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MARMELDA Y SIDANGOLI
The existence of Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) as important stakeholders and facilitators is widely and internationally accepted and recognised in area of conservation and environmental management in general and in particularly, the Marine Protected Area (MPA) management. The widely recognition and experience are usually determined or measured by the public perception on the role conducted by NGOs. Instead of using the public perception to analyse the outcome, the thesis was designed to provide a solution to a research problem: How effective RARE in engaging the community in management in Bunaken National Park. Using the case of RARE’s community empowerment programme in the Bunaken National Park, North Sulawesi, Indonesia, the public perceptions of their role and effectiveness were analysed. In the thesis, the research design, case study approach (Yin, 2009) was employed using a deductive process to analyse focus group discussions, key informant interviews with key stakeholders, observation, and document analysis.

The results of the research show that the public perception on the RARE’s program process has led to the community’s recognise to the leadership quality of the community patrol members as well as other community members, due to the increased capacity and skills of the participants of the RARE’s programme. The findings also show that community needs and expectations, and government agenda are the most influential aspects of the public perceptions. However, in terms of supporting resources and environment, such as lack of alternative livelihood and resources, and institutional top down approach constrained the development of the individual empowerment into the collective empowerment. As a consequence, the social impacts such as social exclusion were unavoidably occurred. The thesis concludes that the public perceptions impacted not only individual, but also social and institutional achievement. However, the existing social and institutional aspects indirectly constrained the development of achievements into conservation outcome of the NGO.

Finally a new model for describing the interaction of the social, institutional and environmental aspects is presented with the aim of making this process more effective in the future.
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1.1. Introduction

There are a number of reasons why involvement of Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) in the decision making process is being encouraged at all levels of government, however a major focus being to improve the legitimacy of the process (Simmons, 1998). In the context of marine protected area (MPA) management, NGO involvement in the management process represents a collaborative management scheme, which is perceived as the ideal model for marine environment management (Borrini-Feyerabend, 2003). Compared to government-controlled process, the collaborative management model is promoted by Borrini-Feyerabend, (2003) as the more favoured approach arguing for its potential to improve the supporting factors of MPA management and implementation. Improvement of the key important factors, such as improved trust of government and other stakeholders, efficiency in reducing enforcement and negotiation cost, public acceptability of management programmes, and understanding of the relationship between the natural and social system, is expected to lead to
improved effectiveness of the management (Pinkerton, 1999; Borrini-Feyerabend, 1996). In the IUCN Resolution 1.42 concerning collaborative management, it was stated that that

“The participation in which government agencies, local communities and resource users, non-government organisations, and other stakeholders negotiate, as appropriate to each context, the authority and the responsibility for the management of a specific area or set of stakeholders”. (IUCN, 1996)

Due to the widespread work in the area of participations, empowerment, and local community, NGOs than were associated with the success in implementing the programs in the three areas. As a consequence, few times NGOs make claims of playing important roles such as donors and a channel for funding, community’s environmental awareness educator, government delegations and partners and environmental rehabilitation practitioners (Agarwal, 2005; Fisher, 1997, p.442).

NGO Claims

Given the wide range of NGO roles, particularly environmental NGOs, it is claimed that NGOs act as a link between global issues and solutions based around local initiatives (Princen, 1994a). Intervention of environmental NGOs in bridging the gap between the global context and local situation or between the concept of environmental science and public acceptance, distinguishes the effectiveness of these NGOs from other types of NGOs that just focus and emphasise only one framework, such as development NGOs (Princen, 1995a). The focus on a local approach is also consistent with Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu (2002)’s opinion that local inclusion and extension efforts have strengthened NGO functional roles in the global environmental governance.

The focus of this research is to examine the claims made by some environmental NGOs as to their effectiveness in providing local facilitation to deal with global environmental issues. This has been done by using a case study approach examining the roles of RARE in the Bunaken National Park, Indonesia.

NGO, Community Empowerment, Participation, and Social value

Empowerment is a complex, multifaceted, multi dimension concept that varies considerably, depending on locations, contexts, scopes, domains, and even experts (Hur, 2006; Kasmel, 2011; Laverack, 2001; Page and Czuba, 1999; Panda, 2000). The discourse of empowerment is divided into three areas: psychological, organisational and community empowerment (Israel et al., 1994). Originally, the concept of empowerment was divided into two levels, either as a process or as an outcome. However, due to difficulties in distinguishing the two levels, this thesis combines the two levels into one, as suggested by Kasmel (2011). In terms of the relationship between empowerment and other concepts, such as participation and social value, participation is acknowledged as the essence of empowerment (Laverack, 2001). The concept of participation also has a mutual relationship with empowerment as, Kasmel (2011) argues, the relationship is interdependent as both empowerment and participation are intended to bring about political and social change (Laverack, 2001), including social value accomplishment.

In the context of community empowerment in protected area management, the concept of community empowerment usually refers to issues such as capacity building (Barker, 2005; Kalikoski et al., 2010), governance (Berkes, 2010), and social capital (Bouma et al., 2008).
The complexity of the community empowerment concept, and its relationship with other concepts, leads to challenges in measuring the performance of NGO requiring a multilayer assessment (Fowler, 1997; Thrandardottir, 2013) to determine the quality of the NGO roles (Lee and Nowell, 2014).

Given the importance of the public’s perception and community’s value to assess NGO roles, community value has been used as a focus of this thesis, especially as it relates to RARE – which is an international NGO based in the USA community empowerment program. In this thesis, the focus of research is on the exploration of how the community perception of social value changed toward the Marine Protected Area concept and the effectiveness of the community participation program conducted by the NGO. An examination of the community values was achieved through understanding the community meaning, belief, experience, and expectation they attached to the marine Park concept, and how the NGO, in this case RARE, influenced and facilitated the expectations. The examination includes the improvement of local people participation and acceptability of the marine Park management and actions, and also strengthening partnership with central government in the Bunaken National Park. The enquiry for this research was conducted at two levels, the level of RARE project and the Bunaken Protected Area. RARE was chosen as the object of the research because the NGO has maintained records about its participation and implementation of the Bunaken MPA project. This will be developed further in the methodology section, Chapter 3.

1.2. Aims and Objectives

The aim of this thesis is to answer the research question, “How effective was RARE in engaging the community in management in the BNP”. Achievement of this aim will contribute towards improved understanding of the effects of the public perception of the roles of an environmental management Non-Government Organisation (NGO) in achieving conservation outcomes in a marine protected area in Indonesia, the Bunaken National Park. The conservation outcomes are limitedly related to NGO’s programs and focuses in the Bunaken National Park such as empowerment, participation, governance and social pride. To achieve the aim identification, four objectives have been established:

1. To identify the history and past practices of a key conservation NGO -- RARE -- in supporting the environmental management of Bunaken National Park.

2. To contextualise the activities of RARE and analyse the fit between the NGO's programme implementation and the social and institutional contexts.
   a. To analyse the fit between RARE’s program implementation and social expectations
   b. To analyse the fit between RARE’s program implementation and institutional issues

3. To analysis the social relationships between government, the NGO and the communities living within the Bunaken National Park, especially from the perspective of the public perceptions of the activities of the NGO.

4. To develop an analytical model of the processes of NGO engagement with the local community and identify enablers and barriers to successful NGO-driven environmental management.
1.3. Rationale for the thesis

1.3.1 Theoretical justification

A major contribution to knowledge that is expected to be delivered through the thesis is to identify the gap between the NGOs perceived roles and achievements, in community empowerment, and the experiences of community in gaining acceptance of the Bunaken National Park. Community empowerment research has been conducted in many areas such as health, (cf. Rifkin, 2003; Laverack and Labonte, 2000) education (cf. Kasmel, 2011) and in the context marine protected area management. However, integration of the evaluation of the NGO’s empowerment program that focused mainly on the program’s outcome and impact with the context of marine protected area governance as part of comprehensive assessment the as required by Lee and Nowell (2014) not many studied. Moreover, the integration and combination of program’s impacts on the community and performance of NGO (outcome) as suggested by Fowler et al. (1995) has not been established.

Table 1 Summaries the research of the effectiveness of NGOs’ roles conducted in the coastal community context in different areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. NGO focus</td>
<td>International NGO</td>
<td>Local NGO</td>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>WWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Emphasis on NGO approach /program</td>
<td>Unclear- not strongly specified</td>
<td>-unclear Management plan made by WWF</td>
<td>Very clear- WWF participation program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Focus empowerment</td>
<td>Environmental education, local knowledge, participation</td>
<td>Fisherman perception</td>
<td>Power, collective action</td>
<td>Participation, empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. NGO goals</td>
<td>Increase participation</td>
<td>Nd</td>
<td>Nd</td>
<td>Local participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NGO value</td>
<td>Sustainable development</td>
<td>Nd</td>
<td>Nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Area</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Philippine</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Research design</td>
<td>Explorative, Qualitative and participatory research</td>
<td>Ethnographic</td>
<td>Mixed method</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Types of works</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Journal Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Report style</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Web not linear</td>
<td>linear</td>
<td>Non Linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Contribution to knowledge</td>
<td>• Role of young people • Nature of Local knowledge • Reconceptualization and reorientation building of</td>
<td>• Differences perception between NGO and fishermen</td>
<td>• Nature and role of power in economics</td>
<td>• Contextualisation collision of participation and indigenous empowerment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of the contextual setting, the Bunaken National Park, which is located in Indonesia, a developing country, has not received much attention (key research for Bunaken MP is summarized in Table 2). Most of the research focuses on the effectiveness of the Park management and failed to assess the effectiveness of role of the NGO, which was acknowledged for its role in the establishment of the community forum (Erdman et al., 2004, p. 47).

One of very similar studies was conducted by Gurney et al. (2014) presenting a study of evaluation of the Costal Resources Management Project conducted in North Sulawesi Waters, Indonesia. The study is similar in terms use of empowerment, opportunity, and security issue of local people as components of poverty of assessing effectiveness of the project. However, in terms of locations of study, the four villages, Tinongko, Talise, Minanga, and Blongko are not categorized in the Bunaken National Park, although the four villages are located in the same province with the Park, North Sulawesi. Moreover, the study emphasized an evaluation on a project that was collectively conducted by a collection of NGOs; therefore, if there were any critiques or credits about process it should be attributed to the project, not to an individual NGO, as this study sought to do.

Another similar study is conducted by Sievanen (2008). In her PhD thesis, she focuses on social conflicts and community perceptions of tourism in the Park. Despite of similarities in the enquiry into community perceptions, the Sievanen’s thesis differs from this thesis in terms of focus on the community perception for analysis of the effectiveness of the NGO as the facilitator of community empowerment program. The summary of studies that conducted in the Bunaken National Park can be seen in Table 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors, year</th>
<th>Focus of the research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christie et al., 2004</td>
<td>Effectiveness of the Bunaken National Park from biological and social aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford et al., 1998</td>
<td>Community based management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahl-Tacconi, 2005</td>
<td>Evaluation of the effectiveness of the Bunaken Park management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erdman et al., 2004</td>
<td>Effective co-management system building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollenbach, 2005</td>
<td>Failure of Bunaken National Park management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patlis (2005)</td>
<td>Importance of legal and law institutions in influencing success of management of integrated coastal project in Indonesia, including in the Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidangoli et al., 2013</td>
<td>Institutional challenges of the Bunaken Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sievanen, 2008</td>
<td>Social conflicts and cooperation as part of seascape in the Bunaken National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straton, 2006</td>
<td>Implementation of assessment based “jury citizen concept’ of the Park’s community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.4. Structure of the Thesis

Overall, the thesis consists of three sections; literature reviews, case study and discussion, and conclusion, and the same diagram will be repeated at the beginning of each section. The diagram of the thesis’s structure can be seen in Figure 2.

Keywords: NGO, social impact, NGO claim, community empowerment, public perception, Bunaken National Park, participation.
Figure 2 Diagram of the thesis’s structure
CHAPTER 2. NGO, Marine Protected Areas, Organisational Model, and Community Empowerment

Principally, this research investigates the interrelation of two themes: the NGO’s roles with RARE as a self-selected example of community participation; and, linking this to marine protected area governance issues. The aim of this chapter is to describe the evolution of the keywords used in the thesis, such as NGO, community empowerment, marine protected areas, and organisational model. Also, the aim is to present the evaluation and critique of the relationship between one and another concept in development of the body of knowledge.

The chapter is organised in four parts: NGO history and definition, marine protected area implementation and NGO roles, organisational model of NGO and community empowerment and participation. The topics are important due to their relevance to the research and also significant in assessing the NGOs’ effectiveness especially community perceptions of the establishment of a marine protected area.

The diagram of organisational structure of the chapter can be seen in Figure 3.
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2.1 NGOs, history, definition

2.1.1 History of Non-Government Organisation (NGO) prominence at international environmental governance

Increasingly, the involvement of non-government organisations (NGOs) is widespread in both development and environmental conservation efforts (Backstrand, 2006; Betsill and Corell, 2001; Petras, 1999; Wapner, 1997). The participation at the international level is due to many factors, especially the demand by the global community for NGO involvement in decision-making in all areas (Fisher, 1997; Ford, 2003; Oberthür et al., 2002), especially conservation. Backstrand (2006), Fisher (1997), and Simmons (1998) also acknowledge NGOs importance and influence has been formally recognised as key element of the management process by international decision-making bodies, such as the United Nations and the World Bank. Simmons (1998) claims that the reason for an increased demand for NGO roles is to improve the legitimacy of the decisions made, which is very important to ensure the success of the implementation.

A few authors argue that formal recognition of participation at the global environment governance was started at two international forums, the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED), and the UNCED (the United Nation Conference on Environment and Development) in 1992 (Finger, 1994; Breitmeier and Rittberger, 1997; Toropova et al., 2010). The participation at these two United Nations’ events are important milestones of NGOs taking on critical roles, especially in the establishment of UNCED (the United Nation Conference on Environment and Development) in 1992 which was an important watershed in the course of sustainable development (Finger, 1994; Backstrand, 2006; Toropova et al., 2010).

Participation of NGOs in the UNCED not only led to the development of the concept of ‘sustainable development and environmental quality’ of UNCED itself; but also to the definition and recognition of NGOs existence as a main element of civil society by many parties such as states, intergovernmental organisations, and industries (Backstrand, 2006; Finger, 1994), and also by media (Breitmeier and Rittberger, 1997). As a consequence of this recognised position at international forums, NGO roles and functions at the international environmental governance have grown and developed significantly since that time.

Many NGOs used the conference to gain access and other advantages (Finger, 1994). Later, NGOs also received mandates from the forum secretary to share and spread the sustainable development concept in many ways- from the global context to local context, due to the recognised expertise in analysing the environmental issues (Princen, 1994c; Toropova et al., 2010). The milestones of emergence of roles of NGO at the international environmental governance level can be seen in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Development of the roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autumn of 1982, Nairobi</td>
<td>A delegate recommended the establishment of a World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) that produced the Bruntland Report in 1987, seen as a birth of sustainable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
development concept.

1983
Two members of Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF) and one member of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) became members of the WCED.

1983-1987
NGOs submitted input as part of public input. In terms of creating a definition of sustainable development. NGO role not only limited in providing input of the Bruntland report making process, but also providing and establishing implementation of the reports such as development planning, decision making and implementation of project.

1992-UNCED
The general assembly Resolution 44/228 requested the consultative contribution of NGO in the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in order to increase the quality of the Conference’s deliberations and to promote a sustainable development policy at the national and international level.

1992-Rio Conference
Declaration and establishment of “NGO global community”

1992-
Recognition NGOs as a social learning agent of sustainable development

**NGO statement of achievement**

The implementation of the international mandate to conduct education around the sustainable development process has required NGOs to deal with local situations as well as global expectations with successful outcomes with several cases (e.g. dealing with issue of the ivory trade in Africa (Princen, 1994a), and mediating and facilitating agreement of the Great Lakes water quality (Manno, 1994)) have led to the emergence of the claim by NGOs for authority, capacity and effectiveness in translating the biophysical dimension to political dimensions, and also, connecting the local values to the global process (Princen, 1994a). These claims were later aligned with, and strengthened with the commitment of NGOs to ‘stand-up’ on behalf of community interests (Bryant, 2002; Clarke, 1998). Examining the implementation of NGO commitments and roles are important in order to confirm NGO statement. However, the examination cannot be conducted without understanding the definitions, and characteristics of the organisations. Next is a description of NGO forms and definitions.

### 2.1.2 Non-Government Organisations defined

Several studies by Bell (2004), Clarke (1998), Lewis (2001), and Finger (1994) find that NGOs may describe a wide range and diversity of organisations, in terms of organisational structure, purpose and on-ground activity. Many experts offer definitions of NGOs. However, for the purposes of this thesis, a definition by (Oberthür et al., 2003) is utilised due its completeness:

“A non-governmental organisation is a permanent organization of individuals or groups of individuals qualified in relevant fields and operating independently from government influence. NGOs may derive funding from governments and may have governments and government officials as members provided that such funding or membership does not limit the organisation’s ability to express its views independently.
Despite the simple definition, NGOs vary widely in terms of organizational mechanism, activities, structure and goals (Clarke, 1998), and cover wide-ranging political, legal and sociocultural contexts and scales (Roth, 2004). To simplify this, NGOs can be basically identified in terms of their main organisational claims and statements concerning their performance, motives and effectiveness (Bell, 2004; Bryant, 2001; Fisher, 1997).

NGO roles in the environmental world are not limited to involvement at international forums and conferences, but also at various levels, contexts, forms of activities, movements and initiatives, including marine protected areas. NGO activities in the conservation and environmental movements are also very varied. It is argued that NGOs have a role in encouraging and endorsing implementation of conservation related principles such as natural resource protection, sustainable development, and community awareness advocacy as well as pollution eradication (Agarwal, 2008) and management of Marine Protected Areas (Castro, 2008). Islam and Sultana (2008) add that NGOs have important contributions in establishment of facts, findings and analysis, providing factual and reliable environmental information, educating community, collaborating with government, and promoting community participation and empowerment.

Next, a review of literatures related to marine protected areas and how NGOs play a role in these contexts, especially regarding community participation and empowerment. The literature includes a history of the scheme and the importance of NGO activities and programs in the scheme’s implementation.

2.2 Marine Protected Area implementation and NGO role

The history of Marine Protected Areas began in 1970s when recognition of the issue of global fisheries collapse (Toropova et al., 2010). The increased concern of the international community to the issue, started officially with the introduction of Marine Protected Areas at the first International Conference on Marine Parks and Reserves in Japan. At the conference, NGOs in particular, the IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature), played a significant role as host of the conference that deliberated and proposed declaration of marine protected areas (MPAs) as a tool of the global ocean governance system (Toropova et al., 2010). Another result of the conference was a call for active support and participation from all governments in the development of a network of Marine Protected Area globally, and was prioritised again at the 1988 IUCN General Assembly (Toropova et al., 2010).

The importance of Marine Protected Areas at the global level was supported and strengthened at the 2002 World Summit of Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg, South Africa. The results of the summit were the commitment of governments to support eradicating destructive and illegal fishing practice and land use (Toropova et al., 2010). In the same year, parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) agreed to adopt a strategic plan to achieving global targets on declarations and prevention of marine species by 2012 (Toropova et al., 2010). The presence of marine protected areas was not seen only as a result of global ocean conservation efforts, but also as a consequence of international environmental conventions (Boersma and Parrish, 1999). The development of MPA designation, as a part of global law, can be seen at Table 4.
Table 4 The development of MPA as global law (Adapted from Boersma and Parrish (1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Convention/Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>International marine organisation establishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Conventions on Wetlands of international importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>UNESCO, Man and the Biosphere program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Convention for the protection of World natural and cultural heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International convention for the Prevention of Pollution from the ships (MARPOL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>UN-environmental program (UNEP) – regional seas program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>International conference on Tanker safety and pollution prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Convention on the Conservation of the Antarctic Marine Living Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Hague declaration of the Protection of the North Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Convention on the protection of the North Sea Antarctic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Convention on the protection of the marine environment of the Baltic Sea Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Jakarta mandate on marine and coastal biological diversity (Marine Protected Area)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.1 NGOs effectiveness in the marine protected area implementation

NGOs have played significant and important roles in Marine Protected Areas, especially in the strengthening of the governance and management aspects since the enactment of the concept by the international community. However the relationship between Marine Protected Areas and NGOs needs to be understood (Jones et al., 2013). Many studies of the NGO’s roles in a marine protected area were presented as part of an integrated environmental project that used NGOs as the facilitators without directly pointing and assessing the NGO’s effectiveness as an independent organisational recognition (Jones et al., 2013, p.60).

2.2.2 Development of Marine Protected Area

Experts agree that Marine Protected Areas are an effective tool for marine and coastal resource management (Agardy, 1999, Anon, 2006 cited in Jentoft et al., 2007; Kelleher and Kenchington 1992; Lloyd et al., 2005, 2011). Marine Protected Area based on the IUCN’s definition is:

‘Any area of inter-tidal or sub-tidal terrain, together with its overlying water and associated flora, fauna, historical, or cultural features, which has been reserved by law or other effective means to protect part or all of the enclosed environment’ (Kelleher and Kenchington 1992, p. ix).

At present, there are almost 13,000 Marine Protected Areas located in 124 countries around the world, together covering 12,000 km². Even though the number of new established MPAs is increasing, the number of MPAs is still below target (IUCN, 2014). The term MPA was designated to deal with the variety of designations set out in legislative instruments to define protected waters including: marine park, marine reserve, fisheries reserve, closed area, marine sanctuary, MACPAs/MCPAs (marine and coastal protected areas), nature reserve, ecological reserve, replenishment reserve, marine management area, coastal preserve, area of conservation concern, sensitive sea area, biosphere reserve, no-take area, coastal park, national marine park, marine conservation area and marine wilderness area (Agardy et al.,
The environmental strategy, no matter the label, is a flexible and capable tool dealing with practical issues of the marine resource management (Kelleher and Kenchington 1992; Lloyd et al., 2005, 2011). However, in order to improve the effectiveness of the scheme, Agardy et al. (2003) and Lloyd et al. (2005, 2011) found that a comprehensive understanding of governance, scientific, socioeconomic and natural characteristics of the area is paramount.

2.2.3 Importance of community support in MPA governance

Despite the endeavours of many parties at the global level and the significant increase in numbers and networks (Toropova et al., 2010), the marine protected area scheme has not been effective as hoped (Kareiva, 2006; Rife et al., 2013), especially in terms of governance of marine parks (Jentoft et al., 2007). The increase in number is not followed by good quality management, maintenance and governance implementation (Jentoft et al., 2007). Lack of effectiveness of marine parks was acknowledged by the existence of many "paper parks" (Kareiva, 2006; Rife et al., 2013), and one of the causes of many "paper parks" Marine Protected Areas is the community rejection toward a parks existence (Rife et al., 2013) effectively prohibit governance of the marine protected area.

There are three governance models: hierarchical, self-governing and co-governance. Borrini-Feyerabend (1996) argues that the marine protected area governance is located somewhere on a continuum of full government control on one edge, and local people control on the other side. Traditionally, governance in Marine Protected Area management is identical with government institution responsibilities (Borrini-Feyerabend, 1996). However, Jentoft et al. (2007) point out that most literature related to Marine Protected Area (MPA) governance accommodate and recognise the multi-stakeholder approach as the scheme favoured most. A study by Cicin-Sain and Belfiore (2005) argues that the governance model also serves to provide the opportunity for multi-stakeholder participation development. A few researchers argue that a combination of top-down and bottom-up approaches, in the form of collaborative management, may be recommended (Jones, 2012; Gaymer, 2014; Christie and White, 2007). However, based on results and findings of study in a Honduras Marine Protected Area, Bown et al. (2013) argue that the full implementation of community-based management scheme is difficult to achieve. Similar experience is also shown by the experience of management of the Bunaken National Park in North Sulawesi, Indonesia. The collaborative scheme initiated by an international program with a local and national institutional context created institutional challenges that eventually led to ineffectiveness of park management (Sidangoli et al., 2013).

A direct impact of implementation of collaborative management is a shift in the decision making approach, from top-down to bottom-up, in terms of the recognition of local people’s rights in the process (Persoon and van Est, 2003). Terms also used to describe this, from a variety of disciplines, include: social acceptability (Thomassin et al., 2010; Voyer et al., 2015); social license (Voyer et al., 2015); community support itself (Salm and Clark, 2000); and stakeholder commitment and cooperation (Mason et al., 2015). Social acceptability along with social rejection is expressed in two ways, covert (secretly) and overt (publicly) (Thomassin et al., 2010).

Salm and Clark (2000) argue that community support, is crucial in determining the success of management of conservation efforts and an important element in the establishment and management of marine protected areas (Erdman et al., 2004). As a consequence,
understanding the community is very important in order to engage the community and obtain community support (Salm and Clark, 2000).

2.2.4 Values, images and principles of community in MPA governance

The importance of recognition of community support, existence and expectations in park governance also includes a concept of the social dimension, especially a social justice. Consideration of compensation to the community for loss, due to the existence and implementation of a marine park, is paramount in the context (Christie and White, 2007; Jones, 2009, 2013; Nursey-Bray and Jacobson, 2014; Sanchirico et al., 2002; Scholz et al., 2004). The consideration includes provision of economic incentives and options (Clifton, 2013; Ferse et al., 2010).

In terms of understanding community responses to a marine park use, an investigation of values, image and of the community is useful in order to provide direction for the Marine Protected Area governance (Song et al., 2013) and has been called the “heart of the social system to be governed” (Voyer et al., 2015, p. 93).

The aim of using social value in my research are designed to achieve a goal to understand meta–level governance, which is characterised by judgements relating to values, images and principles (Song et al., 2013, p.2). An exploration of difference in these values, image and principles between the park practitioners and community, and also an investigation on how these influence and dominate “fisheries discourse”, therefore, are important (Song et al., 2013). Song et al. (2013) defines the first element, ‘value’, as ‘what is desirable’. Value acts as an attachment to objects, places, relationships and practices, and is an important influence of the marine resource users’ responses toward the management and conservation effort.

The second element, ‘image’, outlined by Jentoft et al. (2012) is defined as ‘worldview’, and refers to how the world is interpreted and understood by people. Jentoft et al. (2012) provide a complete and full definition of ‘image’ as ‘representation of what people believed, what they perceive could happen and what they think things should be’. The term ‘image’ also has a parallel meaning with the cosmology term that is defined in the Miriam Webster Dictionary (nd) as “a branch of metaphysics that deals with the nature of the universe”. The similarities between image and cosmology are the ways people understand the world, including the environment, and what is required from them, which has implications for behaviour, and survival. An old but important article by Gerardo Reichel-Dolmatoff (1976), provides an example of the cosmology in the Tukano Indian community in the Colombian Amazons that explains how people perceive themselves as part of the complex network and interaction of the entire universe system (Waltner-Toews et al., 2013).

The last element, ‘principles’, is more tangible and explicit when compared to images and values. It is about a community definition of an ideal form of a Marine Protected Area management, and sometimes treated the same as norms because it defines and distinguishes the right from the wrong in term of action. As a consequence, the element is called ‘codes of conduct’ or ‘operating guidelines’ (Song et al., 2013; Voyer et al., 2015) and this relates to NGO effectiveness.

2.3 NGO Organisation model

A model of organisation of NGO’s programme effectiveness introduced by Fowler et al. (1995), links the important aspects of NGOs, NGO program, NGO relationship with external
stakeholders, including government, and NGO’s goals and strategies as aspects of NGO internal governance. According to the model, one of the indicators of effectiveness of an NGO program consists of a combination of impacts of the program on the performance (outcome) and impacts it has on community. The model has not been widely used as a framework of NGO’s roles effectiveness, especially in the context of MPA. The assessment and evaluation of effectiveness of an NGO program commonly follows the internal decisions and methods of evaluation (Lee and Nowell, 2014). The model that was developed from varied literature, such as leadership and capacity building. It assumes that the public are beneficiaries of NGO’s activities’. Leadership development as part of capacity building efforts were seen and observed as main elements in the literature (Gibbon et al., 2002; Hadina, 2006; Laverack, 1999).

The other elements of the NGO organisation model used in this thesis are public perceptions, especially community perceptions, and social changes due to NGO program implementation. Perceptions provide a measure of the effectiveness of the implementation of environment related schemes undertaken by NGOs (Abelson and Gauvin, 2006; Hagen, 2013; Lee and Nowell, 2014; Pope, 2013; Rice, 2014; Shao, 2012). Regarding community perception, Nanavati (2007) also proposes that NGO beneficiaries, including community perception as one of indicators of the NGO measurement mechanism. Besides community experience, Epstein and Buhovac (2009) also point the important social changes experienced by the community as an impact that will be measured. The developed model can be seen in Figure 4.
The developed model later needed to pass a refining process using a community empowerment and participation framework. The selection of the focused element was due to a practical consideration of RARE’s work focussing on community empowerment and participation in the field.

### 2.4 Community empowerment and participation in marine protected area

The developed model later needed to pass a refining process using a community empowerment and participation framework. The selection of the focused element was due to a practical consideration of RARE’s work focussing on community empowerment and participation in the field.

#### 2.4.1 Community empowerment

‘Empowerment’ is a difficult concept to define, and hence to design, implement and evaluate (Panda, 2000), due to its complexity, multifaceted, multi dimension characteristics and also lack of clarity (Hur, 2006; Kasmel, 2011; Laverack, 2001; Panda, 2000; Page and Czuba, 1999). The concept has different meanings to different people and different disciplines.
The concept of Empowerment introduced in 1990s, has key elements such as “enabling” and ‘providing power’ (Panda, 2000) beside power, autonomy, self-reliance, entitlement, participation, and process of building awareness, and capacity (Panda, 2000), and also “self-help, self-reliance, collective decision making and collective action” (Atack, 1999, p. 861). One of the important parts of community participation and empowerment is community capacity change that was recognised by Page and Czuba (1999) and Panda (2000) as the essential of the efforts of a community empowerment program.

Similarly, terminology and concepts, related to community empowerment, capacity building is not easy to defined (Simmons et al., 2011). A community’s capacity for change is considered as one of social change caused by a program and involved aspects such as skills, knowledge and education (Howe, 2001). Besides, knowledge and skills, the capacity concept is considered the capacity or ability of a community to solve the problem (Parker et al., 1999). Downing et al. (2002) argue the concept involves important features such as identification of public concerns and issues, provisions of assistance of issues and problem identification, formulation and evaluation of alternatives, public listening, incorporation of public interest and concern into decision making process and provision of the feedback on the decision based on the input. Moreover, Fish and Walton (2013) also recognise the importance of the recognition of the community needs as part of the capacity building process.

Empowerment is perceived as the key solution of the poverty alleviation effort in developing countries (Dawson 1998 cited in Panda 2000), Hur (2006) argues beside the complexity and multidimensionality of the concept, the other issues is whether empowerment happens at individual, organisation or community levels (Israel et al., 1994, Zimmerman, 2000). The last issue in the empowerment dilemma is that it is perceived as social process, or as an outcome. In order to address these issues, in particular the second issue, community empowerment, was selected as an object of study given the empirical approach of RARE as the object of the study and the community empowerment is perceived and treated both as an outcome and a process as well (Kasmel and Andersen, 2011; Israel et al., 1994).

In terms of community, as defined in this thesis, recognises the complexity in the identification and examination of an appropriate definition, as is pointed by Israel et al. (1994) and Laverack and Wallerstein (2001). Therefore this thesis besides aligning a practical consideration of RARE’s works, also follows the definition of community proposed by Israel et al. (1994) that employ six shared and common elements of community, membership that shares same sense of belonging and identity, shared symbol system includes customs language and practical aspects, shared mutual influence, shared needs and commitment of fulfilment the shared needs commitment and emotional connections with the past (Israel et al., 1994).

Community empowerment is conducted as a consequence of state or formal authority incapacity of community aspiration satisfaction and fulfilment (Gilchrist, 2009) and has been
seen as a preventive way as well as a curation strategy (Gilchrist, 2009). Due to the complexity of the concept of community empowerment, this thesis uses a continuum of community empowerment that provides personal empowerment at one end and collective political and social action at the other end (Laverack, 2004; Rissel, 1994). In the spectrum, the concept application consists of five progressive steps, personal action/development, mutual group supports, issue identification/community organisations, partnership and coalition and the last is collection political and social actions. The spectrum of the community empowerment can be seen in Figure 5.

![Empowerment Continuum](image)

**Figure 5 Continuum of community empowerment (Adopted from Laverack, 2004; Rissel, 1994)**

Despite the hope and promise offered by the concept, there are some weaknesses in terms of use of ‘Empowerment’ as an object and lens for assessing NGO roles, and the term has been strongly criticised by the Thrandardottir (2013) as difficult, indirect, and inappropriate as it makes the empowerment program the focus, not the NGO itself. However, Atack (1999) argues that empowerment is one of the sources of a NGOs’ legitimacy. Furthermore, he argues empowerment is one of the important features of ‘substantive-purposive’ aspect of NGO legitimacy (Atack, 1999). Moreover, empowerment is recognised as one of the three important benefits of natural resource management run by a community (Murfhee, 2009). In addition, in terms of accountability, the NGO’s role should not be accountable only to the donors, and governments, it must also be accountable to the beneficiaries, in this case the community (Kilby, 2006). As a consequence, in order to be categorised as legitimate, NGOs work is expected to be consistent with “desirable, proper or appropriate within the socially constructed system of norms and beliefs and definitions” (Suchman, 1995, p. 574).

The empowerment concept and an NGO legitimacy assessment are influenced by the transactional relationship between NGOs and their constituencies. The selection of the empowerment aspect also supports the active roles of NGO (Fisher, 1997, p. 442), as well as “popular power, empowerment, sustainable development, bottom-up leadership and gender equality” (Petras, 1999, p. 434).

The association is also relevant with the development of NGO work from generation to generation, especially for the last generation focusing NGO roles as an educator and activist, while the main actors are still the people with informal connections with the NGO (Korten, 1990 cited in Mekonen, 2007). More importantly, assessment of NGO roles using different approaches, for example assessing and evaluating the claim and direct public perception of the NGO name or term, but not NGO works like what is offered by Thrandardottir (2013) is difficult to conduct, given the NGO terms itself in certain countries especially in developing countries, for example in Pakistan, the term is unfamiliar, even tend to present a negative image to the public (Bano, 2012).
At a practical level, empowerment of an NGO is also controversial. The empowerment concept itself is perceived leading to a dilemma to NGOs due to having on one hand, an empowerment program to create independency of the community, while on the other hand, the interaction with a community can create a dependency (Kilby, 2006). However, Freire (1996) argues that through the empowerment process, change is generated through dialogues between the oppressed party and the empowering party. Ansell and Gash (2008, p. 4) argue that one implication of being involved in the consensus oriented decision making process is stakeholders should have “real responsibility for the policy outcome”, that is, expected to encourage the responsibility of the public in the implementation of the produced policy. In order to assess community empowerment, there are a few domains or aspects offered by the empowerment experts and one of the domains is participation (Fetterman, 2005; Laverack, 1999; Panda, 2000).

2.4.2 Community participation in a Marine Protected Area

Makara (1994) argues that community empowerment leads to participation of a community, and this is strongly suggested as an effective tool to make the public understand management and environmental responsibility. UNEP (2004) suggests five main principles of community: (i) significant local government commitment and good willing; (ii) comprehensive planning and compliance; (iii) provision of enabling system; (iv) performance and accountability; and measurement and improvement. Similar to UNEP’s recommendations, Rodriguez-Martinez’s (2007) research in Marine Protected Areas identified the importance of government commitment, identification of local leaders, consensus building among stakeholders, and continuous problem solving discussions. The understanding includes controlling the use of a fishery resource and is expected to increase care and initiatives to protect the ocean (Salm and Clark, 2000). Besides increasing awareness, community participation is also argued as useful to reduce conflict, stewardship development and management improvement (Suman et al., 1999), local ownership promotion, and an increase in fair decision (Smith, 2003).

However, the advantages and benefits of the community participation are not consistent with the related complex and diverse meanings. Salm and Clark (2000) argue that community participation has diverse interpretations and forms, and that meanings depend on the scope, location, and context of the people. Community participation as a concept is perceived as a dilemma and ambiguity, just like its sister concept – community empowerment. The concept is considered as a means or an end (Pierre, 2007), although the concept implementation tends to end up as a means (Bakke, 2015). Moreover, practically, Cooke and Kothari (2001) argue that participation of local people, for example in Indonesia, is a form of imposition of a new tyranny on the local people that leads to limitations of local potential and illegitimate local power practices. In the research of Cooke and Kothari (2001), active participation of the community has negative and destructive influences in the participation implementation (Cooke and Kothari, 2001). Cooke and Kothari argues that the efforts to empower local people as part of participation has led to disempowered and weakened established local leaders and locals structures impacting on social capital. The negative impacts and outcomes of community participation are also presented by many researchers. Examples include difficulties in evaluation, less meaningful participation, lack of traditional rights recognition (Bockstael et al., 2016), exclusiveness (Andrade and Rhodes, 2012), and lack of power to shape decisions (Bakke, 2015).

Even though Ferreday and Hodgson (2008) argue that the new tyranny imposition incident happened due to practitioners lack of understanding of different and alternative methods of
community participation, the negative consequences of the participation program according to Cooke and Kothari (2001) provide an important justification for my research, in two ways, first in terms of country relevance (Indonesia) and second, the examination of public perceptions on RARE’s community empowerment and participation program, especially in the Bunaken National Park. The justification of assessing NGO roles as the practitioner of empowerment programs for communities in Marine Protected Areas, especially in terms of provision and enforcement of social justice aspects, is supported by many authors and researchers (Charles and Wilson, 2009; Hattam et al., 2014; Jones, 2009; Mascia, 2004; Pomeroy et al., 2006; Voyer et al., 2014). Moreover, despite so many challenges, community participation remains a research focus in this thesis due to a practical reason that community participation was a focal point of RARE’s program.
CHAPTER 3. Methodology

This methodology chapter presents the procedures that have been taken and implemented in conducting the research, and also the justification of selection of each method or approach. The chapter covers the background methodology, research design, data collection phase, methods, data analysis, bias, triangulation, trust building, trustworthiness, and ethical approval.
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3.1. Background of methodology selection

The research question of the thesis is; “How effective was RARE in engaging the community in management in the BNP?” In order to answer the question, the case study research was conducted. Ashley and Boyd (2006) argue that the case study method emphasises integrity and example of mechanism of social processes and phenomenon. This method is suitable in order to provide answers to “how” and “why” related questions are exposed by the study. The question of the mechanism of a complex social process and the phenomenon is out of control of the researcher and having multi variables (Yin, 2009). Case study research is a “research that is an in-depth examination of an extensive amount of information about very few units or cases for one period of across multiple periods of time” (Neuman 2011, p. 42). Specifically, this research applies a single case-study due to its representation as an extreme or unique case (Yin, 2009).

The study examines perceptions of three general stakeholders; namely government, a Non-Government Organisation, and the community. The approach of this project will be based on multiple methods and multi-disciplinary qualitative methods (Christie, 2005) such as key informant interviews with semi structured questions (Maykut and Morehouse, 1994; Yin, 2009), direct observations (Neuman, 2011; Yin, 2009), documentation review, participant observations (Maykut and Morehouse, 1994; Yin, 2009) and focus group discussion. As a consequence of the use of case study, the general characteristics of the results is analytical (Yin, 2009). The explanatory case study research design was used in the thesis, instead of other designs, due to its relevance and consistency with the aim of the research focusing and using of the theory as the framework of the study (Bernard, 2006; Thomas, 2011). Consistency with the focus was constantly maintained and confirmed through monitoring of the fit of data, interpretation, theoretical thinking and sampling strategies (Morse et al., 2002).

3.2. Research design

The blueprint or the grand design of the research follows the methodologies, provided by Yin, (2009, 2012) that acted and served the guidelines of the research.

3.2.1 Linear sequence

In order to provide an explanation of the ‘how’ and ‘why’ question, the research was conducted following the linear sequence based on the stipulation of the knowledge driven theory (Yin, 2012). The research was started by use of the ideas of the basic research (theory) that led to inventions of applied research. The research design applied in this thesis can be seen in Figure 7.
3.2.2 Components of the research design

There are five components of the research design (Yin, 2009) as follows;

1. A study question
2. Propositions
3. Unit of analysis
4. The logic linking the data to the propositions
5. The criteria for interpreting the findings

The first component, establishing the research question is “How effective was RARE in engaging the community in management of Bunaken National Park?” Part of the first component is the justification behind the selection of RARE and the RARE’s programme as the object of the study and the Bunaken National Park as the setting. In order to choose and
limit the number NGOs that were eligible to be the object of the thesis, self-criteria were established. This was that the NGO should have:

(i) Implemented an individual and independent programme, not collectively with other NGOs;
(ii) Fixed locations of project, and
(iii) Had complete documents including activities report.

After rejecting a number of NGOs that were not able to meet one or more of the criteria, RARE, an international environmental NGO based in the USA, (RARE, 2013) was selected. RARE worked during 2010-2012 in the Bunaken National Park. The selection of RARE was also strongly supported by the nomination and recognition the NGO received from The Global Journal as one of the 100 best NGOs in the world two years in a row (2012 and 2013) (RARE, 2013). In order to receive the achievement, RARE must have fulfilled criteria prescribed by The Global Journal, such as the provision of essential service gaps, to drive innovation and to shape public opinion and social change throughout the world’ (NGO Nexis of the Global Journal, nd). A complete description of RARE will be presented in Chapter 4.

The other part, of the first component, is the setting definition. The Bunaken National Park was chosen as the location of research because of its typicality as a marine protected area in Indonesia (Yin, 2009). In addition, the similar political and social backgrounds and management issues experienced by the park (e.g. environmental degradation, poverty, community rejection, and overlapping authorities and rules), are typical in these countries (Syarif, 2009, Sidangoli et al., 2013). Another reason to choose the park as the context, of the research is its uniqueness in terms of the park’s achievements as nominated by various national and international parties including the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration and World Wildlife Fund (WWF) who selected the park as one of ‘22 pilot sites of development management effectiveness measurement guidelines’ (Erdman et al., 2004, p. 57). The International Coral Reef Action Network also appointed the park as their Asian Marine Protected Area ‘demonstration site of sustainable reef tourism’ (Erdman et al., 2004, p. 57). The park was also nominated as a site to be included on the World Heritage List, which should be protected due to its natural heritage values.

The second component is the establishment of the theoretical proposition: the case study will show how and why implementation of the RARE’s pride instilment programme was not sufficient to successfully change the behaviour of the community. Instead of an increase in the sense of stewardship of the community, the report of the programme shows that the quality decreased. The establishment of the unit of analysis was based on the theory of NGO organisational capacity implies that the NGO through its programme was able to present good impacts on the community, performance and the policy (Fowler et al., 1995). The proposition was used as frame of the case and aimed at increasing feasibility (Baxter and Jack, 2008).

The third component, the unit of analysis identification is the community and government agency that were involved in the RARE’s community empowerment programme on the community as well as the RARE’s staff.

The fourth component, establishment of the logic linking the data to the proposition, the general strategy chosen is the explanation building development. While the specific strategy was development of the two overlapping rival substantive explanations (Yin, 2012), the two
explanations are not mutually exclusive. The first explanation is that the community has higher expectations and urgent needs than values offered by the RARE’s community empowerment programme, and the second, which is an alternative to the first explanation, is that the community’s culture does not fit with the culture of individual pride values that has negative impacts on the collective community values.

The fifth component is the establishment of the criteria of interpreting the findings. In the research, the general strategy of data interpretation chosen is called ‘rival conditions examination’, and is achieved by contrasting perspectives of participants and comparison groups (Yin, 2009). The examination of the rival conditions actually involved data types of two natures, both qualitative and quantitative. However, in this thesis, due to the limited time frame and budget the researcher faced as a student, the survey of households that aimed to quantitatively study the community perception in the Mantehage and Nain Island was not conducted. Moreover, qualitative inquiry is sufficient to be used for different purposes such as theory development, refinement, or refutation (Keating, 1995).

3.2.3 Single case study challenge and reliability

The use of the single case study in generating generalisation was criticised as an insufficient effort (Marying, 2007). However, the explanation provided and generated through the single case studies can be richer than explanation derived from experimental research, although the level of certainty as not high as the true experiment. As it is argued by Yin (2012):

“the explanation contained in a case study usually can enrich the understanding of a cause-and-effect relationship beyond what can be discerned by using experiments of quasi- experiment alone” (Yin, 2012, p. 89).

3.3. Data collection phases

The data collection process was conducted in two phases. Phase 1 served as a preliminary study of the research. The three aims of the preliminary study were; firstly to establish a connection and good relationship with the gate keepers and the authority in the Bunaken National Park management, including learning about the official structure of the park management and authority. Secondly, to learn about the general governance issues in the Park and general roles of NGOs in the park establishment and management. The last aim was to learn how to obtain the official research permit in the park area including the conditions and requirements. For the second phase, multiple methods were applied to examine the public perceptions, including the government and community, about the RARE’s community empowerment programme in the Bunaken National Park.

3.4. Methods

One of the advantages of the case study approach is use of multiple methods such as key informant interviews, women’s group discussions, observations and secondary data. Tariq and Woodman (2010) argue that use of multiple methods is expensive and time consuming. However, Yin (2009) argues that the employment of multi method increases the validity of the case study research, especially construct. Following are descriptions of each method used in the research.
3.4.1 Key informant interviews

The data collection of the thesis depends mainly on key informants, Informant data was collected through semi-structured interviews using an interview schedule comprising open-ended questions. In order to examine experience, meanings, values, expectations of the community and central government officials and the Bunaken Park management board members on the NGO community empowerment programme and concepts.

Head of village interview questions (n=4)

- Perceived social impacts of patrol recruitment (How do you perceive recruitment of community patrol influences harmony within your community?)

- Perception of pride of the park concept: (What is your pride as a villager? What is your pride of the Bunaken Park in your area?)

- Perception of sense of ownership (What is your pride related to the existence of the Bunaken Park in your village, how do you feel/perceive the park existence, bans, patrol and zonation, what is your expectation to the patrol member in your village?)

- Reporting (Can you tell me any violations to the park rules which happened in the village?)

The same set of questions was asked to different groups or individual participants in order to obtain different and comprehensive perspectives. The researcher’s opinions and perceptions on the response of the first group, or individuals could be confirmed or tested in the next interview or discussions. Replication of questions in order to obtain different perspectives from different participants was conducted (Eisenhart and Graebner, 2007). In determining the interviewees, theoretical sampling was conducted (Eisenhart and Graebner, 2007; Suddaby, 2006) by establishing criteria of participants, not only key informants, but also women’s groups and patrol members. The key informants were selected purposely using a set of selection criteria that were previously established. The key informants would be interviewed if they have relevant attributes or characteristics, such as wide knowledge, life experience, deep involvement and understanding of the RARE’s community programme, including the patrol activities. The patrol members were limited to the members of the community patrol from villages on the Mantehage and Nain Island where the NGO conducted their activities. Based on the criteria, the key informants were head of villagers (n=4), government officials from the Balai Taman Nasional Bunaken (Bunaken National Park office) (n=5), the management board members (n=4), and community members that had ever been actively involved in RARE’s activities, especially community patrol members (n=7). All the interview results were audio recorded. The data collection process was conducted during early 2012 - 2014. The questions and themes of the key informant interviews can be seen as follow,

Community patrol members interview questions

Community patrol members are community members who were recruited by RARE and the Bunaken National Park Agency as part of community empowerment and participation program of the NGO and government institution. By providing the members salary and skills, the members were expected to be an agent of community change.
Increase in self-confidence (How did the requirement as a community patrol member improve your self-confidence?)
Satisfaction with the salary (are you satisfied with the salary you receive?)
Sustainable the program (Do you want to continue to be a patrol member?)
Social response (How did your recruitment change your relationship with your social environment?)
Increase in knowledge and skill (How did the requirement improve your self-knowledge and skill?)
Sufficiency of the new knowledge (What do you think about the sufficiency of the new knowledge?)

3.4.2 Women groups discussions

Discussion groups investigated women’s perceptions, experiences, feelings and meaning about the pride concept brought by the NGO, and also expectation towards the Bunaken National Park existence and programme. The women’s perception towards the community patrol was perceived as an outcome of the pride concept programme and also as a process of assessment of impacts of the activity.

Women focus group discussion questions

Equity of the recruitment process (What do you think of the equality in the patrol recruitment process?) Perceived effectiveness (How did the patrol help the community to accept the park? How did the patrol convince the community to obey the rules of the park? How did the patrol convince the community to comply with the zonation scheme?) Conflict resolution (How did the patrol’s presence solve the conflict of the community and the park? How did you perceive the past conflict between the community and the Park?) Reporting (Can you tell me about the violation of the Park’s rules in your village?).

While the discussions broadly followed these question, some questions needed to be rephrased due to changes of members’ responses towards particular questions.

Four focus group discussions were conducted in the villages of Tinongko, Buhias, Bango, and Nain Village where the NGO conducted their programmes. Women were especially chosen as participants of focus group discussion because, as in many developing countries (Brazil (Di Chiommo and Schiavetti, 2012), Ecuador, the Philippines and Liberia (IUCN, 2015)), women participation in decision making in protected area management is socially limited and marginalised. Moreover, all participants of key informant interviews were, by chance, male.

The focus group discussion itself was chosen because the method allows a combination with other methods such as direct observation and informant interviews (Morgan, 1996). The technique of purposive sampling was chosen (Sarantakos, 2005). Members of focus group discussions were determined based on the information of head of villages participated in the research as key informants. The focus groups contained 5-8 participants, all women organisation members, and they generall lasted from 1 to 3 hours depending on how active the members were in the discussions. Some group members were lively and active in the discussion, while some were very shy and reluctant. In a village, an entire group was unengaged. It took different styles and techniques to encourage the active involvement of the
participants, especially to narrow the gap between the researcher and the discussion members: sitting on the floor with the participants, creating informal conversations, and providing details and personal information about the researcher, as well as professional background in order to increase the participants’ trust. The women preferred to call themselves by a special call such as mother of … (their first child’s name), and they seemed to lack self-confidence, therefore, required consistent reminders that their knowledge, opinions, feelings are experience are of paramount importance for this study.

3.4.3 RARE interview

Interviews with two staff of RARE, the campaign manager, and the partnership manager of the NGO were conducted in order to obtain information about RARE’s concepts, focus goals, programmes, implementation and achievement of the community programmes. In particular, what they have done, how the programmes of community empowerment have been conducted, and what are the organisational purpose, approach and goals of community empowerment, participation, and partnership. Based on RARE’s empowerment program goal, assessment of the program outcome was focused on an increase on individual and organisational capacity.

The selection of interview participant and timelines of interviews with the NGO staff followed the case study protocol that was established prior to the data collection. The questions for the NGO staff following are:

- Individual and organisational capacity building (How did the programme increase your personal capacity? How did the programme impact on the institutional capacity?)
- RARE’s efforts and strategies (How did RARE support the community patrol activities, and conduct community meeting and campaigns? How did RARE anticipate the rejection toward the patrol members?)
- Conflict resolution (How did RARE's programme recognise the community’s rejection towards the park?)
- Perceived importance of women participation in patrol (What is your perception of women participation in patrol?)

3.4.4 Participant Observation

As part of the data collection, direct and unstructured observations during the field trip to the Bunaken National Park were conducted that are characterised with employment of flexible design, low level of standardisation, indirect and direct and whole setting focus, natural setting, and occurred continuously and persistently Park (Sarantakos, 2005). Observations, conducted were mixed of participant observations and controlled observations and conducted during two phases of the study. The participant observations were conducted at Phase 1 and Phase 2 of study. The participant observations were conducted during the stay of the researcher in the villages of location of research (Spradley, 1980) While, in particularly in Phase 2, controlled observations were conducted during interviews and discussions, The observations were more structured and deeper focus and attention provided, specifically to the responses of the participants of women’s group discussions and key informant interviews on questions that related to certain topics such as violation, arresting, No-Take Zone, Community Patrol and the community’s dependence on the marine resources.
The participants’ unusual changes including body language and facial expressions were observed and noted. Despite of the method’s strengths, (Mahr, 1995 in Sarantakos, 2005) argues that observation has weaknesses, such as inadequateness of studying sensitive issues, dependency on personal selection, memory, perception and bias vulnerability of the observers, and also lack of measurement of the observers’ bias, attitudes and opinions. However, observations conducted was an additional method to other methods, such as key informant interviews, women’s group discussions, NGO interviews, and document analysis employed as part of the case study research design that was chosen. The employment of all the methods altogether contributes to the strength and reliability of the case study approach employed in study (Yin, 1991) because it allowed multiple perspectives to occur and be analysed (Tellis, 1997).

To cope with a potential lack of balance due to personal bias, opinions and attitude as a researcher, four strategies of observations were employed. First, during the field stay, considering the researcher’s perception is subject to change (Yin, 2009), notes of the impressions, ideas, thoughts, and insights from hearing, sight, and other senses were taken straightaway once they were obtained. Mistakes or misunderstandings were corrected once they were realised (Libraries, nd), especially in the reflective contents (Libraries, nd). Secondly, discussion with members of the survey team about the observed issue produced rich descriptions and insights, and these were recorded or notes were taken of the discussion results (Sarantakos, 2005). Thirdly, based on the permission of the participants, video recording, audio recording or at least, photographs were made, enabling the events to be observed again. Fourth, as suggested by Schwarz et al. (2005), training of being an attentive listener and a neutral facilitator of the discussion were conducted personally. The training was conducted by developing respectful attitudes and the willingness to attentively listen to the participants’ story, and be considerate to a sudden or radical change. The sudden changes, such as sudden quietness, sad expression, or reluctant attitudes, could be displayed by any participants of the discussion in the middle of discussion or interview. Also, flexibility and adaptability of the researcher was developed to keep focus on the interview instructions and questions and the participants response at the same time. Moreover, the researcher’s understanding and knowledge and familiarity with the research topic and participants, and anticipation toward unexpected reactions were increased as well (Sarantakos, 2005).

In general, two types of observations were made as part of data collection can be seen in Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During Phase 1</th>
<th>During Phase 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Direct, passive, open observation means the villagers get to know my identity as a researcher</td>
<td>- Focused on physical environment of the villages, e.g. infrastructure, house quality, geographical issues, access, and esp. the marine resource use of the villagers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Focus on geographical challenges of</td>
<td>- Another important focus was the NGO’s campaign tools, e.g. stickers and billboards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Taking pictures and notes in every</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During my field stay in the villages-research sites</td>
<td>During the implementation of key informant interviews, woman group discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Developed self-alert and awareness of sudden change in response of the participants to certain questions related to a sensitive issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Observations during Phase 1 and Phase 2
villagers, e.g. isolation, access
- Community response to the new people

village and other settings including what people said when I was observing the campaigns tools.
- More structured, specific and deeper than previous phase
- Have pre-occupied understanding the context, issues, from other methods e.g. key informant interviews.

- Noticed and observed sudden change in response of participants, e.g. change in gesture, body language, need of questions paraphrasing, ignorance to answer certain questions, defensiveness or aggressiveness.

3.4.5 Secondary data

In order to support the data collection process and to provide a complete description of the case study, analysis of documents including reports, annual reports, files, memoranda, survey results, computerised data records, census information, project documentation was conducted. The documents belong to Bunaken National Park Management Board, the Bunaken National Park office (government institution), RARE and other relevant parties. The history and descriptions of the rationales of RARE’s work in the Bunaken National Park, as well as its policy, priorities, values and achievements were obtained from analysing the documents. The government’s data about the institutional priorities was also collected. Data from these secondary resources was scanned and saved in pdf file format to avoid duplication and missing data (Mitchel, 2002).

Data archival has limitation in terms of consistency of data availability (Yin, 2009). However, a careful attitude toward choosing data sources was employed in terms of reliability and consistency of the data sources, and the chosen data were used selectively in assisting the researcher in illuminating the case (Yin, 2009).

3.5. Data processing and coding

Once the data was collected, the data of interviews and discussion was processed (Dunn, 2000);

1. Audio and sometimes video recordings were conducted.
2. Transcribing process. In order to make the participants’ answers clear and make sense, and also to obtain best quality of the transcription, the sentences of the answers of the interviewees was completed by adding extra information depending on the need. The additional word could be verb, noun, adjective, or proposition and put in [ ] without changing the real meaning and content of the original sentence. The use of transcription process is useful to obtain the real voice of the participants.
3. Assembling field notes files.

3.6. Data analysis techniques and procedures

The next procedure was categorisation through comparisons, including highlighting similarities and differences. General data analysis technique was chosen as building explanation with stipulations of rival explanations (Yin, 2009, 2012) using contrasted perspectives of participant and comparisons groups from different conditions (Yin, 2009).
These results of analyses of independent data will be validated through a triangulation process in form of merging of analysed data from all methods (Yin, 2009).

The specific data analyses strategy used was content analysis technique and following a deductive approach (Bernard, 2006; Hsiu-Fang and Shannon, 2005). Summative content analysis was used and applied (Hsiu-Fang and Shannon, 2005). Content analysis has been criticised as a time consuming process (Macnamara, 2005). However, the technique of analysis is widely used in qualitative research (Franzosi, 2007). In the data analysis, some aspects became considerations.

As a consequence of the deductive approach used, priori coding was established such as sense of stewardship, community need, community expectations, government expectation, pride instilment, community acceptance, pride, value, zonation, violation, and rejection. Reducing the data by creating model and categories (Elo et al., 2014) and a matrix of categorisation was developed in the organisation of the data (Elo et al., 2014). The process of development of the matrix was influenced by RARE’s activities and programme, and also the aspects of the organisational framework, such as interaction of the government, community and NGO that is developed and employed in the thesis. The matrix of RARE’s activities can be seen in the Table 6.

**Table 6 Matrix of RARE’s roles in the park**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RARE’s roles</th>
<th>Influential factors</th>
<th>Effects on the park conservation</th>
<th>Direct/ultimate effects (social impact)</th>
<th>Direct/ultimate effects (environmental effects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community pride (individual empowerment)</td>
<td>• Community expectations • Community needs • Community experience • Community feelings</td>
<td>Capacity increase, conflicts, social exclusion</td>
<td>Community rejections to the park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government’s partnership</td>
<td>• Agenda • Target • Priority</td>
<td>Funding, skills provision</td>
<td>Community rejections to the park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the first coding process, both latent and manifest coding was exercised in order to strengthen the results of analysis (Neuman, 2014). Latent coding covered the coding process based on the explicit meaning, while the manifest coding used and developed using implicit or semantic meaning (Neuman, 2014). Analytical memo was developed during the process of coding and categorising (Gibbs, 2002) that is useful to help the researcher track how and why a code or category was developed (Morse et al., 2002). Beside over use of pronouns (I, me, he, she), some elements are used such as type of adjectives, metaphors, verb, tonal qualities, visual imaginary also become part of the analysis (Macnamara, 2005).
Six questions were addressed in the implementation of content analysis (Krippendorff, 1980).

1. Which data are analysed?
2. How are they defined?
3. What is the population from which they are drawn?
4. What are the contexts relative to which the data are analysed?
5. What are the boundaries of the analysis?
6. What is the target of the inferences?

In conducting data analysis, the researcher was assisted by NVIVO programme, but it did not automatically ignore the researcher’s role as the main element and the main analyst in the research process (Gibbs, 2002). The system of qualitative data consists of three parts: documents, nodes, and attributes (Gibbs, 2002; Lyn, 1999). Openness and nurturing creativity and institution in unanticipated data is needed (Suddaby, 2006), and developing a tentative model in every step of the data analysis (Morse et al., 2002).

3.7. Bias

Due to the qualitative nature of the research that was employed in this thesis, the main accusation of bias is subjectivity of the research. The accusation occurs because the methods depend on the researcher as the main data collector and analyst (Rajendran, 2001). Potential biases that were anticipated in the research are selection bias and the superficiality of the researcher’s opinion and prejudices during the data collection and interpretations process that depends on skills, insights and training of the researcher (Patton, 2002; Rajendran, 2001). The first potential bias was related to reliability of participant from the government institutions that might have not yet become an official in the relevant position in the time when the RARE’s programme was conducted. Beside the government, the researcher was faced with a similar potential risk of bias in dealing with the head of village.

In order to deal with the potential biases and to minimise the degree of the biases, a series of strategies were applied. For the first bias, beside use of the established criteria of participant selection information was traced back to past officials, including looking for information related to the past officials, head of the villages and park managers. For the second potential bias, a set of strategies was devised such as development of guidelines of the case study (Yin, 2009) and maintaining the continuous writing process during the data collection and data interpretation. The program of NUD*IST Vivo (NVIVO) was also used during the data collection and analysis that provided access to analyse the database developed and the data sources. Field notes were maintained that contained honest insights and reflections of the researcher developed especially during the data collection on the field (Rajendran, 2001). The other strategies of coping with biases that would be done in the research are use of quantitative method such as surveys. However, due to limitation of time and logistics of the researcher as a student the survey could not be conducted.

Anticipated reliability issues in terms of use of content analysis is the inconsistence of the meaning applied in the word, therefore establishment of the definitions of meaning and rules and guidelines of the categorisation was applied (Stemler, 2001).

Regarding personal subjectivity, instead of leaving it behind due to its unavoidability, the issue was regarded as virtuous. The researcher’s subjectivity is the basis for the story able to be told, part of the personal strength on which the researcher built. It equipped the researcher with perspectives and insights that shaped all that the researcher conducted and implemented.
As Patton (2002) argues, bias in qualitative research is a dilemma, but the issue is not about the involvement of personal insights and opinion of the researcher in research, but about the extent or degree the personal insight influence the truth and answer construction.

### 3.8. Trustworthiness (credibility, transferability, dependability, confirmability, validity and reliability)

In developing and building trustworthiness of the research, the Guba and Lincoln’s four criteria of trustworthiness developed by Morse et al. (2002) and Shenton (2004) were employed. The four criteria credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability were used during the process of study. In order to fulfil the criteria of credibility, a series of strategies were used, such as implementation of verification process. The whole process of verification required constant monitoring and consistency of the dependency of each element of research (Morse et al., 2002).

The verification process of the research was conducted through methodological coherence and establishment and appropriateness of sampling. The first aspect, the methodological coherence involved modifying the research questions and methods back and forth until it reached “analytical goal” (Morse et al., 2002). Replication of the same set of questions to different participants was applied. In determining the participants, theoretical sampling was conducted (Eisenhart and Graebner, 2007; Suddaby, 2006) by establishing criteria of sampling. This reconfirmation and verification continued until it reached the fixed structure.

As part of the efforts to establish validity and reliability, the researcher’s sensitivity, creativity and insight was developed in conducting verification during the process of the research. Adoption of well-established method (Shenton, 2004) and aligning with the guidelines of case study by Yin (2009, 2012) was conducted and also development of familiarity with the culture of organisation and context (Shenton, 2004).

Familiarisation with the context, setting and issues was conducted during the first phase and the second phase. Beside the long terms of the second phase, the wide interviews were conducted at the first phase. Triangulation will be explained later in this chapter. Frequent debriefing sessions were held (Shenton, 2004). Intensive consultations and discussions with the experts, such as the supervisors were conducted during the process. As part of the consultation, maintaining transparency with the supervisors was one of the strategies (Meloy, 1994). Reflective summary establishment was undertaken (Shenton, 2004). This includes building of the researcher’s responsiveness as a researcher (Morse et al., 2002).

**Transferability:** Provision of basic information clearly (Shenton, 2004) such as:

- Number of organisations taking part
- Restrictions in the type of people who contributed data
- The number of participants involved in the field work
- The data collection methods that were employed
- The number and length of the data collection sessions
- The time period over which the data was collected

**Confirmability:** Use of triangulation (Yin, 2009, Shenton, 2004), recognition of any weaknesses of the research and potential effects on the research (Shenton, 2004). Consideration and building of the trustworthiness aspect of the research were not only related to the qualitative inquiry, but also related to the case study design that was applied. In order
to increase the reliability of the case, a case study database was developed covering the case study notes, case study documents and also narratives. The notes cover results of interviews, audio recording, photos, video recording, field notes, document analysis, and narratives including development of the open ended questions (Yin, 2009). Hand writings were transferred into the PDF form or retyped in the Microsoft Word application and all of these components were then stored in NVIVO programmes (Gibbs, 2002). The trustworthiness building of case study is illustrated in Table 7.

Table 7 The trustworthiness building of case study (Adapted from Yin, 2009, p.41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Case study tactics</th>
<th>Phase of research in which tactic occurs</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construct validity</td>
<td>□ Use of multiple sources of evidence</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>□ Define the sense of stewardship meaning, pride meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Establish chain of evidence</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>□ Identify operational measures of the expectations of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal validity</td>
<td>□ Conducted explanation building</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>Establishment of alternative explanations of the impacts of the RARE’s activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External validity</td>
<td>□ Used theory</td>
<td>Research design</td>
<td>Use of the organisational theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>□ Use of case study protocol</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Developed case study database</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to enforce trustworthiness, especially the data analysis process that depended on content analysis technique, the checklist suggested by Elo et al. (2014) was followed both at the organisation and reporting steps. The checklist of organisation steps can be seen in Table 8, while the reporting steps both checklist of the results and data analysis at Table 9.

Table 8 The checklist of organisation steps (Adapted from Elo et al., 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of organisations</th>
<th>Questions to check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Categorisation and abstraction</td>
<td>How should the concept or categories be created?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there still too many concepts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there any overlap between categories?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>What is the degree of interpretation in the analysis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do I ensure that the data accurately represent the information that the participants provided?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representativeness</td>
<td>How do I check the trustworthiness of the analysis process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do I check the representativeness of the data as a whole?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 Checklist of the reporting results (Adapted from Elo, 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions to check</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are the results reported systematically and logically?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are the connections between the data and results reported?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the content and structure of the concepts presented in a clear and understandable way?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the reader evaluate the transferability of the results (are the data, sampling method and participants described in a detailed manner)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well do the categories cover the data?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there similarities within and differences between categories</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are quotations used systematically?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is scientific language used to convey the results?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a full description of the analysis process?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the trustworthiness of the context analysis discussed based on some criteria?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.9. Triangulation

In order to increase and construct confidence, reliability, accuracy, and validity, especially during the interpretation, the researcher conducted a triangulation process that emphasises convergence of evidence process (Yin, 2009). In order to achieve meaning clarification and verification of repeatability of an observation and interpretation, triangulation process is suggested (Patton, 2002; Stake, 2000). Types of triangulation used were the theoretical methods focusing on same data set analysis and examination. Based on the Developed Model discussed in Chapter 2, it shows that NGO empowerment program should have “capacity” and also provide other important aspects such as positive social, institutional and individual impacts on the participants of the program. The implementation of aspects of the model, then were examined, confirmed and verified to participants of interviews and focus group discussions and observation through established set of the questions. The findings of the examinations were then compared one and another in order to obtain deep insight and holistic and comprehensive perspectives on the same phenomenon which increased and strengthened validity and confidence of the findings of the study. Moreover, the sources of information are quasi-independent, offering a degree of triangulation to the results. The convergence process can be seen in Figure 8.

Figure 8 Convergence of evidence (Adapted from Yin, 2009)
3.10. Trust building

Trust building of candidate participants was one of the main issues during the data collection process, especially in terms of high levels of rejection by participants to participate in the Phase 1. The suspicious attitude towards the researcher was challenging. Not only at that stage, but also most of the time when the researcher was about conducting one interview or focus group discussion at Phase 2. Even, the researcher was once severely investigated by a village government structure, especially when it was found out that the researcher’s current university is in Australia, an ally of the USA administration that through its agency is accused of taking over the coastal area of the Bunaken National Park. The issue is not only including the lack of trust of the people toward the newcomers that were perceived as a provocateur, and also the controversial discussions about the existence of the park. The researcher’s existence as a young, woman, and a PhD student from a western country based university, studying the NGO roles, and the Bunaken National Park issues including patrol existence are a perfect combination to hinder trust building to the researcher. A few of the candidates or potential participants refused to participate in the research, and even were afraid and terrified to sign the consent form the researcher offered. This was because they thought that the researcher was the park authority, or a police informant, or a spy who came to investigate their illegal fishing operations. One of the participants’ concerns was the research could bring them a problem with the police or the patrol. However, for the researcher, the community's distrustful attitudes and fear of the researcher and the research actually are the reflection of what happened in the past in the community, and what is in their minds at the moment, and at the same time provided significant contributions for the researcher’s understanding about what the people were thinking, feeling, perceiving and experiencing in the deeper way from their perspectives. Based on the researcher’s experience, a series of strategies in order to cope with the hindrance of trust of the community were developed, as follows:

- Contacted the gate keepers, such as the head of village or their family and close relatives, priest, other village government structures in the villages and made them know and understood what the research topic is about by asking them to be participants of the research and staying at their house.
- Employed and optimised a use of informal channels, connections and information, such as mentioning or linking a close neighbour who once worked as a nurse in the given village, or villagers that became neighbours.
- Showed sincere attitudes and feelings, that participants can feel it. Be humble by using their terminology, asking the participants how to address them prior to interviews or discussions and also treating them as they want, in a respectful way.
- Be transparent about the researcher’s personal information, such as what is the researcher’s address, contact, occupation, family background, even church affiliation. Repeated it consistently.
- Past position and knowledge as a youth leader in the church that is under the same synod as the participants’ church, or as a government employee in the general government department were used when faced with a proud, aggressive, stubborn, pushy, male, senior government village structure.
- Expressing openly, sincerely that personal, professional and relational safety and comforts as participants are paramount to the research.

As a result of the trust building process, the good communication and relationship with participants take place until now, not only prior to and during the data collection, but also
after that, from keeping in touch on social media, casual visits to the researcher’s residence to inform the researcher about a new baby birth and an invitation to the thanksgiving festivals on their island. The most important part of trust building of the participants is that the process of data collection and data analysis were not violating the ethical concerns and approval, as outlined in next section.

3.11. Ethical approval

Research implementation presented in this thesis complies with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. As part of the compliance, an ethics application was submitted and was approved by Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) of Southern Cross University on 22 November 2012; Approval Number ECN-299 in the name of Marmelda Y Sidangoli as the principal investigator and Prof. William Boyd and Dr. David Lloyd as supervisors and co-investigators. In order to conduct the second phase of the research, a change of protocol was applied and was granted on 22 May 2013; Approval number ECN-13-126. The approval was renewed in October 2014 and the renewed approval number is ECN-14-252. The committee considered the research as a low or negligible risk to the participants. Moreover, the research also provided a scheme for respondents to deliver their complaints. However, until now, there is no complaint received.
CHAPTER 4. Introduction to the Case Study

This chapter of introduction to the case study is aimed at describing and providing relevant information that is needed in order to understand the causal relationships as well as the conditions established in the thesis, related to the Bunaken National Park, RARE and the community.

The first description relates to the Bunaken National Park which is the location of the RARE Community Empowerment Programme. The description is important due to the Park’s existence as the setting of the programme. The second description outlines what the NGO is, the organisational values, approaches, strategies, and implementation of the Community Empowerment Programme. The third part describes RARE’s regional, national and local work, including within the community, that has become the object of the RARE’s Community Empowerment Programme. Lastly an evaluation of RARE’s programme in the Bunaken National Park is provided. The diagram of the chapter can be seen in Figure 9.

Figure 9 Diagram of Chapter 4
4.1 Bunaken Park: Establishment and Management

Bunaken National Park located c.15 km from Manado, the capital of North Sulawesi, Indonesia, covers 75,265 ha and was declared as a National Park in 1991 (Syarif, 2009). Ecologically, Sulawesi Water is important due to its geographical position as part of the Wallace Area (Rhee, et al., 2004), a home of various and diverse coral species and endangered and ancient species such as Coelacanth fish (Latimeria chalumnae) that has been living for almost 400 million years (Erdman and Moosa, 1999). As a consequence, the Park has been nominated as a Natural World Heritage Site ((Erdman et al., 2004; Rhee et al., 2004).

In terms of management, the Park is organised into two regions, the southern region covering part of coastal area of the South Minahasa Regency and the northern region consists of five main islands, Bunaken, Mantehage, Manado Tua, Siladen and Nain. The northern part is more attractive to the global and local divers than the southern section (BTNB, 2011). The Park’s positions near Manado City as the province’s capital city that is inhabited by more than 410,000 people putting the marine resources in the Park water under a significant pressure (BLH, 2011).

In terms of governance, the Park was established and governed solely by the National Forestry Ministry through the extended body is called the Balai Pengelola Taman Nasional Bunaken (Bunaken National Park Management Institution). However, nine years after establishment, a collaborative board called Dewan Pengelola Taman Nasional Bunaken (the Bunaken National Park Management Advisory Board) that consisted of representative of the Agency, the North Sulawesi Province, municipalities government, NGOs and representative of local people called Forum Masyarakat Peduli Taman Nasional Bunaken (Forum of citizens) was established to complement the Park Agency’s task.
4.2 RARE’s Organisational Values, Approach and Strategies

Organisationally, RARE is an international environmental NGO that is based in the USA (Santoso, 2012). Internationally, the vision of this NGO is “to inspire changes so people and nature can thrive” (RARE, nd-c). While, specifically in relation to community empowerment programmes, the principle of the NGO is ‘the community based solution for global conservation’ (RARE, nd-a). In terms of partnership, the vision embraced by the NGO is “local leadership for lasting change’. RARE’s Community Empowerment Programme was conducted using a ‘Social Marketing Model’ approach that emphasises the change in behaviour as a result of accumulation of change in knowledge, attitudes and awareness (Santoso, 2012). The approach is dictated by a dependence and attachment to sequence of steps to achieve conservation results, starting with a combination of knowledge, attitude, interpersonal communication activities, barrier removal, followed in theory by behaviour change and threat reduction. The Social Marketing Approach can be seen in Figure 11. In terms of measuring the success of the programme including community empowerment, three aspects called three Cs (Capacity, Constituent, and Conservation) were used (RARE, nd-a).
In terms of principal values, especially in the NGO’s implementation of the community Empowerment Programme, a concept called ‘Pride’ was used. Using the new meaning of Pride Value of the resources offered by the NGO, a given community was encouraged to exchange illegal and destructive behaviours with behaviours as good and responsible managers of the resources (Santoso, 2012). In terms of the effectiveness of Pride as a “proven solution” at the global level issue, the success in implementing a Pride Instilment Campaign in several places has encouraged by the NGO to hold to the strategy and developing the Pride formula. The Pride concept has become a fixed formula, or template, and the core value of all RARE’s Community Empowerment Programmes and activities all over the world, including in the Bunaken Park. A flowchart of RARE’s vision, mission, strategies, goal, and motto in Community Empowerment Programs can be seen in Figure 12.

**Figure 11** The social marketing approach of RARE (Santoso, 2012)

**Figure 12** RARE’s vision, goals, indicators, values (adapted from Santoso, 2012)
4.3 RARE’s Regional, National, and Local Work

This NGO works all over the world including in the Coral Triangle areas considered ecologically globally important due to the high diversity of corals. The importance of the area has received international wide attention since the emergence of the Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral Reefs, Fisheries and Food Security (CTI) initiated by President Susilo Bambang Yudoyono of Indonesia. The initiative is an agreement between the Governments of Indonesia, the Philippines, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands and Timor-Leste to take action ensuring the marine benefits can be enjoyed by the next generation as well as the current generation (Rosen and Olsson, 2013). The CTI was implemented as a result of the 2009 World Ocean Conference (WOC) held in Manado, North Sulawesi, Indonesia (Rosen and Olsson, 2013) where the Bunaken National Park is located.

At the national level, RARE builds cooperation and collaboration with the Forestry Ministry of Indonesia (RARE, nd-a) which has formal and legal authority of establishment and management of protected areas in Indonesia, along with other National Government Department such as the Fisheries and Marine Resource Ministry. From all protected areas under the Forestry Ministry, six protected areas were chosen including the Bunaken National Park. During the period 2010-2012, the Community Empowerment Programme in the National Park was conducted in collaboration with the Balai Taman National Bunaken (The Bunaken National Park Office) – a management Agency under the Ministry of Forestry that legally manages the Park. RARE’s work structure from the international level to the local level can be seen in Figure 13.
4.3.1 The Community Background- The People of the Mantehage and Nain Islands

In terms of the targeted community, the first period was indirectly targeted at the whole community of the Park, while the second period, the community empowerment programme, NGO focused on the Mantehage Island and Nain Island. These areas are known to have had past severe conflicts and fierce resistance toward the Park (BTNB, 2011).

Bunaken National Park has over 30,000 people occupying the area, in 22 villages, within the Park. The village communities include local ethnic groups, including the Minahasa, Sanger, Borgo, and Bajau (Erdman et al., 2004; Rhee et al., 2004; van Beukering et al., 2007). However, RARE’s programme of community empowerment, especially for the second term was limited to the villages on Mantehage and Nain islands. Most of these community members live within the Park area are predominantly Sangers. As a consequence, the Sangihe/Siau language is used in daily conversation of the people. However, the people in the Park use Manadonese dialect when speaking with strangers from the mainland with as strong Sangihe accent. Christian is a religion hold by the majority people in the Park area, especially by Sangihe and Minahasa People, while Islam is hold by the Bajau.
The low level of education is a major problem for the islanders. Junior elementary school is the highest education facility for the four villages located on the Mantehage Island in Tinongko village. In order to go to the school, the students from other villages must cross the mangrove forest and private farms.

4.3.2 RARE’s Strategies in the Bunaken Park

RARE’s Community Empowerment Programme adopted strategies based on the Social Marketing Model including recruitment and education of a Government Agency staff to be the NGO’s campaign manager; recruitment of community members to be Community Patrol members. The NGO also conducted community education campaigns about the importance of sustainability of the resources in the Bunaken National Park.

The details of RARE’s activities in the Park are as follows:

Building Capacity of the Government staff as a Campaign Manager

RARE’s Community Empowerment Programme was started by the recruitment of the staff of the Government Agency to be a RARE Campaign Managers, and provision of scholarships to a master programme to the selected staff.

Community Education Campaign and Meetings

The community campaigns were conducted in form of direct communications, such as informal gatherings, and indirect tools, such as that production of slogans, radio advertisements, stickers, billboards, songs, calendars, mascots, Short Message Sending (SMS), and religious sermons (Santoso, 2012). The aim of the activities was to achieve community changes in behaviour, by providing knowledge, and increasing awareness.

Community Patrol

The Community Patrol members were originally in a programme of the Government Agency as a partner of RARE in the Park. Later, the programme was claimed as a form of outcome of the Pride Instilment Programme by RARE. An expected outcome of the programme was to encourage the recruited community members as the ‘agent of change’ of the community negative behaviours.

4.4 Evaluation of the RARE’s Community Empowerment Programme

The final report of the community programme has showed some progress and outlined advantages of the programme (Santoso, 20012). The programme was successful in building a partnership with the National Government, in providing a master programme scholarship to a staff of the Park Agency and in conducting pre and post surveys (Santoso, 2012). The final report by the RARE Campaign Manager stated that 100% of all strategies were successfully conducted (Santoso, 2012).

From the implementation of the varied strategies under the Pride spirit, three aspects of barriers removal were able be to achieved by the NGO; the establishment of the standard operational procedures of the joint Patrol activity, training and education of community empowerment based on the established SOP and lastly is a set buoys positioned as boundary of the tourism zone. However, the final evaluation of the programme found that the programme was not able to achieve the goals of the Park in relation to the community’s
behaviour change in terms of community agreement that forbade particular fishing gear, the importance of punishment for zonation violation and illegal fishing activities in the two No Take Zones on Mantehage Island. The achievement of the strategies is referred to as ‘still in process’ (Santoso, 2012).

The experience of implementation of RARE’s programme, both in relation to accomplished and unaccomplished goals, provides a justification for the study of this thesis to analyse how to improve potential results of similar programmes. Analysis of the ‘why’ and ‘how’ RARE failed to achieve three aspects related to Capacity, Community, and Conservation will be discussed in the next chapter. Therefore, as a part of this thesis, an assessment of community and government perception on the RARE’s activities was conducted in order to fulfil the aim of the research. The results of the research will be presented in the next four chapters.
SECTION 2. CASE STUDY

Introduction

Section two, Case Study is the results of the synthesising of the feelings, expectations, and experience of the local community, local leaders, and Government officials in the Community Empowerment Programme conducted by RARE. The section consists of two main parts; the first part covers two chapters. The first, the organisational success of RARE’s Community Empowerment Programme especially at the individual level, and also the barriers and impediments to achieve the community’s collective level of empowerment, and the second a chapter related to RARE’s issues in developing individual empowerment to achieve the collective empowerment.

The location of the section in the thesis can be seen in Figure 14.
CHAPTER 1: Introduction (including, Statement of Aim and Objectives

CHAPTER 2: NGO, Community Empowerment, Social values

CHAPTER 3: Methodology

CHAPTER 4: Introduction to the Case Study

RARE COMMUNITY PROGRAMME

CHAPTER 5: RARE’s Success

CHAPTER 6: Individual Empowerment Issues

INTRODUCTION OF THE SECTION

CHAPTER 7: Intrapersonal Relationship

CHAPTER 8: Officials Perception

SOCIAL PERCEPTION & EXPECTATION

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY OF THE SECTION

SECTION 3: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

CHAPTER 9: Issues and Processes of Social Engagement with NGO Programs at the Bunaken National Park

CHAPTER 10: Lessons from Study Improving Community-NGO Relationship

CHAPTER 11: Study Conclusion

CHAPTER 12: Executive Summary of Recommendations for NGO Improvement

CHAPTER 13: Personal Reflections

Figure 14 Diagram of structure of the thesis
CHAPTER 5. The Organisational Success of RARE’s Individual Empowerment Programme

The programme of community empowerment by RARE through community education, community campaign, and Patrol recruitment is a continuous process that is passed several steps in its efforts to achieve the ultimate goal of the programme is conservation of the Bunaken National Park. The results of research regarding individual success were presented according to RARE’s activities and the success of the activities. As a result, this chapter is organized in five main parts firstly the improved knowledge, secondly, the improved understanding and awareness, thirdly, the improved commitment and pride, fourthly improved leadership and confidence, and lastly, improved community skills. A diagram of the structure of Chapter Five can be seen in Figure 15.

THE SUCCESS OF RARE’S INDIVIDUAL EMPOWERMENT
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Figure 15 Diagram of the structure of Chapter 5

In order to increase the understanding of the exchanges between the interviewees and interviewer, explanations of the certain terms that are frequently used by the local people including lists of resources, natural topography and fishing gear and methods are presented in Tables 10, 11 and 12.
Table 10 Resource names referenced in the interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local name</th>
<th>Bahasa Indonesia</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Latin Name</th>
<th>Local Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food source</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bia nuning</td>
<td>Siput/kerang Bulan</td>
<td>Gold Mouth Turbo</td>
<td><em>Turbo chryseostomus</em></td>
<td>Food source and commercial commodity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bia Kodo</td>
<td>Siput/kerang Hijau</td>
<td>Green Turban</td>
<td><em>Turbo marmoratus</em></td>
<td>Food source and commercial commodity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boboca</td>
<td>Cumi-cumi</td>
<td>Squid</td>
<td><em>Loligo spp</em></td>
<td>Food source and commercial commodity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maming</td>
<td>Napoleon</td>
<td>Napoleon wrasse</td>
<td><em>Cheilinus undulatus</em></td>
<td>Food source and commercial commodity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuturuga</td>
<td>Penyu</td>
<td>Turtle</td>
<td><em>Chelonia mydas</em></td>
<td>Food source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goropa</td>
<td>Kerapu</td>
<td>Groper</td>
<td><em>Ephinephelus spiritoceps</em></td>
<td>Food source and commercial commodity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketang</td>
<td>Kepting</td>
<td>Crab</td>
<td><em>Scilla serrata</em></td>
<td>Food source and commercial commodity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry (timber, fire woods, logs)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makurung Laut</td>
<td>Bakau</td>
<td>Large leafed Orange Mangrove</td>
<td><em>Bruguiera gymnorrhiza</em></td>
<td>Fire wood and coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makurung</td>
<td>Bakau bunga kecil</td>
<td>Red Mangrove</td>
<td><em>B. parviflora</em></td>
<td>Fire wood, coal, herbal medicine, poles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makurung Darat</td>
<td>Bakau</td>
<td>Up river Orange Mangrove</td>
<td><em>B. sexangula</em></td>
<td>Fire wood, coal, herbal medicine, poles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayu Ting Putih</td>
<td>Bakau putih</td>
<td>Small leafed Orange Mangrove</td>
<td><em>B. cylindrica</em></td>
<td>Fire wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lolang Bajo</td>
<td>Bakau</td>
<td>Black Mangrove</td>
<td><em>Lumnitzera littorea</em></td>
<td>Less quality, alternative to mangrove (Bango village)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lolang Bajo Putih</td>
<td>Bakau putih</td>
<td>Black Mangrove</td>
<td><em>L. racemosa</em></td>
<td>Strong and water resistant building material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation related knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poparade</td>
<td>Bulu babi</td>
<td>Sea urchin</td>
<td><em>Temnopleurus alexandrii</em></td>
<td>Poisonous no use for the community, it is an indicator of coral health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamtoro</td>
<td>Lamtoro</td>
<td>Miracle tree</td>
<td><em>Leucaena leucocephala</em></td>
<td>Greening efforts, alternative to mangrove wood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 Traditional fishing methods and gear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local name</th>
<th>Bahasa Indonesia</th>
<th>Common name</th>
<th>Principle Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sero Tanam</td>
<td>Sero</td>
<td>Set net (guiding barriers)</td>
<td>A fish trap uses a lot of mangrove woods that are planted like a fence to guide and trap fish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubi</td>
<td>Senapan Ikan</td>
<td>Spear gun</td>
<td>Selective fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakumpul bia</td>
<td>Pengumpul Kerang</td>
<td>Collection/hunting/extraction of molluscs</td>
<td>Conducted during the low tide. This activity requires access to walk on the protected corals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borri</td>
<td>Racun</td>
<td>Fish poisoning</td>
<td>Use of natural poison that made of roots or stem of certain plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolutu</td>
<td>Perahu Bolutu</td>
<td>Traditional boat</td>
<td>Depends on balance of the user</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katingting</td>
<td>Katingting</td>
<td>Small engine</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kompressor</td>
<td>Kompresor</td>
<td>Diving air compressor</td>
<td>Gas compressor provides direct supply gas breathing to a diver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 Natural geography and topography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local name</th>
<th>Bahasa Indonesia</th>
<th>English name</th>
<th>Economic and Cultural Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nyare</td>
<td>Daerah pasang surut</td>
<td>Intertidal area</td>
<td>Location of food sources and place of livelihood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubir</td>
<td>Cekungan (Lubuk laut)</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>The edge or border to the intertidal area, as a cultural border of water territory of a village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talaga</td>
<td>Bakau</td>
<td>Pond/mangrove</td>
<td>Social pride and identity of the community of the Buhias village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air jaha/ air kurang</td>
<td>Pasang surut</td>
<td>Low tide</td>
<td>As a sign to collect molluscs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following are the improvements to individual empowerment as experienced by the community and also by the Community Patrol Members as a result of the RARE programme. Improvements are related to aspects such as knowledge, awareness, understanding and individual responsibility, leadership and capacity.

5.1 Improved Knowledge

The increase in knowledge, awareness and understanding experienced by the community comprised of different areas of knowledge such as ecological knowledge, the importance of the next generation benefits, and also the zonation benefits and the systems of the Park. The first aspect of the new knowledge is the knowledge related to the zonation system of the Bunaken National Park, as was stated by a Community Patrol member below:

Q: Can you tell me about new knowledge about forbidden gears used in the No-Take Zone you obtained from the Patrol activities?
A: There are different types of zones depend on the purpose. The zone system consists of the tourism zone, the community zone, and the core zone where all activities are forbidden to conduct. Even, for conducting research, you should obtain a permit from the Balai [the Bunaken National Park Agency] (Community Patrol 3)
Q: Regarding the No-Take Zone, what do you know about activities allowed in the zone?
A: No activity is allowed in the zone, even boats are only allowed to pass not to halt. For us [on the island] the zone is started from the edge of mangrove to the end of coastal line. So it does not include ‘Tubir’ [sea basin], it is only nyare [intertidal] area. (Community Patrol 2)

The improvement in ecological and management-related knowledge also was experienced by Community Patrol 6:

Q: You said that your knowledge has been improved since you have become a Patrol member, how do you teach the fishermen about the rules?
A: [I let them know that] the public zone or the zone [is protected] for community use is only for the fishermen, while the tourist zone should be kept from the fishermen. That’s all.
Q: How do you teach the people about the core zone? [By sharing and explaining], that we [the community] cannot do any activities in the zonation, any, including diving, [and] fishing. (Community Patrol 6)

Community Patrol 3 pointed at the same improvement:

Q: How has your knowledge related to the coral conservation improved?
A: I involved in the coral conservation activities, such as coral seedling nurturing and also eco reef making activities. Eco reef is an artificial coral and it is a stimulant of the growth of the new coral. It is made of ceramic. It looks like corals, but it was made of ceramic and made in Korea or Singapore, and serves to catch sperms of corals so the new coral will grow in the unit. It looks like corals that have a finger like shape. It is located in the respective site where damaged corals are located [and] aimed at [enabling the corals] to catch the sperms. It is expected that the new seeds will grow in the place.
Q: Based on your new knowledge, how long it takes to grow the new seedlings?
A: The new seedlings will grow well if it is supported by the good water circulation, current circulation, and clean water that free from any pollution or debris. It took one year at least. The growth of coral seedlings can reach [only] one cm per year.
Q: So the growth of coral seedlings takes time?
A: Yes, if there is no natural disturbance, such as fish disturbance. (Community Patrol 3)

While the Patrol members presented their knowledge about the zonation system of the Park, one woman in the group discussion in Bango village expressed her knowledge about the size limit of catching the protected Cheilinus undulates (Napoleon wrasse), thus:

They [RARE] told me that Maming (Napoleon wrasse) is forbidden to catch when it is still in the small size, the size around a couple centimeters. The small size means it has not laid its eggs yet. If it is large, they (RARE and the Park authority) do not prohibit catching, it means, economically, [it is more profitable] because we could generate more money from selling the large Maming [than the small ones]. They [RARE and the Park authority] told me that if Maming was caught in the small size, it is just enough as food, it means the Bango villagers [would] ignore the opportunity to make much money. They [RARE and the Park authority] want us if we want to catch
Maming should be in the large size, so that we can make a large income. They said that the price is around Rp. 1 million per kilo [for the large fish].

5.2 Improved Understanding and Awareness

Development of the new knowledge of the community did not stand alone or stop at this level, but it leads to the creation of new understanding and awareness of the community covering the mangrove forest preservation and other Park’s rules implementation.

5.2.1 The Ecological Importance of Mangroves

Regarding the understanding and paradigms specifically related to the importance of mangrove are varied. Some people emphasised the habitat as erosion preventer, its importance in the preservation of the mangrove forest and the new ecological mindset. While, some people focused on the function of mangrove habitat as beach protectors and was commented below by the women group discussion in Buhias Village:

A1: As I knew, in the past, there was not any ban. We used to use a lot of the mangrove trees.
A2: It was just recently [enacted], it is said that [the protection of mangrove is important] in order to prevent beach (from beach abrasion).
A1: Since around five years ago the rules have been implemented.
Q: What do you think about the rules?
A5: [The rules are useful] by maintaining and preserving the mangrove, we protect our village.
A1: [It protects] the [natural] form of the beach, so that it will not be destroyed.

The ecological importance of the mangrove is also echoed by the Head of Bango Village:

I told them do not cut the trees because it is part of the [regeneration] programme. Mantehage is a [fragile] island and the land is infertile, so if we did not conduct the greener program, it would be a problem [for the island]. The same benefit [comes from] the mangrove [protection] as a protector toward the waves. [The impact of the lost mangrove was severe] for example, other islands that suffered from erosion because of the trees have been [significantly] depleted. (Head of Bango Village)

Q: Why is mangrove protection important to conduct?
A2: Because the mangroves existence is to aim at protecting the village. If we cut the trees more and more, it will be gone forever. As a result, there will be no our [beach] protector (the Head of Bango Village).

The community improvement of knowledge and understanding and awareness of the conservation in form of community initiative emergence was confirmed by a community Patrol Member:

In the conservation context, the community’s awareness is already high. [It can be seen in an initiative showed by the community], for example, the community initiatively taken and planted all the [tree] seeds provided by the Balai (the Bunaken National Park Agency). When the Balai (Balai Taman Nasional Bunaken or the
Bunaken National Park Agency team and I checked, the planted seeds were already 80-90% success and still alive (Community Patrol 6).

The confirmation of the improved understanding was also expressed by the Head of Tinongko Village and Buhias Village:

That is why I think we should understand the rules and [consider] not conducting the livelihood [as mangrove wood collectors] anymore because we have already aware that the mangrove forest benefits us. It happened because [now] we think from a different perspective, not only from the cultural perspectives based on our ancestors’ customs to work in the forest, but also from the different perspectives (the Head of Buhias Village)

The community [now] understands that the rules benefit them and also our next generation. For example, mangrove [forest], at the moment, to enter the mangrove forest, you could get lost in the mangrove area because it is so dense and it was not cut and sold to Manado anymore. It was not like in the past when the mangrove cut [collection] was a [main] and easy to conduct livelihood, you just needed to bring an axe and a machete, and you could go home with hundred thousand rupiah per day. [Although] It was difficult to change the [community livelihood], the community became understand and aware that the rules benefit them. Moreover, the Mantehage Island community, (especially in Tinongko Village) became proud to be part of the TNB (Taman Nasional Bunaken or Bunaken National Park). (Head of Tinongko Village)

5.2.2 Park Rules

Beside the new understanding and awareness about the mangrove forest’s ecological service, another new understanding is about the importance and benefits of the Park rules on the community life. Some women and Heads of Village understand the benefits rules in relation to the current life of the community, while others perceived the benefits of the rules (such as rock mining on the next generation), that are shown in a discussion of the Women’s Group in Nain, thus;

Q : What do you think are the reasons of the ban of potassium use?
A1: The reason is potassium will disturb the fish.
A2: [The ban is] for the future of our children and grandchildren. It [the poison] will make [fish] finished because the poison kills everything even the juvenile.
A1: The coral will die too.
A2: Coral will be destroyed.
A3: Not only fish, even seaweed will die because of the poison.

The improved understanding and awareness of the importance of the Park rules and conservation for the next generation was also shown by a Community Patrol member:

Q: So, all the rules are for the benefits of the next generation?
A: Yes, for our next generation, at the point, they [the community] quite understand. If we catch everything, nothing will be left (Community Patrol 1).
Community Patrol 4 confirmed the improved understanding of the community towards the Park rules:

Q: Since 2007 until now, how have the community obeyed the rules?
A: The community’s attitude has changed, they started being obedient to the rules [and] thinking of the consequences of action they will do [especially on the next generation] whether it is destructive or not. If [the action would] threaten the sustainability [of the resources], the community believe that their next generation will not enjoy the resources, [for example] in regarding [fishing] the rare fish. Generally speaking, they (the community) became more carefully [with the impact of their actions], [especially] when they were naughty. For example, in the past, the community used to gather corals.

The Women’s Group in Bango Village also confirmed their new understanding of the benefits of the fish and coral protection as it is showed in the exchange, as follows:

Q: What is the reason of the ban of the rock mining activity?
A1: The reason which I think it is right. If all stones are taken, fish cannot lay their eggs because the rock is the place of laying their eggs and a shelter to the fish, many fish hide in the rock. The same as mangroves, a lot of fish hide near the roots of the mangrove trees. As told I you previously, that we felt relief because [of the rules]. Before the [implementation of] the bans, to be honest, it is difficult to find the fish because many rocks have been taken. After we took the rock which is our [house building] need, the [significant] impact will be affected our next generation who will not enjoy the abundance of fish. We are now in difficulties. How much more our next generation?

The improved understanding of the Park rules and system also experienced by Community Patrol 3:

Q: What have you done for your environment?
A: After I became a Patrol, I have the concern because I became understand about [the Bunaken National Park]’s laws, conservation issues. Since the time, we have been able to distinguish [something] whether it is an appropriate thing or not.

Q: Can you tell me about the differences between before and after you became a Patrol?
A: I used not to understand the rules of zonation, about cleanliness, [and] conservation.

5.3 Improved Commitment and Pride

The other individual qualities obtained by the community Patrol members were the opportunity to show and express their pride, love, and concern for their environment, their community, and their state. Pride instilment is a program conducted by RARE aimed at
increasing sense of belonging of the community of presence of the Bunaken National Park. A Community Patrol who was interviewed discusses the love below:

Can you tell me about your motivation to be a Patrol member?
[I have] a concern and awareness of the environment in order to conserve the environment

How do you feel after you become the Patrol in terms of your confidence?
Honestly, there is a certain pride, which is a proud of being able to direct the community to be more concerned and love the environment. There is also a specific pride. Although it is said the work is only dedication or [volunteerism]. Moreover, I feel pride about the [improvement of] environment quality we protect. [In the past], the environment used to be damaged due to the pond activities, but now almost all areas are green with the mangrove (Community Patrol 3).

Improvement in commitment to the country and to the environmental conservation was experienced by Community Patrol 6, as follows:

Can you tell me about the most significant benefit of becoming a Patrol member?
Individually, I can say this is our dedication to the country. The benefits are for the community while for me individually, no significant benefits. Sometimes, the community provided something for us.

5.4 Improved Leadership and Confidence

The increase in the quality of individual of the Community Patrol development in particularly was assessed in improvement in the quality of individual confidence and leadership of Patrol members. Not only skills related to ecological work and research related skills, the Patrol members also gained different types of skills such a leadership skill in their new work of place, for example, as an Environmental Supervisor, as Security, or as a secretary of a Village Government, as stated by a former Patrol member in Buhias Village below:

What kind of knowledge and skills did you gain when you joined Patrol?
I had a lot of knowledge and one of them is the security work system, I use my experience as a Patrol in my current work as security (Community Patrol 1).

Beside the new skills that are related to leadership, the other skills obtained were related to Standard Operational Procedures of handling violations, as expressed by Patrol Member 5 as follows:

So, there is significant improvement in your individual knowledge and skills dealing with cases in the community?
Yes, there is, [especially it is useful] in that time when I became the secretary to the Head of Village, the time when before I obtained a permanent job as a civil servant.
An increase in the individual confidence was expressed clearly by a Community Patrol member below:

Q:  How did your confidence improve due to your involvement in the Patrol?
A:  I feel more confident due to the position. My friends used to remind me that I should be a model and set a good example and distinguish myself as a guard (Community Patrol 3).

Increase in self-confidence was also experienced by Community Patrol 5:

Q:  How did your recruitment as a Community Patrol member impact your self-confidence?
A:  As I told previously, I found the experiences of [being a Community Patrol member] useful [especially] when I became a member of the Government of the village. The experience then [become more useful and relevant] when I became a civil servant. There is [new] knowledge, methods, and terms [I obtained when I became a Patrol member] that previously we did not understand. [The recruitment increases my self-confidence] by providing experiences on the fields, especially the surveillance and [techniques and procedures to] deal with findings [of investigation and surveillance]. The procedures [include] how we will handle [the cases] and [responses of village] government and the community. Generally speaking, by the [Patrol] team, I obtained [a lot] experiences (Community Patrol member 5).

5.5 Improved Communication Skills

Beside individual leadership and confidence, the Community Patrol members also developed their own communication skills and styles through participation in RARE’s activity. The communication skills consist of a variety of communication techniques useful in both formal and informal interactions. The formal methods developed with and through coordination with the Bunaken National Park Agency, while the informal ways were basically based on the individual creativity and initiative of the Patrol members.

5.5.1 Formal Approach

The main method of communication developed by the community Patrol was development of sharing, discussion and teaching through insemination of information sessions at the community meetings:

Q:  How did you convince the community not to use mangrove as firewood anymore?
A:  In our place, mangrove related cases are only few. We conducted information insemination, which contained and explained the use of the mangrove as the tsunami preventer or barrier. We allowed them to take one or two woods, but they should plant it again (Community Patrol member 1).

The communities meetings were also accompanied with provisions of fruit seeds by the Bunaken National Park Agency as discussed below a Patrol member:
Q: How did you convince the people to obey the rules?
A: One of the efforts is information insemination and other programmes of the Balai [the Bunaken National Park Agency] and the Dewan (the management advisory of the Bunaken National Park) that involved the community, for example in provision of seed of fruits and seeds of wood. So, through such programmes, it was expected that the program will touch and increase the community’s [awareness] directly (Community Patrol member 7).

5.5.2 Informal Approach

Beside the formal interactions such as information meetings, the Community Patrol members also creatively developed their own informal ways, such as use of analogy, jokes, home visits, and empathy building in sharing and spreading their spirit. The informal techniques were developed by the community members to convince and teach the community and to communicate with their own friends, family and relatives. The first method is use of analogy that is useful to ease the community Patrol members to explain the different types of zones in a simple and understandable way. Following is an example of an analogy by a Community Patrol member:

Q: What do you think about the zonation use in terms of the community perception?
A: [The community perceived] that the zonation is analogised as a broken line of street, as a borderline between one line and another (Community Patrol Member 6).

However, the use of analogy is not the only method used by the Community Patrol members to convince the community about the benefits of zonation scheme in the Bunaken National Park. Community Patrol members used and developed other convincing methods such as jokes, as described below:

Q: How did you convince the community to accept the zonation scheme?
A: In the past, we were used to be fishermen [so we understand the fishermen’ perspectives and preferences of approach]. We used jokes, and letting the people know slowly and easily, the purpose [of the informal way] is to inform [nicely] the community why we cannot catch certain types of fish (Community Patrol member 2).

Not only the preventive ways in terms of providing information, analogy and jokes, the Community Patrol members also conducted warning methods. The method used by Community Patrol members is to visit an offender’s house, which takes a lot of courage. The method is used especially to deal with violation of the community to the Bunaken National Park rules; the comment of the Patrol member was pointed out below:

Q: How did you approach and communicate your message to the community?
A: We came to the house of the villagers. [Also], we approached and talked [nicely] to them when we met them on the road, or in the location of mangrove extraction (Community Patrol Member 1).
Although the initiative is the main strategy of warning and arresting action, the community Patrol members also developed the fourth social communication skill known as tolerance development. Tolerance is important especially to develop of empathy toward the community situation and difficulties:

**Q:** How did you convince the community, especially to your relatives and families know about the restriction?

**A:** We have and apply our own strategy. [First], we should know [and understand] the reason why they committed the violation. [Second] we should have a tolerance [to the community violation]. However, [the tolerance is not unlimited], it was only limited to [mangrove wood collection] that occurred at the certain locations where they are allowed to take. [In enforcing the rules, there are some issues], especially when [the violation] committed in forest woods that located in the [area with] the individual property status. [Another issue] is especially on the Independence Day, every one in the village [needs] and be busy to [collect] mangrove woods in order to make a fence. It depends on us to deal with the offenders wisely and properly (Community Patrol 3).

To sum up, the NGO’s program has impacted positively on the community, especially in terms of cognitive aspects. Aspects such as ecological knowledge, understanding, personal commitment, and communication skills are appear to have been successfully improved.
CHAPTER 6. Issues impeding RARE’ goals to develop individual empowerment into collective empowerment

RARE has determined the ultimate goal of their Community Empowerment Programme is to achieve conservation that involves a community as ‘a good marine citizen and a responsible stakeholder in the governance of the Bunaken National Park’. However, various issues such as economic need and intrarelationship of the participants of the community Patrol activity have impeded RARE from achieving this ultimate goal. The organisation of the chapter is shown in Figure 16:

![Diagram of Chapter 6](image)

The factors below is a discussion of issues impeding RARE’s individual empowerment program:

6.1 Economic Need Issues

The first reason for Community Patrol members to stop involvement in the Community Patrol activity is their personal and family need for a decent and good salary from a permanent job. The economic restraints include the fulfilment of family needs as expressed by a Patrol member below:
Q: Why did you resign [from the Patrol activity]?
A: [It was] two of us were recruited [again], but I was not determined [anymore] because I thought the system [of the activity] was not good anymore. Moreover, my child was attending the university. So I needed more money and I moved to different jobs. I wish both the Balai (the Bunaken National Park Agency) and the Dewan (the management advisory board) [to activate] again the Patrol activity because the situation is ignored now.

The same issue regarding economic limitation was also stated not only by a community Patrol with families, but also by a young Patrol member. The insufficient salary is a significant issue; following is a statement by a Patrol member who resigned from the activity:

Q: Can you tell about sufficiency of the financial benefit?
A: It was helpful but it was not sufficient [for making a living] (Community Patrol 3).

6.2 Interrelationship Issues

The second issues are interrelationship issues that are faced by the Patrol members as a consequence of their participation in the surveillance program conducted by RARE and the Park authority and issues between one and the other villagers due to the same activity. The social issues consists of horizontal conflicts, Following are the discussions of the social changes caused by the program experienced by Patrol members:

6.2.1 Horizontal Conflicts

The major social impacts of RARE’s efforts to strengthen the Park’s existence are the loosening of kinship and neighbour relationships, in terms of stopping and preventing the sharing habit, development of suspicions, imposing of new horizontal community conflicts. The conflicts occurred in three forms, between inhabitants of one village and another, between the ‘for’ and ‘against’ conservation groups of a community, and between kinship groups and the authority, as discussed by the Head of Buhias Village:

My secretary was a Patrol member, before I was elected to be the Head of Village. When I just was about to be the Head of Village, I brought my crews fishing using jubi (traditional spear gun) at the Park area, and the Patrol caught us and inspected our boats. When they were investigating us, I told them, I just was using jubi (traditional spear gun) at the time, we did not catch any fish and also they did not find anything [wrong]. However, the secretary kept reporting my case to the Head of Village of Tangkasi who then became angry. [Then] I [became upset] I told them- the secretary and the Patrol member from the Bango Village I did not catch any fish and [if you kept continuing the arresting process] ‘I would shoot you’ using the jubi. At eight o’clock pm, we were called by the former Head of Village. I asked him, why I should be called, did I commit a rape or a murder, so you called me at such late time? I was not upset but my relatives were upset [and tried to stop the arresting process], but the former Head of Village kept writing a letter of invitation [of investigation and interrogation]. As a result, my relatives became so angry and preventing and blocking the Head of Tangkasi Village from coming to this village.
Meanwhile, the horizontal conflict also happened between the community of one village and another as discussed by the Head of a village below:

Because of the No-Take Zone implementation, the fishing ground of the [Mantehage] people is getting limited and narrowed. [This limitation became more tangible], when the Mantehage Islanders complained that Nain islanders’ coming and fishing near the Mantehage people’ [limited] fishing ground. The Nain fishermen also have built houses along the mangrove strip in Mantehage, and stayed there, and even the number of built houses increases. We have invited and discussed about this issue with the Head of Nain Village. [However], there is no solution until now.

In addition, the social conflict also happened amongst internal villagers, as discussed by the participants of Women Groups on Nain Island below:

Q: What is your opinion on the Park Authority and RARE’s explanation [about the No-Take Zone scheme]?
A3: We accepted it.
A4: We acknowledged it.
A2: [However], for other villagers who are lack of intelligence would be very resistant, [by saying], “So, do you ask us to steal?” , ‘Do you want us to be a thief”? “How our husband can feed us?”

Moreover, the Women’s Group in Tinongko Village found that the existence of the Park, not only impacts on the relationship and harmony between the kinships group and the village authority, but also on the neighbourhood relationship by the prevention of sharing habits of the community:

Q: How did the change of the job influence your social relationship?
A5: It is difficult, we used to share fish in the past, but now our catch is just enough for our daily food. [Due to the limitation in catching fish], the economic values of fish were increased. As a consequence, the relationship between neighbors one and another have been changed and also no more [expression such as] ‘come, here are some fish to grill for free’, but now we have to buy because catching fish is more difficult and limited [due to the bans].
A2: However, for sure, there is still a sharing practice sometimes, even though rice price and gas price increase. [What we did] is we limit our consumption to two fish and set the other fish up to sell to buy rice.

Negative changes also occurred in the intrapersonal relationship between one villager and another, in terms of suspicious attitude development towards outsiders and insiders or other villagers. The manager of RARE reported the development of the suspicion between one and another villager as follows:

Every time I go from one place to another, I saw one and another village blaming each other. What do you think about that?
I personally think that we should investigate [a case of violation] wisely. The [level of the social conflicts] not only covers blaming but also accusing. “Mas (Javanese male addressing name), could you investigate that man please?” but
I did not take any action immediately [based on the report] because the report needed to be clarified first. If it is proved, we should provide education at first, including the consideration of risk.

Mistrust not only developed between villagers, but also the members of social organisations such as Church mistrust of its leader, who was coincidently once a violator of the Park rules. The mistrust was expressed by a Head of Village who is the one of the congregations, as follows:

*The Church [ministers] [looked] embracing and accepting the same concept [of the importance of conservation [as the government]. However, it does not necessarily mean that they [the ministers] supported the conservation issue wholeheartedly, and supported it in their daily lives. Even though their heart tends to turn left [not to turn right as it was expected by the government], they had no choice but to express [openly and publicly] their support to the [Park] conservation as the right way that is the government will and the Lord will. If the Church [really] determined to support the government, they would direct the member of Church to obey the government’s policy, so the government just would need to be relax and sit back.*

The Head of the same village also experienced a mistrust of the Church minister in regard to the integrity of the ministry:

Q: How the Church was involved in enacting the rules?
A: I think the Church is consistent with the government’s rules including consistently reminds the congregation about the rules such as plantation, maintaining the cleanliness of the village. As a consequence, a good relationship between Government and the Church is established.

The way the Church provides understanding to the congregations about the implementation of the rules is by using the local people’s language, for example, the community uses Siau language, we do not use a heavy and difficult Manado dialect. However, there is [dilemma] with my double positions, if I acted as a Head of Village too far and strictly, the community would remind me to my position as on elder of the Church. If I acted less responsibly, they would question “What kind of Head of Village you are”?

Mistrust the one of the Church’s ministers was also expressed by a Women’s Group member as follows:

**A2:** The impact [in terms of conflict], for example [the Patrol] has a ministry in the Church, and the Church members are used to fishing [in illegal ways], the relationship [in the Church] will change. [For instance, when], [the Patrol] is giving a sermon, and the congregations will ask: who are you? We don’t want to hear your sermon. You will arrest us when we are making our livelihood.

**A1:** [The congregation would say] ‘You preached for yourself’. The spiritual life in the community has been shaken.

At the same time, the feeling of being mistrusted was experienced and encountered by a Church minister; as a Head of Village he commented thus:
I was accused [as a traitor] because I attended an information insemination meeting conducted by a foreigner in the Church where I always attend. I could not avoid because I was the Head of congregation. What can I do? I must attend the meeting.

6.2.2 Social Exclusion

Despite of the social respect and acknowledgement enjoyed by some Patrol members, community hostility brought negative impacts on the Community Patrol members’ effectiveness. Many Community Patrol members experienced negatives feelings such as dilemma, shame, feeling powerless and also loneliness due to a community’s negative responses towards their job implementation. A community Patrol member stated about his loneliness due to the exclusion of the community:

Q: How does the community perceive your existence as a Community Patrol?
A: In the past, I had a feeling of being [isolated], because most of the Patrol became a community enemy to those who are predominantly fishermen. [The rejection happened] because if they were fishing in the forbidden zone, we would warn and remind them. [Moreover], I did not know how to fulfil the Mantehage fishermen’s demand that outside fishermen that mostly come from Nain Island not be allowed to fishing near the [Mantehage] Island.

Feelings of powerlessness and reluctance to act due to the community hostility are especially related to the relationship between Patrol members and other villagers, as mentioned below:

Q: How the difference between before and after you became a Patrol member in term of the community’s perception of you?
A: [I think the community] has rasa kerene (feeling of afraid and respect) to me.

Besides feeling helplessness, another emotions described by the Community Patrol include the feeling of shame, especially due to an expose to violation committed by their fellow villagers. A Patrol member provided this comment and statement (Community Patrol 4):

Q: In other villages you told me that people give you respect, how about the people in your own village?
A: [Instead of feeling proud], I felt shame [especially] if I met (caught) an offender who is coincidently one of my own relatives. I just tried to strengthen my heart and my mind as strong as I could; remembering that what I was doing is a right thing, and not a wrong thing.

Other Petrol members also experienced a feeling of shame due to violation committed by their kin and fellow villagers:

Q: How did you convince the community to accept the No-Take Zone scheme?
A: Particularly for the shooter cases, I used to tell the motorist to ignore the violation happening, especially if it was only the [Patrol] boat rider and I. If I Patrolled with other friends, I used to be pretended that I [enforced the rules
consistently]. However, I used to inform the villagers that goodness of the core zone is for all.

Q: So, have you caught someone you know?
A: Never.

Other Community Patrol members also experienced issues of feeling shame and powerlessness when dealing with their own relatives:

Q: Can you tell me your experience dealing with your own relatives?
A: [Conflicts of interests] are unavoidable, mercy was also there, upset was also there. However, I became upset [due to the conflict of interests] because in that time I was conducting my job. Why I feel sorry because they are my community, even they are my relatives, but because of rules’ implementation, I had to face the problem [with the community], based on the law that is the main and only consideration.

Q: Can you tell more about conflict of interests in terms of the different dimensions as a Patrol member and as a member of the government?
A: Yes, it happened to my own mother, who was going to make a [chicken] cage using protected mangrove that is prohibited; I was then trapped by the community with that case. The community [was waiting] whether I would implement the rules or not, and when they saw my mother committing the violation, it was a good opportunity for them. So, unavoidable, my mother was then investigated eventually. The violation was she hired people to cut the trees making the cage (Community Patrol 5).

6.2.3 Family Dysfunction

Many people argue that the Park’s existence in general and the Patrol in particular, have impacts on the imposing of the requirement of the new job as a consequence of the Park. At the family level, the new jobs have destructive impacts on family life such as family separation, family structure change, dysfunction for the roles of father and conflict amongst the family members. As some women in the group discussions expressed their complaint that the Park weakened family relationships and ties through separation of the family:

Q: Mrs. Awu looked like she is thinking hard, I’ve observed since a few minutes ago. It seemed that your family was influenced by the community Patrol activity. Can you tell me how does the community Patrol existence influence your family relationship?
A1, A2: [The impact of the Patrol activity on the family is the husband should [leave their forbidden work] and looked for a work outside the island. Now they work in construction [in the mainland]. How did the separation impact on the family relationship?
A2: Even though I am here and my husbands in Manado, we always have a good communication.
A3: [I] feel a little bit doubt at one another.
A2: Just like the song lyrics, ‘it is far from eyes but close to the heart’.
A2: They [the husbands] live in a rented room or stayed with relatives.
Not only brings separation, the Park also leads to change the family structure and function of the decision making process in the household. The Women’s Group in Buhias Village commented on the changes:

Q: How does the long distance impact on your relationship with your husband?
A1: There is jealousy [of course].
A5: [I tried to] ignore that issue. We are even, getting closer because of the jealousy. It is said jealousy means love.

What is the problem emerged due to the long distance relationship?
A2: [I] miss [my husband] and feel envy every time I see a couple walk together.
A3: [I] feel envy when I see other people walk with their spouse, while I walk alone, and also I need to face all problems at home by my own.

In contrast, the separation not only led to problems for the wife, but also feeling of guilt by the husband, as discussed by a former Patrol member who is now a secretary to the Head of Village comments:

Q: How do the Patrolling activities impact the separation of your family?
A: .....I felt sorry when I had to leave my wife and children [to go to work in mainland]. [I was worried] of what they would eat and how they would fulfil their needs, meanwhile I was away for months. [I was especially sad] especially, when my master fed me with gourmet food such as meat, I was thinking what kind of food my family was eating at the same time (Community Patrol 5).

In summary, two main factors impeded RARE from achieving its conservation goals. The first are economic needs, and the second is the matter of interrelationships among the community members. Interrelationship issues have led to three main social problems, that is horizontal conflict, social exclusion and family dysfunction.
CHAPTER 7. Community perception of RARE’s community empowerment implementation

In measuring, evaluating and understanding the effectiveness of RARE’s community empowerment program, the community perceptions of the social and cultural impacts of the program are important. The community perceptions towards the Park existence and RARE’s program consisted of the socioeconomic consequences emerging from the program implementation and the community rejection towards the Park existence.

The community perception consists of issues of the unfulfilled expectations for the community such as lack of financial compensation for community loss of livelihood and access to use of resource; community perceptions of the Park scheme (including No Take Zones), Community Patrols, pride instilment, and the lastly is community meeting quality.

7.1 Lack of financial compensation

Many participants of the interviews and Group discussions expressed their unfulfilled demands and expectations to compensation for the loss of access to fish and to use the resource. Some people referred to expectations of alternative resources provision, while most demanded alternative job provision.

7.1.1 Lack of compensation for livelihood loss

The community’s requirement of the provision of alternative livelihoods as a compensation to the loss to access to fish was explained by a member of Patrol, as follows:
Q: Can you tell me more about the fishermen’s rejection toward the Park?
A: The problem is [the ban of Park] directly impacted on their livelihood, including collection sand and stone. There were challenges [dealing with the issue] but the [core] issue is what they wanted to do is [contrast to] our [conservation] interest and goal. As a consequence, we became an enemy [of the community]. I also had swearing from the community. A couple years ago, at the very first beginning [of the ban implementation], when the production of mangrove logs was still being carried on, we were the ones who first try to eradicate the practice. The situation was worsening, and even the community chased after us with swords, because their interests to make their livelihood of production of mangrove logs were prohibited. However, we were consistent with the police water and the Balai (The Bunaken National Park Agency) that were joined together in that time [to enforce the ban].

At a same time, participants of a woman Group discussion in Nain expressed their concern of the loss of livelihood below:

A2: [We told to the Patrol member], ‘Why you would for sure arrest us when we were making our livelihood’.
A1: [Due to the ban], we have now more [economic] pressures and problems, a very heavy burden.
A2: While [at the same time], we have a lot of [household] needs, such as to register our children to schools [that needed to be fulfilled].
A2: Even, we cannot sleep well [since then].
A3: [The ban implementation is fine for] Mrs. Steni’s husband, [because he] works in construction. However, [it is a significant problem for] our husband [who] works as a fisherman.

The demand to provide alternative jobs for the local people was also expressed by the Head of the village:

In order to be a leader, someone should be smart. When there was a meeting of [village] leaders outside the village, it is an opportunity to ask other leaders if there is a job opportunity in their areas, such as carpenter, or farming. Also, [at the end of the meeting], we exchanged [mobile phone] numbers; [just in case] there is a job vacancy we would inform one another. [The logic is] if we could provide an alternative [livelihood], we could stop someone from conducting their previous forbidden job. Also, they would not be stressful; especially if they had a child was going to school [and needs tuition fee]. [Even], we [tried at any cost including] communication with other leaders or even with the Head of sub district, ‘Pak Camat [Head of sub district], this is a difficult situation when [the community really] needs a job, if you hear or know anything about job vacancy, [please let me know]’ (Head of village Tinongko).

The similar expectation also was commented on by the Head of Buhias village:
[The problem with the ban] is the local community have difficulty to earn something to eat. Even, the community is prohibited to walk past the nyare (protected intertidal area) because it will destroy the coral. Particularly, when the community was collecting bia (green and gold mouth turban) requiring the collectors to step on the corals and [unavoidably], it will break the [protected] corals. If we enforced [firmly] the rule, the problem is the practice of eating bia (green and gold mouth turban) is part of local cultures. However, stepping on [corals in] the nyare cannot be avoided because collecting bia (green and gold mouth turban) is conducted not by diving but [by walking] when low tide. [Moreover], if we prohibited the community, it is the same as we killed the community, therefore, we supposed [think how to] feed and [provide an alternative livelihood to] the community as an alternative to bia collection. That is why [I think that] the rules are against and not aligned with the culture of the community such as catching, eating and shooting fish (Head of Village of Buhias).

Expectations around the provision of alternative employment were implicitly stated by a Group of Women in Buhias village:

Q: What is your expectation as the community to the national Park?
A5: [A job], because our [coastal] area is majority is swamp so tourism cannot be developed here.
A2: My husband used to developed seagrass cultivation in Nain.
A1: But now it was destroyed because of weeds.
A2: We don’t have sand which is wanted by the foreign tourists.

Furthermore, the woman’s Group in Tangkoko Village expressed its unfulfilled expectations for an alternative livelihood as compensation for the community loss:

Q: When the ban was applied, were there any alternatives offered?
A5: The solutions in terms of livelihood alternatives were not given. It was only [loosened rules], for example allowing domestic use.

The community’s expectation of the alternative livelihood and prohibited fishing also was expressed in specific forms, such as provision of new fishing gears, methods and fleet, new job and new skills.

The woman’s Group in Nain discussed its expectations for alternatives to the banned access to fish especially for their fishermen husbands:

Q: Why do you disagree with the Park bans in no take zones?
A3: Because the only livelihood of our husband [is able to do] is on the sea.
A4: If there is a [no-take] zone, [we] are not allowed to makes lines of seaweed [farming].
A1: Even, just to pass the [no-take] zone, we are not allowed.
A2: Due to the border in every area. As a result, we cannot obtain extra money,
A3: We cannot enter the [closed] area.

Besides new job for the fishermen and the seaweed farmers, several other unfulfilled community requests were noted. There included a new and more advanced fleet, with hoped-
for new boats and fishing gear such as nets. This hope was expressed by the Head of village of Buhias:

Q: How was the alternative livelihood provided by the Park Authority?
A: I have already questioned [about provision of alternative livelihood for community since 2013], [when] we had a [community] meeting and I argued [to the Park Authority that] the community said that if they (Park authorities) wants to prohibit us from using the resources in the area, they supposed to provide [the community] a replacement, for example boats, [and] nets like in Nain where a fishing Group have been formed [and received the new gears] and so, we will not destroy the coral. However, [if] eventually we will need to go to the deep [and far] sea, [please] provide us tuna boats that is fibre boats [that is able to go far], so we will not go fishing in the near [that is protected] coastal area. The only support so far is only from the Fisheries Department [not from the Park Authority].

Beside the boats and fishing gear expected by the community, other unfulfilled provisions requested included small engines, called katingting (small boat engine) (described below by the Head of Buhias), and alternative fishing gear such as lira (rope fishing gear), noted by a Patrol member:

The [only] responses [to the community expectation] [given by the Park Authority] so far were only in forms of public facilities provision [such as pier and the waiting room], but not in form of the provision of fishing gear such as a katingting engine as expected by the community.

I discussed with Mas Pandu, I questioned again about the ban. I suggested provide alternative livelihood, instead of sero tanam (fish trap made of mangrove wood), using lira (fish trap made of rope) (Community Patrol 3).

Beside the provision of a reliable long-range fleet and gear, another unfulfilled expectation of the community is the skills provision to farm and to develop the land which has infertility issues for these coastal communities. The Head of village of Buhias discussed the issue below:

Q: Why did the communities in Nain refuse strongly the no take zone scheme?
A: In Nain, the villagers strongly refused the scheme, especially, [because] their livelihood is only on the sea and different from people in the Mantehage [Island] who are able to farm. The Nain islanders cannot farm, it can be said that 100 % of the Nain Islanders are fisheries. They cannot farm because the land is infertile.

7.1.2 Lack of compensation for access loss

The second type of the unfulfilled expectation is the provision of compensation for the loss of access to use the resource as an impact of the Park rules. Some discussed alternative of fuel, while other commented on the need of provision of alternative resources of building materials. Regarding the building materials, one of the materials needed is black [terrestrial] rock requested by the community; the Head of Tinongko village stated his experience attending a community meeting in Nain:
It [the community expectation of alternative source] was described by a community member who only was a lay people who argued that, ‘How if you provided black terrestrial rocks for us. If you had shown us [the alternative rock], we would have picked up and used them now. Here, we need sand to make cement block as the main materials of foundation of house, the sand we used to use is marine sand, so, you can imagine how long the house can survive if the marine sand is used. Iron would be destroyed and rust easily and fast. It does not mean that we did not recognise the rules but what we need [the community] and wish for [an alternative resource]. If there are available black rocks in the village, we would use them. We could buy black rock in Manado, but for the poor villagers, it would be very hard. [Listening to our statement], the DPTNB (the management Advisory Board) also looked confused and helpless.

Besides providing rock as an alternative material building, alternatives to sand as building material are also needed, as discussed by a Women’s Group in Bango Village below:

A3: [The demand of alternative resource emerged] because the community also needs sand to build their houses.
A1: It is so expensive to buy one dump truck of sand [in the mainland], not mention the [extra] transportation cost [from the main land to the island], using boats as a transport.

The expectation of compensation for the ban is not only also related to domestic use, but also covers the commercial use, as expressed by the Head of a village below:

That is why I think it is difficult to [enforce the rules] because it is difficult to find an alternative solution to the [collective action development] issue, in this case extraction of stone and sand. I think also the law is difficult to be enforced because the community’s [interest] is violated and the extraction is only for domestic use not for commercial use.

The other types of the alternative provision required by the community are alternatives to mangrove wood as firewood. The community would be acceptable of the ban to use mangrove as fire wood as long as the rule is accompanied with alternative resources such as gas stoves:

Q: How does the community, especially the mothers see the ban of cutting mangroves?
A1-A5: It is ok because of rinai.
Q: What is it rinai?
A3: It is a gas stove [brand].
A1: Most people use the [stove].
A4: Because in the past, there was an aid [from government].
A1: [but] my husband is [still] afraid of using the stove.
A2: Whoever resisted the use of the stove, [then] you must use [a stove that use] kerosene [as fuel] which is very expensive.
Likewise, the Head of Buhias village commented on the need for economic compensation and subsidies as a consequence of the ban of taking coral and sand:

*About the zonation, there is no rejection from the community, whatever the ban is the community will obey. There is no rejection, [but] if they do not concern about the community’s [interest], the community will be ignored, because they (the Park Authority) do not provide any solution. We used to have fishing potentials, but it was prohibited, we used to take corals to build our house but it was not allowed too, we have to buy rocks in Manado and the transport fee from Manado costs us Rp. 6,000 per dump truck and for deliverance, it costs us Rp 1.5 million, so when the rocks reach the island the cost reaches Rp. 2 million and not mention the truck hire costs us Rp. 500,000 per dump truck. So, the comparison of building cost between Manado and Mantehage is two and one. It is the same as the sand. So we buy cement brick in Manado too. The extra cost is around same. There is no use of coral in foundation of house building. I hope and expect that we (the community and the Park Authority) will have a [mutual] understanding; if they (the Park Authority) was understanding and are attentive to the village [‘s expectation] then the village would be too. [I wish the Park Authority] did not only ask support of the community without showing any concern to the community’s [difficulties]. How the community could be developed if there is no aid [at all].*

The similar opinion also came from the Head of the village of Buhias who commented as follows:

*Sand and stone [are brought] from Manado, if we buy sand from Manado one dump truck [of sand] approximately around 3-4 cubic costs us Rp. 400,000 - Rp. 500,000 ($AU 40-50). The transportation [cost] is [even] more expensive, for 3-4 cubic of sand takes around 300 sacks and transportation fee for per sack is Rp. 6,000 [$US 6 cents]. So, it takes around Rp. 1,8 million [$US 180] [just] for transportation. [In other word], the expenses increased to more than Rp. 2 million. Not mention, the transportation fee from the beach to our house, it takes Rp. 2,000 [$US 2 cents] per sack. So, if you would like to build a house in Mantehage, you should prepare and count [the cost] carefully, the comparison cost between mainland and island cost is one and two. If we would buy bricks in the store, it costs us Rp. 2,500 [$US 25 cents] each and Rp. 1,500 [$US 15 cents] each for renting a boat. I was the Head of village facing such great dilemma and confusion, how could I manage the community. If we did not enforce the rules, we would be wrong and blamed, but if we enforced the rules firmly, we would deal against the community. At the present, the community still takes rocks, but it is just for their [domestic] needs (Head of Village of Buhias).*

In addition to compensation for the increase in the prices of house building, the Head of Buhias expressed an expectation of compensation for the bans on catching fish which can fetch higher prices:

*The other community’s expectation is related to fish’s prices, for the certain fish even though we caught it in the a lot of amount, but its price just Rp. 10,000 or Rp. 15,000 per kg and if [it was caught] by three of us, [it means the benefits should be divided*
into three and it would be very small], but if we can catch [protected] Napoleon [wrasse] that can be sold at Rp 35,000 per kg, we just need to take and catch two kg in few hours [in order to obtain sufficient benefits]. Therefore, the people requested to the Park to provide a support [and compensation for ban of] catching the fish, and [so we could] leave the ‘jubi’ practice [to catch the fish] that is prohibited because it damages the corals. However, until now, there is no answer from the Park or the Balai (the management Advisory Board) [of the request and expectation].

7.2 Community acceptability

Community rejections towards the Bunaken Park existence were expressed towards the Park in generally and in particularly, schemes of the Park such as No -Take Zone, the law enforcement of the Park rules, the pride as a community and reporting scheme instilment, and to the community Patrol existence.

7.2.1 Community Patrol

Many people have a negative perception of the community Patrol as a community enemy, a terrorist, a whistle blower, and even a trauma reminder. This is despite RARE’s effort to make the image of the Patrol member as a role model and an agent of change:

Q: When you heard “Patrol” what do you think about Patrol?
A: I did not know about the people’s perspectives. Honestly, before I became the Head of this village, I was against the Patrol [members] that prevent the Mantehage people from cutting the mangrove trees, [and] because of the impacts of the ban on the community life. However, later I became aware of the ban benefits [the community] (the Head of Buhias village).

A woman’s discussion Group in Buhias and Nain expressed their feeling of the community Patrol in their village as a frightening source:

Q: How did you feel the first time when you heard Mr. Makagansa became the Patrol?
A2: My feeling [to him suddenly] changed. There is dig, dig, [increase the heat beating], there was a [significant] worry and anxiety. [If] the [zonation scheme] will be reapplied, the community will be upset again. [I felt] as if, we were being hunted.
A1: For example, the incident when the Patrol chase after [the community], [Woman Discussion Group in Nain].

The community negative attitude and feelings towards the community Patrol members are expressed as sources of fear and anxiety was clear in the next exchange of the Women’s Group in Nain:

Q: If the Patrol catches you when you are working, what will happen?
A1-A5: They will burn the harvested wood.
A2: They will arrest the people who are working.
A2: They will catch the people. So what we can do?
The negative feelings about the existence of the community Patrol also were expressed by Women in Bango Village:

Q: What do you think about community Patrol existence?
A2: For the word of Patrol, the Patrol is aimed at protecting the National Park and the Patrol apply too much ban,
A1: I think with the existence of the Patrol,…
A2: Everything is limited.
A1: Everything things are banned such as zone,
A3: Mangrove.
A1: Mangrove and other [resources] are limited to be used, especially in Bango Village, I did say it never, we did, but because of the ban of the Patrol of the Bunaken National Park, until now we [are] still…
A3: limited.

The negative expression also was added by a member of the woman's group in Tinongko village:

*It is right that the [community] Patrol [members] protects [our resources], but we still have uncomfortable feelings [including] a little bit angry. We [tried hard] to have positive thinking that they benefit protecting us.*

Q: Before they bring to Wori (the capital village of the sub district where the police office is), did the Authority give education to the offenders?
A1-A5: Yes, they did.
A5: However, it rarely happened providing the offender education, the Patrol would bring [the offenders] straight to the [Park Agency] office.
A1: Because they cannot catch the offenders who usually escaped [A Women Group in Buhias].

The same negative comments and opinions also came from the Head of Buhias village:

*I used to [adversely] protest to the forestry Agency (Park Agency) related to the mangrove ban. [Even] I would burn the wood and my boat altogether [as a protest sign]. As a consequence, the Patrol became a hostile with me. However, we became aware when we had an [alternative] job. [In general], the [community] Patrols [members] on the Mantehage Island are nice people especially in Buhias, but it is different from the village to village. The Patrols in other villages [even] were accused ‘a whistle blower’. The [community] Patrols in Buhias were not too strict; they just warned the community, while, in Tangkasi, their Patrol used to report the community’s violation straight to the [Park] office. [Community] Patrol in Buhias understood and considered the community’s interests. I told to the Patrol that “there are only three of you, while the community is many, if you used a rude way, the community would be harsher and aggressive,” they should to approach the community in a polite and gentle way.*

Moreover, the Patrol members were associated with judgmental meeting perceived frightening or punishing moment as noted by the Group from Buhias village below:
Q: Why do you become afraid with the Patrol?
A2: Because there is ban from the Patrol.
A3: Once they caught us when we were working.
A1: and suddenly, a [corrective and judgmental community] meeting would be held.

The community acceptability toward the community Patrol also related to the community’s trauma and rejections to the Park. The trauma itself is related to the past trauma of the past riots between the Park and community. The event of trauma was experienced by the interviewee who is a Head of village as well as his community:

Once, they caught a local woman [and would bring the Women to the police office] and the woman cried [loudly] like a child [due to the possibility to be sent to a jail]. She was caught because she was taking mangrove tress just for fire wood; the situation was a dilemma because she cut a living tree not a dead tree. They [the woman and her family and relatives] did not conduct and apply selection cut practice but cut the all trees in one area. In that time, there were 13 officials from the police, the Balai, prosecutors, there were 13 personnel altogether. The team did not go home but they spent one night in the village, in this house and they consulted me and asked what happened with my community. When I inspected there were a lot of wood binding, it was around 100 bindings, and all of trees were living trees. The Patrol members did not take the woman away but they just took the wood around two bindings of wood and they sit here and told me that they would bring the wood as an evidence and I was worry because if it said an evidence, it means that the process would continue and the woman has a lot of relatives [who protected her]. So, I reminded them, ‘if you bring the wood as evidence of violation, the case would be needed to be processed’ but if you bring the wood as a simple investigation finding, it would be not a case because the offender cannot be found and identified.

The community Patrol members that receiving with negative responses was also expressed by Women in Nain:

If they [the community Patrol members] would follow and enforce strictly the rules, there would be [another] conflict. Some people said that, because we are the local people, and then supposed would be a dispensation for us. ‘Your parents also used to work and make a life here. So, please, be understand and compromising in enforcing the rules’.

7.2.2 The No-Take Zone

All Women’s Group members associated the No-Take Zone scheme negatively, expressing disagreement, rejection, difficulties and limitations. The association of the scheme with limitations is showed in a discussion with the Women’s Group Buhias:

Q: What is first impression whenever you heard of the No-Take Zone?
A1: I think it is forbidden, limiting, to cut mangrove, or no take stone or sand, and also maming fish (Napoleon wretch) catch is forbidden,
A1: That is the definition of border they established. We cannot take sand and rocks.
A5: Also the mangrove tree cannot be cut (Women Group in Buhias).

The similar opinions were also showed by a Group of woman in Tinongko village:

Q: What do you think of the No-Take Zone?
A5: Part of it is core zone is difficult for the fishermen because when they are enjoying fishing, they did not realise that they had entered the core zone. Moreover, regarding [fish] shooting using spear gun, they used to be choose the place where there are a lot of fish but now, the locations where a lot of fish schooling are prohibited and including the core zone where shooting and fishing are not allowed. The complaint of the local people including from my own brother who loves shooting so much, it is limited because almost everywhere is forbidden while the locations where are allowed do not have many fish. As a result, he tries to find another job.

On Nain Island, the community responses are more dramatic, the scheme was rejected by the community, and the rejection was shown in the exchange, below:

Q: Is there any special place where fishing is forbidden?
A1: No, there is not, only on Mantehage Island and Siladen island where are [No-Take Zone exist].
So, here, there is (No-Take) Zone scheme?
A4: In the past, the (No-Take) Zone scheme was attempted but it was not accepted here.
A3: Poor us, we are difficult to make livelihood because our only livelihood is on the sea. We will be difficult to catch the fish if there is a [no take zone].
A1: It became a problem, in terms of sharing. [Our livelihood] would be limited. It was only Gora fish we used to share fish [for example] Kombong fish that is also called Sembilan fish and looked like catfish.
A2: We will not be able to share if zonation scheme is applied because our livelihood will be limited.
When was the scheme introduced the first time?
A1: A long time ago.
A3: Around 20 years ago.
A2: It is difficult to be applied here.
A3: The community keeps disagreeing [with the scheme].

The community’s rejection to the scheme was also confirmed by a Patrol member:

Q: From the all rules of the Park which one is the most difficult rule for the community to accept?
A: The No-Take Zonation scheme is the most difficult to accept because it affects [community] livelihood (Community Patrol 1).
7.2.3 To the ‘Pride’ and reporting scheme

The last aspect of community perception is community acceptability to an idea of community’s ‘pride’ of the Park existence in their area that is expected by RARE as a trigger to change community’s negative behaviour and attitudes towards the Park. Also, community acceptability to a reporting scheme introduced by RARE that encouraged the community to report any violation that happened in the Park area committed by their village fellows. Many people including participants of the Women’s Discussion Groups refused to report and admit any serious violation committed by villagers.

The Women’s Group in Bango claimed that offenders against controls of crab collecting came from a different village, such as Buhias Village:

Q: How do the rules impact on the local people who have crabs collection and harvesting as a livelihood?

A2: [The practice of crabs collection and harvesting] is rare [here].
A1: Not like in Buhias village where many people committed the crab collection practice.
A2: Even, the Buhias villagers used to come and gather crabs here.

When pressed on the common violations by their fellow villages, the Bango Women emphasised the use of legal fishing gear and the difference of their fishing methods to other villages, below is an example:

How about the Bango Villagers then, what are violations typically committed by villagers?
A1: Bango villagers are different [from villagers on the Island]. If we did not catch enough fish, we would use [traditional and legal] borri (a poison from a plant root), and..
A2: We use [only] fishing net [and], fishing (that are allowed fishing methods).

The same spirit of saving their own village reputation also was showed by the Women Group members in the Buhias village who together pointed out that the numbers of violations committed by Nain inhabitants were more than the violations by the Buhias people in terms of frequency and seriousness:

Q: Can you tell me the influence of implementation of the community Patrol’s duty on the relationship of relatives?
A1: [The sentencing and arresting process of Park offenders] never [happened] here, but in the other villages such as Nain, it happened frequently because the use of compressors (diving).
A2: [While], in the Buhias Village, the Patrol arrested [only] once the people who were cutting the mangrove trees.
A5: The living trees.
Q: So, what happened to the offenders [of Park rules]?
A5: They were brought directly to the office.
A1: They had to face a trial, especially users of diving compressor [who were from] the Nain village, it is almost twice.
So if Nain villagers are associated with the use of compressors, how about Buhias?
A8: Use of compressor [diving] is illegal here [and Nainers were associated with the violation], while, Buhias is [only] associated with use of borri (poison).
A2: However, [the used poison] is [only] traditional borri that is made of special leaves and roots which is allowed. It is different from the chemical borri that is prohibited like use of diving compressor.
A8: This year, [even] the Nain islanders were caught twice for using the diving compressors.

Besides blaming Nainers as the main violators of the rules against compressor diving practice, the Group members together pointed to the Tangkasi Villagers as the violators of other rules, for example of the mangroves:

Q: How did the joint Patrols arrest the offenders?
A5: They burnt the wood a couple time ago.
A1: [However, the offenders not from Buhias], they were from Tangkasi Village.

### 7.3 Community meeting quality

The third aspect of the community perception of the RARE’s projects relates to the quality community meetings. These are issues related to such area unclear resolution and answer to the problem and the also lack of opportunity to speak up in the meeting. A few members of Women’s Group Discussion talked about the issue with the freedom of speech as experienced by the Women’s Group in Buhias:

A3: If we were allowed to complain, we would speak up [but we were not allowed], so it would not offend anybody.

The freedom to speak up at the community meeting was observed by the group members in Buhias village:

Q: How did the Community Patrol make the community understand about the importance of the core zone?
A5: Sometimes, they invited [us] at a community meeting.
Q: How did you express your opinion at the meeting?
A4: There were discussions.
A1: [However], they were only allowed to accept the right opinion.

The second signification issue with the community meeting was the lack of clear and effective solutions offered by RARE to the community request. This is stated by the Head of Buhias Village below:

Q: How did the participation at the meeting benefit the community?
A: I did not see any benefits [of the meeting] because they did not provide any solutions until they had to face with the community and the [village] government because there is no support.
Q: How did they listen to your complaints and expectation at the meeting?
A: They heard [but] the members of the BPD (Village Representative Committee) said that it is useless to complain because there will be no [satisfying] responses from the Park. They (the Park Authority staff) were reasoning that
(the staff are lack of Authority because) they are divided into two parties (of the Park Management) which made difficult to [give proper responses and answers].

The Head of Buhias Village expressed his feeling about the need of alternative jobs for his community:

_If we are prohibited [to go fishing], so where we are going to? How about our daily live. However, if I attended [a community meeting], the meeting organiser would be look panicked for example the [community] meeting conducted by the joint team consisted of the Balai (Balai Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Bunaken National Park Agency), water police, the DPTNB (the Bunaken National Park Management Advisory Board), after the meeting held, I have never seen them again until now._

Inconsistent, unclear responses and answers were given by RARE and the Park Authority to the community request to use mangrove wood. A Woman’s Group in Buhias explained as follows:

Q: What did you think of the response from the Park Authority and RARE about your request to use the mangrove wood at the meeting?

A5: They accept it but they said…. 
A1: ‘Don’t take too much’.
A5: We can take [the mangrove wood] but not in a lot numbers.

A Head of Buhias Village also expressed the issue of unclear answer by the Park Authority and RARE about the community use:

_At the meeting, it seems that the team was overwhelmed in providing an answer in terms of solution when the community member told them “Sir, we will not take sand and coral again if you provide an alternative, as well mangrove”. They were lay people, so what they asked was [only] based on their needs._

The similar situation also was observed by a member of woman’s Group in Buhias as a follow:

_The issue [of the community request to use the mangrove resource] has been discussed in the meeting and at the last meeting with the staff of Balai (the Bunaken National Park Agency), Mr. Adi [the Park Agency staff] was asked if the community is allowed to take rocks and sand to build our house while based on our need, we cannot afford buying rocks from Manado. [Because there was no solution that can be offered to the community, then], the Patrols [compromisingly and secretly] answered that ‘we would not intend to ban [your practice] as long as you are able to maintain our reputation, it is ok]. We should understand one another. Once you take corals, [do not let anyone knows], do not let on the beach but bring them home as soon as possible. If there is a guest asking, you should answer that it will only be used for your house building’. I cannot imagine if we could not take the corals at all. It is impossible for us to stay in a nice house._
Q: How about the information insemination?
A: They (the Park Authority) came here [only] to explain [to the community] about the [the differences between living corals and died corals]. The dead rocks [corals] are characterised with the black colour. If the rock [coral] life, its colour will be yellowish. If the rock is black with new coral stem attached, it will grow up, [it is forbidden]. So, for example, for the dead rock, we take a coral and attach it on the dead coral, it will grow. The attached coral will be bigger and cover the dead stone [we cannot take it]. I saw the community keeps taking both living and dead stones.

The unclear responses was also confirmed by the Manager of RARE in the final report where the community sacrifice was analogized with something bitter like jamu - a bitter herb drink in the Javanese culture so popular to eradicate many sickness and illness (panacea in Javanese culture), it is kind of the aspirin pill that is believed to cure any diseases. In the report by the RARE Manager, the NGO planned to ask the community to sacrifice for their own good:


_In order to balance the community sacrifice and benefits will be derived [from the program], the community is approached by touching its emotional part. The used analogy is to drink Jamu which is bitter in the beginning but later, it will make the community healthy. [The expected impacts] are the proud fisherman who is responsible for the sustainability of the next generation and concern for fish resource conservation._

Another issue with meeting quality is the two real community motivations to attend community meetings, i.e, and availability of pocket money and ‘goodie’ bags.

A Head of Village observed that uang duduk or pocket money is provided at every meeting:

Q: How are the community invited to a community meeting?
A: Through TOA (loud speaker), for example from the Balai [Balai Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Bunaken National Park Agency] will conduct information insemination, and it is provided uang duduk (pocket money) around Rp. 30,000 or Rp. 40,000, meals and t-shirt. If they asked for 30 participants, the people would come 40 or [even] 50 people.

The RARE Field Manager admitted that the pocket money provision is part of their strategy to involve the community members in their activities:

Q: How was the role of Patrol activated at the community meeting?
A: We keep involving them in all activities which are being conducted by the Balai [Balai Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Bunaken National Park Agency], for example we have an activity of mangrove species, we involve the Patrol in the village where the activities will be held, for example in Mantehage, then, the Patrol in Mantehage will be involved. Besides having new knowledge, they would find an [interesting] location or site of certain species of mangrove, and also they received pocket money.
Also, Women’s Group discussion participants admitted the t-shirts are a bonus of the meeting:

Q: How did you get involved at the community meeting?
A5: All of the villagers were invited to the meeting and received a t-shirt,
A2: All villagers from Tinongko, Buhias.
Q: How about the announcement of the result of meeting?
A1-A5: No,
A1: They just gave us books to read.
A2: T-shirt, I received two [of it] (with a big smile).

In general, community acceptability towards RARE’s program – including the presence of community patrol members, efforts to re-establish and strengthen the No-Take Zones, and the instalment of the Pride and reporting schemes – is conditional and partial. The community had various unmet expectations, notably regarding provision of compensation for access and livelihood loss.
CHAPTER 8. Officials Perception of the RARE programme

This chapter presents the perception, thinking, opinion, experience and expectations of the Officials of the Balai Taman Nasional Bunaken (The Bunaken National Park Agency) as well as the Patrol members on the community empowerment activities as part of the program by RARE. This government Agency acts as the authority of the Park, as a representative by Forestry Ministry, and at the same time as a Field partner of RARE. The Officials’ perspectives were divided into main issues such as financial limitation, Top-Down relationship, hierarchical issues and community compliance.

OFFICIALS PERCEPTION – ISSUE WITH ORGANISATIONAL AGENDA

- LOW COMMUNITY HIERARCHICAL AND FINANCIAL COMPLIANCE
- HIERARCHICAL AND TOP DOWN ISSUES
- FINANCIAL LIMITATION

- COMMUNITY ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT ACTIVITIES
- ROUTINE OPERATIONAL FUNDING
- COMMUNITY PATROL ACTIVITIES
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8.1 Community Compliance

Most of the government Officials pointed to issues of the community compliance to the Park rules both inside and outside of the Park:

Q: How do you think the Patrol activities influence the obedience and compliance of the community to the rules?
A: Most of the community inside the Park becomes more obedient to the rules, but some people still do not. Even, some insiders are also hard-headed. They would stop committing violation just if the Patrol comes, but when the Patrol members go, they will return to their activities (Park Agency Official 5).

The same Park Agency official also expressed the issue of low levels of the community compliance:

I have two different experiences, first when I handled an offender from Nain Island. Even though I have released a warning shoot to warn them not to escape, they kept escaping [from me]. Even, one of the offenders was under water coming out the water and ran. Sometimes, when we told the offenders not to run, they did not run. Facing two different responses, we should apply two different methods. First response, they run [from us], and second stay in place. Until we had to release shoots several time and the offenders jump out from the boat into the sea because the offenders are those who had been caught in the past (Park Agency Official 5).

While other Officials emphasised lack of compliance of the insiders, some Officials found it difficult to deal with outsiders’ violations:

Q: How did you find the information insemination effective in eradicating the violation of the Park rules?
A: Due to the intensive information insemination, the violations by the insiders are less than outsiders. In the last case I found the offenders from Budo Village which is not part of the Park. Generally speaking, the offenders are mostly outsiders. What we have been doing now is to monitor community outside the area because most of violations were committed by outsiders (Park Agency Official 5).

Park Agency Official 4 shared and reported the cases of community violation:

Recently, one case has been committed. We used to catch offenders of cases of compressor diving, and it still happened. The offender was Budonese [not include the Park area]. We received a report from the Head of Sub District of Bunaken Archipelago, Robert Dauhan, I met him at a meeting (Park Agency Official 4).

Other community violations to the Park rules were also explained by Park Agency Official 1:

[The community still committed violation, for example] Arakan people conducted most the violations, five boats were caught in one day due to
[forbidden] compressor diving practice. However, sometimes [the internal] the community does not understand [of the rules importance] as well as the offenders. Moreover, a lot of offenders have backing ups. [The community might change] not because I enforce the rule, but because the [pressure] comes from the surrounding and neighboring Village that is against [the practice]. For example, the people in Arakan that still practices the use of diving compressor, and when the fish in that area is finished, the Arakanese fishing in other Villagers’ fishing area. As a result, the local community protested to the Arakanese], ‘you just come to finish our fish while the fish in your area is depleted already, if we want to bajubi (to use traditional spear gun), the fish is already gone’ (Park Agency Official 1).

8.2 Hierarchical and Top-Down Issues

The second issue with the RARE program is the hierarchical issues of the Government that are faced by Government staff to support the RARE’s program with the Park Agency and also especially faced by the Government staff who are selected as the RARE Field Manager to develop his new capacity and skills:

Q: What solution to the community rejection and demand was presented in terms of provision of the alternative livelihood to the community?
A: I am not the decision makers but the head of Balai [Balai Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Bunaken National Park Agency], or at least the head of Park section, so we just do our best. Personally, I am on the Field and what I know is in order to fulfil daily needs, the community [faces] it is difficult, not to mention the small needs. That is why I beg the community please [understand] I am nobody [and I could not help you]. I felt sorry if sometimes one of the community members was arrested in the legal process, they have to back and forth [the office], and an issue is how the husband feed their family, for example the offenders of the two arrested compressors engine which have been arrested for more than two months.

The RARE Field Manager continued the story of limitations of power he faced:

All programmes are good, but not at technical level and [implementation], at the same we cannot do anything [due to limited authority]. Who am I? Even though I had a position [in the office], [it would be useless] if I was alone without supports from my staff, what is it use for? Just say I was supported by my staff; but it was still useless if I was not supported by other stakeholders. That is [important] why everyone should have had a same vision and orientation and then the implementation would not be too difficult. I always I said that [the success of Patrol activity] depends on an individual [responsibility of the Patrol member]. I always I questioned why [my] coworkers the rangers have an issue of lack of intention going to the field. From that point, we can understand in the deeper way that the community are more likely to stop their intention [to commit violation]. If there was an officer of the Field, at least it would prevent them [the community] committing violation. How can the community provide respect, [if we did not work well?]
[As a consequence], we should always conduct self - introspection. We admitted that presence of our staff is not enough on the Field, and therefore, we always need to review what the reason of their absence, what the deep answer, why in the past, they could [conduct their job responsibly], but why not now? [The other issue is] a come of new leader [of the office] has a different leadership [style] and policy [leading the achievement of the programme] was back to the zero point. So if I was asked ‘how effective the project is, it will not be effective if just like this, it is about change [that takes time], for example from a smoker to a non-smoker.

The incapacity issues due to his low position, as well as limited authority to influence other stakeholders from government parties, such as provincial and municipalities’ government:

Q: How do you perceive the change of the community’s acceptance after the information insemination session at a community meeting held?
A: I think as I said previously, personally, I am not superman or superhero, [the effectiveness] depends on individual staff roles [and responsibility]. It is not only roles of the BNP office, but also other parties for example, the local government, or other stakeholders to support it. For me personally, for that sort of activities [takes time], just like current situation of the presidential campaign, in one month, the people can decide who is their choice, it is just the same, in the break, [they] would say something, but it is unsure in the future. My expectation is the previous activities [conducted by RARE] can be a stimulant of the people to change.

We consider the complaints [of the community] as inputs; otherwise we might assume that everything is running well. For example, level of presence of rangers on the field, was it insufficient and we questioned why is minimal? [We brought the explanation] to the Manager [of the Park], why and what the reasons, and we discussed why the community tended to mine sand and the reason is because the [building] material is far to take, they should take sand from Manado.

The hierarchical issues that were faced limited the staff from building necessary external partnership. The issues consisted of the relationship between the Park Agency and the Management Board, and between the Park Agency and the local government institutions:

Q: Why, you did not get involved directly in the Community Empowerment Program conducted by government other institution
A: [We wish] we were there to facilitate [the community] [but] it was not our authority. The [issue of the Community Empowerment] problem [in the Park] is lack of capacity [of other institution]. If the program is from us, we could interfere, but it is from the government Agency or other institutions [so we cannot interfere]. Their principle is a long as the project is done and the budget absorption at 100%, there is a documentation, there is a result even though it just run in one or two months but unsure in the future, [then everything will be ok]. The main issue with the program [of other institutions] is lack of facilitation.

Q: How about conflict happened because of the offenders are the relatives of Patrol members?
We should as a government bureaucrat, we have to coordinate with the lowest government level on the site, in this case is the head of Village, so they will have a responsibility for the thing is conducted. We also can inseminate information to them, and if it is through the Village [government] will be formal that this is a Village’s program.

Besides the issues in relationship with local government institutions, the issues also occurred with partnership between the Park Agency (Balai Taman Nasional Bunaken –BTNB-Bunaken National Park Agency) that is a central government Agency and the Bunaken National Park Management Board (Dewan Taman Nasional Bunaken – DPTNB) that is an informal body consists of local and regional agencies around the Park and the Agency was used to join the Board:

* I am from the Balai [Balai Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Bunaken National-BTNB -Park Agency], while the DPTNB are Dewan [the Management Advisory Board]. In the past, they are basically NGOs, and the owner of the area and of the authority is the Balai because the Balai [Balai Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Bunaken National Park Agency] is legitimatized by the [Forestry] minister’s decree while the Dewan [the Management Advisory Board] was formed by NGOs, so it is not legal. That is why according to the latest version of the rules; we are the [authority] to collect the [tourist entry ticket] and not the Dewan [the Management Advisory Board]. The rule has been enacted since 2013 but we have not conducted the rule yet. Coincidently, we have a new leader who said and determined that it was lucky there was no audit, if there was an audit, we would be caught because we did not conduct the collection [of the entry ticket of tourist] and also the pin [selling] so now we produced the pin. It was our weakness (Park Agency Official 4).

Q: Since when, did the Park Agency take over the Management of the entry fee from the Management Board?
A: About now, we are producing [the pin] because the rules have been issued a few years ago, but the letter of decree is just issued last year. So, the Dewan [the Dewan Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Management Advisory Board of the Bunaken Park] is not involved anymore. As a result, the community Patrol activities since last year (2013) have been taken over by the Balai [BTNBNB] (Park Agency Official 4).

Q: So the Park Management Advisory Board did not want to submit under the Park Agency?
A: They [the Management Board-DPTNB] want to be as equal as us. However, the Board is not a government institution. Conceptually, the Dewan [DPTNB] is good because the issue happened in the Bunaken could be discussed at the level of local government. As a consequence, all policies [related to the Park] could be synchronized [at the level of the policy making process]. However, they want to occupy and dominate [the Park authority] including taking over our Official job, and as a result of their dominance, the community looked for them the most. If the community was asked, which one is more well-known, it would be answered: the Dewan. Actually, the institution with the job
description related to the Park is the Balai, because the Dewan [the Dewan Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Management Advisory Board of the Bunaken Park-DPTNB] is collection of local fisheries, tourism department, Water Police, the Balai, while the rule should be conducted and implemented (Park Agency Official 1).

The issue with the membership and involvement of the Agency in the Bunaken Management Advisory Board was also stated by Park Agency Official 1:

Since 2012, the Balai [BTNB] has been resigned from the membership of the Dewan [Dewan Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Management Advisory Board of the Bunaken Park [DPTNB]. I think becoming a member of the Dewan [DPTNB] because we are only having the authority [of the central government while the authority is the Dewan is under authority of the governor [of the province]. Moreover, as the member, we could not make a decision that against the chairman of the [Board], while at the same time, the policy cannot be conducted in the area of the Park (Park Agency Official 1).

The individual staff and the Park Agency at the same time face the issues with the Top – Down characteristic of the relationship between the local Park Agency and the Forestry Ministry as a parent/mother institution. The technical and operational institution of the Bunaken National Park was described as follows:

Q: How about the implementation of job description of the Agency you lead?
A: As it is instructed by the Ministry of Forestry that refers to Law No. 5 of 1990, that [task] the Agency of National Park not only Bunaken, but also [covers] all National Parks in Indonesia, it [acts] as a UPT (Unit Pelaksana Teknis-Technical Manager Unit) of the Ministry of Forestry which is called Department of Forestry in the past. The unit was appointed as an authorized Management, as a stakeholder and as a Manager. [We] manage and supervise the area, so everything in that work area of 89.065 ha is under Management and supervision of the BTNB.

The authority of the Park Agency was also confirmed by Park Agency Official 3:

Regarding the status and function of the Bunaken National Park Agency as the Manager of the Park, the Agency conducts the close surveillance and supervision together with the community (Park Agency Official 3).

The Park Agency Official 1 also found the Official task and duty of the Park Agency as important, including following up on an agreement between the National Forestry Ministry and RARE:

It has been warned by the current administrative that PNPB (Pendapatan Negara Bukan Pajak) non – tax National income should be pushed and increased. According to Mr. President, in order to save the National budget, some parts of Village funding scheme (that is enacted nationally by the President) will not be taken from the National budget but from PNPB (that include the entry ticket of the Park). Probably the budget at Rp. 1 million for each Village will be taken from the post. Unavoidably, we have to run it,
and if the local government said no (of our task implementation), so how could we fulfil our obligation?

The Field Manager of RARE also commented on the relationship between RARE and the Park Agency as follows,

_Coincidently, this is cooperation [between RARE and the Park Agency] principally is a cooperation between two institutions, between the Ministry of Forestry (not the local Park Agency) and RARE. The NGO was appointed because of their concern in marine area conservation, especially the change of the community’s behaviour from destructive behaviour to constructive behaviour. After a MOU of cooperation (between RARE and the National Agency) was signed, four of us from the Ministry of Forestry at the same year, from the Wakatobi [National Park], the Karimun Jawa [National Park], the Kepulauan Seribu [National Park] and the Bunaken [National Park]. I was assigned to participate in that program (The Field Manager of RARE)._}

8.3 Financial Limitations

One of the main institutional issues of the Park Agency that cannot be dealt by the RARE’s program is the financial issue. The issues themselves impacted the institutional capacity to run the Park patrolling operational activities, and also to deal with the community loss due to the Park existence.

8.3.1 Community Empowerment Activity

The institutional capacity to the deal with community loss of access to fish and resource use, and demands to be provided compensation, the provision of alternative resources and livelihood for the impacted community:

Q: So, at least the community feels that they receive a sufficient attention with the Patrol station and Patrol activities existence. However, if the community is forbidden from using mangrove for various uses, how about the alternative resource provided by the Balai [the Bunaken National Park Agency-BTNB]?

A: While, the Balai [BTNBN- the Bunaken National Park Agency] handles only with the rules and law, and the rules of the Village became our handout in conducting our task [but not providing alternative livelihood], we [just] coordinate with the Village government in order to manage the use [of the resources], for example limited the mangrove wood as wood fire. However, there is no replacement we offer because there is Village government that should handle the community. In general, the rules of the replacement of the wood fire are the business of the Village Government,

Q: Do you think the program conducted by Mr Gatot of RARE is helping implementation of your job?

A: It is very helpful. Why I said it is very helpful, especially regarding the issue of surveillance in the area the Bunaken National Park. However, what we [really] need is how to increase the community’s awareness [and empower the community]. So the community should be able to help and support us [to
conduct] our job. We cannot implement our job fully guarding the Park [without the community support] which is very important. [I realized] that the Park really needs their existence because the community is already there. It is different if the area was empty [without the community when the Park was established] (Park Agency Official 2).

The same Official expressed his expectation of the RARE’s community empowerment program, specifically in terms of providing and encouraging the Leucaena leucocephala tree:

*My expectation to RARE is to educate the community to find and plant lamtoro seeds. In the southern area, most of the businessmen use sero on the sea, they plant sero made of woods. Many of them use lamtoro that is one of water resistant water and equally in strength with fire woods. However, it has not been planted there. I used to have a dump truck when I was having a project. I would have liked to help the community by using the truck but I needed someone to cut the trees as a seed. In the southern area of the Park, I was so famous, due to my confronting attitudes (against the mangrove use practice) until the community stopped. I directed the community to replace the use mangrove with lamtoro [Leucaena leucocephala] wood. I asked them to use lamtoro [L. leucocephala] wood which is tough. I once wanted to help them to find the lamtoro [L. leucocephala] wood from the Belang area where lamtoro woods are abundant (Park Agency Official 2).*

The other institutional incapacity is to provide solution to a negative consequence of the Park rules on the fishing practice experienced by the community. The RARE Field Manager, who also an official of the Agency explained:

**Q:** The community complained that due to Park ban, the community needed to fish in a further fishing ground. How did the Government Agency provide solution to the consequence, for example availability of the fishing gear provided to the fishers?

**A:** [Unfortunately, there was no solution like that]. The responsibility to provide the solution belongs to all stakeholders, [not only the Central Agency]. [However, the effectiveness of the solution] is always back to the roles of multi stakeholders, if the aim is good, so entire Indonesia, even though I am a government, I can say 80% of the aid reached on the wrong targets. The person who has the responsibility to go Field and to conduct a program which included community education and consultation, did not go the Village. However, the Officials just gave the Head of Village a call and asked the recipient to pick up the package at the Jengki Pier [a port in mainland for boats go the island], and also asked the Head of Village to give their signature on the presence list of meeting. The assistance includes seaweed aid, fiber boats, katingting [small engine]. The assistance was a lot, but it is only going to Village elites (RARE Field Manager).

The Park Agency’s institutional incapacity to provide alternative community livelihood was also confirmed by Park Agency Official 1:
We have considered about the community livelihood’s [alternative provision]. At the beginning, it is easy to ban the community from using jubi [the tradition spear gun] in the no-take zone, but later the number of population developed and increased [significantly], so it is difficult to conduct the ban strictly. If we apply strictly the concept of [conservation], it will not align with the pace of the population growth and [the community needs]. It is told that ‘please conduct the community empowerment’, so resources can be enjoyed [sustainably] by the community at the same time. This is part of the new concept of [sustainable development] introduced by the [Forestry] Ministry, the community empowerment coexists with the conservation. However, how to implement [the new concept] we are here [on the Field] was confused and helpless how to implement the concept [due to limited resources]. It is difficult, isn’t it?

The importance of provision of alternative livelihood of the community as a result of the existence of the Park also stated by Park Agency Official 1:

Then, about the solution [to providing the community with a livelihood alternative], we conduct [community] empowerment in many ways every year, including economic empowerment which is a compulsory activity of the community. We provided aid [to the community], for example, cattle, and seeds of plants. So, basically our concept is not to eradicate the community passion to go fishing or to eradicate their livelihood in the ocean, but we provided aid to reduce the community’s contact with the ocean. However, we did not provide anything related to the fishing activities such as fishing gear, boats, so mostly, [we directed the community] to the land based livelihood. The main goal of the community empowerment is to increase the level of the community wellbeing. However, the limitation is located in the community thinking, for example thousand seeds have been provided to the community and a pilot project has been conducted, for example fruit tree provision. It is impossible for me to guard the community non-stop during the process. So I just encourage the community to plant the provided seed plant. [I told the community], ‘If it is not enough space in your house yard, you can plant the seed in your farm’. Sometimes they forgot, and when we conducted evaluation, the only living trees are the tree we planted. While the trees planted by the community were forgotten and ignored, just like that. Moreover, the government aid was also useless. Some programmes were successful [in other places] such as Manado tua [and] Mantehage. When the pan stove [a set of aluminum pan [with a small stove or heater underneath] was trending, we provided the pan stove to the community to be rented [the profit can be borrowed by the group members]. It developed well. In Manado tua, we provided seeds and money which we meant to be used as a capital of micro finance. After I evaluated, it is developed well and they asked me for more finance aid as capital, but I said I needed to check the budget availability of the office. If one community group succeeded, other group in the community will have jealousy instead of learning how to obtain the funding. Furthermore, if the non-group members do not want to conduct any efforts but showed negative sentiment feelings such as complains (Park Agency Official 1).
8.3.2 Routine Operational Funding

The issues of lack of funding not only impacted on the capacity of the institution to deal with the community demand and expectations of compensation, but also to the Village funding provision and to guarantee the quality and sustainability of the operational Patrol activities:

*Because we do not have an annual budget to conduct recruitment process and trainings, we just called the current Community Patrol members again and extend their contracts. They have already had the required experience and already known how to conduct a Patrol activity with us* (RARE Field Manager).

The lack of routine operational funding was also experienced by the Community Patrol members:

Q: What do you think of the Patrol mechanism?  
A: The advantages we have supports from Water Police but the weaknesses we face such as lack of sufficient facilities including lack of speed boats with good engines because most of the engines used now are old (Community Patrol 2).

The funding issue was confirmed by Park Agency Official 2 and 1:

What are the weaknesses of the Patrol activities?  
The quality of facility is old and not good. Until now, there is no new assistance [for the Patrol from the Central Government].  
So, in the Patrol activity, the community was involved?  
It was [actively], involved but because of the funding limitation, [it stopped]. Probably, next year, the activity will be held again (Park Agency Official 1).

It is interesting, because you said that you are in charge of Patrol activity and you have the authority, how did you deal with the difficulties or challenges in conducting your job?  
There is no enough operational [funding]. The most significance challenge is lack of quality marine transport, equipment and other facilities. It is important because in order to conduct and support the Patrol activity, we need more than one or two speed boats. We have large a surveilled area and our fleet is old already, almost 10 years. As a consequence, we proposed to the central government to provide speed boat again and the provision of new boats will be held soon. I talked to the NSWA [North Sulawesi Water Sports Association], one of the managers of a resort, Kerri, who told me that they (the NSWA) would like to invite the Balai [BTNB- the Balai Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Park Agency] at their forum and discuss how they can help the Balai [BTNB]. This year, there is no gasoline budget for our speed boats, and no specific and routine budget for Patrol so we just paid the fee from our wages to assist this activity and if there is a sudden inspection, the budget will be provided. So, Kerrie will talk to the NSWA to provide gasoline fee, but the Balai should provide at least three Patrol boats in the northern area. We need 150L per day and the total budget could reach around Rp. 1 million per day. If the NSWA can work together with us, it will be great because we will not run
out of budget [anymore]. The budget for gasoline will be started provided next year. If the entry fee can be collected and deposited to the country until Rp 500 million, it will be easier for us to ask for gasoline budget [from the Central Government]. So far, the income never goes to the country [but to the Park Advisory Board] (Park Agency Official 2).

Government incapacity also showed in unfulfilled community expectations of the Village Conservation Funds. The demand for better quality of Village infrastructure and facilities has created a significant demand on the Village development funding which is controversial and has a potential to become corrupted. In the beginning of the Park establishment, the community refused the idea of the Park zonation because it was seen as an action denying access to the sea by the community. Expectation of the community toward the Village Conservation Funds was expressed by a Head of Village below:

Q: Can you tell me about how the complaints and input of the community was followed up by the Park Authority?
A: The Management of the Park is held by the DPTNB at the moment, there is budget for each region but recently the community contribution has been not distributed well. I think it has been five or six years, the Village conservation budget has never been accepted. Every Village supposed to accept 10% per year of entry ticket sold.

Q: The funding is very useful?
A: Yes, it is very useful, for example in the past the funding was used to renovate the Village meeting hall, so everybody could enjoy the benefit [of the Park] and we could maintain [the sea resource] together. However, at the moment, the community does not care [because the funding distribution was stopped]. I discussed with some Villagers and they said it would be better if the Conservation Fund could be received by the Villagers.

Lack of sufficient funding especially in term of Conservation Village Funds was complained about by the Head of Buhias Village:

However, one weaknesses of the Park is the halt to the aid to the conservation in Village that was once happened but not now. In the past, the waiting room was part of the aid of the conservation of the Bunaken National Park. More than ten years, it was not assigned again. The [financial] aid was Rp. 10 million. We received it two or three times. It was promised that there will be an ‘Arisan Simpan Pinjam’ [Micro Finance], but it was not happened. When I was conducting comparison study in Jogja a few years ago, I joined the tourism group of study, I saw that the contribution of the tourism area to the Village around 50%, part here, I have never received such contribution, how can I convince the community to protect the marine area, if there was no benefit for the community even though our area belongs to the tourism destination. In Hong Kong also like that the practice of contribution of the tourism area occurred. Because of the contribution, the Villagers willing to clean the Village, how the Village will develop [without the willingness of the community]. They just take results, but there is no return [to the Village] [Head of Buhias Village].

So if we would go and visit the community, [for example attending] meeting of the forum of [citizen] that has a programme of Village Conservation Funds …… We would be avoiding the [discussion] about the topics, because it would provoke a conflict. The process [of obtaining community agreement] would be very slow.
[However], by conducting the programme in the area we let the community to understand [by themselves] the [importance] and function of the protected resources by themselves.

At the moment, I do not know about that [Village Conservation] Funds provision. As I know there was a special funding for conservation of the community, but it was Rp. 10 million and we only received once. That is what the community was complaining when we tried hard to enforce the core zone scheme, and simultaneously received the [negative] consequence of conducting conservation because [the community knows] that there is a reward and compensation [for our Village]. Due to the lack of the Village funding, we expelled tourists that were diving in the Park. They (Park Authority and RARE) told us that tourism is one of local foreign exchange’s sources but who has enjoyed it? As a consequence, the community [strongly] challenges [the No-Take Zone] scheme and the community has a [strong] reason for it. They [the Park Authority] asked the community to manage [the Zone], but [how come] we manage if we [just] received compensation only once in almost ten years, that is issue we questioned significantly in the community meeting in the Balai [BTNB] and the Dewan DPTNB-the Bunaken National Park Management Board] (Head of Buhias Village).

The community complaint regarding lack of funding of Village conservation from the Park Agency was confirmed by a Community Patrol member:

Q: So, the main problem of the Patrol activities is gasoline and finance?
A: Yes, gasoline and finance is the main issue. [However], it is only that [but Village Conservation Funds]. In the past, [the distribution and assignation of the funding] was good and the Villagers benefited the fund so we did not raise any objection to conduct surveillance. The results of diving ticket sale in terms of Village conservation fund were still provided to the Village, but not at the moment.

8.3.3 Community Patrol Activity

Funding issue of the Community Patrol activities has several impacts on the program, such as discontinuity of the Patrol programme, lack of facility, ineffective Patrol activity, and a feeling of reduced powerlessness of the Patrol. The first impact of the lack of funding issues is incomplete facilities that deployed the interest of the community Patrol members to continuously participate in the Patrol activities. A Patrol member expressed his concern of the lack of funding led to ineffectiveness of the Community Patrol work, as stated below:

All the Patrol system’s weaknesses are located in the funding systems. Many activities were cancelled because of lack of funding related issues such as lack of gasoline. [Because] the operational budget was not enough, as a result, many violations [still] occurred out there.

Besides leading to ineffectiveness of the work, the lack of funding has led to the issues of incomplete facilities that brought an issue of insufficient job performance, as noted by a Patrol member below:

Q: So you feel incapable to arrest an offender?
A: Yes, moreover, the facilitation availability is not supportive, for example we used only a small engine that only 15 HP attached to a large boat, so it only could run slowly and we had to stop frequently (Community Patrol 1).

The incomplete facility also led to ineffectiveness of their job implementation of surveillance, a Patrol member expressed his experience below:

How was the operation of surveillance effective?
No, [it wasn’t], especially we spent the whole day under the sun [and we had nothing], and we [only] used to use katingting (the small engine) only, not a speed boat due to insufficient the gasoline availability for speed boat for surveillance from Mantehage Island to Nain Island (Community Patrol 2).

While other Community Patrol members complained about feelings of powerless and helplessness to effect surveillance, one Patrol member focused on the safety issue, as discussed below:

That is why I requested again and again a pair of boots so I could surveillance around the mangrove area where many offenders committed their actions but I did not receive them [until now].

The same request of a pair of boots also expressed by a Patrol member:

*Therefore, I kept telling and suggesting about boots, so we can follow and investigate someone who is being suspected especially in the mangrove area.*

Moreover, the incomplete facilities issue also implied on the inappropriateness of safety tools the Patrol members received, as commented below:

Q: So, they did not provide a safety kit to the Patrol?
A: No, in the past, it was only life jacket which is I thought it would be useless for people who can swim. Even I did not receive any uniform like which was received by Mr. Ira. I only received a vest which is useless and uncomfortable for us to work in under the sun.

Eventually, the issue of fuel sufficiency has led to scepticism of the Patrol, as noted below:

Another issue is the limited fuel. They gave us limited amount of fuel. The problem is when the violations [happened] a lot on the sea, [then] we should walk on the sea?

Overall, based on official perceptions in the light of organisational agenda, the NGO needs to deal with considerable issues. From an official perspective, these issues include low community compliance, hierarchical and top-down issues, and financial limitations of the government institution. The financial issue direct affects limitations in the community economic program, patrol activities and community patrol program.
SECTION 3. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Section Three consists of four subsections, a Discussion that consists of two chapters, first, ‘Issues and Processes of Social Engagement with the RARE program at the Bunaken National Park’, and a chapter of lessons from the study aimed at improving community-NGO relationships. The third is ‘Conclusions’; fourth, an Executive Summary of recommendations for NGO improvement and the last is a personal reflection (Figure 19).

The results of the research that were mentioned in the previous chapters will be discussed in the Discussion subsection, while, the Conclusion chapter presents the summary of the findings, Discussions and other important points of the thesis and research. In the Recommendations chapter, practical suggestions in order to improve the performance of same or similar NGOs that might have interests in the Bunaken National Park or other Parks with similar circumstances and situations will be provided. In the chapter, a brief Executive Summary is presented. While Reflections are the results of meditated and contemplated lessons including mistakes and constraints that were dealt with during the research design and implementation.
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CHAPTER 9. Issues and Processes of Social Engagement with Rare Programs of Bunaken National Park

This chapter is aimed at presenting a Discussion of the issues of development and the process of social engagement, including the community and the Government Agency, involved in the implementation of the RARE program. The chapter was developed in order to fulfil Objectives four of the study: to develop an analytical model of the processes of NGO engagement with the local community and identify enablers and barriers to successful NGO-driven environmental management.

The findings confirm that RARE’s work and activities in the Bunaken National Park appear to be less effective in encouraging and improving the community acceptance of the Park Scheme, and approaches of the program were also incapable of fulfilling the community expectations and the Government Agency’s conservation agenda. Also, the program showed some insensitivity and was inappropriate in relation to the local cultural values. These issues have led to negative social impacts, in particular, relationships within the community.

The results chapters (Chapter 5 to Chapter 8) presented evidence for views about the perceived effectiveness and ineffectiveness of RARE’s implementation program. Each Chapter is a presentation of study results obtained to answer and fulfil each objective. Chapter 5 presented identification of RARE’s history and past practices in the Bunaken National Park as per Objective 1. Chapter 6 summarised results of data collection addressing the Objective 2a, analyse of RARE’s program implementation and social expectations. Chapter 7 addressed the requirements of Objective 2b, analyse the fit of RARE’s program and institutional issues, and Chapter 8, addressed Objective 3. In this Chapter, the discussion, evidence of enablers of and barriers to RARE’s program will be elaborated upon. The Discussion consists of five main parts. The first part is effectiveness of the NGO’s past roles, the second part is the fit of the program with the institutional issues and context, the third part is the fit of the program in fulfilling the social expectations, the fourth is the social relationship between Government, RARE and community and the last is conclusion of the chapter. The outline of the chapter follows the diagram that can be seen in Figure 20.
Figure 20 Organisational diagram of issues and process of social engagement with NGO program of BNP
The Discussion is developed and established based on combination and elaboration of the Organisational Model (Fowler et al., 1995), then Empowerment Model (Rissel, 1994) and RARE’s internal interests and agenda at different levels and contexts. Organisational, internal elements and aspects of RARE, such as the NGO’s interests, goals, aims and approaches influenced development of the Combined Model given the NGO’s role as the object of the study. The Organisation Model, in this thesis, contributed a main structure of investigation of interaction of NGO’s program, social impacts of NGO’s program and relationship of NGO with external stakeholders such as Government.

While elements of the Empowerment Model were used especially in order to assess and analyse the effectiveness of the program. The effectiveness of the NGO’s program of empowerment was analysed based on consistence of expected outcomes and social impacts of the program with the goal and purpose of the NGO. The impacts consisted of the impacts of the RARE Program on the community individually and collectively. An elaboration of the Developed Model can be seen in Figure 21,
Figure 21 An elaboration of the developed model

The Developed Model is based on an integration of two original models, the Organisational Model that emphasises and focuses on the relationship of NGO’s internal values and goals with other relevant elements such as relationship with Government and impacts on the community. The original model can be seen in Figure 22.
The Original and Developed Models passed a refining process that is an examination process including elaborating analysed data and existing relevant literatures leading to the emergence of a new model. The refined model employs new elements those of the barriers and supporting aspects of NGO effectiveness in the Bunaken National Park. The refined model is illustrated in Figure 23.
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9.1 Objective 1: Identification of RARE’s history and past roles in the Bunaken National Park

In order to achieve Objective 1 of the research, the identification of RARE’s history and past roles, was seen and addressed in three ways, first the community’s responses to the Park’s existence, second, the community’s responses toward the No-Take Zone and the last is the community’s responses towards the Community Patrol Members as told by the Patrol members themselves.

9.1.1 Rejection of the Bunaken National Park’s existence

Existence of the Bunaken National Park is inseparable from the community who lives in the adjacent area of the Park. RARE’s program was conducted to improve community acceptance to the Park. In terms of RARE’s effectiveness in shaping the community attitudes towards the Park’s existence, the findings in the Chapter 6 showed that the community rejections of the Park are in the majority compared to positive attitudes. The attitudes displayed were varied depending on the people’s personal background and history with the Park, also the availability of alternative jobs or occupations. Even though the degree of community rejection was not assessed in the research, it appears that not many, even very few of the group participants and interviewees related experiences with the Park positively.

Most of the participants of the Women’s Discussion Groups, and interviews with the Heads of Village, related their experiences with the Park with negative experiences and expressions. Most of the Women’s Groups referred to their Park related experiences as ‘limitations’ and used the terms ‘bans’ and ‘rules’, and some Women’s Group members associated the Park existence with experiences of past social riots which occurred between the community and the Park Authority a few years ago. Only 1 out of 20 members of the Women’s Discussion Groups related the Bunaken National Park with improved ecological knowledge and commented on additional support by the Park Agency.

Similar negative feelings were also expressed by the Heads of Villages, and 2 out 4 of Heads of Villages still referred to Park related experiences in terms of past riots and conflicts, and all of Heads of Villages linked the existence of the Bunaken National Park with the community’s obligation to comply and obey the Park rules and experience of this enforcement.

In terms of the way of showing their expressions and experience, especially some of the participants of the Women’s Discussions Groups showed rejection to the Park using a wide range of expressions of rejection. Most of the Women’s Groups’ members employed indirect and covert ways including a wide range of unspoken forms of expressions, from being salient and defensive in answering certain questions, to ignoring and, even denial of the presence and existence of the Park. The only overt rejections came from a Head of Village who had been arrested once due to violation of the Park rules, while other Heads of Villages expressed their rejection in more covert ways such as ignoring questions about the Park existence and also by being sceptical and pessimistic. The attitudes of the community towards the Bunaken Park can be seen in Table 13.
Table 13 Attitudes towards the Bunaken National Park existence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways of Expression</th>
<th>Attitudes Towards the Park Existence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert</td>
<td>√√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most tangible expressions of the community’s negative feelings towards the Park were the rejection of all villages to the RARE and Park Agency’s plans and intentions to encourage the community enacting their own village. Compliance of the park rules would lead to the social consequence for the park rule offenders. A graphic of community rejection spectrum is shown in Figure 24.

![Figure 24 Spectrum of negative community responses towards the Bunaken National Park](image)

The community’s negative attitudes towards the Park were divided into attitudes towards the past situation and experience with the Park, and the current experience with the Park. In expressing their attitudes towards their past experience with the Park, the community attitudes were more aggressive than towards to the current situation. In the past, the community rejection was expressed in a fierce and violent conflict, whereas at present, in response to questions about current situations, the community provides more subtle expressions of rejection of the Park. However, the threat of potential community riots also kept being mentioned and warned of by the participants. The negative community attitude towards the Bunaken Park can be seen in Table 14.
The community negative responses and feelings towards the Park are also confirmed by the internal final report of the RARE Project in 2012. Based on the results of the survey aimed at measuring the community attitudes before and after the programme’s implementation and interventions, the community support to the Park had relatively decreased. Only 4 out of 11 targeted aspects, including Discussion with family and friends and willingness to attend community meetings, were achieved, while the most of aspects of community support failed (Santoso, 2012).

The results of the survey also showed that instead of success in increasing quality of community support toward the Park on both targeted islands, Mantehage Island and Nain Island, most of the criteria decreased slightly, and some were significantly depleted (Santoso,
One of the extreme failures is the decrease in the agreement and the support levels of the community from the Fishermen and Non-Fishermen Groups on both islands towards a Community Patrol Member decreased after the intervention. Not only willingness to be a Community Patrol Members, the community willingness to be a Conservation Cadre which has similar tasks and roles as Community Patrol Member as a Park Conservation and Campaigner Agent in the community also significantly decreased, especially on Mantehage Island. The other extreme rejections came especially from the Fishermen Group on Nain Island in terms of the willingness of the community to report violations of other villagers, decreasing from 1% to 0% from the 30% target which means that no one in the village wants to be a whistle blower. The figures of the decrease in positive attitudes of the community both, from the Fishermen and Non-Fishermen Group on Mantehage Island and Nain Island can be seen in Table 15.

Table 15 Achievement of the RARE’s campaign programme on Mantehage and Nain islands summarised from Santoso (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Fishermen</th>
<th>Non Fishermen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Pre-campaign</td>
<td>Fishermen</td>
<td>Non Fishermen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>70% of Fishermen or Non - Fishermen disagree or strongly disagree about unclear zonation rules</td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>Pre-campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>90% of Fishermen or Non - Fishermen agree to participate in zonation Patrol supervision activity</td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>Pre-campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>75% Fishermen or Non - Fishermen agree to participate as Conservation Cadre</td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>Pre-campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>70% Non - Fishermen agree to participate in zonation surveillance Patrol activity</td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>Pre-campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>30% Fishermen willing to report any fishing activity in the No-Take Zone</td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>Pre - campaign:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post - campaign:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre- campaign :</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post- campaign :</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impacts and outcome of programme on the community’s change of behaviour from the perspectives of Theory of Empowerment were counted as a continuous and improving process from negative results into positive outcomes (Russel, 1997). However, the trend of decrease in the community support to the Park is likely being continued. As a consequence, the NGO’s intervention and programme have weakened achievements of the outcome of the previous Community Empowerment Programme.

The lack of effectiveness of the Park implies lack of effectiveness of the practitioners efforts, including RARE and the Bunaken Park Agency in communicating and encouraging public support towards the Park, and vice versa. As a consequence, the community rejection towards the Bunaken National Park also implies the status of the Park as a ‘Paper Park’. The Paper Park status of the Bunaken Park has led to weakening of the governance of the Park that requires strong support from the public, especially from the community. Even though the application of the status did not specifically fulfil the criteria as the Paper Park developed by the Tobey and Torell (2006), the community rejection towards the existence of the Bunaken National Park has led to the confirmation of the existence of a trend for ‘Paper Parks’ around the world (Kareiva, 2006; Rife et al., 2012).

Charles and Wilson (2009, p. 6) also considered community acceptance as one of ‘the entry points’ of the community acceptance to an MPA. According to them, a balance between Program Human Related Goals and Conservation is required (Charles and Wilson, 2009).

The other aspect regarding the results of the study into community negatives responds towards the Park are inconsistent with the research findings of Thomassin et al. (2010) who studied community acceptability to the Marine Protected Area on the Reunion Island, Tanzania. In their study, Thomassin et al. (2010) found more than 70% of the surveyed respondents were found in favour with the existence of the Park. However, the social economic background of respondents of the study was totally different from the community in the Bunaken Park who are mostly fishermen and poor (BTNB, 2011).

9.1.2 Rejection to the No-Take Zone

The second aspect of the NGO’s effectiveness is the community attitudes towards the No-Take Zone. The findings showed that most of the participants indicated negative attitudes towards the existence of the scheme. Despite RARE’s campaign and other efforts of the RARE program, along with the Park Agency, the presence of the No-Take Zone seemed strongly rejected by the local people. All Women’s Groups appeared to express disagreement to the Scheme, and 1 out 4 Groups members strongly disagreed with the Park scheme and referred the long history of the rejection of the Park in their village. In terms of the image of the scheme, 2 out of 4 Groups referred the scheme as ‘a limitation’ or ‘a ban’, 1 out of 4 Groups referred the policy as ‘difficult and providing extra burden’. In comparison with other bans, the four Groups of Women admitted that they are more likely to accept other rules such as Species Protection Bans, such as turtle or napoleon, Gear Restrictions and ban of fish poisoning practice, but without the No–Take Zone policy. The strongest rejection of the community towards the No-Take Zone compared to other rules was also confirmed by the Head of Buhias Village as follows:
Q: From the all rules which one is the most difficult rule for the community to accept?
A: The zonation scheme is the most difficult to accept because it is in the area of livelihood.

The community negative responses towards the plan of the reestablishment and strengthening of the No-Take Zone were confirmed also in the final report by the RARE Campaign Manager. The community responses and support towards the scheme decreased after the RARE Community Campaign Program, especially on Mantehage Island community. The community support and agreement to any efforts to improve community understanding and awareness of the No-Take Zone existence reduced from 35% to 20% for the Fishermen Group, and decreased from 33.6% to 25.6% for the Non- Fishermen Group (Santoso, 2012).

The other tangible evidence of the community was the strong community rejection towards the Park Rules, especially about the No-Take Zone scheme is the unachieved agreement between RARE, the Park Agency and the local community about the form and types of punishment given to the trespassers and offenders of the Protected and Closed Zone. Furthermore, the community’s strong resistance and disagreement to the Park No-Take Zone, not only was expressed at community meetings, the resistance was also expressed in more tangible and practical ways, such as the destroying and removals of buoys delineating the zone.

The anticipation of community rejections towards a Marine Protected Area immediately after the reintroduction of the rules and restrictions of a Park implementation was also found by Tonioli and Agar (2009). In their study in the US Caribbean waters, Tonioli and Agar (2009), found that the community especially the fishermen, showed strong rejection to the Park scheme in terms Closure Areas. The low community compliance of the No-Take Zone compared to other restrictions is consistent with the work of Campbell et al. (2012) located in the Karimunjawa National Park in Indonesia, the same country as the Bunaken National Park. The research by Campbell et al. (2012) found that the high compliance with the fishing rules of the community was not necessary followed by the compliance with the spatial rules in terms of the No-Take Zone.

The issues of the community rejection towards the No-Take Zone in particular and the Bunaken National Park in particularly were confirmed with the past roles of the NGO. Despite of the long story and period of time of RARE involvement the issues still the same and the approach of science emphasise also still the same. The long terms of the community violation and rejection of the Park rules and restrictions are still the same, especially the No-Take Zone implementation. A Community Patrol member shared his story of the rejection of the community toward the No-Take Zone Scheme

In the past, when the zonation was established, if I am not mistaken in 2001 and it was revised in 2006 due to too many zones and name of zones which are confusing the community. [It is different from current situation], especially in the coastal area, there are three zones only, community zone, tourism zone, and another zone. So at the beginning, the Dewan and the Balai came to the community with the Patrol [members] to conduct information insemination, there were a lot of controversy because the community wanted to be free in their own territories and then suddenly the territories were bordered consisting of which are allowed and which are not. Here is allowed but with certain restriction of the
RARE’s roles in the Park are not something new along with the long history of the NGO involvement in the Park. The NGO has conducted their programme twice, during two periods of time, 1999-2002 and 2010-2012 and both of the programmes applied similar aspects of implementation as well as differences. During the first period, the NGO worked providing educations to other NGOs that were working under the Natural Resources Management (NRM), a programme of the USA administration. The specific goal of the NRM’s NGOs was the same to create a Conservation community that understand, and are able to be a good steward of the marine resources (Erdman et al., 2004). While, in the second period, the NGO specifically collaborated with the Park Government Agency by recruiting one of the staff of the Bunaken National Park Agency to be the RARE’s field programme manager in the Park. The aim of the second period that is the border of the research is “to create constituent that is needed to start change in policy, legislative reformation, and area by shifting the public’s behaviour to sustainable practical and by focussing the public’s attention towards the critically threatened species and ecosystem” (Santoso, 2012). However, the specific and practical goals are to decrease human related threatening activities such as illegal fishing and overfishing stated as the pressures to the environment, especially to in the near shore water (RARE, nd-e).

Social marketing approach that emphasises developing knowledge and understanding of the community in the Bunaken Park was chosen and employed in the first project of the NGO as well as the second project. In both projects, the approach was treated as a main tool to increase and achieve the Conservation results of the Park (Santoso, 2012). As well tools such as press releases, Church sermon sheet making, and distribution, billboards; surveys of knowledge, attitudes and practices, songs, puppet shows, custom, school visits, conservation and comic and activities booklets are exactly the same in the Project 1 and Project 2 (Erdman et al., 2004; Santoso, 2012). Moreover, since 1999, the social marketing approach had become a buzzword in the project implementation of many environmental NGOs under the USAid’s Natural Resource Management (NRM)/EPIC in the Park (Erdman et al., 2004). RARE’s approach, program and outcome of the program in two different periods of time can be seen in Table 16.

| Table 16 Difference and similarities between the first and second project
| (*Source: Erdman et al., 2004; **Santoso, 2012) |
|---|---|---|
| Aspects | 1999-2002 campaign * | 2010-2012 campaign ** |
| Partners | Partner with other NGOs under the NRM project, Government, teachers | Partner with Government Agency |
| Approach term | Social marketing approach | Social marketing approach |
| Location | The whole area of the Bunaken Park | Focus on Mantehage and Nain islands (one of areas of more resistance). |
| Use of slogan | Yes, Torang pe nyare (We all) | Yes, Torang bangga jadi orang |
own the nyare); Bunaken terjaga Manado ternama (Protecting Bunaken keeps Manado famous)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>The NRM/EPIQ</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of mascot</td>
<td>Yes (Dugong)</td>
<td>Yes (Napolon wrasse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign media</td>
<td>Newspapers, radios, sermon sheets, popular songs, comics Strips.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride use</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome/impacts</td>
<td>Conflict, social riots</td>
<td>Community rejection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dominance of the science in the intervention of practitioners of MPA by RARE is also recognised by Sowman et al. (2011) in their study of use of old paradigm that emphasises science domination and importance in the management of Marine Protected Area in South Africa. The study found that ignorance of the human factor including social and cultural aspect of the community in the decision making process of the Conservation scheme has undermined the success of MPA (Sowman et al., 2011). The study conducted by (Sowman et al., 2011) showed that balancing goal between the two important aspects should be important and incorporation of social aspect and ecological aspect, although in many cases also do not obtain priority and highly acknowledgement.

### 9.1.3 Community Patrol Members

The third aspect of RARE’s effectiveness is community responses towards the Community Patrol Members that were claimed as ‘Agents of Change’ by RARE and the Park Agency. Despite of the increased personal capacity in Patrol members to mobilise and organise the community, the Patrol members appeared to face crucial issues regarding their ineffectiveness of conducting formal and operational tasks, and also weakened intrapersonal relationships with other community members.

All Patrol members interviewed experienced social exclusion in a wide range of forms from pressure of the mutual Group to feeling treated as a public enemy. 1 out 7 was called a whistle blower and 4 out of 7 experienced severe rejections to their Conservation messages. They also felt that they were being treated as a ‘community enemy’ (2 out of 7), especially when conducting law enforcement and taking action against internal offenders, such as arresting the offenders. The powerlessness of the situation experienced by one of the Patrol members regarding his experience of the community’s questions toward his actions:

A: Can you talk to me about the conflicts of interest with the community regarding your work as a Patrol member?

Q: When the community saw me inclined to the rules, I was tested by the community with a case of my mother who was caught hiring people to cut the trees to make a cage using [the protected] mangrove woods. The community
was prying and observing what I would do. As a consequence, [I was under significant pressure] to investigate the case of my mother [carefully] (Community Patrol 5).

The recruitment of the Patrol members put the Patrol members under social pressure, rejection and exclusion from the surrounding environment was also experienced by another Community Patrol Member, as described by the given Patrol member as follows,

Q: Can you tell me about the change of people’s attitudes toward your new position?
A: The people did not become afraid of me, they just felt quite more reluctant to get close me. [In many cases], my friends [eventually took an advantage] by [cynically] reminding me that I should have become a model, set a good example and distinguish myself as a guard.

In other words, the individual loss not only impacted on the given individual’s capacity, but also indirectly the societal loss that is important and significant especially in the community that embraced a collective and kinship system. On one hand, social acceptance was attributed to the Patrol members as ‘heroes’ or ‘protectors of the community’s interests’ in saving the marine resources from the outside poachers. On the other hand, recognition was provided only as long as the Patrol members did not prohibit the community from conducting their own exploitation activities. The social consequence and punishment of the violation to the conditions provided by the community was social exclusion toward the Community Patrol Members as well as involving them in social disputes and conflict. The community exclusion towards the Community Patrol can be seen in Table 17.

Table 17 Social exclusion experienced by the community patrol members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of social exclusion</th>
<th>Community Patrol Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Group demand/pressures</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community enemy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance creation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community rejection of messages</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whistle blower</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The community exclusion of the Community Patrol Members was also expressed in the application of the social conditional expected of the members. The condition to community acceptance to the Patrol members was expressed by the Women’s Group on Nain Island:
Q: What is your expectation to the new Patrol members?
A2: If they will follow strictly the rules, there will be a conflict. Some people said that, because you are the local people, there would be a dispensation for you. Your parents also used to work and make a life here. Please, be compromised in applying the rules.

The conditional acceptance towards the Community Patrol Members and compromises made the Patrol Members were also expressed and emphasized by the Women’s Group members in Bango village:

Q: How does Jenri (the current Patrol Member) deal with the community, has Jenri ever had a conflict with the community?
A5: No, never.
A1: I knew that Jenri is a Patrol member just now. I did not know about it previously.
How did the Patrol before Jenri deal with the community’s violation?
A5: It used to be a frequent conflict [between the Patrol Members and community members], because they [the previous Patrol Members] forbid many things. It is [because] probably, even though Jendri was enforcing the rules, he is not too strict. It is impossible for him to enforce the [Park] rules without any motivation to conduct it strictly and consistently. However, at the same time, somehow he tries to make the community [can] accept and understand his [responsibility]. If he followed the community’s want, it means that he did not conduct his job (well), to be honest. Now, probably, he compromised with the community’s [needs], because if he insisted to enforce the rules consistently, the community would be insisted too…
A2: ….So [eventually] the past conflict would happen [again].
A1: Because based on the past experience with the Patrol before Jenri, the conflict had ever happened because of the ban’s [strict application]. Probably, based on the experience, in conducting his job and responsibility, Jenri may have a personal commitment and policy to understand the community. Moreover, at the moment, he is also building his house. How can he build his house [if he did not compromise the rules for himself], it would be very difficult [for him]. Indeed, it is very difficult.

The other community negative responses towards the recruitment of the Patrol Members can be seen in the creation of further emotional distance between the Community Patrol Members and non-Patrol members. The further emotional distance and a gap in the relationship between the Community Patrol Members and other community village were also confirmed and reported by members of Women’s Group in Nain village,

How do you feel when you heard Mr. Makagansa became the Patrol first time?
A2: My feeling [to him suddenly] changed. There is a dug, dig, [an increase the heart beating speed], there is a [significant] worry and anxiety, the [zonation] will be reapplied and the community will be upset again. We are hunted.
A1: For example, the incident when the Patrol chase after [the community],
[With the condition provided to the new Patrol Members], the community feeling [automatically] has changed [towards the new Patrol Members]?

A2: Yes, ooh [of course], the incidents [between the Patrol Members and the community] in the past might happen again.

A2: The impacts [of the conflict], for example [the Patrol member] has a Ministry [position] in the Church, and [at the same time] the Church members are used to fishing [in illegal ways], the relationship [between the two parties] would [automatically] change, [for instance], [the Patrol] was giving a sermon, and the congregations would say and question: ‘Who do you think you are [to teach us]? We do not want and need to hear your sermon. You would just arrest us when we are making our livelihood’.

A1: [The Church members would say also] ‘you just preached for yourself’.

A2: The spiritual life in the community has been shaken.

A1: We have had more pressures [since the Official recruitment of the Patrol], a very heavy burden.

A2: While [at the same time], we have a lot of needs and [high living costs] such as [fees] to register our children to schools.

A2: Even, we cannot sleep at night well now.

A3: [It is ok for] Mrs. Stenny because her husband works in construction, but our husbands work as fisherman.

The threat to encounter social exclusion experienced by the Community Patrol members have indirectly impacted on the social life of the Patrol members as well as their professional life. The local community’s strong rejection to the existence of the Community Patrol Members impacted on the effectiveness of the Community Patrol to consistently deliver Conservation messages and education, and to be consistent with the mission as an ‘agent of change’ and as practitioners of the new environmentally- friendly behaviours.

The weaknesses and powerlessness of the Community Patrol Members implies on the ineffectiveness of RARE in conducting program of empowerment. The Community Patrol Members were only equipped with creativity, acceptance, and development of inner potential such as confidence, achievement and respect from other villagers. While, at the same time the Community Patrol Members actually required the provision of employment, social stable relationship and sense of connection with other villagers. As a consequence, the Community Patrol Members were prohibited from conducting their educative roles effectively and the reporting task properly and choose to compromise on community violations.

Most of the Patrol members reported the need to compromise standards of duty and responsibility with community expectations and pressures in order to avoid conflict with the community. The compromises were made in many various ways, stemming from a understanding the cause of the community violation, and so for example distinguishing the dead mangrove woods from the living wood, or even pretending that they did not see any violation happening. The various compromise attitudes showed by the Patrol members can be seen in Table 18.
Table 18 Various compromise attitudes taken by the community patrol members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowed the community to take the dead mangrove wood</td>
<td>1 out of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing the coming of the Joint Patrol operation team</td>
<td>2 out of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed the community to take dead coral</td>
<td>1 out of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conspiracy with the Patrol boat’s operator</td>
<td>1 out of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to understand the needs and reasons of the community</td>
<td>7 out of 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The compromises that showed and made by Community Patrol Members was reported and confirmed by a Patrol Community member, as follows:

Q: How did you handle a violation committed by the village community?
A: Special for the jubi [spear gun] case, I used to tell the Patrol boat operator to ignore the violation happening and if it was only the operator and I. [However], if I Patrolled with other friends [other Patrol members], I used to be pretended that I [consistently enforced the rules]. Meanwhile, I used to keep informing the villagers that [environmental] goodness and benefits of the existence of the Core Zone are [at the end] for community members. At the moment, the number of people is high that lead to increase in the needs of the people including the needs of more fish [as food source] and needs of more livelihoods. As a consequence I cannot be too strict. In the past, people are used to livelihood near the beach, but not now (Community Patrol 2).

The compromises by the Community Patrol members was also confirmed by the Women’s Groups especially in relation to the Joint Patrol that involved the Government Agency, Water Police as well as the Community Patrol members,

A5: My husband was the leader of the [Community] Patrol, so if a Joint Patrol was going to operate, he would let Roberts [the Community Patrol member] knew and let other people [in the village] know that today do not cut the mangrove trees.
A2: Do not you ever try.
So, the Community Patrol would inform the villagers, so no one would be caught and arrested by the Joint Patrol?
A5: There will be information from the local Community Patrol members and also from other village’s Patrol. Before they [the Joint Patrol team from all institutions] go Patrolling, my husband would let the community knows. The Joint Patrol used to use their own speed boat and they are more than 10 people. [They are so many] because they are Joint teams from all [institutions]. So, [the violation] cannot be compromised. So my husband would let Kobe his staff knew [and Kobe will let everyone in the village knew] that ‘it will be your fault if you make something because this time the Joint Patrol will come’. [The difficulties with the Joint Patrolling] are if the Joint Patrol came [and could catch offenders of the Park rules], they would not show any mercy.

The compromises must have been made by the Community Patrol members were also confirmed by the Women’s Group in Buhias and by the Head of Buhias Village:
A: So, what are the impacts of the Patrol work on the loosening relationship of the family and relatives? Are there other examples of the impacts of the Patrol in terms of the harmony of the relationship in the village?

Q: [It was a dilemma] between their task implementation and their relationship [with relatives and families], but Robert [the Patrol member in the village] knows how to control himself in facing and dealing the community’s violation, because [he realized] that he is part of the community and [eventually] he would face the community’s [responses to him]. Everywhere, every time he would see the community’s [violation] he knows how to manage [it well]. [If] he perceived [the violation] as a Patrol [member], [he would properly act as a Patrol], so that he can get praise from the office. However, at the same time, he should deal with the community who are including his own family and relatives. However, Robert is still able to understand [his] family and friends.

The NGO’s ineffectiveness to encourage and build the community capacity seemed inconsistent with a study of Nikkah and Redzuan (2010). In their study of NGO’s roles in developing Sustainable development, the NGO is proposed as making an ideal contribution and role as a Community Capacity Builder, as well as a Micro Finance Facilitator and Self-Reliance Promoter (Nikkah and Redzuan, 2010). The negative responses of the community, and the compromises that ‘forcibly’ had to be made by the Community Patrol members have implications not only the ineffectiveness of the NGO’s contribution to the existence of the Bunaken Park, but also to a need of more and extra efforts by RARE and the Park Agency to strengthen the social dimension of the Park.

The results and findings related to the low level of effectiveness of the RARE program in achieving collective empowerment due to the strong rejection from the surrounding community and social environment, was consistent with the Spectrum of Empowerment designed and proposed by Rissel (1994, p. 43). In his study of empowerment, personal empowerment was only one of the steps towards Collective Social and Political empowerment. In this case, personal development and empowerment of the Community Patrol Member, it appeared that social environment, including social network, can be a support or constraint to the change of personal development. As a consequence, there is no improved personal capacity to encourage the Collective Empowerment, due to the existence of social implication for the individual, especially in terms of personal loss in terms of the declines in social relationships.

However, the negative impacts of social rejection of the Community Patrol that are perceived as a destructive impact were inconsistency with the study by Sadan (1997) about the benefits and advantages of rejection to the Empowered party. In Sadan’s study (1997), the process of Empowerment especially the Individual Empowerment, can be triggered by existence of social rejection.
9.2 Objective 2a: Fit between RARE’s Program and the Institutional Issues

The rejection of the community does not only imply an incapacity of RARE to provide a solution to technical issues of the No-Take Zone, but also an incapacity of the NGO to be able to deal with institutional issues and characteristics such as Top–Down Management and a lack of financial capacity that hindered the Government institute from implementing the Bunaken National Park. The relationship between the Government priorities and needs, and the NGO’s role were clearly seen in incapacity of RARE to provide the required financial provision to the Government Agency to support the Government intended program including alternative provisions for the community. The weaknesses occurred at two levels; incapacity of individual staff and of the institution. Following is a contextualization of the situation and circumstances of RARE’s program and the Government Agency priorities and issues are discussed.

9.2.1 New Capacity and Hierarchical Issues

One of the RARE individual Empowerment programs is a recruitment programme to find one of the Government staff to be a RARE Campaign Manager. However, the results and findings of this study showed that the recruitment program achieved only partial success. Resources provided by RARE’s programme to the Government staff increased the staff individual academic and cognitive capacity. However, at the same time the new capacity of the staff was not automatically followed by institutional capacity and performance improvement.

In other word, the RARE program tended to be comprehensive only at the individual level not at the institutional level of Government. The staff received a scholarship for a Master programme from a university in the USA together with two other selected staff from two Park agencies in Indonesia. As part of the Master programme, the staff obtained skills covering an ability to conduct campaign programmes, and adjustment of the NGO’s empowerment programme with the Bunaken Park Agency, and also conducted surveys of community perception of the Park:

For me personally, I am not a ranger, I am a consultant which is a kind of expert in Conservation, we conducted monitoring, inventory and, collecting data on potentials of the Bunaken National Park, both the natural resources potential including ecosystem and also human potentials, social economy potentials. My roles are like the design interior [in determining the function of the room of the house], [for example] this is the living room, and the other would be used for another [purpose] with the assessment why the living room was placed here because of the sun shine, design. While rangers focus on guarding. In an analogy of a house, the rangers are security.

He also received mentoring from a National and Program Mentor provided by RARE. He had access also to RARE’s Official website to share his experiences as well as discussions with other recipients of the same programme from all over the world (RARE, 2013, Santoso, 2012). The interaction of the new capacity, skills and resources of the staff has led to a significant increase in personal self-esteem and confidence of the given staff.
Q: Can you tell me about your experience when you were studying, how significant did the Programme improve your individual ability?
A: It was very significant. Until now, the knowledge and the experience I obtained [from involvement] in the Program are still applied, one of the places is on the Nain Island. Now we are able to make a survey, both pre-survey and post-survey, for instance, in order to know how is level of community’s knowledge of the Bunaken National Park, because not all community’s members know about the National Park, and we asked questions about the National Park, [for instance], what is the National Park, what is the use of the National Park, how far their knowledge and after an intervention, we would find out, the knowledge of the community about the National Park is only about 50% and we targeted after conducting an activity, it would increase to 80% during a certain period of time, that is why we tried to conduct activities, what the appropriate and needed treatment and after two years, we will conduct a survey again using the same questions such as “do you know” and they say “yes”, [we will find out] whether the result reach the target or tend to decrease, what the reasons, after that we can draw a conclusion this is should be conducted by the Bunaken National Park, stakeholders, what are the influencing factors.

The improvements in the personal knowledge and skills of the given staff were not only recognised by the staff themselves, but also from the co-workers in the same Agency. 3 out of the 5 Government employees admitted that RARE’s Community Empowerment has increased the individual capacity of the given staff of the Agency. Moreover, as a RARE Campaign Manager in the Park area, the staff had legitimacy from the NGO along with from Government Agency to make and build cooperation with the Government institution as a RARE representative (Santoso, 2012).

Despite of the new improvement in the personal capacity and skill of the Government staff, the application of the new capacity of the staff was limited by various financial and hierarchical issues of the Agency itself. The institutional Top-Down approach of the Forestry Ministry and limited professional Authority in the Office were critical issues prohibiting enablement of new capacity, skills and resources from developing up into the organisational level of the Agency.

The personal achievements in staff empowerment were expected to become a trigger in development of the institutional capacity to deal with community expectations toward the Park Agency. However, this was constrained by the low personal and professional positions of the staff in the office. The limited authority in the Office also created high dependence on the ‘top’ and surrounding professional environment in creating relevant policy to support RARE programme. As a result, the given empowered Government employee was limited in creating and enacting a community expectations fulfilment related policy, at the organisational level, as part of implementation of the new skills and knowledge obtained from participation in RARE programme:

Q: Besides provision of new knowledge to you and the community members, How did RARE and Government provide a solution [to the community’s lack of livelihood] as one of the community’s main expectations?
A: It did not depend only on us [the staff]. Personally, I am [just] a Field staff [so could not do anything]. I know in order to fulfil daily needs [for the
community] is so difficult, not mention the small needs. The decision should be made by the Head of Balai [The Park Agency], or at least a Head of section. What we do was just do our best. That is why I beg the community, please [understand] I am nobody. I felt sorry if something one of the community members was arrested in the legal process [due to committing violation]. As a consequence, the offenders have to be back and forth [the office]. [The issue is] if they are a husband, how they could feed their family for long time, for example two offenders of diving compressors use which are arrested for more than two months.

Ignorance of the personal experience of the Government staff that was recruited as RARE Campaign Manager seriously hindered the Policy makers in building an effective Conservation scheme and was inconsistent with guidelines or best practices suggested by Christie and White (2007). Their study of governance of Marine Protected Areas found that direct experiences of the President of the Philippines, Fidel Ramos, as a SCUBA diver benefited the Conservation related Policy making process in the Philippines. This was used by the researchers as an example of how the personal interests and experience will be useful and benefit in improving the governance of a Park.

Limited Authority, also led to limited power to conduct monitoring of the project results, as required by the RARE project due to the lack of willingness of the employer. The authority of the staff was only limited to design the implementation of the RARE programme but not to implement monitoring the programme. The same issues of the limited Authority were an obstacle to encouraging and stimulating other staff to conduct Information Insemination Programmes and Patrol activities that were consistent with the RARE program.

Q: How do you perceive the community’s acceptance and change after Information Insemination conducted?
A: As I said previously, personally, I am not a superman or a superhero. I think [the success of the community change and acceptance to the Park] depends on the individual responsibility of other staff [to continue the insemination], not only me.

The hierarchical issues were not only faced by individual staff but were also experienced by the Bunaken Park Agency in relationship with the Forestry Ministry as the ‘mother/parent institution’ in Jakarta. In the relationship between the Central Government and the Bunaken Park Agency, the Agency was expected to act as an UPT (Unit Pelaksana Teknis- Unit of Technical Operation) developing and designing a program suitable and effective to solve the local issues and challenges in the Bunaken National Park.

However, at the same time, the ‘Top – Down’ approach and hierarchical relationship between the two institutions required the local Agency to act as the ‘child institution’, to obey all dictated by the Ministry in terms of all policies and programmes of the Ministry and left the local Bunaken Park Agency with limited opportunities to participate in the decision and program making process.

All the Unit employees said that there is a requirement for them to implement the formal programme of the Forestry Ministry in Jakarta. However, it required extra resources needed in order to achieve the new policy and were unavailable in the local Agency. One of the leaders of Unit argued that:
The new concept of the Department [the Forest Ministry] is the Community Empowerment alongside Conservation. So we were not wrong if we used to conduct the ‘no, no, no’ policy [in the past] because it was the concept of the Central Government in the moment. However, now the concept of Conservation is changed [by the Ministry]. [We are encouraged] to conduct the Community Empowerment and Park resources management can be enjoyed by the community. However, we are here [on the field] and confused how to implement [the new concept] and how to make the resources can be enjoyed by the community, but still considering the Conservation principle. It is difficult until now (Park Agency Official 1).

The hierarchical issue individually faced by the Park Agency staff in developing and applying the new capacity, and altogether with the strong community rejection of the Park, implies the traditional approach to Park implementation and governance embraced by the Park Agency. The implication of the Park Agency approach to the governance of the Park consisted of the characteristics of traditional governance approaches, as it was theorised by Borrini-Feyerabend (1996). This study, explains that there are three models of Park governance; hierarchical, self-governing and co-governance and the most ideal form is co-governance that actively involved the community in the governance of the Park. However, the traditional form is far from an ideal form of governance involving the community as an important stakeholder in Park governance, as well as other important stakeholders (Jentoft et al., 2007).

The issues of hierarchy of the Bunaken National Park Agency faced by the staff also worsened by ‘sectoral ego’ that embraced by the Park institution and other Government institutions at different areas. The ‘sectoral ego’ related issues constrained the staff from promoting community acceptance by building a good relationship and conducting coordination with regional and provincial Government institutions and the Management Advisory Board of the Bunaken National Park (DPTNB-Dewan Pengelola Taman Nasional Bunaken) as a collaborative body of the Bunaken Park Management. As a consequence, the efforts to fulfil community expectations and needs were not maximised:

[In terms of the success of encouraging community acceptance], this needs not only roles of the BNP [Bunaken National Park] office, but also other parties for example, the local Government, or other stakeholders to support it. However, there are some barriers [to efforts of fulfilling community expectations], for example, ego-sectoral barrier and the change of leader that has a different leadership [style] and policy. [The different priority] led the project back to the zero point. So if I was asked ‘how effective the project is, it would not be effective if [the situation] just like this [changed institutional priority]. The community acceptance is about [gradual] change [process], for example from a smoker to a non-smoker, [so it should be continuous].

The importance of the good relationship between the Park Agency and the Management Board and the impact of the not constructive relationship with the Management Board, were also recognized by the other staff of the Agency. Most of the Government employees and Officials who were interviewed claimed that the authority of the Park belongs to the Agency,
and even accused the Management Board as the cause of the failure of the Agency’s programme.

Since 2012, the Balai [Park Agency] was not the member of the Dewan but later, it is problematic, so we resigned, but I think it is wrong to be the member of the Dewan because we have the Authority while the Authority is the Dewan is belong to the Governor [of North Sulawesi Province where the Park is located] so as the member we could not make a decision, against the Chief while the policy cannot be conducted in the area of the Park.

Conceptually, [the idea of] the Dewan [the Management Board Advisory] is good, so the issue happened in the Bunaken Park could be discussed at the level of local Government. As a consequence, all policy could be synchronised. However, later, they wanted to occupy, dominate and take over our official job description. So, the community most looked for them, and if the community was asked, which one is more well-known, it would be answered: the Dewan. However, basically, the institution with the formal job description related to the Park only is the Balai [Park Agency], because the Dewan is just collection of local fisheries, tourism department, water police and the Balai, while according to the [National] rule that should be conducted and implemented well, [the authority is Park Agency] (Park Agency Official 1).

Lack of good coordination and integration between the local Park Agency and the NGO has indirectly led to ineffectiveness of the RARE program and the Government’s priority at the same time. This issue was also emphasized by Prasertcharoensuk et al. (2010) and Bennet and Dearden (2014). These two studies were conducted in the same country, Thailand, and found that the overlapping jurisdiction and Authority as well as Top-Down approach between one and other Government institutions in the country, has prohibited coordination from being developed. The negative impacts of the Top-Down approach of Government in designing and implementing the Park in the Bunaken Park is also a confirmation of the same issue in the study area of Sowman et al. (2011). In their study in Africa, the approach led to perception of the community, especially fishers, of the restrictions as an unfair and unjust policy (Sowman et al., 2011).

It is clear that the integration and adaptability of the RARE’s program, with the institutional internal issues, has diminished the quality of the partnership between the NGO and the Government Agency. As a consequence, the good governance aspects of the Park, ‘adaptability and integration’ could not be achieved (Bennet and Dearden, 2014).

RARE’s incapacity in dealing with hierarchical and structure related issues are also shown in the level of knowledge of the Government Officials about the detailed implementation program designed by RARE and the Agency. 2 out of 5 Officials interviewed admitted that the details of the programme were not known, and 2 out 5 Officials never heard about RARE but then were able to relate the programme of RARE by relating to the name of staff who became a RARE Campaign Manager. In terms of the effectiveness of the program in supporting the Agency’s priority and program, 2 out of the 5 Officials reported that they did not know of the direct benefits derived from the program to the institution excepting the scholarship provision to one of the staff of the Agency and an interesting and attractive community campaign.
The unproductive and less optimal relationship between an NGO and the Government was also pointed by Islam and Morgan (2012) in a study of NGO potential in Bangladesh. Even though the issue of the relationship not exactly the same as in the Bunaken Park, the less constructive relationship with Government was proved as influencing the NGO’s effectiveness (Islam and Morgan, 2012).

9.2.2 Institutional Funding issues

The second aspect of ineffectiveness of the NGO in dealing with the Park Agency is the incapacity in providing sufficient funding to the Government Agency to conduct an Official programme with priority. The issue of funding has impacted the development of the new capacity of the staff of the Agency, who was also RARE manager, effectiveness and sustainability of the Community Patrol members, fulfilment of the Agency commitment and promises to conduct a Community Empowerment Program.

All Government Officials interviewed in the Agency reported that one of the main problems in the implementation and operation of institutional tasks and duties was the lack of sufficient funding for the Patrol program. Particularly, the Community Patrol members, the provision of additional funding including from the NGO is especially important to guarantee the quality recruitment of Patrol members and to afford the operational costs of the Patrol activities and eventually to guarantee the continuity of the program. Government Officials and the RARE Campaign Manager who was also the one of the Government Officials expressed his concern of this issue, as follows,

*Because we do not have annual budget to conduct the recruitment process and training, we just called them back and expanded their contracts. They have already had experience and already known how to conduct Patrol with us.*

Another Official also shared his concern for the lack of finances in the institution led to resorting to use of this own salary to fund the operational cost and limited him from working optimally,

Q: It is interesting, because you said that you are in charge and you have the Authority, what are the difficulties or challenges in conducting your job?

A: There is no enough operational [funding]. The most significant challenge is the lack of quality modes of marine transport, a fleet and other facilities. As a consequence, we proposed to the central Government to provide a speed boat again. In order to support the Patrol activity, using one or two speed boats is not enough. We have large area of surveillance and our fleet is old already, almost 10 years. So the provision of new boats will be held soon. I talked to NWSA (North Sulawesi Water Sports Association), one of the Managers of the Resort, Kerrie who told me that they (the NWSA) would like to invite the Balai to their forum and discuss how they can help the Balai. This year, there is no gasoline budget for our speed boats; we just took from our wages to help this activity. So, there is no specific and routine budget for the Patrol, if there is a sudden inspection, the budget will be provided. We do not have the gasoline budget. So, Kerrie will talk to the NWSA to provide gasoline but the Balai should provide at least three Patrol boats in the northern area. We need 150L per day and the total budget could reach around Rp. 1 million per day. If the NWSA can work together with us, it will be great because we will not run out of budget. The budget from gasoline will start next year. If the entry fee
can be collected and deposit to the country until Rp 500 million, it will be easier for us to ask for gasoline. So far, the income never goes to the country (Park Agency Official 2).

The impacts of lack of provision of the institutional funding of the Patrol activity were also expressed by the Community Patrol Members. Most of the Community Patrol Members complained about the lack of funding that led to ineffectiveness and even a halt to their work in the community:

_The facilitation availability is not supportive, for example we used only a small engine attached to a large boat, so it only could run slowly and we had to stop frequently. The engine was only at 15 HP (Community Patrol member 1)._  

Eventually, the financial issues not only impacted on the lack of effectiveness of the Patrol Member but also have led to unsustainability of the Patrol activities, as expressed by a Community Patrol Member:

**Q:** Do you mean there is no Patrol member in Buhias?  
**A:** There is a Patrol member, but there is no operation of the Patrol anymore. In my time, I used to go around but now, it is only formality. There is a Patrol but there is no activity anymore, there is no implementation, suddenly they received their wages. So, there is no Patrol activity from 2011 until now. It used to be two representatives of each village and now there is no surveillance.

The other impacts of the financial issues on the Patrolling faced by the Agency are a lack of funding to conduct community education for those who live outside the Park area. A Government Official shared his opinion (Park Agency Official 5).

**Q:** How did the Balai [the Park Agency] deliver the information to the community?  
**A:** In general, the community in the area has known about the prohibition since couple years ago because the Balai keeps conducting information sessions, including the laws. What we have been doing now is to monitor the community outside the area because most of violations were committed by outsiders. Due to the intensive information sessions, the violation by the insiders became less than outsiders’ because in the last case I found the offenders from Budo Village, Sub District of Wori. Generally speaking, the offenders mostly are outsiders (Park Agency Official 2).

The institutional financial problem also impacted on the institutional capacity to fulfil the community expectations and needs through provision of Village Conservation Funds, and also the implementation of a promised Poverty Alleviation Programme, such as Microfinance. The Village Conservation Funding Scheme that was practiced at the beginning of the Park implementation was used as a bartering coin to develop the community support to the Park in the past:
A Park Official confirmed about the unclear issue of the Conservation Village Funding management:

Q: We went to the community and the community asked for the 10 million for the village budget, what do you think about the community expectation?
A: At the beginning, the funding was distributed well, but I do not know what happen later. However, but the personnel was changed so was the policy. The mistake is located in the Perda [Local Rules]. The money was collected from the community so the accountability should be publicly conducted, the Dewan become authoritarian that they cannot be touched or audited, so it depends on them what they will do with the money collected. Because the money sent to them and they were in the Authority to run and manage the money, who can rebuke them? For example, ‘where is the activity?’ where is the money? Nobody dares [to ask].

The provision of the funding was especially expected by the Heads of Village. 2 out of 4 of the Heads of Village emphasized the importance the provision of the funding. However, at the same time, the change in the National rules of the Institutional Agency’s official tasks requires the Agency become the earner institution of the National income (Park Agency Official 3). As a consequence, the Agency Official was thinking and considering how to earn income as much as they can, instead of conducting efforts to gain community support to the Park through the Community Empowerment Programme:

Q: So, how is the mechanism of the management of the entry fee run by the Balai?
A: We send the fund directly, [not use it]. You saw a man with glasses, his name is Jemmy, and he is the treasurer of PNBP (National Non Tax Income). Once, the team returned [from Patrolling], we submit the money to him, in order to submit to the State Treasury (Park Agency Official 4).

The lack of funding of the Agency also impacted on an inconsistent Microfinance scheme as part of the Economic Empowerment Program of the Government Agency was expressed and shared by a Park Agency Official:

Some Community Empowerment Programmes were successful such as on Manado Tua Island and Mantehage. [For example] when the pan stove was trending, we provided pans stove to the community to be rented, and it developed well. On Manado Tua Island [one of the islands in the Park area], we provided [plant]s seeds, and money which we avoided to be used as a capital of Micro Finance. After I evaluated the Micro Finance Program, it is developed well and the community asked me for more finance aid as capital. However, I told the community that I needed to check first the institutional budget availability of the office. [The consistence of budget is important because] if one Group [of the community] succeeded, other Group will have a jealousy [if they do not receive the same scheme] (Park Agency Official 1).
As a consequence of the inconsistent Micro Finance funding availability, the community members, including most of the Heads of Village and Patrol members complained and were dissatisfied with Park Agency. The Head of Buhias Village expressed his complaint to the Park:

However, one of the weaknesses of the Park is lack of the aid to the Conservation to the village that was once happened, but not now. In the past, the waiting room was part of the aid of the Conservation of the Bunaken National Park. More than ten years, it was not provided again. The aid was Rp. 10 million. We received it two or three times. It was promised that there will be a program of ‘Arisan Simpan Pinjam’ [Micro Finance], but it did not happen. When I was conducting a comparison study in Jogja a few years ago, I joined the tourism Group of study, I saw that the contribution of the tourism area to the village around 50%, part here, I have never received such contribution, how can I convince the community to protect the marine area, if there was no benefit for the community even though our area belongs to the tourism destination. In Hong Kong also like that the practice of contribution of the tourism area occurred. Because of the contribution, the villagers willing to clean the village, how the village will be developed [without the willingness of the community]. They just take results [of income], but no giving return [to the village].

The similar complaint about distribution issues of Village Conservation Funding was also shared by the Head of Bango Village, as follows,

At the moment I do not know about that. As I know there was a funding for Conservation of the community but it was only received once, it was Rp. 10 million. That is what the community complained about and told, ‘we tried hard to enact the core zone, and conduct Conservation because there is a reward [for our village]’. As a consequence, we expelled tourists that were diving in the Park. They told us that tourism is one of local foreign exchange’s sources but who would enjoy it? But now the community challenge [the zonation] practice and the community had a reason for it. They [the Park Agency] asked to manage [the Park], but we received [the village funding] only once in almost ten years. That issue we questioned persistently at the community meeting with the Balai [the Park Agency] and the Dewan [the Bunaken National Park Management Advisory Board].

The complexity of the Government Agency including the Top-Down, hierarchical organisation and financial problems implies that more efforts by the NGO were required in empowering the Agency. At the same time, provision of the NGO’s assistance in terms of technical and funding support was not sufficient to provide and enable the Agency to conduct their Conservation agenda, and to achieve community agreement on the Park. The lack of sufficient funding provided by the NGO to the Government Agency was also confirmed by a Patrol member as follows:

Q: Can you tell me about the complaint and input of the community from the follow up?
A: The management of the Park is held by the DPTNB [Management Board] at the moment, there is budget for each region but recently the community contribution has been not distributed well. I think it has been five or six years, the Village Conservation Budget has never been accepted. Every village supposed to accept 10% of entry ticket sells (Community Patrol Member 3).

The community’s doubts and questions about the issue of transparency and equity of the Park Fee management and contribution to the community were also expressed by the community of the Marine Protected Area in the Andaman Sea, Thailand (Bennet and Dearden, 2014). The study conducted by the two researchers found that the perception of the community in the areas was negative to the transparency, equity and fairness aspects of the Park Program including funding allocation (Bennet and Dearden, 2014).

In the case of the RARE’s program to increase the capacity of Park Agency faced difficulties. The difficulties in increasing the institutional capacity were also recognized by Jameson et al. (2002) and Liang et al. (2011). In their research, the incapacity of the Government Agency to provide alternative livelihood to the local people, despite of the institutional recognition of its importance is consistent with the research by Liang et al. (2011). The issue with ineffective roles of the NGO’s program in developing good cooperation, coordination and partnership with the local Park Agency that led to the effective of NGO roles in connecting the Conservation and development by was inconsistent with findings of Brandon and O’Herron (2004). In their studies, Brandon and O’Herron (2004) found that NGOs under the ICDSP project were successful to establish integration with local Government agencies.

NGO incapacity in providing and fulfilling the Government’s need of the increased capacity is broadly consistent with findings of the study of Clark (nd). In his study of a relationship between Government and NGO, he found that one of the main barriers of effective barriers and issues of development healthy relationship is lack of NGO capacity in developing a comprehensive program planning and implementation (Clark, nd), including financial consistence. While at the same time, in the context of establishment of Marine Protected Area, one of the better governance aspects is needed is integration of all aspects including financial provision. The requirement of the consistent funding and other technical assistances such as education in order to achieve the effective MPA governance was also confirmed by the research of Liang et al. (2011) and Christie and White (2007). In this study of best practice of Coral Protected Area Governance, Christie and White (2007) suggested the importance of the consistence funding provision of the Park implementation. While, in China, the issue lack of funding of the Marine Protected Area practitioners also is prominent (Liang et al., 2011).

Another issue related with the institutional financial issue is lack of sustainability of Community Patrol activity. The development of the personal skills and knowledge of Community Patrol members was hindered by the lack of sufficiency of salary. On one hand, the communication skills and marine resource and ecological related knowledge of the Community Patrol members have been increased. On the other hand, economic need issues such as lack of alternative livelihood, insufficient salary and uncertainty of the job status as a Government employee hindering the members from being effective in conducting their duty.

The RARE programme, in the context of the Community Patrol members’ recruitment and education have contributed to an increase in the individual capacity of the members to conduct community organising and mobilising. This study did not specifically research about
how statistically significant was the increase of the members’ knowledge and skills. However, the analysis of results of the interviews showed the increase as acknowledged by the interviewed members of Community Patrol.

The increase in Capacity was shown by an increase in knowledge and self-confidence of the members. 6 out of 7 admitted that the Programme has increased their knowledge, skills, understanding and self-esteem, as well as their capacity to communicate the message of Conservation to their social environment. The increased in the communication skills also led to an increase in their individual confidence. Most of the Patrol members reported that they are confident not only to initiate, but also to create alternative ways of communication with the community. The Patrol members, by their own developed and employed their own creation and innovation of communication methods that are really locally contextually appropriated, such as the employment of jokes and analogy and making themselves as a role model, or an example to the community:

Q: How did you convince the community to accept the Zonation Scheme?
A: In the past, we were used to be fishermen [so we understand the fishermen’ perspectives and preferences of approach]. We used jokes, and letting the people know slowly and easily. The purpose [of conducting the informal way] is to inform [nicely] the community about the reason why we cannot catch certain types of fish (Community Patrol member 2).

The initiatives and creativity of the Patrol members also accompanied with the increase in the confidence and commitment to conduct law enforcement. Most of the Patrol members expressed their confidence to make a call to the community members caught committing violations in the Park, communication with the Village Authority regarding the violation incidents, and also to conduct the law enforcement to the prominent local leaders.

Q: What are the benefits you received in terms of knowledge and skills after you joined the Patrol teams.
A: Experiences on the fields, ways to supervise on the field and deal with findings. How we will handle [the cases], they are experiences, [when] it comes to Government and the community, I joined the team so I have already had experiences (Community Patrol 5).

As a consequence, the Patrol members’ initiative, creativity and commitment in conducting community mobilisation and organising are likely leading to recognition of the community on the leadership capacity of the Patrol members. A few former Patrol members have even been elected by the community to be village leaders.

However, as well as other Government programs, the financial issue also became a major issue in the sustainability of the Community Patrol program. Insufficient salary and poverty are the main hindrances halting further development of their improved capacity and skills. The new communication skills are most likely not enough to maintain the commitment of the Community Patrol Members. The complimentary facility to the new skills in terms of provision of economic needs is required. 1 out 7 reported that the salary is just “padamu negeri” (our dedication and contribution to the country), 4 out 7 Patrol members reported that the salary they received are ‘just enough for survival’, while the rest said that it is not enough when the needs of the family increased, such as the children growing up and needing more money, and decided to resign from the membership:
Q: Why did you resign from being a Community Patrol Member?
A: [It was] two of us were recruited, but I was not determined because I thought the system [of salary payment] was not good anymore [especially] when my child was attending the university. So I need more money and I moved to different jobs. I wish both the Balai (the Bunaken National Park Agency) and the Dewan (the Management Advisory Board) [to activate] again the Patrol, because the situation is ignored now.

The second issue that is related to the economic and livelihood issue of the Community Patrol Members is related to the guarantee from the Park and the NGO of the changing status from a Volunteer to a Permanent employee of the Government Agency. 3 out of 7 Patrol members questioned about the potential of changed job status to increase to becoming a Government employee. The issues of economic incapacity of the members were worsened also by the changes of the salary payment system and ultimately the halt of the programme due to institutional changes that is in charge of managing ticket funding. As a consequence, the initiative of the Patrol members are influential and significant because the approach of communication conducted by the members was perceived by the community as an alternative to the formal communication conducted by Government.

Lack of offered RARE’s compensation showed by the NGO has other implications on the completeness of the RARE Education Campaign program, especially for the Community Patrol Members. The increase in personal capacity was not necessarily followed by an increase in capacity of changing the surrounding community behaviours. The issues of the lack knowledge and skills are recognised as well as other aspects that called “barriers” such as destructive fishing practice, violation to the No-Take Zone function, lack of village rules, lack of human resources of Community Patrol in terms of knowledge and skills, lack of funding to respond to violation and the expensiveness of the investigations (Santoso, 2012). However, the economic capacity requirement and needs are not recognised as prioritised barriers and the strategies of the “barrier removal efforts” of the RARE’s community empowerment such as setting of the effective buoyance of the No-Take Zone, enactment of the standard operation procedures of Community Patrol and the agreement at the village level of the law enforcement of the No-Take Zone violation (Santoso, 2012).

The inactiveness and ineffectiveness of the Community Patrol Member, the community member and the Agency staff to exercise their new capacity did not align with the ideal definition of empowerment by Atack (2009). The empowerment process was defined as an enabling process and providing power process (Atack, 2009). Based on the study of empowerment by Atack (2009) Empowerment effort should lead to self-reliance and self-help creation of the Empowered party.

9.3 Objective 2b: Fit between the Program and Social Expectations

Beside inapplicability of RARE’s Empowerment program with the Government context, another context needed to be considered relates to social expectations. Due to the lack of effective solution offered by RARE’s programme and the Government Agency, the expected consensus creation about the implication of the No-Take Zone, and legal and social consequences of the rules appeared unachieved, and also the community rejection to the Park scheme seemed worsened. There are two unfulfilled community expectations that will be discussed later; lack of the alternative livelihood provision and lack of a diversification
scheme as part of compensation to the community for loss of access to the Park in general and the No-Take Zone area.

9.3.1 Lack of Compensation for the Community Loss

The study has given a voice to the community to express its concerns, and found that the different Groups of participants within the community largely expressed the same concern about the community loss of access to make livelihood and to provide food for the family. Lack of the compensations for the community loss in terms of provision alternative livelihoods and resources has become one of the significant problems for community about the Park practitioners including RARE and the Park Authority. The Park practitioners, including the RARE program were unable to provide an alternative to the basic needs of the community. As a result, most of the community members including Women’s Group participants, complained about the lack of the alternative livelihood and other compensations scheme offered by the Government Agency and the RARE program.

The ineffectiveness of the RARE program in dealing with local community’s expectations seemed divided into two main aspects, lack of RARE quality discernment about the community basic needs and also incapacity to fulfil basic needs. In terms of the unfitness of the NGO’s approach in a poor country might lead to the question of the fitness of the NGO’s definition and understanding of the community’s most important and basic needs, compared to the NGO’s efforts, offers and solutions.

The NGO’s Empowerment program was provided in the form of self-actualization including development of inner potential, understanding and acceptance of the fact of the negative impacts of the illegal and destructive fishing ways and methods on the next generation’s benefits, and also encouraging spontaneity in reporting violations of the Park. While, at the same time, the community was still struggling with the lower hierarchy of needs such as status and success and even much lower needs such as provision of food, water, shelter, family and social stability and employment. As a consequence, the solutions were provided is not appropriate and too early or premature considering the issue of the local community’s basic needs. As a consequence, the efforts of empowerment of the NGO tended to be unable to satisfy the real needs of community. The differences between capacity needed by the community and offered by the NGO can be seen in Table 19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group of community</th>
<th>Community needs</th>
<th>NGO’s empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic alternative</td>
<td>Resource alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Group members</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Villages</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol members</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ignorance of community of the RARE’s community education and pride campaign program and the persistent existence of the community demand and expectation of alternative livelihood and food availability may be understood further in terms of Maslow’s hierarchical needs (Maslow, 1943). In the hierarchical needs of Maslow, people tend to satisfied the lower level needs and then consider the higher level in this case self - esteem. The similar issues found by Tosun (2000). In the study of the community participation in the developing countries, especially in tourism development, the community struggle with the basic needs is a one of the main issue of the community participation in the scheme (Tosun, 2000). Moreover, the existence of the Bunaken Park since 1991 in the area has showed that there is no improvement of the poverty situation in the area. Evidence of persistent poverty requiring provision of the community’s alternative livelihood was also supported by the Badan Pusat Statistic (BPS- Statistics Central Bureau). Based on the bureau’s data, more than half people in the area of the Park, especially people on Mantehage and Nain Island are poor and there were no significant changes in the level of the poverty of the area during the last several years (BPS, 2005). Most of the people live in the Park including people on Mantehage Island and Nain Island live under the poverty line, with an average income per month of Rp. 500.000,- (or around $US 53) per month (BTNB, 2011).

The inappropriateness of the NGO priority with the community priority might have been worsened by the issues of the incapacity of the RARE’s program in fulfilling the community expectation of provision of compensation of community loss due to the Park existence.

20 out of 20 participants of Women’s Groups reported that the Park existence has negative impacts on the community livelihood by leading to the limitation of the access of making livelihood and marine resource use. While, 9 out of 20 of the participants of the Women’s Group Discussions admitted that the Park existence has forced their husband leaving the family and going to the city to look for the alternative job. Most of the Patrol members convinced that the Park rules have somehow had negative implication on the local people especially the fishermen livelihood. The subsistence livelihood highly depends on the marine resource, and uses include hunting, collecting, poaching, harvesting shells and mangrove wood was also confirmed by a report of the Park Agency (BTNB, 2011). Traditional uses of fishery gear such as the ‘jubi’ (traditional spear gun) and, ‘patok tanam’ (fish trap), besides fishing and netting are widely practiced (Balai, 2011). Community’s violations of the Bunaken Park in the two islands are dominated by mangrove area deforestation, and coral and sand mining (BTNB, 2011).

As a consequence of the high dependence on resources, 4 out of 4 Heads of Villages and most of the Women’s Group Discussions members and the Patrol members pointed the community losing issues as one of the most urgent issues in the community facing and at the hindering the community from supporting the Park existence.

Q: How was the alternative livelihood provided?
A: I have questioned [about the issue of the provision of alternative livelihood for community since 2013], [when] we had a meeting and I argued [to the Park Authority that] the community said that if they (Park authorities) want to prohibit us [the community] from using the resources in the area, they supposed to provide [the community] a replacement, for example boats, [and] nets like in Nain where a fishing Group have been formed [and received the new gear]. So, we will not destroy the coral, but [if] we will have to go to the
deep [and far] sea, or [please] provide us tuna boats-fibre boats [that is able to go far], so we will not go fishing in the near coastal area. The only support [the community received] was only from the Fisheries Department [not form the Park Authority].

A woman Group in Nain discussed about their expectation of alternative to the banned access to their livelihood,

Q: Why do you disagree with the Bunaken Park?
A3: Because [fishing] is the only livelihood of our husband and nothing else.
A4: If there is a zone, [we] are not allowed to make seaweed line.
A1: Even, just we are not allowed to pass the zone.
A2: Because there is a border of every area, [as a consequence] we cannot earn extra money,
A3: [Even], we cannot pass the [closed] area.

The significance of the negative impacts of the community loss due to the Park was clearly seen in the Women’s participations and activeness in the Group Discussion of the Women. The Women who are a housewife and a wife of subsistence fishermen depending on the marine resource poaching, collecting and hunting activities were likely less supportive to the Park area initiatives. The members of the Discussions with the characteristics of background were more likely to be quite and less active during the Discussion. Even, for certain and specific topics, such as zonation, violation to the Park rules and restriction, and arresting impacts, the Women tend to be looking down and looked with concern expressions. The Women activeness and supports to the Park is illustrated in Table 20.

Table 20 Women's activeness and supports to the park in the focus group discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>The most supportive members</th>
<th>The most unsupportive member (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tinongko</td>
<td>5 members; young Women and mothers 30-early 40s.</td>
<td>The teacher who is the coordinator of RARE's Women workshop activity of banana chips.</td>
<td>Housewife, wife of coral and sand miners,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bango</td>
<td>5 members; late 30s- 60s.</td>
<td>The former Head of Village and the wife of the current Head of Village, a mother of a Community Patrol Member.</td>
<td>Housewife, wife of coral and sand miners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nain</td>
<td>6 members; late 20s – 50s.</td>
<td>The Minister of the Church who is an outsider and a wife of a builder, the university</td>
<td>Housewife, wife of fishermen, wife of a <em>boboca</em> [squid] hunter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not only Women’s Group participants complained about the lack of compensations to the community loss, but also Community Patrol Members who are claimed as the agent of the change by the RARE’s program and also the Head of Village that acted as community representatives prevision and requiring the same issues. 4 out of 4 Heads of Village stated that the village leaders have to face the issue of the lack of the alternative livelihood and livelihood diversification as significant barriers of the villager to embrace the Park Conservation mechanism. The complaints were expressed by Head of Buhias village:

So, I think the Park should have made rules that harmless the villagers, they supposed to make a rules benefiting the community. I told [to the Park Authority], ‘you conserve corals, not conserve the people, and so just are careful with the implementation of the rules. If we are prohibited, so, where we are going to? How about our daily live?’ (Head of Bango Village)

The similar complaint was expressed also by a colleague of the Head of Buhias Village, the Head of Bango Village as follows,

Sand and stone [should be brought] from Manado that cost us per one dump truck of [sand] with capacity around 3-4 cubic costs us Rp. 400,000 - Rp. 500,000 ($AU 40-50). The transportation is [even] more expensive, for 3-4 cubic of sand takes around Rp. 300,000 per sack and [transportation fee] per sack is around Rp. 6,000, it takes around Rp. 1.8 million for transportation, the expenses increased to more by 2 million. Not mention, the transportation fee from the beach to our house, it takes Rp. 2,000 per sack. If we would buy bricks in the store [in the mainland], it costs us Rp. 2,500 each and Rp. 1,500 each hiring a boat. So, if you want to build a [decent] house in Mantehage, it should be prepared and counted carefully, the comparison cost between the mainland and the island cost is one and two (Head of Buhias Village).

The same expectation also shared and added by another Head of Village:

[The problem] is the local community are difficult to earn something to eat, even to walk pass the nyare [intertidal] through that way is forbidden because it will destroy the coral, especially when the community to collect bia (green and gold mouth turban) and it requires the collector to step on the corals and the coral will be broken, it is prohibited. If we obeyed that rule while the practice of eating bia is part of local cultures, it cannot be avoid because collecting bia is conducted not by diving but when low tide. It means we could not avoid stepping on the nyare. If we prohibited the community is as same as we killed the community. We supposed to feed the community because it was their livelihood. That is why the rules are against the culture of the community, the cultures such as catching and eating fish and shooting fish (Head of Buhias Village).
The compensation required by the Head of Village related to the livelihood issue of the community is diversification of the fishing gear and fleet

How was the alternative livelihood provided by the Park Authority?
[No], I have asked in 2013, we had a meeting and I argued the community said that if they want to prohibit us from using the area, they supposed to provide change, for example boats and nets like in Nain where a fishermen Group has been formed. So, we will not destroy the coral but we will go to the deep sea, or [please] provide tuna boats made of fibber, so we will not go fishing in the near area. The only supports were only from the Fisheries Department [not from the Park Authority] (Head of Buhias Village).

Due to the significance of the issues, the Heads of Village had to conduct various ways from contacting the Head of Sub District- their supervisions for asking a job opportunity to the villagers to begging of apology on behalf of the community.

I heard you said that you tried to find an alternative job for your community? How did you convince the local people that there is a better job while it was a habit on the sea?
To be a leader, someone should be smart [and initiative]. When there is a meeting of Head of Village outside the village, it became an opportunity to ask to other Head of Village if there is a job opportunity in their areas, such as carpenter, farming, so we exchange numbers if there is a job vacancy we would inform one another so if we stop someone from their previous forbidden job, they would not be stressful, especially if they had a child whom was going to school, we would have an alternative, by communication with other leaders or even with the Head of sub district , “Pak Camat [Head of sub district], this is a very difficult and urgent situation that the community needs a job, did you heard about information about the job vacancy”

The community’s requirement of the provision of alternative livelihood as a compensation to the loss to access to fish was explained by a member of Patrol, as follows

Q: Can you tell me more about the problem with the fishermen?
A: The problem is [the ban of No- Take Zone] directly related and impacted to their livelihood, including collection sand and stone. As a consequence, we became an enemy, the issue is what they wanted to do is [contrast to] our interest and goal. There were challenges [dealing with the issue]. I also had received swearing of the community. A couple years ago, at the very first beginning [of the ban], when the production of mangrove logs was still on, we were the first party who eradicated the practice which was worsening and even the community chased after us using swords, because their interests and livelihood to produce mangrove logs were prohibited. However, we were consistent with the Water Police and the Balai that joint altogether in that time [to ban the practice] (Community Patrol 5).

Q: How was the alternative livelihood of mangrove cutting ban provided by RARE and the Balai?
A: [No, there was no specific provision]. I discussed [many times about the issue of lack of livelihood alternative] with Mas Pandu [the Park Agency staff], I
questioned again [and again] about the ban’s [implication on the community livelihood]. I kept suggesting [the Park] to provide an alternative livelihood, including to encourage the community to conduct sero (set net), using lira [rope] (Community Patrol 2).

The lack satisfaction of the community towards the RARE’s programme and the Agency also showed in the low satisfaction on the meeting quality is relatively low. Most of the Women’s Group Discussions, and even all Heads of Village expressed their disappointments and concerns about how they voice was not heard properly by the Park Authority and RARE in the Park’s rules decision making process, the No-Take Zone related rules. The effectiveness of the community meeting conducted by RARE. However, the various forms of the community negative attitudes towards the Park are sufficient evidence to show the less effectiveness NGO roles and lack of willingness to listen the community.

All of the Heads of Village also stated that the leaders used the formal meeting with the Park Agency and the RARE’s campaign manager as an opportunity to remind about the importance of the alternative livelihood of the community in addition to the efforts of looking for job opportunity to the villager:

Every time I attended [a community meeting], the meeting holder [the Park Agency and RARE] looked panic. For example a meeting conducted by the Joint team consisted of the Balai, water police, the DPTNB, after the meeting, I have never seen them again. At the meeting, it seems that the team was overwhelmed in providing solution when the community member told them “Sir, we will not take sand and coral again if you provide the alternative, as well mangrove”. They were just lay people but they asked according to their needs.

In terms of the quality of the community meeting, inclusion of the community members at the meetings was not the issue. All interviewed Heads of Village and most of the Women’s Groups members stated that all villagers were invited at the meeting. However, for the participants of the community meeting, the issue did not relate to their involvement at the meeting, but at how they opinions, concern of alternative livelihood and resources as the consequence of the Park rules were accommodated and discussed. Instead of the success in building consensus among the community members, the meeting ended up a chaotic and problematic and disputing situation between the ‘knowledgeable and non-knowledgeable Groups’.

Differences in attitudes toward the Park and Park’s rules including the No-Take Zone between the pro Park Group that refers themselves as the knowledgeable that implicitly referred the against Park Group as ‘the non-knowledgeable Group occurred. Furthermore, the acceptance of the pro No-Take Zone scheme was negatively used as a symbol and mean of accusing and undermining other people who against the scheme. As a consequence, the social conflict that already exists in the community was widened with RARE’s community empowerment programme.

Q: What the response you received about your complaint of the Park rules at the community meeting?
A2: They [Park Authority and RARE] answered that there are alternatives of livelihood available, and the bans benefits the future generation because the
bombing and potassium use will destroy corals. We were suggested that we need to consider our next generation.

A1. [Yes,] we could destroy the corals.
A2: Our children could enjoy for the next 20 years, but with the situation like now, the coral will finish very soon.

How about your opinion with their explanation?

A3: We received it.
A4: We acknowledged it.

A2: [However], for other villagers who have a low quality human resource, the explanation was rejected. They argued “so, do you ask us to steal?” and “how our husband will feed us?” Some of them use high tones in arguing, while some of them walked out. Then the meeting speaker said that there are a lot of other alternatives, while the compressor use is widely recognised forbidden, just like potassium and poisoning. While, fishing, angle, netting, tuna fishing, and hundreds and even thousand pajeko [wood fishing] boats [are allowed] because they do not commit exploitative fishing. That is what the Balai [the Bunaken Park Agency] always argues.

The results of my study of the needs of a comprehensive approach including a combination of all economic and social strategies and other important aspects in encouraging the community empowerment is important and encouraged by the Marine Protected Areas practitioners was consistent with findings of the study of Bennet and Dearden (2014). The studies of Bennet and Dearden (2014) showed that the negative community perception happened due to lack of supporting livelihood for the people.

Align with the findings of Jones (2014) and Jones et al. (2013), the ignorance of the complexity issues and situation in the Marine Protected Area including the social economic issues and institutional issues impeded the success of intervention and effort to achieve the Conservation aims of the Marine Protected Area (Agardy et al., 2003). Moreover, the community expectation itself is a one of critical guarantees the Park effectiveness and act as a fulfilment of the guidelines of activeness of the community participation. Violation to the ‘guidelines of the community expectation implies the violation of the community’s ideal world of the Park existence (Song et al., 2013; Voyer et al., 2015).

However, the finding of Agardy et al. (2003); Jones (2014) and Jones et al. (2013) of importance of economic alternative livelihood as a key issue was contrast to the findings of Mwaipopo (2008). In another case study conducted by Mwaipopo (2008) in Tanzania, Africa showed that availability of alternative livelihood to the community itself was not sufficient to encourage people to substitute and replace of the fishing activity with the new livelihood as long as the new livelihood cannot provide as same high income as that from fishing activities. Despite of the fulfilment of demand of the community of the provision alternative as a coin of change of the destruction attitude and shifting the fisheries related livelihood with other alternative livelihood has not been achieved in the site. Moreover, the strong influence of poverty on the increase and use of the destructive gear by poor fishers were against research result by Cinner (2010). In his study about correlation between poverty and destructive gear practice in east Africa, he found that the young poorer fishers are likely to use the forbidden gear.

Lack of compensation and ignorance of social dimension of the Park has influenced and led to the lack of community acceptance and effectiveness of the marine Park is consisted with
result of research of Ya et al. (2013). As a consequence, understanding of the community’s needs and values are important to make sure the unnecessary negative social implications can be minimised or avoided (Tonioli and Agar, 2009; Voyer et al., 2014; Ya et al., 2013). The recognition of the community and the people rights at the same time is also the heart or principle of the community governance Jentoft et al. (2012). Moreover, the lack of fulfilment the economic related demand of the community, the governance of the Park also cannot achieve and fulfil five important governance aspects proposed by Jones (2014) and Jones et al. (2013), especially the economic aspects. In his study of the importance of compensation of community loss, Jones (2014) found that lack of compensation to the community loss also has impacted on the governance of Marine Protected Area as well as social justice and existence of economic incentives are necessary as well as legal, knowledge, interpretative incentives (Jones, et al., 2013). The importance of provision of the compensation of the individual losses and societal welfare due to environmental Conservation and protection schemes is also emphasised by many authors such as Charles and Wilson, 2008; Hattam et al., 2014; Jones, 2009; Mascia, 2004; Pomeroy et al., 2006; Voyer et al., 2014.

Furthermore, RARE’s limitation in providing alternative livelihood, as it was needed by the local people, is mirrored in the study results of Islam and Morgan (2012). In the study of Islam and Morgan (2012) of the potentials of NGO’s roles in empowering local people in Bangladesh, the NGOs under the study showed incapacity to provide sufficient intervention that was expected have been able to deal with the poverty. Especially in developing countries like Indonesia where poverty is one of the social enemies, the economic empowerment is an absolute feature in order to achieve Conservation goal (Tobey and Torell, 2006). Lack of anticipation of the Park advocates especially to the Non - Take Zone scheme advocates of the socio economic impacts is also reported by Jones, 2009; Tonioli and Agar, 2009.

9.4 Objective 3: Social Relationships between Government, RARE and community

9.4.1 The Impacts on the Community's Intrapersonal Relationship

The second issue with the impacts of ignorance of the RARE’s program for compensation of the community loss on the social life of the community. The lack of alternative of livelihood provision not only impacted economically on the community but also in relationships and the psychological dimensions of the community. These took places individually as well as collectively.

One of the impacts is the negative influence on the family structure and function. Instead of experiencing empowerment, the community members, especially heads of households experienced disempowerment. The issue of lack of livelihood forced the heads of family to leave their families to look for jobs in the city. These fathers experienced guilt feeling in leaving the family behind for months for a job that was sometimes uncertain. A former Patrol member, household head, and also a village Government official shared his story and experience as follows:

Q: However, the changes of livelihood led to the separation of family, how do you think the impact of the separation on the family relationship based on your personal experience?

A: [I think] it [the impact of separation] is normal, but it depends on the individual. It is a common problem, but it is not accepted. Based on my own
experience, I felt sorry [and concerned] when I left my wife and children. What they would eat? How they would fulfil their needs when I was away for months. Especially, when my employer feed me with gourmet food such as meat, I was [more] concerned with my family’s survival.

The negative personal and psychological impacts of RARE’s community campaign programme also were also experienced by the fathers who preferred to stay on the island. These fathers were faced with a severe insecure feeling issue. During the first phase of the research, more than 85% of the candidates of household survey participants, who basically were the fathers, at the beginning of the survey strongly refused and rejected to involve in the survey feelings of personal insecurity and suspicious beliefs. Instead of willing to meet directly the researcher by themselves, the fathers asked and ordered their daughters and or wife to meet the researcher, while they hid themselves in the bed room. Once they overheard that the purpose of the researcher to conduct a study about the community perceptions of the Bunaken National Park, and not to investigate the case of the past violation of the Park might be committed by them, they then went out from their hiding place and joined the interview.

The issues of feelings of incapacity and insecurity of the fathers and heads of household have indirectly led to the incapacity of mother as the active and supporting partners as well. As an individual, the Women recognised the effectiveness of the RARE’s campaign programme in increasing their knowledge and understanding. The increase in marine and ecological knowledge was expressed with ability to explain the ecological importance of the protected habitats, such as coral, sand and mangrove were shown by the Women’s Group members. However, as wives, they were unavoidably forced to be the main decision makers, something that they were not used to and prepared for as a consequence of their absent husband. They also acted as single parents while their husband worked in the city. The Women responses are illustrated in Table 21:

- Q: What is the problem which emerged due to the long distance relationship?
- A2: I miss and feel [envy] every time I see a couple walk together
- A3: I feel envy to see other people walk with their spouse, while I walk alone and I need to face all problems at home on my own.

The family separation was not only impacted on the Women as mother, but also as wives. The separation led to the undermining of the quality of the relationship between wives and the husbands. 7 out of 9 Women in the Group Discussions whose husband were working outside the village admitted that the long distance relationship impacted quality of their relationship in many ways, namely anxiety for the security of the husband (4 out of 9), missing feelings of togetherness (3 out of 9), loneliness (1 out of 9), having extra responsibility as a single parent (1 out of 9) and children complaining (1 out of 9).

Table 21 Women's negative responses on the impacts on the family relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feelings</th>
<th>Villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buhias (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worry/anxiety</td>
<td>1 out 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jealous</td>
<td>2 out 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The community disempowerment through absent father and weakened mothers/ wife is evidence of the negative and indirect impacts of the community participation in the Bunaken National Park in general and community participation in the RARE programme specifically. While at the same time lack of available alternative resources is required to complement the obtained knowledge and understanding. The obligation for the local people to bear the cultural and economic cost of the implementation of the Park, for the wider gain, has harmed the equity aspects of social justice of the Park scheme.

The lack of compensation of the community both societal and individual loss due to the imposing of the Bunaken National Park has implied the effectiveness of the NGO and the marine Park Agency to ensure the social justice were taken account into the Bunaken Park implementation in generally and in the NGO’s role specifically.

As a consequence, in order to increase the community acceptability towards the Bunaken Park, compensation for both individual and societal loss should have been provided. The lack of the compensation has two implications. First the NGO was incapable and showed insensitivity. The lack of the anticipation of the social economic impacts of the Park on the community and also anticipation of the social economic impacts of the community participation are probably caused by the two aspects of the NGO’s effectiveness.

A member of Women Focus Group Discussion in Nain Village commented on the issue as follows:

*If you see the houses in the village, many houses are nice but empty because the houses were left by the owner to work in the city. We just came to the village after a few weeks, even months. We had nothing to do here. So we had to build another house in the city.*

The implementation of the RARE community empowerment program required active involvement of the Heads of Village. However, due to lack of alternative livelihood the involvement of the Heads of Village in the programme led to negative consequences on the community recognition of the given leaders’ legitimacy, capacity and Authority. Incapacity of the programme to provide alternative livelihood to the community has led to emergence of questions and doubts from their own community about the leaders’ capacity to guarantee and provide for the community’s basic needs. 4 out of 4 Heads of Village were complaint that their power and Authority as leader was significantly and deeply questioned by their villagers due to these issues.

*You imagined, I faced [dilemma], on 17 August celebration, when every villager was asked to make a fence, and asked for a permit to cut mangroves. If I did not allow, they would be reasoning, “If someone asked why you did not fix the fence”,*
they would answer, “Because Opo [Head of Village] did not allow us to cut the mangrove”, I was confused.

One of the Heads of Village in Tinongko even had to apologise for the violation committed by his villagers in order to avoid punishment and legal implications on the villagers.

As the Father of the village, I had an obligation to protect my people’s [dignity]. When one of them was caught red handed committing a violation, I did not reluctant and doubt to ask for an apology from the Park Agency staff and ask for their understanding with my people [poor] situation’.

Lack of community recognition and rejection of the Head of Village as the indirect consequence of RARE’s programme implementation was expressed and confirmed by community members. The community rejected to participate in the survey because it was argued that the community programme just for the family and relatives of the Head of Village. The diminishing position of the heads of the village can be seen in Table 22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buhias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father of the village</td>
<td>Nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of the Church</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of the Sea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The social conflict as a consequence of the relationship between the community and the Bunaken Park implementation in forms of the disharmony situation in the community implied the insensitivity of the RARE’s programme in recognising the social values and in anticipating the social negative impacts that would be indirectly brought by the Park scheme.

The other implication of the lack of commitment is also the harm to social bonds and a betrayal by the other villagers. As a consequence, the social balance was harmed and the quality of the relationship with other villagers in terms of the strengths of the bound (Peterson, 2014). RARE has changed the community somehow by loosening the strength of the community’s capacity. This violation of value not only led to weakened of the community value but also created a stumbling block to the community acceptability. In other words, RARE cannot escape from the consideration of the community value implication on their program. Ignoring one of the values leads to losing the chance and potential to be successful and also at the same time, increasing the risk of failure. The NGO efforts to translate global conservation interests into the local practice require the anticipation and consideration of multi and complex community values.

The other of unavoidable impacts of RARE’s lack of compensation for the community loss is new horizontal conflicts which occurred at the various levels such as island, village, clan and
individual levels. At the societal level, the conflicts and dispute between two Groups of community took place when the community from other villages and islands came to the cultural territory of a village where the resources were still abundant to exploit marine resources, for example the conflict between the Mantehage Islanders and the Nain Islanders over fishing resources near Mantehage Island. The Mantehage Islanders protested the Nainers fishermen were coming to the Mantehage water to conduct fishing. Because of running out of fish resources, they moved their ground from the coastal area to the area that was closer to the coastal area of Mantehage Island. Even though this trend somehow was perceived positively by the Field Manager as a ‘good lesson’ for the Nainers to accept the Conservation policy, the conflicts between the inhabitants of the two islands were unavoidable and even extensive. The Head of the Bango Island emphasised the issue of conflict between Bango Villagers and the Nain Islanders:

*It is an issue now between Nain people and Mantehage people, of whom the majority are fishermen is over the same fishing ground. The Nainers moved their fishing ground to an area near Mantehage Island’s [fishing ground]. [Even], the Nain islanders have built houses along the mangrove strip in Mantehage and stayed there, and the number of houses increases. We have invited the Head of Village to discuss about the issue.*

The existence of the community horizontal conflicts have consequences for the effectiveness of RARE’s community empowerment programme, through the insensitivity of the NGO. The conflicts over the resources imply the lack of good relationships between the social, economic and institutional aspects in the Marine Protected Area. Consideration of the community cost of the Park should have been recognised in the program implementation as well as the community benefits. Ignorance of the aspect of the social and environmental justice has led to a weakened Marine Protected Area. As a consequence, horizontal conflicts also took place at the internal level or scope of village especially between two Groups of relatives. Based on the personal experience of the Head of Buhias Bango, his arrest due to making his livelihood as a fisherman was leading to a conflict between two clans and families.

*In that time* I was not upset [with the arresting], but my relatives were. Instead, the Head of Tinongko village kept writing letters calling me [to his office]. [As a consequence], my relatives were so angry and intended to block the Head of Village from coming to this village. I was afraid it would be a [violent] conflict [between my relatives and his].

The last level of the community conflict is at the individual level. Loss of tenure and access should be anticipated as negative consequences of the Park existence by the Park practitioners including RARE. Human related goals such as poverty alleviation and community empowerment are required as well as the Conservation and biological related goals. The importance of the consideration of socio economic impacts of the marine Park on the community is also confirmed by Richmond and Kotowicz (2015), especially for a community which has a long story of settlement and has a strong emotional relationships and attachments with the place. The limitation and lack of alternative access leads to conflict between two individuals:
My [current village] secretary was a [community] Patrol [members] before I was elected as the Head of Village. [When] I just was about to be the Head of Village, I brought my crews shooting at the Park area, and the Patrol caught us and inspected our boats. After they investigated us, and they did not find anything [wrong]. I told them, I just was using Jubi [the traditional spear gun]. At the time, we did not catch any fish but the secretary reported my case to the Head of Village of Tangkasi who became angry. I [became upset] I told them, I did not catch any fish and [I threatened] the secretary and the other Patrol member from the Bango village them ‘I would shoot you using the Jubi [the traditional spear gun]’. At eight o’clock we were called by the former Head of Village. I told him, ‘why I should be called, did I commit a rape or a murder, so you called me at 8 clock pm?’

As a result, the emergence of new conflicts and ignorance of the RARE program and Park Authority to the conflict and disputes in the community implies to an incapacity issue of the NGO’s to conduct effective improvement, especially community empowerment efforts. The issue was inconsistent and even contrary with the findings of the research conducted by Añabieza et al., (2010), and Plummer and Fennell (2009) showing that NGOs are effective and useful in the mediating conflicts and bridging differences in the community. Lack of alternative livelihoods impacted on emergence of community conflict in the Bunaken Park is similar to the results of study conducted by Bennet and Dearden (2014). The study of the community perception that was conducted in a Marine Protected Area in the Andaman Sea, Thailand, found that potential loss of community to fish access and harvest had led to depleted food security and hence the wellbeing of the community as well as increased new conflicts. Lack of economic empowerment as complementary to other aspects or type of empowerment such as political empowerment also was suggested by (Scheyvens, 1999).

The negative impacts of the Marine Protected Area on the local community in the Bunaken Park case include social changes, increased human migration and other potential issues such as increased user conflict, lack of alternative income and livelihood as social costs of Par scheme are consistent with research of Hatam et al. (2014). In their research the social impacts of the interaction of Marine Protected Areas and the community, individual loss and societal loss are unavoidable consequences of Marine Protected Areas existence (Hattam et al., 2014). The results of the research also did not align with the ideal conditions of Marine Protected Area establishment and implementation as suggested by Pomeroy (2010). In his book, Pomeroy (2010) suggested that in order to achieve optimal a Marine Protected Area, social impacts should be considered in process the establishment and implementing of a Marine Protected Area.

9.4.2 Community Denial and Rejection of the Bunaken Park

RARE’s insensitivity to the community values suggested and expressed in the form of the implementation of the individual pride value of becoming a whistle blower. This is contradictory to the collectivism spirit, and traditionally strongly harmony embraced by the community. The insensitivity of the NGO led to the imposing of Western related concepts delivered in the NGO’s decision to use certain community empowerment strategies. RARE’s effort to increase the public communication and awareness through ‘individual pride’ reporting scheme are most likely prohibited and hindered by the RARE’s insensitivity with the local collective pride.
4 out of 4 Women’s Groups admitted that collectivism natures and characteristics such as harmony, helping, protecting and caring, respecting one another are the main characteristics of the community, while, at the same time, the reporting that was introduced by RARE through its program strongly emphasised the willingness of community members to be a whistle blower (RARE) for other villagers’ violation. Due to the contradiction, as a consequence, the instilment of the reporting practice and practitioners were strongly rejected by the community. The community themselves perceived the practice and practitioners of the reporting practice as a major threat to their collective way of life and also collective credibility as a civilised and esteemed community.

The social context created high and significant pressures to the practitioners and supporters of the Park scheme and prohibiting the agent of change from maximising and developing their capacity. The existence of social barriers of development of individual and personal capacity and empowerment due to lack of mutual Group support is also consistent with the findings of (Islam and Morgan, 2012). In their findings, Islam and Morgan (2012) found that mutual Group support somehow is a determinant of an individual progress.

The community rejection and disagreement itself were expressed in various ways including to deny certain violations that ever committed by their village fellows, and devaluated the undeniable violations. In terms of denial, most of the participants of the Women’s Group Discussions were more likely to refuse admitting openly any incident of violation to the Park rule that ever happened in their village committed by their fellow villages. The participants preferred to refer the offenders of violations of the Park rules to non-villagers than to their own villagers. While, the violations committed by the villagers were only referred as “an action of survival’ or ‘a harmless version’. The Women in the Bango village expressed their defence of their fellow villagers,

Q: How about people who have crab collecting as their livelihood?
A2: It is rarely conducted by people here [Bango Village].
A1: It is not like in the Buhias village, many people conducted crab collection.
A2: Even, the Buhias villagers used to come and gather crabs here. How about the Bango villagers then?
A1: Bango villagers are different, once we do not catch enough fish; we then use borri [fish poisoning] but…
A2: We [only] conduct [permitted fishing methods such as] net and fishing. Can you tell me the influence of implementation of Patrol’s duty on the relationship of relatives in the Bango village?
A1: [The arresting process to the offenders of the Park rules] never [happened] here [in the Bango village], but in the other villages, such as Nain, yes, it happened [even] frequently related to the use of compressor.
A2: [Also], in the Buhias village, the Patrol arrested once the people who were cutting the mangrove trees.
A5: Actually the raw trees.
A1: There are no [Bango] people here cut the mangrove to sell but in Buhias Village.
A2-A5: No, it is only in Buhias. How about in the past, was there any people cutting the mangrove to sell
A2: No, it only happened in the other village.
So, in each village has a different characteristic?

A1: In the past, Buhias, Tinongko, Tangkasi villagers were wood cutters.
A5: Until now, Bango Village still becomes their [the habitants of other villages] location to cut the wood.
A1: …………………..You can see the [rapid] mangrove strip along the beach [of the village] that never be reduced because Bango villagers do not cut mangrove in a lot of numbers. We just cut in a small numbers for sero which is planted in the sea and also fence pillar.

The denial attitude also not only occurred expressed by the Women in Bango Village but also in the different village such as Buhias Village the similar tendency and habit also found,

Q: If the Nain Islanders are identified with practice of [diving] compressors, how about Buhias?
A8: We recognise that the practice is illegal [that is why we did not commit it]; Buhias [Village] is well-known with use of borri [fish poisoning].
A2: However, the borri [poison] is not the made of chemicals but traditionally made of certain leaves and roots. Traditional borri [fish poisoning] is legal but not with the [diving] compressor use.
A8: Nainers were even caught [by the Patrol members] twice this year for practicing [diving] compressors.

The community denial and rejection towards the reporting scheme driven by the social value is a reflection of the findings in research by Peterson (2014). In the study of the values and relationships in a Mexican fishing community, Peterson found that social values and relationships are important aspects influencing the community attitude in using the resource, even more significant than economic and selfish interests (Peterson, 2014).

The denial attitude of the community due to the community’s perspectives of meanings and images of natural resources use and the devaluation of the weight of the importance of violation committed by their fellow villagers confirmed the theory of the local people’s cosmology about the resources and the world including their fellow villagers (Reichel-Dolmatoff, 1976; Waltner-Toews et al., 2013). In their research of the Tukano Indian Community in Amazon Forest of Colombia was shown and strong encouragement and willingness to protect the other people’s credibility is consistent with the spirit of the collectivism and kinship. The community chose to lie or to be introvert or pretend they did not know about an insider faults rather than being open and transparent to other people they consider as an outsider, rather than harm the collective pride and credibility. The community rejection to act as a whistle blower implies the reporting habits or whistle blowing practice, encouraged by RARE, actually opposing the collective pride of the villagers. The practice of protection of other villagers is consistent with the influence of people imagination about the world as discussed by Jentoft et al. (2012).

RARE’s cultural and social approach which did not fit with the local approach has not only led to the community negative responses towards the Park existence, but also indirectly changed the community’s resource consumption patterns and led to the negative impacts on the collectiveness value of the community. The findings of research about the collective community rejection towards the individual value introduced by the RARE program were not surprising and anticipated because the same result was confirmed by Bennet and Dearden,
2014. The adaptability of the programme with the local values and norms that should have been conducted through the NGO’s intervention was one of important aspects of measuring the Park governance (Bennet and Dearden, 2014). The selection of Western related and concepts influenced the NGO selection to inappropriate and irrelevant strategies that not only led to consequence of failure of NGO in achieving their goals, but also resulted in a disempowered community and governance of the Park. The results and findings of the study were consistent with the results of the study of the participation conducted by (Kilby, 2006) about the differences in value between an empowering party and the empowered party. As a consequence, as Kilby (2006) found, the empowerment has created new and greater independence of the community on the NGO as the empowered party.

9.4.3 Competitive Spirit

Besides being inconsistent with the local values, the reporting habits and the ‘pride’ value encouraged by RARE’s community empowerment programme also had a relationship with the development of competition spirit of the community members. The community members competed for the social acknowledgement of the highest social status in the community. As a result, the competitive spirit led to social segregation and creation of craving of the resource consumption. 4 out of 5 Women’s Groups emphasised that the importance of the achievement value to the community. 3 out of 4 Head of Village also emphasised the same issue. As a consequence, the community members faced a high social pressure competing with other villagers to have and build the nicest house in the village and the standard of the community has been changed from collectivism to materialism and hedonism and the community personality and values also have been changed from the modest based emphasise to the pride based emphasise. The pressure has provoked and created higher needs to exploit the resource such as corals and sands.

Q: There are more nice houses in the village than in other villages; can you tell me what the reasons are?
A: [Yes, they are] because they knew how to use their results [of their livelihood wisely]. They wanted to compete fairly. At the first glance, the new comer would think that there are no poor people in Tinongko [based on the quality of houses]. However, for everyday life, they are in difficulties, for example my staff in the Head of Village office whose husband is a fishermen, selling fish but difficult to eat fish, but because wants to earn money to buy glass. When they earned Rp. 1 million after working in the hinterland, they would not buy of a pan of rice, but ceramic tile, cement, only 2 kg [of rice] for two days, and after that they would work but if you came to their house and asked them how many time they eat, they would answer three times but the question is what kind of food. If you go in their house including bed rooms, it is covered with ceramic tile.

The lack of RARE’s sensitivity to local values and norms have implications on the minimal contributions of the interventions of the NGO to the efforts of establishment of good governance of the Park (Bennet and Dearden, 2014). The community rejection and denial also led to the increase in the social resilience that was pointed by the Jones et al. (2013). The implication on the increase of the social resilience on the RARE’s contribution to the effective Park governance is the negative contribution. The pressure to the local community to keep committing the illegal and destructive fishing was not necessarily influenced by the individual economic needs, but also by the social values. This aligns with the findings and
conclusions of the study conducted by Peterson (2014). Social values determine what are important and what are necessary to conduct by the community.

Regarding the relationship between social value and marine resource use practice, this study found that the coastal community still relatively strongly embraced a principle that the local marine resources as collective property, therefore, everyone was entitled to access the resource freely. As a consequence, law enforcement of the Park rules becomes difficult. This finding is consistent with the findings of study by Jentoft et al. (1998). Their study found that presence of a system of open access to marine resources in a coastal community leads to a difficulty in protecting and conserving the resources, and at the same time difficulties in prohibiting the local people from conducting illegal and constructive fishing practice.

The social and economic aspects of the community were considered altogether as constraints and supporters and driving factors (Charles and Wilson, 2009). In their study of success of two MPAs in Canada, people’s social economic and institutional aspects were recognised as an ‘entry point of the community acceptance of the Park as well as Park governance, and other relevant and importance aspects (Charles and Wilson, 2009, p.7).

### 9.5 Conclusion of the Chapter

In summary, the RARE’s program appeared to achieve accomplishment especially in terms of improvement in community knowledge, as well as weaknesses during its implementation. First, the program was less effective achieving the community support and acceptability to the Park in general and in particular to the No-Take Zone and Community Patrol. Second, the NGO showed less incapability to provide the demands and expectation of the community in terms of economic needs and alternative livelihood provision, and the Government Agency’s context including top down and hierarchical situation. Third, the program of RARE was most likely insensitive to the local value leading to negative impacts on the social relationship of the community.
CHAPTER 10. Lessons From Study For Improving NGO Relationship

Besides contribution to the body of knowledge, this thesis provides lessons, assistance and contribution at the practical basis of the NGO’s programme in relationship with government as well as the community. The lessons include comments on the needs for adjustment to institutional characteristics, the importance of economic options and the need for social sensitivity. The diagram of the chapter can be seen in Figure 25.

LESSONS FROM STUDY FOR IMPROVING NGO RELATIONSHIP

10.1 Adjust to government characteristics

The first lesson is the importance of adjustment of government. From the case study, it is found that NGO also needs to consider the characteristics of the government that they cooperate and build partnership with. The characteristics that might fit with the NGO’s approach are a financially strong government, a strongly democratic government, and a more or less clean government. Without all characteristics, the government would be only a burden to the NGO and a hindrance to the NGO to conduct their programme and achieve their goals.

The lessons derived from the building partnership process between the NGO and the government agency with the top-down and past militaristic background characteristics that is NGO should be brave, independent and capable to adopt a mix of bottom-up and top-down approach that is counted as an ideal approach of community participation and empowerment.

If the NGO blamed the government’s top–down approach as one of the barriers in conducting the individual empowerment, the NGO than should be able to model an alternative version of local involvement the bottom–up approach and combine with the top-down method of government preferences. The NGO should learn first, and learn flexibility as an aspiration accommodative party. The NGO also needs to recognise, and being honest with, the situation they face and the expectations they set. As it is argued by Fowler (1997), that NGO should be able to obtain and set a balance between the two prominent paradigms of developing community development program.
The thesis provides the lesson that selected and recruited staff of the government should from a leader position or decision maker in the office. The recruited staff should be someone with a sufficient authority to change or enact a priority of the local park agency. The issue of sufficient authority is especially relevant in the top-down based agency; this is important in order to ensure that the NGO’s priority can be well accommodated, prioritised and combined with the programme and priority of the government agency. More importantly, the sufficient authority can equip the RARE’s campaign manager to make sure that implementation of the combined program run consistently and permanently.

The other contributions to the park authority, especially the national forest ministry, are the priority and urgency of the provision of the integrated approach of NGO as a standardised requirement of NGO’s partnership with the government. So, instead of the partial approach that used by the NGO in empowering the community in the protected area, the NGO seeking to build a genuine social partnership should adopt a holistic and comprehensive program. The holistic approach should be treated as a compulsory requirement, not an optional of the future partnership development between the government ministry and potential NGO in building memorandum of understanding.

The funding NGO provided can barter with the government in setting up the programme. This implies a need for a changing the type of a relationship with the government, from contractual to partnership. The government needs the NGO as much as the NGO needs the government, especially in the poorer countries. This form of partnership implies greater equality and reduced hierarchy in which both parties complement one another. The NGO needs to running and not avoiding similar projects to the government from the NGO, but recognise and learn what the government needs, and try to provide it. Without the understanding on the government’s situation, the programme will be less effective and efficient.

From the local institutional aspect, the first important lesson is that a good and constructive social dimension of the Bunaken National Park can be achieved if the NGO extends its program’s goal not only to empowering individual staff, but also the institution as a system. The program should include processes that impact the government agency by enlarging and extending the aims at empowering the institution as an institution and a system. This would include institutional construction and the building of the government park agency. The importance of acknowledging the government’s characteristics is also suggested by Coston (1998). In her model of the typology of NGO relationship with government, she suggests that, in order to achieve an ideal cooperation with government, the NGO should have increased influence, while at the same time acceptance of institutional characteristics and increase information-sharing with the government.

The acceptance to the government issues also covers the need of the provision of the sufficient and consistent funding to the agency. The NGO’s programme has been good by providing the financial support to assist the government agency to conduct community campaign. However, the funding only for the community campaign was not enough to guarantee the effectiveness of the program. The agency requires more funding to conduct other important and relevant community empowerment programme, such as the patrolling activities, and economic empowerment option. The bottom line of this lesson is the need for additional funding provision for the NGO is part of the needed assistance of the agency. The similar issue also became a lesson of relationship between NGO and community, in the next part.
10.2 Money is important

The second lesson is the importance of continuity of financial supports to the community patrol members. The Bunaken Park case may share a lesson that sustainability of the agent of change depends on their ability to support their family financially. Other lessons also stemmed from examination of the practice of the community patrol activities. The RARE program believed that the community patrol is an agent of change for the community. However, the community perceived the community patrols to be a traitor and community enemy. The lessons derived the law enforcement is not always and necessary effective to encourage the compliance of the community to the park.

One of reasons why patrol members stopped being involved their participation in the activity of mobilising community is the lack of guarantee of having a permanent job from the government and the NGO. The issue was exacerbated with changes in salary due to a change in entry ticket system management. Islam and Morgan (2012) found similar issues in their study in Bangladesh.

RARE needed to be able to recognise the community expectations and needs, especially basic economic needs. Without any consideration of social economic and cultural aspects, community support cannot be achieved. RARE’s programme seemed to not provide any significant economic needs solution for community poverty. The absence of the strategy addressing community economic empowerment suggests RARE’s ignorance of the most basic need of the local people. This appears to have led to persistent and consistent community rejection, especially by subsistence fishermen, and their families and relatives. RARE believed that social marketing through an education campaign and developing a local pride was an effective and sufficient tool to change negative and environmentally-unfriendly attitudes and behaviour of the community in using the marine resources. However, the community perceived that the campaign using, for example, posters, mascots and songs was just limited for the community entertainment, and did not guarantee to provide family livelihood sustainably.

From this point of view, the first lessons of analysis of RARE’s program, from the economic aspect, is the need for recognition and provision of the effective poverty alleviation strategy. Negative community perceptions towards a park’s existence has also been recorded by Bennet and Dearden (2014) and Jones (2014). In their research, limitation in livelihood options provision and other relevant economic schemes partly explained community rejection of the environmental scheme.

The second lesson is a need for combination and integration of the NGO’s program and the government program, by including and recognising the progress of economic related programme run by the park agency. The initial good progress and success of the government’s micro finance program can be a seed and is a good starting point of efforts of the provision of the community economic need solution, especially the subsistence fishermen on the islands. Nikkah and Redzuan (2010) also agree with potentials of NGO as microfinance scheme facilitator as part of community empowerment program.

From the perspectives of provision of economic needs of the community, an increase in the capacity and sensitivity of the organisation in accommodating the aspirations of the community is paramount. Organisational capacity is also not only related to ability to conduct and accommodate public and community perceptions, but also to being honest, realistic and flexible. Being honest is related to the publication of achievement or outcomes
regardless of level of success. Being realistic is important in setting targets that are not overly high. Being flexible means being able to vary the tools or approaches by the NGO; if the NGO only has one tool and it fails or is less effective, the NGO needs to be able to look for a different tool that might be able to change the situation and this improves the NGO’s ability. It is necessary, therefore, for the NGO to be able to adjust its programme to deal with different situations. It is important not to generalise into all protected areas in all countries. One situation might need and require different tools. Instead of using and applying a certain tool to deal with all situations, a comprehensive approach is needed. Besides being flexible with the different approach and strategies, the NGO also needs to be flexible in setting and changing the goal of the project. Dependency on the donor is often suggested as the main reason of the incapacity of an NGO, as the dependence creates limitations of NGO to be flexible in conducting and designing a program that is suitable for the context. Fowler (1997) and Islam and Morgan (2010) both found the issue of dependency on donor was a barrier factor for NGO’s capacity on the field.

10.3 Be sensitive

The thesis also provides lessons regarding the relationship between the NGO and the community and its values. The third lesson, therefore, is the need to be sensitive with the local leaders, and values. Recognising local community leaders and religious leaders, as well respect the local tradition and values was important in this case. Being sensitive can be shown by presenting more respect and understanding the leaders’ past background and attitudes towards the park scheme. The Bunaken Park case demonstrated that an unproductive relationship between NGO staff and local leaders led indirectly to failure of enactment of village rule as an expected outcome of the community empowerment program run by RARE. Community education, which was supposed to be conducted at all level and organisations in the community, seemed prohibited by the unfruitful relationship. Once again, Islam and Morgan’s (2012) works shared similar aspects of NGO’s weaknesses in Bangladesh. In their study, the religious leaders played unsupportive roles and attitudes towards community empowerment program conducted by NGOs in the country. Provision of respects and appreciation are also suggested by Fowler (1997), ‘Striking a balance, a guide to enhancing the effectiveness on NGOs in international development.

The other aspect of being more sensitive is being sensitive to the voice of the community. In the study, the NGO appeared not to show sufficient care about the community’s voice, background and difficulties. The community’s voice, especially in the area of the repressive and militaristic background is different from the voice of the community in a free place. The community, as a consequence, presented a weak voice. It takes, therefore, a special attention to listen the community voice. If the NGO could change and increase its ability to hear the community voice then, communication would be improved. Caring and understanding would reduce resistance from the community. Two - way or dialogue communication should be endorsed and encouraged between the park authority and the community and the NGO. Learning from the community’s experience in the park and willingness to hear and adjust with the local situation is important. Black and Hidges (2001) and Hur (2006), argue that community empowerment should lead to strengthening community voice to speak up about their right, in order to be an influential community. Kasmel (2011) emphasises the importance of listening attentively to community voice; this is not only guarantees the success of research of community empowerment, but also improves program implementation.
The other lessons are related to recognition of the cultural and social aspects of the local community. Properly adjustment of the value of the NGO to the local value is important and needed. Emphasising and enforcing individual value, pride and rewards, in form of villager whistle blowing practice, into a collective context was proved culturally irrelevant to the social context. The culturally improprieties were seen in emergence of community conflicts and disputes as the consequence of the practice.

From that lesson, it can be said that the social collective system held by the community is also a hindrance to the implementation of RARE’s programme. Understanding the whole system of the community, including social, economic and cultural background will assist in determining the capacity of the empowered individual. The lesson is that the collective credibility and pride, rather than individual value, is the main value of the community that can be employed, emphasised and offered as an effective influence on acceptance on the NGO’s program.

Strengthening villagers’ collective pride can be a starting point in the community empowerment program. Recognising the importance of local values by adjusting the RARE’s program to the local cultural and social values is also another important lesson derived from the study. Cultural differences and the gap in the community empowerment practice between eastern and western values were also noted by Cooke and Kothari (2001). They argued that the gap may lead to disempowerment of the community. The importance of understanding these differences, and ways to address them, was also highlighted by the Cooke and Kothari.
CHAPTER 11. Study Conclusion and Future Research Needs

The chapter just consists of two main parts the study conclusion and future research needs. The diagram of this chapter can be seen in Figure 26.

Figure 26 Diagram of structure of Chapter 11

11.1 Study Conclusion

The first chapter, introduced and justified the aims, objectives of this thesis’s. In the second chapter was a discussion of the development and evolution of relevant literatures and also an identification of needs and gaps in the body of the knowledge that contributed to the thesis. In the third chapter, methodology and data analysis method that were justified for the study. This included an introduction to the case study presented in the chapter four. Chapter five to eight presented the results of the study assessing RARE’s success in developing an individual empowerment program. This included issues impeding and hindering RARE’s goal to develop individual empowerment into collective empowerment, the community perception of RARE’s community empowerment program implementation and, the perception of government officials to the community empowerment program. In the chapter nine, discussions of the study findings are presented and elaborated with results of previous similar research in different areas. In this chapter, I presented a model that was a refinement of the original model.

The study concludes that the community and public perception on the RARE’s empowerment program showed the RARE’s programme achieved partial success in changing the community’s negative responses and attitudes to the existence of Bunaken National Park. To some extent, the program has some successes in the implementation of the community empowerment program, in particular the campaign’s education program. The NGO was able to increase individual capacity and confidence of the community patrol and government staff, and also ecological knowledge and awareness of the community. However, the program was
not able to fulfil basic and essential expectations and needs of the community, which were financial to compensate for the loss of income the community experienced due to the Park bans being enforced. However, at the same time, the skills and resources provided were not sufficient to empower the community thoroughly into the next level of self-management which includes improved capacity for collective empowerment. Most participants in the study demanded provision of alternative livelihood and resource, and asked for greater alignment of RARE’s program with the local’s social and cultural values. The unfulfilled expectations and demands of the community were not only prohibiting the community from providing expected support the Park, but also created social horizontal conflicts between the communities that are ‘for’ and ‘against’ the Park.

The second aspects of the NGO’s ineffectiveness are demonstrated in the program’s insensitivity to the local community’s collective values. The RARE’s program, that emphasised individual pride and reward, is reportedly inconsistent with the collective value of the community. As a result, the unfulfilled expectations, together with the cultural insensitivity that was demonstrated, led to unconstructive social pressures that excluded the empowered community patrol members from the general community.

RARE’s ignorance of compensation for the community loss due to the Park existence has led the unravelling the relationship between the empowered individuals and their family, friends and relatives in the village. It also, created an atmosphere of suspicion between the villagers towards outsiders.

The program was also not able to fulfil a main agenda identified by the Park agency, which was to improve community compliance to the Park rules. The Park agency also believed the program ignored the financial and hierarchical protocols of the agency, as RARE’s program emphasised improvement to individual government agency’s staff with an expectation that the chosen staff would lead institutional transformation of the agency. Without by in from those in the agency with authority and power, the identified staff champions could not turn RARE’s expectations into a reality.

The social impacts and costs caused by the implementation RARE’s empowerment program in the Bunaken National Park, due to unfulfilled expectations and demands of the public, have both practical and theoretical implications. The first practical and indirect implication was questioning the program’s impartiality, as consultation could be perceived as manipulation if community views differed from the desired response. As a result, the success was also limited and partial. The program used only the community education campaign to counter the negative attitudes towards the Park, instead on a holistic and comprehensive program as demanded by the public and community to engage. Second implication is the NGO itself was not able and did not have enough capacity or flexibility to fulfill the public and community expectations presented to the NGO and the Park agency. Another practical implication is the NGO performance in the Park was inconsistent with awards the NGO received as one of the 100 top NGOs in two years in a row 2012 and 2013 (RARE, 2013). In other words, RARE’s previous achievement in other places could not be generalised to imply success in other protected areas in the world, including the Bunaken Park.

While theoretically, the implications of the public perception on organisational framework as to the effectiveness of NGO as an organisation could be improved, this can only occur if the NGO considered comprehensively the important factors such as social, cultural economic and institutional factors of the affected community as paramount. The organisational performance could be improved if the social considerations, including identification of barriers and
enabling factors for community engagement, were counted and recognised in the refining the framework.

The general first conclusion of this thesis is the importance of recognising the community’s and government’s expectations and needs, to develop prioritised programs. The second conclusion is that community cultural values can be a crucial barrier to the empowerment programme, while, the third conclusion is the NGO did not show any relevant and effective efforts to advance anticipate and accommodate the aspiration of the public in the programme.

To sum up, based on the findings of the study, the NGO’s roles in the Bunaken National Park were mostly not culturally, socially, and institutionally sufficient, or appropriate, in fulfilling the community expectations and needs, assisting the fulfilment of the government’s agenda of the Park conservation, and providing a bridge from individual empowerment into the next level of collective empowerment.

11.2 Future research

The study provided the public and community perceptions on RARE’s community empowerment programme by using and employing qualitative methods, such as observation, document analysis, discussion and interviews with women’s group, heads of villages, community patrol members and government agency officials, the study was focused on the development individual capacity and progress and the proses of the new capacity into collective development level, as well and also limiting factors of the progress.

The study also provided an important understanding of RARE’s programme based the perspectives of different groups in the community, such as women, head of village and community patrol members. However, the study did not provide the whole community perception using quantitative survey techniques to understand the breadth to which the opinions expressed were held. The potential use of a quantitative survey might increase and offer an interesting alternative to the results and conclusions provided by this study particularly a statistical differentiation between the community expectations and needs, and their perceived outcomes from the RARE’s programme.

Moreover, the study did not conduct an economic study specifically on an influence of income and livelihood factor on the community perception on the Park. This may have demonstrated impact and also a change to social capital in communities impacted and changed by RARE’s community empowerment programme.

From the results and discussion, the study concluded that the community’s economic, social and cultural and institutional aspects are influential factors in the success of the RARE’s empowerment progress. However, the thesis did not offer a study of level of importance or significance among the four aspects, or a study about statistical correlation between all influential factors and the NGO’s responses. Furthermore, the study focused on an analysis of the NGO’s effectiveness in the context of governance aspect of Marine Protected Area (MPA), but the study did not provide a study the effectiveness of the NGO’s roles specifically in the context of local development and management of the Park.

The study was also limited to a specific and certain cultural, social, geographical and political context. Therefore, implementation of the similar study on the different context is recommended. Comparison between the public perceptions of the RARE’s community programme in the Bunaken National Park with other environmental NGOs in the different
national parks in Indonesia or other countries are also needed. The study will be useful to provide a conclusive description of the RARE’s work and approach.

In terms of governmental and institutional context differences, the studies did not draw a direct conclusion of how values and responses of NGOs from developed countries interacted with the cultural differences with communities and government agencies in developing countries’. Also, research of impacts of the government’s corruption environment on effectiveness of the NGO’s work implementations is suggested.

Regarding to the other potential future research, a potential studies comparing areas with a strong tourism background and less tourism background, is also suggested. Moreover, social impacts of the RARE’s program was presented and discussed in the thesis, but not the consideration of the biological and ecological outcome of RARE’s programme.

The study discusses an organisational model use as a framework of the study, especially the impacts of the program on the community and the performance of the program of community empowerment itself. As a consequence, the other future research might be undertaken are a study or analysis of impacts of the NGO’s program specifically on the organisational capacity of the government agency. In terms of the development of organisational values, consistency between two aspects NGO’s values and NGO’s approach is needed, along with a study of conflicts and relationship between the NGO’s donors’ interests and community interests and conflicting accountability to the community, international community and the donor’s agenda.

This study also provided an analysis of the combination of the organisational theory and empowerment theory as a framework based on the public perception on the role of RARE, especially in term of increase in capacity of the community. However, the capacity itself is a complex concept and consists of the multiple domains. Therefore, one area of potential future research is about the effectiveness of RARE’s programme in terms of the efforts to increase the capacity building, specifically in the areas of participation, leadership, problem assessment, resources mobilisation, asking why, links with others, roles of the outside agents and programme management are important to be conducted (Gibbon et al., 2002).

The study offered the public perception in the Bunaken National Park in order to analyse outcomes and social impacts of RARE’ program employed social marketing approach. However, a direct implication of the analysis to the sequence and prioritisation of the logic method that used by the approach has not been studied. The summary of the future research needs can be seen in Table 23.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Different cultural, institutional, social, political and ecological context of marine Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific aspects</td>
<td>Use of the different framework, combination the organisational theory with other theories, use of specific domain of capacity in research, implication of the study on the sequence of the social marketing approach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 12. Executive summary of recommendation for NGO improvement

This chapter is an executive summary that consists of four parts: research questions and overall methodology; key findings; implications; and recommendations. The diagram of the chapter structure can be seen in Figure 27.
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Non-government organisations (NGOs) and their programs; are common across world. In marine protected area management, NGOs are accepted as important stakeholders. However, the study of the effectiveness of the work of the NGO, in the context of marine protected areas is still limited. Most studies (cf. Austin, 2003, Soylu, 2010, Walker et al., 2007) investigate the implementation of NGO works in a marine park within a particular project, not from the perspective of the individual organisation. Based on organisational theory, the effectiveness of an NGO’s work should be able to be perceived from records of (i) the impacts of the program on the community, and (ii) the measures of NGO’s performance.

The organisational theory used in this thesis is similar to other NGO effectiveness evaluation frameworks; especially those whose emphasis is an assessment of the social impact of an NGO’s program (cf. Lee and Nowel, 2014). However, the theory has not been widely used or developed, especially in assessing and evaluating the effectiveness of an NGO’s role, particularly in a marine park.

The purpose of this study, therefore, is to analyse the effectiveness of an NGO in a marine protected area, based on public perception, especially expectations of community and government, regarding the impacts of that NGO’s roles on the process of community empowerment.
12.1 Research questions and overall methodology

The study employed a case study approach (Yin, 2009), examining public perceptions of and community responses to the effectiveness of a program run by RARE, an NGO from the USA, in the Bunaken National Park, North Sulawesi, Indonesia. The case study approach was chosen because it is effective in providing answers regarding how and why process and events have occurred (Yin, 2009), especially where the context is complex and not clear (Yin, 2009). The location of the research is the Bunaken National Park, Indonesia, chosen because of the management and natural resources potential (Erdman et al., 2004; Sidangoli et al., 2013). RARE was chosen to be studied after it fulfilled a set of eligibility criteria established by the researcher notably that, there is complete record of program implementation, and practical access to success of evidence to inform the case study. Methods included interviews and discussion with women’s groups, heads of villages, community patrol officers, NGO, government employees, complemented observation and secondary data analysis. The results were analysed using deductive methods. Organisational theory was used as the analytical framework, using the conceptual frame of the community empowerment continuum, and the data was analysed using content analysis.

12.2 Key findings

The study identified a generally negative view in the community about the national park. Lack of alternative livelihoods and resources as part of financial compensations for the community loss of access due to the park’s existence appear to be the primary cause of this community rejection and negative attitude towards the park. The NGO was successful in increasing the individual capacity and knowledge of community members, especially the community patrol members, as well as the park agency staff who selected as the RARE campaign manager. However, at the collective community level, RARE’s empowerment program did not reach its intended ultimate outcome that is community acceptance of the park. Most of the community showed low levels of support for the park’s existence, no-take zone scheme, and community patrol members.

The strong rejection to the existence of the park was especially demonstrated by the community members with a fisheries background or interest. The community perceived the existence of the park as a limit to their livelihood, and also understood it lead indirectly to negative consequences on social relationships. The ineffectiveness of the NGO in encouraging positive community attitude to the park reflects an inconsistence and negative relationship between the NGO’s program values and those values held by the community.

12.3 Implications

By presenting and discussing evidence from this case study, the study contributes to the confirmation of the difficulties and challenges to social empowerment implementation. Insensitivity and incapacity of the NGO is reflected in unfulfilled community expectations and unachieved community support for this park which are main goals and objectives of the government agency program in the park. In the context of community empowerment, development of individual empowerment into collective empowerment should consider the social impacts of the program, both positive and negative. The negative impacts not only affect the community at the individual level but also at the collective level. As a consequence,
the study’s contribution emphasises the need for a holistic approach to the NGO’s program outcome, rather than solely depending on the efforts of individual cognitive and capacity building. The development of an organisational model to understand this situation focuses on several important aspects: social impact; compensation for community loss; hierarchical and financial aspects of the government agency; and community support. The model allows for suggestions for improvement in the NGO’s work and roles in developing a protected area in a developing country, including recognition of the importance of considering community livelihood, law enforcement and ecological knowledge.

12.4 Recommendations

This section presents a set of recommendations to improve the performance of RARE, government and local community engagement, in particular, and NGOs in general.

For RARE:

- Flexibility to adjust to social values and expectations in implementing community participation and empowerment program is needed.
- Learning from past history is important. Without a paradigm of learning from previous mistakes, failure may be repeated, especially in the same context.

For the community empowerment program:

- The community empowerment program especially aimed at changing negative community perceptions should realistically be conducted over long time periods, and should be divided into small subprograms that are integrated into a large and main goal.

For government:

- Understanding of NGOs’ vision, mission, and method of working is useful in order to set government expectations and to provide an appropriate space in the institutional structure and system based on NGO’s skill and interests.

For NGOs in general:

- Funding needs to be sufficient to comprehensively cover program design and implementation.
- Setting of realistic objectives and goals is paramount, especially in the area that has a past negative history of engaging with environmental conservation schemes. Even evaluation of an NGO’s performance from the community perception is important to increase the effectiveness of the NGO’s performance.
CHAPTER 13. Personal Reflections

This final chapter provides five lessons as results of my personal reflections, development of critical thinking skills, consistence with research questions and aims, importance of being patience and persistent, being flexible and well-prepared and being an independent researcher.

The structure of this chapter is illustrated in Figure 28.

While undertaking this thesis about the community empowerment aimed for RARE, actually it was not only an examination of the effectiveness of RARE’s community empowerment program according to community perception, it was an analysis of my own personal empowerment. Yes, I was being academically, personally and emotionally empowered during my academic journey as a novice researcher. Recognition of importance of abilities to deal with various issues and limitations, both technical and personal issues derived from this process of learning by doing that is learning from mistakes, learning to be brave and articulate about my opinions and developing my critical thinking were valuable lessons I obtained throughout the journey. Following are the lessons learned during the journey,

One of the personal weaknesses I encountered as new researcher was lack of personal critical thinking skills. My background as a government employee in a country, which for decades applied a strong militaristic approach to departmental management, prohibited me from developing my personal critical thinking which is important as a PhD candidate. I found that it was difficult to change my previous personal approach of as ‘a Yes sir’ employee to become a creative and independent researcher. While, as a PhD candidate the skills required are not only to know or to understand, but also are to analyze, synthesis and evaluate data are paramount. This was not an easy job. However, it was made possible, through self-conscious efforts and hard work.
My professional background was negatively influenced by my age, gender, ethnicity and religious background. As a person comes from a minority group, a woman, young, Christian, and Sangihe, I had to recognize the socio-cultural factors that made me not to question anything and to become a passive listener, which were barriers not only to developing personal critical analysis skills, but also in conducting my research. Being open to critique, without being afraid of ‘losing face’ and becoming unafraid to read different opinions about aspects of study, I found is important to establish a comprehensive understanding and increase my critical analysis skills. Other strategies I used to develop my critical thinking capacity included questioning observations made as part of ensuring the validity and reliability of conclusions made. This involved a lot a great deal of reading about the concepts being investigated.

A second lesson deals with the aspect of PhD life that is important to stick to the research problems and aims. I found this important when I learned about deductive case study approach. It was relatively easy for me being tempted running out from the initial research problem, especially when I was conducting data analysis qualitatively. I also learned that the research problem should be a guard, mirror and map of the research data collection, data analysis and discussion. Understanding the deep meaning of each word of the research questions and objectives is paramount, especially for me as a student with background of English as a Second Language. Learning the implication of each word and learning about the alternative meaning and discussing with my supervisors about the fixed meanings I found as a useful and important in the process.

Finally, I have another suggestion, which is to ‘stick to’ the research proposal and conduct the research based on the plan. If the data phase needed to be conducted two phases, do not join these two phase together as confusion might lead to negative consequence on the quality collected data. If the data collected is not as reliable as it was expected or standardized, than the joined time would be useless and wasteful.

Thirdly, I have had to learn to be patient and persistent and to collect appropriate information before taking an action or making a decision. I used to be a person of ‘Let's do it now’, or ‘Just make it happen and we will think about its consequence later’, and slowly the research process changed me somehow into a person of ‘Wait, give me a second, and let me think about it first’. I learned not to be in hurry, or to rush to conducting the data collection without first making sure I have a comprehensive understanding about the research problems and that aims and objectives are established before going to the field.

I found that reflection was an important part of this change. Reflection itself is one of important aspects that supposed to be conducted from beginning to the end of the research process. It is part of the analysis of data in a process involving qualitative data.

Taking notes of every new idea and insight derived from the reflection process are important aspects of research as a PhD student, i.e. thinking, writing and acting. At first, a lack of one aspect such as thinking and reflection led me to be unclear about the research aim and led to loosing time in wasted process. Practically, making and writing a daily journal, including writing the personal reflection was very helpful as a reminder and also as a torch when my mind was dark. Reflection during the process is an opportunity to rethink a problem in a better way and from different perspectives, therefore, giving me new ideas or insights as to how to approach an issue and solve a problem. Sometimes, just being quiet, calm, still, or simply changing my viewpoints of the issue helped me step by step, to get closer to my main aim of understanding the role of NGOs from perspective of the community.
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My fourth lesson is that I learned to be flexible and well prepared in conducting fieldwork, and not to depend on desktop study. Sometimes, there are differences between the expected results of a study developed in an office study and real data in the field. Flexibility and anticipation are important aspects in conducting research. In my case, once I reached the field, I found that most of the NGOs have been disappeared, or changed into new structures with new visions and mission. As a result, I needed to look for a new potential NGO that is able to the fulfil eligibility criteria I had established. I learned there is always a need for a ‘Plan B’ and also of learning and knowing is the fact that sometimes planning did not work on the field are lessons I obtained from this experience. I also learnt how to use seeming irrelevant data, and keep being positive and learning from mistakes. Even though the data from household survey cannot be used in terms of statistics relationship due to the inappropriate sampling area and NGOs as the subject of the study, the observation resulted during the survey implementation, especially in the location are insightful and valuable in support the real data collection.

From the experience, I learned also not to avoid problems, and to face up to difficulties and hardships. I found that it is no use run from a problem as it will continue to be there and never disappeared, despite of my escape and avoidance. The trouble can be set aside, but do not try to forget or pretend that the issue was gone or been solved. Be determined, persevere and had a goal and solution focused attitude, rather than a problem focused approach.

The fifth lesson I from the journey as a PhD student is to not depend totally on supervisors; my thesis is my responsibility and my future. I learned that I should take the responsibility for the completion of my research and thesis completion and do not have my supervisors think through the issue for me. I had to, therefore, develop and increase my personal skills in browsing information and data on the internet. I learned that relevant data and information would not be result without skills of browsing in a search engine by browsing for data using specific keywords that not too general or not too narrow in meaning. Specific words are important in order to increase the chance of obtaining relevant information that is needed in developing the research question and the thesis research.

I had to also be active in building communication with the supervisors, and other academics environments such as other PhD candidates who might be conducting the same or similar research topic. I found, communication with my supervisors is extremely important. At first, my reluctance to communicate openly with my supervisors about the problems I was facing including lack of an "eligible' NGO in the field that had sufficient documents on which to base in study lead to significant issues that consumed a lot of my time, energy and other resources a lot. On one hand I was expected to be independent and waited to be independent. On the other hand, however, I wish I would have been more communicative about the substantial problems in the field. Being open about my weaknesses and limitations to my supervisors would have saved a lot of time and stress. Reluctance attitudes to communicate the issue both as technical issues and practical issues led me to become misdirected in my research and the cost of the misleading could be beyond my expectations and could reduce the success potentials.

As part of the importance of development of communication skills with supervisors, I learned that identification of my personal background was important to recognise the impacts of this on the implementation of the research, as well as an increase in skills in articulating questions. The most important thing is use question as part of a critical thinking approach are very important in discussion with supervisors, therefore, leading to more fruitful and effective communication.


BLH. (2011). *Status Lingkungan Hidup Daerah (Local environmental status)*: Badan Lingkungan Hidup (Environmental Body of North Sulawesi).


Bown, N. K., Gray, G. S and S. M. Stead. (2013). Co-management and adaptive co-
management: Two modes of governance in a Honduran marine protected area. 
*Marine Policy, 39*, 128-134.

change in Vietnam* (Doctor of Philosophy), The University of Sydney, Sydney. 
Retrieved from 

BPS. (2015). Garis kemiskinan dan penduduk miskin di Kabupaten Minahasa Utara 2005-
Retrieved from: http://minutkab.bps.go.id/frontend/linkTabelStatis/view/id/6

Costa Rican ICDPs. In T. O. M. a. M. P. Wells (Ed.), *Getting biodiversity projects to 
work: Towards more effective conservation and development* (pp. 154-180 ). 
New York: Columbia University Press.

Century, UN Headquarter, New York.

Bryant, R. L. (2001). Explaining state-environmental NGO relations in the Philippines and 

and Natural Resources, 15*(7), 629-639.

BTNB. (2011). *Kumpulan hasil kegiatan inventarisasi/monitoring Taman Nasional Bunaken 
(Collection of results of inventarisation/monitoring activities in the Bunaken National 
Park): Balai Taman Nasional Bunaken, Direktorat Jenderal Perlindungan Hutan dan 
Konservasi, Kementerian Kehutanan.*

Burke, L., Selig, E, and M. Spalding. (2002). Reefs at risk in Southeast Asia (pp. 72): World 
Resource Institute.

H. Baird. (2012). Weak compliance undermines the success of no-take zones in a 
large government-controlled marine protected area *PLOS one, 7*(11).


Christie, P. (2004). Marine protected areas as biological successes and social failures in 


marine protected areas. *Coral Reefs*(27), 1047–1056

177


Clarke, G. (1998). Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and politics in the developing world. Political Studies, 46(1), 36.


Government, Q. (nd). Community capacities building toolkits for rural and regional communities: Department of community.


Laverack, G. (1999). *Addressing the contradiction between discourse and practice in health promotion*. (PhD ), Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia.


Miriam Webster Dictionary.


Pierre, F. (2007). *Participation as an end versus a means: understanding a recurring dilemma in urban upgrading*. (PhD), Massachusetts Institute of Technology.


Pomeroy, R. S. (2010). People matter, the social impact of marine protected area Santa Barbara, California: MPA Federal Advisory Committee Meeting.


RARE. (nd-c). RARE inspires change so people and nature thrive.


Smith, T. A. (2012). *At the crux of development? Local knowledge, participation empowerment and environmental education in Tanzania.* (PhD), University of Glasgow.


M. Sidangoli et al.

Article removed because of publisher copyright restrictions. Available at 10.1111/apv.12031
Effectiveness of Bunaken MPA management

Article removed because of publisher copyright restrictions. Available at 10.1111/apv.12031
Article removed because of publisher copyright restrictions. Available at 10.1111/apv.12031
Effectiveness of Bunaken MPA management

Article removed because of publisher copyright restrictions. Available at 10.1111/apv.12031
Effectiveness of Bunaken MPA management

Article removed because of publisher copyright restrictions. Available at 10.1111/apv.12031
Effectiveness of Bunaken MPA management

Article removed because of publisher copyright restrictions. Available at 10.1111/apv.12031
Article removed because of publisher copyright restrictions. Available at 10.1111/apv.12031
Article removed because of publisher copyright restrictions. Available at 10.1111/apv.12031
Effectiveness of Bunaken MPA management

Article removed because of publisher copyright restrictions. Available at 10.1111/apv.12031
Article removed because of publisher copyright restrictions. Available at 10.1111/apv.12031
Effectiveness of Bunaken MPA management

Article removed because of publisher copyright restrictions. Available at 10.1111/apv.12031
APPENDIX B – TRANSCRIPTIONS OF INTERVIEWS AND DISCUSSIONS

KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS

Interview with the Head of Bango Village

Q: Can you introduce your name please?
A: My name is Kansil Masedung.

Q: Can you tell me about your carrier as a village government?
A: I started [my carrier] as a Pala [head of block] for long time, and then I became a Head of Village for six years, from 2008-2013, our village’s status is Desa [traditional village] not Kelurahan [modern village].

Q: How about your other position in the Church?
A: I was the eldest of Kolom [groups in Church] and then I became the eldest of man Ministry. Previously, I could not be re-elected because of the rules stated that for the BIPRA [Bapak, Ibu, Pemuda, Remaja, Anak – Man, Woman, Young adult, teenager, children], Ministry it is only once.

Q: What are aspect make you proud became a Mantehage?
A: Coincidently, I married to a lady who is originally a Sanger, the majority of the Mantehage people.

Q: What aspects of Mantehage Island make you happy became a Mantehage?
A: Mantehage has a lot of potentials that make me interested in this island. The problem is how the community to manage the potentials, both in the land or on the sea. You can farm here but the main agricultural products here are coconut and other products. There are a lot potentials including in the sea, the fish is sufficient. However, the controversial issue between the community and the government is about the Management of the potentials. The issues are related to the problem of using forbidden things, for example, the use of poisoning and also related to other conditions for example, in terms of wood management, there are a lot of mangroves in this village. The [main] problem is people here are not prohibited to take mangrove but the way of taking. At the moment, the people are directed to plant, any kind of trees including mangrove trees. For the mangrove trees plantation once happened here around two years ago, it was around 3,000 trees but according to result of research of Ministry of Forestry, it is difficult to plant mangrove. From 1000 trees, it would be grow around 10 trees. It was difficult, even though there was a budget from the Balai, from thousand seedlings and it was only around 20 trees growing. Because of waves, the seedling will be swept away that is why we just planted in the small bays, we could not plant in front of the island because when the monsoon comes, the plantation would be destroyed. Regarding the Management of mangrove, according to results of community meetings that involved the Balai, we are allowed to take mangrove as long as we conducted regeneration of the mangrove and the extraction is just for domestic use not for commercial use but the community was complaining why government enact the such rules, actually the
rules not like that. For example, *Mahogany* trees around the village field which were planted by the college students a couple years ago cut down by the villagers. I told them do not cut the trees because it is part of the [regeneration] programme. Mantehage is a [fragile] island and the land is infertile, so if we did not conduct the greenery programme, it would be a problem [for the island]. The same benefit of the mangrove [protection] as a protector toward the waves. [The impact of the lost mangrove was severe] for example, other islands that suffered from erosion because of the trees have been [significantly] depleted.

Q: What is the pride of the Mantehage people since the establishment of the island as part of the Bunaken Park?
A: The pride [as a Mantehage people] since the establishment of the Park, the coral is protected, mangrove is protected, because the people taken the resource in accordance with the rules, it is one of the pride. How we protect the conservation that is one of our proud because the Balai many times conducted insemination of information. When I came here in 1980s, there was no cement pedestrian walk, it was all wet. We can say that there are a lot of potentials can be developed commercially but most of people prefer to go out.

Q: One of the parties who concerned about the conservation is Patrol?
A: Some of them are community members. So the community members are recruited. Sometimes, once in three months, they come and conduct insemination of information.

Q: What do you think about the Patrol?
A: So, their job is guarding the resources, beside the Patrol from the Balai, Water Police, and the DPTNB [Dewan Pengelolaan Taman Nasional Bunaken, Management Board of Bunaken National Park].

Q: Have you ever become a member of Community Patrol?
A: No, I have never become a member, but there are Patrol members in this village because every village is allowed to propose two candidates. If we recruited outsiders, the Patrol would come once in three months. There are two people, one lives near the Patrol’s post.

Q: Can you tell me about the recruitment system of the Patrol?
A: The information was spread out to the community using a TOA, after we received the information from the Balai, we received a letter from the Balai about the recruitment of Community Patrol, along with the criteria of the Balai, and it is open for everyone, because after they were recruited they will be selected, including woman.

Q: What are the special criteria to be a Patrol member?
A: Including concern of the environmental protection

Q: If you were given to be a Patrol, are you available?
A: It is not about availability but about the problem is about age, but I want to give an opportunity to the young generation, that is why I refused to run for the Head of Village, I told them do not talk about regeneration if we are the old generation.
whose again almost 60s still wanted to be a leader. That is why I told my wife not to start a business yet when I was the Head of Village because it would attract criticism and mockery from our villagers. The main problems with the small villagers are jealousy due to lack of education, most of the people only graduated from the elementary school. If we wanted to continue to SMP [Junior High School] and SMA [Senior High School], we had to go to Manado. So if the people could not afford it, the education would be limited to elementary school. When we wanted to build the high school, there is a problem in terms of the number of children that ready to attend the school was too small.

Q: Here as a Sanger community, we have a habit of sharing, what do you think about the impact of the Patrol on the habit?
A: I have directed the Patrol members how to adapt to the community, how they deal with they own relatives, I told them do not use violence when they want to enforce the rules or take an action instantly. We supposed to consider education background of the people and use their language, for example, if they could not speak English, do not speak English, if they can speak Siaunesse, use Siaunesse to communicate so it would be easy for the community to understand the message. If we met Siu people, do not use Japanese, we should consider their language. How we approach the community by considering their preferred language is paramount.

Q: What do you see the approach of the Patrol members?
A: I think it is good, although sometimes, some small issues happened. However, the issues are solved quickly. Sometimes, some villagers insisted.

Q: What do you suggest about good approach?
A: I think it should adjust circumstance and characters of the community, for example, facing people with bad temper, the Patrol members should approach in a persuasive way.

Q: Why is mangrove protection important to conduct?
A2: Because the mangroves existence is to aim at protecting the village. If we cut the trees more and more, it will be gone forever. As a result, there will be no our [beach] protector. There is none of government wants to enact a rule to harm the people, it is impossible but the community misunderstand about the intention of government. It depends on how we direct the community not to take the mangrove trees deliberately.

Q: What do you think about the weaknesses of the rules so many people rejected the rules?
A: The rules do not have a weaknesses, it depend on the consistency of enforcement of the rules, the enforcer of the rules. Sometimes, there are systems of “he was my grandfather’ or ‘my uncle’. I did not say that the rules are wrong but the enforcement system is inconsistent. At the moment, people became smart just by watching television or reading newspaper, so everyone knows about everything but the most important issue is the enforcer of the rules, for example village rules, if the rules is enforced consistently, it would not be an issue, but we should not apply the rules just to certain parties, because the offender was my uncle, was my grandfather, it was the
weaken. So the rules do not recognise anyone, if the rules implemented consistently, it would be all proud.

Q: How the community was get involved in community meetings, how the complaint of the community was accommodated?
A: In the meeting at the village hall, there was a meeting with the Balai staff [Bunaken Agency], and regarding the community’s complaint, they said, ‘sir, we took corals because it is our need” we do not have white rocks, if we needed to take in Manado, [the price of coral would be expensive and] we could not afford.

Q: How was it responded?
A: It [the community expectation of alternative source] was described by a community member who only was a lay people who argued that, ‘How if you provided black [terrestrial] rocks for us. If you had shown us [the alternative rock], we would have picked up and used them now. Here, we need sand to make cement block as the [main] materials of foundation of house, the sand we used to use is marine sand, so, you can imagine how long the house can survive if the marine sand is used. Iron would be destroyed and rust easily and fast. It does not mean that we did not recognise the rules but what we need [the community] and wish for [an alternative resource]. If there are available black rocks in the village, we would use them. We could buy black rock in Manado, but for the poor villagers, it would be very hard. [Listening to our statement], the DPTNB (the Management Advisory Board) also looked confused and helpless.

Q: In the other villages, the community complaints about the Park rules, how about the community in this village responded to the rules?
A: The solutions offered are selective cut and replantation. We allow the community to cut down the trees just in a needed amount, [not more]. If the community needed 10 trees, they were allowed to take 10, not more and [they have to] plant its seedling again.

Q: How were the community request of alternative livelihood and resources get respond?
A: They gave solutions, for example, for the corals. If the community needs, there are two kinds, dead corals and living corals, but the issue how to distinguish whether a coral is dead or live.

Q: How about the information insemination conducted?
A: They came here and explained, for the dead stones are characterised with the black colour, if the stone is living, its colour will be yellowish, however, if the black stone, if there is a new coral attached, it will grow up. So, for example, on the dead stone, we take a coral and attach it on the dead stone, it will grow. The attached stone will be bigger and cover up the dead stone. I saw the community keeps taking both living and dead stones. Sand and stone [are brought] from Manado, if we buy sand from Manado a dump truck [of sand] approximately around 3-4 cubic costs us Rp. 400,000 - Rp. 500,000 ($AU 40-50). The transportation [cost] is [even] more expensive, for 3-4 cubic of sand takes around 300 sacks and transportation fee for per sack is Rp. 6,000 [$US 6 cents]. So, it takes around Rp. 1,8 million [$US 180] [just] for transportation.
[in other word], the expenses increased to more than Rp. 2 million. Not mention, the transportation fee from the beach to our house, it takes Rp. 2,000 [$ US 2 cents] per sack. So, if you would like to build a house in Mantehage, you should prepare and count [the cost] carefully, the comparison cost between mainland and island cost is one and two. If we would buy bricks in the store, it costs us Rp. 2,500 [$ US 25 cents] each and Rp. 1,500 [$US 15 cents] each for renting a boat.

Q: How were about the meeting results announced to the community?
A: The community usually would be informed.

Q: What do you think about zonation?
A: There are some zones Core Zone, Use Zone and Tourism Zone and the purposes of the zonation are to protect the conservation of the marine environment and to protect the fish and coral existence. If I am not mistaken, the location of zonation is moved every five year, for example in front of the village, there is a tourism zone which is not able to touch for five years, including protecting marine biota, and coral reefs. Based on their [Park Agency staff] explanation, the fish that is spawning its eggs will not stay in the area but it will go to different area and moveable. If it is big already, it will move.

Q: Is there any sign of buoys of zonation?
A: There are some signs of buoys, according to the rules, every five years, the buoys will be moved for example, this zone will be changed into use zone.

Q: How about the resistance of the community?
A: [Do you know] why Sangeres do not like to stay in inland because our livelihood is on the sea, since our ancestors living time, I think the zonation is good but the community is quite [refused], I was the Head of Village facing such great dilemma and confusion, how could I manage the community. If we did not enforce the rules, we would be wrong and blamed, but if we enforced the rules firmly, we would deal against the community. At the present, the community still takes rocks, but it is just for their [domestic] needs.

Q: How the Patrol conducted the information insemination about the zonation?
A: The zonation location for five years cannot be questioned.

Q: So, the Community Patrol confused and helpless how to deal with the conflict related to the No-Take Zone scheme?
A: Hadeeeh,,, they are so helpless [with the rejection to zonation].

Q: Can you tell me community’s rejection towards the No-Take Zone implementation on the community in this village? For example, in Nain, they refuse strongly zonation scheme
A: Because of the No-Take Zone implementation, the fishing ground of the [Mantehage] people is getting limited and narrowed. [This limitation became more tangible], when the Mantehage Islanders complained that Nain Islanders’ coming and fishing near the Mantehage people’ [limited] fishing ground. The Nain fishermen also have built houses along the mangrove strip in Mantehage, and stayed there, and even the number of built houses increases. We have invited and discussed about this issue with the Head of Nain Village. [However], there is no solution until now.
Q: What Gatot’s programmes were conducted in the village?
A: Gatot, Pandu, and others. I heard that there is a conflict between the Balai and the Dewan. How come a private party is in conflict with the government? It seems now, the Balai takes over managing the Park now.

Q: Can you tell me about village conservation funding management?
A: At the moment I do not know about that. As I know there was a funding for conservation of the community but it was only received once, it was Rp. 10 million. That is why the community complained about and told, ‘we tried hard to enact the Core Zone restriction, and conduct conservation because there is a reward [for our village]’. As a consequence, we expelled tourists that were diving in the Park. They told us that tourism is one of local foreign exchange’s sources but who would enjoy it? But now the community challenges [the zonation] practice and the community had a reason for it. They [the Park Agency] asked ask to manage [the Park], but we received [the village funding] only once in almost ten years. That issue we questioned persistently at the community meeting with the Balai [the Park Agency] and the Dewan [the Bunaken National Park Management Board]. sometimes we had a meeting in the hotel, we ‘hit’ them with the question and they answers “yes, Sir, in the future, we will put efforts” that was only their response but until now, there is no realisation [of their promise], they just answered me [diplomatically],” it will be afforded’,

Q: Regarding Gatot’s program, how the program increased the pride of the community to the marine Park?
A: I think there was an increased in terms of pride but I do not know precisely the effectiveness of the program. I think there were a lot enough programmes of theirs but I think the [implementation] of the programmes were stumbling.

Q: Last year, we came here and this house looked different, what happened?
A: It had not been built. That is why I told to my wife, we should not conduct renovation where I was the Head of Village because it would put me under spotlight. The community would say that we committed corruption. It is difficult to construct [a house building here when you are an official] in the village.

Q: And the transportation fee from the mainland to the island is so expensive?
A: Once we had a community development funding scheme and I was asked to make a plan but the project leader asked me why the amount of my proposal was so high, and I told him to calculate and include the expensiveness of transportation expenses. That is why I told them that the allocation of funding of islands is different from the mainland basis village.

Q: What is your most difficult challenge to manage the community in terms of enact the Park rules?
A: I say it is classic, but I think it is the risk to be government, every one.
Q: How the Church was involved in enacting the rules?
A: I think the Church is consistent with the government’s rules. The Church consistently reminds the congregation about the Park rules such as tree plantation, and importance of keeping the cleanliness of the village, so there is a good relationship between government and the Church. How the Church provides understanding to the congregations about the implementation of the Park rules. By using the local people’s language, for example, the community use siau language, we do not use a heavy and difficult Manado dialect. However, there is [a dilemma] regarding my double positions, if I acted as a Head of Village too consistent, the community would question and remind me to my other position as the eldest at the Church. If acted less responsibly, they would question “What kind of Head of Village you are”?

Q: Is there any specific village rules supporting the Park Rules?
A: Yes, there is a separated Park regulation. However, the problem is the village rules are inconsistent with the local rules. That is why I told those [Park Agency staff] about the procedure of village rule enactment that before a rule would be signed by the Regency Government, it was still in a draft form, and could not be implemented yet. So after the village officials and village representatives involved the whole community members in a village making process, it [the draft] would be proposed to the Regency Government to consider and examine whether the draft’s content would put the community in difficulties or not. If the result of examination of the Government said that the draft would have negative impacts on the community, the draft would not be signed by the regent and needed to be changed.

Q: Regarding the zonation rules, is there any village rules regarding the scheme?
A: In my period, the rules were enacted. The community has conducted the [fishing] practice in accordance with the rules, for example taking mangrove trees just to make fence stiff. According to the rules, the extraction will need recommendation of the Head of Village or also one of the village officials. I just reminded that the rules were signed by the Head of Village, Head of Sub District and Regent and agreed by the all of community members. So, I asked the community how many mangrove trees you want for allowable numbers, they said 10 trees, I said ok, I make a recommendation of 10 trees and I would be in responsibility in the 10 trees but not more than that.

Q: So, there is a rules regarding the extraction of mangrove?
A: Yes, there is but I do not understanding about the differences between dead stone and living stone.

Q: So, the community was get involved in the making rules process?
A: Yes, the community was get involved in all process of making the rules because when we wanted to make any decision, the community are needed to be involved whether the process was initiated by the Balai [Park Agency], the DPTNB [Park Advisory Management Body] or the government. All process involved the community because if we managed by our self and without involving the community, they would say ignorantly, it was managed already, we just obeyed it. So everything in the community should involve the community including funding accountability of any
project in the village, not only community representative body members but also all community members have a right to observe and supervise the use of funding and the implementation of project, whether the fund was spent appropriately in accordance with the budget or not. So everything is transparent now. However, I think probably, the transparency is only applied in the village, not in the central government, because ‘simple’ people are more afraid to commit corruption especially the simple people.

Q: Are the rules applied on the whole island or just in one village?
A: It is only in one village, it depends on a decision of each village. For example, the rules in the Bango village were enacted based on the agreement on the Bango villagers. It has nothing to do with other villages such as Tinongko.

Q: Can you tell the process of decision making of the rules?
A: There were a lot of controversies, the local people said, ‘sir, since our ancestors time, we had been using corals to build our house, if it is forbidden now, so what we can do? How it can be? Will you provide an alternative? The questions like that I think is normal.

Q: How were about alternative resources and livelihood provided the Park Agency?
A: That is the main problem, for example, regarding the coral destruction issue, the fishermen which is dominant on the Mantehage Island, around 75% of the population, said that ‘do not only forbid us, please provide an alternative of [livelihood]. So we do not disturb the corals. If is only giving prohibition without providing any solution, how can we make a living. It is ok to be prohibited as long as there is a solution. I once presented this issue. If I [as the Head of Village], prohibited the villagers, how could I assure their livelihood. That is why I think it is difficult to find alternative solution to the issue, for example, extraction of stone and sand. That is why I think it is difficult to [enforce the rules] because it is difficult to find an alternative solution to the [collective action development] issue, in this case extraction of rock and sand. I think also the law is difficult to be enforced because the community’s [interest] is violated and the extraction is only for domestic use not for commercial use.

Q: How the impact of the prohibition on the change of livelihood?
A: A lot of people changed their livelihood due to the rules and went to Manado, working as construction labours, for example in settlement projects or as shop keepers, but it was only from the community’s own initiatives and not provided by the government. That is why I questioned many times about the solutions provision [from the government] because as a citizen has a right and we pay taxes, I questioned about our rights.

Q: What do you think about the Marine Park before and after the establishment of the Marine Park?
A: I think there is a change, at the beginning, the number of people was not as many as now. In the past, they conducted research for example there was a riot I forgot to be precisely when the community committed riots a few years ago because a villager were caught when he was fishing and taken to the Balai [the Park Agency] office. The boy just was fishing and he was taken to the office and the community immediately committed a riot, the boats of the Balai were burned and all officers disappeared. The boy just fishing for fish for eat, and for refreshing. Moreover, according to the law he could not be caught because he was under age, but he was caught and taken to the office. It took time to solve the problem. So, I think the Park should have made rules that harmless the villagers, they supposed to make a rules benefiting the community. I told [to the Park authority], you conserve corals, not conserve the people, so just [please] be careful with the implementation of the rules. If we are prohibited, so, where we are going to? How about our daily live. However, if I presented [at a meeting], the meeting holder would be panic, for example a meeting conducted by the joint team consisted of the Balai, Water Police, the DPTNB, after the meeting, I have never seen them again. At the meeting, it seems that the team was overwhelmed in providing solution when the community member told them “sir, we will not take sand and coral again if you provide the alternative, as well mangrove”. They were lay people but they asked according to their needs. You imagined, I faced [dilemma], on 17 August celebration, when every villager was asked to make fence, and asked for a permit to cut mangrove. If I did not allow, they would be reasoning, if someone asked why you did not fix the fence, they would answer, “Opo did not allow us to cut the mangrove”, I was helpless. Once, they caught a local Woman [and would bring the Women to the police office] and the Women cried [loudly] like a child [due to the possibility to be sent to a jail]. She was caught because she was taking mangrove tress just for fire wood; the situation was a dilemma because she cut a living tree not a dead tree. They [the Women and her family and relatives] did not conduct and apply selection cut practice but cut the all trees in one area. In that time, there were 13 officials from the police, the Balai, prosecutors, there were 13 personnel altogether. The team did not go home but they spent one night in the village, in this house and they consulted me and asked what happened with my community. When I inspected there were a lot of wood binding, it was around 100 bindings, and all of trees were living trees. The Patrol members did not take the Women away but they just took the wood around two bindings of wood and they sit here and told me that they would bring the wood as an evidence and I was worry because if it said an evidence, it means that the process would continue and the Women has a lot of relatives [who protected her]. So, I reminded them, ‘if you bring the wood as evidence of violation, the case would be needed to be processed’ but if you bring the wood as a simple investigation finding, it would be not a case because the offender cannot be found and identified. I once found black wood, a lot, around nine cubic. It is controversial, the judge argued that the black wood could not be sold, [so I was innocent] but the prosecutors told me that at the store, [a lot of] souvenirs made of the black wood are sold. So that is how the case was closed but repetition of the same activity will not be permitted at all. The weaknesses of the law were not placed on the law but the object of the law itself.
Q: What the most difficult case you ever known?
A: I think the community should have been given better understanding about the rules due to lack of education. That is why I am grateful now in Bango village at least there is a one elementary school. In the past, the children should pass the swamp area when they were going to school. As a consequence, many children were dropped out not because they did not want to go to school but because it was too difficult especially in the high tide, they had to swim in order to come to school. Tangkasi as well, the road village is rough and wet especially after raining.

Thank you

Interview with the Head of Nain Tatampi Village

Q: Thank you for your participation in this interview. Can you introduce yourself?
A: My name is Ferdinand Salindeho. [I am famous] even the whole regency knows who I am. I am the first Head of Village in Nain.

Q: Can you tell me about your role the Head of Village?
A: I became the Head of Village since 2000.

Q: Can you tell me about your roles in the Church?
A: I grew up in Manado Tuan, and was born in Nain. I grew up as a Sunday school teacher in GMPI. I am so happy [with the role]. I attended an examination and graduated from Junior High School in 1970. I was back and forth Nain and then I made a close friend with Nainers including the wife of a Pastor in the area. I visited again Nain to attend a wedding party in a home place of my wife. I met her in the party, and got married in 1973.

Q: What things made you proud of becoming a Nainer?
A: I did not and never expect that I would become a Head of Village. I thought, I am just an outsider. How come I became a Head of Village here? When I entered the Church, I met Pastor Mesakh and they gave me understanding that I should become the Head of Village. I told them as a poor people, becoming the Head of Village is not an easy task. I was invited in the community meeting and there was a discussion about my availability to become the Head of Village. We talked and I asked to the Pastor what the topic of the meeting was. The Pastor said that there was a good intention. I have heard from the community that I was able to become the Head of Village. I said yes as long as the community agreed. I was surprised because everyone agreed. I told the community that I was just graduated from the Junior High School. However, they still support me and saying that in Tatampi Village, an acting Head of Village that is the second place after the Head of Village Position should be selected. I said it was not easy but they kept convincing me that they would help me. I met the Head of Wori Sub District who told me that I would be able to bear the responsibility and she would help me.
Q: So, the main pride of being a Nainer is the available opportunity for you who have less education.
A: Yes, it was. Previously, I did not intend to be the Head of Village but the community told them that they would support me.

Q: What things about the Island make you happy?
A: I am proud that there is improvement in the community and family.

Q: We know that Nain is part of the Bunaken National Park. What things about the Park make you proud?
A: I am proud with the [promised] aid from the Park to help the community. However, I told the Park please do not make our community more suffer.

Q: What kind of assistance promised by the Park?
A: It is not clear but the Park promised that they would rebuild the school.

Q: There is a representative of the Park Agency who came to Nain. Do you know Mr. A Gatot?
A: I think I know. We talked.

Q: How Mr. Gatot’s program helped the community in terms of knowledge and wellbeing?
A: I just heard from Pastor Mesakh that there was an aid from the government.

Q: So, can you tell me the effectiveness of Mr. Gatot’s program?
A: Nothing specific. There was only information about education and school.

Q: Have you ever talked face to face?
A: Yes, we have. Because the Park is a national Park so surveillance should be conducted.

Q: There is a program of the Bunaken National Park Agency called Community Patrol, what do you image when you heard these words?
A: I have heard. When I was fishing, a ship came towards me. They asked me what I am doing. Jokingly, I told them I was stealing and I asked them where the Police Headquarter is. They answer me nowhere.

Q: There was no warning from the Community Patrol members?
A: Use of potassium in fishing is not allowed.

Q: Are there the Community Patrol members here in this village?
A: Yes, they are.

Q: How about the recruitment system of the members? Did you provide a recommendation letter for the candidates?
A: Yes, I did, that is all.
Q: So, there was a letter from the Park Agency?
A: No, there was not.

Q: If you were asked to be a Community Patrol member, would you join?
A: My sons joined [but not me]. In other villages, there was a problem when the Community Patrol members catching their own relatives.

Q: Have has the issue happened here?
A: No, there was no kind of issue. I think it would not become a problem. As long as we work hard, we will be blessed. There is a Mighty God who arranges everything.

Q: The Community Patrol members told me that there is a difficulty with obedience of the Community with the Park rules. What should the Patrol members do so the community will obey?
A: In the evening, there was a Patrol arresting offenders of the rules. I told the Patrol members and they checked the boat if there was a compressor. I also reminded the community not use potassium that is ban by the government.

Q: Was there information insemination to the community in their own house?
A: No, never. All community members were invited in an information insemination session hold by Patrol members from Manado. Some people attended but I did not.

Q: Have you invited in a discussion of the Park rules.
A: Not here, only in Tampi Besar.

Q: Have you been invited in the community meetings?
A: Yes, I have.

Q: How the community’s complain was followed up by the Park Agency in the meeting?
A: No, there were no solutions offered.

Q: In the meeting, were you given sufficient opportunity to speak up?
A: Yes, I was. I was attending a meeting held by officials from regency government who conducted information insemination in the Christian village. Mr. Buyung conducted the sharing of information. We just acted as a good listener.

Q: So, the meeting is not always open?
A: No, sometimes, the meeting are limited to certain people.

Q: Who else was invited from the Tatampi Village?
A: It was only me.

Q: Did the organiser send a letter for you?
A: No, they did not. They came to pick me up after I hear information from the Sub District government.
Q: So, you are saying that the community’s compliance did not receive enough attentions from the meeting organisers?
A: No, they did not.

Q: So, the most important thing was only the presence of the community? I think so.
A: Because this village is part of the Bunaken Nasional Park that includes the ban.

Q: Do you think that the scheme leads to difficulty to the community?
A: School children somethings come to me and let me know that do not destroy the corals. I told the Park Agency, the ban was applied since long time ago. If they insisted prohibiting us, and then how we would survive? I told to the community, they can go fishing as long as they do not destroy the corals. There is a national rule arranging the use of coral that does not belong to us.

Q: From so many rules, which rule is the most difficult to be accepted by the community?
A: The most difficult rule to be accepted when they are fishing is how not to violate the borders of the No-Take Zone.

Q: So, compared to other zones such as the Tourism Zone, the Core Zone is the hated most?
A: Yes, it is. It is the most difficult to be accepted because the community thinks that the sea is special gift from God for them. So, the most difficult thing about the ban is the rule has impacted on the life and on the livelihood of the community. Especially, the Nainers totally depend on the sea.

Q: When the information insemination of the zonation scheme was conducted, did the Park Agency offer alternative job to the community as compensation of the ban?
A: No, they did not.

Q: From the beginning of the zona scheme implementation, there was no alternative?
A: No, never. I tried to convince the Agency giving a guarantee [of alternative livelihood] to the community so the community would be happy. The Park staff asked me what should be provided and I answer: give us an engine.

Q: So you need an engine?
A: Yes, we need an engine called katingting (small engine) because it is the cheapest one.

Q: In the last three months, what do you thing about the change of community’s acceptance to the zonation scheme?
A: Nothing changed.

Q: It is only Tatampi? or Nain Island as a whole?
A: On the Nain Island.

Q: In other words, the community has not received the scheme yet?
A: No, not yet.
Q: The community’s rejection happened because of lack of assistance from the Agency?
A: I think so. I think the Agency was not serious gaining the community support.

Q: So, the point is the Park Agency did not show enough seriousness with the community’s complaints?
A: No, the community told me that as long as the Park Agency provided an engine for them, [they would be happy]. I ask them how many and [what kind of engine]. They answered me 15. I said as long as the engine is katingting and around 15, it is ok. However, if not, the country would be bankrupt.

Q: Is there a complaint of the community about the absence of the lack of solutions and answers?
A: No, in other meetings, I was not invited anymore.

Q: From Mr. Gatot, there is no financial assistance?
A: No, there is not.

Q: How about assistance in terms of activity?
A: No, there is not.

Q: How about a restriction of Maming [Napoleon wrasse] fish?
A: It was applied since long time ago.

Q: Is it because of the high price of the fish?
A: I did not hide. I used to make a fish trap and was given money. I went to Lihunu Village where the No-Take Zone is absent.

Q: How about the community thinks about impacts of the Park on their livelihood.
A: The community thinks that the Park’s presence makes the community in trouble. The community said that if the Park Agency provided an engine and operational money to go fishing in further area, [it would be better].

Q: So the community expected financial support from the Park Agency?
A: That is their request. They ask me, ‘Head of Village, please give us an engine’.

Q: So, until now, the zonation scheme is still a controversy?
A: Yes, it is.

Q: How about with a mangrove use restriction?
A: We do not use mangrove anymore. It is only few community members still using mangroves, especially in Tarente. The community dives in the night.

Q: How about a change of fish population number?
A: It decreased because of use of small net.

Q: So, main problems are lack of information insemination and alternative livelihood?
A: Yes, when I almost finished my job as a Head of Village, I was promised to receive a motor cycle. However, until now, I did not receive anything.

Thank you for your participation.

Date:

Interview with Head of Village of Buhias

Q: Can you introduce yourself?
A: My name is Frens Bere. My ancestors were Tamako, Sanger people. My grandmother was from the Santiago family that was part of the kingdom in the past. Since I have married my wife, there was no intention to me to seek our heritage, the risk was being sick and finally died.

Q: Can you tell me your position in the Church beside in the community?
A: I was the head of Church congregation for four periods; the first period I was the Secretary of the Head of Congregation and at the moment, I have been the deputy of the Chairman of the Congregation for the two periods. I have been the eldest of kolom [group of Church] since 35 years ago, when I was about 26 years old. According to the GMIM rules, the minimum age of being the eldest is 25, so until now I am still the eldest, I am 59 years old. A building of the Church of GMIM was built by me. I did not have a plan to be the Head of Village but the community keeps choosing me as the leader.

Q: How long have you become the Head of Village?
A: I have been the Head of Village since 2010. It was already 4 years, and [I will reign] two years more. I told the people, it is enough for me, but the chairman Bango’ BPD [parliament members] said that it still OK [for me to continue]. I think it is enough for me because what I never imagine of God’s grace I enjoyed, including a reward from the State in form of trips to foreign countries such as Bangkok, Malaysia and also to domestic places such as Bali, Batam and Jakarta a few times.

Q: In what purposes the trips were conducted?
A: Comparison study. [I received the reward] due to [my accomplishment] finishing tax collection. In 2010, it was a training of village structure. In June, one month after I was inaugurated I had a business travel. I was loyal for many times as the servant of God, and that is the blessing God provided. Many people wonder why [I had so many trips].

Q: What thing makes you proud to be a Mantehage people?
A: I felt proud of the trust of the Mantehage people [to be a leader] both as the Church leader and the community leader and [the experience] cannot be forgotten. It cannot be paid with money. That is why I told to my children and my grandchildren to keep and maintain the [precious] trust. If we mistrust the people’s trust, our future would be lost.
Q: What is the proud as the Mantehage people since the Mantehage has been declared as part of the TNB?
A: The proud of the TNB especially [indirect] impacts of the enactment of rules of banning the mangrove trees on the community. In the past, when there was no the rules, I did not intent to underestimate, but the life of the Mantehage people was [very] simple and [lawless]. In the past the Mantehage Island was not known and frequently had a problem with police, the people used to cut the tree and once they sold the wood in Manado, the police would catch them. Since we have limited the trees cutting, unexpectedly, the village has been developed in terms of the development of the boat and transportation quality. In the past, due to bad quality, the people must wear thongs to get into boat but now we can wear shoes. Now, people do not work as wood collectors anymore, so the preferences of the people are not being collectors and cutters of mangrove trees anymore, but their perspectives are more advance now and wider than it was in the past. The lifestyle is more modern now, due to the Park establishment. However, one of the weaknesses of the Park is lack of the aid of conservation to the village that was once happened, but not now. In the past, the waiting room was part of the aid of the conservation of the Bunaken National Park. More than ten years, it was not provided again. The aid was Rp. 10 million. We received it two or three times. It was promised that there will be a program of ‘Arisan Simpan Pinjam’ [Micro Finance], but it did not happen. When I was conducting a comparison study in Jogja a few years ago, I joined a tourism group of study, I saw that the contribution of the tourism area to the village around 50%, part here, I have never received such contribution, how can I convince the community to protect the marine area, if there was no benefit for the community even though our area belongs to the tourism destination. In Hong Kong also like that the practice of contribution of the tourism area occurred. Because of the contribution, the villagers willing to clean the village, how the village will be developed [without the willingness of the community]. They just take results [of income], but no giving return [to the village].

Q: What do you think about the Community Patrol activity by the Balai?
A: It was only a few years ago but now, there is no Patrol anymore. The last time was 2011. When they wanted to apply again [but] not accepted. So, they were disappointed and became security. They still want to be a Community Patrol member because they want to protect our environment. If an outsider was a Patrol member, even though the violation was a simple case, the handling process would directly be handled by the Police. If the Patrol member was a local people, we could solve the issue just in the village, and the offender could be just given warning and education and no need of riots to occur. If the offenders had received warning so many times, what could we do? The expression is if we could not educate the offenders, we should have perished them. Sometimes, explosive fishing happened [again] because there is no surveillance. How can we protect and guard [the resource], who would prevent the community from committing the practice even they had a bomb. If the community was caught red handed, they could throw the bomb to us. It would better they took the fish and coral than throwing the bomb to us.
Q: As the Head of community, how were you get involved in the meeting related to the Patrol activities?
A: I was, and I used to emphasis that Patrol to be conducted again. The community also gave similar pressures and they [Park Agency] promised that they would operate in 2013, but not until now, there is no activity. The community argues that even in the past, when the Mantehage Island showed no result and no support [toward the Park], the village received an aid. How much more now, when the Mantehage Islanders have shown much supports. Moreover, the post of Patrol is centrally located on the Mantehage Island, how could the Mantehage villages not receive any aid. They said that they were divided into two. One side said that they would come and give Rp. 10 million per village for simpan pinjam [Micro Finance] but it did not happen until now.

Q: When you heard “Patrol” what do you think about Patrol?
A: I did not know about the people’s perspectives. Honestly, before I became the Head of this village, I was against the Patrol [members] that prevent the Mantehage people from cutting the mangrove trees, [and] because of the impacts of the ban on the community life. However, later I became aware of the ban benefits [the community]. I wish and expect that we (the community and the Park Authority) would have a [mutual] understanding; if they (the Park Authority) was understanding and are attentive to the village [’s expectation] then the village would be too. [I wish the Park Authority] did not only ask support of the community without showing any concern to the community’s [difficulties]. How the community could be developed if there is no aid [at all].

Q: Can you tell me the recruitment system of the Patrol?
A: They applied and passed a test, they were sent by the village government. They should have a recommendation from the village when they applied. For example, Jonas gave the recommendation and assigned by the Head of Village.

Q: How was information about the recruitment announced to the community?
A: It was announced based on the Letter of the Balai [Park Agency], whoever interested in becoming a Patrol member, they were welcomed to apply. The period of time of a Community Patrol member is one year or two years. After the period finished, the Patrol members would be changed. We opened an opportunity to the new people who should pass the test, especially their ability, and education. If they passed the test, they would be Patrol members. They also had a test, but they were not accepted, none of the four villages on the Mantehage Island was accepted. That is why Robert and his friends who attended the test felt disappointed. So, there was no Patrol. Even the joint Patrol activity is seldom.

Q: Was there any special condition? Male, female?
A: The recruitment was special for men, because it was rare for female to apply because their operating time used to be in the night.

Q: If there is an opportunity, do you want to be a Patrol member?
A: No, even to be the Head of Village again, I would say no, how much more become a Patrol member. Every position has an art, becoming a Patrol member means you were ready spend night on the sea. While to be the Head of Village, even though it was difficult, we just need to work on day time. Not mention the risk to argue and deal with so many offenders, for example when three Patrol members were facing 30 fishermen using illegal soma jarring (net). What they could do is they just needed to win the nerve war against the offenders. My secretary was a Patrol member, before I was elected to be the Head of Village. When I just was about to be the Head of Village, I brought my crews fishing using jubi (traditional spear gun) at the Park area, and the Patrol caught us and inspected our boats. When they were investigating us, I told them, I just was using jubi (traditional spear gun) at the time, we did not catch any fish and also they did not find anything wrong. However, the secretary kept reporting my case to the Head of Village of Tangkasi who then became angry. [Then] I [became upset] I told them-the secretary and the Patrol member from the Bango Village I did not catch any fish and [if you kept continuing the arresting process] ‘I would shoot you’ using the jubi. At eight o’clock pm, we were called by the former Head of Village. I asked him, why I should be called, did I commit a rape or a murder, so you called me at such late time? I was not upset but my relatives were upset [and tried to stop the arresting process], but the former Head of Village kept writing a letter of invitation [of investigation and interrogation]. As a result, my relatives became so angry and preventing and blocking the Head of Tangkasi Village from coming to this village.

Q: So, what are the impacts of the Patrol work on the loosening relationship of the family and relatives? Are there other examples of the impacts of the Patrol in terms of the harmony of the relationship in the village?

Q: What do you think, how the Patrol should do in order to convince the community?

A: At the Robert’s era, community listened to him, because he knew how to approach the community, he made a friend with the community. If he just overemphasised his duty and ignored the community, it means that he was not part of the community. Therefore, he supposed to control his authority, otherwise he would stand against the community. His approaches were in form of information insemination. If the people did not about the rules, automatically, they would commit the violation against the rules, for example zonation, you could not catch fish in the Core Zone, or in terms of restriction coral harvesting, you were just allowed to take dead stones. If he just
enforced his task consistently without [compromising] and conducting any information insemination information, it is clear that he chose to stand against the community. For the last few years, the Patrol members did not operate. However, even though they did not operate the community’s awareness has improved.

Q: When you were the community members, how about the impact of information insemination to the change of the community’s obedience to the rules?
A: Some of community members obeyed but some not because their rules sometimes changed.

Q: For example?
A: In the past, as I know at the beginning, it was forbidden to cut mangrove and take stones but later, there is an [new] change of the rules and the zones. As a result, the community when they want to take stone and sand confused. In the past, it is allowed to take dead stones after the community obeyed the rules by taking the dead stone, the community found out that the practice was also forbidden because if the dead stone finished or run out, the living stone would be taken eventually. Automatically, the Balai should provide information insemination about the rules. [The confusion] happened recently here in Mantehage related to the Park violation, the offender would have sent to jail, someone who was caught but escape, and it was accused that the village government reported the violation. I told them I never have reported anybody but probably someone or Patrol members did that using the technology advantage. I was accused because I attended an information insemination meeting by a foreigner in the Church, a meeting I must attend due to my position as the Head of congregation. What can I do? I must attend the meeting. [The problem with the ban] is the local community members have difficulty to earn something to eat. Even, the community is prohibited to walk past the nyare (Protected intertidal area) because it will destroy the coral. Particularly, when the community was collecting bia (green and gold mouth turban) requiring the collectors to step on the corals and [unavoidably], it will break the [protected] corals. If we enforced [firmly] the rule, the problem is the practice of eating bia (green and gold mouth turban) is part of local cultures. However, stepping on [corals in] the nyare cannot be avoided because collecting bia (green and gold mouth turban) is conducted not by diving but [by walking] when low tide. [Moreover], if we prohibited the community, it is the same as we killed the community, therefore, we supposed [think how to] feed and [provide an alternative livelihood to] the community as an alternative to bia collection. That is why [I think that] the rules are against and not aligned with the culture of the community such as catching, eating and shooting fish. In terms of turtle consumption restriction has been obeyed. In the past, we used to catch turtle but not now because we already aware so we did not catch it anymore except if there is a big party. However, it was not common, it was only one party who committed it, but it used to be two or three turtles in one boat sold to Manado but that practice is gone already because the community is already afraid and also aware. There is improvement and development of the community in terms of law related awareness of the community. However, from the Balai [Park Agency] did not understand the community’s expectation. As a result, when we were applying and enforcing the
rules, we should have provided a reason [why there was no attention from the Park Agency]. We cannot say “no” to the community without [receiving] any concern and attention and contribution [in return] from the relevant institution to the local community.

Q: How did the Patrol deal with the community’s disagreement toward the zonation?
A: That is I told before, but because the Patrol members are local people so the way to deal with the disagreement is to make a friend with the other local people. Before Robert became a Patrol member, there was a hostile between the Patrol and the local community, before Robert there was a local people who became a Patrol. I used to [adversely] protest to the Forestry Agency (Park Agency) related to the mangrove ban. [Even] I would burn the wood and my boat altogether [as a protest sign]. As a consequence, the Patrol became a hostile with me. However, we became aware when we had an [alternative] job. [In general], the [community] Patrols [members] on the Mantehage Island are nice people especially in Buhias, but it is different from the village to village. The Patrols in other villages [even] were accused ‘a whistle blower’. The [community] Patrols in Buhias were not too strict; they just warned the community, while, inn Tangkasi, their Patrol used to report the community’s violation straight to the [Park] office. [Community] Patrol in Buhias understood and considered the community’s interests. I told to the Patrol that “there are only three of you, while the community is many, if you used a rude way, the community would be harsher and aggressive,” they should to approach the community in a polite and gentle way.

Q: What do you think about zonation?
A: Regarding [the Patrol members]’ works protecting the zonation, I do not understand deeply and thoroughly. If I said it was clear, [it is not true. The operation was not intense or significant. Since I have become the Head of Village, it was only once or twice they worked. I also did not chase after them.

Q: What is good thing or benefit the zone?
A: I think the zonation is good [to protect the environment], but there is no responsibility of the officers in implementing the zonation, they supposed to come a few times a year but since for the last year they have never come. How they could enforce the rules, if they did not present in the community and make a friend with the community. It is already August, they never came. How they could effectively enforce the zonation. Human are not all the same.

Q: From the all rules which one is the most difficult rule for the community to accept?
A: The zonation scheme is the most difficult to accept because it is in the area of livelihood.

Q: How was the alternative livelihood provided by the Park Authority?
A: I have already questioned [about provision of alternative livelihood for community since 2013], [when] we had a [community] meeting and I argued [to the Park Authority that] the community said that if they (Park authorities) wants to prohibit
us from using the resources in the area, they supposed to provide [the community] a replacement, for example boats, and nets like in Nain where a fishing Group have been formed [and received the new gears] and so, we will not destroy the coral. However, [if] eventually we will need to go to the deep [and far] sea, [please] provide us tuna boats that is fiber boats [that is able to go far], so we will not go fishing in the near [that is protected] coastal area. The only support so far is only from the Fisheries Department [not from the Park Authority].

Q: When they heard about Maming fish ban, how the community accepts the ban?
A: The community obeys not to catch Maming but [not accept the rules]. Actually, the ban has no significant [economic] impacts because the price of Maming is cheaper than price of Kerapu fish, the price of Maming just as low as other common fish.

Q: So, in terms of price, Maming is less valuable comparing to Kerapu?
A: Yes, it is.

Q: But why the Park asked the community to protect the fish?
A: The fish is important in the zonation, because the fish kills something with sharp sides in Sangerese called Poparede which are able to damage the coral and poisonous. So, if the thing was not destroyed, the corals will destroy. That is the function of Maming fish. is On the Siladen Island, the thing was looked for and collected and paid Rp, 1,000 each. That is part of the zonation’s function. However, because the zonation became a business for them, they provided [the opportunity] to the businesspeople who ran the zonation. However, I questioned the Park management of the zonation because they answered that Poparede will be collected and [for benefits] of the community. I asked what the guarantee was for the community due to its danger. When we were collecting it and loading it to the boat and we got stink what was a medical for us. So, I told the Park staf there must be a cure to the poison, and then we could trust and be satisfied with Rp. 1000 fee. If it comes out in the corals, the corals will die. The Napoleon fish with its tick lips is able to kill the sharp thing which is a prey to the fish. Moreover, the community has no significant interest with the fish [conservation] because the fish is cheap. It has no [economic] impact on the community.

Q: How about the seedling’s price of the Maming, does it have a good price?
A: They [the community] used a net and catch the seedling to nurture and grow it, for example in Nain and the Water Police released them all because it is forbidden. It is common on the Nain Island. It should obtain a permit but I do not understand which practice is allowed and which practice is not.

Q: Do you think there is a change in zonation acceptance of the community in the last three years?
A: About the zonation, there is no rejection from the community, whatever the ban is the community will obey. There is no rejection. However, if they [the Park Agency staff] do not concern about the community’s [problem], the community would be defensive.
Q: The zonation is a place where many fish gather?
A: Here in Mantehage, fish existence follows the moon-sky system which arranges that fish will appear sometimes at certain place at certain time. So, in certain months based on information of expert person, fish will come up.

Q: Do you is there any change of fish abundance?
A: Just the same but the people still put small efforts because the potential of fishing is a lot here but the people want to develop, for example, a fisher can catch five kg and sell it only, Rp. 10,000 per kg. It is beneficial for them to work in the construction which provided wages Rp. 100,000,- per day, to be a carpenter they would be paid Rp. 80,000 per day and the builders paid more than Rp. 100,000 per day. That is why people prefer to work in the construction site than to fishing. As a consequence, it is difficult to find fish to eat here in Buhias Village, because the price is too cheap. People are more available to [have alternative] livelihood. It is easy to find carpenters here in Buhias. It is a lot of carpenters here. Everyone is in Manado, already.

Q: Beside the Patrol activity, how the community was get involved in the community meetings?
A: All was get involved in the meeting but not in Patrol activities, it is only them [the selected Patrol members]. If there are two Patrol here and there three people, they woud be shifted but in the meeting, all community always are invited.

Q: How are the community invited to a community meeting?
A: Through TOA (loud speaker), for example from the Balai [Balai Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Bunaken National Park Agency] will conduct information insemination, and it is provided uang duduk (pocket money) around Rp. 30,000 or Rp. 40,000, meals and t-shirt. If they asked for 30 participants, the people would come 40 or [even] 50 people.

Q: Who were invited usually in the meeting?
A: Everyone, the community who wants to come.

Q: How did the participation at the meeting benefit the community?
A: I did not see any benefits [of the meeting] because they did not provide any solutions until they had to face with the community and the [village] government because there is no support.

Q: How did they listen to your complaints and expectation at the meeting?
A: They heard [but] the members of the BPD (Village Representative Committee) said that it is useless to complain because there will be no [satisfying] responses from the Park. They (the Park Authority staff) were reasoning that (the staff are lack of Authority because) they are divided into two parties (of the Park Management) which made difficult to [give proper responses and answers].

Q: For example?
A: I told them since I was the Head of Congregations of the Church, I have heard about the [financial] support [from the Park Agency] but why it was absent now. Compared to their [Park Agency] responsibility, I conducted my job more credible than them
I participated in several comparison study trips until abroad regarding the Park [management]. I expected the same as a return of our concern to the Park from the Park Agency. I told them, what the use is for us involving in the Park if there is no return for us. As a result, the Park would be in hostile with the community and eventually the [village] government would be blamed. I took it as if we made our ears deaf if the situation liked this because we asked for the poverty alleviation efforts for the village community, but [it was not provided].

Q: So the complaint of community to the Park Agency was related to the poverty alleviation of the community?
A: Yes, [unfortunately] there is no solution.

Q: From many complaints, how the complaints were followed up in the meeting?
A: Nothing, it was limited to the organized meeting, I think for them [Park Agency staff] it was sufficient just to come and obtain a signature and expected that the community would be proud with Rp.40,000 and one box lunch. In contrast, the community’s concern to them [to the Park interests] was clear, significant and proved by obeying the rules, not taking rock, sand and not cutting the mangrove. It is proved on my house backyard. In the past, there was no mangrove there but we from PNPM planted it [and succeeded]. The plantation is so dense so we could not get through the forest now.

Q: How about the dead mangrove tree taking practice?
A: That is why I told previously, there is no honesty from their side about the rules. First of all, I was also an entrepreneur of mangrove wood. Later, I was caught and attended the information insemination, they told us that from three branches, we are allowed to cut two branches and leave one branch that will multiply slowly but surely, mangrove cutting activities are not allowed at all, that is I told them, it is unfair, same as corals. That is why I think we should understand the rules and [consider] not conducting the livelihood [as mangrove wood collectors] anymore because we have already aware that the mangrove forest benefits us. It happened because [now] we think from a different perspective, not only from the cultural perspectives based on our ancestors’ customs to work in the forest, but also from the different perspectives. As a result, now, there are so many people in the village become carpenters. However, at least, I wish the Park would do something to get the community out from the poverty. So, we did not manage the forest again. Regarding the dry and wet on average we did not touch it anymore. We do not use the mangrove wood in our house anymore. We use coconut branches, even though it is weaker and more difficult to get burnt than mangrove wood because mangrove wood will not be easily fragile in the water.

Q: Why did the communities in Nain refuse strongly the no take zone scheme?
A: In Nain, the villagers strongly refused the scheme, especially, [because] their livelihood is only on the sea and different from people in the Mantehage [Island] who are able to farm. The Nain islanders cannot farm, it can be said that 100% of the Nain Islanders are fisheries. They cannot farm because the land is infertile.

Q: Do you have a village regulation related to the rules?
A: No, we cannot apply the rules in the village regulation because it was not included as a village regulation because there is no cooperation between [the Park] and the village [government], while the Park regulation includes the zonation.

Q: How was the Church get involved?
A: It was get involved but in form of information insemination. However, as I said before it was without any appropriate and emergent concern expressed and showed [by the Park Agency]. However, if they saw the community was taking sand and corals, they would give a fast respond. Instead, they would bring the offenders once.

Q: How about the demarcation of zonation, how was the community get involved in the process?
A: There was no community involvement, although here it was a zone in the past. There was a Community Zone, special for the community, while down there, there was a prohibited zone but now, there is no zone [for the community use] anymore, all zones are prohibited now and the community did not against the rule anymore because Buhias did not use the wood anymore.

Q: So, there is no village rule here?
A: No, because village rules used to be enacted in every January and February each year but they did not come until two years, what we can do? There is a Patrol post in Bango but it is rare to see them coming and reviewing the post.

Q: Do you know Gatot?
A: I do not know him but someone else with short hair used to give me a call but not now. During the last year, they have not come. They used to invite the community in the past, but not now. Three months ago, I was invited to attend an event in Nain but I think it was useless, whatever their activities, there would no benefits [for the community]. After attending the meeting, I would not ignore the need of financial aid to the community but I wish the money would be used for the community. For me, as the Head of Village, [it is easy to earn money]. Even though we were just sitting down, we would receive money if someone came and asked for my signature but we need the financial aid for the community. Once, they conducted a meeting here, the meeting [organizer just] provided t-shirt and pocket money. However, until now, there is no contact anymore.

Q: What is your expectation to the Balai?
A: I [recognise] they have unarguable regulations and bans. I told the community, if on the Park Board is written [the Park name as] the National Park which means the land belongs to the state. However, for the individual uses, what [is the contribution] for the community because once I read a book of the Park which was left unintentionally, the book says that an area like the Mantehage which has no beach, no sand and surrounded by mangrove, the land belongs to the state. While, at the same time the land of the Mantehage are [categorised] as Passini land and there are people in the land. That is why I argued that their secret book is with me. This island supposed not to be habituated and belongs the state, had no beach, then so it could be managed as a Park and. I think this is a weakness of the previous government that has had accepted
the Park without reading first whether the Park was harmful or beneficial to the community. We had to send our children to school otherwise our future would be in harm because the land belongs to the state because of the National Park existence. In the future, there would be lawyers or judges [in our children generation], the situation would be different and [they would] question why the government apply the National Park here while here is the Passini land. We were deceit. My wife said that our freedom and independence that was enjoyed just around it just was around 30% or 40% from 100%. We did not totally enjoy the freedom because we were under the colonism, by our own state, our government. About the zonation, there is no [openly] rejection from the community, whatever the ban is the community would obey. There is no rejection, [but] if they do not concern about the community’s [interest], the community will be ignored, because they (the Park Authority) do not provide any solution.

We used to have fishing potentials, but it was prohibited, we used to take corals to build our house but it was not allowed too, we have to buy rocks in Manado and the transport fee from Manado costs us Rp. 6,000 per dump truck and for deliverance, it costs us Rp 1.5 million, so when the rocks reach the island the cost reaches Rp. 2 million and not mention the truck hire costs us Rp. 500,000 per dump truck. So, the comparison of building cost between Manado and Mantehage is two and one. It is the same as the sand. So we buy cement brick in Manado too. The extra cost is around same. There is no use of coral in foundation of house building. In the past, it was allowed to take coral for personal use but now if you take coral in a few numbers even for personal use, it would be reported via BBM (Black Berry Messenger) and the Patrol would come immediately and we would be called from the Balai. That is why I mentioned before about our life, we were deceit and tortured too. On the other hand, there is development [of infrastructure]. Because God also provides human [ability] to think different ways so in the village, there is development, based on potentials of the village. Existence of the Park had led the community to think hard. It is also one of the prides, after being prohibited the community’s cultures changed from not knowing how to build house to knowing to build their house. In the past, when I was building the Church, I needed to find outside builder because in that time, there was very few builders here in Buhias. The positive impacts, now when we wanted to build Church we do not need to find capable outsider to build many story building. The other community’s expectation is related to fish’s prices, for the certain fish even though we caught it in the a lot of amount, but its price just Rp. 10,000 or Rp. 15,000 per kg and if [it was caught] by three of us, [it means the benefits should be divided into three and it would be very small], but if we can catch [protected] Napoleon [wrasse] that can be sold at Rp 35,000 per kg, we just need to take and catch two kg in few hours [in order to obtain sufficient benefits]. Therefore, the people requested to the Park to provide a support [and compensation for ban of] catching the fish, and [so we could] leave the ‘jubi’ practice [to catch the fish] that is prohibited because it damages the corals. However, until now, there is no answer from the Park or the Balai (the Management Advisory Board) [of the request and expectation].

Q: Did you have a lot of rewards and travelling due to the rewards?
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A: Yes, in 2012, I was invited by the KPK as the best Kuntua [Head of Village] to attend the Independence Day celebration at the state palace. The key is integrity. Probably, it is blessing because I have worked many times for God. In terms of administration and governance, the Head of Village cannot be defeated.

Interview with Tinongko’s Head of Village

Q: Can you introduce yourself please?
A: My name is Agustinus Manumpil. I was the leader of the forum of citizens [of the Park] in my village. However, at the regional level that covers islands such as Nain, Mantehage, Bunaken, Manado Tua and Siladen I was trusted to be a treasure. In the next two years, I became a treasure of PNPM which was PPK (Sub district development project). In 2001, I became the Head of Village, until 2011. I was the deputy of leader of Male Ministry of the Bunaken region. In 2001, I was the leader of Male Ministry, and also the treasure of Church development. In 2006, I became the Head of Development Commission until 2013. Recently, I became the Head of kamtibmas mapalus [local security system] since 2012. A few months ago I was trusted to be a member of the public election commission in the village. I was proud to be trusted by the community, although I was not born here. I was born in Sanger. I married to a local girl who continued her study and moved here, so I am here.

Q: What things make you proud to be a Mantehage people?
A: [I am] very proud, clearly, of what the local people had done following a good example of the community in Sanger [in terms of development].

Q: For example?
A: In terms of [initiatives] of local people who develop their own village without any order or instruction from the government. We showed this is a good thing and we should follow that way. Next, in terms of the conducting the given trust [as a Head of Village], we should show that this is a way [of community initiative] is a good practice considering a position of the island is closer to Manado than to Sanger island, its development is left behind. When I was back to Sanger, I saw its development and I decided to take it as an example. The election of me as the Head of Village cannot be separated from an influence of the relatives. People who have insignificant influencing relatives are likely not to be elected as the Head of Village. This is the way of democracy in the village [including] helping one and another.

Q: What things make you proud with the inclusion of the Mantehage Island as part of the Bunaken Part?
A: Clearly, the inclusion of the Mantehage Island as part of the TNB [the Bunaken National park] is a pride. Before it, the community did not know [and aware] that we had a rule which benefits us and our next generation, for example, [benefit of rule of] the protection of fish and coral. Based on the folk story, [in the past], it was easy to catch fish and people could touch and choose the large fish. However, after the community mistreated blessings of God by committing explosive fishing and other
destructive practices such as coral destruction and mangrove cutting, it was destroyed. However, since the island became part of the TNB, the community has understood about every practice as a rule. Even though at beginning the rules were very difficult to be understood and accepted by the community, but as the time goes by. After a lot of information insemination sessions, the community understands that the rules benefit them and also our next generation. For example, mangrove forest, at the moment, to enter the mangrove forest, you could get lost in the mangrove area because it is so dense and it was not cut and sold to Manado anymore. It was not like in the past when the mangrove cut collection was a main and easy – to- conduct livelihood, you just needed to bring an axe and a machete, and you could go home with hundred thousand rupiah per day. [Although] It was difficult to change the community livelihood, the community became understand and aware that the rules benefit them. Moreover, the Mantehage Island community, (especially in Tinongko Village) became proud to be part of the TNB (Taman Nasional Bunaken or Bunaken National Park).

Q: One of the Park’s management systems is the Community Patrol, what do you think about the Community Patrol members?
A: Although the government and private organization that are competent parties to provide wages did not provide enough salary to the members, patrol is participative and the community still feels proud to apply as Patrol member. In the past, the community members who were not recruited to be a member of Patrol felt afraid every time they met the Patrol member. However, they recognise that the Patrol is beneficial to the community not only individually but also collectively.

Q: Can you tell me the recruitment system?
A: The recruitment system was conducted through the village government who informed the community criteria of becoming the Patrol members, so the community can apply. In the past, it used to be two people selected, but now it was only one per village. The positions were offered patrol members and a boat rider, so everyone who has a skill of riding a boat could apply for that position.

Q: Was it spread out using TOA [speaker]?
A: Yes, through a loud speaker and a [announcement] letter that put on the public places in village.

Q: How about female patrol?
A: No, it did not include woman because the job offered would be conducted on the sea. The issue is when the Patrol members face dangerous offenders that are committing jubi [traditional spear gun] use and explosive fishing. Actually, if there was a brave and smart woman, it is ok, because the job should not be conducted in a rude way, the task should be conducted by the people who use the polite words in a persuasive way [that usually used by a woman]. This is important because most of the people who work as fishermen have a low level human resource. As a consequence, they have short mind and were so rude. They even could through
a bomb to us. However, in the last 10 years, there was no explosive fishing anymore.

Q: You said that, it takes patience to face a rough people, how did the Patrol members influence their relatives to obey the rules?
A: The Patrol members were trained and accompanied [with skills], for example, when they found explosive fishing or potassium use case, everything has a procedure. First, [the members] approached and reminded [the offenders] that the activity was forbidden. However, the members took a note how many times the offenders committed the violation and how many times they were warned. However, after we warned them a few times and they still kept committing the job, we increased the level of handling to the upper stage involving different stakeholders such as the Forestry Ministry, and the Water Police. If the offenders were caught by joint patrol, the offenders would not be given to the police but to the community Patrol members on the Mantehage Island. There are eight members [with same tasks]. However, not all Patrol members has same ability to deal with the community, the person who has the highest skills including persuading the community that nobody would be harmed in the arresting procedure, would be trusted to be the leader of the team.

Q: How did the Patrol conduct coordination with you as the Head of Village?
A: If the offenders were my community, they [Patrol members] should bring the offenders to me. As the Father of the village, I had an obligation to protect my people’s [dignity]. When one of them was caught red handed committing a violation, I did not reluctant and doubt to ask for an apology from the Park Agency staff and ask for their understanding with my people [poor] situation’. Some community just wanted to earn extra money but some people were deliberately disobedient. So, the treatment should be different. I used to remind them not to repeat again. [The problem is] how to remind them not to repeat it without making them disappointed and taking a revenge. If we directed them gently and reminded them [properly] about the risk of the job they chose, [they would obey]. Although, at the beginning, [looked for an alternative] job, [the community could accept] because I used to give an understanding [to the community], that as long as we want to work hard [and not be picky including to be] an assistant of a construction labour, there would not be a problem. Also I used to pray so the community would understand and they would have a job. So, [not only pray], as a leader I also should provide an alternative job for the community by collecting information about a job vacancy for my community or bringing my community to the highland that used to have job vacancies for example guard of coconut field or clove field. So when I prevented them from conducting a forbidden fishing method or fishing in a protected place, they would not be angry or lose their job.

Q: How did the community get involved in the protected area management?
A: [The community was get involved through Community Patrol activity]. [However], the number of the Patrol [members] is just small and not sufficient. The Patrol member who was recommended by the government village is the representative of the village. However, all community members should work and are responsible [to warn the offenders]. However, The community rather to
report [any violation] to the Patrol members in their post in Bango Village, than to warn the offender because the community is lay people and lack of authority, except [the witnesses was an] village official or the offenders were outsiders, the non-community Patrol would be dare to warn the offenders, “be careful, because a Patrol member is here, or the fishing method you are doing is forbidden”.

Q: I heard you said that you tried to find an alternative job, how did you conduct it?
A: [In order] to be a leader, someone should be smart. When there was a meeting of village leaders outside the village, it is an opportunity to ask other leaders if there is a job opportunity in their areas, such as carpenter, or farming. Also, [at the end of the meeting], we exchanged [mobile phone] numbers; [just in case] there is a job vacancy we would inform one another. [The logic is] if we could provide an alternative [livelihood], we could stop someone from conducting their previous forbidden job. Also, they would not be stressful; especially if they had a child was going to school [and needs tuition fee]. [Even], we [tried at any cost including] communication with other leaders or even with the Head of sub district, ‘Pak Camat [Head of sub district], this is a difficult situation when [the community really] needs a job, if you hear or know anything about job vacancy, [please let me know]’.

Q: How did the community response the zonation scheme?
A: Regarding zonation, the [success] key the is information insemination about the benefit of zonation by the person who is trusted to be a member of forum of citizen and government who exactly know the rules about zonation, the core zone and the community zone. At the beginning it was difficult to change the community’s habit, but when they understood the benefit of the zone [especially] to their next generation and also they were given available alternative job, they became aware and understand. In the past, when we wanted to build houses, we used to use bad [marine] sand. However, since they had a good job in the mainland, when they wanted to build a house, they would buy [terrestrial] sand in Manado. Sand here is used for the appropriate use. However, [instead of using marine sand] they used the black sand in order to make batako [cement brick] and bought hollow bricks, [and] tella [clay bricks] to build new house. [The new practice happened] because they now understand that the practice was not good, and also in terms of the quality, bricks made of black [terrestrial] sand is better than white [marine] sand.

Q: So, the changed happened gradually?
A: Yes, it was gradually happened.

Q: In the last three years, how did the community’s attitude change during the period of time?
A: They became more understand [about the rules] but if they need [the resources] for example mangrove, they still take it.

Q: How about the dry mangrove use restriction?
A: It is allowed to take dry mangrove wood because it is a [traditional] habit. Even though there are terrestrial woods, the community still prefers to use and take wood
of mangrove. However, it is not destructive because mangrove wood are abundant.

Q: We interviewed people in Bango that there is a village rule of the restricted use, how about in Tinongko?
A: All villages have a rule but all rules that made by the village government and the BPD [village representative] should not inconsistent with the rules made by the higher government. That is why the Perdes [Peraturan Desa- Village Rule] is not assigned directly at the village, but the [regency level]. [At the village level], [a draft] of the [new] rules [was made] and would be proposed to the Kabupaten [Regency] government to check whether the draft was consistent with the Kabupaten rules. After checking and revising process and [the draft] would be returned to the village government [to re-drafting].

Q: How about the community decision making of the rules?
A: Village rules making process should involve the community because the rules should be conducted by the community not the government, so all community members should be involved. [The other things are] rules should be made based on the community’s interests and [ability to bear the punishment and consequence]. For example, regarding coral restrictions relate rules, community should be asked about the type of the punishment should be given to the offender. Also, the punishment should not be able to bear by the community, for example, for coral related case, the punishment should be heavy and [the fine should be] expensive in order to [stop the community from committing the violation again]. However, government should be able to explain why such expensive fine applied. Also, the chosen language [of explanation], [should be considered]. The explanation would be accepted as long as the used words were not [intimidating] and [the approach] was not militaristic. Otherwise, they could think that we were jealous of their plan to build their house. In other words, we need to understand how to approach the community, in a persuasive way.

Q: How was the community’s complaint followed up?
A: The right to make a decision belong the community, but as a government who is trusted to compose the rules, we should be aware that we cannot decide it neither the BPD [the village parliament]. That is the rule. For example an issue raising cattle, whoever wants to raise cattle in the village will have to pay tax monthly, but because the community is the party who has to pay the tax, the amount of tax should be determined by the community, for example, Rp. 5,000 per cow per year that was decided by the owners of the cattle according to their ability. [Once the rules were approved by the community and assigned by the government], a fellowship of thanksgiving should be conducted. It is a must. So everyone will remember [this new rule] because fellowship was conducted. So, if the rules were not celebrated like that, [it is believed that] the rules would not work.

Q: How about the roles of the Church in decision making process about the Bunaken Park?
A: Church [leaders]’s supports at the moment depends on [an approach] of the leaders of the community [including] the Head of Village and the BPD. For example, when I
was running a campaign as the Head of Village, I was not supported by the Church leaders, so when I was elected, of course, the Church leaders did not support me. If I did not approach the Church leaders, of course, the Church would not support me. Church leaders are human, especially those who involved in politics, sometimes misunderstood [the Park] as a bad thing but it depends on the person. Even though the Church leaders were not graduated from the elementary school, they were more sincere. For example, the previous Head of the Congregation who did not finish his elementary school, but he was in a good relationship with [village government], not like the current Church leader, a priest who was graduated from the university and able to play politics. Even though their heart tends to be left [against the Park], they showed an opposite attitude [to support the Park] wanted by the government and the Lord wants. However, it does not necessarily mean that they wholeheartedly supported the Park. Even though the Church expressively and openly supported [the Park], they directed [the congregations] to the positive things, but it does not necessarily mean that in daily lives they were also supportive. If the Church determined to support the government directing the community in order to obey the government's policy [to protect the Park], the government would just need to sit back. The easiest party to work is Church because the Church just needs to call [the congregations] through TOA and need to ring the bell on Sunday and the community will gather, that is time we deliver a little bit about the government program. It was different from the government’s call, even though the TOA would be almost damaged, the community would not gather, so all keys belong to cooperation of all the leaders. So if the leaders are limited in thinking capacity, it would be difficult. As a leader, we supposed to know and able analyse everything about a candidate leader, including their daily life and background of education.

Q: How about the Maming catch restriction?
A: In the Park, Maming is prime don, top, and delicious to eat. It looks like a common fish but for the researchers know the fish as the richness of the Park area, so it cannot be caught. For the community who understand about the fish will release the fish if it was been coincidently caught. However, for the community who needs the fish, they will take it but they will not sell because they were afraid because they understand that if the Maming sold to Manado and would be seen by tourists or people who worked for the Park, it would be taken, they would be caught. A dispensation is if there is a special occasion and it was limited to one or two fish.

Q: Was small number of fish?
A: It is abundant, but because it is forbidden, so the fishermen stopped it. The practice is not the same as ours in the past. If we caught today, it would be known the day after tomorrow but now, if you caught the fish today, in your way to home, the news already known by people in Manado. So, the people feel [afraid]. If they sold the fish around Rp, 50,000 but it would cost them Rp, 500,000,- in the next future, it would be better for them to release the catch. Their understanding at the moment based on [the fact] that because of the Maming, they could see and meet the foreign tourists coming to Mantehage. They could receive aids of government, one by one would understand.
the points, including the Fisheries department, and they knew it.

Q: What is the most difficult task you have ever dealt with related to the zonation?
A: Realisation of Perdes (Peraturan Desa-Village Rules), because the want of the community is against the rules from above Even though the draft rules are from the community, the decision making right and enforcement belong to the top including prohibition of catching fish with certain fishing gear such as trawls. However, [the enforcement] disappointed the community for example, the offender has a big brother or relatives here and there who are able to realise them. They were brought by the police to Manado, on the day after tomorrow, the offenders were relished.

The most difficult thing is lack of the education of community, especially the young people, for example four people violated rules that supposed to be educated for one day by Police or the Head of Sub District and returned on the next day. However, because the offender had an uncle the process was not conducted. It was expected with the education process the offenders would be back to the village and not repeat again, even though the education of the offenders was just in form of a letter of statement making. The [legitimacy] of the statement in the village is different from the statement in the Kecamatan or Police Office. Another issue, distribution of Government aid, we should have our own way, for example, the recipient was already dead, and the child of the recipient was a single, so if we gave publicly, there would be a critics that how we gave to a young people, but we had a way for example, we would call him secretly, but before, it became to realisation, the community had already made a chaos, after making a chaos, we called the offenders of the chaos, but because the chaos case was heavy and difficult, we delivered them to the police.

However, because not all offenders were caught by the police, it was a reason of jealous. The jealous people who had a police relatives provoked their police relatives and run an amuck to the village government. They screamed and sworn. However, because they had a relative who works as a Police, they would not be caught, unless the Head of Village had power and a contact person who is in the higher position. All [enforcement effort] was destroyed by government. We could help our own nephew but should be conducted somehow so it won’t disturb the public interest or make other people disappointed. My father used to be like an advisor of the Head of Village, if the Head of Village had such problem and needed someone to advise the offender, they used to call my father. When he got home, he used to tell anything to us, so we get used to hear such stories. Relatives from my mother and father’s lineage are the Head of Village. My mother and father in law’s lineage also like that.

Q: The last question, there is a program of Gatot, how do you make a cooperation with Gatot in term of community education?
A: No, you supposed to hear [directly] from Gatot. Not because Gatot did not look for us, probably, the people who were met by Gatot did not direct him to meet us. This happened because of the characteristics of the community that did not want to build their community, their just want to build their own personality, because the community is not limited to the village scope but it reaches until the Church, it was the difficulties.
There are more nice houses in the village than in other villages; can you tell me what the reasons are?
[Yes, they are] because they knew how to use their results [of their livelihood wisely]. They wanted to compete fairly. At the first glance, the new comer would think that there are no poor people in Tinongko [based on the quality of houses]. However, for everyday life, they are in difficulties, for example my staff in the Head of Village office whose husband is a fishermen, selling fish but difficult to eat fish, but because wants to earn money to buy glass. When they earned Rp. 1 million after working in the hinterland, they would not buy of a pan of rice, but ceramic tile, cement, only 2 kg [of rice] for two days, and after that they would work but if you came to their house and asked them how many time they eat, they would answer three times but the question is what kind of food. If you go in their house including bed rooms, it is covered with ceramic tile

Q: On average, the houses were beton?
A: In 1993 when I came here the first time Tangkasi, in the past, permanent houses were only four. Now, a lot of houses are houses with tile, from four village, the least developed village is Bango where a few house still used katu. In the past, Tangkasi had a lot of house with wood floor. Tangkasi a lot of houses in Tangkasi are nice, even sometimes, in terms of the construction, Tangkasi is more advance than houses in Tinongko. Even though, they do not have farm, coconut, depends only on the sea and carpentry. Here, development of human resources is fast in learning, for example, in the marriage party, the people with “lidah jago” are here. Tinongko people became mc until restaurants in Manado. My wife’s little sibling is one of the MC and our neighbor. The paving block paths are the results of the tsunami drilling program a few years ago, we as the Head of Villages were directed by the head of Sub district, it was only me who paid attention to the direction, eventually, it was only me did the direction and got the aid. It supposed to Buhias, but because the Buhias Head of Village was slow. The head of sub district said that if I could accompany the team from Manado to the Mantehage Island and dropped them back to Manado, I did it to do it, if there was fried banana or a glass of water, just served it to them. Based on my parents’ knowledge, because of the team love eating fish, I provided dried fish and gave them and one of the team is one tribe, he as a Talaud and because my father is law is a Talaud people, I asked him to approach the guest. On the way to Manado, the guest told me that the project would give to the me, while the other 3 Head of Villagers, were rare with them. Even though, the guests came in Buhias, because they were coming with me. It supposed to be in Buhias but I accompanied them.
WOMEN’S FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION

Date:

Transcribe of Woman group Discussion in Nain Village

Q: Can you introduce yourself?
A1: [You can call me] Mama Awu but my full name is Wilce Tamarongke,
A2: [You can call me] Mama Steni but my full name is Steni Ingkiriwang,
A3: [You can call me] Mama Awu [but my full name is] Angelista Dalapis.
A4: [You can call me] Nolly.
A5: [You can call me] Mama Ni.

Q: What did make you proud to be a Nain People?
A5: Even though I am not originally Nain, my mother comes from Biaro Island, Tagulandang, I heard many Nain Islanders say that Nain is the best. We can work hard [in other places] but it cannot defeat Nain’s benefits in terms of making a livelihood. I asked them why? And they told me, Nain is the best in term of [amount] income generated, as a livelihood place including the sea is greater than other islands. If there is no fish, we the women [can] row, [and] angle near the beach [and] collect bia kima, we can find food.

Q: So, it is easy to make a livelihood here?
A1: We can just go to forests to collect cassava leaves for vegetables.
A2: The nature [provides], [everything is] free.
A3: Everything is available [here].

Q: What is the most important thing related to the sea, what the best fish and most delicious fish in sea?
A3: *Goropa, bobara, behang, kuli paser.*

Q: How about *bia*, what is the most delicious fish in the sea?
A3, A1: *Bia kima.*

Q: Why they become important?
A2: They are consumed in special occasions.
A2: In Bajo, *lebaran ketupat* will be very a special if there is *bia kima* meals presented.
A3: *Boboca,*
A5: *Tuturaga* (penyu).
A2: *Tuturaga* is rarely to consume because [consuming] *Tuturaga* is forbidden.

Q: So, from all these animals on the sea, it only *tuturaga* is forbidden?
A1: A lot.
A4: hahahahaah

Q: What else are forbidden?
A2: That’s all.
A3: The forbidden [activities] are use of potassium.

Q: What else are forbidden?
A2: The most important is the potassium use.

Q: How can the people here live without eating *Maming*?
A1: There is no a problem at all.

Q: So, it will be ok in a party without the fish?
A1: We have a lot of coral fish, [so we do not worry].

Q: Why do you think the reasons of the ban of potassium use?
A1: Because it will disturb the fish.
A2: For the future of our children and grandchildren. It will make [fish] running out because the poison kills everything including the juvenile.
A1: Even the coral will die.
A2: Coral will be destroyed.
A3: Not even fish, even seaweed will die because of the poison.

Q: Regarding the seaweed, is there any special regulation of seaweed line?
A2: [It] depends.
A1: Like in the forest, each person has their own part and localization.

Q: Who did manage the division of line?
A4: Since long time ago,
A2: Since the beginning
A3: Each people will arrange based on understanding.
Q: I can see many advantages living in the village in terms of natural resource availability. How about the issue raised from the block arrangement?
A3: [There is] no any issue.
A2: Sometimes a block was left by the owner and used by another person. It would be a problem, when the block would be used by another person while it was being used by another person. Sometimes, the owner will get angry.
A1: Sometimes, the owner will only remind the current user that they will use the area, so everything is in peaceful [here].

Q: That is the first part of the discussion, now we move to the next part, what is your opinion of following words, community Patrol members?
A2: They are the person who will catch the offenders.
A3: [However], the offenders not from our village but outsiders.
Q4: What else?
A3: They will eradicate the use of potassium.
A2: Use of explosive fishing.
A5: Tuturuga [turtle] hunter.
A4: To protect mangrove forests.

Q: What do you think impacts of arresting local people on the harmony of relationship in this village?
A2: Sometimes, the relationship becomes loosening.

Q: So it created a distance, what do you feel if there is someone in the village is arrested?
A2: There is a complaint [of the community] including unavailability to make a livelihood because they would be arrested [when they were committing it]. How can they earn money if they are arrested? [Another case] is [diving] compressor use.

Q: How the villagers use of diving compressor use?
A: They use a compressor to dive on a certain depth of the sea.

Q: Why it is forbidden if the use of compressor just for diving?
A1: It is assumed that the people use a compressor to catch turtle. Last year, without any strong evidence, the user of compressor was caught by the Patrol.
A3: He faced a trial.

Q: What was the offender experienced?
A5: He was arrested.
A2: He caught fine otherwise he had to be arrested for 21 days. The fine reached millions rupiah.
A3: They had to be arrested for three weeks before they face a trial, so [the process] around months.

Q: How much the fine?
A2: I do not know.
A1: Probably Rp. 50 million [$US5,000].
A2, A3, A5: Huuh??
A5: Indeed, it was expensive.
A4: and their gear was destroyed
A3: they gear was arrested

Q: So, if they use compressor for diving, their boat will be arrested too?
A4: yes, all equipment.

Q: What do you feel about the arresting process?
A3: [We felt] sad.
A2: Disappointed and sad with of their situation.
A1: [Besides] they were arrested, they also had to spend money.
A2: They wasted their time, so they could make a livelihood.
A1: Because they caught shrimps.

Q: But there is a ban to catch shrimps?
A1 - A5: No.

Q: Can you tell me a habit of sharing in this village?
A1-A5: Yes, it is important.
A1: Because love is the biggest, except the people did not recognise religion.

Q: What do think about the impact of the Patrol existence on the sharing habits?
A2: Here, there is no fluctuation in terms of fish price. We are still able to eat fish. At least [less economic] fish, we can still eat fish. Unless, we go to Manado City to send our children school, we suffer from the high price of fish. As long as we on the island, fish was not a problem.
A1: If we have no money [to buy fish], just ask [from other villagers], so we can eat with cabo rice.

Q: What is cabo rice?
A1: Rice for poor people.

Q: So the sharing habits are not influenced by the price of fish?
A1-A5: No.

Q: You said that the impact of arresting on the relationship of the villagers led to loosening the relationship between one and other villagers. Can you give me an example?
A1: The Patrol members come from outside, from the Sub District, and from the Moeslim village.

Q: How about community Patrol members in the Christian village?
A3: They just were selected.
A2: Mr. Makagansa is one of the new Community Patrol members.

Q: How long did they become Patrols?
A2: They were recently selected [and] he is also Minister have in the Church. They not started operating yet. They just were recruited.
Q: When they were recruited, did you hear about the process?
A1-A5: No, we did not hear the process.

Q: If you have an opportunity to be a Patrol member, would you like to join?
A1-A5: hahahaha
A1: It sounds strange.
A3: There is no announcement and suddenly they were recruited.

Q: How do you find the ban of cutting mangrove impacted on your work as housewife?
A1: We cannot cut mangrove trees.

Q: Both living mangroves and dead mangrove
A1-A5: No, neither.

Q: How did you find the ban impact on your work of cooking?
A3: There is no problem.
A2: We use gas stoves now but in the past, when we used fireplace [for cooking] it was a problem. If, I cannot imagine if the gas was stopped and we should be back to fireplace again and the mangrove would be run out and the Patrol members would arrest us.

Q: How about bia gathering ban?
A4: No, it is not forbidden.

Q: Why is Maming catching forbidden?
A1: Because Maming is the protector of coral.
A2: Because he is the protector so that he is protected.

Q: How about change of Maming’s number due to the ban?
A2: No, it was not changed.

Q: How about the impacts of compressor use ban on your family livelihood?
A2: There is no problem due to alternative livelihood availability.

Q: Can you tell me about the community meeting?
A3: We were invited.

Q: Did you tell your complaint in the meeting?
A2: Yes, we told them, [especially] about our complaint [to the ban] in regarding our livelihood.

Q: What the response did you receive can you tell me?
A2: They answered that there are alternatives of livelihood available and the bans benefits the future generation because explosive fishing and potassium use will destroy corals. We were suggested we need to consider our next generation.
A1: We destroyed the corals [with the forbidden activities].
A2: Our children can enjoy for the next 20 years but with the activities would finish the fish right now.

Q: What is your opinion on the Park Authority and RARE’s explanation [about the No-Take Zone scheme]?
A3: We accepted it.
A4: We acknowledged it.
A2: [However], for other villagers who are lack of intelligence would be very resistant, [by saying], “So, do you ask us to steal?” “Do you want us to be a thief”? “How our husband can feed us?”

Q: Why they became angry?
A3: Because they have experienced earning a lot of income in quick ways.

Q: How about use of bajubi [traditional spear gun] ban?
A2: It is allowed, only explosive fishing is forbidden, because it will kill all fish including the juvenile.

Q: How about Mama Nolin’s opinion?
A1: Her husband works as a fish collecting device keeper.

Q: So, the rules have not many negative impacts on Mama Nolin’s livelihood? How about other women?
A1: My husband just makes a livelihood by shooting boboca.

Q: Is there any special place where fishing activity is forbidden?
A1: No, there is not, it is only on Mantehage Island, Siladen island where are [No-Take] Zones established.

Q: So, here in Nain, there is no zonation scheme?
A4: In the past, the zonation scheme was implied but it was not accepted here.
A3: Poor us, we are difficult to make livelihood because our only livelihood is on the sea. We would be difficult to catch the fish if there was zonation.
A1: It became a problem, in terms of sharing. [Our livelihood] would be limited. It was only Gora fish we used to share fish [for example] Kombong Fish that is called Sembilan fish and looked like catfish.
A2: We will not be able to share if zonation scheme was applied here because our livelihood will be limited.

Q: When the scheme was introduced for the first time?
A1: Long time ago.
A3: Around 20 years ago.
A2: It is difficult to be applied here.
A3: The community disagrees.

Q: Why do you disagree?
A3: Because the only livelihood of our husband is on the sea.
A4: If there is a [Core] Zone, [we] are not allowed to make seaweed lines.
A1: Even, just we are not allowed to pass the zone.
Because there is a border of every area, we cannot obtain extra money.
We cannot enter the [closed] area.
If the zone is already set up, borders would be signed with buoys, and they would put the sign there: zone.
On the buoy will have a word of zone.
So nobody wanted to go in the area.
Just like to get a trial.
just wanted to get a trouble.
We want to make a livelihood not a trouble
We just want to shoot fish around one kilo of fish in order to find food for one day only and we went to have a trial. It just committed a suicide.

Q: How large is the zone?
A1: It was large, the size is large.
Research conducted here and stated this is the zone area and they [deliberately] targeted the areas where we used to make our livelihood and the place where are a lot of fish.
That makes the community disagree.
The habits of sharing and love one another would disappear and there is a limit of loving one another. Instead of loving one another, we would hate one another.

Q: How did the community get involved in the establishment of the Core Zone?
A: We were asked to discuss in an open forum.

Q: What the community’s opinion about the No-Take Zone?
A3: We did not allow the zone established.
A1: We did not agree.
A4: The community insists refusing the scheme in all meetings of insemination information of zonation. The government could not do anything because the community [strongly] refused.

Q: What were the main reasons of the community’s rejection to the scheme?
A1: The area is large.
A2: The place is a daily livelihood taken place, look at the Mantehage islanders

Q: Why?
A2: They are difficulty to conduct their livelihood. [As a result] they have a tension with us. They keep coming and entering [our area] because they do not have freedom [to fishing] anymore [in their own water]. The Mantehage Island has only has very small nyare [intertidal area] which became [protected Core] Zones, how can they make livelihood.

Q: So Nain has the largest nyare?
A1: [Yes], the largest.
A2: In North Sulawesi province.

Q: What are actually the benefits of the nyare?
A1: Our husband can catch fish and boboca [in the area],
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A3: Everything.

Q: What activities are forbidden in a [Core] Zone besides no passing? How about shooting?
A3: No, it is not allowed.
A4: Everything [is forbidden].
A2: Even pass by the zone is not permitted, how much more the shooting.
A4: Because they have built the fence around the area.
A2: There is a buoy means we cannot enter, even to pass by.

Q: Including seaweed?
A2: That is the strongest reason of zonation rejection because we would not have any area to plant the seaweed
A1: While one of our main sources of income is seaweed cultivation where conducted in nyare area.

Q: Except the zonation, basically do you agree with other rules?
A2: The diving with compressor [only] is conducted in tubir [basin],

Q: What the differences between tubir and nyare?
A1: Tubir’s bottom is deep while nyare’s bottom is shallow.
A3: occurs, the corals in the area will appear. We can walk on the nyare.

Q: If there is a meeting in the community, how about the announcement of the result?
A3: No, there is no announcement.

Q: Is there any reward or thank you from the Balai or authority because of your involvement in keeping and maintaining the environment?
A1: Yes, from the Balai, the government’s agency.

Q: For example?
A2: They said thank you.

Q: So verbally, how do you feel?
A4: We were happy.

Q: Ma awu looked thinking hard, I’ve observed since a couple minutes ago. Is the impact of the Community Patrol on the family so the husband should work outside the island?
A1, A2: Yes, they work in construction.

Q: How it is?
A1: They just like not because of the Patrol, there are a lot of alternative livelihood here.

Q: How did you feel the first time when you heard Mr. Makagansa became the Patrol?
A2: My feeling [to him suddenly] changed. There is dig, dig, [increase the heat beating], there was a [significant] worry and anxiety. [If] the [zonation scheme] will be reapplied, the community will be upset again. [I felt] as if, we were being hunted.

A1: For example, the incident when the Patrol chase after [the community].

Q: How did the recruitment of the Community Patrol members influence your feelings to the members?

A2: [It is uncomfortable] because we will not be free anymore
A3: No be free.

A2: We will not be free to make a life, and even to take a breath. Yes, sometimes, [while her taking deep breath]. Thousand thoughts appear on our mind.

Q: What is your expectation to the new Patrol members?

A2: If they will follow strictly the rules, there will be a conflict. Some people said that, because you are the local people, there would be a dispensation for you. Your parents also used to work and make a life here. Please, be compromised in applying the rules.

Q: With the condition provided to the new Patrol Members], how the community’s feeling [automatically] has changed [towards the new Patrol Members]?

A2: Yes, ooh [of course], the incidents [between the Patrol Members and the community.
A2: [Conflict with community] in the past might happen again. The impacts [of the conflict], for example [the Patrol member] has a Ministry [position] in the Church, and [at the same time] the Church members are used to fishing [in illegal ways], the relationship [between the two parties] would [automatically] change, [for instance], [the Patrol] was giving a sermon, and the congregations would say and question: ‘Who do you think you are [to teach us]? We do not want and need to hear your sermon.

A1: You would just arrest us when we are making our livelihood’.
[The Church members would say also] ‘you just preached for yourself”.

A2: The spiritual life in the community has been shaken.
[We told to the Patrol member], ‘Why you would for sure arrest us when we were making our livelihood’.
[Due to the ban], we have now more [economic] pressures and problems, a very heavy burden.

A1: While [at the same time], we have a lot of [household] needs, such as to register our children to schools [that needed to be fulfilled].
A2: Even, we cannot sleep well [since then].
[The ban implementation is fine for] Mrs. Steni’s husband, [because he] works in construction. However, [it is a significant problem for] our husband
A3: [who] works as a fisherman.

Q: No wonder, Ma Awu looks concern since 30 minutes ago, keep looking down.
A2: Yes, she started worrying [with the impacts on her family livelihood].

Q: And no wonder Ma uwa 1 and Ma Uwa 2 sounds calmed.
A2: Their husband are a fisherman, sometimes if they have time they work in construction but my husband works totally in construction. He stays on the sea.

Q: What are negative impacts of the Patrol on the social events, such as wedding, funeral and christening?
A2: Yes, it increases especially as a Church Ministry.
A3: If there was a Patrol, we would have complaints.

Thank you for your participation.

Date:

Interview with women group in Tinongko

Q: What make you proud to be a Mantehage Islander?
A1: Surely, the ocean.
A2: The Park.
A1: The Island is peaceful.
A3: [The people] are friendly.
A1: [The people] are diligent to go to [religious] fellowship.
A4: Unity in the fellowship is very good.

Q: If someone said that the ocean is one of the things make you proud, what aspects of the ocean do make you proud in details?
A2: Fish.

Q: What kind of fish?
A4: Coral fish, and bobara.
A2: Bia which is so delicious to cook with coconut milk, rw style, deep fried, with tomato sauce.

Q: What kind of Bia consumed in Tinongko?
A1: Sengetang, kima, bahutung.
A2: Bia minya.
A4: Batuang.
A3: Nuning.
A5: Kodo.

Q: Which one is the most delicious Bia?
A1: I think Bia kima.
A2: Kima.

Q: What else, things make Mantehage is so special?
A1: Barehe.
A2: Teripang.
A1: Which is frequently bought by foreigners.

Q: How the local people love the animals?
A1- Some people love to eat this animal but some not.
A3: We cook it with sweet soy sauce.

Q: What else makes Mantehage is so special?

Q: Why the mangrove became something special on the island?
A1: Because it makes us safe for sure, safe from wind.
A2: [From] waves.
A3: [The Island] has a lot of fish.
A4: Because it is the home of fish.
A3: Even, women can go fishing easily in the area.
A1: We used to fish gete-gete.
A3: For the organic matter starts to develop in the area of mangrove. So there is a species of fish called gete-gete that can be caught in area near the mangrove trees. So even women can catch it by themselves and they do not need to walk long distance and they can fish by themselves.

Q: How do you cook gete-gete?
A1- In many ways.
A5: Deep fried.
A2: With tomato sauce.
A3: With coconut milk.
A4: Coated with flour.
A2: Cook as perkedel.

Q: So can you fish by yourself?
A5: Yes, especially, in the season when fish is difficult to find.
A1: In the low tide, we collect bia, [then], bite it and use it as a pry and put it at the edge of fishing line.
A5: So, it will not be difficult for women.

Q: How free is to catch gete-gete?
A1: It is free.
A4: There is no any ban against [the practice].
A2: The ban is regarding mangrove cut but not to catch gete-gete.

Q: Have you experienced preventing from fishing gate-gate in the Core Zone?
A2: Never.
A1: Not in this village, probably in different villages, the activity is forbidden.
A3: Cutting mangrove is not allowed.

Q: If gete-gete or other species is gone in the mangrove, how it would influence your pride as a Mantehage islander?
A2: It is still a special place because Mantehage is the place where we were born.

Q: How about the ban of fishing?
A1: Actually, turtle is not allowed to catch.
A5: Bia is forbidden to take if it is for commercial reason.
A4: For domestic use, it is ok.
A3: Because all of these we need.
A1: It is for our life.
A2: If everything is forbidden, how can we live then?
A3: [While] our main livelihood is fishermen.

Q: How this ban emerged?
A2: At the beginning, everything was forbidden.
A5: At the beginning, from the Balai [the Park Agency] and the staff of regency government stated that corals are forbidden to collect and also sand. For the corals, there is a criteria, if dead corals that cannot grow up anymore is allowed to be taken and [used for domestic use] but not for commercial use. The same rules applied for sand, while for fish, such as Maming cannot be caught.
A2: Turtle as well.

Q: Turtle is one of local food here?
A1-A5 Yes, it is.

Q: Is there any curiosity to eat turtle due to the ban?
A2: No, it depends on individual taste.

Q: What do you opinion about Community Patrol members?
A1: It is about ban of taking rocks, sand, cutting mangrove?
A2: While they are our basic needs. Taking sand is accepted except for selling, while cutting mangrove tree to use for making fence at home is also allowed.

Q: What are opinions about Community Patrol members?
A2: They also protect our village.
A1: Protect our sea.

Q: How does existence of the Community Patrol members impact on the community’s harmony?
A1: It is just fine.
A2: As far as it is fine, everything will be fine.
A3: It is right that the [Community] Patrol [members] protects [our resources]. However, we still have uncomfortable feelings [including] a little bit angry. We [tried hard] to have positive thinking that they benefit protecting us.
Q: Ibu Sisil said that there is a negative feeling about Patrol, what does it mean? Can you give me an example?
A3: [There is a negative feeling] because when we need to take [materials] to build our house, [we are banned].
A2: Our livelihood as well.
A3: We are prohibited from [conducting our livelihood].
A3: If we want to take wood, they will prohibit us.
A1: Yes.
A4: Feeling like upset.

Q: How the bans lead to the upset feeling?
A2: Because we heavily rely on the beach and on the sea.
A1: It is free but if in Manado we should have paid it.
A4: If we take rocks and sand from Manado.
A3: We need to hire boats [to bring the building materials from Manado].
A2: But on the sea, it is will be free. We will be able to reduce the cost.
A3: If we were allowed to complaint, we would speak up, so it would not offend anybody.

Q: How about the meeting to deliver your complaint?
A5: There were villagers meetings with the village government [discussing many issues].
Including the criteria of allowed coral taking activities. [This is important]
because some villagers take advantages to benefiting themselves, for example cutting the mangrove tree in a lot of numbers for selling.

Q: So, for domestic use, using the resource is allowed?
A5: To build a house is allowed but not for selling, just like mangrove, if it is already dead, it is ok to cut as long as for household needs.

Q: How did you get involved in the meeting?
A2: We were also invited and participated actively.

Q: How about your opportunity to speak up?
A2: Without reluctant feelings because we were transparent one another.

Q: How the pressure not to talk in such meeting for the women?
A1: We were to speak up.
A3: We were open and articulated with what our aspiration.

Q: How did the ban impact on the livelihood of local people such as mangrove trees cutters and gatherers?
A5: In the past, majority of the villagers’ livelihood was fire wood cutting and selling.
A1: [We used to sell the wood] in Manado
A2: Also, in Nain we used to make a seaweed platform.
A1: But not now, it is forbidden.

Q: When the ban was applied, were there any alternatives offered?
The solutions in terms of livelihood alternatives were not given. It was only [loosing rules] for example allowing domestic use.

So, how about the husband who were stopped to be a wood cutter and collector, what alternative jobs they chose?

They work in construction.

Everyone goes out to work in Manado.

Which one of you whose husband work in Manado?

My husband works in Manado at the Ria Rio Restaurant.

What is the problem emerged due to the long distance relationship?

[I] miss [my husband] and [envy] every time I see a couple walk together.

[I] feel envy to see other people walk with their spouse while I walk alone and I need to face all problems at home by my own.

How was the complaint given by your children?

No, there is no complaint from them, [I] used to tell them that their father goes away to make a life for us.

How close was the relationship between the community and Commity Patrol members?

Some of Patrol members are local people, and one of the Patrols is Ibu Melly’s husband.

He just applied but no accepted.

Leslie, and Mr. Maki.

Head of Village, the current Head of Village, Steri.

While from the province, the leader is Pak Gatot who also provided a small project for us and for women, we were given from gas stoves, frying pans, and also fund to buy bananas to made crackers. He also provided markets of the crackers including in supermarkets. We labelled the product, Maming crackers of Mantehage village. So he has put some efforts to make it success.

We also were grouped which are still active. Other activities are saving [Micro Finance]. We have four groups consisted of 10 people per group.

How about the profits gained from the activities?

It is quite helpful, I am one of the members but I stopped because in that time I was pregnant.

It is supposed to be one of activities displaying here in this house but it should be routine so the profits can be significant. So, there are routine meetings including savings activities. It supposed to be routine but the women here thought that if the activities were slowly to generate income compared to other economic activities such as making coconut oil or working at the garden. [Unfortunately], those thoughts became barriers. So in the process of time management, we sometimes faced difficulties because we were ten but only four of use [frequently] came. As a consequence, the selling was not effective but it happened due to the insufficient numbers of members. We brought the products to schools, in Manado and the products sold out.
Q: How about the marketing?
A5: They also looked for access of marketing in supermarkets such as in Multimart.

Q: So, Pak Gatot also accompanied?
A5: Always, when we faced difficulties, every problem.

Q: How about the women’s desire to be a Community Patrol member?
A2: Is it allowed for women?

Q: How about the recruitment process of the Patrol members? Was it announced?
A3: My husband was asked by Rudi and Jeffry,
A1: From mouth to mouth.
A3: There is was public announcement.
A4: I would be ready if women are allowed.

Q: How about you, if there was an opportunity, you would like to join?
A1: If it will be accepted, I would.
A2: Yes, me too.

Q: So what is your opinion about the transparency of the system of recruitment?
A3: Suddenly, we heard that there are new recruited Patrol members.
A2: It was not transparent.

Q: How fair was the selection process?
A3: In the last process, they required [my husband] to submit certificate, ID card and others including letters of good behaviour from police. However, after we waited for, I asked my husband ‘so how about the test’ and he said ‘I think I failed’ but I did not ask him what his weaknesses were. That’s all and I told him probably ‘it is not your time yet’.

Q: How the arresting process influences relationship between the Community Patrol members and the arrested relatives?
A2: Here, there is no villager who ever caught by the Patrol

Q: In the Bango village, they said that the Community Patrols members benefits villagers in terms to protect their resources from outsiders. How about the advantages of Community Patrol in this village?
A5: First, we feel secure from when we know that the Patrol beside provided us information that mangrove is part of the Bunaken National Park, their existence are also useful when we saw someone was cutting the mangrove trees and we feel reluctant to remind them. Here, with the customs of harmony of relationship among neighbours and relatives, it is reluctant to warn. However, with the existence of the Patrol, we can take advantage the Patrol’s name when we want to remind them by saying ‘watch out, the Patrol is coming’ and [it is effective] because suddenly they stopped cutting.
The mangrove at the back of house was almost gone.

For me, a simple example, when a cutting voice was heard, we could remind ‘There is a Patrol’, once heard that they would stop using explosive materials for fishing. I did not to mention any name but a name of Patrol, the offenders’ activity stopped at once.

Q: If you want to build a house, how can you keep building your house despite of ban of taking of the corals and sand?
A3: We will be able to take sand and corals as long as for building houses. We used to take publicly from the sea.
A2: In the last meeting with the staff of Balai, Mr Adi asked if the community is allowed to take rocks and sand to build our house while based on our need, we cannot afford buying rocks from Manado. The Patrols answered that ‘we are not aimed to ban as long as you are able to maintain our reputation, it is ok. We should understand one another. Once you take corals do not let on the beach but bring home as soon as possible. If there is a guest asking, we should answer that it will be used for our house building’. The issue was discussed in the meeting. I cannot imagine if we could not take the corals at all. It is impossible for us to stay in a nice house.

Q: What was the way of approach of the Community Patrol members when they were catching someone in hand to the community?
A2: For example, in my husband’s case. Couple times ago, his cousin wanted to build a house and asked for his help to take corals so that this is not for commercial purpose. After the rocks were taken to the beach, Mr. Lexi the local Patrol urged my husband to move the corals quickly to the location of construction. So, it would not be a warning from above.

Q: You told me that the Patrol is flexible to enact the rules, can you tell me your experience regarding inflexible Patrol?
A1: No, never.
A2: They always protect the community’s interest.

Q: From all these bans, which one is the strictest?
A1: Ban of cutting mangrove.

Q: Why?
A2: Because the mangrove there is aimed to protect the village, if we cut the trees more and more, it will be gone forever. As a result, there is no our protector.

Q: Of the all bans, which is the most difficult to obey?
A1: Diving with compressor because when the Patrol members found the offender currently was using compressors, they would arrest and bring to the office to be advised.
A2: Some of them fined, we do not know but some offenders were Nain islanders. There was no offender of compressor use here but we heard. [Here] most offenders were explosive fishing offenders.
A2: It will destroy fish.
Q: What do you think of the No-Take Zone?
A5: Part of it, Core Zone is a difficulty for the fishermen because when they are enjoying fishing, they did not realise that they had entered the core zone. Moreover, regarding [fish] shooting using spear gun, they used to be choose the place where there are a lot of fish but now, the locations where a lot of fish schooling are prohibited and including the core zone where shooting and fishing are not allowed. The complaint of the local people including from my own brother who loves shooting so much, it is limited because almost everywhere is forbidden while the locations where are allowed do not have many fish. As a result, he tries to find another job.

Q: How did the change of the job influence your social relationship?
A5: It is difficult, we used to share fish in the past, but now our catch is just enough for our daily food. [Due to the limitation in catching fish], the economic values of fish were increased. As a consequence, the relationship between neighbors one and another have been changed and also no more [expression such as] 'come, here are some fish to grill for free', but now we have to buy because catching fish is more difficult and limited [due to the bans].
A2: However, for sure, there is still a sharing practice sometimes, even though rice price and gas price increase. [What we did] is we limit our consumption to two fish and set the other fish up to sell to buy rice.

Q: How about the reports of meeting?
A1: There was a verbal report after the meeting and limited to the participants but not a written version, except the PPIP’s activity.

Q: How the non-participant would know the result of the meetings?
A2: We used to inform them verbally.

Q: How about the financial report?
A1-A5: No, never.

Q: How about the most difficult punishment ever given to offenders?
A2: No, never. Zegab who cut the trees was protected by the government. [I am not sure] whether Zegab or Corneles.

Q: How do perceive the difference in attitudes between before and after becoming a Community Patrol member?
A2: a little bit.

Q: For example?
A1: They become more firmly.
A2: They are respected by the community.
A1: Even though they are local people but we want to respect one and another. Thank you for your participation.
Discussion of a woman group in Buhias

Q: What things make you proud to be a Mantehage islander?
A1: It is easy to find something needed in the kitchen ingredients. It is as wood fire,
A2: It is easy to find herbs.
A3: Vegetable,
A2: Still good

Q: Is it still good?
A2: Easy to plant vegetable

Q: Ma Yen said that it is easy to find wood?
A4: Yes, land wood.
A2: Yes, because to gather wood in talaga is already forbidden

Q: The pond? What do you mean with the talaga?
A1- [The pond] is swamp area.
A3: Mangrove logs.
A1: It is not allowed to gather woods from mangroves.
A2: We now gather woods from the garden.
A3: for example coconut branch.
A1: If we do not have kerosene, we just need to gather the wood.
A2: It is easy to cultivate here.
A1: We do not need to buy [the food].
A3: At least we can eat cassava, banana, better but we can eat.
A1: but we now use gas stoves.
A3: It is easy to make a life here. We do not need to bother to think about food on
daily basis.
A2: Cassava is more favourable than bette

Q: I am interesting in the pond. It is a pond or a swamp?
A1- It is a swap.
A5: But the local call it a pond.
A2: It is a swamp and wood called.
A1: Mangrove.
A3: It is forbidden.
A1: It is forbidden.
A4: We cannot use it.
A1: Just like Mr, Robert forbids it.
A2: The Patrol does not allows us to take the mangrove wood.
Q: From these things including, garden, vegetable, wood, the ponds, which is the most important?
A1- Farming.
A5: banana farming.

Q: How important the talaga is for you?
A4: If we do not have fish, we will go to talaga, or if we want to collect bia,
A2: Bia kodo, fish for example goropa fish
A1: Kobos fish made the swamp is very benefit

Q: Is it edible?
A1- It is delicious
A5: It is delicious if we grill, deep fry it, woku.

Q: What else we can gather in the pond?
A3: Crab.
A2: Crab.
A2: For the people who knows how to catch crab, the swamp is the home of crab.

Q: How we cook this kodo bia?
A2: garo rica.
A1: Deep fried.
A2: tomato sauce.

Q: How about if the crab is forbidden to eat?
A4: Crab is collected to sell.

Q: How much is it per kilo?
AQ: Rp. 80,000,-
A4: It is so expensive, it is the same price as imported Australian beef.
My husband is a collector.

Q: Your family is rich, is not it?
A1: Sometimes it takes one week to gather 1 kilo

Q: How long it takes to collect one kilo of crabs?
A4: Sometimes if the "water is bad"?

Q: What does it mean?
A4: The water is less?

Q: What does it mean?
A1: Just like today when we came here,
A2: nyare water
A3: The water reaches below [normal] level of water
Q: So it happens every day.
A1: If it is their fate, it happens everyday.

Q: How do you sell the catches?
A2: There is someone who will collect and buy the catch and bring to manado.

Q: So the local people do not eat crabs because of the price?
Q: How about in party, it should be presented?
A3: No, only fish.
A2: It is said that just go shooting.
A3: Many fish.

Q: How about bia kodo,?
A2: In Manado, they make satay,
A1: We can eat all kinds in the talaga, for example bia paku.

Q: Are they staple food?
A1: If they want, they can collect by themselves.
A2: It is not available, it will be ok but we can catch fish on the sea.

Q: What other types of fish that can be caught in the talaga?
A1: Darume fish, a kind of bandeng fish.

Q: So, we have many opportunity to cultivate, to gather wood?
A1: We can cultivate, chillies. It depends on people.
A2: But not all people loves farming.

Q: How do you maintaince the talaga’s existence?
A1: We do not cut the mangrove’s trees.

Q: If the mangrove cannot be cut, how the community obtain the fire wood?
A1: We use land wood.

Q: How it influence on your life?
A1: We can use coconut branch,

Q: How difficult to gather that?
A1: It is close
A4: Just on the back of the village
A1: While the mangrove is far from the village

Q: How the ban related to the crab gathering?
A4: No, there is not a ban about that
A1: Once it was forbidden, but the people complaint because it is our main livelihood. In a meeting, we complaint,

Q: How wide the practice?
A1: [It] depends on individual skills. For those who don’t know how to catch the crab, they will be clapsed.
Q: How about the bia kodo’s ban?
A2, A3: No, it has no any ban since the beginning.

Q: How clear is the ban?
A1: They forbid just crabs gathering and mangrove cut.
A2: Mangrove is forbidden.
A1: In order to protect the beach.
A1: from the wave [attack].

Q: How the community especially the mother see the ban of mangrove cut?
A1-A5: It is ok because of rinai.

Q: What is it rinai?
A3: Gas stove.
A1: Most people use that.
A4: Because in the past, there was an aid.
A1: My husband is afraid of using the stove.
A2: Whoever resisted use of the stove, you must use kerosine.

Q: How important the nyare?
A2: We have large nyare here and bia kima that can be collected there.

Q: How good the bia kima is?
A2: is very delicious. Whoever wants to eat that, they just gathered it

Q: What else we can find in the nyare?
A3: *bia jare, bahutung, bia lana*, a lot of kind of bia in the nyare, nuning,
A1: lives in the sand,
A2: On the rock.

Q: How good is that?
A5: Very delicious.

Q: How the ban of the bia kima, nuning?
A5: No, there is no any ban.
A2: Because it is for eating.
A1: The forbidden actions are taking rocks, stones,
A5: The living stones which still have roots, while the dead stones are the stones which hit frequently and destroyed and separated and appeared on the surface by the waves.

Q: How the ban of taking the dead stone
A5: No, there is no specific ban. We can confirm to the authority that we will use the dead stones for example, building house foundation
A2: If we want to use for house building, it will be ok, even the white sand.
Q: How the ban on the sea?
A5: [just] in the area..
A2: Bunaken.
A5: No, in the area where my husband Jonas used to visit, called zone.
A2: What kind of fish, they called.
A3: maming fish catch is forbidden.

Q: What is first impression whenever you heard of the No-Take Zone?
A1 I think it is forbidden, limiting, to cut mangrove, or no take stone or sand,
A2 and also Maming fish (Napoleon wrasse) catch is forbidden. That is the definition
A3 of border they established. We cannot take sand and rocks. Also the mangrove
tree cannot be cut.

Q: What do you think about the rules?
A5: [The rules are useful] by maintaining and preserving the mangrove, we protect
our village.
A1: [It protects] the [natural] form of the beach, so that it will not be destroyed.

Q: How about ma erna, ma yen, what else, it is ok if different from other people
A5: We feel proud because it will protect our….
A1: Our coastal area, so the waves will not reach our settlement.
A5: We see the zone as a ban sign. zone is a sign of ban. In core zones, we apply the
core zones so that nobody will come and do fish bombing and we plant the
mangrove so weaves will not reach the land that we prevent.

Q: How about mama yen’s opinion?
A5: [if] you let me know first that you would discuss about zone and the core zone,
there are a lot of documents related to the zonation in the warehouse. My husband
is one of the [forum members]. You will not need to ask us, you just use the
document to answer your questions.

Q: Yes, but I need women’s opinions?
A1: As I knew, in the past, there was not any ban. We used to use a lot of the
mangroves trees.
A2: It was just recently [enacted], it is said that [the protection of mangrove is
important in order to prevent beach (from beach abrasion).
A1: Since around five years ago the rules have been implemented.
A2: We cannot do more again. We cannot work using wood anymore.
A5: Regina is 14 years old now, since Regina was born, the practice has been not
existed anymore.

Q: So how the people feeling about the ban such as should stop gathering the wood?
A5: We were afraid and stopped that job and looked for another job but there are
many alternative of [livelihood] here. We can go farming, climbing coconut trees,
crab gathering,
A2: Catch fish on the sea,
A5: Only bombing is forbidden,
A1: bombing kills all include small fish.

Q: Ma fin said that there is a feeling of scare?
A2: Especially, when we were working on fire wood making.
A1: There is a ban; we don’t want to be against the rules.

Q: Why do you become afraid with the Patrol?
A2: Because there is ban from the Patrol.
A3: Once they caught us when we were working.
A1: and suddenly, a [corrective and judgmental community] meeting would be held.

Q: If the Patrol catches you when you are working, what will happen?
A1: they will burn the collected wood.
A5: They will arrest the people who are working.
A2: They will catch the people. So what we can do?

Q: What would happen to the offenders?
A1: They will put in the jail.
A3: They will bring the offenders.
A2: Bring them to Wori.
A2: Bring them to the police office, dear.
A1: The police would ask if there is a rule against their action or not.
A2: The ranger office.

Q: Before they bring to Worry, does the authority give education to the offenders?
A1-A5: Yes.
A5: But it is rare they give them education, the Patrol will bring directly to the Office.
A1: If the Patrol wants to catch the offenders, they will run away.
A3: Because they cannot catch the offenders, they usually run.
A2: The Patrol will take pictures [of the offenders] from a far but not now, it was in the past. Secretly, the Patrol took the pictures. Suddenly, the pictures have already been taken.
A3: The Patrol will secretly enter [the area].
A1: Without any voice.
A5: When we were focusing on cutting the tree, we could not hear their coming, they were sneaking in behind us.
A2: We did not realise that they were behind us.
A2: They were sneaking in.
A1: It is ok if it was only taking pictures but if they arrested.
A2: 

Q: Do they bring a gun, or pistol when they arrested the offenders?
A1: No, they don’t. The offenders will be brought to the Head of Village and inform the Head of Village about the information about the offenders including they names, their violations,

Q: How about the arrest process by the Patrol?
A3: The offenders will be educated once or twice.
A2: They will be given advice, [for example] the offenders of sand and rock collection,
A1: So they will not repeat their action again.

Q: How about wood, the offenders still receive an advice?
A2: Yes, but now there is no wood cutting case recently.

Q: How about with the escaped person, will they be chased continually by the Patrol?
A5: No, nobody wants to chase them until the rapid forest with sharp trees.

Q: How the Bunaken National Park’s existence makes you proud?
A5: The National Park so that the Bunaken islanders protect the National Park is its corals.
A1: like basin.
A5: Its fish is amazing, [but] it is not allowed to catch. Even by shouting, it is not allowed.
A3: In the Park, shouting is not allowed at all,
A1: Even to enter.
A5: So taking is not allowed at all.

Q: How is different with Mantehage island then?
A2: In the National Park area which is on the Bunaken, it is not allowed.

Q: So, on the Mantehage Island, is there a National Park?
A1-A5: No, dear.
A2: It is only on the Bunaken because it is a tourism object, for example my husband who works as a guide on the island.
A1: Many people come and want to see the [amazing] underwater view.

Q: So, there is no take zone here?
A2: There are a few here.
A1: Down there.
A5: Up there, we have some.
A1: Four areas.
A5: I forgot, how many,
A1: Near the pier of tangkasi, a little bit up.

Q: So what it is forbidden here,?
A3: Bombing.
A5: Trawl.
A1: Until the juvenile will be caught.
A5: Shooting is allowed.
A2: Some people are farmers, some of villagers are fishermen,

Q: How about use of hand net?
A1: It is allowed.

Q: So, in the core zone, it is only traditional boats are allowed to enter the zone?
A5: Yes, it is.

Q: How the Patrol make the community understand about the important of the core zone?
A5: Sometimes, they invited [us] into a meeting.

Q: How did you involve in the meeting?
A5: All of the villagers were invited in the meeting and receives a t-shirt, A2; all villagers from Tinongko, Buhias,

Q: How did you express your opinion?
A4: There were discussions in the meetings.
A1: They used to accept the right opinion.

Q: How did you deliver your objection in the meeting?
A1: Yes, we delivered it.

Q: So, how they response to the community’s complaints?
A1: They still considered it but they already agreed on it [for example] how the community make a livelihood which is the main issue?
A1: Based on the result of the last meeting, even the dry mangrove branch cannot be used but the community disagree,
A2: because it is important.
A1: It is better than to let it brought by the current of sea.
A5: The community needs it.
A2: As long as it is dry, [it is ok].
A1: for the raw mangrove is not allowed at all. They said that their aims are for the benefit and safety of our island because our island is located in the middle of the sea.

Q: How do you feeling about the result of meeting?
A1: We feel relief.
A2: We think it is for our advantages.
A1: The only request of the community is to ask for a permit to take mangrove trees for fence and they said that for domestic use is allowed.
A5: but we not allowed using to mangrove trees for sale. It has good price but it is not allowed now.
A1: The mangrove wood is good to be used as fire wood, make smoked fish, dudutu.
A2: It is good for dudutu because it is heavy.
A1: They called ‘kayu ting’.

Q: How the ban influence the family’ income?
A1: There are a lot of alternative, for example work in the construction in Manado.
A5: Such as my husband, in the tourism area.

Q: How the ban influences the trend of the husband work outside the island?
A1, A5: Yes, it does.
Q: How the separation impacts on the family relationship?
A2: Even though I am here and my husband in manado, we always have good communication.
A3: Feel a little bit doubt at one another.
A2: just like the song lyrics, it is far from eyes but close to the heart.
A2: They live in the rented room or with relatives.

Q: How does the long distance impact on your relationship with your husband?
A1: There is jealousy. I tried to ignore that issue. We are even, getting closer because of the jealousy. It is said jealousy means love.

Q: What is the problem emerged due to the long distance relationship?
A2: I miss my husband and feel envy every time I see a couple walk together.
A3: I feel envy when I see other people walk with their spouse, while I walk alone, and also I need to face all problems at home by my own.

Q: How work of Patrol impacts of the relationship of relatives
A5: It has a significant influence, if they arrest the offender, they will give an advice. There is no difference in terms of the way of arresting between relatives and non-relatives. If the joint Patrol is operating, there is no compromise. If the community Patrol catches in hand the offenders, there is always a compromise.

Q: What will happen if the joint Patrol arrest?
A1: Without any education.
A5: My husband was the leader of the [Community] Patrol, so if a joint Patrol was going to operate, he would let Roberts [the Community Patrol member] knew and let other people [in the village] know that today do not cut the mangrove trees.
A2: Do not you ever try.

Q: So, the Community Patrol would inform the villagers, so no one would be caught an arrested by the Joint Patrol?
A5: There will be information from the local Community Patrol members and also from other village’s Patrol. Before they [the joint Patrol team from all institutions] go Patrolling, my husband would let the community knows. The Joint Patrol used to use their own speed boat and they are more than 10 people. [They are so many] because they are joint teams from all [institutions]. So, [the violation] cannot be compromised. So my husband would let Kobe his staff knew [and Kobe will let everyone in the village knew] that ‘it will be your fault if you make something because this time the joint Patrol will come’. [The difficulties with the joint Patrolling] are if the Joint Patrol came [and could catch offenders of the Park rules], they would not show any mercy.

Q: Were there any people they arrested?
Q: How the joint Patrols arrest the offenders?
A5: They burnt the wood a couple time ago.
A1: from tangkasi village.
A2: The offenders used to advised by the Patrol team.
A5: They could find the offender.

Q: How the Patrol influence the obedience of the community to the rules.
A5: We realised that [the rules] are for our advantages.

Q: How the ban impacts of the family’s welfare?
A5: Yes, in the past, especially, when our main livelihood was [collecting the wood fire], the bans were influential but not now. How changes change your livelihood?

Q: Staff of the balai always come to make a meeting.
A5: Sometimes the head of subdistrict comes altogether. Also the community of Tinongko, buhias, the meeting was held in the hall of village.

Q: How about the announcement of the result of meeting?
A1-A5: No,
A1: They just gave us books to read.
A2: T-shirt, I have two [books].

Q: How the reward system of the community’s involvement is happened?
A: There is no reward system.

Q: How the acceptance of the Patrol’s advice by the community happened
A1: We plant the mangrove in the empty area of swamp

Q: What is your expectation as the community to the National Park?
A5: [An alternative livelihood], because our [coastal] area is majority is swamp so tourism cannot be developed here.
A2: My husband used to developed seagrass cultivation in Nain.
A1: But now it was destroyed because of weeds.
A2: We do not have sand which is wanted by the foreign tourists.

Q: In Buhias, the people is proud with talaga, how about other villages?
A2: We have farm only. All villages have a farm but in Mantehage the farm is larger than in Nain.
A1: Tangkasi does not have the talaga, while Bango and Tinongko also have the talaga but it is smaller than is in Buhias. We do not need to for fishing in the far fishing ground but only in talaga, we just need to bring nets.
A2: In the dry sea, we collect bia kodo,
A3: In little water time, we collect bia kodo.
Q: So not only men collect women?
A1: for collecting bia, men is rarely conducting it but mostly women.

Q: So in the high tide, men are active while in the low tide women?
A2: Sometimes the bia is sold. Rp. 10,000 per half of plastic bag.

Q: Nain is wellknown with use of compressors, how about Buhias?
A1: Use of compressor is illegal; Buhias is well known with use of borri.
A2: but traditional borri is allowed. However, not the chemical borri. The traditional borri made of special leaves, and roots but the compressor use is illegal. This year, Nainers was caught twice for using the compressors.

Date

**Woman group discussion in Bango**

Q: What things make you pride by being a Bango villager?
A1: I think the good things about Bango village are the unity and a [custom] of helping one another between one villager and another, between the villagers and the government. Other things make me as a villager proud is from the Bunaken National Park Agency comes to this place to provide everything [including] interviews [with the staff] or their knowledge to the villagers in order to make the villagers understand. So, until today, the community understands what things are forbidden, what the potentials of Bango and the community keeps obeying the rules. Until now, the relationship between the Bango villagers and the government is still good and maintained although sometimes there is a small friction. Thank God, until now, the village is still safe. That’s the things making me proud as a mother and a villager.

Q: How about other mothers? What is your opinion about the pride of being a Bango villager?
A2: We are happy living here in Bango because if we lived in Manado, everything should be bought including fish, vegetable, [or] rice. However, when we live here where most of villagers live as a farmer and cultivate many plants such as vegetable, cassava, coconut, bete, [everything will be free] and in the corn plantation season, they cultivate corn, and rice. With all things, as the Bango villagers, we become happy because not everything would be paid with
money. In Manado, you have to pay to have something, while here fish can be caught in the sea.

Q: How about Mrs. Vonny’s opinion?
A: Good cooperation among different religious leaders, harmony and solidarity among different Churches members.

Q: If we depart from the point of having resources for free, what is your opinion and image of Community Patrol members?
A: For the word of Patrol, the Patrol is aimed at to protect the National Park, and the Patrol apply too much ban,
A: I think with the existence of the Patrol,
A: Everything is limited.
A: Everything is banned such as No-Take Zone.
A: [Includes] cutting mangrove.
A: Mangrove and other [resources] are limited to be used, especially in Bango Village, I did not say we never [commit violations of the ban]. We still did it but because of the ban of the Patrol members, [we tried to stop it].
A: [Our livelihood] was limited.
A: [Our livelihood] was limited. We just cut what we need and I think the Community Patrol members’ existence is good [because] Patrol benefits us by protecting and maintaining the security the environment both in the land and on the sea. When it is heard the Patrol is coming, the people who want to do bad things will escape. Everything will be solved if the Patrol members present. With the Patrol, the community feels safe, although sometimes, the community wants to take this or take that, the community feels afraid to commit because of the Patrol members.

Q: Can you tell me how the Patrol activity influences the use of resources such as fish?
A: Explosive fishing is not allowed.
A: Or using borri [poisons].
A: Or using compressor.
A: No potassium use is allowed.

Q: Can you tell me how the Core Zone implementation does influence of the family livelihood?
A: In the zone, catching fish is prohibited.
A: The zone is specialised as an area where fish lay its eggs.
A: It is only in the zone.
A: But in different zones, it is ok.

Q: So, in different areas, to catch fish is allowed?
A: Yes, as long as it is caught with an allowed gear.

Q: How does the ban impact the people who have conduct crab collecting as their livelihood?
A: People here are rarely to commit the activity.
A: It is not like in Buhias village, some people do.
A2: Even, the Buhias villagers used to come and gather crabs here.

Q: How about the Bango villagers then?
A1: Bango villagers are different. If we do not catch enough fish, we use *borri*.
A2: We use [allowed] fishing net.

Q: Can you tell me the influence of implementation of Community Patrol’s duty on the relationship of relatives in the Bango village?
A1: Never here, but in the other villages such as Nain, it happened frequently because the use of compressor in diving.
A2: In the Buhias village, the Patrol members arrested once the people who were cutting the mangrove trees.
A5: The raw trees.

Q: What happened to the offenders?
A5: They were brought directly to the office.
A1: They had to face a trial, especially use of diving compressor. Nain villagers, it is almost twice.
A3: They were given advice.
A4: Except they cut the mangrove for domestic use, for example *sero* plantation, but they just received advice.
A2: The case was closed on the spot.
A4: So they will not repeat it again.
A5: Because the wood we cut it was only for our own need.

Q: Why diving compressor is the most difficult case?
A5: Because all fish can be caught.
A1: Small or large fish.
A5: Includes shrimp.

Q: How about restriction of traditional spear gun was implemented?
A5: It is not forbidden.
A1: Catching turtle is forbidden.

Q: Is it edible?
A1: It depends on the individual.
A1: It is a long time since the villages caught turtle last time.
A5: But if there is somebody caught the turtle, they should hide it or release it.

Q: What happened if the turtle catcher was caught?
A5: They will receive a warning again.
A5: If the mangrove trees were cut in a lot of numbers, the offenders will be taken to the office and the wood would be burn.

Q: How did the Patrol make an approach to the community?
A1: Through meeting, everywhere and every time they always discuss with the community and the community realised that what the Patrol members have done are for the advantages of the community.
Q: How did you get involved in such meetings?
A5: We were invited.

Q: How did you deliver compliance of the meeting?
A5: They accept it but they said.
A1: We do not take too much.
A5: We can take it but not too much.
A5: Here we use the mangrove wood as fire wood for domestic use.
A5: How can we [live] and also it is already dry but we have never taken when it is still raw, it is died already.
A2: It will not live again.
A5: It will not grow again.

How about others ban implementation?
A3: Taking sand is prohibited.
A1: Taking coral is not allowed.
A2: Not long time ago, there was a call for the villagers to face the [office].

Q: You told me that there is a feeling of afraid if you want to take something illegally?
A1: The men in this village used to take rocks on the sea when the Patrol members do not present. If there were Patrol members, it would not be happened. If there is a Patrol member, the activities of taking rocks and sand would not be conducted although it is the community needs. Because the activities are forbidden, so they will take when the Patrols were not there. Because it is the need of the community.
A2: [Only] to build a house.
A5: You can imagine if we must buy rocks in Manado, you can imagine how much rock per dam truck.
A5: Not mention taking sand restriction.

Q: So, there is no Patrol member in the village?
A5: There is one.
A3: No, two, one called Aman.
A1: He is a [Patrol boat] rider.
A5: The Patrol member here is only Jendri.
A5: Even, if he was here, the community may secretly take corals.
A3: But if there is joint Patrol, the community would not do it.
A5: There is an expression, if the joint Patrol will come, the community members who were taking the coral expected to stop their activities and when the joint Patrol members go back home, they can continue the activities.

Q: How did Jendry inform and convince the community to obey the rules?
A2: Her husband is used to take rocks.
A4: The Patrol members would give a call to the community if the joint Patrol members will operate
A3: [The demand of alternative resource emerged] because the community also needs sand to build their houses.
A1: It is so expensive to buy one dump truck of sand [in the mainland], not mention the [extra] transportation cost [from the mainland to the island], using boats as a transport.

Q: How did Jenri (the current Patrol Member) deal with the community, has Jenri ever had a conflict with the community?
A5: No, he never.
A1: I knew that Jenri is a Patrol member just now. I did not know about it previously.

Q: So there is a lack of insemination of information insemination that he is a Patrol
A5: Yes, there is.

Q: So, there is a difference in terms of strictness to rules between conducting a Patrol alone and join other members?
A5-A1: Yes, there is.

Q: How did the Patrol before Jenri deal with the community’s violation?
A5: It used to be a frequent conflict [between the Patrol Members and community members], because they [the previous Patrol Members] forbid many things. It is probably, even though Jenri was enforcing the rules, he is not too strict. It is impossible for him to enforce the rules without any motivation to conduct it strictly and consistently. However, at the same time, somehow he tries to make the community [can] accept and understand his responsibility. If he followed the community’s want, it means that he did not conduct his job well, to be honest. Now, probably, he compromised with the community’s needs, because if he insisted to enforce the rules consistently, the community would be insisted too...

A2: So [eventually] the past conflict would happen [again].
A1: Based on the past experience with the Patrol before Jenri, the conflict had ever happened because of the ban’s strict application. Probably, based on the experience, in conducting his job and responsibility, Jenri may have a personal commitment and policy to understand the community. Moreover, at the moment, he is also building his house. How can he build his house [if he did not compromise the rules for himself], it would be very difficult [for him]. Indeed, it is very difficult.

A4: If the rock is still with a head cannot be taken.

Q: Mrs. Camelia said that in the past, there was conflict, how did it happen?
A5: The offenders who took rocks, sands and cut mangrove to make sero tanam have ever received complaints because the Patrol did not want to allow. One is called Amang Toris lives near the beach but now he is a motorist, because he was too strict to enforce the rules.

A5: If we took sand from Manado, we should pay,
A5: now if buy a brick from Manado costs us Rp, 6000,- for hiring a boat, so if we buy 100 means we should pay Rp, 600,000,-, it is black sand while here white sand.
A3: It will not be enough to build a house.

Q: How about to make fence?
A3: As long as it is a dead rock.

Q: What is the reason of the ban of the stones mining activity?
A1: The reason which I think it is right. If all stones are taken, fish cannot lay their eggs because the rock is the place of laying their eggs and a shelter to the fish, many fish hide in the rock. The same as mangroves, a lot of fish hide near the roots of the mangrove trees. As told I you previously, that we felt relief because [of the rules]. Before the [implementation of] the bans, to be honest, it is difficult to find the fish because many rocks have been taken. After we took the rock which is our [house building] need, the [significant] impact will be affected our next generation who will not enjoy the abundance of fish. We are now in difficulties. How much more our next generation?

Q: How about alternative livelihood as a compensation provided by the Patrol?
A1: Back to be farmers. There are no people here to cut the mangrove to sell, except in Buhias
A2-A5: No, it is only in Buhias.

Q: How about in the past, was there any people cutting the mangrove to sell
A2: It was only in the other village.

Q: So, in each village has different characteristic?
A1: In the past, Buhias, Tinongko and Tangkasi villagers were wood cutters.
A5: Until now in the Bango used to be their location to cut the wood.
A1: That is why I said with the Patrol members in our village our mangrove trees in the swamp is safe because the non-villages were afraid to cut the mangrove. If there is no mangrove, our beach will be definitely destroyed so when [large] waves come, it will impact directly [the village]. You can see the mangrove along the beach that never be reduced because Bango villagers do not cut mangrove in a lot of numbers. We just cut in a small numbers for sero which is planted in the sea and also fence pillar.

Q: But all of uses are still officially acknowledged?
A1: No, we did it secretly,
A5: Actually, the use of mangrove for making a fence also is not allowed.
A1: But it is difficult to find a hard wood here.
A5: And the fence will be long life.

Q: How about other hard wood in the forest?
A1: It is not as good as ting wood.
A5: It is not ting wood but matoti wood.
A2: It is called lolang bajo.

Q: Can you tell me your experience receiving a reward or gratitude from the Balai or anybody on your participation to protect the environment?
A5: Acknowledgment was given just at the meeting but any other form of appreciation, we never received.

Q: Have you known Mr. Gatot? What he has done in this village?
A3: He had once conducted a competition as part of celebration of Indonesian Independence Day, for example sack race, and pinang climbing.

Q: How about activities related to Maming protection?
A1: He had once made a quiz whoever could answer would receive a price. It was conducted in the Village Square on 17th of August 2 years ago.
A5: Also he gave a billboard of kiosk. When I participate at a training last year, they told me that Maming is forbidden to catch when it is still in small size, the size round a couple centimeters. Small size means it has not laying eggs yet. If it is large, it is prohibited to catch. It means the money we could generate from selling Maming will be a lot as well. They told me that if Maming is caught in a small size, it is just enough to eat means the Bango village will ignore the opportunity to make much money. They want if we want to catch Maming should be in a large size so that we can create large income. They said that the price is around Rp. 1 million per kilo.
A5: It is expensive.
A1: They said that the fish is the most expensive fish.

Q: So what would you do if you catch a small Maming?
A3: We [instantly] eat.
A4: We never catch the large maming.
A5: It is rarely.
A2: If we [accidently] caught Maming, we would hide it because it is forbidden to catch and they want us to catch the large fish. If the community catches the small Maming, the community will lose.

Thank you for your participation

COMMUNITY PATROL MEMBERS

Interview transcription with Merton Pimpin

Q: Can you tell me your name please?
A: My name is Merton Pimpin and I live in Alungbanua village.

Q: How long were you a member of the Patrol activity?
A: I joined the Patrol for three years ago, from 2009 to 2011.

Q: Can you tell me about your motivation to be a Patrol Member?
A: Because [I have] concerns and awareness of the environment, and in order to conserve the environment.

Q: What did you learn after you became a Patrol member?
A: I have the concern and I became to understand about the laws, conservation issues and since the time, we have been able to distinguish whether [something] is an appropriate thing or not.

Q: Can you give me an example of what you have done for your environment?
A: For example, implementation of the rules of throwing garbage on the bin.

Q: How were you involved in coral related conservation activities?
A: I was involved in coral conservation activities such as seeding activities and also Eco-reef making activities. Eco reefs are artificial corals and these are a stimulant to new coral growing. It is made of ceramic. It looks like coral but is made of ceramic in Korea or Singapore, and they serve as a catcher of sperm, so the new seedlings of coral will grow in the unit. The artificial coral also looks like finger shape corals and were set up in the respective site where corals were damaged to catch the sperms. It is expected that the new seeds will grow in the place.

Q: How long it takes to grow new seedlings?
A: The new seedlings will grow well if supported by good water circulation, current circulation, clean water without any pollution or garbage. It takes one year at least. The growth of coral seedlings in one year can reach [only] one cm.

Q: The growth of coral seedlings takes time?
A: Yes, if there is no natural disturbance such as fish disturbance.

Q: How about the monitoring of the plantation?
A: Especially in the early stage, we should conduct monitoring frequently in order to make sure there is no garbage catching in the unit.

Q: This was part of the Patrol’s function?
A: Yes, it was part the Patrol’s functions and also divers [from tourist resorts] were assigned to conduct the same thing.

Q: Previously, you said that you received new knowledge, skills and also other benefits, can you tell me about special skills you obtained when you were a patrol?
A: I once participated in a training rescue session aimed at [teaching us] how to help people who were drowning. The program was provided by the Water Police.

Q: Can you tell about financial benefit, was it sufficient?
A: It was helpful but it was not sufficient.

Q: Can you tell me about the differences between before and after you became a Patrol member?
A: I used to not understand about the rules of zonation, about cleanliness, about conservation. However, now I understand.

Q: How about your changes of confidence due to your involvement in the Patrol?
A: I feel more confident because I had a position. However, my friends always remind me, that I should be a model and set a good example and distinguish myself as a guard.

Q: Can you tell me about the change of people’s attitude toward your new position in 2009?
A: The people did not become afraid of me, they just felt quite reluctant speak and meet me.

Q: Can you tell me how did you first obtain information about the Patrol first?
A: There was an announcement by the Dewan [the Park Management Advisory Board] about vacancy in the Patrol. The announcement was spread out to the entire villages in the Park area.

Q: How many people were recruited to be a Patrol in your village?
A: I am not sure because the Patrol has been implemented since 2000.

Q: How about your contract status now?
A: I resigned. I did not want to continue my contract.

Q: Why?
A: I changed my profession. A shifting system of Patrol was conducted in order to give the same opportunities to other villagers to be a Patrol member as well and to make them understand about the issues.

Q: Can you tell me about the specific criteria you should fulfil in order to be a Patrol?
A: The range of age is about from 20 to 48 I think, being able to swim.

Q: What do you think of the transparency of the system?
A: I think it was a transparent system

Q: How about women’s involvement in the Patrol?
A: No, it is only for men because most of the work time is in the evening. The work system is we work for 15 days in one month but we work in the day and evening.

Q: Can you tell me about evaluation of the Patrol?
A: We used to make a report of activities in every period of time.

Q: Can you tell me the most difficult case you have ever handled?
A: Violations of zonation.

Q: Can you tell me about the difficult cases?
A: Because there are some community members who have power to enact the rules but they are also the same people who commit violation. It was the most difficult.
Q: What do you mean?
A: They understand about zonation scheme but because they are powerful they [deliberately] violated the rules.

Q: How did you deal with such difficult cases?
A: I did catch them. Once, a two star general that came here from Jakarta to relax and fish was brought out by an NDC [a resort]’s guide. They used an NDC guide who was supposed to know the rules. [This was denied]. Moreover, he was a government employee, how come he did not know about the rules? I caught him because there was [strong] legal evidence.

Q: Can you tell me about the procedure to handle violations such as warning letter?
A: Warning letters are just applied to the small violations, but [in the serious violation with] [strong] legal evidence, the offenders would be caught and brought to the Police Office.

Q: Can you tell me about new knowledge about forbidden gears used in the No-Take Zone you obtained from the Patrol activities?
A: There are different types of zones depend on the purpose. The zone system consists of the tourism zone, the community zone, and the core zone [where] all activities are forbidden [to conduct]. Even, for conducting research, you should obtain a permit from the Balai [the Bunaken National Park Agency].

Q: What other gear is limited beside compressors?
A: The forbidden fishing gear such as net called a chang.

Q: How about implementation of Jubi [spear gun] restriction?
A: [Principally], the use of Jubi is not allowed in the [Core] zone. However, to the local villagers, the use was allowed because it was their basic livelihood, and was one of the most popular types of traditional fishing gear, but not for outsiders who usually have modern shooters such as spear gun. The use of spear guns is forbidden in all zones because it is a modern gear.

Q: Why is a modern gear forbidden?
A: Because of the modernity, it is more effective than traditional gear.

Q: What were the community’ responses toward the limitations of fishing gear?
A: In the past, the community was focused on mainly fisheries, but now because of the development of tourism (that provide more job opportunity to the villagers), there are many villagers changing their livelihoods.

Q: How about the responses by traditional fishermen toward the restrictions?
A: The traditional fishermen also still conduct [forbidden] netting, although they understand about the zone types and purposes. There are certain places provided for the fishermen. In the Use zone, the community is allowed to catch fish because the zone is designed special for them. However, there are only certain types of gear allowed and certain methods of fishing allowed.

Q: Did you attend other types of training besides the rescue training?
A: During the three year period, it was the only type of training conducted at the end of each year.

Q: Can you tell me about community meetings?
A: All members of the community were invited by the Balai [the Bunaken Park Agency] or the Dewan and also some foundations that were involved in the Dewan [Management Advisory Board of the Bunaken National Park].

Q: How did people perceive implementation of No-Take Zone?
A: In the past, the community thought that by the zonation scheme, the government had blocked community space and make making a livelihood harder. However, they enjoyed benefit of the zonation [system]. The rejection was normal because most of community members are lay people, especially the villagers in the island where the education quality and background to the issue is not sufficient. Even, people with a good education background but with lack of understanding could not accept that [the No-Take Zone].

Q: Can you tell me about the complaints and other input by the community at meeting?
A: The management of the Park is held by the DPTNB [the Park Management Board]. At the moment, there is a budget for each region but recently the community contribution has been not distributed well. I think it has been five or six years, the Village Conservation Budget has never been received. Every village supposed to receive 10% of entry ticket sells.

Q: I discussed this with the Balai and they said that they will take over the management of the ticket sales. How do you react to this?
A: The source of conflict is a dispute between government of [Manado] City and the province government who are competing for the Park area but the funding is still run by the Dewan.

Q: How does the Patrol influence the community’s acceptance to the rules of the Park?
A: It is [not really] effective because [for example] mangroves are still taken by few members of community for their domestic use such as fence making or for fire wood.

Q: Is it allowed to take dead trees?
A: Yes, it is, because if [the dead tree would not be taken], it would be useless. However, the Patrol keeps controlling the gathering.

Q: How did you let the community knows about the restriction, especially to your relatives and family?
A: We have our own tricks. [First], we should know [and understand and compromise with] the reason why they committed the violation, in particular regarding personal property status of protected forest woods. [Second], on the Independence Day, every one in the village will be busy to make a fence. It will depend on us. We should have a tolerance but it was limited to certain location where they could take the wood.
Q: Do you think the community is happy with your existence?
A: In the past, the community was unhappy because they felt that their activities [of making livelihood] were limited.

Q: What do you think are the weaknesses toward the Patrol system?
A: All the Patrol system’s weaknesses are located in the funding systems. Most activities were cancelled because of lack of funding related issues, such as there was no enough gasoline, the operational budget is not enough and as a result many violations occurred out there.

Q: What are the advantages of the system of Patrol activities for your self-confidence improvement?
A: We only received new knowledge, wide perspectives, a wider social life, as we are known by more people.

Q: What are your expectations toward the Patrol activities?
A: We hope in the future, the management and conservation will be better managed.

Q: What do you think about the transparency of the management?
A: I think the management is sufficiently transparent but the [financial] contribution to the village is not running well, that makes many people question the Park implementation.

Q: If you could be recruited again, are you available?
A: I do not think so, if only to help sometimes is ok. If the Dewan still controls [the Patrol activity] I will not join unless the Balai takes over because the Balai is a government institution and in terms of operational cost, they are more reliable than the Dewan.

Q: Do you still visit the Dewan office?
A: Yes, I do. I need to go there to obtain their recommendation for me to get a new job.

Q: How many people usually work at the same time?
A: In the Bunaken region, Siladen and Manado Tua, every block of settlement is represented by one Patrol member. However, in every surveillance activity, it used to be four people Patrolling, plus Water Police and the Rangers.

Q: Do you a CLO member like Welly?
A: I do not know what the CLO is, but probably he is an outsourcing staff of the Balai.

Q: How do you see the opportunity to being an outsourced staff of the Balai?
A: It is a [large opportunity].
Date:

**Interview with Refli Taturu**

Q: Could you please introduce yourself?
A: My name is Refli Taturu.

Q: How long have you been involved in Patrol?

Q: Can you tell me about the recruitment system?
A: In 2004 due to emergent needs, there was no an [appropriate] recruitment [system], so it was only two representatives [were sent] from each village. In 2006, a [new] recruitment system was applied and allowed all people who wanted to be a Patrol to apply. The recruitment system consisted of verbal and oral tests.

Q: What are the specific criteria to be a Patrol?
A: At least, you must know how to swim, know the area situation, and know about the water situation.

Q: How did you obtain the information about the recruitment?
A: I obtained the information from the community Forum which gave me a recommendation to become a Patrol member.

Q: Can you tell me about training you participated in?
A: Instructors were from the *Balai*, [the Bunaken National Park Agency] and from the Citizens Forum and from the Water Police.

Q: How did you apply the new knowledge you gained from the training?
A: The results of the training focused on the Patrol system, and the enforcement system, while lessons about the community were taught by the Forum [Community of the Bunaken Park forum] and the DPTNB. The lessons are about how to conduct information insemination to the community. So, the enforcement consists of two parts, the enforcement itself and insemination of information.

Q: How do you conduct the insemination of information?
A: I did not conduct mobilisation of the community but on the sea, in the mangrove forest, in *nyare* [intertidal area] and on coral reefs. I did it individually but also I did insemination of information in the fellowship place, in the community meetings, in the middle of crowds, or at the certain times, when many people gathered such as when watching football.

Q: What was the community’s perception of you when they found out that you were a Patrol member?
A: At the beginning, it can be said that the community could not accept my role because in that time they perceived that the [sea] belonged at the state and belongs to us and belong to our village, so nobody could ban us from using the resources.

Q: How did you face such problems?
A: We did insemination information first, then we explained which resources could be taken and which could not, which should be protected, conserved, and how to maintain [the resource]. So the community began to realise that the ban is right.

Q: How do you see the change in the community’s awareness after the Patrol’s work?
A: At the beginning, it seems that the community was ignorant with the programmes of the Balai and the DPTNB, but probably since they have found the benefits of the implementation of the programmes, slowly but surely the community becomes aware.

Q: How about the level of violations?
A: It can be said that violations on the coastal line are not absent, [it is still there with very limited numbers of incidents] and uncaught offenders because there was no a confessing thief. If the violation happened and offenders caught, they must be outsiders of the Bunaken Park area, for example, the case of cutting mangrove [and] diving compressor uses were committed by the non-area inhabitants. While the insiders committed cases are limited to small cases such as taking mangrove woods for one or two trees for their own domestic use.

Q: Can you tell me about the most significant benefit of becoming a Patrol member?
A: Individually, I can say this is our dedication to the country. The benefits are for the community while for me individually, no significant benefits. Sometimes, the community provided something for us.

Q: How about financial benefits?
A: Since 2004, we have applied a system of team work. One team worked 6-7 hours per day and our payment was at Rp.35,000. After that in 2008 or 2009, after the WOC, we were paid Rp. 75,000 per 24 hours. Since last year or two years ago, the incentives have been down to Rp. 500,000 per month.

Q: How do you feel after you become a Patrol member in terms of improving your confidence?
A: Honestly, there is a certain pride of being able to direct the community to be more concerned about the environment. There is a specific pride, although it is said the work is only dedication. However, I feel proud with the environment we protect, the environment that used to be damage due to pond activities but now almost all areas green with mangroves.

Q: How about women’s involvement in the Patrol? Can you tell me about the women’s involvement in the Patrol?
A: The Patrol members from the community elements are male only, but if there is a male member, she must be a staff of the Balai. If she included in the roster, she had to join Patrolling with the team.

Q: Can you tell me about the strengths and weaknesses of the training program?
A: Funding of the training from the Balai and the Dewan was limited, so the training sessions were too short, so many good lessons of the session were lessened due to the limited time. We did not receive the lessons maximal because of the time limitation.

Q: Can you tell me about the participation of the community?
A: We mostly talked to the community’s members who are involved frequently in the coastal area and interacted with the coastal area and coral reefs and those people were the first people we aimed at.

Q: How did you convince the people to obey the rules?
A: One of the [main] efforts was information insemination and other programmes of the Balai [Balai Taman Nasional Bunaken or The Bunaken National Park Agency] and the Dewan [Dewan Pengelolaan Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Advisory Board of the Bunaken National Park] that involved the community, for example, the distribution of fruits seeds and wood provision. So, through such programmes, it was expected to influence the community directly.

Q: Beside information insemination, how did the Patrols convince the community to comply with the zonation scheme?
A: In the past, when the zonation was established, if I am not mistaken in 2001, and it was revised in 2006, due to too many zones and name of zones which were confusing the community, especially in the coastal area, now there are three zones only the Community zone, Tourism zone, and another zone. So at the beginning, the Dewan and the Balai came to the community with the [community] Patrol to conduct information insemination. There were a lot of controversies because the community [still] wanted to feel free in their own territories, and then suddenly the territories were bordered with rules about which activities were allowed and which were not. Here [in this village, fishing] is allowed but with a certain restriction of the [allowed] methods. It was a controversy for the community, but probably due to the good information insemination, the community then accepted the zonation. In the Mera, it was declared one zone called the Saving Zone but since that time [of establishment] until now, it has no clear borders or border sign were put there. So, only the community who were involved in the establishment knew [about the zone], but for the community who did not, they will not know and they keep conducting their [fishing] activities in the area. Moreover, outsiders were also fishing in the area as well because no sign was put there.

Q: How was the solution offered regarding the community’s rejection to zonation?
A: In the past, if we caught up a violation in the zone, we warned [the offenders], and every month during the evaluation section, we submitted input to the Dewan and the Balai. [We] hoped that the sign [of No-Take Zone border] would be set up in the area and a billboard announcing that it is forbidden to conduct any
fishing activities in the area. However, until now, there is no realisation of our request. If there is an activity [of surveillance], it was only [dealing with] emergency incidents such as sinking boats. It can be said that we were the party who interacted directly with the community, especially the offenders. Therefore, it will be monotonous if you caught up [offenders] of the same violation over and over, while there was no clear sign in the area.

Q: How did the rules impact on the fishermen’s access?
A: For the community, we had conducted an information insemination about what fishing gears are banned or allowed and the fishing methods which were allowed. With the enacted rules, the community, especially the fishermen will think slowly that the quality and quantity of the catch increased gradually. [Moreover], other [positive] changes were for example, if in the past the size of their catch was just at 5 cm, but then now around 7-8 cm, and in the past they used to catch 10 fish but now some of them caught 15-16 fish.

Q: What do you think about the zonation in term of the community attitudes?
A: Regarding zonation, [the system] is analogized as one line of street, even though there was another line, it must be a border around there, but because there is no signs so the community is freely to access the area. In the conservation context, the community’s awareness is already high, for example, all the seeds provided by the Balai taken and planted by the community. When the Balai team and I checked it was already 80-90% is successful and alive.

Q: What is your expectation of the Bunaken National Park?
A: Personally, for the Patrol, it activity can be said it is running [well]. However, at the same time I wish it would be like in the past when the Patrol operated almost every day, when we used to conduct monitoring until enforcement of the entry tag collection. I wish [the system would be] like that. However, I think there are certain areas that should be [intensively and seriously] rehabilitated including coral [reefs] because corals were destructed not only by human but also by nature.

Date:

Interview with Robert Dauhan

Q: Can you introduce yourself?
A: My name is Robert

Q: Since when you did become a Patrol member?
A: Since 2006
Q: What was your main motivation to be a Patrol member?
A: I was motivated to protect the environment because I am originally a villager. Besides that, in order to fulfil my family needs such as sending my children to school.

Q: How helpful financially your participation as a Patrol member?
A: It is quite helpful but it is not enough.

Q: Can you tell me about the Patrol system?
A: At the moment, there are no Patrol members. In our time, we worked for 10 days for 24 hours both in the land and on the sea and we stayed in the Patrol station in Bango Village.

Q: Can you tell me the recruitment system?
A: There is an announcement from the Head of Village. We applied and passed a test about the National Park Area

Q: What were the requirements?
A: The [School] certificate, a letter of recommendation by the police, a job seeker letter, a recommendation by the Head of Village.

Q: How about female applicants?
A: It was [for] only men.

Q: How did you convince the community to accept the Bunaken Park’s rules?
A: Mostly by information insemination.

Q: Can you tell me about conflict you’ve ever experienced regarding your job as a Patrol?
A: In the field we faced a lot of problems, the community did not accept when we forbidden the community from taking the rocks, and mangroves. However, we [tried to] educate them slowly and continually. Some of the community accepted but [still] not all.

Q: How did you approach the community?
A: We came to the houses of the villagers or we approached them when they were on the road, or in the location of mangrove extraction.

Q: How about the meeting of community?
A: Not frequent and only some of the community’s opinions were listened to.

Q: What are your expectations to the Balai regarding the Patrol system?
A: I resigned in 2012 as there was no surveillance conducted by Patrol members at that time. However, I saw the current Patrol still receives salary. One of them worked in Tateli but he still is paid by the Dewan. I do not understand, it was around Rp. 500,000 per month. That is our [main] complaint. Moreover, explosive fishing related cases still happened, but the Patrol did not work [anymore].
Q: Why did you resign from being a Community Patrol Member?
A: [It was] two of us were recruited, but I am not interested in [becoming a member anymore] because I thought that the system [of salary payment] became not good. Moreover, [as my family expenses increased, especially] my child was attending university. So I needed more money and I moved to a different job. I wish both the Balai (the Bunaken National Park Agency) and the Dewan (the Management Advisory Board) [to activate] again the Patrol, because the situation is ignored now.

Q: How about the coordination between the Balai and the Dewan?
A: I heard that there is no coordination anymore, not like in the past.

Q: What happened if you caught an offender who was one of your relatives?
A: At the first time, I used to warn the offender if the violation was still small. In the past, we caught a lot of compressors users from Nain Island, but they were released so it was useless for us to arrest them. We caught them at 12 mid night.

Q: What are the weaknesses of the Patrol System?
A: It was only members of the Patrol doing the community work without accompanying Police Water, or Rangers. We were rarely in our station. We must consider the situation when we wanted to take an action, but mostly we did approach offenders.

Q: So, did you feel insufficient able to arrest an offender?
A: Yes, moreover, the equipment was not supportive, for example we used only a small engine attached to a large boat, so it only could run slowly. As a consequence, we had to stop frequently. The engine was only at 15 HP.

Q: What is the difference between before and after you became a Patrol member in terms of the community’s perception of the Patrol?
A: [After I became a Patrol member], the community showed rasa kerene, reluctant feeling.

Q: How do you feel in terms of improvement of your self-confidence?
A: I felt more confident in terms of being a Patrol member. All good but they did not conduct a recruitment anymore, so the good performance could be lasting.

Q: What kind of knowledge did you gain when you joined the Patrol?
A: I had a lot of knowledge and one part is about security work systems, I use my experience as a Patrol member in my current work in security.

Q: Can you tell me about the training you have ever participated in?
A: Everything, marching, diving.

Q: How about the new knowledge about rules?
A: Most of the knowledge already has disappeared from my brain. [However, few still stayed], for example, [knowledge about existence of] a Community Use Zone, Tourism Zone, [and which activities of] the community are allowed and which are not.
Q: How about the information insemination?
A: It was rare, the Dewan did not go there many times to conduct a meeting so it was only us until now.

Q: Due to the community’s rejection to the implementation of the zonation system, what were solutions you offer to solve the issue?
A: We explained about zonation to them, we told them that we would not forbid them forever, it was only for five year, for example, for the first five years, you can catch fish in this area and after that you can move to a different place.

Q: What for the benefits for the next generation you offered to the community?
A: Yes, for our next generation, on the point, they quite understand. If we catch Jeverything, nothing will be left.

Q: With the explanation, the community’s rejection is reduced. However, how about the restrictions of diving with compressors?
A: When we were the Patrols not many cases, but at the moment I heard from the local people that some cases are happening due to lack of surveillance

Q: What do you think should be improved?
A: I think the recruitment should be conducted again and the Patrol should be recruited from each settlement. At the moment, the current Patrol receives salary but they did not work or conduct surveillance anymore.

Q: How about the mangrove related cases? How did you convince the community not to use mangrove as fire wood.
A: In our place, the mangrove cases were only a few. We conducted information insemination which contained and explained the use of the mangrove as the tsunami preventer or barrier. We allowed them to take one or two woods but they should plant to replace.

Q: How did you solve the issue of use of larger needs for mangrove wood by the community, for example making fences?
A: We directed them to make a request to Kepala Jaga [head of block of settlement] or Kuntua [Head of Village] and then send it to the Balai.

Q: How did you handle the offenders who were your relatives?
A: We gave a call to the offenders and we kept doing insemination of information until the community understood.

Q: In that time, did you attend meeting with the Dewan [Management Advisory]
A: These were so rare.

Q: How about the evaluation of your work?
A: Once a month, it used to be a brief meeting at the office of the Balai [the Bunaken Park Agency] about our performance, but they did not conduct surveillance by themselves as well. Another issue was the limited fuel. They gave us limited amount
of fuel. The problem was when there were violations a lot on the sea, should we have walked on the sea?

Q: What is your expectation of Patrol operation?
A: I hope the recruitment will be conducted again and it will involve a representative of each village and each Patrol will protect their own area.

Q: Even though you have finished working as a Patrol member, are there any activities related to conservation you still conduct?
A: If I have time, we look for seeds [of mangrove] and seedlings and plant them. We have done this many times.

Q: How about if they called you again?
A: I am available to work in my own village.

Q: How about involvement of Kuntua [Head of Village] in supporting the Patrol activities?
A: [This was] not frequent.

Q: What do you think are the benefits of Patrol to the community?
A: Some of the community members were happy [with the impact of surveillance] because the amount of catch increased, especially crabs when the mangrove cut incidents were lowered. So, after the activities finished, every time I went home to the village, and the community would report me that there were violations again and the offenders were from the neighboring village, Nain, because they wanted to make tumpal-tumpal [ ]. In my time, we used to Patrol around so the intention to take the mangrove was able not to happen. So I hope the Patrol will be activated again.

Q: During 2006-2012, were there any changes in terms of the Patrol?
A: Yes, there was a recruitment including tests.

Q: Which is your preference the Patrol to be under the authority of the Balai [the Bunaken National Park] or the Dewan?
A: If they could cooperate, it would be better, if both of the two institutions, so the surveillance could be assisted by the Balai.

Thank you for your participation.
Interviews with Pak Ira Sumombo

Q: Can you tell me about the recruitment process you passed?
A: At the first, we were just directly appointed.

Q: I am sorry what is your full name?
A: Ira Sumombo, [the name] is well known everywhere.

Q: Can you tell me how did you become a Community Patrol member?
A: In 2006, we were the first members of Community Patrol in this village since the establishment of the Bunaken National Park. So we are the members who were appointed at the first time. After we worked for three years, the system was changed with a recruitment process that requires certificates, [and] an application. In 2007, there was a new recruitment requiring a certificate and I worked for one year, so every year, [the new Patrol member] was rotated every year because all community should enjoy [an opportunity to be a Patrol member] and [also] the existence of the Bunaken National Park. In the following year, there was a recruitment I applied but it is said that the member should be changed to the new members. Since that time, there are a few new members, from my time to my son, there are five times recruitments based on my memory. So the community was used as a supervisor of the National Park, [in particular] at the nyare [intertidal] area.

Q: Why did you want to be a Patrol member?
A: In the time, due to a concern, even we first time to work, people whoever want to work needed money. It is a must. Then other concerns are to protect the National Park. However, the first [motivation] of working is money. It is impossible to work if there is no money [salary] promised. People work to make a living.

Q: What are the benefits you received in terms of knowledge and skills after you joined the Patrol teams?
A: [The recruitment increases my self - confidence] by providing experiences on the fields, especially the surveillance and [techniques and procedures to] deal with findings [of investigation and surveillance]. The procedures [include] how we will handle [the cases] and [responds of village] government and the community. Generally speaking, by the [Patrol] team, I obtained [a lot] experiences.

Q: So, there is significant improvement in your individual knowledge and skills dealing with cases in the community?
A: Yes, there is, [especially it is useful] in that time when I became the secretary to the Head of Village, the time before I obtained a permanent job as a civil servant.

Q: Beside that new knowledge, what are other skills you obtained from your participation as a Community Patrol member?
A: Nothing else. In Tinongko village, the Patrol members obtained a skill of making souvenirs made of coconut shells [but not us].

Q: How about trainings?
A: There were trainings, but only to improve our knowledge [about Park rules].
Q: How about rescue or riding a boat related skills?
A: No, the skills [just] were for a motorist, while I was at surveillance not as a motorist.

Q: So, how many types of the Patrol?
A: It is only one, motorists are not Patrol. They are in charge of riding the [Patrol] boats, sending us to the [surveillance] location and going around the Park area.

Q: Can you tell me how the work system?
A: There was a joint with Water Police.

Q: So tell me about the training, were you trained to use a gun?
A: No, in the recruitment system that required a certificate, the trainings consisted of marching from the Balai [the Park Agency] conducted in Liang [Village], and also swimming.

Q: How about the skills of arresting people?
A: There was a [lesson], but it was not so clear, I meant I developed by my own the way of [arresting people] based on my own experience. The skills were not provided in the trainings.

Q: This is quite personal, but you tell me that there was a benefit from being a Patrol member to make a life? How significant the financial benefits for you?
A: In the first year, I was paid Rp. 150, 000 per month, it is paid monthly but I worked only for five working days. We had a shift every five days in a month, so we have team one, team two, and team three. One team would work for five days, and another team would shift and work for another five days, until it reached one month.

Q: What are the difference between your work system in the past and now?
A: In my time there was no Jamsostek [a labour assurance system] which has been applied since 2008 or 2009 if I am not mistaken. My own son benefited the system. He works now for construction.

Q: So, an alternative livelihood to implementation of Park rules is a must for the community?
A: Yes, [the alternative job] is important especially for the villagers who have no permanent job and monthly salary such as teachers and civil servants. Livelihood on the villagers depends on seasons most. So in the cengkeh [glove]’s harvest time, people goes out [to the Mainland]. If the harvest time has not come yet, the people keep going out to work at construction in Manado. Only some people are able to depend on farming because the land is only fit annual plantations, so we are able to plant banana [and] coconuts. [Moreover], it is only for those who have a land, so that I felt sorry to the community [who has no land] and [at the same time] being grateful to be inaugurated as a civil servant.

Q: How did your recruitment as a Community Patrol member impact your self-confidence?
A: As I told previously, I found the experiences of [being a Community Patrol member] useful [especially] when I became a member of the Government of the village. The experience then [become more useful and relevant] when I became a civil servant. There is [new] knowledge, methods, and terms I obtained when I became a Patrol member that previously we did not understand, [for example terminology of] remuneration and many other words.

Q: How your existences as a Patrol member influence the community’s perception on your role as a government in the village?
A: Probably, [leadership] characteristics of [a Community] Patrol member were found in me by the community. Through my existence as a [Community] Patrol member was seen by the community as a person with knowledge. As a result, I was invited in the meetings in the community.

Q: Is it a kind of appreciation to your personal improvement?
A: Yes, [I think so]. However, I had an issue, when I became a Patrol [member], I became a public enemy.

Q: Can you tell me more about the problem with the fishermen?
A: The problem is [the ban of No-Take Zone] directly related and impacted to their livelihood, including collection sand and stone. As a consequence, we became an enemy, the issue is what they wanted to do is [contrast to] our interest and goal. There were challenges [dealing with the issue]. I also had received swearing of the community. A couple years ago, at the very first beginning [of the ban], when the production of mangrove logs was still on, we were the first party who eradicated the practice which was worsening and even the community chased after us using swords, because their interests and livelihood to produce mangrove logs were prohibited. However, we were consistent with the Water. Police and the Balai that joint altogether in that time [to ban the practice].

Q: What were your methods to convince the community to stop the prohibited practice?
A: The first [intention] was we wanted to do our jobs. The second is to provide a series of information insemination programmes, and approach [to the community] which from that point they started to realise. However, [the program] should be accompanied with firmness.

Q: How did you convince your community to change their behaviour from chasing you with a sword to accept your idea of conservation?
A: The point is to [convince] them is the mangrove use is not limited in certain ways, but mangrove has a great benefit to the community. Moreover, we conducted information inseminations and one of the knowledge is that [that sharing and teaching the community about impacts of mangrove cut and use of mangrove]. [It is taught that] beside as a house material, mangrove has other important as a fish house. So, if we cut the mangrove, the fish will be gone.
For example, in the past, when mangrove numbers were a lot, we went fishing [just] near the settlement. When the rocks [corals] have not been taken, we went fishing in the near place [and] in front of the village. However, [the fishing ground] is very far, as far as Tanjung, until the area called Darro, or in Karang
timbul, they called batu kapal, or it is called barakuda by DPTNB [the Management Board of the Bunaken National Park].

Q: How is your membership as the Patrol supports your concern of the environment?
A: Yes, there must have a concern of the environment because we should commit [and] we should provide information insemination, it can be called a concern, [and] how we approach the community is also [a proof of our] concern.

Q: How did you solve community conflicts related to the zonation in this village?
A: The keys are information insemination, [community] approach, provision of information that mangrove is paramount as a fish’ egg laying place, and information of function of stone [coral] as a breaker of big waves. However, if the insemination did not work, or the words did not work, we would use firmness to enforce the law.

Q: How the Park Rules were punished?
A: Usually the offenders would be brought to the office of the Head of Village, and we together [with Park Agency and Joint Patrol] gave understanding [to the community] so the offenders would understand and accept the rules. However, if they rebelled, they would brought to the authority,

Q: Can you tell me your experience dealing with your own relatives?
A: [Conflicts of interests] are unavoidable, mercy was also there, upset was also there. However, I became upset [due to the conflict of interests] because in that time I was conducting my job. Why I feel sorry because they are my community, even they are my relatives, but because of rules’ [implementation], I had to face the problem [with the community], based on the law that is the main and only consideration.

Q: How was the Park Rules enforced by the Patrol?
A: We are [just] lay people to the law. We do not understand it [well] about it but we also have [compromised] the strictness of the officers. As a village government we used to provide defense [to the offender] in order to lighten their mistakes. The reasons are besides as a [Community] Patrol member, we are the village government, as the secretary of the Head of Village [that serves as villager protectors]. My justification [of our defense] is that we have a custom [and] a customary law here in the village, that’s all, so [conflicts] will not be very large. [The law is not] harmful the community because there is [always] a defense.

Q: Can you tell more about conflict of interests in terms of the different dimensions as a Patrol member and as a member of the government?
A: Yes, it happened to my own mother, who was going to make a [chicken] cage using protected mangrove that is prohibited; I was then trapped by the community with that case. The community [was waiting] whether I would implement the rules or not, and when they saw my mother committing the violation, it was a good opportunity for them. So, unavoidable, my mother was then investigated eventually. The violation was she hired people to cut the trees making the cage.
Q: I think the cutter of mangrove wood should be punished?
A: Yes, but it is only the cutter but also the receiver [the buyer] of stolen things [Mangrove wood].

Q: So, the rules applied not only on the thieves but also the buyer?
A: If there is no receiver [and buyer], off course there is no violation. However, the case was handled customarily by the joint Patrol team and the offenders are [just] get imposed and warned.

Q: How about your close relatives saw this incident of arresting?
A: From that time, the community started perceiving and [observing] and that is the [effective] way to convince the community. Even, a Patrol member’s mother was not considered and experienced privilege, how much more other people.

Q: Can you tell me how the complaint of the community was accepted and responded in the community meetings?
A: The community just told us if you prevent us from conducting the activity, then you should replace it [with an alternative] because it was our livelihood. So if you prevent us from cutting the trees, you should replace with other livelihood so we will not commit it again. As a [village government] what we can do?

Q: So, what did the Balai [Park Agency] offer as an alternative livelihood?
A: So until now, there is no solution but public facilities provision such as waiting rooms [near village pier]. In the past, there was a funding but it is unavailable, per year it was Rp, 10 million. I have been a treasurer [of the forum] and we built the waiting room, the funding was from the DPTNB.

Q: So, you mean there is no correct answer to the community’s complaint?
A: There is no a [verbal] answer but there is no replacement. The [only] responses are in forms of public facilities [which is against with the community will. The community in that time asked for fishing gear or farming gear for example katingting [small engine] engine not [public facilities].

Q: What has Mr Gatot [Government staff who was educated by RARE] has done in this village to fulfil the community expectation?
A: They did nothing in this village, probably in the neighboring village, I have seen any reality of their programmes, probably there was funding.

Q: How about your involvement in pride programme?
A: I do not know about the programme, probably they conducted in the other villages. As I remembered the meetings I attended were a common meeting which is usually conducted in Tinongko. So in that time, I was not invited. What form of the programme to precise?

Q: For example, Maming [Napoleon wrasse] fish protection campaign?
A: I think it is only in Tinongko, as I remembered there is no such activity in Buhias.
Q: What are the impacts of the ban of gathering corals, and cutting the mangroves trees on the identity of the community as a coastal community?
A: Previously, they take the mangrove freely but now it is not anymore due to the legal reason and functional reasons of the mangrove. The benefits [of the ban implementation] for them [the community] are creation of new skills. In the past, the only skills they knew was mangrove cutting skill and very few people knew about construction but now, on average, the people are construction expert now. Some of them work in construction since they have gone out to Manado to find a job.

Q: How do the Patrolling activities impact the separation of your family?
A: …..I felt sorry when I had to leave my wife and children [to go to work in mainland]. [I was worried] of what they would eat and how they would fulfil their needs, meanwhile I was away for months. [I was especially sad] especially, when my master fed me with gourmet food such as meat, I was thinking what kind of food my family was eating at the same time.

Q: So, if you live in Mantehage, your livelihood is not enough?
A: No, live in Mantehage, nothing can be earned. Prohibited livelihood was conducted, for example stones collection and selling, intensively especially in the past.

Q: The community said that taking living stone is forbidden while dead stone is allowed? What do you think?
A: [Nothing is different], it depends on to the evidence [community’s violation], the differentiation was created only too lighten the punishment.

Q: So taking both living and dead stones are forbidden?
A: Yes, it is. However, dead stone [coral] consumption is allowed because it is a need of construction in the village. As a consequence, the term of dead stones is [applied] to answer the needs. In the past, all kind of stone gathering is forbidden.

Q: So, the rules were loosened?
A: Initially, they were not. However, in order to lighten punishment to community, the rules were compromised].

Q: How was living wood and dead woods differentiated?
A: Oh, dead wood taking is allowed because the use of the wood is only as fire wood, for cooking [and] baking cakes. In the new year eve, when we want to make platted cookies, we need a large flame of fire from large logs, especially flame of ting wood (Small leafed Orange Mangrove) and makuru wood (Red Mangrove) because the flame of the woods are consistent more than coconut shell’s flame. Their flame is live longer than coconut shell’s flame. The heat it produced is as large as the flame of fire in a large stove where [Prophet] Daniel was thrown in.
Q: You told that there are impacts of the existence of Community Patrol on the tree cutters and stone collectors, how about the existence on the fishermen and *bia* (Gold Mouth Turban) collectors?

A: Because the activities are forbidden, they [the collectors] must be disappointed and upset due to the limitation to their livelihood. However, the Patrol members do not ban all their livelihood but only limit certain types of [fishing] gear and [method] they use. If we prevent the community from using *bori* [poisonous] roots, they will be unhappy and conflicts will happen.

Q: How was the community attitude changed?

A: First, insemination of information and second, importance of [the Community Patrol] consistency with the rules. If they did not stop from committing violations, they will be arrested. *Borri* [poison] is specially used for catching fish and not for borri. Crabs are caught using hooks. Since 2011, there is no surveillance at all, there is no Patrol, and I heard bombing happened, it maybe outsiders, they started using poisons.

Q: Do you mean there is no Patrol member in Buhias?

A: There is a Patrol member but there is no operation of Community Patrol anymore. In my time, I used to go around but now, it is only formality. There is a Patrol but there is no activity and surveillance, and suddenly they [the current Community Patrol members] received their wages. So, there is no Patrol from 2011 until now.

---

**Interview with Franklyn**

Q: Can tell me about violation to rules of control the coral collection?

A: Because of this surveillance, the practice cannot be conducted anymore.

Q: I heard that in a few villages, use of dry mangrove trees are allowed, what are actually right rules?

A: No, the practice is not allowed. Even, [to collect] dry branches are forbidden. However, [why we do not allow it?], because if we give an opportunity to [the community] to take the dry trees, the living tree [even] will be cut and made it dry [on purposively], as dry as possible, so it would be allowed to take.

Q: So the practice of collection both of dry and living trees cannot be cut?

A: No, based on the rules of the Balai, both dry and young trees are not allowed to cut. Probably, it is allowed and compromised as long as there is a permit of the office, for example, there was a case in Tallasa Resort called Lulay now, when they wanted to cut mangrove Forests [near the resort], in order to broaden their peers, they were not allowed by the Balai. Until now, I do not the progress of the
case, [I predicted] reaching the central Forestry Ministry and stopped at the level of proposing construction peers.

Q: In other villages you told me that people give you respect, how about the people in your own village?
A: [Instead of feeling proud], I felt shame [especially] if I met (caught) an offender who is coincidently one of my own relatives. I just tried to strengthen my heart and my mind as strong as I could; remembering that what I was doing is a right thing, and not a wrong thing

Q: What are the current programmes of the Patrol?
A: [Mostly are information inseminations of protection of coral issue, mangrove issue, fish issue, which practices are allowed, which are not.]

Q: Until now, how about the violation rate?
A: In the Bunaken Park, the community violation to the rules is rare, not many. However, on the islands area, [several cases are] still many, [such as] Mantehage, Manado Tua, Siladen, [especially] on Nain Island, such as practice of banned Napoleon (wrasse) captivity. Until now, the Water Police run an operation there [due to the case].

Q: So the captivity is forbidden?
A: No, only certain types of fish, because Napoleon fish is protected fish, so the captivity is not allowed at all.

Q: So what is the best way to stop the practice?
A: Based on my experience working with the Ministry of Forestry, the captivity was taken and the fish was released.

Q: Based on your experience, what is the most difficult experience dealing with the community?
A: About land [border] related to the Park area. The community’s [claimed] the land which is including mangrove areas as their [personal] property.

Q: So what was the solution to the issue?
A: The solution process is directly done the Balai [because] the area of Park is authorised by the Balai.

Q: How about the progress of the case until now?
A: Yes, in Bunaken, about, issue about land claimed belongs to the government, the community, while the land belongs to the Park area?

Q: Can you tell me an improvement in the community’s awareness?
A: Yes, in the past, the community [can be said] was wild, in terms of illegally taking the resources. In the past, they caught the fish using potassium, but since, the Patrol has been operated, there is no sort of cases, the people became afraid [to commit that] because of the legal consequence of the violation. In the past, [the community] was free.
So, the recruitment process was conducted in every village and every year, can you
tell me about the process of re-recruitment of senior Patrol member?
It depends, if the senior person is incompetent, they will recruit new people. It is the
use of recruitment, so every year there is a new people, but for me, [traditionally]
because they know that I am the son of Head of Village, so they did not conduct the
recruitment of other people.

Q: Can you tell me about the surveillance activity?
A: In the past, we were placed in the Wori Peers, and every month there were three
teams that worked for ten days, so the new people was paired to the senior Patrol
[member]. As a consequence, the operation would run well [and effective]. In the
past, we used to use speed boats and to operate every day, but at the moment, the
DPTNB’s programmes have not been run anymore since two years ago. The Patrol
members still exist, but they [Community Patrol member just were asked to stay and
observe their own villages and surrounding areas.

Q: You told me that the operation now is handled by the Balai, but how about the
recruitment of the DPTNB [Park Advisory Management]?
A: Yes, it [recruitment by the Park Agency] still works. Basically, there is a Patrol
member in every village, but there is a change in the process of surveillance. In the
past, the operation of Patrol used a speed boat and went in to the mangrove areas
every day at least three times a week, but now probably because of the [limited]
funding they stopped the [daily field] operation two years ago. Then, they assigned
the Patrol members in every village to conduct [passive] surveillance.

Q: So the Patrol activity still works until now on the village basis?
A: Yes, still. So there is an evaluation every month and [we receive] an incentive and
make a report to the office every month.

Q: Can you tell me about the work system of Community Patrol when it was handled by
the DPTNB [the Park Advisory Board]?
A: In the past, they [the Park Agency and Park Advisory Board] worked together where
the DPTNB is a kind of an umbrella of the activity and taking over joint Patrols from
the police water, [and] the Balai.

Q: So, in the past, there was a joint Patrol?
A: Yes, it was, but now the Balai runs the Patrol by their selves.

Q: Since when?
A: About 2012, since the Balai resigned from the joint Patrol programme, the Patrol has
been conducted on the village basis,.

Q: How the operation now until by the Balai?
A: There is a routine operation, almost every day.

Q: Can you tell me about the Patrol activity run by the definitive staff of the Balai?
A: Yes, they are the functional staff of the Balai, they are civil servants and they will
operate if there is a report of violation from community. They cannot operate
every day due to limited budget of gasoline. So, there is a benefit of the Community Patrol in every village, if they receive a report of use of compressors, they will give the Balai a call and the Balai staff will come and make an inspection and investigation.

Q: Since 2007 until now, how was community’s attitude to the Park rules change?
A: The community’s attitude has slowly changed. They started being obedient to the rules and thinking of the consequences of what they will do, whether it is destructive or not. If [the action] threatens sustainability [of the resources] and their next generation will not receive the resource, the community [would consider again the action]. Other example of community’ awareness and knowledge improvement is about type of fish becomes distinct. So, they became carefully [the impact of their action], [especially] when they were used to be disobedient for example gathering protected corals.

Q: How about the community meeting?
A: The meetings were organized by the Balai including information insemination, while the DPTNB conducted evaluation of Patrol’s works.

Q: In the community meeting, who were invited?
A: Fishermen, especially those who work closely with the protected water.

Q: How did the Community Patrol member convince the fishermen that the zonation and the rules are for the community’s benefits?
A: [By informing them] that the zonation scheme has allocated a special area of community’s practice of catching fish area, besides a special area of tourism and core [No-Take] Zone but the largest area is still the community use area. [I think] it is impossible the fish from the core zone stays forever in the No-Take zone; it must go to the different zones [such as the community area]. However, the community mistakenly responded about the core zone.

Thank you.

**Interview with Roland Tolandang**

Q: What is your name?
A: My name is Roland Tolandang.

Q: Where do you come from?
A: Buhias village.

Q: How long have you been a Community Patrol member?
A: [from] 2011 until now.

Q: Can you tell me the recruitment of Patrol system?
A: I had news from the Balai [Balai Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Bunaken National Park] in form of a letter to the village [government], and I applied.
Q: In that time, can you tell me the test process?
A: There were tests such as face-to-face test, interviews, theoretical and practical tests.

Q: How about the recruitment condition?
A: The only recruitment is the certificate of school at least senior high school,

Q: How about the female Patrol member’s participation?
A: It is only for men.

Q: How beneficial is your salary as a Community Patrol member?
A: It is very helpful.

Q: How did you convince the community to obey the rules?
A: Through information insemination, so if the Balai [Park Agency] officials come, we conduct the insemination programme together.

Q: How did the community get involved in the meeting?
A: The community was invited.

Q: How did solution to the community’s complains of the Park’s ban?
A: The Balai responded positively the community’s inputs because the practice such as cut mangrove tree has been conducted by the community for many purposes such as to build house, hunts, coconut grilling platforms, fence,

Q: How did you change community’s negative perceptions on the Park’s rules?
A: If we want to change totally, probably it will be difficult. However, at the moment, there is a gradual change, but we need to conduct a insemination of information continually and [consistently].

Q: Can you tell me the most difficult case you ever handled?
A: Mangrove cut, [diving with] compressor and explosive fishing.

Q: How did the most difficult cases happen?
A: I think probably, when the fishermen want to go fishing, the fishing area became further. While in the past, they did not need to go far, now they need to go [until] the edge of tubir [Sea Basin]. As a consequence, they look for being at ease [with any cost includes] putting their life on danger.

Q: What are achievements as a Patrol member?
A: There was an achievement, for example I caught someone red-handed violating the rules and I brought them along with the evidence to the Balai office. Mostly they are outsiders. However, for the locals, none of them committing explosive fishing and diving with compressors. Probably they are aware already.

Q: What are the difference in terms of knowledge improvement between before and after you become a Patrol member?
A: Basically, just the same as a lay people, but there is a high awareness of environmental concern. As a Patrol member, we should show first that we concern and then the community [will follow].

Q: What is new knowledge you obtained from the training?
A: Not really new knowledge because the Patrol recruitment was [only] aimed to check the [tourist] pin.

Q: Can you tell me about trainings you ever participated?
A: Twice. First, training of rescue on the Bunaken Island, second in Kalasey, in Pondok Daun [Restaurant]

Q: How do you feel after you become a Patrol member?
A: A little feeling of being respected by the community.

Q: How did you convince the people to obey the rules?
A: One of the efforts is information insemination and other programmes of the Balai [the Bunaken National Park Agency] and the Dewan (the management advisory of the Bunaken National Park) that involved the community, for example in provision of seed of fruits and seeds of wood. So, through such programmes, it was expected that the program will touch and increase the community’s [awareness] directly.

Q: But the core zone?
A: We cannot do any activities in the zone, any, including diving and, fishing.

Q: How do you teach the fishermen about the rules?
A: The public zone or the community’s use zone is [limited] only for the fishermen, while the tourist zone should be kept from the fishermen. That’s all.

Q: How the traditional fishermen understand about the rules?
A: They understand and they will move to allowed places.

Q: What are the weaknesses of the Community Patrol system?
A: There are two, first, the Balai does not handle it directly [and comprehensively], they handled but there is no clarity of the arresting process of the offenders, and the second is the zonation borders which are unclear.

Q: What are the benefits of the Patrol to the community?
A: By prevention [of the resources], we provide benefits to the next generations enjoying everything including fish, [and other] marine resources, and also all marine plants such as coral will grow and be preserved well.

Q: Patrol members from other villages require a pair of boots, how about you?
A: At the moment we do not use speed boats, so [we] just stay in the [Patrol] post which is on the land. So we conduct [only land based Patrolling most.

Q: Can you tell me about an evaluation process of the Community Patrol activity?
A: Every month [we conduct an evaluation] and we come to the DPTNB [Dewan Pengelolaan Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Bunaken National Park Management Advisory Board] because all budget still held by the Dewan.

Q: What are you expectations to the Park Management in the future?
A: I think it is better if the Patrol [activity] is handled by the Balai [the Bunaken National Park Agency]. Another thing is all the Patrol members required becoming a contracted staff of the Balai.

INTERVIEW WITH ROLLY DALETA

Q: How long have you been a Patrol?
A: Two years, from 2006 [until 2008].

Q: Can you tell me your involvement in the Patrol?
A: The Management Board [came and] conducted a recruitment. Coincidently, [in that time] nobody applied so I tried to apply.

Q: What are the specific criteria?
A: No, it was only school certificate, Junior High School at least and availability to work as a [Community] Patrol. Other criteria are health certificate and good attitude certificate [from Police Office].

Q: What is your motivation to be a Community Patrol member?
A: In that time after graduating from school, [I joined] a mapping programme of Kelola, so I went with them conducting what it is called manta tow and transect of mangrove. After that, they kept telling [me] to maintain and protecting [mangrove].

Q: Because this related to conservation, what did knowledge you obtain from involving in the Patrol?
A: Nice [diving] spots such as Barakuda, and also Tarsier [habitats]

Q: How about knowledge about rules?
A: Yes, rules about kind of fish are not allowed to catch, activities that cannot be done in different zones such as core zone, tourism zones, and also public use including what we can do and what we cannot do in the zone. From [being the Patrol] we know [because] information insemination programs were conducted
Q: Regarding the No-Take Zone, what do you know about activities allowed in the zone?
A: No activity is allowed in the zone, even boats are only allowed to pass not to halt. For us [on the island] the zone is started from the edge of mangrove to the end of coastal line. So it does not include 'Tubir' [sea basin], it is only nyare [intertidal] area.

Q: What skills did you obtain after joining Patrol?
A: It was only rescuing skills, how to rescue victim of accident on the sea.

Q: Is there any special training?
A: Yes, in the past, we conducted a workshop in Pantai Liang, but it was only theoretical not practical workshop including explanation on how to save a drowned person who is unable to swim.

Q: How about marching skills?
A: In our time, there was no marching training but at the moment, I saw there is [kind] of training for the new [Community] Patrol member which is conducted by the police in Pineleng.

Q: How is the Community Patrol still active?
A: It is not as active as we were in the past. At the moment, the activity of the [Community] Patrol is only to collect data. I am not sure whether they are active or not and the community does not know and understand what their job is at the moment.

Q: How sufficient is your salary as a Community Patrol member?
A: I think it is not enough. Compared to the current Patrol, we conducted [more frequent] surveillances. We used to spend a whole day on the sea [for surveillance] and we did not receive 'land based salary'. In the past, we used to receive Rp. 45,000 per day.

Q: How frequent was you used to operate?
A: We used to have a roster organising different teams. Team 1, Team 2 and Team 3 joined [Park] rangers and sometimes Water Police [conducting joint surveillance] and each team used to work for ten days. We received Rp. 45,000 per month.

Q: How sufficient is the available Patrol operational funding?
A: No, especially when we spent a whole day under the sun, we [just] used katingting [a small engine] which is not enough to surveillance from Mantehage Island to Nain Island, rather than using a speed boat which is a gasoline consumed boat.
Q: So, the main problems are gasoline and finance?
A: Yes, gasoline and finance. However, in the past it was good because results of diving tag sale in terms of village conservation fund were still contributed to the village but not at the moment. In the past, the villagers benefited the fund, so we did not raise any objection to conduct surveillance together. So, now as if they [the Park Authority] just took money from the village, but not return the money back.

Q: How useful is the Village Conservation Fund to the Village?
A: It is very useful, for example in the past the funding was used to renovate village meeting hall, so everybody can enjoy benefit and as a consequence, we would [have encouragement to preserve the sea resource] together. However, at the moment, the community does not care. I discussed with some villagers and they said it would be better if the conservation fund could be received by the villagers.

Q: How you position as a Patrol influence your confidence?
A: In the past, I had a feeling of being [isolated] because most of the [Community] Patrol [in that time] became the community enemy. This happened because most of the villagers are fishermen, and if they were fishing in the forbidden zone, we would warn them. Furthermore, I did not know how to convince [to the fishermen about the rules] because the fishermen we warned demanded that outside fishermen [also] which come mostly from Nain must not be allowed to fish near the island.

Q: Can you tell me the most difficult case you have ever dealt with?
A: The people cut the [protected] mangrove tree and committed bori, a fish poison made of plant’s root. The offenders are difficult to red handed because the target of [Community] Patrol are [just] to arrest the illegal diving and to check the [tourist] pin, but the violations are not seriously handled. I assessed it was only emphasised, the income [of the Park]. That is why I requested again and again a pair of boots so I could conduct surveillance around the mangrove area where many offenders committed their action but I did not receive [until now].

Q: So, they did not provide a safety kit to the Patrol?
A: No, they did not. In the past, it was only life jacket which is I taught it would be useless for people who can swim. Even, I did not receive any uniform which is received by Mr Ira. I only received a vest which is useless and uncomfortable for us to work under the sun.

Q: What do you think of the Patrol mechanism?
A: The advantages we have supports from Water Police but the weaknesses we face such as lack of sufficient facilities including lack of speed boats with good engines because most of the engines used now are old.
Q: In the Balai [the Park Agency] office, there are arrested boats. How were they treated?
A: Yes, if the Balai arrested [the offender], it will be consistent while if it was sent to the police water station, the case would be closed with fine and offenders were free immediately and re-operated again very soon.

Q: How did you convince the community to accept the zonation scheme?
A: In the past, we were used to be fishermen [so we understand the fishermen’ perspectives and preferences of approach]. We used jokes, and letting the people know slowly and easily. The purpose [of conducting the informal way] is to inform [nicely] the community about the reason why we cannot catch certain types of fish.

Q: Have you ever caught someone you know?
A: [I] never.

Q: How about women Patrol?
A: No, there is no woman in the Patrol.

Q: In the recruitment process, were women embraced?
A: No due to the risk, in the past, we used to be prepared to be frightened by the offenders. In the past we did not have an identity tag. Once our job finished, the police water would take over [the case]. However, the Patrol activity was stopped again and the Patrol station is ignored now. Last year our work method was just like a spy so that we will not be a community enemy [again]. If a violation occurred, the spy will inform the Balai officer who will come and arrest the offenders by them own.

Q: Why did the change of the Patrol method happen?
A: I think, the change happened after program evaluation [by the Agency] and [probably] they tried to avoid the community conflict.

Q: Can you tell me the recruitment system?
A: They sent a letter to the Head of Village, and the Head of Village announced and read the letter through speakers and they provided the time [to apply].

Q: How did you deal with the zonation related community conflict?
A: It happened in many places because [the closed areas] are our ancestors’ place of fishing. Moreover, amount of fish in that area was not depleted.

Q: How did you handle a violation committed by the village community?
A: Special for the jubi [spear gun] case, I used to tell the Patrol boat operator to ignore the violation happening and if it was only the operator and I. [However], if I Patrolled with other friends [other Patrol members], I used to be pretended that I [consistently enforced the rules]. Meanwhile, I used to keep informing the villagers that [environmental] goodness and benefits of the existence of the Core Zone are [at the end] for community members. At the moment, the number of people is high that lead to increase in the needs of the people including the needs
of more fish [as food source] and needs of more livelihoods. As a consequence I cannot be too strict. In the past, people are used to livelihood near the beach, but not now.

Q: So the most difficult is explosive fishing?
A: [Yes, it is]. We can hear from here because it used to happen [only] at the edge of tubir [Sea Basin]. We could use a speed boat or give the Balai [the Park Agency] a call to inform the case but for the bori [poisoning fishing] cases which are used to be happened at the low tide. We used to operate around the edge of tubir but we did not go to near the beach. So we could not catch. Therefore, I kept telling and suggesting about boots, so if there is a person we suspect we can follow and [investigate].

Q: So the people give a respect to you due to your new position as a Community Patrol member?
A: No, they do not. Even, the officers do not receive sort of respect from the community.

Q: How about the expectation to be a Patrol again?
A: No, there is no any expectation. [I will be available] to be an assistant of the good case.

Q: What have you done with the environment after you finished your work as a Patrol?
A: Not really because I have things to do. However, even though I am not a Patrol [member] anymore, I keep reminding and warning my friends who did something that lead [a destructive activity] called overfishing, for example babori [poisoning fishing]. I told him that someday if we want to fishing by shooting, it would be very difficult [and fish would be rare]. Also poisoning in the mangrove area, it will make the fish will not grow.

Q: In general how awareness of the local community improved with your involvement as a Community Patrol member?
A: Awareness of the marine resources increased. More people do not agree with the actions of other people who did something wrong. The only thing is difficult to eradicate is the habit to cut the mangrove tree. However, it is used [only] for domestic use, not for commercial, for sero tanam [set net] making.

Q: How was the alternative livelihood of mangrove cutting ban provided by RARE?
A: [No, there was no specific provision]. I discussed [many times about the issue of lack of livelihood alternative] with Mas Pandu [the Park Agency staff], I questioned again [and again] about the ban’s [implication on the community livelihood. I kept suggesting [the Park] to provide an alternative livelihood, including to encourage the community to conduct sero plantation, using lira [rope]
Interview with Edy

Q: Can you tell me please your involvement in the Bunaken Park?
A: I joined the Bunaken National Park Agency since January 2011 until now.

Q: Can you tell me please the establishment of the Park?
A: If we trace back the process of establishment of the Bunaken Park which is started 1980s, the by time when the diving spots were found. So basically, all potentials especially on the bottom of the sea are so interesting, so many, both corals and fish, especially marine flora and fauna, wonderful, so in that time, declaration of protected area was conducted, just like a nature conservation. Later, it developed until 1990s in that time it was under management of local government. Then, in 1990s the minister of Forestry, based on the recommendation of governor [of North Sulawesi] and regent and majors conducted a review [of the potential of the areas] which led to establishment of KSTA agency. In that time, based on the reviews’ results of [different parties] including international NGOs, NRM along with different parties such as local universities and colleagues of Forestry Ministry and also local government, conducted [many] reviews and surveys showed that the potentials of that areas [can be used to as a justification of its declaration as] a conservation area. Then, it was proposed to the Ministry of Forestry, so that the area of around 89.65 hectare became a National Park in 1996, you can check later. From the later on, because of its potential of the Bunaken National Park, it besides as a living buffer system, also [serves] as a research location, and education including tourism supports that is the natural tourism or [called] eco-tourism.

Q: How about the implementation of job description of the agency you lead?
A: As it is instructed by the Ministry of Forestry that refers to Law No 5 of 1990, that the agency of National Park not only Bunaken, but also whole [National Parks in Indonesia], [acts] as a UPT (unit pelaksana teknis) (technical manager unit) of the Ministry of Forestry which is called department of Forestry in the past. The unit was appointed as an authorised management, as a stakeholder and as a manager. [We] manage and execute the area so everything in that work area of 89,065 ha is under management and execution of the BTNB.

Q: How the community participation is obtained in the implementation?
A: So the BTNB since its establishment until now conducted a series of activities in the management and one of them is to try involving the community, so that the community involvement can support the conservation area itself.

Q: Can you tell me please about any conflicts?
A: Yes, in managing an area or region, always there is a conflict. So the issue related to conflict of interests both individual and organisational. However, sometimes [the source of conflicts are] from the government which is a lot. From the local
government itself when the government that feel they have interests [and authority], and then they wanted to explore the potentials both in the sea and also in the land. However, we perceive functional statues [of the Park] [allowing] indirect use to be conducted more intensive [than the direct use]. However, given the area is a conservation area of water, direct uses are allowed under one condition that the community and the stakeholders understand sustainable aspect [of the direct use].

Q: How about your agency’s relationship with other institutions?
A: In the relationship between the Park Agency and other institutions, the conflicts are there. For example, development of [infrastructure in the area] that is clearly as a conservation area, it should be environmentally friendly and accompanied with an environmental assessment. Even, [development] outside area needs to consider environmental perspectives, [how much more in the conservation area]. While the development [in the Park] at the beginning was conducted as if it was only intended to build as many hotels as they could. If we keep developing such practice, as a consequence, by the time goes, we will attain significant damages that leads to destruction of the Park potentials. I called a “pepesan kosong” (an empty wrap).

Q: How far your agency bridges the gap?
A: Clearly, we tried in meetings of forum of community and we [approached] the province [government] at the meeting. We also conducted seminars or workshops by inviting many parties, for example, seminars to increase the community’s awareness of all aspects we could and government’s roles to reduce [impacts] of development.

Q: In the special management beside the Park Agency which other stakeholders involved?
A: In term of management, from the perspectives of existing regulations, it is clearly that the management of the Park should be run only by the Minister of Forestry. Then, if there are other parties that would like to assist the Agency, they then should make an MOU [with the Agency]. This is the principle [of the management] laws and regulations, so if other parties are willing to play a role, in that time we will develop a partnership and coordination. As a result, one area with a lot of managers that will lead to difficulties in controlling implementation would not be created.

Q: How was a space for NGOs to collaborate with the Agency provided by Government?
A: Yes, there is a certain mechanism. If there is collaboration and collaborative scheme, we will make an MOU that will provide explanations about what area the party will be taken over, for example, economic empowerment of the community either in the area or outside the area. If they want to help conducting restoration activity, it can be on the sea or in the land such as in the coral reefs and mangrove, and they are welcomed, but [it should be clear first] in what areas. [This mechanism] is not applicable necessary to NGOs but also other institutions that want to build cooperation with the Park Agency.
Q: I heard that your agency resigned from the DPTNB; can you tell me how and why it happened?
A: There is a board called DPTNB [Dewan Pengelolaan Taman Nasional Bunaken, the Bunaken National Park Management Advisory Board], at this point, I perceive and not only myself but also the Inspectorate Body of the Forestry Ministry and BPKP (Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan dan Pembangunan- Financial and Development Auditory Body), yes, it is BPKP. Even though the BPK has not clearly stated yet that this practice is unappropriated, what it is called management of a National Park should be run by the Agency of National Park which is under the Ministry of Forestry. It is the assessment from the legal aspect. Here, from the name of the [Management Advisory] Board it implied that as if its [authority] was above the Park Agency. On the field, the community or other institutions here [treated] as if the agency was under the board and then what were conducted by the board also unappropriated, both from the lens of the conservation law and also from the law of the collection and use of funding of the community. [So], from the perceptive of the inspectorate and the BPKP, the collection practice and then used directly cannot be accepted except by the BLU (Badan Layanan Umum) (Public Service Body). Indonesia has a scheme called BLU, [for example] the hospital that is a Public Service Body but it has own law and regulations of the practice of BLU. [So] if the Board is not a public service body, then it is illegal to collect funding from the community and then use it. We, for example, if we withdraw money from the community, we will deposit it [to the official unit] and then the use of the funding will be conducted through the BLU mechanism, local government and BPD as well.

Q: What is your expectation about the relationship pattern between your agency and the Advisory Board?
A: Just in accordance with the existing rules, that is why I resigned because the practice is the only example of improper practices in Indonesia, that is why I resigned from the membership [of the board]. How the Agency of the Bunaken Park or the Balai KSDA Agency [Konservasi Sumberdaya Alam-Office of Natural Resource Conservation] that should have become a partner of the Advisory Board but we were just a causal member. As a result, it is better to quit given the terms of partnership that should be defined as equality [among members, in term of capacities due to willingness to help.]

Q: How about an ideal partnership did you expect?
A: The partnership should be [equal] and [the potential partner] needed to keep being flexible in doing activities and fulfilling empty space left [by the Agency] or [encouraging] from the entrepreneurship aspect [of the community]. There is a rule related to such partnership that we cannot be released from. We should obey the rules so that [we] will not be wrong and blamed. I wish the partnership would be in accordance to the rule.

Q: How effective NGOs were in supporting the implementation of job descriptions of your agency?
A: As long as I am here, we never saw a document that was built based on an MOU with a NGO that really formal and legal. There is a partnership between the Agency and NGOs, for example with WWF, WCS or with Bintang Laut (sea star).
However, legally and formally there is no MOU, [so it happened] because we [personally] are close enough with the friends from NGOs in terms of conducting same activities in the surrounding area of the Park. We also worked together in the main area [of the Park] and sometimes we asked them to assist us and also they involved in a discussion.

Q: How their initiatives to provide information to the Agency of Bunaken Park?
A: Even though informally an NGO such as WSC has an interest to build a formal cooperation [with the Agency], they have a mother organisation that ask them to provide explanation before they attain 'blessing' of their interest from the mother organization to get involved in the Bunaken management. [This is important] because they need financial support [from the mother organisation]. However, until now it seems that it has not happened yet. However, from the informal relationship if the NGO find certain information [related to the Agency's work] they have the first opportunity to convey it.

Q: I have heard about an issue of modifying the form of the Bunaken Park management into cooperation form?
A: Once again, if it is related to the management should stick to the regulation which requires the management of the Park should be run by the Agency and if another party wants to conduct entrepreneurship should make an MOU [with the Agency].

Q: How the implementation of the entrepreneurship?
A: It is regulated in the government regulation No. 18 of 2004 and then the rule was amended with Government Regulation No. 36 of 2011 which legalises the entrepreneurship conducted by either an individual, an organisation, a cooperative, a state owned company, a local owned company or a private company. A main thing is they have to comply with the criteria set by the rules and fulfill prerequisites enacted by the Minister of Forestry. However, in the case transportation and food business it is not necessary to submit a proposal to the Ministry but only to the directorate of general even to the lower level the Agency.

Q: How about the mechanism of the monitoring and controlling of the community activities of involved parties including NGOs?
A: Regarding the status and function of the Bunaken National Park Agency as the Manager of the Park, the Agency conducts close surveillance and supervision together with the community.

Q: What do you think about issue of modifying the management board in order to support the agency?
A: We have informed [to the Inspectorate Body] because based [on the result] of inspection from the BPKP that referred to the existing law that any institution that want to conduct an activities should make an MOU [with an agency]. If the proposed activities in the form of business, the institution should obtain an entrepreneurship permit, so that the DPTNB in this case [should have] establish an enterprise or submit a permit application, then and it would be legal. It is the principle of our work.
Q: Have you inspected the fund use of the Management Advisory Board?
A: For a special assessment is clearly not yet because according to the BPK [Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan – Financial Auditory Body] Sulut Branch, the assessment is not included PNPT so it is not comprehensive. I do not understand their way of thinking why, [probably] is it because [the Board] was created by the Vice Governor so it is seen as a government institution, actually it is not. We need to [be able] to distinguish it.

Q: Can you tell me about roles of other stakeholders in supporting the official tasks of the Agency?
A: Because the Bunaken Park has been managed by the Agency since the beginning, especially because it is functioned as natural object tourism. As a result, the impression that wanted to be built [by the Local Agency] as if the Park would be managed by the Tourism Agency, whereas the Tourism Agency should have worked [only] at the macro level. However, in terms of management aspect of the Park, the Tourism Agency is not allowed. Minister Parekrap knows that, and I met Mr. Teguh the Director [of the Tourism Department] who also knows about it well. The [local Tourism] Agency cannot act like that.

Q: How did the local Tourism Agency initiative a consultation with you?
A: That is what I frequently questioned and protested when the local Agency of Tourism and Cultures wanted to conduct an activity in the Park area, they would invite the DPTNB and while the Park Agency not. So, if it is necessary [the tourism agency] just would be cashed away. I wish they did not act as if it their work area or their [authorised area] to manage. The Minister of Tourism and Creative Economic understands that. Even, when they conducted an activity in area of the Park, we never been invited, we never knew. [We wish they would have] consulted with us first.

Q: How was effective your warning about the misleading role of the local agency?
A: Because [I do] reminded them continuously by the end they realised that they should invite us and also they need to be reminded that if there is an activity, it is need to consult [with us] first.

Q: How do you provide an opportunity to NGOs?
A: From the beginning, there is cooperation with NGOs especially NGO that work in the environmental area. They understand which spaces that need to fulfil, for example WWF, and WCS that already knew what we are discussing, and also more than one NGO work a same thing and activity.

Q: Can you tell me about your plan related to “Simaksi”?
A: International NGO must provide a report to the Minster [of Forestry] while for the National NGOs must provide and submit a report only to the Agency of the Bunaken Park. Then, [the proposal] will be presented in Jakarta. We along with Mandiri Bank presented a proposal in front of the directorate general.
Interview with Lian Garing

Q: So, the ticket is printed by the Balai now?
A: Information insemination is going on now but its realisation will be started in June or July. The insemination of information is targeted to the community who previously knew that the Dewan [Management Advisory Board of the park] who was in charge of the ticket but now [the authority] was given to the Balai. [This is important] because the Dewan is just organised under a decree of Governor of North Sulawesi, while the Balai is supported by the central government.

Q: So, the DPTNB is still there or already dismissed?
A: We do not know because we have resigned from the Dewan but I am sure the Dewan's authority will be disappeared [soon] because the ticketing system has been taken over by the Balai. That is why the Patrol member recruitment and management were conducted by the Balai.

Q: You said about information insemination of conservation, can you tell me about how information delivered?
A: I think [basically] there are two types of conservation insemination information activities, first is surveillance and second is conservation of coral reefs, or seagrass meadows. Given the conservation of seagrass meadow and corals, we have conducted rehabilitation of corals, so we took corals [branches] and planted and multiplied in the different places, while, conservation surveillance is aimed to stop use of diving compressors. Recently, diving compressor use has been a plaque in the Park while in the Park, the use of compressor is not allowed. For example we caught one offender of compressor use from Budo Village. The offender was operating in Tanjung Pisok and we caught him red handed and we processed the case and at the moment, they are under process of compulsory self-report, probably they thought that there is no Patrol in the Bunaken National Park. Probably they heard about the transition process of authority over the Park from the Dewan to the Balai, so they dared to commit a violation in the area of Park.

Q: How frequent the Patrol is conducted?
A: It is conducted once a month because there is MMP [ ] involving the community in the area. [MMP is important] because when we caught an offender, a community member should be presented as a witness. I am not a ranger but I am the Head of Speed Boat Operation. So, when they [the Community Patrol members] are conducting surveillance, they should involve me. So, I would know the whole process including law information insemination to the community and the rules enforcement such as prohibition of coral destruction.

Q: How did you find the information insemination effective in eradicating the community violation of the Park rules?
A: Due to the intensive information insemination, the violations by the insiders are less than outsiders. In the last case I found the offenders from Budo Village which is not part of the Park. Generally speaking, the offenders are mostly outsiders.
Q: Can you tell me about the benefits involving as a Patrol?
A: We obtained knowledge, for example, how to handle offenders.

Q: How the community’s reaction when they were caught?
A: I have two different experiences, first when I handled an offender from Nain Island. Even though I have released a warning shoot to warn them not to escape, they kept escaping [from me]. Even, one of the offenders was under water coming out the water and ran. Sometimes, when we told the offenders not to run, they did not run. Facing two different responses, we should apply two different methods. First response, they run [from us], and second stay in place. Until we had to release shoots several time and the offenders jump out from the boat into the sea because the offenders are those who had been caught in the past.

Q: How was the community get involved in the Patrol?
A: We recruited the candidate Patrol members through the Head of Villages. First, the Balai sends a letter to the Head of Village asking for representatives of each settlement. There is no limited number of recommended names because [later] they will be selected by the Balai.

Q: So, there are specific criteria?
A: Whoever wants to be a Patrol Boat Rider should hold a riding licence of special skills. The letter is kind of driving licence and also a license of having good behaviour from the Police. So, the recommended person of the Head of Village was not immediately accepted or passed the test. There are selection processes such as administration related tests and interviews. If they are declared passing the test, they will be selected one by one.

Q: How long recruitment process has been done?
A: Since long time ago.

Q: In the past, how the involvement of the Dewan of the process?
A: The letter of Balai used to be forwarded to Dewan that would go to the field but the institution that selected, recruited Community Patrol members are the Balai.

Q: How does the system of the Patrol work?
A: They are under one year contract. So they work for one year and in the next year the contract will be considered again. After one year, the Balai will send the letter to the Head of Village again.

Q: How about training process?
A: After they pass the test, they will receive training from the rangers of the Balai.

Q: How about the source of their salary?
A: At the moment, their salary comes from the 80% of the operational cost of the tourist tag. The Dewan takes the 100% but from 80% of the income sent to the Patrol member salary.

Q: How about the evaluation of performance of the Community Patrol member?
Q: They should make a report and because they are divided into team, for example Bunaken Patrol is divided into three teams that work for 10 days, and each team should submit a report every 10 days. While Mantehage and Nain Patrol teams are divided into five teams that work for 15 days and the Southern Team has same system as well. In Bunaken, there are five people because Bunaken is the main spot so it should be preserved well.

Q: How about the training for the community Patrol members?
A: The training of how to catch offenders, SAR and how to save drowning victims.

Q: What do you think the Patrol mechanism?
A: We have received supports from the Water Police. However, at the same time, we faced challenges such as lack of sufficient facilities such as lack of speed boats’ number and good engines which are currently already old.

Q: How about the Patrol activities in the past?
A: So in the past, the activities were joint Patrol involving the Water Police, rangers, and the DPTNB.

Q: What do you think about law enforcement in order to provide deterrent effect to the offenders?
A: Previously, I caught a Nain Islander who was under the P2I process and he was sentenced in the Main Police Office. As a consequence, they became deterrent to commit the violation again. So we do not put the offenders in the Water Police Office but the Main Police Office.

Q: What do you think the weaknesses of the rules so many violations of the rules still happened?
A: I think because the enforcement just limited to education and the offenders are the same people but now they will be ended up in the Police Office.

Q: How did the local people get involved in the information insemination conducted by the Balai?
A: So, as the Balai Agency staff, when we want to conduct a community meeting, we will send a letter to the Head of Village to gather maximum 50 villagers and the name of invited people depended up on the Head of Village. We do not know for sure who would be invited but the budget of the meeting of the Balai is for 50 people.

Q: Can you tell me about the zonation?
A: We used to conduct insemination of information covering the zonation system such as Use Zone, and Tourism Zone. As a consequence, most of the people in the area have already understood about the zonation system.

Q: How about the inputs of the community in the meeting?
A: Yes, it was accommodated. I saw many inputs of the community in the meetings such as cutting mangrove rules. They asked if they can cut mangrove for house building. Basically, the Balai does not allow any practice regarding cutting the mangrove. However, the Balai chose to enact a policy that accommodate the
community use managed in accordance with existing village rules, including how many trees are allowed to cut under one condition the use is not for commercial use. I think for the practice of cutting dry mangrove is allowed but it should be in accordance with the village rules. So far, we just follow the local rules from the village. The dry trees can be taken if it is part of the consensus in the village. If they take a lot, we will conduct confiscation.

Q: So, should be in accordance with the rules of respected village?
A: Yes, it should.

Q: So, the Patrol Team members do not catch people at random?
A: No, they did not.

Q: What do you think about influence of the Patrol activities on the obedience and compliance of the community to the Park rules?
A: Most of the community inside the Park becomes more obedient to the rules, but some people still not. Even, some insiders are also hard-headed. They would stop committing violation just if the Patrol comes, but when the Patrol members go, they will return to their activities.

Q: How do you convince the community to obey the rules?
A: Personally, if I go to the island, I tell the community not to step on the corals or using jubi (traditional spear gun) or do no cut the mangrove. I hope they will tell their family and relatives.

Q: How did you solve the conflict about the zonation system?
A: If I meet the community members, I always give enlightening about the types and use of the zonation and the allowed activities in the zone, for example, in the Tourism Zone, they can use jubi (traditional spear gun) but they cannot throw an anchor out into the sea. While, in the Core Zone, there is no activity allowed including diving.

Q: How can the community distinguish the location of each zone?
A: The community can recognise the location because we have set a boundary of each zone. It is kind of buoys.

Q: So, at least the community feels that they receive an attention from the Park Agency. How was the alternative resource provided by the Balai?
A: One thing for sure, we coordinate with the village government in order to manage the Community use, for example by limiting number of allowed mangrove wood to cut. However, there is no replacement we offer because there is village government that should handle the community. While, the Balai handles only with the rules and law, and the rules of the village became our handout in conducting our task. In other word, the rules of the replacement of the wood fire are a business of the village government.
Interview with Jemmy

Q: Can you introduce your name?
A: My name is Jemmy.

Q: Can you tell me aims of community Patrol activity?
A: The [community] Patrol is intended to build cooperation with the community that domicile in our territory of our zone. We are in the Bunaken National Park have [different] zones [such as] core zone, use zone and tourism zone. As a Patrol, we protect the preservation of the resource in the sea, first is coral, and from anybody who wants to damage the resource, so when we want to conduct Patrol, our aims are to make sure corals keep alive, because, we observe many corals at the spots around the Bunaken Park died due to humans’ actions such as fishermen’s’ [action] and also outsiders who come and commit [negative things] such as bombing, using potassium that are destructive to the corals. In order to maintain and preserve the zone, we Patrol and guard the zones to prevent [offenders] especially the fishermen who throw the anchor [of their boat to the sea] and the action can damage the corals. So we conduct the Patrol joins the community who originally really domiciles in the area which consists of Bunaken, Siladen, Manado Tua, Mantehage and Nain area that are included in the Northern region, while for the southern part such as Arakan, Poopoh, Sondaken, Popareng, Wawontulap which are under Minahasa Selatan’s territory. So, we recruited the community that lives in the Park area and we request the representation of Manado Tua, Bunaken, Alban, Mantehage which consists of four villages, Bango, Tinongko, Buhias and Tangkasi and Nain which is comprised of three villages on Nain Island, Negeri, Nain and Tatampi. We recruited the community [with expectation that] the community can recognise the Patrol [or vice versa], for example I was a Buhias inhabitant, off course I knew who are “the naughty fishers”, probably my own relative, I would warn them from using potassium and especially compressors which is one of the main violations we used to catch, and the cases have been faced to trials several times. However, until now, it still happens but sometimes, it is outsiders. Recently, we have conducted functional guards, besides community guards we have guard activities that are consisted of functional guard, joint guard and sudden inspection, and incidental guard. The joint guard is consisted of the Balai and also the Water Police, we are the rangers and plus the police.

Q: So, you are a Balai officer [Park Agency], not from the DPTNB?
A: I am from the Balai [Balai Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Bunaken National-BTNB -Park Agency], while the DPTNB are Dewan [the Management Advisory Board]. In the past, they are basically NGOs, and the owner of the area and of the authority is the Balai because the Balai [Balai Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Bunaken National Park Agency] is legitimatized by the [Forestry] minister’s decree while the Dewan [the Management Advisory Board] was formed by NGOs, so it is not legal. That is why according to the latest version of the rules; we are the [authority] to collect the [tourist entry ticket] and not the Dewan [the Management Advisory Board]. The rule has been enacted since 2013 but we have not conducted the rule yet. Coincidently, we have a new leader who said and
determined that it was lucky there was no audit, if there was an audit, we would be caught because we did not conduct the collection [of the entry ticket of tourist] and also the pin [selling] so now we produced the pin. It was our weakness

Q: Since when, did the Park Agency take over the Management of the entry fee from the Management Board?
A: About now, we are producing [the pin] that supposed to be produced few years ago because the rules have been issued a few years ago. However, the letter of Government decree was just issued last year. So, the Dewan [the Dewan Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Management Advisory Board of the Bunaken Park] was not get involved anymore. As a result, the community Patrol activities since last year (2013) have been taken over by the Balai [BTNB].

Q: How about the recruitment process?
A: We announced and made a sheet of announcement which was given to the Head of Village in the area, and two representatives in every village would be chosen and join us in the Patrol activity.

Q: How about their salary?
A: In the past, their salary was responsibility of the Dewan but now, we provide the salary and involve the patrol members in our activities such as the guard which is categorised and considered as the Park Agency staff’s business trips. For example, the Community Patrol members conducted a five day trip would be payed as much as the Agency’s staff’s five day business trip. While, the system of payment of the Dewan is different, the salary was considered as an incentive, so it was small. Based on my previous experience involving in the Patrol in 2000, the salary was decent because the salary was counted on a daily basis. However, now it is changed into a contract system. In 2000, I received Rp. 25,000 per day. So if I conducted my duty full, I would receive Rp. 750,000 per month. In the contract system, we are divided into two areas, the Northern Area and Southern Area. The Northern Area consists of Bunaken and Manado Tua which are joined together with Mantehage and Nain. [The mechanism of payment] is based on the region, Bunaken and Manado Tua area are allocated a sum of money which will be divided into two and it will be divided depending on how many people involved. In the past, the Dewan who took care of the salary but now, it is us. So the community Patrol joins us now and their jobs are to stay in the Patrol post in their own village. If we have an activity, we will ask them joining us, for example, our activities are in the Bunaken, we just called them and joined our activity and we paid them. It is easy because we have already known who are the Patrol members there A, B, C and D.

Q: So, how about an induction program of handling community’s violations the Park rules?
A: We did, and they have already known about that, beforehand, we recruited them and provided training sessions.

Q: Can you tell me more about the recruitment system?
A: We let the Head of Village knew and they recommended the local people and we conducted the test, and figured out the background of the candidates such as education background and we sent the selected people to training sessions.

Q: Is there any special recruitment?
A: No, because the selection aspects were only related to the Bunaken area.

Q: How about the individual shift of the Community Patrol members?
A: Every year, they are supposed to be shifted. However, every year we expand the contract, for example for one year period, we could recruit or expand the contract, but [we did not] because if we recruited new personnel, we should have started from beginning and because we do not have annual budget to conduct recruitment process and trainings. So, we just called the same personnel and expand their contracts. They have already had experience and already known how to conduct a Patrol with us.

Q: How did the community on the field perceive you as a Patrol member?
A: No, without feeling afraid, we as the Balai staff that categorized based on resorts system which means every work organised based on the resort [system]. We have eight regions, region one consists of five resorts and region two has three resorts. The region one consists of Wori, Bunaken, Mantehage, Nain, Manado Tua and each resort has its own Head of Resort and each resort has a Resort Post, for example the Post of Bango and Bunaken was already moved to Tawara, while the Post in the Manado Tua is located in Manado Tua Dua.

Q: How the routine activities of surveillance are conducted?
A: We actually operate every week because there are the resorts and each resort has a Head of Resort and its members. So they are regularly shifted.

Q: Is there any special case regarding the Patrol activity?
A: Recently, there was one case. We used to catch offenders of cases of diving compressor. The offender was a Budonese. We received a report about the case from the Head of Sub District of Bunaken Archipelago in a meeting. I met Robert Dauhan also in the meeting.

---

Interview with Gatot Susanto (RARE’s Field Manager)

Q: Can you tell me about RARE?
A: It is an NGO that concern about conservation, an institution that works in area of conservation, but its main concern is the changes of the community behaviour. How do you know about RARE?

Q: I knew about it from the website of RARE on the Internet and your name was written in the website.
A: Principally, this is a cooperation between two institutions, between the Ministry of Forestry (not the local Park Agency) and RARE. The NGO was appointed because of their concern in marine area conservation, especially in order to
change of the community’s behaviour from destructive behaviour to constructive behaviour. After a MOU of cooperation (between RARE and the National Agency) was signed, four of us from the Ministry of Forestry at the same year, from the Wakatobi [National Park], the Karimun Jawa [National Park], the Kepulauan Seribu [National Park] and the Bunaken [National Park]. I was assigned to participate in that program.

Q: When, it was happened?
A: From 2010-2012.

Q: After you passed a selection process conducted by RARE and then you studied in
A: It was an external class and was actually not a formal school, but a programme. Because we participated in the RARE program, we were get involved altogether in a [Master] programme called study [programme]. However, because in Indonesia there was not a study of behaviour changes, we undertook an external class at the University of Texas, El Passo which is similar to an open university. They provided a module [of the study] and the lecturers who came here. However, the system of [university] abroad is different from the system of Indonesia’s education which emphasises on coursework. In contrast, in abroad [the education system] emphasises on practicum and the theoretical emphasis just small portion. Once we received a theory, we immediately practiced it, just like that. Coincidently, we did not have a lot tasks, we conducted the practicum here. The direction of the practicum was about how to change community] behaviour. However, its [main] tools were media campaign, social media such posters, radio, and everything can improve community behaviour, while, the main emphasis on pride of the community which be automatically influenced [the community] by encouraging the Community Pride of having Napoleon fish in the area with one expectation that they will protect the fish due to that pride. The fish was only found in the area, it is the mascot of the Park. Moreover, foreigners want to come to the Park because of this mascot.

Q: How about use of Maming [Napoleon wrasse] as a mascot to change the Community’s behaviour?
A: We used Maming as the mascot because it was by the community. We did pre-test first, what became the pride of the local people as a local people and they answered with a lot answers, such as turtle. Finally, the answers were saturated with another pre-test and we decided the Maming became the mascot [of the Park and community empowerment effort] because [ecologically] philosophically, it is an indicator of the health of coral reefs. So, if the fish presents, it means the corals’ state is good, ecosystem was maintained well, and all of these were designed by the community, including the picture [of Maming] is also drawn by the community.

Q: So, it was a bottom-up approach?
A: Yes, it was a [bottom-up] approach. We just acted as a facilitator. All products including audio-video [products] were created by the community after we reached a consensus, and conducted Focus Group Discussion (FGD). However, measuring how effective the effort of changing of community’s knowledge,
attitude, and the interpersonal communication difficult because we must have a pre-data.

Q: Can you tell me about your experience when you were studying, how significant was the programme to improve your individual ability?
A: It was very significant. Until now, the knowledge and the experience I obtained from involvement in the program are still applied, one of the places is on the Nain Island. Now we are able to make a survey, both pre-survey and post-survey, for instance, in order to know how is level of community’s knowledge of the Bunaken National Park, because not all community’s members know about the National Park, and we asked questions about the National Park, [for instance], what is the National Park, what is the use of the National Park, how far their knowledge and after an intervention, we would find out, the knowledge of the community about the National Park is only about 50% and we targeted after conducting an activity, it would increase to 80% during a certain period of time, that is why we tried to conduct activities, what the appropriate and needed treatment and after two years, we will conduct a survey again using the same questions such as “do you know” and they say “yes”, [we will find out] whether the result reach the target or tend to decrease, what the reasons, after that we can draw a conclusion this should be conducted by the Bunaken National Park, stakeholders, what are the influencing factors.

Q: When it was implemented?
A: Firstly, from 2012 to 2014 but [in terms of evaluation of its effectiveness] I think we have a moral obligation [to make it succeeded] because in terms of the community campaigns conducted on Mantehage Island and on Nain Island aiming at increasing the community's pride, with the present of the Forestry Park were considered useful. However, [in terms] of activation the function of the zonation scheme since during this period of time, [it failed] because the community does not understand the use of the zonation. Instead of embracing the zonation, previously, the community perceives the zonation as a limitation to [their livelihood] and showed and expressed resistance. [Even], [some of] them had been arrested, but we try to shit the [community's] perception from a different angle about zonation that zonation is useful for all of you.

Q: So, it should be perceived from the ecological functional perception?
A: Yes, but if we started lecturing the community what the theoretical definition of zonation is, and [what activity is allowed] in a certain zone, [the community would resist].

Q: So, the zonation scheme was rejected by the community?
A: Yes, it was. Even, we were just about to start discussing about zonation scheme, they had already felt allergic in advance. As a consequence, we emphasised on the different aspects, [for example] we did not say ‘ban’ first, but we emphasised on “do you think fish needs a house?” and also included what is the use of a house [and the community answered] ‘Yes, they do’. We reversed that approach, not starting from the definition and the ban first but the benefits [of conservation of the fish]. We asked the community “what do you think the needs of fish”? , they need a house, what is the house use for? For making livelihood, breeding, and
then, what kind of fish live in the coral reef, how to make the house feel comfort, ‘we should protect’ and finally, the direction would be appeared, “what we need to make fish comfort”? A place, a special place that cannot be disturbed, ‘what it is called”? etc. For paragraph it is kind of an inductive paragraph, not deductive. Eventually, [the community] became realised.

Q: After two or three years, is there any plan to assess [the program] again?
A: Yes, it should have been [the government] institution’s responsibility. Previously, I targeted 3 years after 2012, in 2015 the survey will conducted again, with an expectation that each achievement should be maintained. This is important [to be conducted]. A product, [for example] aqua can be said that it is already known well by the public who understands its content and its use, but if there was no advertising, especially at the moment a lot of competitors, the product would fail. In our [Park conservation] context, [the competitors were] the increase in community daily needs and also biased information, if we did not maintain [popularity of the Park] it, it would be degraded.

Q: How do you perceive the change of the community’s acceptance after the information insemination session at a community meeting held?
A: I think as I said previously, personally, I am not superman or superhero, [the effectiveness] depends on individual staff roles [and responsibility]. It is not only roles of the BNP office, but also other parties for example, the local government, or other stakeholders to support it. For me personally, for that sort of activities [takes time], just like current situation of the presidential campaign, in one month, the people can decide who is their choice, it is just the same, in the break, [they] would say something, but it is unsure in the future. My expectation is the previous activities [conducted by RARE] can be a stimulant of the people to change. However, there are some barriers [to efforts of fulfilling community expectations], for example, ego-sectoral barrier and the change of leader that has a different leadership [style] and policy. [The other issue is] a come of new leader [of the office] has a different leadership [style] and policy [leading the achievement of the programme] was back to the zero point. So if I was asked ‘how effective the project is, it will not be effective if just like this, it is about change [that takes time], for example from a smoker to a non-smoker.

Q: At least, so the information insemination can reduce the community violations.
A: The system of [Community] Patrol here actually is good, since 1999, one of the strategies was to involve the local people and [other parties] and was called Joint Patrol initiated by the Balai, the Water Police, some academics and tourism industry that saw that the [human] pressures on the Bunaken area was [so] high in that time. Even though we had a lot of meetings and Patrol [operations] and there was no significant change, that is why initiated by the NRM program, the Community Patrol was established in 1999. The [recruitment] system was conducted recruiting one person per settlement, based on the village government’s recommendation. From Popareng to Nain, there was a Community Patrol member. So it was not based on village but settlement, for example on the Nain Island, we chose four people from Tampi, Negeri, Siau and Tarente. In the past, when it was still supported, one settlement had two Patrol members.
However, at the moment, the support of the donors has reduced and one settlement is only one Patrol member. We recruited member based on a certain criteria such as age is not beyond 45 years old and he must have conservation concern, local domicile, has a skill such as swimming and a [good] relation with the community. The aim of the community involvement is important due to our limitations as the Park officers who are not able to be 24 hours surveillance. Given that reason, we intended to create agents of [the Balai] who are able to inseminate information about programs about the National Park to the community that is expected wiser in terms of using their local terminology. Second, the aim of the Community Patrol member is to act as an informant of violation in the area where they live, just as an informant and we would decide which proper actions [to be given], especially after the offender had received warnings. From the previous recruitment process, we obtained 40 members. We trained and provide them with basic skills such as marching skills, rescue skills, [knowledge] around the National Park, guarding and a little about village security.

Q: How the recruited people were prepared to face social conflicts?
A: Yes, there was, because there are people who are against and favour [the Park] in the area, until some of them whose house was stoned, burnt, they were isolated, but it is a dedication. It is normal, I think nobody will not 100% support or against, there is some people accept, some people reject. There is a potential of management, we can [do something] by talking to the community, a lot.

Q: Can you tell any examples of resistance?
A: A lot, for example, someone cut mangrove trees in a small numbers and then received warning from the Patrol members regarding the knowledge that has been received by the community about the use of mangrove. However, in the community, even though the warnings were given gently, [rejections] are still there, especially in a village, so that the offender did not say hi anymore [to the Patrol members]. Another thing, a case of rejection is once the Patrol was chased after by the villagers with a sword.

Q: How the Patrol members to be prepared to face such problems?
A: We prioritised safety and we did not force the Patrol members that they must warn the community about the violation, but if the situation is dangerous, [I suggested them] just take a note and give us information of the violation.

Q: How the Patrol members are allowed to use guns when they are catching offenders?
A: No, they are not allowed, just a guarding unit and controlling the community use. The Community Patrol members get involved working together with us and also the Water Police. The Patrol members have a position that is recognised at the local level. For example, on the Mantehage Island, there are two Patrol members that already became a Head of Village’s Secretary, while two former Patrol members became Head of Village. So, there is [an extra] value. When we want to choose people, it must be supported by [their] track record.

Q: How the recruitment was announced?
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A: Yes, it was publicly announced. Basically, we go to the village and we let them know that we need Patrol members who are fulfilled the criteria. We allow that mechanism to the village government, why we involve the village government because the village government should play a role, in order to share responsibilities, so the person was selected based on the perception of the village government, so if the selected person was bad, the village government will be blamed. So the village should have an active role in conserving the Park.

Q: Why there is no female Patrol member?
A: The work has a risk such as an obligation to leave her family even though it was only a couple days and second risk is on the field if something happens, we feel sorry. Basically, the work has a risk that can be handled only by men. Women are also able to involve but the role is not as a Patrol member. Also, we consider the risk of the role on the family value, especially for women that need to leave their children alone at home.

Q: Beside the value risk, what do you think about an opinion that woman is weak?
A: Probably, that is the reason, because we adopted eastern cultures, and feminism, then we put women in a different program such as economic community empowerment where woman roles we prioritised in form of training, for example, development of mangrove seed use in order to increase extra values to the community’s income, for example, the women were taught develop mangrove seed as flour, syrup. Automatically, they will protect the mangrove.

Q: So, how about women were got involved in different form of community empowerment activity?
A: Yes, [we involved women]. When we were conducting information insemination, we always invited women to join. So, we arranged [women’s] role and did not try to marginalise women’s roles which are already great in the Bunaken Park area.

Q: You told me about the donor of the activities, who usually becomes the donor?
A: At the moment, as we know that the system of entrance revenue run by the DPTNB [Dewan Pengelolaan Taman Nasional Bunaken, the Bunaken National Park Management Advisory Board]. Part of the fund was allocated for Patrol activity to assist monitoring, to buy fuels and to pay the Patrol members’ wages, kind of pocket money and all expenses were taken from the system. In the past, beside from the system, funding of Patrol was also generated from donors’ contribution such as WWF. However, such system is a temporary program and one of the programs called CRMP, so all of donors was incidental. The routine budget is for fuels and the Patrol members’ pocket money. However, the donor supports that are called investment were shown in forms of trainings, development, and increasing capacity and facilities of the Patrol members.

Q: How did RARE support the Community Patrol members?
A: We emphasised on the capacity of the [Community Patrol] members in the time. We, as the program [developer] supported efforts to increase in [Patrol members] capacity. This important because the increased capacity [would be useful] until the Patrol members did not became a Patrol member anymore that...
is limited in working time. A Patrol member is recruited and contracted for one year period and can be extended for twice. [In order] to provide opportunity to other people in developing their own capacity, a shifting system was applied. In the Patrol system, activities of the Patrol members were not only necessary related to surveillance but also training [and] capacity development [including] how to increase skills of communication [of the Patrol members]. All skills are expected not will be disappeared, although they do not become a Patrol member anymore.

Q: It is interesting?
A: It seems valueless. However, a lot of examples showed that someone finally has a role in the community [for instance] becoming secretary of village, Head of Village, or a community leader who is involved in many activities.

Q: So, it is how increase individual capacity in order to increase the community’s capacity?
A: Yes, it is.

Q: How about the next plan of RARE?
A: Yes, it is not necessary about RARE program but also [related to] other stakeholders. At the moment, a lot of programs were conducted, as I told you the program such as empowerment and capacity improvement. However, the main issue is whether the program reached the right target or not. On the islands, a lot of programmes have been conducted but [I am not sure] whether the programs were rightly targeted or not.

Q: What does it mean with that?
A: Reaching the right target means when there is a program, the orientation that that is a project, and by the village elites, it has a funding, so when there is a project, [everyone] was in, but the people who were in are people without a capacity to conduct the project for example, the close friends, relatives, even their domiciles are not on the island but in the mainland, and it happened frequently.

Q: How to deal with that.
A: It is difficult.

Q: Why you did not get involved directly in the Community Empowerment Program conducted by government of other institutions?
A: [We wish] we were there to facilitate [the community] [but] it was not our authority. The [issue of the Community Empowerment] problem [in the Park] is lack of capacity [of other institution]. If the program is from us, we could interfere, but it is from the government Agency or other institutions [so we cannot interfere]. Their [only] target is as long as the project is done and the budget absorption at 100%, there is documentation and an appeared result, although the project was run just in one or two months with unsure [quality], [then everything will be ok]. The main issue with the program [of other institutions] is lack of facilitation.
Q: Has it happened long time?
A: No, it has not. However, [I think] issues of lack of facilitation can be managed, how is it done? We can make evaluation for example once a month, or we can hold a meeting and discuss what the barrier is.

Q: In the community meeting, how the role of Patrol is activated?
A: We keep involving them in all activities which are being conducted by the Balai, for example we had an activity of conservation of mangrove trees, we involved the Patrol members in the village where the location will be held for example in Mantehage, the Patrol members in Mantehage will be involved. Besides having knowledge, they had find a [specific] location or sites of certain species of mangrove, and also they received pocket money.

Q: At the moment, the Patrol members were underestimated as people who are just involved in monitoring. Can you tell me about their involvement and roles expanded until inventory, plantation of mangrove?
A: The title as a Patrol member has led to a problem of having [negative] image. If we dig in a deeper way, more of a lot of positive things [about the Patrol members including] their [improved] knowledge such as fish inventory would appear.

Q: The image that was developed in the community that the Patrol member is scary, what do you think about the community's perspective?
A: Due to previous incidents, when we were talking about zonation [to the community], [the community thought] they would be caught and they were forbidden to take the Park resources.

Q: So, the new images of the Patrol members are as an environmental protector?
A: Yes, although they just receive incentives, they have a great role.

Q: How the reward system was applied in the Patrol activity?
A: The reward is the pride, for example I brought two Patrol members to attend a presentation in Jakarta. Besides to grow pride, we also provided an opportunity for the Patrol members to exchange information with other participant there, and to widen insight. If there is an activity, the Patrol was inserted to join.

Q: My discussion with women in Tatampi Nain they told me about an issue in the recruitment of the Community Patrol members, what do you think about the issue?
A: In the past, there is a classic problem, we cannot draw a conclusion based on my [personal] understanding [of the village], in a village where a village politics is strong, for example, the Head of Village disagree on something, or based on their policy was not disagreed with some villagers, finally it was politicised. For example, when the Head of Village purposed person A but because of the politicising, the villagers because of the thing said no, not the person, in different case, the Head of Village sent the person to be a Patrol someone who is their relatives,
Q: How about conflict happened because of the offenders are the relatives of Patrol members?
A: We should act as a government bureaucrat by establishing coordinate with the lowest government level on the site, in this case is the Head of Village, so they will have a responsibility for dealing with the issue. We also can inseminate information to them [the offender], and if it is through the Village [government], [the handling] would be formal and official in accordance with the Village’s program.

Q: How the issue was acknowledged in RARE program implementation?
A: The program is not always successful. Sometimes, there were some barriers, and we did not deny that it was there. We could not do anything. However, the percentage [of failure] is small.

Q: How was the complaint of the community followed up?
A: We consider the complaints [of the community] as inputs; otherwise we might assume that everything is running well. For example, level of presence of rangers on the field, was it insufficient and we questioned why is minimal? [We brought the explanation] to the Manager [of the Park], why and what the reasons, and we discussed why the community tended to mine sand and the reason is because the [building] material is far to take, they should take sand from Manado.

Q: What solution to the community rejection and demand was presented in terms of provision of the alternative livelihood to the community?
A: I am not the decision makers but the head of Balai [Balai Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Bunaken National Park Agency], or at least the head of Park section, so we just do our best. Personally, I am on the Field and what I know is in order to fulfill daily needs, the community [faces] it is difficult, not to mention the small needs. That is why I beg the community please [understand] I am nobody [and I could not help you]. I felt sorry if sometimes one of the community members was arrested in the legal process, they have to back and forth [the office], and an issue is how the husband feed their family, for example the offenders of the two arrested compressors engine which have been arrested for more than two months.

Q: How was the legal process applied?
A: If the evidence available, we [will] go to the court.

Q: What is the maximal sentence?
A: [It] depends of the violation types but based on our experience it can be 2 years. It should be more, 5 years according to law number 5 on conservation of 1999 or fined Rp. 1 trillion but we are back to feel sorry because the offenders are just field actors while the interest providers cannot be arrested because there is no strong evidence, just said, it is said, for example, the compressor use offenders which is known by me, and I know where they live, how much their income, while the taipan [earned a lot].

Q: Can you tell me more about the conflict of interest?
It is difficult, I suggest if there was another job [as an alternative], just try it to [commit violations] which are risky for our live. Moreover, we still have a wife and children who need us to feed. If we died, who would feed them?

Q: How about the level of legal process?
A: We should perceive and consider first, the type of violation, for the small violation, for example sand mining and mangrove cut, we always educate them, to ask them to make a statement in front of the Head of Village said that if they commit the violation again, they will be go under legal process, and ask them to give their signature on a stamp. However, in the quotation mark, [violations such as] compressor use, bombing, there is no mercy, because the violations are categorised as heavy violation and can be trapped with the law no 5 of 1959 of emergency.

Q: So there is a category?
A: If education failed [to change the community behavior], we call them to go to office.

Q: How about treatment of the recidivist?
A: We should review [the reason] why they became a recidivist, what usually I saw is they kept committing violation due to their needs.

Q: What do you usually do with the recidivist?
A: Institutionally, it will not be a favouritism weather they are poor or rich, they cannot be escaped. However, for me, personally I prefer to consider what the reasons why they committed violations, especially when the offenders are poor people. In Tampi, I asked the people who ever committed the violation.

Q: What are actually the negative impacts of use of diving compressor on the environment?
A: First, they usually do poisoning in order to catch lobsters living in corals reefs. They need to spray the poisons and the lobsters will come out from the corals. Second impacts on the environment are ecological balance destruction because they catch also fish that is about to laying their eggs. While from the health aspect, the use of compressor is dangerous. There are some examples of victims, some of them died, hold in the corals, were suffering from decompression, or paralysed. If it happened, then who would take the responsibility, it is not worth doing [due to the risk] and also income that is generated from that activity is so small. I asked them how much income they generated for one night, they said it is only Rp 800,000 and will be cut for fuels and the change will be divided into two with the shareholders and it is only Rp 50,000 for net for the catcher. Moreover, there is complain of the local community and traditional fishing community who just use traditional shooter to catch fish because of the poisoning the fish does not want to go up the surface of the water. Normally, if the low tide, fish will go up the survey seeking food and, they would be prevented from going up with the lamp of the lobster fisher down the bottom. So the fish will stay down the bottom of the sea and it makes the traditional shooter complaint which is only used for food. I ask people on Mantehage Island, and they answered me, that they just caught 5 fish which is not enough even for food and I asked them why? They
answered me because there are a lot of divers which is popular terms for the lobster catcher and who are with their actions preventing fish from going up. The similar case happened also on Nain.

Q: I saw every time I go from one place to another I saw one and another village blame one and another?
A: I personally think that we should review wisely, [the community] was not only blaming [one and another], but also accusing. "Mas, could you investigate that man” but I did not take it instantly because it needs to be clarify, if it is proved, we should provide education including the consideration of risk.

Q: How effective the community education was done?
A: It depends on individual who conducts the community education [in terms of] the communication way, for me personally, because we work in a team, it depends on other members. If we prioritised and emphasized our conscience when we were dealing with the community, Insya Allah [if God will], I think we would be fine. It is said, a resistance there, or here, but it is alright.

Q: Can you tell me the challenge you face when you enter a village as an outsider?
A: It depends on individual, I work on the island and I spent nights there. Also, it depends on the communication method for example, when we were conducting an information insemination about the Park program but the image we were developing was using sun glasses on the head, wearing shorts, playing with BB [Black Berry], or tattooing, how could we be accepted by the community. How we could talk about a certain concept for example the community empowerment to the community, if we looked busy with BB [Black Berry]. After that, I reviewed that how will they listen us if we have already make a distance with the community by displaying the [inappropriate] identity, this is me. It seems in front of us the community accepted what we were talking about but not behind us. When I entered Nain Island it did not take long time, it was only one or two months. At the moment I have been 10 months and I go there once a week and stay there three days. I join fishing and collecting seaweed in order to dig deeper about the community’s perspective. This is important because when we were wearing uniform like this, they were afraid [to me], so I took off my uniform. I asked them if I could join them going fishing, and talking with them. They showed me the compressor while I was collecting information.

Q: I saw in every village, there are different ban implications for example bia kima, what do you think?
A: It is forbidden but I always ask myself what the paradigm we use. If the law enforcement perception, then there would be not a favouritism, it can be processed. However, for me individually, we should consider why they conducted it, we should find the roots of the problems, we find, first they are subsistence fishermen who do not production tool. Even that, they did not have traditional boats, the only thing they have is a jubi [a traditional spear gun] which is used when low tide or they usually move to different areas.

Q: The community complained that due to Park ban, the community needed to fish in a further fishing ground. How did the Government Agency provide solution to
the consequence, for example availability of the fishing gear provided to the fishers?

Q: [Unfortunately, there was no solution like that]. The responsibility to provide the solution belongs to all stakeholders, [not only the Central Agency]. [However, the effectiveness of the solution] is always back to the roles of multi stakeholders, if the aim is good, so entire Indonesia, even though I am a government, I can say 80% of the aid reached on the wrong targets. The person, who has the responsibility to go Field and to conduct a program which included community education and consultation, did not go the Village. However, the Officials just gave the Head of Village a call and asked the recipient to pick up the package at the Jengki Pier [a port in mainland for boats go the island], and also asked the Head of Village to give their signature on the presence list of meeting. The assistance includes seaweed aid, fiber boats, katingting [small engine]. The assistance was a lot, but it is only going to Village elites

Q: I saw a katingting [a small hanging engine] and a fiber boat were being parked. Both boats are said as an aid boats but the use became the personal use.

A: All programmes are good, but not at technical level and [implementation], at the same we cannot do anything [due to limited authority]. Who am I? Even though I had a position [in the office], [it would be useless] if I was alone without supports from my staff, what is it use for? Just say I was supported by my staff, but it was still useless if I was not supported by other stakeholders. That is [important] why everyone should have had a same vision and orientation and then the implementation would not be too difficult.

Q: Why it seems that every village has different priorities of village?

A: Bango has a Patrol station but as I always I said that [the success of Patrol activity] depends on an individual [responsibility of the Patrol member]. I always questioned why [my] coworkers the rangers have an issue of lack of intention going to the field. From that point, we can understand in the deeper way that the community are more likely to stop their intention [to commit violation]. If there was an officer of the Field, at least it would prevent them [the community] committing violation. How can the community provide respect, [if we did not work well? [As a consequence], we should always conduct self - introspection. We admitted that presence of our staff is not enough on the Field, and therefore, we always need to review what the reason of their absence, what the deep answer, why in the past, they could [conduct their job responsibly], but why not now?

Q: From WWF, what did they do besides funding provision?

A: The fund that was provided programmes such as Depot establishment which is part of CSR of BNI bank. The Nain villagers were planned to receive KUR scheme which is over a small interest, around Rp 20 trillion for seaweed development. They also planned to make cash so the community will not need to go Manado in they want to save money. The KUR scheme offers a small interest.

Q: Was it working?
A: Back to individual again, because the programme has reached the wrong target, so that around 80% of the programmes did not work and I asked the farmers of sea weed if they received the scheme, they say they did not.

Q: What is the significant difference of the system of recruitment you did under the RARE program and under the Park Agency?
A: I think it is just the same, I think RARE is just a trigger of existing of the Patrol members, we did not develop something new. We conducted the same things have been conducted by the Balai with a different packaging and image.

Q: So what is so special about RARE programme of recruitment?
A: It is about packaging, for example which is the most part. We conducted first a pretest first, which picture is the most interesting, for a media, the above picture or the down picture?

Q: The down picture.
A: The fish picture, why?

Q: Less colourful, small fonts, lights background?
A: That it is. We conducted a pre-test, which is one is the most interesting by putting pictures on the wall including pictures of people which being arrested. While, the pictures have a same message “do not use compressors or you will be arrested”, the picture with a text “use of compressors will make our generation’s life difficult” will be more interesting and has different approaches. Pictures showed that a person who is in handcuffs and arrested by an officer, on an investigation, and the back the officers are guarding the offenders, which ones are more effective to [engage] the community?

Q: These ones?
A: Those are not developed in the past, this picture has an explanation, while the explanation of the different picture are “if you offend the chapter .of the law you will be arrested for five years of sentence and fined at Rp. 1 million. For me personally, I am not a ranger, I am a consultant which is a kind of an expert in conservation area. We conduct monitoring, inventory, collecting data on potentials of the Bunaken National Park, both the natural resources potential including ecosystem and also human potentials, social economy potentials. While rangers focus on guarding in terms of house, they are security, and the roles of design interior are mine, this is the living room, this room is used for this, with the assessment why the living room was placed here, because of the sun shine.

Date:

Interview with Donny Maringka

Q: Can you introduce your name and job description please?
A: My name is Donny Maringka and my position is the daily acting official of Head of Section of the area 1. My job descriptions are related to conservation and protection of the Bunaken National Park area.

Q: How long have you become a civil servant?
A: 15 years but I just had this position for a few months.

Q: What do you think of RARE’s contribution to the community empowerment of the Balai [the Park Agency]?
A: Personally, I have heard about RARE. However, to be exactly I have never known about the vision and mission of the organisation. Probably, institutionally, it was informed but personally, I really do not understand. However, from its program, banners, I considered its program related to the community empowerment, and to the conservation of fish and fishing areas, but not arranging the Patrol activities. The Patrol activities come from Balai’s initiatives. RARE went to the community who use the area of the Park, [especially] fish resources. I think they conducted personal approaches to the community members. They [RARE] informed and educated the community about what the legal [and non-destructive] fishing methods and it was aligned with rules of the zonation of the Balai Taman Nasional Bunaken [the Park Agency]. The ways they educated the community are in an indirect way in order to make the community understands about the impacts of their [illegal] fishing methods [on the conservation].

Q: One of the RARE’s conservation programs is information insemination about Maming, how do you perceive impacts of the program on the community’s violation eradication efforts?
A: I do not know much about RARE [in details] but from Balai, we conduct a few information insemination sessions a year. The information includes conservation, rules and laws and protected biota. Based on species types, Maming is not protected but in the Bunaken Park area, Maming is protected if it is in the Core Zone or in other zones depends on the Management. Maming is a predator of Acanthaster [planci] (sea urchin) in a certain amount is fine, but in a large amount, it is dangerous for the coral reefs. In the large amount, the sea urchin will suck the coral reefs that lead to bleaching and death. So in a large amount, it indicates that its predator is few and the food chains do not run well. So we prohibit the people in the Bunaken area from catching it.

Q: Why Maming [Napoleon wrasse] become a mascot of the Park?
A: Probably, because in the food of chains, it plays an important roles.

Q: From the Balai, there is a joint Patrol program, how the community Patrol members benefit the program?
A: It is very advantageous because the main goal of the community Patrol activity is not only to conduct surveillance, but also to break a bridge between opportunity and intention [to commit violation]. For example, if someone had an intention but because there was a Patrol going around, [they would cancel their intention] because they could not find any opportunity to commit it. So the intention to commit a violation was not successfully conducted, implemented and executed. In contrast, for people actually whose no intentions at all, but because there was
no Patrol members around provoking the people to commit the violations. For example, when someone was coincidently committing jubing [using traditional spear gun] and they saw a large fish, they would see the absence of the Patrol members around as an opportunity. As a consequence, they would commit it due to that reason. However, if we have a [routine] Patrol operation, besides creating a sense of safety to the tourists in the Park, we bring safety to unsafe places. Here, on the Bunaken Island, the vulnerable places are Tawara, around the diving spot, where a lot people swimming there. It is said that, you have not been in Bunaken, unless you swim. Even though the tourists cannot swim, they force themselves to swim. Even though they need to wear life jacket and make sure their head above the water surface, they will try to swim and stand up on the bottom of the sea including on the coral an activity we prohibit.

Q: So, RARE’s empowerment program is not known by all officials in the Balai?
A: I do not know how to explain, if I am not mistaken, RARE has an MOU with a certain division in the Forest Department. The MOU is related to the conservation area and then their programmes are attached to the programmes of the UPTs [Unit Pelaksana Teknis/Technical Executor unit] such as the Bunaken National Park. The NGO also provided a scholarship for employees of the UPT such as Gatot who underwent a Master Program under RARE’s program. Eko also received the same scholarship program as Gatot. So, they kept working while they were studying and RARE’s programmes were aligned to their official job. So what they learnt they directly practiced it here. Personally, I do not know much about the detail of the program of the scholarship.

Q: How the Balai anticipated sensitive issues of the community?
A: The National Park has been established since 1991. At the beginning of the establishment stage of the agency, a lot and continuous insemination sessions were conducted about the Balai, the rules and other issues. Until know, if was asked to the community, ‘Do you know the Balai?’ It is impossible if the community said they do not know. They have received information [about the Balai] since long time ago about. Few people refuse the rules of the Park because they do not like the rule of the zonation. That is what happens. They think the zonation scheme limits their fishing activity. They do not know the principle of the zonation is to provide fish sustainably. So, if they commit fishing in all area of the Park, it is called significant exploitation. If fish finished quickly, who would take a responsibility? It then would be pointed at the Fisheries Agency or the Balai. That’s because they do not really understand about the concept. As a result, a few people do not like the Balai. Then, about the solution [to providing the community with a livelihood alternative], we conduct [community] empowerment in many ways every year, including economic empowerment which is a compulsory activity of the Agency. We provided aid [to the community], for example, cattle, and seeds of plants. So, basically our concept is not to eradicate the community’s passion to go fishing or to eradicate their livelihood in the ocean, but we provided aid to reduce the community’s contact with the ocean.

Q: So, in the Patrol activity, the community was get involved?
The community was get [actively] involved but because of the fund limitation, [it stopped]. Probably, next year, the activity will be held again.

Q: There are special requirement for the Community Patrol members recruitment?
A: Yes, there are internal tests. It is impossible for us to select people with lack of integrity issues and unteachable, because at the end we will present them to the community.

Q: What are the main constraints for you to work with the community?
A: I cannot say there was no problem [with the community], but the [resolution of the] issues depends on the individual [of the Park Agency staff]. We have informed them but they did not implement the information. However, we cannot blame the community. As a government official, we must to let the community know continuously. Actually, everyone knows about the rules from the government of the village including the lay people. If we asked people whether they knew about the rule and they would say that they did not know, probably they are new comers or just married to the villager.

Q: How was the community violation was reduced with the Community Empowerment program?
A: If I perceive with the seriousness of the Balai, the community violation decreased. Especially in the Southern Part that is vulnerable to explosive fishing case. Since I joined this office in 2000, the case still occurred there, if there were routine operations and surveillance, the case would [suddenly] disappear. However, recently, it has appeared again just like diving with compressor practices. Especially in Arakan area, when surveillance happened, it disappeared. However, after that it happened again. In February I caught [an offender] of the diving with compressors from Arakan. I think there is a trend in certain years, when they would happen and disappear. Even though they have been told that compressor diving is absolutely banned, they reasoned that how they could survive. If they caught, how they would feed their family. However, now we were thinking and considering, whether the Balai would take responsibility [for feeding the family] if the rules would be applied consistently, for the community wellbeing.

Q: What were the difficulties you faced to conduct a program of community education and empowerment?
A: We had to conduct brain washing to the community. However, personally I think the brain washing process to the adult is very difficult. A new approach of the community of the Balai is the conservation education at the very early age. We went to the school and conducted the education of conservation program. So the importance of conservation will grow since the early ages. The result has not been obtained right now, but in 10, 20, 30 years later and the next generation’s mindset will be changed. If we did not change from the beginning, it would be difficult because everything conducted by the parents, 90% will be followed by the children. That is why we moved [our attention] to the children. However, we cannot conduct it frontally and directly but we go through the schools especially in the area of the Park, while outside the Park we conducted campaigns which
were not like political campaigns that involved political oration. The campaigns were conducted on the road or in the mall by the stickers.

Q: What are the interesting aspects you encountered related to the community empowerment program?
A: The main goal of the community empowerment is to increase the level of the community wellbeing. However, the issue is located in the community’s perspective, for example, thousand seeds and fruit tree had been provided to the community and a pilot project had been conducted including fruit tree provision. However, [it was failed] because it was impossible for me to guard the community non-stop during the process. So I just encourage the community to plant the provided seed plant. [I told the community], ‘If it is not enough space in your house yard, you can plant the seed in your farm’. Sometimes they forgot, and when we conducted evaluation, the only living trees are the tree we planted. While the trees planted by the community were forgotten and ignored. Moreover, the government aid was also useless. Some programmes were successful [in other places] such as Manado tua [and] Mantehage. When the pan stove [a set of aluminum pan with a small stove or heater underneath] was trending, we provided the pan stove to the community to be rented [the profit can be borrowed by the group members]. It developed well. In Manado Tua, we provided seeds and money which we meant to be used as a capital of Micro Finance. After I evaluated, it was developed well and they asked me for more financial aid as capital, but I said I needed to check the Government budget availability. If one community group succeeded, other group in the community will have jealousy instead of learning how to obtain the funding. Furthermore, if the non-group members do not want to conduct any efforts but showed negative sentiment feelings such as complains.

Q: What are the weaknesses of the Patrol activities?
A: The quality facility is not good and old. Until know, there is no new assistance [from the central government].

Q: Can you tell me about community’s perception on the Bunaken National Park?
A: It would be more difficult to visualise than the terrestrial protected area because the people perceive the protected area is just ocean. All they saw just the surface of the ocean until we went down to the ocean. If we used a concept of [conservation] but it did not align with the pace of the population growth, [we would be in trouble]. At the beginning [and when the community number was small], it is easy to let the community knew not to commit jubi [traditional spear gun] in the No Take Zone, but the number of population develops and increases. As a result, it is so difficult to conduct the ban. So, we have to consider [its impacts] on the community’s livelihood. We have considered about the community livelihood’s [alternative provision]. It is told to us that ‘please conduct the community empowerment’, so resources can be enjoyed [sustainably] by the community at the same time. This is part of the new concept of [sustainable development] introduced by the [Forestry] Ministry, the community empowerment coexists with the conservation. However, how to implement [the new concept] we are here [on the Field] was confused and
helpless how to implement the concept [due to limited resources]. It is difficult, isn’t it?

Q: The community was very careful talking about the community violation?
A: The community still committed violation, for example] Arakan people conducted most the violations, 5 boats were caught in one day due to [forbidden] compressor diving practice. However, sometimes [the internal] the community does not understand [of the rules importance] as well as the offenders. Moreover, a lot of offenders have backing ups. [The community might change] not because I enforce the rule, but because the [pressure] comes from the surrounding and neighboring Village that is against [the practice]. For example, the people in Arakan that still practices the use of diving compressor, and when the fish in that area is finished, the Arakanese fishing in other Villagers’ fishing area. As a result, the local community protested to the Arakanese, ‘you just come to finish our fish while the fish in your area is depleted already, if we want to bajubi (to use traditional spear gun), the fish is already gone’.

Q: So the programmes of Balai such as joint Patrol have been worked long time before RARE?
A: Yes, we conducted the resource management, but also conducted the community management including information insemination and community empowerment but we have to conduct evaluation whether we have achieved the target or not. I think it can be reached. Certain people do not like the rules, [especially special cases] for example, the issues of the entry fee. At the beginning, the concept was good but the use of the fund was changed. Historically, in 2000, we had already received entry fee even though it was small. Previously, few people from NGOs initiated the so there would be entry fee for the foreign tourists that regulated by the local rules. So, in that time, they adopted the tourist pin system in the Caribbean Island with the price the Rp 10,000,-. Later, a new rule called PP [Peraturan Pemerintah, Government Rules] No 12 of 2014 was enacted that Rp. 150,000,-entry fee for tourists diving in the Park area.

Q: So the Park Management Advisory Board did not want to submit under the Park Agency?
A: They [the Management Board-DPTNB] want to be as equal as us. However, the Board is not a government institution. Conceptually, the Dewan [DPTNB] is good because the issue happened in the Bunaken could be discussed at the level of local government. As a consequence, all policies [related to the Park] could be synchronized [at the level of the policy making process]. However, they want to occupy and dominate [the Park authority] including taking over our Official job, and as a result of their dominance, the community looked for them the most. If the community was asked, which one is more well-known, it would be answered: the Dewan. Actually, the institution with the job description related to the Park is the Balai, because the Dewan [the Dewan Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Management Advisory Board of the Bunaken Park-DPTNB] is collection of local fisheries, tourism department, Water Police, the Balai, while the rule should be conducted and implemented. It has been warned by the current administrative that PNPB (Pendapatan Negara Bukan Pajak) non – tax National income should
be pushed and increased. According to Mr. President, in order to save the National budget, some parts of Village funding scheme (that is enacted nationally by the President) will not be taken from the National budget but from PNPB (that include the entry ticket of the Park). Probably the budget at Rp 1million for each Village will be taken from the post. Unavoidably, we have to run it, and if the local government said no (of our task implementation), so how could we fulfil our obligation?

Q: How did the Balai [the Park agency] deliver the information to the community?
A: In general, the community in the area has known about the prohibition since couple years ago because the Balai keeps conducting information sessions, including the laws. What we have been doing now is to monitor the community outside the area because most of violations were committed by outsiders. Due to the intensive information sessions, the violation by the insiders became less than outsiders’ because in the last case I found the offenders form Budo Village, sub district of Wori. Generally speaking, the offenders mostly are outsiders. Since 2012, the Balai [BTNB] has been resigned from the membership of the Dewan [Dewan Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Management Advisory Board of the Bunaken Park [DPTNB]. I think becoming a member of the Dewan [DPTNB] because we are only having the authority [of the central government while the authority is the Dewan is under authority of the governor [of the province]. Moreover, as the member, we could not make a decision that against the chairman of the [Board], while at the same time, the policy cannot be conducted in the area of the Park.

Q: Can you tell me please your name and your job description please?
A: My name is Fransiscus Moto and my job is as Patrol officer in the Bunaken National Park, especially, the resort of Mantehage. My main duty is to guard the Bunaken National Park, so everything related to the security issue of the Park especially the resort is belong to [my] authority. We have a shift in guarding and maintaining the security of the Park area. We just finished two days before. So not only us can work and operate in the Mantehage resort, every one of us can do as best as we can.

Q: So you could be transferred and assigned to Siladen area?
A: Anywhere, even the Southern Area we will go, if we are assigned.

Q: Is Mantehage area under your authority?
A: Yes, it is part my authority.

Q: How long have you been working as the staff of the Park area especially in the Balai?
A: for four months.
Q: What do you think the program conducted by RARE? Did Mr Gatot’a program helping implementation of your job?

A: It was very helpful. Why I said it was very helpful, especially regarding the issue of security of the Bunaken National Park, the most important thing is the community. So the community should be able to help and support us [to conduct] our job. We cannot completely implement our job fully guarding the Park [without the community support]. As a result, we need to increase the community’s awareness that is really needed and important to the Park considering long term existence the community. It would be different if there were no inhabitants in the Park area.

Q: So, the major issue is how the Park coexists with the community?

A: Yes, it a must. We have a plan to conduct a partnership between the community and the [Park] Rangers and we will recruit the community to help conducting basic and main job of the Park Agency. It will be formed in the near time. So in each village, one or two people will be recruited.

Q: When is the realisation of the plan?

A: This year. A budget is provided already and ‘lunsum’ [pocket money] is provided to the community members [who are selected] to assist our job implementation. They will receive salary and the Balai [the Bunaken National Park agency] will pay for it.

Q: Sir, there is a community campaign and education program of the zonation scheme using Maming [Napoleon wrasse] as a mascot. How the program impacted on eradication of the community’ violation?

A: I am sure that there is [a good] impact.

Q: Could please give me an example?

A: There is an increase in the community’s awareness [including awareness that] catching this fish is forbidden activity, which size [of fish] is allowed and which size is not, then which fishing method is allowed. If we used high technology, of course the amount of fish will be depleted quickly but if we use [traditional] way such as angle, bajubi [traditional spear gun], and no use of compressor diving, conducting selective fishing, [the amount of fish will be steady]. For example, Maming [Napoleon] wrasse, the [allowed] limit [of weight] is around 2.5 kg. Less than 2.5 kg is not allowed to catch. So, we have a range [of fish size] that can be caught. However, I forgot the specific rules. As I know an old rule says that Maming [Napoleon wrasse] is maximal 2.5 kg can be caught but I do not with the new rules and which category of the fish, [probably] in Appendix one.

Q: So, the fish is rare?

A: The number is depleted.

Previously, you mentioned about the joint Patrol. What do you think about the benefits of the Community Patrol existence to the Joint Patrol implementation?

At the moment, the Community Patrol started disappearing. In the past, there was a Community Patrol because the existence of the Dewan Pengelola Taman
Nasional Bunaken [the Management Advisory Board of the Bunaken National Park] but at the moment, it is absent. It cannot be said they have been eliminated but they are inexistence anymore, because we [the Park Agency] refer to a new rule, the Government Rules No. 12 of 2014 about entry fee of the Bunaken National Park and other National in the Republic of Indonesia. For example, for the foreign tourist, the entry fee is at Rp. 150,000 and for the local [tourists] is at Rp. 5,000,-. In the past, there was a Local Rule [regarding the entry fee], but automatically the Local Rule was eliminated by the enactment of the [National] Government Rule. Now, we run [our job] based on the National Government Rule. The Ranger run their job based on the rule, so automatically the Dewan [the Management Advisory Board of the Bunaken National Park] was deactivated temporarily waiting the National Government decision, probably. So, in present, they did not collect the retribution anymore in the Park area but by the Balai does and directly submit to the Country Treasury to increase the National income from the non-tax sector called PNPB.

Q: So, there is no Community Patrol activity run by the Dewan?
A: No, but we want to establish by our own, MMP I told before.

Q: What are the differences?
A: The characteristics of the activity are the same, but in terms of [the budget], the activity was [different]. Previously it was run by the private, NGO but now it will be run by the Balai. So, the activity will have nothing to do with them.

Q: So, the only difference is the about management of the program?
A: Yes, we still empower the community. So, the community [MMP member] will help the Ranger’s task including become our spies and our front guard. So they will be under our management just like when they were with the Dewan that had no legal umbrella. The legal umbrella of the Dewan was the Balai. They were protected by the Balai implying that they could not make any decision if something happened on the sea but us. If they wanted to make any decision, [they should] be back up by us. I do not think that they will get involved because when the management was provided to them, [the accountability] of the funding was unclear. It was said that a certain percentage of the funding would be given to the community but when we checked it was not given.

Q: How did the Balai [the Park agency] deliver the information to the community?
A: In general, the community in the area has known about the prohibition since couple years ago because the Balai keeps conducting information sessions, including the laws. What we have been doing now is to monitor the community outside the area because most of violations were committed by outsiders. Due to the intensive information sessions, the violation by the insiders became less than outsiders’ because in the last case I found the offenders form Budo Village, sub district of Wori. Generally speaking, the offenders mostly are outsiders. Not like them, save in their own pocket. I did say that. However, the use by the community was not clear in direction, and not accountable. How the government can will help if the funding use is not countable,
Q: What is the difference of qualities of community Patrol members before and after recruited by RARE?
A: Until now, I do not have any coordination with Mr. Gatot about RARE’s activity and I have never talked with Mr. Gatot. However, I think somehow the program was very useful in helping us to conduct the surveillance. After I learned about this, there is a benefit for us the Ranger as the Police of the Bunaken Park, so we expect the program will be run again.

Q: Is there any data about the development of violation?
A: I just moved in from the Southern Area last year. You asked for the violation handling, you supposed to ask Mr. Donny because it is his authority, not mine. I am just Field Patrol helping their task implementation. He is an investigator as well. So automatically, all reports went to him. He is with Mr. Rosman but for action related enforcement and punishment is my authority.

Q: For a sensitive case for the community, for example conflicts with the community, what do you think about the anticipation of the program?
A: It has never been happening here, but in the South Area, in Wawontulap Village. Lian took the [illegal mangrove woods] [from the community] that took the woods not for fire woods but for sero [ ] requiring a lot of woods. Each sero requires hundreds of woods [logs]. When I was in the Southern Area, I was the craziest official handling cases like that. I have never made anybody afraid if I need to catch somebody. I was so famous in the Southern Area due to my fronter attitudes that I consistently conducted until the community stopped. I directed the community to replace the mangrove wood with lantoro wood. I was in a difficulty to ask them to use lantoro wood. I once wanted to help them to find the lantoro wood from the Belang area where lantoro woods are abundant. Therefore, my expectation to RARE is to educate the community to find and plant lantoro seeds. In the Southern Area, most of the businessmen plant sero on the sea, they plant sero made of woods. Many of them use lantoro that is one of water resistant water and equally in strength with fire woods. However, it has not been planted there. I used to have a dump truck when I was having a project. I would have like to help the community by using the truck but I needed someone to cut the trees as a seed.

Q: The community complaint about the solution of impact of the Park ban on their livelihood. How did the solution provided by the Balai?
A: I have given a solution to the community [in terms of lantoro related suggestion] and even information insemination in Popareng, Wawontulap, and Teling. Most of the business of the sero in Arakan used lantoro which is as strong as mangrove in the water.

Q: The RARE program reached the Southern Area?
A: Yes, as I know, Eko went to the area.

Q: What is the new thing (innovation) brought by the program?
A: Until now I have not seen it yet or any complaint yet because the program is still new so at least it takes one year to see the impact of the program.
Q: From your own perspective, what do you think the program brought by Eko, for example the effectiveness aspect?
A: It is interesting, especially in terms of a visit of an official of the Park Agency to the community which is always interesting to the community. However, evidently, I do not have any clear idea what is the benefits, what is the advantage as well as the weakness [of the program] but basically some community member said the activity was good.

Q: When we went to the community, a few members believe in the community rather than to the Dewan?
A: Yes, because, the Balai is organic, and as government employees, we are under the National government not the local government. We are not employed, we are sent to help. While, the Dewan is not government, kind of NGO, that their funding management is different from the Balai. The Balai has formal funding investigation from the BPK [Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan or Financial Auditory Body] but not the Dewan. So far, they have not been touched by the investigation for years and I think they misused the money a lot. I have heard that they once lost money around Rp. 400 million. It is right or not, that is the news I heard but it will not happen to us because we have a formal mechanism, such as the treasurer, [regular] investigation, and formal mechanism of sending the money to the state treasury. So there will not be misused. For us as government employee, we bet our job [if we misused the money], it means that we had no responsibility to the country.

Q: What else the specialty and uniqueness of Eko’s program especially in terms of community empowerment that belong to the RARE and Balai?
A: I cannot answer that question in detail way because I am afraid to deliver any statement that might have negative impacts on them. I can only provide answers related to my job not about their program. However, one thing I know that the community looks happy with the program but about other things [effectiveness] I am reluctant to answer, especially about the impact of the program. I am afraid my answer might have negative impacts on their reputation. Probably, they just gave a try.

Q: It is interesting, because you said that you are in charge and you have the authority, what are the difficulties or challenges in conducting your job?
A: There is no enough operational [funding]. The most significance challenge is lack of quality marine transport, equipment and other facilities. It is important because in order to conduct and support the Patrol activity, we need more than one or two speed boats. We have large a surveyed area and our fleet is old already, almost 10 years. As a consequence, we proposed to the central government to provide speed boat again and the provision of new boats will be held soon. I talked to the NSWA [North Sulawesi Water Sports Association], one of the managers of a resort, Kerri, who told me that they (the NSWA) would like to invite the Balai [BTNB- the Balai Taman Nasional Bunaken or the Park Agency] at their forum and discuss how they can help the Balai [BTNB]. This year, there is no gasoline budget for our speed boats, and no specific and routine budget for Patrol so we just paid the fee from our wages to assist this activity and if there is a sudden inspection, the budget will be provided. So, Kerrie will talk to
the NSWA to provide gasoline fee, but the Balai should provide at least three Patrol boats in the northern area. We need 150L per day and the total budget could reach around Rp. 1 million per day. If the NSWA can work together with us, it will be great because we will not run out of budget [anymore]. The budget for gasoline will be started provided next year. If the entry fee can be collected and deposited to the country until Rp 500 million, it will be easier for us to ask for gasoline budget [from the Central Government]. So far, the income never goes to the country [but to the Park Advisory Board]

Q: So the main issue is lack of funding of transport and gasoline?
A: Yes, there is no sufficient transports and gasoline budget. It just was proposed, whether it will be accepted or not. If the Patrol fund is provided, including boat provision, it will be followed with the gasoline fund provision as well. We used to use our own salary to fulfil the gasoline need, until NSWA invited us in their monthly meetings. At the moment, the Balai is undergoing the administrative improvement.

Q: How about the community acceptance to the rules of the Park?
A: In general, the community accepts the rules because we [frequently] familiarise the Park issue with the community. We inseminated enacted rules to the community. However, only few people refused it because of their [opposing] own and personal interest but I do not really care [about them].
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