development programs must also be designed within the context of value chains and trade protection for SSF communities. Additionally, there is a need to redefine settlement programs from being compliance-driven to human-rights driven programs that respects the dignity of people in SSF.

At present, implementation of policies on decent work for SSF fishworkers remains ineffective. This calls for a shift from a reactive response to employment and decent work challenges of fishworkers to a more proactive response by recognizing these needs as part of their rights.

Value Chains, Post-Harvest and Trade (Chapter 7)

Four (4) of the Fisherfolks Organization representatives interviewed consider livelihood and enterprise development a top priority for SSF communities. Support on value chains, post-harvest and trade development need to be integrated and convergence of different government programs will ensure that the interventions gain traction and are sustained over time.

SSF Community

Based on the experience of SSF organizations on livelihood and value chains interventions, conduct of social preparation facilitate consultative mechanisms for government programs. Full registration of fisherfolks will also improve targeting of beneficiaries. Access to post-harvest facilities and recognition of women as partner of MAO in program development and project implementation can

serve as a key strategy in ensuring support from the community. Additionally, this must include provision of logistics support for SSF to level the playing field between fishers and their institutional buyers. Capacity building must also be supported by provision of necessary resources and utilization of information technology in price monitoring and climate data monitoring affecting SSF communities.

Food Security must be promoted through improvements in local food production and reduction of dependence on external markets through importation. If importations are to continue, programs must be put in place to reduce the impact of imported seafood (fresh/frozen) on local SSF enterprises, particularly those that are still in the start-up stage. With imported seafood often cheaper than locally produced seafood, SSF communities cannot compete when they enter the local wet markets. Mechanisms to protect SSF products from the impacts of government-led importing of seafood product must be instituted. At present, the DA only requires issuance of “Certificate of Necessity” without the need for approval from the sector. Introduction of limitation on the utilization of imported seafood products to restaurant, manufacturing plants and other food establishments will help limit its impact on local wet markets.

It is also crucial to design and develop appropriate technologies with proper support in capacity building, materials procurement and technical guidance on aquaculture projects of the government. This may include development of livelihood and enterprises on seaweed and shell farming, high-value seafood aquaculture, value addition/seafood processing, and collective marketing. SSF organizations need access to technologies on climate change adaptation that are adapted to the context SSF communities towards

increase resiliency. Through program development and allocation of investment in post-harvest infrastructures, critical support to women will provide households with greater opportunity to diversify or find alternative income sources. Partnership with the locality in provision of utilities to support start-up livelihoods/enterprises will allow SSF organizations to compete in its early stages. Access to aquaculture technology adapted to community-based operations need to be promoted.

In order to consolidate livelihoods and support scaling up of enterprises, there is a need to redesign the framework for cooperative development for the SSF sector. Currently, the cooperative framework is more adapted to farmers. Within this context, promotion of partnerships with LGU, NGOs, Private Sector, BFAR, the National Fisheries Research and Development Institute (NFRDI) and DOST in SSF community-based enterprise development will ensure support at all levels. Similarly, increasing public awareness on key policies affecting the entire economy to get support from other sectors.

Fisherfolk Council

SSF councils are continuously pushing for the inclusion of the fisherfolk organizations in the primary programs and projects, particularly on alternative livelihoods, of the locality and key government agencies working in fisheries. With the increasing uncertainty of income from capture fishing, there is a need to develop alternative livelihoods (e.g., oyster aquaculture) and support on technology identification, technical support in materials preparation/procurement, and matching of resources to the actual needs and situation of each locality.

In order to reduce the uncertainty and reduce losses from fishing, LGUs need to address gear-use conflict among SSF stakeholders and



Unsold fresh catch is processed into dried fish to recover a fraction of the fishing costs

protection of spaces for livelihood through the implementation of zonation.

Local Government Units

LGUs plans to increase investments on post-harvest infrastructure development for SSF communities. Critical infrastructures can provide protection for fishers during peak season when the volume exceeds the capacity of the fishers to market seafood products resulting in reduction in price beyond expected margins. This can be done through provision of LGU assistance in accessing funds for SSF organizations through utilization of identified SSF beneficiaries under the FishR, BoatR and RSBSA.

However, LGUs can only affect local policies and is limited in regulating trade. Therefore, the establishment of price monitoring for seafood products through the DTI will allow fishers to manage their margins. At present, other commodities allows regulation of floor and ceiling prices (e.g., chicken and pork)

under certain context.

Local Non-Government Organizations

Local NGOs are developing and implementing programs to address the continuing reduction of catch and income due to increasing high input costs. Increasing access of SSF organizations to low-interest financing services will allow consolidation of livelihood/enterprises and give them a match better position in bargaining for the price of their product. At present, support is very limited and often lack scale to make an impact

at the community level. Start-up community-based enterprises often lacks resources to move their products and find the right buyer.

For enterprise projects in partnership with government agencies, local NGO experience revealed the need to improve government procurement process to properly match the fisher’s needs and technology requirements of each project. To ensure sustainability and continuity of operations, institutionalization of follow up activities in terms of evaluation and learning from project implementation can be done in partnership with SSF communities.

Government Agency

Current programs on value chains, post-harvest and trade are being implemented in silos. Convergence of government agencies and their programs on enterprise development initiatives are often not linked with programs on shared facilities for production that multiple government agencies are already implementing. This will

also allow organizing of SSF for large scale production and increase marketability.

Development of post-harvest facilities will address seasonality in income and production. By introducing value-adding activities, continuity of income among SSF household can be secured. These, however, need to be complemented by development of market linkages particularly for SSF organizations engaged in production and processing of seafood products.

In conjunction with targets under Chapter 5a, investment on the protection and development of local SSF assets, production support, post-harvest support and market linkages will increase the sustainability of livelihoods and enterprises of SSF organizations.

Gender Equality (Chapter 8)

SSF Community

Adoption and implementation of the Magna Carta of Women and Magna Carta of the Poor will better guide the development of SSF sector. Through improvement in registration system, discrimination against women in fisheries can be reduced. However, interventions must take into consideration the cultural, religious, and geographic context in promoting equality. Government agencies must promote ‘equality of opportunity’ by establishing incentive structures to promote women participation and representation in government and as focal persons for the GAD units.

Considering the women in SSF communities do not have access to personal income, the

Women engaged in oyster aquaculture post-harvest



introduction or increase of representation allowance will allow women to participate both local and regional fisheries management. This must be complemented by enhanced organizing of women's associations to establish the base for participation and representation (i.e., organizing of cooperatives, associations, and women committees under organizations to promote the welfare and rights of women).

Introduction of targeted capacity development and training on leadership and project implementation will allow women to work as equal partners in fisheries development. With fewer women's organization compared to largely male-dominated fisherfolks associations, there is a need for institutionalization of mechanisms to ensure at least 40% women representation in key fisheries decision-making bodies.

Similarly, increase in LGU GAD budget (currently at 5%) and improve monitoring of utilization of the allocations will be supported by the Mandanas-Garcia Ruling. To increase women's bargaining power, allocation of budget for establishment of Women Managed Areas is crucial. By designing interventions addressing the needs of households—which overlap with the known burden of women in SSF communities—and development technologies for women in SSF can be done through partnerships with the BFAR and DOST.

Fisherfolk Council

No priorities mentioned during the discussions with the MFARM representatives.

Local Government Units

LGUs are working towards promotion of women-led organizing and supporting existing initiatives of women groups in the locality (e.g., KALIPI, Rural Improvement Club) in partnership with the Municipal Social

Welfare and Development Office (MSWDO). At present, utilization of the 5% GAD budget remains limited and are often not dedicated towards supporting women in SSF.

Pilot LGUs are actively promoting the participation and employment of women in LGUs to better guide the development of programs and interventions for women in SSF.

Local Non-Government Organizations

Local NGOs has recently adopted community organizing explicitly promoting equal opportunity to participate in resource management, livelihood and enterprise development, and policy-making. In order to promote effective implementation of programs and interventions, there is a need to mainstream gender equality indicators and include gender and development as priority concern among LGUs. Although the GAD Office exist in most LGUs, they do not often have programs for SSF communities.

Government Agencies

The NAPC, through its basic sector representative council, recognizes the role of women in post-production. SSF communities will benefit more from promotion of women-led or women-managed pre- and post-harvest facilities.

Disaster and Climate Change (Chapter 9)

Disaster and climate change is recognized by national fisherfolk representative and NAPC Basic Sector Vice Chair, as well as by government representative as a time-critical indicator. Without proper support programs on disaster and climate change, progress made through other interventions can be easily set back by typhoons or disasters similar to the Covid-19 pandemic.



Women engaged in oyster aquaculture post-harvest

SSF Community

Inclusion of basic sector (SSF) representation in local DRRM bodies. Inclusion of the NAPC under disaster-related management and response bodies (e.g., the IATF) to better guide grassroots interventions.

Transparent access to adaptation of the People Survival Fund through public consultations. Provision of targeted support for fishers during typhoons. Introduce programs promoting use of efficient energy (solar power for SSF communities). Promote resilient livelihoods in aquaculture with support from LGUs (e.g., oyster, crab, milkfish aquaculture) Design and implement climate-resilient settlement programs for SSF communities in combination with designation of evacuation areas for fishers.

Enhance enforcement of regulations on human-induced pollution.

Fisherfolk Council

No priorities surfaced during the discussion.

Local Government Units

Promoting resilience is an integral part of sustainable resource management and should form part of project identification process. By enhancing resiliency of SSF communities through Information and Education Campaigns, they will be able to secure not only their household needs and contribute to management of fisheries resources.

LGUs require support in the development of infrastructure to increase protection of

communities from sea level rise during typhoon season and storm surges. At present, the localities are limited to provision of designated evacuation centers for area for known sites vulnerable to flooding.

Local Non-Government Organizations

In addition to programs and projects increasing the climate resiliency of SSF organizations through habitat management (e.g., mangrove rehabilitation), local NGOs are pushing for enhance disaster response through continued efforts to address habagat (Southwest Monsoon) as a lean catch period for fishers. By improving the economic resiliency of fishers, they can be protected from shocks due to climate change impacts.

Government Agencies

There is a need to address existing and already exacerbated problem on vulnerability of SSF communities. Government programs must recognize the vulnerability of the natural resource assets of the SSF communities and how it adds to their economic vulnerability. Programs can be rendered useless if climate change adaptation mechanism are not in place.

SSF Data and Digitalization

There is a general consensus among respondents interviewed on the need for a more comprehensive and centralized data management for SSF. Data limitation on the actual contribution of SSF in fisheries production is cited as a major hindrance to the recognition of the SSF sector and due allocation of resources to support its development.

Data limitation is likely to prevent full implementation of the MEL process.

Data Collection and Sources

SSF stakeholders collect and maintain data on local fisheries. These often form part of organizations activities and/or project compliance. However, the regularity of data collection and updating is not yet in place for many datasets. Some data are easier to access than others. SSF communities only serve as source of data and are not part of analysis and planning for utilization of collected data. LGUs, NGOs and National Government Agencies (NGAs) that collects data from SSF communities often do not provide copies of the datasets to fisherfolk organizations. This prevents conduct of regular data updating by SSF organizations and utilization for community initiatives.

At the local level, SSF organizations collect and monitor socio-economic data, community observations and profile of members of organizations and local fisheries industry that are not currently being collected by relevant government agencies. SSF communities often collect environmental and IUUF observations, generate reports, and collect their own data to support the operations of their projects and advocacies. Local organizations, particularly women-led, maintains financial data relevant to fisheries operations and livelihood projects. SSF community members also serve as primary data sources for the PSA, DSWD, DA-BFAR and other agencies on data on production, local prices, hectarage of production areas, impacts of disasters, damage reports, and number of people affected. For the DA-BFAR, fishers mainly contribute to the Fisherfolks Registration (FishR) and Boat Registration (BoatR), and the Registry System for Basic Sectors and Agriculture. SSF communities often complain on the inconvenience associated with data collection of different government agencies that are requesting the same datasets from them. Specifically, these is a major issue with the DA, BFAR, DSWD, and PSA census.

Additionally, data collected, and analysis are not being shared back to the SSF communities. Moreover, SSF-led local data collection is limited due to financial constraints of involved fishers/fisherfolks groups. SSF organizations need to first lobby their respective LGU-MAO to consolidate or gather data to better respond to the needs of the fisherfolk organizations. There is currently no accessible data on network of organizations, particularly on organizations providing legal and technical support for SSF communities. This limits the opportunities for convergence of programs and resources for SSF development.

LGUs mainly maintain hard copies and Excel-encoded FishR and BoatR raw data while the encoded data are transmitted to the DA-BFAR. The FishR data contains information on SSF community's pre- to post-harvest profile. Reports are submitted to the BFAR but LGUs often complain on the lack of feedback and technical support in the utilization of the data after collection. Moreover, only technical personnel within the BFAR and LGUs are given access to the database. The system is also unreliable for those who can access the database.

LGUs also maintains data and profile of SSF community in disaster risks areas. The mapping is done by the DRRM, DENR, and MGB. The LGU-MAO is often limited in resources and personnel for data collection and maintenance. LGUs are also cognization of the attention to SSF as secondary only to the agriculture (farming) in most municipalities. This is due to the institutionalized incentive mechanisms for the farming sector based on targeting of high-value crops development initiatives. Additionally, LGUs also faces constant challenge in its data collection due to the declaration of incomplete information for FishR and BoatR.

Data collected by the LGU-MAO need to be requested first and analysis and validation are not often done on the data. LGUs recognizes the participation of SSF communities in monitoring of implementation of programs and projects through community reports which are often mainly done through collection of verbal reports which are then encoded by the LGU's fisheries technician—if the LGU budget allocation allows for hiring of separate personnel for fisheries.

Local NGOs are also engaged in data collection but there is currently no concerted effort to collect and maintain local data on SSF. NGOs generate comprehensive local data and information through Participatory Rural Assessments (e.g., data on gears, seasonality calendar, habitat data based on community's historical records/observation, major species caught, and history of local fisheries, livelihood operations, program/project implementation records). However, these datasets are not being collected by the LGU, BFAR and other agencies that could benefit greatly from the wealth of information contained in these datasets. These are often only included if the localities and agencies have a partnership project with the NGO. For projects in partnership with NGOs, data are often retained by the NGOs with option to share with the LGU. Analysis of data are often done only if there are scientist or academe involve in the project.

The National Stock Assessment Program (NSAP) of the BFAR collects sample data on landed catch. However, LGUs complain that the NSAP is not present in all municipalities/ barangays which render their data on local fisheries a representation only of commercial fishing operation. Main data collection happens at the ports where majority of landed catches are from commercial operators. Considering that there should be no commercial fishing operations within the

municipal waters, local fisheries production is not reflected in current datasets. Moreover, NSAP data are only presented to select fisheries stakeholders and provides no venue for validation and review. SSF community members are often not the primary target of these presentations or sharing of data and validation. Therefore, data collected cannot often guide local fisheries management initiatives. Based on the experience of LGUs, SSF organizations and local NGOs on the BFAR and NSAP presentations of the collected data, scientific analysis is shared but prescriptions on how the data can be used is often lacking. With many LGUs not versed in fisheries science and not provided with required guidance, the analysis provided are often not utilized.

The BFAR also conducts data collection and validation for its MMK (Malinis at Masaganang Karagatan) competition program towards the promotion of local fisheries management through recognition and awarding of well-managed local fisheries. Data collected include FishR and BoatR, local visits to assess ridge to reef area, document review of fisheries policies, community interviews and assessment of fisherfolks organization activities and projects on fisheries management, and DRRM activities of LGUs for coastal communities. These are however not extended to other programs to consolidate data collection and better guide policy developments.

The NAPC monitors poverty reduction initiatives for SSF communities, but data are not currently being shared or collected by the BFAR and other agencies that forms part of the Human Development Poverty Reduction Cluster (HDPRC)—a convergence mechanism for departments with poverty reduction programs through the formation of a Technical Working Group. Government agencies conduct convergence meetings that

allows for identification of status and capacity of agencies concerned on SSF development, but each agency maintains separate monitoring and evaluation. Harmonization of the database on SSF, particularly for RSBSA, FishR and BoatR is not yet being done. Centralize collection and consolidation of data on poverty reduction initiatives is needed to harmonize current initiatives for SSF. The NAPC, through its Basic Sectors, also collected data on SSF communities during the COVID-19 pandemic. However, with utilization of data collected by the agency is only being utilized by the basic sector representative councils.

Lastly, existing research conducted by different agencies are not being utilized properly. Policies and programs are not being informed by the results of studies which are mainly conducted as part of compliance. At present, there is no database for consolidated government research that could serve as bases for program development. A meta-analysis for research with similar scope and objectives does not exist.

Data and Knowledge Management

The main role of SSF communities in data and knowledge management is currently limited to data source on fishers and their activities and issues. Current data on fisheries are only utilized as reference for the total number of beneficiaries. Datasets are not utilized for development programs and interventions. When opportunities arise, sharing of data and learnings from partnership projects are done through the Barangay and Municipal FARMCs and NGOs serving as conduit between the LGUs and the SSF communities.

Data collection is primarily driven by compliance. LGUs are collecting data for FishR and BoatR as part of the BFAR's data collection activities. There is currently no ownership at the LGU level over the data

collection. This limits the utilization of collected data to aid program development for SSF. Utilization of dataset is limited to identification of the number of beneficiaries for programs. Although multiple datasets exist, selection is often not done in combination with matching and tracking the beneficiaries who may be part of another program that will benefit from convergence of interventions. Among SSF organizations, data analysis requires support from local scientist and academe and only happens for areas where these are present or are in close proximity to the SSF communities.

Monitoring and evaluation process are in place, but learning is not yet part of the process. Current implementation is output driven with agencies hesitant to address the evaluation and learning results due to the required paperwork for introducing changes in succeeding implementation process. Adoption of a more impact-driven implementation of intervention is both a behavioral and technical challenge.

There is no dedicated agency for sharing data analysis on SSF data. Data collection remains a compliance-driven activity. NSAP and PSA are only limited to collection and consolidation. Government programs that are related are not often considered within the same development environment and limits the interchange of data collection (e.g., modernization and best practices programs like the MMK was not implemented in the context of the Biyayang Dagat and AFMA). There is currently a major disconnect between data collection and program development at the government level. Data on fishers is only referenced as source of information on number of beneficiaries.

Tools and indicators on SSF communities are not well adopted. This limits the access of FFOs to data on fisheries. This adds to the

issue on highly compartmentalized data collection. General statistics are maintained by the PSA while the registry system for agriculture is maintained by the Department of Agriculture, the fisherfolks registration is maintained by the BFAR, data on indigenous peoples is maintained by the NCIP, data and registry on poverty is maintained by the DSWD, and data on community-based monitoring system (CBMS) is maintained by the DILG. These are all utilized by each agency as separate datasets in spite of the overlap in the data on SSF and targeted beneficiaries. At present, an SSF member can be registered under all of these registries but there is no mechanism for tracking the overlap in the dataset. Cross checking is being done manually for each intervention.

Accessibility for existing databases remains an issue with direct access limited only to technicians. At present, the BFAR prevents access from external stakeholders citing the agency's data privacy policy. While this limits the accessibility of the data, it also helps in protecting the datasets from being used by politicians for their own gains. However, this also prevents utilization of the data for fisheries development by SSF stakeholders. Access to the BFAR database is slow and only sample data or aggregate data are available. There is also no LGU participation in analysis of the data collected for these datasets. According to LGUs, requesting data from the BFAR requires too many requirements and processing of data is often done by the person requesting. Some data are only shared during workshops or presentations.

At the LGU level, data collected are not yet being utilized properly due to lack of plan and process on how to use them. LGUs need to develop and establish their own database on local fisheries. At present, while data collection for the FishR is done by the LGUs, the maintenance is done only at the national

level by BFAR. Local fisheries development plans are often based on data collected by NGOs and SSF organizations.

Implementation of the Magna Carta of the Poor on requiring a single system of registry for the poor based on the CBMS or DSWD's Listahanan can serve as an initial step in improving data collection and management for SSF. Interpretation of available datasets on SSF can also be done at the collective level to surface different perspective and stakeholder agenda. The Fisheries Management Areas (FMAs) are strategic venues for this purpose. However, FMAs are still in its early stage of development. Nonetheless, the MEL for SSF Handbook can facilitate the operationalization of data and knowledge management for the sector.

Digitalization Issues and Opportunities

There is currently no motivation to adopt digitalization. At the local level, SSF organizations and stakeholders have very limited internal resources to engage in data collection and participate in digitalization. Even for paper-based catch documentation, very few SSF organizations and LGUs are willing to adopt due to the perceive additional workload and low to no benefits in the short term. Digitalization will also require additional manpower costs, capacity and system development which are not yet part of the allocations of LGUs. Although the Mandanas-Garcia ruling is expected to increase the budget allocation of LGUs, there is no prescription on how these will be utilized. Internet access due to lack of information and communication infrastructures in low-income class municipalities is the main challenge to digitalization. Existing database and website are not easily accessible and technical support for troubleshooting is not yet present.

Digitalization will limit participation of SSF

communities in many areas without internet/communication infrastructure. In its initial stages, digitalization must be done in combination with blended approaches (e.g., face-to-face, and online conferencing for sharing of results). Some SSF organizations have access to smart phones and can perform basic operations. However, many are still limited by internet infrastructures in the localities. Training on utilization of Information Technology for SSF is required before digitalization.

Affordability of devices and internet access is limited among fisherfolks households. There are existing affordable options but are often too far from the residence of the fishers. Small-scale technology, like pocket Wi-Fi, are locally available but are still not reliable. This is also affected by unreliable supply of electricity in many coastal areas. Development of alternative sources of energy through establishment of solar energy stations will not only allow remote and island municipalities participate in digitalization, but it will also address accessibility of households to electricity and support their livelihoods. This can be used as a strategy to gather support from SSF communities.

LGUs are currently limited in terms of funding for development of IT infrastructure and hiring of personnel for database management. Cost of existing technology on data collection for monitoring, control, and surveillance are not affordable for SSF communities and for coastal LGUs which often belong to low-income classification.

At the national level, turfing, a practice among agencies to focuses only on their direct mandate and limit their participation in coordinated work between and among agencies with recognized overlap in both identified beneficiaries and jurisdiction. The convergence in data management will also

require assigning a lead agency and is likely to result in political conflict among agencies. Although the process will require more work, the possibility of adoption of centralization and digitalization of data on SSF is more likely to happen at the local level through the different SSF councils from the municipal (Municipal FARMCs), to the provincial (Integrated FARMCs), and to the regional multi-stakeholder platforms (Fisheries Management Areas).

However, tools, methodology, information, and knowledge materials used by academe, government, private sector and SSF communities need to be harmonized. Localization of information, especially translation of scientific terms, is a key challenge in increasing the accessibility of digitalization initiatives. The academe and scientists often only use language only they can understand and limits the opportunity for SSF community to directly participate in the discussions.

Digitalization can also take advantage of already existing local partnerships with international organizations working on some form of digitalization (e.g., UN-FAO partnership with the local coalition of fishers in Zamboanga, COMFAZ). Some areas in Quezon Province have initiated piloting of adoption of vessel monitoring thru partnership with private technology provider, Futuristic Aviation and Maritime Enterprise (FAME). By coordinating these efforts, interoperability mechanisms can be introduced at the early stages of the digitalization process for MEL for SSF.

Additionally, digitalization initiatives can target the children of SSF families who have more familiarity with smart phones and computers. The process can be facilitated through integration of marketing support mechanism to increase the incentive for SSF community

participation. Many communities are already exploring and utilizing e-commerce platforms. The learning from these experiences can guide digitalization initiatives. As primary source of data, municipal fisherfolks are at the forefront of data collection that will populate the databases.

There are also lessons that can be explored from the COVID-19 pandemic experience in SSF communities. Local NGOs, LGUs, and the NAPC observed increased participation of SSF organizations in national consultation through adoption of online conferencing by both the CSO and government agencies. The pandemic also facilitated the updating of beneficiaries' data for SSF. In order to maximize this opportunity, the headway made towards the transition of SSF communities to the virtual marketplace need to be integrated with other initiatives on resource management and take advantage of data analysis to showcase the contributions of sustainable resources management.

*

4.3. Introduction of the MEL4SSF

SSF Stakeholders at the local level have no familiarity with the SSF Guidelines. Due to time and resource constraints, this limited the full introduction of the contents of the MEL for SSF Handbook. Nonetheless, the discussions revealed a significant appreciation on the perceived utility of both the SSF Guidelines and MEL4SSF Framework and Handbook not only for the Philippine Government adoption but as guide for local SSF stakeholders.

The SSF Guidelines provided the much-needed framework for consolidation of issues

and targets that SSF stakeholders are pursuing. In a similar vein, the MEL Handbook and the Impact Pathways are expected to better guide the targeting of activities by SSF organizations, SSF councils, LGUs, and Local NGOs. The progress indicators can serve as a roadmap for consolidating and tracking the activities of SSF stakeholders. For municipal fisherfolks, they believe that this will further equip them in coordinating and working with their respective Municipal Agriculture Office and other offices of the LGUs. However, the effectiveness of the MEL4SSF will still depend on its adoption by the LGU or at least its key offices working with the SSF community.

Respondents of the pilot process generally agree that there is a need for follow activities to introduce the SSF Guidelines and MEL4SSF to other stakeholders who can help in facilitating its adoption at the local level. Proposals for this process include dedicated workshops on the SSF Guidelines and MEL Handbook to localize the tools and guide current SSF data analysis and integration of the tools with the Municipal Fisheries Development Planning (MFDP) and updating of the LGUs' Municipal Fisheries Ordinance (MFOs).

* * *

5 / Recommendations

Based on the lack of knowledge on the SSF Guidelines, a critical step in the introduction and adoption of the MEL4SSF is the localization of the SSF Guidelines. At present, the SSF Guidelines are not being referenced or used at the local level. Community knowledge on the existence of the SSF Guidelines is very limited to none.

There is also a need to increase the awareness of the LGUs on the SSF Guidelines. Based on the discussions with the local SSF stakeholders, the SSF Guidelines need to be shared and adopted not only by fisheries agencies and units but also other agencies and offices whose main mandate may not explicit include the fisheries sector but are working with SSF stakeholders. At the local level, the MPDO, GAD Office, MSWDO, and MENRO need to be engaged in addition to the MAO. At the national level the targets of the SSF Guidelines are distributed to the DA-BFAR, DENR, DOLE, DILG, DSWD, NEDA, DOST, DTI, NAPC, PWC, and the Department of Defense-Office of the Civil Defense as lead agencies in pushing for governance of tenure, responsible resource management, advancing social development, employment and decent work value chains, post-harvest and trade development, promoting gender equality, and mitigation of the impacts of disaster and climate change to SSF.

At the local level, facilitation of adoption of the SSF Guidelines and MEL4SSF will require the designation of personnel and organizations that will push for its implementation. Specific recommendations from the SSF stakeholders include the adoption of SSF Guidelines contents in the Fisheries Development Plans during the planning process of local government units. Conduct of local-level workshops on both the SSF Guidelines and MEL4SSF to introduce the concepts and indicators is also suggested by the respondents.

Where possible, introduce the SSF Guidelines as mandated guidelines for LGUs and include it as a requirement for the DILG checklist in addition to the requirements (e.g., Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Coastal Resource Management Plan) for the awarding of the Seal of Good Governance. The Seal of Good Governance has been one of the effective tools of the DILG to encourage LGUs to perform their function. The Seal is also used by other government agencies and private sector funders in selection of partner LGUs. LGUs with the Seal of Good Governance have broader access to financial resources and supports from both NGAs and private sector. This will also allow it to be supported by the Commission on Audit (COA) for policies on allocation of resources of SSF that are currently not within the scope of LGU capacity.

Of the key thematic chapters, SSF stakeholders took note of the Chapter on governance of tenure as a key stone indicator in terms of securing control over resources and facilitating the development of value chains, post-harvest and trade, as well as increasing the participation of women in SSF development. Similarly, the Chapter on disaster and climate change can be referred to as the most time-critical indicator in terms of addressing vulnerability of the SSF community to shocks. This is also a critical indicator which can render efforts on responsible resource management useless in the short and long-term. For local adoption, it is suggested that the Chapter on gender equality be converted to indicators that are mainstreamed across the key themes.

5.1. SSF Guidelines and the MEL4SSF

Considering that implementation and data collection for monitoring and evaluation happens at the ground, orientation on the contents of the SSF Guidelines is a necessary first step in introducing and adopting a MEL4SSF. This also addresses the key challenge in developing interventions that are tailor fit to the needs of SSF communities in each locality.

Provision of orientation for the Sangguniang Bayan (municipal legislative branch) Committee on Agriculture and Fisheries; Municipal Agriculture Officer; Municipal FARMCs; and People’s Organizations/ Fisherfolk organizations; and implementing the SSF Guidelines at the Fisheries Management Area in partnership with the regional BFAR, will facilitate local adoption and guide its consolidation at the national level. A bottom-up process is therefore preferred over the more top-down approach

that has been used for other interventions. Inclusion of the SSF Guidelines and MEL4SSF in the work of NGOs will facilitate mainstreaming of the tools with its key partners including the SB, MFARMCs, PO/FFO, BFAR, and the Office of the Provincial Agriculture. The partnership can be designed around local BFAR sub-offices, LGUs and FFOs as key players in the implementation of a participatory monitoring, evaluation, and learning.

According to SSF stakeholders, the MEL4SSF can also facilitate the creation of a unified monitoring tool based on existing indicators of each government agency and guide the transition process from output-based monitoring and evaluation to impact-based monitoring. Current approach is too programmatic resulting in compartmentalization of intervention.

✱

5.2. MEL4SSF Handbook

The current limitation in data and knowledge management for SSF also limits the applicability of the MEL4SSF Handbook. This could be addressed by adapting the Handbook to data-poor situations and contexts. However, the indicators provided within the MEL4SSF may still serve as a guide in the initial stage of adoption of the Framework, and can help illuminate what data the country needs to collect, consolidate and maintain.

Although reporting mechanism for similar initiatives like the Sustainable Development Goals are in place, its value for the local communities is minimal to none if they are only used as the Philippine Government’s

compliance to reportorial requirements as a signatory to the international agreement. This sentiment is shared by local SSF stakeholders who sees the value of the MEL4SSF Handbook as a guide in development of activities and interventions to improve the lives of SSF community members.

Data on fisheries, particularly disaggregated data on local SSF, are often limited for many indicators. The few datasets that exist often conflict or simply overlaps with other datasets that need to be consolidated first. With access restriction often preventing cross checking and cross referencing, the utilization of the Handbook and updating of each indicator will be limited. Although the Philippine Statistics Authority maintains key statistics on fisheries, the aggregated data—i.e., too generalized—and focus on production statistics making it less useful for local policy development and fisheries management. There are, however, local data on fisheries but are needed to be curated at the local level prior to the introduction of standardization on data collection, management, and digitalization can be introduced. Given the current local situation, the MEL4SSF Handbook can be introduced to key SSF stakeholders to serve as guide in developing the baselines for each chapter of the SSF Guidelines. Inclusion of diagrams on the resources on the Theory of Change will also facilitate sharing with local SSF stakeholders.

The MEL4SSF can be developed further to include a guide on data collection, management, utilization and digitalization methodology that are adapted to SSF and are based on existing practices that recognize the inherent limitations of the sector and the governments that should support them. Learnings from other countries can be shared to the network of SSF through development of a databank on citizen or community science approaches and documentation of practices.

✱

5.3. Results and Progress Indicators

Although the comprehensiveness of the Handbook’s Progress Indicators is expected to be extremely helpful in the long-term, there is a need to improve how it is introduced to countries like the Philippines with still under-developed local and national monitoring and evaluation systems. This is particularly of great concern for local SSF stakeholder who have no technical background and have very limited resources to hire technical personnel who can be perform the function of M&E and translator for SSF communities.

Without removing the progress indicators entirely, the process of introduction and options for utilization can be streamlined by identifying keystone targets. This can be done by expanding the Result-Specific Questions or reformulating the indicators in question form and further categorizing them into sub-headings that the user can use as reference to filter indicators that are of relevance to them or indicators where data are already available.

Macros or functions to show the progress of the stakeholders in terms of their interventions and post-processing to separate (e.g., through pivot tables) the indicators that are at baseline or accomplished and those that are still in the process of development for interventions.

To facilitate digitalization of the Handbook and the Progress Indicators, introduction of relational links based on identified keystone indicator under each Result Indicator can be

done. Moreover, a guide on the formulation and quantification of the indicators needs to be provided. This will allow the introduction of progress tracking through simple and easy to understand traffic light monitoring (e.g., red for indicators with no progress, yellow for indicators with little progress and green for indicators with significant progress). This will give a visual indicator of progress that can be easily used as reference for non-technical SSF users. A similar system can be applied at the Chapter level to compare the progress of each chapter and highlight the interdependence of each chapter’s targets.

If possible, the progress indicators can be introduced using different levels or by providing a set of forms with increasing level of complexity to allow the would-be adopters to initiate utilization. Using the 295 progress indicators is too intimidating and overwhelming for SSF stakeholders in pilot sites.

The progress indicators can be organized using the following sub-headings or similar forms of categorization—which still need to be validated with target users:

- Improvement in policy environment
 - Improvement in recognition and participation
 - Improvement in programme implementation/targeting
- This can be referenced or used in filtering the indicators, as shown in the figure below:

✱

Additional possible categorization may include:

- Improvement in local governance structures
- Improvement in infrastructures/facilities
- The categorization can also be integrated with existing diagnostic tools, e.g., fishbone or cause-and-effect diagram common categorizations, and may include:
- Improvement in capacity (people)
- Improvement in service delivery (method)
- Improvement in resources (materials)
- Improvement in infrastructure (machinery)
- Improvement in targeting systems (measurement)
- Improvement in participatory environment (environment)

This will allow non-technical users to make sense of the progress indicators without removing its comprehensiveness. A general or simpler categorization should be preferred to allow the adopters to add and facilitate the cultivation of ownership of the tool.

Based on this, the progress indicators can be filtered to get a more manageable list of indicators for the purpose of baselining or use the tools for diagnosing a subsector of small-scale fishery.

✱

5.4. Country Level Adoption of the MEL4SSF

Piloting can be done at the local level to establish a proof of concept of the process. Inclusion of fisherfolks willing to participate in the process must be encourage outside of the lobbying for the adoption of the SSF Guidelines and MEL4SSF by national government agencies. With the exception of opportunities to access funding from international organizations, national government agencies are not likely to adopt and fully implement the SSF Guidelines.

The MEL4SSF Handbook can be piloted to facilitate the turnover of management of community-level critical infrastructures (e.g., Community Fish Landing Centers) to strengthen women’s participation and serve as a venue for application of the MEL4SSF and baselining for the progress indicators. Constant communication between the Municipal Agriculture Office and the SSF communities on disaster concerns can serve as a constant and common area of interest for initial application of the SSF Guidelines and baselining for the progress indicators. Other strategies which can be adopted based on local experience is the introduction of incentive mechanisms for SSF development targets. The Department of Agriculture and local government units provide for incentives on performance for high value crops in farming sector. Using a similar approach, the Handbook ca be piloted for subsector of SSF engaged in high value seafood production. This will need to be combined with increasing grassroots awareness on the SSF Guidelines. There is also a need to facilitate information sharing and allocate budget support for SSF organizations engaged in data collection and reporting (e.g., representatives in FARMCs and

#	Overall Result (with reference to chapter and paragraph of SSF Guidelines)	Indicators of Progress (towards outputs, outcomes and impacts)	Sub-heading	Type of Data Relevant
	Chapter 5a: Responsible Governance of Tenure			
1	Publicly owned resources that are collectively used and managed, in particular by small-scale fishing communities, are recognised and safeguarded (5.6, state)	Number of national and customary laws that advance the rights of small-scale fishing communities to lands, territories and resources	Improvement in policy environment	Geographical location (National); Laws (existing laws, new laws, or amendments)
2		Number of hectares covered by binding agreements for collective use and management of publicly owned SSF resources	Improvement in policy environment	Resource type (coastal zone, tidal zone, island, water body, marine, inland; Collective use and management type (community conserved areas (CCAs); Geographic location (National, Sub-national 1, Sub-National 2); Status (indigenous, non-indigenous)
3		Whether or not SSF community households percieve their tenure rights to publically owned SSF resources as secure	Improvement in implementation	Sex of head of household (male, female); Age bracket (youth, non-youth); Status (indigenous, non-indigenous); Fisheries recource type (inland, marine, land)
4		Proportion of small-scale fishers (value chain actors) with secure user rights over land and water resources, fishery resources, fishing areas, and adjacent lands	Improvement in implementation	Sex of head of household (male, female); Status of land owner (husband, wife, joint-ownership, child/dependent; Geographic location (National, Sub-national 1, Sub-National 2); Status (indigenous, non-indigenous); Use rights (Shore access, gleaning access, boat launch access)
5		Proportion of adult SF population with secure tenure rights who possess legal documentation	Improvement in recognition and participation	Sex (male, female); Type of tenure; Cultural identity; Geographic location (National, Sub-national 1, Sub-National 2);

fisherfolk organizations) which are critical to the utilization of the Handbook.

By integrating the adoption with existing partnerships and programs, local actors can be identified to oversee the implementation at the local level. Nonetheless, there is still a need to institutionalize mechanisms to promote sustained use of the SSF Guidelines and Handbook. In this area, the local and national NGOs and Fisherfolk organizations which are insulated from changes in leadership and personnel due to election transitions are in a strategic position to serve as constant partners in monitoring and promotion of the utilization of the SSF Guidelines and Handbook.

The review of the Mandanas-Garcia Ruling at the local level can be guided using the MEL4SSF Handbook. Allowing use of the handbook and application in other situations outside of SSF Guidelines implementation will increase local appreciation on the utility of this tool. This may also facilitate the identification and mechanism for accessing funding for establishment of local database, hiring of personnel for fisheries and IT.

To consolidate the utilization of the SSF Guidelines and the Handbook, the delineation of jurisdiction between the LGU and BFAR need to be addressed. Implementation of the SSF Guidelines will also require good local government unit leaders to ensure continuity of initiatives. But with the implementation of the SSF Guidelines and the Handbook by the SSF organizations and NGOs in the context of a strong society and a weak state regime, a layer of sustainability for its implementation will be introduced.

✱

5.5. Digitalization of the MEL4SSF

Considering existing limitations on national-level data collection and management in the Philippines, facilitation of the digitalization of the MEL4SSF will require a provision of funds to engage organizations already working with some form of digitalization, and local media to support knowledge sharing. Existing data collection processes on SSF, which do not currently use paper-based data collection methods, can bypass paper-based data, and focus instead on inputting data directly into an online MEL4SSF digital platform. For data that are still largely being collected on paper, an online version of the MEL4SSF will make the digitalization of existing data more practical, since it can more easily accessed and used by various actors within SSF.

In recognition of lack of incentives for SSF organizations, digitalization in SSF can be piloted by engaging micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs) who stand to benefit more from increased access to data and information. Introduction of simple/basic tools for data management to allow sorting and search functions will facilitate utilization of the databases on fisheries. Localization or translation of basic scientific testing for aquaculture development and provision of technical data from scientists that are directly relevant to the operations of local SSF livelihoods/enterprises (e.g., water quality, technology on aquaculture) will increase the interest and participation in the digitalization process.

Promotion and adoption of citizen science as an integral component in enterprise and aquaculture programs will promote transfer of technology and knowledge as a

sustainability mechanism for initiatives targeted towards SSF communities. This will also prepare them for engagement in digitalization and make sure that the data are incorporated in local developing local interventions. Moreover, there is a need to introduce training programs for SSF communities on how to use computers and provision of support for fishers to enhance monitoring and data collection (e.g., inclusion of pictures as data for monitoring).

- At the government level, establishment of LGU-level IT and database infrastructure is a pre-requisite for adoption by government entities. LGUs can be tasked to collect, consolidate, and process operational data generated and maintained by SSF organizations and CSOs in the locality, information on disasters based on community accounts, audit of available local resources often included in the mapping of resources done by the SSF organizations, both formally and informally.
- Another critical area of interest for immediate digitalization is the centralization of system on data management and datasets on SSF vulnerable areas to facilitate DRRM program development. The Office of the Civil Defense can serve as the curator of these datasets. Lastly, integration of the MEL process in the local community consultation will facilitate development of interest and support on digitalization initiatives.

✱ ✱ ✱

06 / Conclusion

The interest shown by the representative fisherfolk leaders and local government units demand the adoption of the MEL4SSF Framework and Handbook as part of a governance structure, rather than by select government agencies. Small-scale fisheries in the Philippines cannot be separated from the domain of local governance. By capitalizing on existing political processes supported within the country's legal framework, organizations like the Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Management Councils (FARMCs) – which generates representations directly from fishing villages (Barangay FARMCs) to the municipal (Municipal FARMCs) – provincial (Integrated FARMCs) and national level (National FARMCs) can better assist and partner with the government to improve small-scale fisheries. Additionally, with the council's representation from the local government units, private sector, the non-governmental sector, and other basic sectors engaged in fisheries, the FARMCs are in a strategic position to adopt and promote the MEL4SSF Handbook as a critical tool in fisheries development. The councils are also represented at the newly organized Fisheries Management Areas (FMAs), where the science advisory group can take the lead in the integration of the Handbook into its policy development and advocacy work. Adoption can be further facilitated and promoted by non-governmental organizations that are working directly with fishing villages and are part of the national networks of NGOs engaged small-scale fisheries policy advocacy.

Highlighting the role of bottom-up institutions and prioritizing local government level adoption will ensure a more organic adoption of the progress indicators and in developing ownership over the MEL4SSF among users. Piloting the adoption at the local level will also provide the necessary proof of concept to encourage the national government to integrate the framework within its policy and planning system. Additionally, the recent legislative landmark Mandanas-Garcia Ruling further increases the pressure on the local government units to address issues in small-scale fisheries. However, this also indirectly reduces the pressure on the national government to take the lead in small-scale fisheries development. When backed up by local support and guidance on local data collection, the MEL4SSF Handbook and the progress indicators can be more easily adopted by national government agencies. The sector's most recent experience in the adoption of new legal requirements for fishing operations with fishworkers on commercial fishing vessels, is proof that without the initial support from the local players, policies adopted at the national level are often faced with more resistance despite the agreement across the sector on the need to protect and promote the welfare of fishworkers. Local stakeholder readiness must be a major consideration in pushing for adoption of similar initiatives in small-scale fisheries.

* * *

07 / Annexes

Annex A:

Katipunan ng mga Kilusan ng mga Artisanong Mangingisda sa Pilipinas (KKAMPi) 10-point Philippine Blue Agenda

Itakda ang tenurial status ng municipal waters

I-delineate ang municipal waters para maprotektahan ito mula sa mapanirang komersyal na pangingisda at illegal, unregulated, and unreported fishing (IUUF).

Isulong ang archipelagic principle sa delineation ng municipal waters with offshore islands upang mapangalagaan ang mga ekosistema sa baybayin at karagatan.

Hikayatin na magparehistro ang mga mangingisda sa fisherfolks registration and licensing system ng LGUs.

Isulong at ipatupad ang coastal use zoning.

Maglaan ng social protection para sa mga mangingisda

Isaayos ang profiling ng munisipal na mangingisda upang matukoy ang angkop na

insurance assistance at allowances, lalo na para sa mga Bantay Dagat (hal. Philhealth, hazard allowance, atbp.)

Tiyakin na may ligtas na tirahan/pabahay ang mga mangingisda.

Magbigay ng libreng legal services para sa Bantay Dagat.

Palawakin ang conditional cash transfer program para sa mga pamilya ng mangingisda.

Palakasin ang pamamahala ng mga mangingisda sa pangisdaan

Magtatag ng Municipal Fisheries Office o iba pang tulad nito sa kada munisipyo para manguna sa implementasyon ng Municipal Fisheries Development Plan/Coastal Resources Management Plan at mapabuti ang komunikasyon sa BFAR Provincial and

Regional Offices.

I-assess ang FARMCs upang matukoy ang mga kakayahan at iba pang pangangailangan para sa pagpapaunlad nito.

Linangin ang kakayahan ng mga Bantay Dagat sa paralegal, case documentation, evidence gathering/preservation, atbp.

Magtatag/Buhayin ang IFARMCs upang mapagkaisa ang mga plano at inisyatiba ng mga magkakalapit na munisipyo.

Palakasin at bigyan ng sapat na representasyon ang FARMC sa FMA Management Bodies (MBs).

Bumuo ng mabisang mekanismo para sa komunikasyon at koordinasyon, at tiyakin na may regular na dayalogo at feedbacking sa pagitan ng mga M/C/IFARMCs, NFARMC, DA-BFAR at FMA MBs.

Suportahan ang pagtatag sa DOFAR para sa harmonization ng mga batas at functions sa pamamahala ng pangisdaan

Pagtibayin ang monitoring, control and surveillance mechanisms sa pangisdaan

Ipatupad ang mga catch documentation and traceability guidelines upang tiyakin na ang seafood na ating kinakain ay nahuli/nakuha sa legal at sustenableng pamamaraan.

- Isama ang catch documentation and traceability system sa pamamalakad ng community fish landing centers (CFLCs).
- Bigyan ng access at linangin ang kakayahan ng mga mangangisda sa mga teknolohiyang makakatulong sa monitoring, control and surveillance tulad ng vessel monitoring mechanisms (VMM) at electronic catch documentation and traceability system

(eCDTS).

- Bumuo at mag-implementa ng work standards para protektahan ang mga kabataang nagtatrabaho o tumutulong sa pangisdaan.

- Palakasin ang kakayanan ng mga kababaihang mangangisda sa pangangalaga ng karagatan at ng pamilyang mangangisda

- Suportahan ang pagtatag ng women-managed areas.

- Hikayatin na magparehistro ang mga kababaihang mangangisda sa fisherfolks registration system ng LGUs.

- Tiyakin ang representasyon ng mga kababaihan sa FARMCs at mga lokal at nasyunal na konseho.

Tiyakin ang ligtas na lugar ng pagtatrabaho ng mga kababaihang mangangisda sa pormal o impormal na ekonomiya.

Equitable and just compensation para sa mga kababaihang nagtatrabaho sa fisheries and aquaculture value chain.

Palakasin ang ekonomiya at sustainable finance mechanisms para sa mga mangangisda

Suriin ang polisiya sa importasyon.

Magbigay ng financial literacy at business management trainings para sa mga mangangisda at mga kooperatiba ng mga mangangisda.

Bawasan ang post-harvest losses sa pamamagitan ng pagbibigay ng mga kagamitan sa CFLCs tulad ng ice making machines, reefer vans, atbp.

Magbigay ng suporta sa transportasyon ng mga produkto upang hindi na dumaan sa mga traders/consolidators na may mas malaking tubo kaysa sa mga mangangisda.

Palakasin ang small to medium social enterprises sa pamamagitan ng paglilinang ng business models at pagbibigay ng access sa teknolohiya tulad ng paggamit ng digital platforms para sa pagmarket ng mga produkto.

Maglaan ng pondo para sa Bantay Dagat, FARMCs at FMAs mula sa karagdagang pondo na makukuha ng mga LGU sa implementasyon ng Mandanas Ruling.

Linangin ang kakayahan ng mga M/C/IFARMCs sa pagpapalano at pagba-budget para sa Fisheries Development Plans.

Magbigay ng incentives para sa mga mangangisdang sumusunod sa sustainable at mabuting pamamaraan ng pangangisda.

Bumuo ng inter-agency collaborations upang magkaroon ng malaking tsansa na makakuha ng pondo para sa fisheries development mula sa multilateral agencies.

Blue Financing Framework

Patatagin ang climate and disaster resilience ng mga komunidad sa isla at baybayin

Ipasok ang climate and disaster resilience sa mga polisiya at programa sa pangangisda at akwakultura, lalo na ang ecosystem-based adaptation.

Magsagawa ng climate change vulnerability assessments (CCVAs) upang makapagbigay ng mga rekomendasyon para sa CNFIDP at mga adaptation plans ng FMAs at coastal LGUs.

Magpatupad ng resource enhancement

programs at nature-based solutions tulad ng pagtatalaga ng coastal greenbelts para magkaroon ng proteksyon mula sa storm surges at malalakas na mga bagyo.

I-monitor ang epekto ng climate change sa katubigan (hal. pagtaas ng temperatura, pagtaas ng lebel ng dagat, atbp.).

Magbigay ng climate services sa mga mangangisda tulad ng early warning systems para sa mga bagyo, storm surge, harmful algal blooms, atbp.

Tumuklas ng climate-resilient livelihoods para sa mga mangangisda sa pamamagitan ng research and development.

Bawasan ang carbon footprint ng supply chains sa pamamagitan ng pagsasaayos ng local fish distribution system.

Magbigay ng access sa renewable energy technologies para sa mga komunidad sa baybayin at small island ecosystems.

Bumuo at magpatupad ng credit assistance programs at risk transfer mechanisms tulad ng indemnity and parametric insurance para sa mga mangangisda.

Rumesponde sa epekto ng COVID-19 pandemic sa pangisdaan

Magpatupad ng mga stratehiya para lutasin ang mga balakid sa supply chain na dulot ng pandemya (hal. pagsasaayos ng post-harvest facilities at online marketing para sa pagbebenta ng mga produkto). Proteksyon sa displacement dulot ng coastal development (reclamation, seabed quarrying, offshore mining, etc.)

Konsultasyon sa mga apektadong komunidad at bigyan ng karampatang suporta

Isaalang alang ang integridad ng coastal and marine environment

Maging prayoridad ang kagalingan ng mga pamayanan sa baybayin at ng likas yamang dagat

Tugunan ang problema ng marine plastic pollution

Pambansang polisiya ng no single use plastic

Magbigay ng insentibo sa mga lokal na pamahalaan na mahusay na nagpapatupad ng solid waste management

Itasa ang performance ng mga pabrika lalo na sa mga malalapit sa ilog, lawa at dagat at ipasara ang mga nagdudulot ng pollution

*

Annex B:

Summary of Indicator Prioritization and Key Areas of Concern by SSF-Relevant Actors

SSF Guidelines	Fisherfolk Representatives & Organizations	Non-Government Organizations	SSF Development Council/ FARMCs (Quasi-Government) ⁴⁹	Government Agencies	Local Government Units
<div>Chapter 5a: Governance of Tenure</div> <div>Top priority of Mindanao Fisherfolk Representative and Chair of the National Coalition of Small- Scale Fisherfolks Organization, Municipal-level/ community-based aquaculture manager, Municipal Agriculture Officer</div>	<div>1. Promotion of Women Managed Areas to protect coastal resources mainly accessed by women and other members of SSF communities.</div> <div>2. Mandanas-Garcia Ruling as a legislation to enforce devolved powers to the LGUs.⁵⁰ The ruling increases the funding of LGUs.</div> <div>3. Exemption of SSF (particularly subsistence fishing) from close season and provision of subsidy during close season or off season (typhoon season) as a form of protection of fisher’s secure their rights.</div> <div>4. Adoption of the formal definition of “katubigan” to include both inland and marine water resources and promote these areas as preferential SSF aquaculture areas (currently only applies to abandoned fishponds).</div> <div>5. Combat encroachment of tourism industry development affecting the claiming of nearshore areas and resources by SSF communities.</div> <div>6. Institutionalization of mechanisms for the protection of the preferential rights of SSF to the municipal waters and nearshore resources</div>	<div>1. Implementation of laws and regulations on municipal waters.</div> <div>2. Addressing gear-use conflict between and among SSF stakeholders through legislation and enforcement of zonation.</div> <div>3. Addressing increasing privatization of coastal areas.</div> <div>4. Expansion and continue support of NGOs in protecting and promoting the rights of fishers.</div>	<div>1. Deputization of Bantay Dagat (fish wardens) from the rank of fishers to support enforcement of rights of fishers.</div>	<div>1. Facilitation of policymaking based on the experience of the SSF community to address weak implementation of existing laws.</div> <div>2. Adoption of a more proactive approach in the implementation of existing laws on fisherfolks’ preferential rights to their fishing grounds.</div> <div>3. Reduce dependence of the government to the Bantay Dagat (fish warden) in the enforcement of regulation and protection of the rights of fishers. Enforcement is the primary function of the government.</div> <div>4. Information and education on fishers’ rights and available venues for participation not often accessed due to lack of knowledge</div>	<div>1. Recognition of the rights of municipal fisherfolks to the municipal water (in terms of access).</div> <div>2. Protection of coastal areas from conversion into resorts/ privatization for tourism development.</div> <div>3. Enforcement of legislation protecting the rights of fishers to the municipal waters and nearshore areas.</div> <div>4. Development of infrastructure and allocation of spaces for docking of boats.</div> <div>5. Allocation of areas for fisherfolks settlement which are strategic and supports continuity of livelihoods of SSF community members.</div> <div>6. Clear allocation of resources, under the Mandanas-Garcia Ruling,⁵¹ for agriculture and fisheries sector (current legislation does not include provision for minimum allocation, e.g., GAD is mandated by law to account for 5% of the locality’s budget)</div>

* Footnotes for annexes are collated at the end of the section.

Annex B:

Summary of Indicator Prioritization and Key Areas of Concern by SSF-Relevant Actors

SSF Guidelines	Fisherfolk Representatives & Organizations	Non-Government Organizations	SSF Development Council/ FARMCs (Quasi-Government)	Government Agencies	Local Government Units
<div>Chapter 5b: Responsible Resource Management</div> <div>Top priority for Visayas Fisherfolk Representative (IUUF as critical issue for SSF communities), 1 Local Government Unit-Municipal Agriculture Office, 1 MFARMC Chair, 2 Municipal-level/ community-based aquaculture manager, 2 local non-government organizations (fisheries management body representatives)</div>	<div>1. Provision of the legal assistance to Bantay Dagat (Fish Warden) volunteers</div> <div>2. Inclusion of the SSF representatives in the BFAR⁵² Adjudication Board</div> <div>3. Addressing election transition impacts on continuity of CSO⁵³ and SSF representations in the FARMCs⁵⁴ and AFCs.⁵⁵ Increase representation at AFC to separate representation for fishers and farmers.</div> <div>4. Insulate Municipal FARMCs from political appointments.⁵⁶</div> <div>5. Allocation of dedicated Fisheries Officers under each Municipal Agriculture Office of the LGUs.</div> <div>6. Adoption of Vessel Monitoring Measures (for MCS)⁵⁷ for commercial fishing operations to address illegal and unregulated fishing within the municipal waters dedicated to SSF communities.</div> <div>7. Establishment and operationalization of the FMAs⁵⁸ following proper local consultation and representations from fisherfolks (SSF organizations and FARMCs).</div> <div>8. Inclusion of the 14 Basic Sectors⁵⁹ in the Regional Development Councils which currently only includes the private sector representatives.</div> <div>9. Coordination between NEDA, DILG, and LGUs to address SSF issues.</div>	<div>1. Organizing of SSF stakeholders to increase their bargaining power.</div> <div>2. Strengthening of partner SSF organizations to increase participation in management and decision-making bodies.</div> <div>3. Operationalization of the Fisheries Management Areas (currently not operational in many areas) as a regional⁶⁹ venue for stakeholders in fisheries. However, implementation of fisheries management initiative still falls under the LGUs.</div> <div>4. Fisheries management and promotion of Marine Protected Areas as a key strategy.</div> <div>5. Strengthening of Municipal FARMCs as key player in data collection and monitoring, community representation, and policymaking.</div> <div>6. Lobbying for increased financial and capacity building support for Municipal FARMCs from their respective LGUs and BFAR.</div>	<div>1. Combat illegal fishing. Prevention of encroachment of commercial fishing operations, destructive fishing.</div> <div>2. Protection and conservation of critical fish species.</div> <div>3. Consultation of Municipal FARMCs as part of recognition.</div>	<div>1. Enhance participation of SSF communities in identifying issues with tenurial rights.</div> <div>2. Inclusion of the SSF communities in the process of designing interventions, monitoring, evaluation, and learning.</div> <div>3. Promote government-supported platforms for participation, i.e., FARMCs. Programs at the local level are more contextualized.</div> <div>4. Redefine treatment of SSF communities as beneficiaries to partners in fisheries development.</div>	<div>1. Implementation of the Fisheries Development Plan of the locality focusing coastal resource management, ordinance enhancement in coordination with the Sangguniang Bayan (legislative branch of the LGU), enforcement of IUUF laws and regulations through deputization of fish wardens (Bantay Dagat) with training and honorarium support.</div> <div>2. Engagement of the SSF community through the Municipal FARMCs (representation of organized fisherfolks) in policymaking and project implementation.</div> <div>3. Combat encroachment of illegal commercial fishing operations from adjacent municipalities.</div> <div>4. Strengthening of enforcement against illegal and destructive fishing operations (IUUF implementation).</div> <div>5. Provision of support to fishers as fish wardens through assistance from BFAR, local PNP⁷⁰ and LGU-MAO.</div> <div>6. Increase budget allocation for local law enforcement (at minimum, increase the visibility of law enforcement at sea).</div> <div>7. Marine Protected Area management through provision of funding, initiatives for improvement in stocks, equipment and training for volunteer fish wardens</div>

Annex B:

Summary of Indicator Prioritization and Key Areas of Concern by SSF-Relevant Actors

SSF Guidelines	Fisherfolk Representatives & Organizations	Non-Government Organizations	SSF Development Council/ FARMCs (Quasi-Government)	Government Agencies	Local Government Units
Chapter 5b: Responsible Resource Management	<p>10. Address overfishing and IUUF through establishment of policies and financial measures supporting the functions of the Municipal FARMCs.</p> <p>11. Compensation for SSF-initiated resource management activities (e.g., coastal clean-ups, mangrove reforestation/ rehabilitation). This can be in partnership with the DSWD.⁶⁰</p> <p>12. Provision of support to SSF to engage in aquaculture to reduce pressure on fishing grounds by adopting a convergence approach through partnership and coordination between and among the CDA,⁶¹ DOLE,⁶² DSWD, and DOST.⁶³</p> <p>13. Inclusion of the SSF representatives in the National Task Force on IUUF (primarily under the DA, DOJ and Senate Committee on Agriculture).</p> <p>14. Promotion of organizing of SSFs into cooperatives.</p> <p>15. Adoption of holistic approach in the implementation of laws defining fisherfolks as those in pre- to post-harvest fisheries sector.</p> <p>16. Combatting Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing, particularly intrusion of commercial fishing operations inside the municipal waters.</p> <p>17. Addressing overfishing due to increase pressure on the fishing grounds.</p> <p>18. Addressing plastic pollution affecting mangroves and habitat protection and rehabilitation in partnership with LGUs.</p>	<p>7. Adopt a more dialogue-driven implementation of IUUF regulation in combination with the formation and strengthening of Task Force on IUUF.</p> <p>8. Provide venues for multi-stakeholder discussions on addressing IUUF issues.</p>	—	—	—

Annex B:

Summary of Indicator Prioritization and Key Areas of Concern by SSF-Relevant Actors

SSF Guidelines	Fisherfolk Representatives & Organizations	Non-Government Organizations	SSF Development Council/ FARMCs (Quasi-Government)	Government Agencies	Local Government Units
Chapter 5b: Responsible Resource Management	<div>19. Capacity building of cooperatives and associations to access and generate their own financial resources.</div> <div>20. Consolidation of SSF into fisherfolks cooperatives and associations.</div> <div>21. Capacity building of cooperatives/SSF organizations working environmental protection and conservation.</div> <div>22. Adoption of tripartite approach to SSF development: LGU-FFO⁶⁷-NGO⁶⁸ partnership.</div> <div>23. Mangrove rehabilitation (SSF community-led in partnership with non-government organizations).</div> <div>24. Organizing of a national coalition of SSF organizations to participate in decision-making and program development for SSF communities.</div> <div>25. Enhanced enforcement of IUUF regulations and increase awareness of local communities on policies and laws.</div> <div>26. Reduction in highly efficient gears to lower the pressure on the fishing grounds.</div>	—	—	—	—

Annex B:

Summary of Indicator Prioritization and Key Areas of Concern by SSF-Relevant Actors

SSF Guidelines	Fisherfolk Representatives & Organizations	Non-Government Organizations	SSF Development Council/ FARMCs (Quasi-Government)	Government Agencies	Local Government Units
<div>Chapter 6: Social Development, Employment and Decent Work</div> <div>Social Development, Employment and Decent Work</div>	<div>1. Settlement beyond housing projects: implementation of the Resettlement Act for SSF communities through coordinated actions of the NHA,⁷¹ NEA,⁷² LWUA,⁷³ BFAR, DILG⁷⁴-LGU, DENR,⁷⁵ and BFAR to ensure provision of the basic services including but not limited to: access to their market, utilities, transportation, livelihoods and other basic needs.</div> <div>2. Legislation of the Bantay Dagat Bill providing for access of SSF volunteer fish wardens to insurance and honorarium.</div> <div>3. Implementation of the DO 196-16⁷⁶ with focus on just compensation and protection of the rights and welfare of fishworkers.</div> <div>4. Improve social safety net for SSF communities and strengthen implementation of existing social protection services being accessed by fisherfolks households (e.g., PhilHealth—which is implemented at the local government unit level)</div> <div>5. Community-based social safety net development (e.g., community-based savings and loan associations) as an additional layer of protection for SSF community members during economic shocks.</div>	<div>1. Security of SSF settlement areas..</div>	—	<div>1. Develop policies based on issues faced by SSF communities.</div> <div>2. Inform social protection based on the current vulnerabilities (to disaster and economic shocks) of the SSF communities.</div> <div>3. Shift the reactive response of the government to employment and decent work challenges of fishworkers to a more proactive response by recognizing these needs as part of the rights of the fishworkers.</div> <div>4. Design social development programs within the context of value chains and trade protection for SSF communities.</div> <div>5. Redefining settlement programs from being compliance-driven to human-rights driven programs that respects the dignity of people in SSF.</div>	<div>1. Provision of insurance coverage (boat and life) for SSF.</div> <div>2. Partnership development with the PCIC⁷⁷ to develop insurance for SSF communities.</div> <div>3. Amendment of existing LGU policies which does not support/ allow provision of insurance support for SSF.</div> <div>4. Partnership with local NGOs in community organizing to facilitate accessing of LGU services and provision of programs for SSF organizations.</div> <div>5. Access to loan services through micro-financing institutions.</div>

Annex B:

Summary of Indicator Prioritization and Key Areas of Concern by SSF-Relevant Actors

SSF Guidelines	Fisherfolk Representatives & Organizations	Non-Government Organizations	SSF Development Council/ FARMCs (Quasi-Government)	Government Agencies	Local Government Units
<div>Chapter 7: Value Chains, Post-Harvest and Trade</div> <div>Top priority for 4 Fisherfolks Organization representatives (engaged in livelihood/enterprise development and aquaculture production)</div>	<div>1. Increasing public awareness on key policies affecting the entire economy to get support from other sectors.</div> <div>2. Provision of logistics support for SSF to level the playing field between fishers and their institutional buyers.</div> <div>3. Full registration of fisherfolks to improve targeting of beneficiaries of government programs and projects.</div> <div>4. Conduct of social preparation to ensure consultative mechanisms for government programs targeting the SSF communities as beneficiaries.</div> <div>5. Utilization of information technology in price monitoring and climate data monitoring affecting SSF communities.</div> <div>6. Institution of mechanism to protect SSF products from the impacts of government-led importing of seafood products which mainly affects local trade. At present, the DA only requires issuance of “Certificate of Necessity” without the need for approval from the sector.</div> <div>7. Introduction of limitation of utilization of imported seafood products to restaurant, manufacturing plants and other food establishments to limit its impact on local wet markets.</div> <div>8. Reduce impact of imported seafood (fresh/frozen) on local SSF enterprises.</div> <div>9. Promote Food Security through improvements in local food production and reduction of dependence on external markets (importation).</div>	<div>1. Addressing reduction of catch and income due to increasing high input costs.</div> <div>2. Increasing access of SSF organizations to financing services.</div> <div>3. Consolidation of livelihood/ enterprise interventions. At present, support is very limited and often lack scale to make an impact at the community level.</div> <div>4. Improvement of procurement process of the government to properly match the fisher’s needs and technology requirements of enterprise development projects.</div> <div>5. Institutionalization of follow up activities in terms of evaluation and learning from project implementation in partnership with SSF communities.</div>	<div>1. Addressing gear-use conflict among SSF stakeholders and protection of spaces for livelihood.</div> <div>2. Inclusion of the fisherfolk organizations in the primary programs and projects, particularly on alternative livelihoods, of the locality and key government agencies working in fisheries.</div> <div>3. Development of alternative livelihoods (e.g., oyster aquaculture) to include support on technology identification, technical support in materials preparation/procurement, and matching of these resources to the actual needs and situation of the localities.</div>	<div>1. Organizing of SSF for large scale production, marketability.</div> <div>2. Introduction of value-adding activities to facilitate continuity of income generation.</div> <div>3. Development of post-harvest facilities to address seasonality income and production.</div> <div>4. Development of market linkages for SSF organizations engaged in production and processing of seafood products.</div> <div>5. Convergence of government agencies and their programs (e.g., enterprise development initiatives are not linked with programs on shared facilities for production that multiple government agencies are already implementing). Programs are implemented in silos.</div> <div>6. Invest in protection and development of local SSF assets, production support, post-harvest support and market linkages. Increase support in terms of developing market linkages as an area where government support is very limited.</div>	<div>1. Post-harvest infrastructure development for SSF communities. Critical infrastructures can provide protection for fishers during peak season when the volume exceeds the capacity of the fishers to market seafood products resulting in reduction in price beyond expected margins.</div> <div>2. Establishment of price monitoring for seafood products through the DTI.⁷⁹ Other commodities are allowed for regulation of floor and ceiling prices (e.g., chicken and pork).</div> <div>3. LGU assistance in accessing funds for SSF organizations through utilization of identified SSF beneficiaries under the FishR, BoatR and RSBSA.</div>

Annex B:

Summary of Indicator Prioritization and Key Areas of Concern by SSF-Relevant Actors

SSF Guidelines	Fisherfolk Representatives & Organizations	Non-Government Organizations	SSF Development Council/ FARMCs (Quasi-Government)	Government Agencies	Local Government Units
<div><div>Chapter 7: Value Chains, Post-Harvest and Trade</div><div>Top priority for 4 Fisherfolks Organization representatives (engaged in livelihood/enterprise development and aquaculture production)</div></div>	<div>10. Enterprise and livelihood development for SSF communities (seaweed and shell farming, high-value seafood aquaculture, value addition/ seafood processing, and collective marketing).</div> <div>11. Design and develop appropriate technologies with proper support in capacity building, materials procurement and technical guidance on aquaculture projects of the government</div> <div>12. Technology transfer on climate change adaptation for SSF communities towards increase resiliency.</div> <div>13. Capacity building must be supported by provision of necessary resources.</div> <div>14. Redesigning of the framework for cooperative development for the SSF sector (currently cooperative framework is more adapted to farmers).</div> <div>15. Access to post-harvest facilities and recognition of women as partner of MAO in program development and project implementation.</div> <div>16. Partnership with the locality in provision of utilities to support start-up livelihoods/enterprises.</div> <div>17. Program development and allocation of investment in post-harvest infrastructures that are critical to women in SSF's main areas of work.</div> <div>18. Access to aquaculture technology adapted to community-based operations.</div> <div>19. Promotion of partnerships with LGU, NGOs, Private Sector, BFAR, NFRDI⁷⁸ and DOST in SSF community-based enterprise development to ensure support at all levels..</div>	—	—	—	—

Annex B:

Summary of Indicator Prioritization and Key Areas of Concern by SSF-Relevant Actors

SSF Guidelines	Fisherfolk Representatives & Organizations	Non-Government Organizations	SSF Development Council/ FARMCs (Quasi-Government)	Government Agencies	Local Government Units
Chapter 8 Gender Equality	<div>1. Improve registration system to reduce discrimination against women in fisheries.</div> <div>2. Increase LGU GAD⁸⁰ budget (currently at 5%) and improve monitoring of utilization (improvement supported by the Mandanas-Garcia Ruling).</div> <div>3. Allocation of budget for establishment of Women Managed Areas.</div> <div>4. Introduction of targeted capacity development and training on leadership and project implementation.</div> <div>5. Institutionalization of mechanisms to ensure at least 40% women representation in key fisheries decision-making bodies.</div> <div>6. Adoption and implementation of the Magna Carta of Women and Magna Carta of the Poor.⁸¹</div> <div>7. Develop technologies for women in SSF through partnerships with women's groups and groups supporting women.</div> <div>8. Ensuring equal opportunities and establishment of incentive structures to promote women participation and representation in government and as focal persons for the GAD units.</div> <div>9. Design interventions which address the needs of households which overlap with the known burden of women in SSF communities.</div> <div>10. Introduction (or increase) of representation allowance for SSF community leaders.</div>	<div>1. Mainstream gender equality indicators across the key themes.</div> <div>2. Inclusion of gender and development as priority concern among LGUs. GAD units often do not have programs for SSF communities.</div> <div>3. Community organizing to promote equal opportunity to participate.</div>	—	<div>1. Recognition of the role of women in post-production and development of programs based on their needs.</div> <div>2. Promote women-led or women-managed pre- and post-harvest facilities.</div>	<div>1. Promotion of participation and employment of women in LGUs.</div> <div>2. Promotion of women-led organizing and supporting existing initiatives of women groups in the locality (e.g., KALIP⁸², RIC⁸³) in partnership with the Municipal Social Welfare and Development Office.</div> <div>3. Utilization of the 5% GAD budget supporting women in SSF.</div>

Annex B:

Summary of Indicator Prioritization and Key Areas of Concern by SSF-Relevant Actors

SSF Guidelines	Fisherfolk Representatives & Organizations	Non-Government Organizations	SSF Development Council/ FARMCs (Quasi-Government)	Government Agencies	Local Government Units
Chapter 8 Gender Equality	<div>11. Recognition of the Basic Sectors as Partners of the government through proper capacity building</div> <div>12. Enhance organizing of women's organization to establish the base for participation and representation (i.e., organizing of cooperatives, associations, and women committees under organizations to promote the welfare and rights of women).</div> <div>13. Inclusion of consideration to cultural, religious, and geographic context in promoting equality. Promote 'equality of opportunity' for women in fisheries.</div> <div>14. Design and develop livelihood and enterprise projects for women through BFAR and DOST partnerships.</div>	—	—	—	—

Annex B:

Summary of Indicator Prioritization and Key Areas of Concern by SSF-Relevant Actors

SSF Guidelines	Fisherfolk Representatives & Organizations	Non-Government Organizations	SSF Development Council/ FARMCs (Quasi-Government)	Government Agencies	Local Government Units
<div><div>Chapter 9: Disaster Risks and Climate Change</div><div>Top priority for National Fisherfolk Representative (NAPC Basic Sector), government representative</div></div>	<div><div>1. Inclusion of basic sector (SSF) representation in local DRRM⁸⁴ bodies.</div><div>2. Provision of targeted support for fishers during typhoons.</div><div>3. Transparent access to adaptation of the People Survival Fund through public consultations.</div><div>4. Inclusion of SSF representative under the DRRM bodies.</div><div>5. Introduce programs promoting use of efficient energy (solar power for SSF communities).</div><div>6. Inclusion of the NAPC⁸⁵ under disaster-related management and response bodies (e.g., the IATF⁸⁶) to better guide grassroots interventions.</div><div>7. Enhance enforcement of regulations on human-induced pollution.</div><div>8. Promote resilient livelihoods in aquaculture with support from LGUs (e.g., oyster, crab, milkfish aquaculture)</div><div>9. Design and implement climate-resilient settlement programs for SSF communities in combination with designation of evacuation areas for fishers.</div></div>	<div><div>1. Enhance disaster response through continued efforts to address habagat (Southwest Monsoon) as a lean catch period of time for fishers.</div></div>	<div><div>—</div></div>	<div><div>1. Addressing the existing and already exacerbated problem on vulnerability of SSF. The vulnerability of the natural resource assets of the SSF communities adds to their economic vulnerability.</div></div>	<div><div>1. Promotion resilience as an integral part of sustainable resource management. DRR forms part of project identification.</div><div>2. Enhancing resiliency of SSF communities through Information and Education Campaigns, and provision of designated evacuation centers for area for known sites vulnerable to flooding.</div><div>3. Development of infrastructure to increase protection of communities from sea level rise during typhoon season and storm surges.</div></div>

Annex B:

Summary of Indicator Prioritization and Key Areas of Concern by SSF-Relevant Actors

SSF Guidelines	Fisherfolk Representatives & Organizations	Non-Government Organizations	SSF Development Council/ FARMCs (Quasi-Government)	Government Agencies	Local Government Units
M&E, Data Collection and Digitalization	<div><div>1. The NAPC monitors poverty reduction initiatives for SSF communities, but data are not currently being shared or collected by the BFAR.</div><div>2. Local SSF organizations (fisherfolk organizations) also collect and monitor data on memberships and local fisheries industry but are not currently being collected by relevant government agencies.</div><div>3. Government agencies conduct convergence meetings that allows for identification of status and capacity of agencies concerned on SSF development, but each agency maintains separate monitoring.</div><div>4. The NAPC, through its Basic Sectors, collected data on SSF communities during the COVID-19 pandemic.</div><div>5. Digitalization will limit participation of SSF communities in many areas without internet/communication infrastructure.</div><div>6. The COVID-19 pandemic, however, increased the opportunity of SSF representatives to participate in national consultation through adoption of online conferencing by both the CSO and government agencies.</div><div>7. Digitalization must be in combination with blended approaches (e.g., face-to-face, and online conferencing for sharing of results).</div><div>8. Harmonization of the database on SSF: RSBSA,⁸⁷ FishR⁸⁸ and BoatR.</div><div>9. Centralize collection and consolidation of data on poverty reduction initiatives is needed to harmonize current initiatives for SSF.</div></div>	<div><div>1. SSF stakeholders are the source of data on fish catch but are not being collected or used by BFAR and LGUs for SSF development.</div><div>2. Local fisheries development plans are often based on data collected by NGOs and SSF organizations.</div><div>3. NGOs generate comprehensive local data and information through Participatory Rural Assessments (e.g., data on gears, seasonality calendar, habitat data based on community's historical records/ observation, major species caught, and history of local fisheries, livelihood operations, program/project implementation records) but are not being collected by the LGU and BFAR. These are often only included if the localities and agencies have a partnership project with the NGO.</div><div>4. Requesting data (often only available in generalized or raw form) from the BFAR requires too many requirements and processing of data is often done by the person requesting. Some data are only shared during workshops or presentations.</div><div>5. Data presented by fisheries agencies are not often validated at the local level (e.g., NSAP data is questioned by SSF communities—only reflecting commercial fishing contributions).</div></div>	<div><div>1. Profiles of the fisherfolk organizations and FishR data are given to LGU.</div><div>2. The main role of fishers is as a data source on fishers and their activities and issues.</div><div>3. Internet access is the main challenge to digitalization.</div><div>4. Affordability of devices and internet access is limited among fisherfolks. There are existing affordable options but are often too far from the residence of the fishers.</div></div>	<div><div>1. Monitoring and evaluation process are in place, but learning is not part of the process. Most agencies are hesitant to address the evaluation and learning results due to the required paperwork for introducing changes in succeeding implementation process.</div><div>2. Current implementation is output driven. Adoption of a more impact-driven implementation of intervention is a big challenge.</div><div>3. Data collection is compartmentalized: general statistics are maintained by the PSA, the registry system for agriculture is maintained by the Department of Agriculture, the fisherfolks registration is maintained by the BFAR, data on indigenous peoples is maintained by the NCIP, data and registry on poverty is maintained by the DSWD, and data on community-based monitoring system (CBMS) is maintained by the DILG. These are all utilized by each agency as separate datasets despite the overlap in the data on SSF.</div><div>4. Implementation of the Magna Carta of the Poor on requiring a single system of registry for the poor based on the CBMS or DSWD's Listahanan. At present, an SSF member can be registered under all of these registries but there is no mechanism for tracking the overlap in the dataset. Cross checking is being done manually for each intervention.</div></div>	<div><div>1. LGUs maintain hard copies and Excel-encoded FishR and BoatR raw data while the encoded data are transmitted to the BFAR. The FishR data contains information on SSF community's pre- to post-harvest profile. Reports are submitted but the BFAR provides no feedback and technical support in the utilization of the data after collection. The system is also unreliable for those who can access the database.</div><div>2. At present, the BFAR prevents access from external stakeholders. This is done as part of the agency's data privacy policy. While this limits the accessibility of the data, it also helps in protecting the datasets from being used by politicians for their own gains.</div><div>3. At the LGU level, data collected are not yet being utilized properly due to lack of plan and process on how to use them.</div><div>4. The NSAP⁹⁶ is not present in all municipalities/barangays which render their data on local fisheries a representation only of commercial fishing operation. Main data collection happens at the ports where majority of landed catches are from commercial operators. Considering that there should be no commercial fishing operations within the municipal waters, local fisheries production is not reflected in current datasets. Therefore, data collected cannot guide fisheries management at the local level.</div></div>

Annex B:

Summary of Indicator Prioritization and Key Areas of Concern by SSF-Relevant Actors

SSF Guidelines	Fisherfolk Representatives & Organizations	Non-Government Organizations	SSF Development Council/ FARMCs (Quasi-Government)	Government Agencies	Local Government Units
M&E, Data Collection and Digitalization	<p>10. SSF communities often collect observations, generate reports, and collect their own data to support their operations. Some data are easier to access than others.</p> <p>11. Data analysis requires support from local scientist and academe near SSF communities.</p> <p>12. SSF-led local data collection is limited due to financial constraints of involved fishers/fisherfolks groups.</p> <p>13. The LGU-MAO is often limited in resources and personnel for data collection and maintenance. Attention to SSF is often secondary only to the agriculture (farming) in most municipalities.</p> <p>14. SSF organizations need to first lobby their respective LGU-MAO to consolidate or gather data to better respond to the needs of the fisherfolk organizations.</p> <p>15. If there are data collected by the LGU-MAO, they need to be requested first and analysis and validation are not often done on the data.</p> <p>16. There non-government organizations engaged in data collection but there is currently no concerted effort to collect and maintain local data on SSF.</p> <p>17. Some SSF organizations have access to smart phones and can perform basic operations, but many are still limited by internet infrastructures in the localities. Training on utilization of Information Technology for SSF is required before digitalization.</p> <p>18. There is currently no accessible data on network of organizations, particularly on organizations providing legal and technical support for SSF communities.</p>	<p>6. NSAP data are only presented to SSF stakeholders without proposed actions that can aid in fisheries management. There is also no opportunity for feedbacking.</p> <p>7. There is currently no incentive for SSF organizations and stakeholders to engage in data collection and participate in digitalization. At present, paper-based catch documentation is limited to none.</p> <p>8. Some areas in Quezon Province have initiated piloting of adoption of vessel monitoring thru partnership with private technology provider, FAME.⁹⁵</p> <p>9. Existing database and website are not easily accessible and technical support for troubleshooting is not yet present.</p> <p>10. Small-scale technology, like pocket Wi-Fi, are locally available but are still not reliable. This is also affected by unreliable supply of electricity in many coastal areas.</p> <p>11. Data transmission is often interrupted in remote areas due to unreliable internet services.</p> <p>12. Cost of existing technology on data collection for monitoring, control, and surveillance are not affordable for SSF communities and for coastal LGUs which often belong to low-income classification.</p>	—	<p>5. Utilization of dataset is limited to identification of (number of) beneficiaries for programs. Selection is often not done in combination with matching and tracking the beneficiaries who may be part of another program that will benefit from convergence of interventions.</p> <p>6. Digitalization will require additional manpower costs, capacity and system development which are not yet part of the allocations of agencies concerned.</p> <p>7. There is currently no motivation to adopt digitalization. Turfing (agencies which focuses only on their direct mandate and does not recognize overlap in both identified beneficiaries and jurisdiction) prevents agencies from coordinating with other agencies. The convergence in data management will also require assigning a lead agency and is likely to result in political conflict among agencies.</p> <p>8. Digitalization can be facilitated through integration of marketing support mechanism.</p> <p>9. Existing research conducted by different agencies are not being utilized properly. Policies and programs are not being informed by the results of studies which are mainly conducted as part of compliance. No database exists to consolidate government research as bases for program development. A meta-analysis for research with similar scope and objectives does not exist.</p>	<p>5. Data limitation on the actual contribution of SSF in fisheries production also prevents recognition of the sector and due allocation of resources to support its development.</p> <p>6. NSAP data are only presented to select fisheries stakeholders but provides no venue for validation and review. SSF community members are often not the primary target of these presentations or sharing of data.</p> <p>7. LGUs maintains data and profile of SSF community in disaster risks areas. The mapping is done by the DRRM, DENR, and MGB.⁹⁷</p> <p>8. Declaration of incomplete information is a key challenge in data collection for FishR and BoatR.</p> <p>9. Access to the BFAR database is slow and only sample data are available. There is also no LGU participation in analysis of the data collected for these datasets.</p> <p>10. SSF communities only serve as source of data and are not part of analysis and planning for utilization of collected data.</p> <p>11. SSF communities are mainly involve in monitoring of implementation of programs and projects through community reports (mainly verbal and written being done by the LGU's fisheries technician).</p>

Annex B:

Summary of Indicator Prioritization and Key Areas of Concern by SSF-Relevant Actors

SSF Guidelines	Fisherfolk Representatives & Organizations	Non-Government Organizations	SSF Development Council/ FARMCs (Quasi-Government)	Government Agencies	Local Government Units
M&E, Data Collection and Digitalization	<p>19. Tools and indicators on SSF communities are not well adopted. This limits the access of FFOs to data on fisheries.</p> <p>20. Data generated/contributed by SSF organizations to PSA,⁹⁰ BFAR and other agencies: data on production, local prices, hectareage of production areas, impacts of disasters (damage reports, number of people affected). Data collected and analysis by SSF organizations are not being shared back to the SSF communities that collected the data.</p> <p>21. There is currently no dedicated agency for sharing data analysis on SSF data. Data collection is often only conducted for compliance. NSAP⁹¹ and PSA are only limited to collection and consolidation.</p> <p>22. There is currently a disconnect between data collection and program development at the government level (e.g., data on fishers is only referenced as source of information on number of beneficiaries).</p> <p>23. There are local partnerships with international organizations towards digitalization (e.g., UN-FAO partnership with the local coalition of fishers in Zamboanga, COMFAZ).</p> <p>24. Localization of information, especially translation of scientific terms, is a key challenge in increasing the accessibility of digitalization initiatives. The academe and scientists often only use language only they can understand and limits the opportunity for SSF community to directly participate in the discussions.</p> <p>25. Tools, methodology, information, and knowledge materials used by academe, government, private sector and SSF communities are not harmonized.</p>	<p>13. Cost of existing technology on data collection for monitoring, control, and surveillance are not affordable for SSF communities and for coastal LGUs which often belong to low-income classification.</p> <p>14. LGUs need to develop and establish their own database on local fisheries. At present, while data collection for the FishR is done by the LGUs, the maintenance is done only at the national level by BFAR.</p> <p>15. Interpretation of data must be done at the collective level to surface different perspective and stakeholder agenda.</p> <p>16. Current data on fisheries are only utilized as reference for the total number of beneficiaries. Datasets are not utilized for development programs and interventions.</p> <p>17. Data collection is driven by compliance. The BFAR is requesting data from LGU to comply with the agency's data collection activities while the LGUs are only collecting data because the BFAR requested the data from them. Data collection is not yet being done to aid program development for SSF.</p>	—	<p>10. Data limitation is likely to prevent full implementation of the MEL process.</p>	<p>12. Sharing of learnings are done through the Barangay and Municipal FARMCs.</p> <p>13. Accessibility for existing databases remains an issue with direct access limited only to technicians.</p> <p>14. SSF communities only currently serves as data sources and have no participation in how the collected data are utilized.</p> <p>15. The BFAR conducts data collection and validation for its MMK program (recognition of well-managed local fisheries) for LGUs: FishR and BoatR, local visits to assess ridge to reef area, document review of fisheries policies, community interviews and assessment of fisherfolks organization activities and projects on fisheries management, and DRRM activities of LGUs for coastal communities.</p> <p>16. LGUs are currently limited in terms of funding for development of IT infrastructure and hiring of personnel for database management.</p> <p>17. There are existing local service providers for information communication technology (internet providers).</p> <p>18. Digitalization can be introduced through the children of SSF families who have more familiarity with smart phones and computers.</p>

Annex B:

Summary of Indicator Prioritization and Key Areas of Concern by SSF-Relevant Actors

SSF Guidelines	Fisherfolk Representatives & Organizations	Non-Government Organizations	SSF Development Council/ FARMCs (Quasi-Government)	Government Agencies	Local Government Units
M&E, Data Collection and Digitalization	<div>26. Government programs that are related are not often considered within the same development environment and limits the interchange of data collection (e.g., modernization and best practices programs like the MMK⁹² was not implemented in the context of the Biyayang Dagat⁹³ and AFMA.⁹⁴</div> <div>27. Organizations, particularly women-led, maintains financial data relevant to fisheries operations and projects. This also include other socio-economic data, community observations and profile of members of organizations.</div>	—	—	—	—

Footnotes for annexes section:

49. MFARMCs
50. Local Government Units
51. New legislation giving more powers and resources to LGUs.
52. Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
53. Civil Society Organizations
54. Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Management Councils
55. Agriculture and Fisheries Council (under the Philippine Council for Agriculture and Fisheries)
56. MFARMC members and officers are elected by SSF representatives from SSF organizations
57. Monitoring, Control and Surveillance
58. Fisheries Management Areas
59. Farmer-peasant, Artisanal fisherfolks, Workers in the formal sector and migrant workers, Workers in the informal sector, Indigenous peoples and cultural communities, Women, Differently-abled persons, Senior citizens, Victims of calamities and disasters, Youth and students, Children, Urban poor, Cooperatives, and Non-government organizations
60. Department of Social Welfare and Development
61. Cooperative Development Authority
62. Department of Labor and Employment
63. Department of Science and Technology
64. Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing
65. Department of Agriculture
66. Department of Justice
67. Fisherfolks Organization
68. Non-government Organization
69. The Philippines is subdivided into municipal, provincial, and regional jurisdictions.
70. Philippine National Police

71. National Housing Authority
72. National Electrification Administration
73. Local Water Utilities Administration
74. Department of the Interior and Local Government
75. Department of Environment and Natural Resources
76. Department Order 196-16 Rules and Regulations Governing the Working and Living Conditions of Fishers on board Fishing Vessels Engaged in Commercial Fishing Operation
77. Philippine Crop Insurance Corporation
78. National Fisheries Research and Development Institute
79. Department of Trade and Industry.
80. Gender and Development
81. Women in fisheries belong to the poorest of the poor basic sector population.
82. Kalipunan ng Liping Pilipina (Coalition of Women).
83. Rural Improvement Club
84. Disaster Risk Reduction Management
85. National Anti-Poverty Commission
86. Inter-Agency Task Force
87. Registry System for Basic Sectors in Agriculture
88. Fisherfolks Registration
89. Boat Registration
90. Philippine Statistics Authority
91. National Stock Assessment Program
92. Malinis and Masaganang Karagatan Program
93. Fisheries Modernization Program
94. Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Act
95. Futuristic Aviation and Maritime Enterprise
96. The National Stock Assessment Program collects sampled data on fish catch.
97. Mines and Geoscience Bureau

Annex C:

Number of Registered Fisherfolks, Municipal Fishing Boats and Gears (BFAR, 2018)

Regions	Number of Municipal Fisherfolks	Number of Municipal Fishing Boats	Number of Gears of Municipal Fisherfolks
NCR	9,402	719	2
CAR	25271	308	12
Region 1	82052	9461	4519
Region 2	95336	10255	651
Region 3	131240	8876	368
Region 4-A	132950	13200	346
Region 4-B	155721	29457	8621
Region 5	158203	21791	306
Region 6	164841	29670	507
Region 7	146790	29358	12559
Region 8	185188	31981	790
Region 9	100360	17528	825
Region 10	69672	10541	3008
Region 11	56927	10713	304
Region 12	87479	9900	197
CARAGA	71659	8027	141
ARMM	253325	21309	763
Total	1,926,416	201,885	29,504

Annex D:

Poverty Incidence for the Fisheries Sector, 2006, 2009, 2012, 2015
(Philippine Statistics Authority)

Regions	2006	2009	2012	2015
Philippines	41.2	41.3	39.2	34
NCR	-	-	-	-
CAR	-	-	-	-
Region 1	44.8	39.5	20.1	22.0
Region 2	-	-	-	-
Region 3	-	-	-	-
Region 4-A	24.7	27.1	39.2	19.0
Region 4-B	37.9	38.7	36.5	26.2
Region 5	47.8	45.1	45.6	48.5
Region 6	33.5	32.1	27.6	18.6
Region 7	46.0	43.4	40.2	31.2
Region 8	45.1	49.0	46.4	40.0
Region 9	56.7	54.3	40.4	34.2
Region 10	-	-	-	-
Region 11	46.3	43.0	36.5	43.8
Region 12	-	-	-	-
CARAGA	61.8	68.6	49.6	38.9
ARMM	44.5	40.3	42.9	43.4

MEL4SSF Piloting

Philippines

