ADDRESSING POVERTY IN COASTAL COMMUNITIES

Tambuyog Development Center

INTRODUCTION

To alleviate poverty in the fisheries sector, the government vowed to: "provide subsistence fishermen access to coastal resources to improve the economic conditions in coastal communities through the provision of alternative sources of livelihood, credit and technical and marketing assistance and strengthen social services in coastal areas through the provision of effective education, health and nutrition services and implementation of population control programs (ADB 1993)."

The municipal fishery remains a significant producer in the fisheries sector. Yet, it remains one of the most marginalized sector in agriculture and fisherfolks continue to be entrapped in the circuitous web of poverty. This paper seeks to provide insights on the government's poverty alleviation strategy based on Tambuyog's fifteen years of working with coastal communities.

Poverty Concepts and Theories

What is poverty? Poverty connotes a deprivation in relation to a social standard, or the lack of the minimum entitlements of households in society which the government must seek to provide, either directly or indirectly. In the context of human development, poverty is defined as the sustained inability of a household to meet its minimal set of capabilities for human, physical, intellectual and psychological functioning, or its minimum basic needs (MBN)¹. An MBN for a particular country is a matter of social consensus at a given historical period. Categories of needs may be broadly divided into survival, security, and empowerment (see table below). The MBN are primarily measures of outcomes, while private income is an important means of achieving those outcomes.

	Health	•	Infant mortality rate Child mortality rate
	Netvitien	•	Family planning practice/access
	Nutrition	•	underweight
Survival		•	Prevalence of acute and chronic malnutrition
		•	Prevalence of micronutrient deficiencies
			(anemia, endemic goiter, xerophthalmia)
		•	Income above the food threshold
	Water and Sanitation	•	Proportion of households with sanitary toilet
			facilities
		•	Proportion of household with access to safe
			water supply

Table 1. Minimum Basic Needs with Corresponding Indicators

¹ A National Strategy to Fight Poverty

Philippine Institute of Development Studies

	Income Security		Income above the total poverty threshold
		•	Amount of household savings
		•	Employment or unemployment
Security	Shelter	-	Housing by type of materials
		•	Proportion of households in makeshift housing
	Peace and Order	-	Crime incidence
		-	Incidence of armed encounters
	Basic Education and	-	Elementary enrollment
	Literacy	-	Completion rate
Enabling		•	Basic and functional literacy
Needs	Participation	-	Membership in at least one area-based
			community organization
		-	Participation in formal electoral exercises

NOTE: These MBN were later expanded to include clothing and family care under survival and enabling needs, respectively. Likewise, a n umber of indictors have been included. Family planning practice/access (already listed above) is the only one of the new indicators added to the list.

Source: A National Strategy to Fight Poverty. Philippine Institute of Development Studies

How is poverty measured? The most widely used approach to measuring poverty is to define a poverty line in terms of real income or expenditure needed to acquire a specified bundle of goods and services (primarily basic needs such as food, clothing, and shelter), and to classify an individual (or household) if the income or expenditure is below the individual (or household) poverty line². Poverty in the Philippines is officially measured relative to a total poverty threshold, which is the officially determined minimum income requirement needed by a family to purchase a specific bundle of basic goods and services; excluding freely provided goods and services such as elementary to high school public education³. Using current income to measure poverty has its limitations. For one, it may overestimate or underestimate current well being even if current income is correctly measured for the year⁴. Current income is not constrained if there is a transfer of income from one household to another (such as the case when a household receives remittances from abroad or financial aid from relatively well-off family member) or if a person can borrow or use his savings. Thus, Balisacan (1999) favors the use of current consumption as a better indicator of welfare than current income. However, current income as proxy indicator of poverty is simple and easily understood and for simplicity and consistency with existing data, will be one of the basis in analyzing poverty in fishing households.

Face of Poverty

Who are the poor? One way to describe the poor is to group them according to resource base or source of income. The description group families according to their means of survival or the resources they manage and depend on for their incomes. One such group is the artisanal or municipal fisherfolks, small-scale subsistence fisherfolks who use gears which do not require a

² T. N. Srinivasan. "Poverty in the Philippines: A Comparative Perspective". Perspectives on Philippine Poverty. Center for Integrative and Development Studies, U. P. Diliman and The Council on Southeast Asian Studies, Yale University. October 1993.

³ A National Strategy to Fight Poverty

Philippine Institute of Development Studies

⁴ Balisacan A.M., "What Do We Really Know - Or Don't Know – About Economic Inequality and Poverty in the Philippines?" Causes of Poverty: Myths, Facts and Policies. UP Press. 1999

boat or require only boats below three tons. This group is one of the poorest of the poor, with per capita income two-thirds below the national poverty line.

Are all fisherfolks poor? This may seem a rhetorical question but, unfortunately, the answer is much more complicated. Fishing communities are one of the most diverse sociocultural group. They are characterized by sub-groups that may or may not be directly dependent on fishing as their main livelihood, including fish processors, fish vendors, and fish buyers (those who provide the link between fisher and market). Because of the heterogeneous nature of fishing communities, it is possible to distinguish a strata of poverty within this group based on the fishing gear used. In fact, social and economic differentiations are evident not only in the gears (passive or active) and vessels (motorized or non-motorized, municipal or commercial) used but also on whether they own or rent their fishing boats, or join fishing trips as crew member; on whether or not they have access to production capital; on whether or not they have other sources of income; on whether or not they have stable families. It is, therefore, very important to identify the particular groups of fishermen in need of assistance rather than channel funds for poverty alleviation to the fishery sector or the small-scale fishery subsector as a whole.

MUNICIPAL FISHERIES PROFILE

The Fisheries Code of 1998 defines municipal fishing as referring to fishing within municipal waters using fishing vessels weighing three gross tons or less. The definition also includes fishing not requiring the use of fishing vessel. Municipal waters are marine waters 15 kilometers from the coastline, and also the streams, lakes, and rivers within the municipality⁵.

The 1999 Philippine Fisheries Profile of the BFAR shows that the fisheries sector's contribution to the country's total gross domestic product (GDP) is estimated at 2.7% at current prices and 3.9% at constant prices. Its percentage contribution to the gross value added (GVA) in agriculture is placed at 19.4 percent. The contribution of the municipal fisheries sector in the total fish production is 919,000 MT (32.3 % of the total) with an estimated value of 30.8 billion pesos; a total of 1.08% increase from the previous year. However, production in municipal fisheries still consistently shows a downward trend from the 1970's production which is estimated at 57%.

Importance and Trends of Fisheries⁶

The Philippine population is highly dependent on food fish. Recorded per capita consumption of the "fish, meat and poultry food group" is 54 kg/yr in 1993 of which 67% is composed of fish and fish products.

In 1998 fishery exports amounted to 185,758 metric tons valued at P20.553 B, an increase of almost 6.8% and 25.8% in volume and value respectively, as compared to 1997 figures. Major fisheries exports were tuna (P7.9 B), shrimp/prawn (P5.08 B), and seaweeds (P2.52 B). Balance of trade was placed at P17.69 B (\$446.7 B). Among the major buyers of Phil. fishery products were Japan (P6.8 B), the USA (P3.98 B), and Hong Kong (P1.4 B).

⁵ The code also explicitly states that areas as defined under the National Integrated Protected Area Systems (NIPAS) Law such as public forest, timber lands, forests reserves, or fishery reserves are not considered part of municipal waters.

⁶ White and Trinidad (1998)

			1997			
	Quantity	FOB	Value	Quantity	FOB	Value
	(MT)	(PM)	(\$M)	(MT)	(PM)	(\$M)
Fishery Export	185,758	20,553	530.0	173,887	16,337	549.8
Fishery Import	165,989	3,288	83.3	295,016	4,020	138.1
Balance of	1,769	17,265	446.7	(121,129)	12,317	411.7
Trade						

Table 2. Balance of Trade in Fisheries, 1997-1998

Source : 1998 BFAR Phil. Fisheries Profile

Demersal fish production is dominated by municipal fishers. As far as production data is concerned, it is notable that production of demersal fish is more stable than pelagic fish production, the domain of commercial fishers. Blue crabs production is increasing and is mostly supplied by the Visayan sea. Squid production is also increasing. Siganids production is becoming a significant commodity and is now being exported to Australia, Korea and other countries. This presents an big opportunity to our municipal fishers to enter the global market. Grouper is a target species for aquaculture possibly because of its decreasing population due to cyanide fishing. Snapper production also seems stable.

Municipal fisheries production dominates the demersal fisheries (bottom-dwelling, nonmigratory species) and certain pelagic species such as big-eyed scad (*matang-baka*), anchovies (*dilis*), and yellow-fin (*albacore*) and big-eyed tuna (*tambakol*). Denersal species include blue crabs, squid, siganids, slipmouth, bisugo, goatfish, parrotfish, grouper, snapper, porgies and mullet. Commercial fisheries, on the other hand, dominates the production of pelagic species such as roundscads (*galunggong*), fimbriated sardines (*tunsoy*), indian sardines (*tamban*), frigate tuna (*tulingan*), and indian mackarel (*alumahan*)⁷.

The fishing industry also provided employment to approximately one million people, roughly 5% of the country's labor force. Of this, 68% is accounted for by the municipal fisheries sector, 28% by aquaculture, and the remaining 4% by the commercial fisheries sector. The commercial fisheries contribution to the total fish production is only 29,000 MT greater than the municipal fisheries (948,000 MT or 33.3% of the total fish production) yet they employ only 4% of the fishing labor force.

In 1999, there is almost equal fish production between the municipal, commercial and aquaculture fishery production. Aquaculture is consistent in production growth from 1989 to 1999. What is alarming is the production of municipal fishers which is consistently decreasing.

Dominance of imports began in 1988 up to 1997. A sudden drop was observed in 1998. Imports include fishmeal, mackerel, squid and cuttlefish, tuna and sardines. It is surprising to note that importation of cuttlefish and mackerel was allowed inspite of its steady supply. Yet the government sees the need to import these products. Without sufficient market support, importation only favors the consumer at the expense of our local producers, the small fishers.

Different fish production studies reveals that 80% of our fish production is consumed locally. Sixty percent of that 80% is consumed fresh, 8% dried and 8% processed. Only around 20% is being exported. Latest study on fish per capita is 27kg. One problem is marketing. Most

⁷ A total of 19 species were studied using the Philippine Fishery Statistics published by BAS from 1982 to 1997.

of our fish produce lands in Navotas because it commands the highest retail price in the whole of Metro Manila. Outside Metro Manila fish price are considerably lower.

COASTAL COMMUNITIES PROFILE

Resource Use

In a coastal community, mixed fishing and farming livelihoods are very common. The diversity of resources used in the households is quite big, and sustenance economy relies in a large part on access to land-based resources.

The total fishing effort by the community varies throughout the year, depending on when specific target species are abundant. Task-division between men and women in resource related activities is quite as generally described in the literature on small-scale fisheries: women do most of the land-based work and are sometimes involved in the fish processing and marketing; men tend to specialize on the fish catching activities, undertake some (specific) marketing work, and may assist in land-based work during harvests.

A fishing community is characterized by a multitude of gears designed to catch a specific species. A gear census conducted by Tambuyog in 1994 shows a total of 463 gears in Barili, Cebu, divided into 8 gear types. The fishers in Sapu Cove, Sarangani utilizes 13 different gears designed to catch 18 species. It is not surprising, therefore, that a fishing household own, or have access to, more than one gear type.

The fisherfolk community does not purely rely on marine resources. Some marine species may even be of secondary importance in sustenance use, while terrestrial resources as *lubi* (coconut) and *mais* (corn) may equal marine-based harvests as source of income for the household. *Lubi* when processed into copra can be a substantial source of income while *mais* is staple food in most fishing household especially in the south.

Work in the households is divided among the two basic ecosystems during the large part of the year. Most commonly, men would be involved in fishing and women would be working on the land. Only for specific times of the year (e.g. harvest in *mais* and/or fry-seasons) would household members work together. However, within that framework of a commonly applied division of labor, men would be engaged for specific tasks in land-based work (e.g. as labor carrying the sacks of *mais*) whereas women would be tapped for specific tasks in the fishery (processing, selling). Thus, both sexes in a household seem to apply a non-exclusive division of work and related responsibilities. Knowledge on the resource biology and extraction technology, and decision making authorities more or less follow a similar line of division.

Household Income

Enormous differences in income may exist between individual fishing households depending on the ownership and use of gear. Typically, in a peak season (approximately 2-4 months per gear) fishing income represents the largest fraction of total household income. During the lean season, most of the household income are derived from non-fishing sources or form the use of less predominant gears. Total income derived from fishing, specifically capture fisheries, may constitute only a little more than 55% of the total income.

The different gears used in the community have different contributions to overall community effort and yield in the fishery. For example, in Sapu Cove, Sarangani, *panamban* (gillnet), *subid-subid* (long line) and *baling* (ring net) are, in terms of effort and yield, the most important gears. More prominent is the economic efficiency with which this contribution is made. Almost all gears operate in combination with a motorized banca, and the engine used on the banca is an important determinant in the choice of fishing ground (larger engines allowing a greater distance covered in fishing), operational costs (repairs and fuel for the engine) and fixed costs (depreciation values per year). Thus, the economic performance of a fishing household is not only dependent on the gear used but also on the combination of gear and engine used.

The size of the engine used can influence the economic performance of a gear. In the case of *panamban* and *subid-subid*, a smaller engine results in smaller catch volumes and smaller net profits per fishing hour. Yet, the total number of hours does not differ that much. The size of the engine used appears not to be important in all gears. It seems to have little effect on the profit in the case of *lantao* (37-8 gillnet set for smaller sized pelagic predators like juvenile tuna and jacks) and little on the volume of the catch in *panti* (bottom set gillnet). In the latter case, the use of a larger engine actually diminishes net profits per fishing hour. As can be expected, the incomes earned from the use of a specific gear-banca combination also differs quite substantially.

The net incomes (on a yearly basis) from each banca-gear combination depend on how often (in a year) the combination is used. Some are highly seasonal in character and are only intensively used for a few months in the year; other combinations are used year-round. In most other cases, fishers would clearly need to be involved in a combination of fishing gears to make a more or less decent living.

To be more accurate, a description of economic performance and profit from a specific banca-gear combination should be done per season. Seasonal differences (when catch composition, volume, costs, fishing ground change) are important. Especially when trying to understand the reality that fishers often (need to) change the use of gears during a year, and thus face continuous choices in an attempt to optimize their total productivity as well as economic efficiency in the fishery. Not surprisingly, it appears to make economic sense to switch gears during the year, or at least to try and acquire (and maintain) the assets and skills that would allow the option to do so.

As the diversity in economic and ecological parameters, and more specifically their relationship with time and fishing ground, indicated, it would make 'economic' sense for the fishers not to specialize on the use of one gear only but to involve themselves with two, or more, gears during a year. It is clear that fishers do use a second, or even a third, gear aside the gear of their preference. Thus, fishing incomes are not made from one gear only but are comprised of the combined income from two, or more, gears during the year.

Although 'switching' gears makes a lot of economic sense, there exist an enormous diversity in both incomes from fishing as well as the basic economic efficiency parameters that may exist within the small community. Some fishers may earn a net (cash and non-cash) net income of 100,000 peso/year while only fishing for 8 months, while others earn less then one-third of that in a whole year. These differences reveal that not all fishers are equally poor.

Socio-economic profile of coastal fisherfolk⁸

At the time of FSP formulation (1989/90), the average household income was way below the poverty line of P2,061 per month, and around 80 percent of the sector's population were estimated as living below the poverty threshold.

The fishing communities were characterized as follows (ADB Loan Appraisal Report, 1989):

- Average family size probably the same or larger than the rural family with 5.5 members;
- Fishing communities with limited access to elementary schools and with 4.9 years of education, on average;
- Only four percent of municipal fishermen owning beds and 0.9 percent with TV sets;
- About 48 percent of the fishing communities with no electricity in their homes and only 23 percent with water provided by water systems;
- Only 16 percent used credit to finance their fishing gear acquisition, 4.8 percent borrowed from informal sources, and 9.6 percent from credit institutions.

In the initial years of FSP implementation (1991/92), the profile of fishing households in the FSP priority bay areas was described as follows (from various SEIOS reports):

- Average age of the household head: 41 years
- Average age of spouse : 37 years
- Educational attainment : 77 percent of household heads with 4-6 years of schooling compared to 68 percent of the spouses.
- Average household size: 5.1
- Average annual household income: P25,426
- House ownership: about 82 percent owned their place of residence
- Type of house: nipa and bamboo (44.1. percent); nipa and wood (34 percent)
- Lot ownership: about 40 percent owned the lots where their houses were built; the rest are renting or squatting
- Toilet facilities: 51 percent had the facilities.
- Boat ownership: most owned boats used for fishing but only 27 percent were motorized
- Fishing gears: hook-and-line, gillnet, beach seine were most popular
- Membership in community organizations; only for 25 percent
- Loan availment: about 20 percent, of which 83 percent came from informal sources
- Awareness of fishery laws: 46 percent were aware, of whom only 22 percent complied with the laws.

Post-FSP Socio-economic conditions in coastal communities. Based on rapid social assessment (RSA) surveys in selected bays (viz., Carigara bay in Leyte, Panguil bay in Northern Mindanao, Balayan bay in Batangas. Honda bay in Palawan, and Davao Gulf in northeastern Mindanao) as part of this TA, the basic demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the coastal communities are not much different from those observed in 1992 (See Table 3).

⁸ Primex and Anzdec (1996)

Indicators	Balayan Bay	Honda Bay	Davao Gulf	Carigara Bay	Panguil Bay	Average
1. Average household size	5.4	6	5.1	6.3	5.3	5.6
2. Average age household head	na	41	43	45	42	43
3. Educational attainment – household head	Elementary	Elementary	Elementary	Elementary	Elementary	Elementary
4. Average annual household income (total)	48,660	47,388	43,200	43,080	43,224	45,110
Monthly	4,055	3,949	3,600	3,590	3,602	3,759
4.1 from fishing	32,940	43,344	36,000	34,285	24,351	34,184
Monthly	2,745	3,610	3,000	2,857	2,209	2,849
4.2. from other sources	15,720	4,044	7,200	8,795	18,893	10,930
Monthly	1,310	337	600	733	1,574	911
5. House/lot ownership (%)						
5.1 House	54	93	91	95	91	85
5.2. Lot	35	30	26	25	32	30
6. Boat/gear ownership (%)						
6.1 Boat	73	84	86	87	95	85
6.2 Gear	90	941	75	98	97	90
7. Participation in gov't. fisheries program (%)	10	16	Not available (na)	48	44	30
8. Membership in fisherfolk organizations	24	39	na	33	38	34
9. Credit availments, 1990-1994	34	41	na	22	7	26

Table 3. Selected socio-economic data in five selected bays (1992)

In general, average total incomes per household are approximately P 8,766 per month. During 'high season' (2-4 months) fishing incomes represent the largest fraction of total household income. However, outside main seasons, most of their household income comes from non-fishing sources or the use of less predominant gears. Estimates of income of fishers in Sapu Cove, Sarangani province are shown in Table 4.

Gears	Net average earned income/ pp / month	Estimated contribution from non-fishing sources			
	from fishing;				
Panti (Gillnet)	2,718 - 6,518	4,345 - 10,872			
Subid-Subid (Longline)	5,773 - 6,066	1,517 – 23,092			
Lantao (Gillnet)	2,022 - 5,186	1,297 - 8,088			
Panamban (gillnet)	2,806 - 6,390	710 - 11,224			
Baling (fine mesh net)	205 - 5,600	0 - 820			
Other gears	2,104 - 3,422	0 - 4,909			

Table 4. Estimated incomes of fishers in Sapu Cove, Sarangani province.

Source: van Mulekom and Aguilar (1999)

POVERTY OF FISHING HOUSEHOLDS

Perez and Cruz (1997) attributes poverty among fisherfolk and their communities to at least four interrelated factors: 1) the low productivity of land-based resources or lack of access to land; 2) low productivity of aquatic resources mainly due to habitat destruction and stock depletion; 3) resource use conflict particularly in coastal waters; 4) and lack of adequate basic services delivery (i.e., health, education, shelter, infrastructures, etc.). The FSP report of the ADB (1993) also cites high population density in most nearshore areas, limitations imposed by weather problems, poor post-harvest handling and inefficient distribution practices which lower product value, and the lack of alternative income-generating opportunities as factors that cause or exacerbate poverty in coastal communities. These problems are manifestations of the *de-facto* open-access nature of the resource base⁹. Coastal and marine resources are state property, owned and managed by the state, yet it lacks the capacity to control access and exploitation¹⁰. The absence of a management mechanism leads to open-access and the outcome is the inefficient non-cooperative equilibrium¹¹ — the "tragedy¹²." The absence of the capacity to exclude opens the resource to unlimited extraction resulting to exhaustion and degradation. The poverty of fishing households, therefore, is a result of the poor articulation of property rights.

Barbers and Jacinto (1997) define property rights in the coastal context as the various claims enforceable by an institution holding and exercising authority under a system of rules that individuals or groups hold against one another with respect to the use of a particular resource. The authors further state that a given resource may be held under a variety of property rights regime, including (1) state property, where the government has sole claim and jurisdiction over the resources; (2) private property where an

⁹ See Fisheries Sector Profile of the Philippines. 1993. ADB; Lundayan Journal Vol. 5, No. 4, Fourth Quarter 1994. Tambuyog Development Center; Barber C.V. and Jacinto E.R (1997).

¹⁰ See Barbers and Jacinto (1997) and Kanbur (1992).

¹¹ Kanbur (1992).

¹² The "tragedy" that Kanbur is referring to is the "Tragedy of the Commons" where Hardin dramatized the problems of openaccess.

individual or corporation has the claim over the resource; and (3) communal or common property where the control of the resource is with the identifiable community of users. This is the case where the natural resource is managed by a communal group that devises and enforces control of exploitation of the resource¹³. Open access, on the other hand, is the manifestation of the absence of a management mechanism. Exclusion becomes impossible and the resource becomes free for all.

Assignment of access to and control over the resources to the communities that directly depend on the fishery resource is one viable option. Community property rights (CPR), in essence, is private ownership assigned to the community as a whole. It is property assignment, not merely management, which is silent about who owns the resource. It means that all others outside the particular community are excluded from resource access and use and from decision making. Individual co-owners have the right to use the resource and consequently have the responsibility to protect the particular resource on which they depend. The open access situation, in all its inefficient and iniquitous consequences is replaced by a defined community property regime. The community property regime is the very backbone of the community-based coastal resources management (CBCRM).

THE DILEMMA OF POVERY ALLEVIATION

Despite the government's long avowed goal of alleviating poverty in coastal communities and among the fisherfolk, certain factors have hindered this endeavor.

During the heyday of the ADB-funded Fisheries Sector Program (FSP), fishing communities saw the proliferation of sari-sari stores and backyard pig raising that were subsidized by the program. This was ostensibly to wean fishers away from the sea in what was basically a reduce fishing effort, introduce alternative (i.e. land based) livelihood approach.

While there has been a realization on the shortcomings of this approach among both government and non-government practitioners in CBCRM, a more grounded and effective strategy to alleviating poverty in coastal areas remains to be developed.

This can be partly attributed to the generic approach often employed by development agencies that often does not take into account fundamental differences between marginalized sectors in both rural and urban areas. In rural areas, there has been a tendency to lump poor fishers with the more numerous poor farmers while in urban areas fishers are often in included in the catch-all term "urban poor".

This situation is aggravated by highly aggregated data on marginalized sectors that prevents closer analysis of the impoverished condition of the fisherfolk and development of more focused approaches to poverty alleviation. Geographical targeting methods would help solve this dilemma but a more effective and long-term solution would be an in-depth analysis of the livelihood strategies of fishing households so as to identify crucial areas for intervention.

Another factor is the apparent bias of Agrikulturang MakaMASA - Fisheries, the fisheries development strategy of the national government, towards the commercial fisheries and aquaculture subsector. Even though the largest part of the budget is allocated for conservation and management, this bias is manifested in the budget items for the fisheries production, and research and development components of the program where there is hardly mention of initiatives to enhance productivity of municipal fisheries from which the majority of poor fishers earn their livelihood. This strategy, if not

¹³ Kanbur (1992).

subjected to a thoroughgoing critique by the fisherfolk themselves, could degenerate into a lineal descendant of the *effort reduction, alternative livelihood school of poverty alleviation*.

Government appropriations

The 1999 approved budget is 585 billion pesos. Appropriation for the Department of Agriculture is 14 billion or 2.4 percent of the total national budget. Out of this 14 billion, the DA office of the secretary controls 11.90 billion or 84.6 percent while BFAR received 1.41 billion or 10 percent. Makamasa programs are implemented by the office of the secretary. Makamasa programs are specific for rice and corn, high value crops, fisheries and livestock (Table 5).

Makamasa Program	Budget (million)	Percent
Rice and Corn	1,625	53.6
High value crops	527	17.4
Fisheries	470	15.5
Livestock	410	13.5
Total	3,032	100.0

Table 5. Makamasa budget for 1999.

Source: Department of Agriculture.

The MakaMASA Fisheries Program of the BFAR implemented the Integrated Livelihood Program For Fisherfolk (ILPF) in collaboration with QUEDANCOR released 26.5 M pesos as loans to 1, 542 fisherfolk beneficiaries in 1998. The selection process for the target beneficiaries is not clear but the bias for livelihood projects is with the fishers directly dislocated by fisheries policies (fish sanctuaries, ban on certain gears and marine conservation zone).

This factor is further complicated by the sometimes conflicting, sometimes confluent overall Policy direction determined by national laws such as the Fisheries Code (R.A. 8850) and the Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Act (R.A. 8435), and influenced by international economic institutions such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization.

Ultimately, the prime consideration in developing an effective and lasting approach to poverty alleviation in coastal communities is the dynamic between status of the fishing ground and the welfare of communities that surround it. If the former can be seen as an indicator of the latter and vice versa, then solving the poverty dilemma cannot be done without dealing with the many ways in which fisherfolk themselves employ the various resources at their disposal to earn their living from the sea. More succinctly, success of poverty alleviation initiatives in coastal communities would have to start from the current livelihood practices and strategies of the fisherfolk.

PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR POVERTY ALLEVIATION

On Income

If current income is the indicator to be used in identifying the poor fisher then the most significant finding of resource use and economics (RU&E) study conducted by Tambuyog in Sapu Cove, Sarangani is the complexity of deriving the net income of a fishing household. Not all fishing households are equally poor and the economic performance of a fishing household primarily depends on the combination of gears utilized in a year. Specifically, income of a fishing household depends on :

- 1) access to more than one gear type;
- 2) ownership and use of gear and the possible combinations of gear employed in a year;
- 3) combination of gear and engine use and how often this combination is used; and
- the income derived from land-based products. Dependency on marine resources is not absolute. In some households, terrestrial resources may even equal marine resources as source of income.

Another significant finding of the RUE study is the community's economic rational in the allocation of efforts over gears. This means that given certain assets and given certain resources, the community is indeed trying to achieve the greatest economic efficiency possible. In this, efficiency appears to be defined by comparing the input (cost) variable 'time' with the output (benefit) variable 'net peso'.

What is the significance of this finding? For one, poverty alleviation programs targeted specifically for fishing communities should take advantage of the multi-gear practice of fishing communities. It should encourage gear-development that would take advantage of relatively new target-species. Soft loans could also be made available to fishers using gears that would best benefit with the addition of engine use. It should be noted, however, that combination of gear and engine use does not favor all gear types. It is therefore important to identify the specific group of fishers using gears that would benefit from the addition of engine use. This could be the primary reason why most fishing households that were lucky enough to access loans for engine purchase were not able to pay. Engine addition does not necessarily translates to gear economic efficiency and therefore does not automatically adds to increase income for a fishing household. It may even burden the household with additional expenses for operation and maintenance.

Domestic fish consumption and marketing¹⁴

There are no official estimates of the pattern of utilization of the Philippine fishing output. However, various studies relating t fish production and consumption suggest that 80 percent of production quantities are consumed locally (64 percent fresh, 8 percent dried and 8 percent processed) and 20 percent are exported.

In commercial selling, brokers charge commissions of 5-7 percent and mark-ups at each stage of the marketing chain range from 10 to 50 percent. Thus, farm-gate prices are generally less than half of the retail prices. Prices at source are not, however, always identical with prices received by the fishermen, especially when the fishermen are hired help and do not own the boats and gear. In such cases, the return to the fisherman is as low as 15 percent of the landed price.

On Livelihood

The credit program of the government for alternative livelihood is aimed at drawing labor away from fishing. The credit program would support (1) livelihood projects and investment through groups established by NGOs for fishermen and fishfarmers to increase family income in program areas; (2) new fishing vessels and improved gear for the marginal fishermen in areas where additional fisheries resources have been identified to also increase family income; (3) construction and improvement of fishponds for fishfarmers in approved aquaculture areas to increase fish production (ADB 1993).

Alternative livelihood projects at the community level are often one-shot deals. The concern of the government is on the provision of capital and the sustainability of the livelihood is often neglected or not even considered. Tanyang and Graham (2001)¹⁵ defined livelihoods as "pertaining to activities that keep up or support the family living; livelihood may mean the escape of a family from poverty, but in most instances, it is simply the means of sustenance or survival of the household." They went on to define sustainability in the sustainable livelihood (SL) context as "the ability to withstand pressures in the environment, social linkages or relations, financial and material limitations, and allow for the next generations to pursue their own livelihood activities without the constant threat to collapse of resources."

The authors further stated that sustainable Livelihoods as a development perspective, is not simply about making positive effects to how financial resources are allocated to different sectors of a community, but how, whether directly targeting financial capital as a starting point for intervention, or elsewhere in the different forms of capital, such interventions take place with the perspective of affecting social relations—within households and beyond—and making equitable conditions particularly for the poor and marginalized. Increased well-being or improved quality of life—which is still much sought from the impacts of development activities—is an integral goal in this regard. This can be achieved when food security, environmental health, community tenure, gender equity and empowerment are also addressed.

Livelihood strategies of a household are constrained by the resources which it is able to access, use or control. In this, the livelihood condition of the household shifts between vulnerability and security, depending on the providence or benevolence of nature, social relationships and productive/economic relationships. Sustainable livelihood interventions, therefore, must target not only increasing incomes or expanding financial opportunities, but also ensures that the basic necessities of healthy, decent and secure standard of living are met. Developing SL activities requires balancing environmental concerns with economic needs. Resource management focused on effort reduction will be limited if seen as an end in itself. This could lead to the displacement or loss of long-standing livelihood activities.

¹⁴ ADB. 1993.

¹⁵ The discussion on sustainable livelihoods was quoted liberally from the works of Tanyang and Graham (1993).

Coastal households maximize social relations to meet daily needs and operational expenses for their productive activities. Changes in the quality of life, securing in the midst of vulnerability, and increased livelihood options lead to shifts in social relations within the household and the community. The altered conditions brought about by the promotion of existing and new livelihood activities, impinge changes in how capital or resources are accessed, used and decided upon, leading to the development of new social relations and structures in a community.

We should look at livelihoods as not only the promotion of economic activities, but as combination of survival strategies by households in coastal communities, which are affected, and in turn affect a number of economic and non-economic conditions in the community. Broadening of resource management approaches is needed to address the multi-faceted and multi-leveled livelihood issues in coastal communities. Banning active and illegal fishing gears must consider support for expanding livelihood opportunities, market growth, and protection or arbitration between labor and capitalists, either through policy or program development.

On Infrastructure and Post-Harvest Facilities

Fisheries infrastructure facilities¹⁶ are important to reduce post-harvest losses. The fisheries postharvest and infrastructure program through the Philippine Fisheries Development Authority (PFDA) include the establishment and improvement of regional and municipal fishports/landings, ice plant and cold storage and other post-harvest and marketing support facilities such as municipal processing plant.

The government's national municipal fishing ports program is aimed at constructing 178 small, simple landing stages with small market shed. Seventy one municipal fishing ports were already constructed in 1991 and more fishing ports are being constructed and rehabilitated financed by the ADB's Fisheries Sector Program. The government also has a private sector ice supply program set-up to increase ice supply in remote regions. Thirty-six ice and cold storage facilities with 10-40 tons per day and 20-350 tons per day capacities, respectively, were constructed. For fish processing and canning, there is a reported 42 canneries in the country in 1991. Fourteen canneries were located in Metro Manila ranging from simple operations to large factories. Nine of the larger canneries handling tuna and small pelagics are found in Metro Manila (2), Cebu (2), General Santos City (2), and Zamboanga (3).

The infrastructure programs in fisheries reflect the development bias of the government. Development efforts tend to be concentrated on investment areas with strong potential for growth. This results in the further marginalization of areas where rural poor are concentrated. An example is the fish landing/trading complex constructed in General Santos City in 1998. The facility was designed to accommodate the developing commercial fishery in the area but the facilities are also suitable for small scale fisheries. The local government ordered the closure of the older fishport and requested all fishers to land their products in the new facility. The new port charges higher fees and is located far from concentration areas of municipal fisherfolks. Trading is also based on large volumes and small fishers are the losers in the bargaining. In the end, the fishport, constructed to provide support services to fisherfolks, actually adds costs to the marketing expenses of the community.

¹⁶ See ADB (1993) for a more detailed report on the country's fisheries infrastructure and facilities.

On Targeting

If the municipal fisherfolks are one of the poorest of the poor and if they are unequally poor, who are the poorest fishers? ⁽²⁾ For poverty alleviation programs to be effective, it is important to identify the specific group of fisherfolks in need of assistance. Effective targeting ensures that poverty alleviations programs reach the poor and leakage to the non-poor is reduced. For policy makers, the challenge is to use available resources to provide the greatest possible assistance to those who need it most.

How do we identify and prioritize beneficiaries of poverty alleviation programs, specifically for the fisheries sector? The absence of reliable information for identifying the poor and the mounting constraints on public resources made targeting by means of indirect indicators the only viable alternative for most developing countries¹⁷. One such methodology is geographical targeting. Bigman and Fofack (2000) states that the basic rationale for targeting poverty alleviation program on the basis of geography is the existence of large differences in living standards between geographic areas and the concentration of poverty in some areas. They further elaborated on the advantages of geographical targeting over other methods enumerated below:

- (1) It provides clear criteria for identifying the target population and avoids the informational constraints that impede most targeted programs.
- (2) It is relatively easy to monitor and administer and local institutions and NGOs can greatly assist in implementing the programs.
- (3) Geographical targeting has relatively little influence on household's behavior, since it is difficult and costly for household to change its place of residence.
- (4) It is possible to improve targeting by combining geographic criterion with other eligibility criteria based on individual or household characteristics.
- (5) The instruments of geographically targeted programs can include not only direct income transfers to the target population but also a wide variety of other measures aimed at increasing the living standards of the entire population of the area (examples include investment in infrastructure, provisions of public health and education services, and provisions of financial services).

The absence of fisheries disaggregated data (from the agriculture sector) makes targeting difficult. Also, as Bigman and Fofack (2000) stated, "one potential difficulty of targeting programs to individual communities is selecting the criteria to determine eligibility". The authors further stated that "unless household survey contains reliable information on the incidence of poverty in each community in the country, we must use indirect indicators that are closely correlated with the incidence of poverty." Examples of indirect indicators cited in the literature include quality of access roads, distance from sources of drinking water, availability of public services, distance from the nearest public school or health clinic among others.

The bias for geographical targeting for poverty alleviation in the fisheries sector is based on the causal link between poverty and the environment¹⁸. Since the livelihood and well-being of a fishing

¹⁷ David Bigman and Hippolyte Fofack. 2000. Geographical Targeting for Poverty Alleviation: An Introduction to the Special Issue. The World Bank.

¹⁸ A study by the Asian Development Bank (Escaping the Poverty Trap: Lessons from Asia. ADB) relates important dimensions of environmental deterioration with rural poverty. The study identified three dimensions of economy-environment linkages: (1) the scale dimension, (2) misallocation dimension, and the (3) maldistribution dimension. The scale dimension focuses on the scale of economic activity (with population and real income levels as the major determinants of scale) relative to the regenerative and adaptive capacities of the environment. Market failures and public policy emanating from private activity leads to the misallocation dimension. The third dimension, called the maldistribution dimension, focuses on the relationship between the distribution of rights to ownership and use of land, forests, water resources and public infrastructure, and on the resulting environmental pressure. The

community is tied to the soundness of its marine and coastal resources, fishing ground status can be an alternative indicator of costal community poverty. Data from the assessment of the country's bays and gulfs are already well-established. The soundness of the community's fishing ground would, therefore, be an effective poverty indicator if sufficiently correlated with income. The fishing ground (FG) approach to poverty alleviation would take care of the environment-poverty side of the equation complimented by social expenditures program to increase access to basic services like health and education. All this while laying the ground for community property rights.

Financing Municipal Fisheries

The formal financial sector in fisheries consists of a wide array of banking and non-banking institutions including private commercial banks, private development banks (PDBs) and stocks savings and loan association, rural banks (RBs), thrift banks, and specialized government banks (SGBs). In the period 1980-1990, a total of P29.56 billion pesos was channeled by the government to the fisheries sector as credit support through development banks and rural banks. This amount represents only about 9.21 percent of the total institutional loans granted to agriculture. Except for the forestry sector, the fishery sector exhibited the lowest share among the major commodity sectors. Under the Fisheries Sector Program (FSP), a credit seed fund of 718.71 million pesos was established in support of income diversification for municipal fisherfolk within 12 priority bays and of intensification of aquaculture production in six identified regions¹⁹. It is estimated that some 50,000 beneficiaries/borrowers availed of loans from the participating banks. Projects eligible for financing under the FSP credit program were alternative livelihood enterprises for coastal fisherfolk (e.g., tilapia, bangus, crabs, etc.). The FSP credit program was coordinated by the Agricultural Credit Policy Council (ACPC) under the Department of Agriculture and the credit funds were channeled through the following five financial institutions: LBP, DBP, the Philippine Crop Insurance Corporation (PCIC), Quedan Guarantee Corporation (QUEDANCOR), the Guarantee Fund for Small and Medium Enterprises (GFSME).

The 1994-1998 loan profile (Table 6) released by the Land Bank of the Philippines (LBP) under the fisheries sector program shows that the greater proportion of fisheries loan is awarded to commercial fishers and aquaculture operators combined. Awarded loan of the commercial fisheries sector increased from 21, 549, 000 pesos in 1994 to 22, 037, 000 pesos in 1998. The aquaculture sector's loan, on the other hand, totals to 218, 409, 000 pesos in 1994 to 378, 768, 000 pesos in 1998. In contrast, loans of municipal fisheries sector totals to 50, 319, 000 in 1994 to 59, 253, 000 in 1998. The Development Bank of the Philippines (DBP) and the Philippine National Bank (PNB) were major sources of fisheries loans in the 1960's and 1970's. This has been replaced by the LBP which has now become the most active government bank in granting loans to the fisheries sector.

three dimensions have relative roles in the poverty-environment linkage. Policies seeking to address poverty alleviation should therefore also look into environmental considerations.

¹⁹ See Primex and Anzdec (1996)

Table 5. Fisheries Sector Program

Louir Frome Dy Commonly in Thousand Fesos										
	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998					
Milkfish	128,102	173,604	218,781	246,953	258,477					
Fixed Assets	87,168	92,325	95,060	98,127	101,656					
Others	57,688	64,955	68,563	70,211	70,599					
Municipal Fishing	50,319	56,531	57,543	58,352	59,253					
Fish Trading/Vending	19,370	23,650	26,277	45,341	47,373					
Tilapia	31,741	33,913	37,822	37,972	39,138					
Seaweeds	19,465	30,464	31,913	32,032	31,990					
Prawn	24,136	26,282	26,587	29,362	29,362					
Commercial Fishing	21,549	22,005	22,037	22,037	22,037					
Livestock	16,032	18,145	19,719	20,261	20,261					
Catfish	8,249	9,044	13,376	13,376	13,204					
Grouper	6,716	6,597	6,597	6,597	6,597					
Fish Processing	4,014	5,828	6,362	6,362	6,362					
Crop Production	5,039	5,365	5,506	5,506	5,506					
Cottage Industry	396	396	606	606	606					
Total	479,894	569,104	636,749	693,095	712,421					

Loan Profile By Commodity In Thousand Pesos

Source: Land Bank of the Philippines

Municipal fisherfolks and even small-scale aquaculture operators has difficulty accessing bank's regular loan facility because they lack collateral and are considered high risk borrowers. Thus, informal credit sources (credit cooperatives, pawnshops, traders and input dealers, private lenders including relatives and friends, etc.) play a significant role in providing financial assistance to the "non-bankable" members of the fisheries sector. They serve approximately 70% of rural borrowers, a significant contribution to the delivery of credit²⁰. This reflects the failure of the formal banking institutions to adequately meet the needs/requirements of specific groups or income classes of the economic sector, particularly the rural poor.

Why are fishers considered high-risk borrowers? The seasonality of fishing household income makes the repayment scheme/policy of most lenders inappropriate for a fishing community. Also, Tambuyog's experience in its program areas show that micro-credit funds acquired for micro-enterprises will likely go to repay other debts and secure household basic needs. Therefore, very small loans are not enough to do more than temporary alleviate or compensate for capital shortages. They are not enough to help families escape from poverty or reduce their vulnerability. The financial assistance needed by coastal households go beyond credit access. It requires other financial assistance such as assistance in savings, accumulating lump suns for larger purchases or investment, or for times of crisis or emergency. Different households or groups might have different priorities in this regard. Rather than just focusing on providing micro-credit, it would be worthwhile to research and experiment with "financial credit packages" that

might help household meet other financial needs. Since financial is only one kind of capital needed by coastal households, POs and NGOs should experiment with developing a system for members to make repayments in human or social capital forms (i.e. sweat or labor as a form of credit repayment). This system of contribution should be formalized and carefully monitored, though. This leads to the belief that micro-credit should not push through at the risk of ignoring other projects or opportunities to strengthen and consolidate the organization and bring benefits to members.

Tambuyog's Sustainable Coastal Area Development Program²¹

Tambuyog Development Center started its work in 1984 by implementing a socio-economic project for fishing communities in Pangasinan, a coastal province north of Manila. Its work has largely been concentrated on organizing fisherfolks and facilitating the delivery of basic services. The core program of Tambuyog for advocating CBCRM in the Philippines is the Sustainable Coastal Area Development (SCAD) program.

The SCAD program aims to: 1) facilitate the establishment of community structures and organizations that shall pursue an area-based integrated and sustainable development agenda; 2) mitigate poverty through cooperation, self-help and shared responsibility; and, 3) lessen the conflict between and among resource users and facilitate the community's active participation in decision-making processes and development efforts in the community.

The SCAD is a five-year program divided into the social preparation phase (one and a half years), program implementation phase (two years); and program phase-out (one and a half years).

The social preparation phase is characterized by forming functional community organizations, conducting participatory and action-oriented researches, which will serve as basis for formulating community resource management plans, implementing small-scale socio-economic projects, and establishing viable co-management formations. On the second phase of the program, all these activities are expected to have intensified and replicated in adjacent villages. On the last phase, Tambuyog and its partner organizations will prepare for the former's withdrawal from the area.

The SCAD program has five components, namely: 1) research, development and planning; 2) organizing and leadership development; 3) environmental rehabilitation and protection; 4) socioeconomic development; and, 5) basic social services delivery. Although it can be thought of as a model, Tambuyog's approach in the SCAD implementation is to generate specific taragets and plans in partnership with a community-based organization. The SCAD program is currently being implemented in selected coastal towns of Cebu, Bicol and Saranggani.

Sustainable Livelihoods (SL) and Community-based Coastal Resources Management (CBCRM)²²

Resource management approaches need to be broadened to address the multifaceted and multileveled livelihood issues in coastal communities. This includes: 1.the need for security in the pursuance of household livelihood and survival strategies, 2. the achievement of a quality of life that is both enduring and environmentally sustainable, and 3. resource management should recognize that people's livelihood strategies and goals are dynamic and will change through time.

²¹ Guieb (1999)

²² Tanyang and Graham (2000)

Again, financial capital is only a means to achieve greater ends. This recognition should lead to the development of creative options and processes at the local level that affect not only the ways in which financial capital including credit are enhanced, but that changes in interpersonal/social relationships, relations in productions and gender gaps are also addressed. Thus, social capital is an important component to consider in developing, enhancing or modifying existing livelihood strategies in coastal communities, in order to shift negative trends in the vulnerabilities of individuals and households dependent on the same resource base for survival. Social capital is not fixed, and therefore, like any other resource can be redistributed—a basic tenet of community organizing—and that power structures can be shifted, thus the notion of empowerment. Empowerment, along with other intangible social goods such as self-esteem and confidence, are other parts of a SL approach, since at the core of sustainable livelihoods thinking is the attainment of quality of life as a central goal and process in itself.

The different persuasions or criteria by the households in selecting their major source of livelihood are:

- Access to information. Knowledge of a particular productive activity is learned primarily within the immediate environment. For example, gears are passed on from father to child. In shellcraft, no level of education is required to make the final product and the neighbors are willing to teach any one who wants to go into this activity. Thus, choice of an economic activity is based on skills learned or transferred from within the immediate social environment.
- Requires small capital. Because of the scarcity of cash, households prefer activities that do not require the actual outlay of cash, or if necessary, that inherent to the production relations it that they have access to cash to be able to venture into a new economic activity.
- Facilitates access to credit. The relationship of "capitalist" or middlepersons in the coastal livelihood activities is not merely productive but extends to the access to credit, both in the form of cash and goods for welfare or providential purposes.
- Food security. How a certain livelihood activity affects food access is also a major factor considered. For example, although fishing activity is not a completely reliable source of income, at the minimum it is able to put food on the table, especially when cash or credit is not available.

For CBCRM to effectively contribute towards sustainable livelihoods, it must look more closely at households that will bear the impacts of its efforts, and the different vulnerability and security factors it tries to resolve in order to survive. CBCRM must also critically locate issues beyond resource management within the overall development framework, and when necessary, actively address issues of food security, access to capital, and provision of basic security. This outlook has implications not only conceptually, but in the outlook that organizations and catalysts at the community level plan and carry out planned livelihood interventions.

Community-based organizations doing resource management must be able to connect initiatives on resource rehabilitation with improvements in economic status of households and better access to different kinds of resources (financial, material, human, social, and natural). It is highly recommended that impacts target household and not only organizations, so that initiatives are more sustainable.

Under an SL approach, it is insufficient for an outsider or community organization to merely list income generating activities or any other kind of potential project, but to consider how these isolated initiatives will impact on overall livelihoods at multiple levels. This requires creative linkages that are both conceptual and practical.

The forms of capital required and generated for each proposed activity must be considered in the planning phase to conduct economic or enterprising activities that promote resource management and income growth. Examples appropriate for Prieto Diaz, Sorsogon include:

- Appropriately sited, low intensity aquaculture. This can be a resource enhancing activity which simultaneously supports income generation and builds food security. It is not a stand alone activity, requiring only new technology and outside capital. Fishers must also be given access to infrastructure, technology and skills development to add value to the aquatic resources and prolong product life such as storage and packaging systems. Aquaculture requires building human and social capital and considering the marketing and other linkages that will make the enterprise viable.
- Installation of a women's organization that manages a seagrass sanctuary simultaneous with shellcraft production. Feasibility studies, education and skills development are required. To reach these goals, women's organizing is both a process and goal. This will also involve more direct dialogue between sectors such as crafters and harvesters that do not have such a forum. They need to search for common ground that will provide an incentive for harvesters to respect the sanctuary and allow women access to the shells they require.
- Formation of credit access groups, like the Grameen system, within resource managementoriented organizations that has a policy for credit access, responsibilities in resource management.
- Other economic activities transform values about environmental health and resource sustainability. For example, hog raising with strict policies on waste management.
- Continuous discussions and conscientization with three-ply fishers to educate and prepare them for the pending adoption of a new local ordinance banning its use.
- Support groups for wives of affected households (baling and three-ply) to access livelihood projects and other social services and resources.
- Creative information and education campaign targeting not only the productive population but more specifically children and youth. Activities that promote local culture will also encourage transformative values.

Recommendations

The fishery sector is among the more vulnerable sectors in agriculture. Being immobile, they tend to suffer consequences not of own making. This include a wide array of problems such as environment degradation, unfair competition, lack of basic services (e.g. water and electricity), and inefficient implementation of fishery laws. The fisherfolk finds himself in a dilemma of feeding his family on a daily routine of survival.

The municipal fishery sector has consistently been the the major producer of demersal species and some pelagic species. This, however, has not resulted in an improvement of the socio-economic conditions of the fisherfolk. The fisherfolk desperately tries to adapt to this circumstance by engaging in multiple labor and using a variety of gears. In some cases, the fisherfolk has no other option but to use illegal ways of fishing and eventually gets entangled in a circuitous web of poverty. In spite of the existence of the RA 8435 and RA 8550, there has been minimal effect on the municipal fishing sector . The fishery sector has remained to be a primary producer (e.g. fishes are mostly sold fresh) and is thereby susceptible to exploitation due to its perishability. Susceptability is characterized by higher prices upon arrival and decreasing prices by the end of the day. Another competitive setback is the importation of fish which has significantly reduced the prices of fish.

In order to reinvigorate the Philippine fishing industry, certain measures are needed. Needless to say that appropriate funding, mechanisms, legislation and political will are necessary.

- 1. The municipal fishery sector should be given full and unconditional support. This entails assistance to local government units regarding implementation, funding and personnel support.
- 2. Importation of fish should be regulated if not disallowed pending a review of the effects to the Philippine fishery sector especially the municipal fishery.
- 3. Government should subsidized the operations of the municipal fishery sector. This can be in the form of incentives (fuel subsidy, tax holidays, certain stewardship agreements, law enforcement incentives, and special marketing schemes both domestic and overseas, etc.)
- 4. It is imperative to review the proposal of a separate Department of Fisheries and Oceans in order to facilitate a more efficient implementation of programs.
- 5. A nationwide consultation among the fishery sector should be convened to develop an alternative Philippine fisheries development agenda using the municipal fishery sector as the core of Philippine fishery development.
- 6. The security of tenure of fisherfolk communities should be settled as soon as possible. This includes land and marine tenure or stewardship agreements.
- 7. CBCRM as an alternative fisheries development strategy should be vigorously proposed.

Concluding Remark

All said and done, the government program for poverty alleviation would benefit most from studying the sectoral dynamics in a coastal community. Statistical data, even if adequate, is blind if the changing social relations and complicated property rights arrangement within a coastal community is not given consideration. Updated disaggregated fisheries sector data from the agricultural sector is the first step in targeting coastal communities for poverty alleviation. Development of indirect or proxy indicators for community targeting is also important to prioritize between the coastal communities distributed in the country's critical yet strategic fishing grounds and to minimize leakage to the non-poor.

Consolidation of the different institutions efforts toward poverty alleviation is also important to maximize result. The government is sure to benefit from the numerous researches conducted by independent institutions if integrated in its programs.

What is notable in the poverty alleviation program of the government is its utter bias towards aquaculture as a means of increasing the fisheries production. It is like turning a blind eye to the contribution of the municipal fisheries sector in the fishing industry. The government needs to look at the feasibility of developing municipal fisheries as the backbone of the fishing industry. It has proven to be more sustainable compared to its commercial and aquaculture counterpart yet continues to receive little support.

References:

- Asian Development Bank. 1993. Fisheries Sector Profile of the Philippines. Agriculture Department. Division 1. June 1993. 88 pp.
- Balisacan, A.M. 1999. What do we really know-or don't know about economic inequality and poverty in the Philippines. *In* Balisacan, A.M. and S. Fujisaki. (eds.) 1999. Causes of Poverty. Myths, Facts and Policies. A Philippine Study. University of the Philippine Press. 240 pp.
- Barber, C.V. and E. R. Jacinto, Jr. 1997. Reforming coastal property rights for CBCRM in the Philippines: a program of research and action. *In* Jacinto (ed.) Community Legal and Institutional Studies. Published by Tambuyog Development Center with assistance from World Resources Institute and the Asia Foundation. 161 pp.
- Besley, T. and R. Kanbur. 1990. The principles of targetting. Policy, Research, and External Affairs. Working Papers. Poverty. Office of the Vice President. Development Economics. The World Bank. March 1990. WPS 385. 41 pp.
- Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources. Briefing Kit: Agrikulturang MakaMASA Fisheries Proposed Budget CY 2000. October 1999. 26pp.
- DA-BFAR. 1999 Philippine Fisheries Profile. 53 pp.
- De la Cruz, Q. 1994. Community-based Coastal Resource Management: a response to an Open-Access Coastal Fishery Resource. *In* Lundayan Journal. Vol.5 No.4. Published by Tambuyog Development Center. 46 pp.
- Guieb, R.R. 1999. Re-inventing Power and Politics in Communities: Community-based Coastal Resources Management in the Philippines. *In* Lundayan Journal. Special 1999 Issue. Power, Spaces and Titles. Issues in Community-based Coastal Resources Management. pp. 3-22.
- Kanbur, R. 1990. Poverty and Development: The Human Development Report and The World Development Report. Invited paper for a special issue of *Pensamiento Iberoamericano*. 25 pp.
- Kanbur, R. 1992. Heterogeneity, distribution, and cooperation in common property resource management. Policy Research. Working Papers. World Development Report. Office of the Vice President. Development Economics. The World Bank. January 1992. WPS 844. 25 pp.
- Lacson, B.M. and H.P. Cruz (eds.) 1998. Community Property Rights. Options and Action Points for Philippine Municipal Waters. Published by Tambuyog Development Center, Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement and Community Empowerment and Resource Development. 111 pp.

NGOs for Fisheries Reform. A Primer on the New Fisheries Code (Republic Act 8850). 24 pp.

- Panayotou, T. (ed.) 1987. Small-scale fisheries in Asia: socioeconomic analysis and policy. Ottawa, Ont., IDRC, 283 p.
- Perez, F.R. and H.P. Cruz. 1997. National Fisheries Policies and Programs. In Community Legal and Institutional Studies. Published by Tambuyog Development Center.

PRIMEX and ANZDEC. 1996. Fisheries Resource Management Project, Philippines (ADB TA No. 2236-PHI) Final Report, Vol. 1: Main Text . November 1996. 137 pp.

Philippine Institute of Development Studies (PIDS). A National Strategy to Fight Poverty.

- Tanyang, G. and J. Graham. 2000. Sustainable Livelihoods and CBCRM. Pilot Research in Prieto Diaz, Sorsogon. Tambuyog Development Center. 56 p. Unpublished Report.
- Tambuyog Development Center. 2000. Community Property Rights and Community Level Impacts of Fisheries Privatization. Unpublished manuscript. 12 pp.
- Van Mulekom L. and F. Aguilar III. 1999. Resource Use and Economics in Sapu Cove, Sarangani. Tambuyog Development Center. 99 p. Unpublished report.
- Van Mulekom, L. 1997. Conceptualizing the SNV Philippines Sub Program for Community-Based Coastal Resources Management Development. SNV Philippines.
- White, A.T. and A. Cruz-Trinidad. 1998. The Values of Philippine Coastal Resources: Why Protection and Management are Critical. Coastal Resource Management Project, Cebu City, Philippines, 96 p.

World Bank. 1995. Philippines. A Strategy to Fight Poverty. Draft Confidential Report No. 14933 – PH. 77 pp.

Box 1 . RA-8435 and RA-8550

Government is now providing the much needed policies with the approval of Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Act (AFMA) of 1997 (RA-8435); and the Fisheries Code of 1998 (RA-8550). These 2 landmark laws, set the directions for fisheries management and conversation, research and development with the involvement of some 10 major agencies.

The Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Act of 1997 (RA-8435)

AFMA strongly supports the growth and development of fishing together with agriculture. The Government shall ensure the development of agriculture and fisheries in accordance with the following principles: a) food security; b) rational use of resources; c) global competitiveness; d) sustainable development; e) people empowerment; and f) protection from unfair competition.

To modernize fishing side by side with agriculture gives the fishing industry the opportunity to be accorded with the same support that agriculture will enjoy in terms of executive concerns and budget.

While statistics show that there is declining catch especially in marine and municipal fisheries, there are only pockets of areas with reduced catches per unit vessel especially in the polluted areas like Manila Bay and Laguna Lake.

The Fisheries Code of 1998 (RA-8550)

The following are the salient features of the Fisheries Code:

1. BFAR was reconstituted as a line Bureau under the DA. It is mandated, among other functions, to prepare a Comprehensive National Fisheries Industry Development Plan; formulate and implement a

Comprehensive Fishery Research and Development program; and maintain a comprehensive Fishing Information System.

- 2. A National Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Management Council shall be created to act as an advisory/recommendatory body of DA to strengthen the involvement of fisherfolk in the national and municipal levels.
- 3. Commercial fishing boundaries were established to delineate fishing activities of the big and small fishermen.
- 4. The LGUs shall now enforce all fishery laws, rules and regulation in the municipal sectors. Valid ordinances shall now be enacted by municipal/city councils.
- 5. Commercial fishermen shall now fish from 15 km. distance from the coastline towards the 200 mile exclusive economic zone. Municipal fishermen shall fish within the 15 km distance from the shoreline.
- 6. DA/ BFAR shall now limit access to fishery resources. Licenses shall be granted only to operators subject to the limits set by the "Maximum Sustainable Yield" of the resource.
- 7. In aquaculture, existing holders of Fishpond Lease Agreements (FLAs) shall be granted an additional extension of 25 years to operate. Abandoned, unproductive and underdeveloped fishponds shall be given priority for development.
- 8. To speed-up the development of the post harvest sector, a "Comprehensive Post-Harvest and Ancillary Industries Plans" will be prepared. This will identify area for development: such as extension of credit and incentives for post harvest operation; promotion of semi processing; processing and handling; development of the cold chain; development of the fishmeal industry and development of shipbuilding and repairs. It is expected that the necessary upgrading are done to be globally competitive.

Box 2. Fisheries Agenda²³

This paper seeks to present a specific 100 day action agenda to contribute to reforms in the fisheries sector and undertake swift and thorough changes in the industry that will benefit small fishers by addressing urgent and concrete issues affecting them. The action agenda will be presented to the new administration of Gloria Macapagal Arroyo. The action agenda is also a pro-poor and pro-environment platform that shall be promoted for adoption by progressive candidates in the coming national and local elections.

Background

The political crisis has ended with the installation of Gloria Macapagal Arroyo as the new President of the Republic. The collapse of the Estrada regime opens up an opportunity for the construction of new politics out of the wreckage of the old. Civil society groups like Tambuyog Development Center (TDC) must be vigilant in pushing for genuine policy reform for the sustainable management and development of fisheries. Moreover, the struggle of municipal fisherfolk to secure tenurial rights over the coastal resources should be prioritized in the agenda of the sector.

The TDC and its networks therefore should facilitate the convergence of different players in the sector in agenda building and to achieve the greatest number of needed support which would give credence to any action agenda that will be drafted.

The current policies of the government in the fisheries industry can be viewed as windows of opportunity for TDC to effect positive policy changes.

Republic Act 8435 (Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Act) today is in full swing as the government's policy and program for developing agriculture and fisheries in line with its over all policy of trade liberalization and modernization consistent with neo-liberal principles of prosperity through untrammeled economic growth with equity. But the conflicting policies in R.A. 8435 and the Fisheries Code of 1998 (R.A. 8550) gives us the impression that the government still needs to define and outline a more comprehensive strategy to achieve its "growth with equity" policy declarations.

The time is opportune for an examination of the problem stated above by marginal sectors in the fisheries industry and to evaluate the propensity of AFMA in delivering the over-all objectives of productivity, food security, poverty alleviation and environmental protection. Likewise, it is high time that these marginal sectors are provided the opportunity to draw up appropriate and adequate responses to the insufficiencies of AFMA. It is also prudent for the small fisheries sector to prepare their ranks from the possible ill-effects of modernization and liberalization by designing social safety nets that can both be instituted by the sector itself and/or government as part of its responsibility of social protection for marginal sectors.

The fisheries code's progressive provisions remains unimplemented in many coastal municipalities because the implementing guidelines still need to be drafted by the DA. We should continue our engagement in this area by drafting and lobbying of FAOs to the DA. There is also an urgent need for LGUs to draft municipal fisheries ordinance which would among others, delineate municipal waters. Related to this, the DA-BFAR is currently developing a model municipal fisheries ordinance which can be used by coastal LGUs. This requires us to review not only RA 8550 but other existing fisheries ordinance that have been issued at the local levels especially in SCAD areas.

²³ Prepared by Dinna Umengan, Advocacy Officer, Tambuyog Development Center. February 2001

The appointment of Sec. Leonardo Montemayor as the new Secretary of Agriculture gives us hope and encouragement to participate in the Department's effort to institute substantial changes in running the bureaucracy. During his term in the House of Representatives, Sec. Montemayor has proven himself to be pro farmers and pro fishers. The opportunity is there for TDC and its network to present itself as a vigilant group in pursuing policy reform in the industry.

NFR Fishery Agenda for the GMA Administration (Draft)

TOPIC	PRESIDENT		DA-BFAR	D	ENR-DILG	0	CONGRESS	JUDICIARY		LGU		LAW
											EN	FORCEME
												NT
Municipal		-	Collect	•	Coordinate	•	RMP for all		•	Pass RMP	-	Implement
Fisheries			Resource		special		LGUs			MFO		FAO 201
			Manageme		bodies	•	Increase		•	Coordinate		
			nt Plans	-	Sundin ang		budget for			special		
		•	Implement		pamantayan		fisheries			bodies		
			FAO 201		ng DENR	-	Bantay		•	Increase		
		-	Coordinate		sa pagsukat		Dagat			Bantay		
			special		ng		benefits			Dagat		
			bodies		Municipal					budget and		
		-	FAO-IRR		waters					benefits		
		-		-	Implement				•	Draft		
			Adjudicatio		Joint DA-					municipal		
			n Board		DENR					water use		
		-	Retraining		Order					plan		
			of Bantay						•	Establish		
			Dagat							legal		
		-	Implement							support		
			Joint DA-							services		
			DENR									
			Order									
Aquaculture		-	Review of	•	Review of	•	Review of		•	Sec.5	•	Removal of
-			Fishpond		titles/FLAs		CPAR re:			(concession		illegal
			Lease	-			loopholes			s)		fishponds
			Agreements		Implementa	-	Review of		-	Sec.22		-
		-	Revert to		tion of		LLDA			(demarcatio		
			mangroves		provision		mandate			n)		
			lands with		on anti-				•			
			expired		conversion					Implementa		
			contracts		of					tion of		
		-	Research		mangroves					provision		
			on lakes	-	-				1	on anti-		

		 Rent-based license 	Reforestati on of mangroves Fast- tracking of CBFMA for mangrove forests			 conversion of mangroves Pass Lake Manageme nt Plan Stop reclamation of lakes 	
Commercial Fisheries		 Incentives Rent-based licenses 	 Monitor and implement provision on fishworkers (DOLE) 				
ΤΟΡΙϹ	PRESIDENT	DA-BFAR	DENR-DILG	CONGRESS	JUDICIARY	LGU	LAW ENFORCEME NT
Coastal Resource Management	 CRM Framework EO creating Manageme nt Council for Manila Bay to draft Manageme nt Plan 	 MSY-TAC CRM Framework 19 bays and gulfs sanctuary/ reserves/ closed season 	 declare protected areas/ implement monitoring / enforcemen t of Environme ntal Compliance Certificate 	CRM Framework		 19 bays and gulfs sanctuary/ reserves/ closed season 	 sanctuary/ reserves/ closed season
Fisheries Trade	 Review of government commitmen ts 	 Define modernizati on of the fisheries FAO 195 		 Review of dumping laws Safety nets 			 Stop smuggling

						-	
		 Regulate entry of imported fish Subsidies for local prod. 					
NFARMC/	 Increase 	Consult		 Increase 		 Consult 	
NAFC/ NAPC	NFARMC	FARMCs		NFARMC		FARMCs	
	Budget	 Review 		budget			
	 Review 	IRR		 Add 			
	mandate of	 Add 		representati			
	NFARMC/	representati		ve from			
	NAFC/	ve from		lakes			
	NAPC	lakes					
		 Review mondate of 					
		NFARMC/					
		NAFC/					
		NAPC					
Structure	 Recall EO 	NFARMC/				 Establish 	
	338	CRM				local	
						fisheries	
						office	
Biopiracy	Review	Formulate FAO	Conduct an	Follow-up	Investigate the	Pass municipal	Formulate rules
	national policy	regarding	assessment on	congressional	possible	ordinances	on engagement
	on	marine	the	inquiry	conflict of	regulating	and
	bioprospecting	bioprospecting	implementation	regarding	Interest of the	bioprospecting	coordination
	reeds of	Review	01 EU 247	bioprospecting	National	Ensure that	DENR
	fisherfolk and	provisions on	Expedite	Facilitate the	Museum	FARMCs are	
	indigenous	benefit sharing	processing of	approval of the	regarding	properly	
	communities	arrangements	ARAs and	National	collections.	consulted	
	Balance the		CRAs	Bioprospecting		regarding	
	need for			Act		marine	

		1		1						1		1
	Research and			Rev	view					bi	oprospecting	
	Development of			prov	visions on	Cl	arify the					
	our scientific			bon	ofit sharing	icc	up of marine					
				ben	ent sharing	155						
	community			arra	ingements	an	d terrestrial					
						tei	nure					
Support		•	DA Post-							-	Soft loans	
Services			Harvest									
			facilities									
		_										
		-	Soft loans									
TOPIC	PRESIDENT		DA-BFAR	DE	ENR-DILG	(CONGRESS	JUD	CIARY		LGU	LAW
												ENFORCEME
												NT
Fisherwomen			IRR								CRM	
r isner wonnen											entire for	
			FARMU								projects for	
			expansion								women	
			of							-	Budget for	
			representati								literacy and	
			on								numeracy	
			CRM								of women	
			projects for								and	
			women								children	
		•	SAFDZ									
			representati									
			on									
Fisherfolk	Review RA		IRR sec		Fast-track						Fast-track	
Sattlement	8/25 (ro:		108		ID of						ID of	
Settlement	0+23 (10.	L _	Tuo East traals									
	ioans)	-	Fast-track		settlement						settlement	
			ID of		areas (see						areas (see	
		1	settlement		JAO)						JAO)	
			areas (see									
		1	JAO)									
Laws and Rills			Review				NLUA					
Laws and DIIIS			CAED7			-	Doviou					
			SAFUL			-	T. I.					
		1					Fisheries					
		1					Code					

		■ LG	С		
		 Inci 	rease		
		pen	alties		

MUNICIPAL FISHERIES

Policy Recommendations

- For the LGUs and special bodies to draft Resource Management Plans for the different marine and inland waters under their jurisdiction and to enact said RMPs into a Municipal Fisheries Management Ordinance consistent with the provisions of RA 8550 (*sec.16, Rule16.1, 16.7*);
- For the Bureau of Fisheries to collect the Resource Management Plans from the LGUs as reference in the preparation of a Comprehensive National Fisheries Industry Development Plan (Secs. 65a, 65q);
- For the DA-BFAR to initiate a program for the retraining of the Bantay Dagat to ensure effective and efficient performance of their duties;
- For the LGUs to increase the budget and benefits given to the Bantay Dagat members to enable them to do their duties more effectively;
- For the DA-BFAR to initiate the formation of an adjudication board to settle fishery disputes in the municipal waters (?);
- For the DA to adopt DENRs standard in measuring and delineating the municipal waters;
- For the Congress to pass a legislation increasing the budget on fisheries and the benefits for Bantay Dagat members;
- For the LGUs to draft a municipal water use plan (*Sec.16, Rule 16.3, 16.7*);
- For the LGUs to establish legal support services for the municipal fisherfolk (Sec.24);
- For the LGUs, DA-BFAR to improve coordination with other government agencies and other special bodies involved with the fisheries sector and coastal resource management;

For Implementation

- For the DA-BFAR to immediately issue the appropriate FAOs on municipal fisheries to fast-track the implementation of RA 8550;
- For the DA-BFAR and other concerned agencies to strictly implement and enforce FAO 201 which prohibits the use of specified active gears in the 15km municipal waters(*Sec.90*);
- For the DA/DENR-Namria to fast-track the implementation of the DA-DENR Joint Administrative Order on the mapping, delineation, and zoning of municipal/coastal waters and foreshore lands;
- For the DA to provide the incentives allotted for Municipal Fisherfolk under the Fisheries Code and to immediately develop and implement a capability-building program for municipal fishers(*Sec.34*, *Rule 34.2*);

COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

For Implementation

- For the DA-BFAR to immediately issue a FAO listing the license fees for Commercial Fishing Boat Licenses **at levels that reflect resource rent** accruing from the utilization of resources (*sec.6, rule 6.1*);
- For the DA to provide the incentives allotted for Small-Scale Commercial Fisherfolk under the Fisheries Code and to immediately develop and implement a capability-building program for small-scale fishers(*Sec.34, Rule 34.2*);
- To immediately implement the incentive program for commercial fishers to fish farther into the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) (*sec.35a-d*);
- For the DA-BFAR, DENR, DOLE and other concerned agencies to monitor the implementation of the provisions on the Labor Code to fishworkers and implement Article 1, Section 25 of RA 8550 which lists the rights and privileges of fishworkers in accordance with the Labor Code;

AQUACULTURE

Policy Recommendations

- For the DA-BFAR to undertake a review of existing Fishpond Lease Agreements in order to determine those with expired FLAs (*Sec.45, Rule 45.1*);
- For the DA-BFAR to identify all abandoned, undeveloped, underutilized fishponds and those with expired contracts to be reverted into their original mangrove state (*Sec.49, Rule 49.2*);
- For the DA, DENR and other concerned agencies to undertake a review of titles of lands used as fishponds and to continue the reforestation of mangrove areas;
- For the LGUs to pass a Lake Management Plan and to campaign to stop the reclamation of lakes;
- For the DILG and other concerned agencies to enforce the provisions on illegal fishponds and to start the removal of all such ponds and to impose the corresponding penalties to violators;
- For the Congress to undertake a review of the mandate of the Laguna Lake Development Authority and the loopholes in the CPAR;

For Implementation

- For the DA-BFAR to undertake a research to determine the carrying capacity of all lakes and inland waters to provide information on suitable water surface area for aquaculture purposes among others (*Sec.51, Rule 51.1*);
- For the DENR, LGUs and other concerned agencies to fast-track the implementation of the CBFMA and the provision in the Fisheries Code prohibiting the conversion of mangroves;
- For the LGUs and other concerned agencies to strictly implement the non-issuance of new concessions, licenses, permits and similar privileges for the establishment or operations of fish pens, fish cages, fish corrals/traps and other similar structures in municipal areas except to municipal fisherfolk and their organizations (*Sec. 53*);
- For the LGUs to strictly implement granting of demarcated fishery rights for mariculture operations in specified areas of the municipal waters only to fisherfolk organizations and cooperatives (*Sec.22*);
- For the DA-BFAR to immediately issue a FAO listing the rentals for fishpond areas covered by the Fishpond Lease Agreement (FLA) at levels that reflect resource rent accruing from the utilization of resources (*sec.6, rule 6.1*);

COASTAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Policy Recommendations

- For the Chief Executive and the DA-BFAR to adopt a Community Based Coastal Resource Management Framework (CBCRM) as the national strategy in the management, protection and development of coastal fisheries and aquatic resources;
- For the Chief Executive to immediately issue an Executive Order creating a Manila Bay Management Council which would speed up the drafting of the Manila Bay Management Plan;
- For the Congress to pass a legislation declaring CBCRM as the national strategy for the management, protection, and development of coastal fisheries and aquatic resources;

For Implementation

- For the DA to issue the appropriate FAO designating areas for fisheries reserves, refuge and sanctuaries (*Sec. 80-81*);
- For the DA to issue the appropriate FAO declaring a closed season on municipal waters, bays, lakes and other environmentally critical areas for the conservation and ecological purposes, upon the concurrence and approval or recommendation of the concerned LGU and FARMCs (*Sec.9, Rule 9.1 and Rule 9.3*);
- For the LGUs to cease the issuance of licenses/permits for fisheries activities in municipal waters and bays in closed season areas or declared as fishery reserve, refuge or sanctuary (*Sec.9, Rule 9.3*);
- For the proper law enforcement agencies to implement the provisions on fishery reserves, refuge and sanctuaries;
- For the DA to fast-track the determination of the Maximum Sustainable Yield and Total Allowable Catch estimates for each major fishing area as basis for determining the number of licenses to be issued and the amount of license fees to be set up (*Sec.7-8*);
- For the DENR to declare specific protected areas and implement the provisions governing it;
- For the DENR to monitor the implementation and enforcement of the 8550 provision requiring every person to secure an Environmental Compliance Certificate before undertaking any development project (*Sec.13*);

FISHERIES TRADE

- For the government to review its commitments to the WTO and other trade organizations regarding fisheries trade;
- For the DA to clearly define 'modernization' of the fisheries and agriculture sectors within the context of sustainable development;
- For the DA-BFAR to freeze FAO 195 and review the existing fisheries and food importation policies of the government since its adversely affects the lives of millions of impoverished fishers and farmers;
- For the DA-BFAR to regulate the entry of imported fish into the wet market;
- For the DA to provide subsidies for local producers and small fishers which reduce exploitation efforts, divert producers from over exploitation, enhance resource base, promote approfishtech, develop infrastructure and post-harvest facilities, access to markets to increase purchasing power.
- For the law enforcement units (PNP-Maricom) to increase its anti-smuggling efforts;
- For DA-BFAR to beef-up its unit in charge of controlling entry of smuggled/dumped/imported fishery products;

• For the Congress to review existing anti-dumping laws and pass a legislation ensuring and delivering safety nets for the local fishers and farmers before they are fully displaced by globalization;

NFARMC/ NAFC/ NAPC

Policy Recommendations

- For the Chief Executive to increase the budget allotted for the National Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Management Council (NFARMC) and to review the mandate of said agency along with the National Agriculture and Fishery Council (NAFC) and the National Anti-Poverty Commission (NAPC);
- For the DA-BFAR to add a representative from the Lakes to the composition of the FARMCs and the NFARMC;
- For the DA to review the mandates of the NFARMC, NAFC and NAPC;
- For the Congress to pass a legislation granting an increase to the NFARMC budget and adding the representation of fisherfolk from the lakes to the composition of the NFARMC;

For Implementation

- For the DA-BFAR and the LGUs to consult the FARMCs on decisions regarding the municipal fisheries;
- For the DA-BFAR to review the IRR on FARMCs (Sec. 68-79; FAO 196);

FISHERIES ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

Policy Recommendation:

• For the Chief Executive to recall Executive Order 338 which in effect returns BFAR to a staff bureau status and undermines the NFARMC;

For Implementation

• For the DA-BFAR to establish fisheries offices in the provincial and municipal level (*Sec.64, Rule 64.1*);

BIOPIRACY

Policy Recommendations:

- For the Chief Executive to issue an Executive Order on Marine Biopiracy;
- For the Congress to pass a legislation on Marine and Terrestrial Biopiracy;

For Implementation

• For the DENR to effectively implement EO 247;

SUPPORT SERVICES

- For DA and the LGUs to establish post-harvest facilities for fishing communities and to register, license and upgrade its existing post-harvest facilities (*Sec.59-60*);
- For the DA-BFAR and the LGUs to provide soft loans and ensure its accessibility for small fisherfolk cooperatives;

For Implementation

• For the DA-BFAR to effectively implement the provision on RA 8550 providing for a Fishery Loan and Guarantee Fund for the small fisherfolk and to immediately prepare the IRR in this provision (*Sec.110*);

FISHERWOMEN

- For the DA-BFAR to revise the IRR on FARMC for the expansion of representation to include fisherwomen;
- For the DA and the LGUs to provide CRM projects for women (*Sec.65m*);
- For the DA BFAR to expand the representation in the SAFDZs to include fisherwomen;
- For the LGUs to allot a budget for the literacy and numeracy of women and children in fisherfolk communities;

FISHERFOLK SETTLEMENT

Policy Recommendations

- For the Chief Executive to review RA 8425 regarding loans for fisherfolk settlement areas;
- For the DA, DENR, LGUs and other concerned agencies to fast-track the identification of suitable settlement areas for the fisherfolk;

For Implementation

• For the DA-BFAR to fast-track the implementation of Section 108 of the Fisheries Code, in coordination with the DAR, DILG and other agencies concerned to establish a fisherfolk settlement area in the context of an integrated, holistic and self-reliant community to include alternative source of income (*Sec. 108*);

LAWS AND BILLS

- For the DA to review the SAFDZ;
- For the Congress to immediately enact the National Land Use Act into law and to undertake a review of the Local Government Code and the Fisheries Code;
- For the Congress to pass an amendment to the Fisheries Code increasing the penalties given to violators.