



Deposited via The University of Leeds.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/186954/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Trialfhianty, TI, Muharram, FW, Suadi et al. (2022) Spatial multi-criteria analysis to capture socio-economic factors in mangrove conservation. *Marine Policy*, 141. 105094. ISSN: 0308-597X

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2022.105094>

© 2022, Elsevier. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Spatial Multi-criteria Analysis to Capture Socio-Economic Factors in Mangrove Conservation

Tyas Ismi Trialfhianty^{1,2*}, Fajrun Wahidil Muharram³, Suadi⁴, Claire Helen Quinn⁵,
Maria Beger^{1,6}

¹School of Biology, Faculty of Biological Sciences, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

²Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Pelita Bangsa, Indonesia

³Parangtritis Geomaritime Science Park, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

⁴Fisheries Department, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

⁵School of Earth and Environment, Faculty of Environment, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

⁶Centre for Biodiversity and Conservation Science, School of Biological Sciences, University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia

*corresponding author
Tyas Ismi Trialfhianty
bstit@leeds.ac.uk

Spatial Multi-criteria Analysis to Capture Socio-Economic Factors in Mangrove Conservation

Abstract

Mangrove forests are among the most productive ecosystems, located in tropical and subtropical coastal waters and river estuaries. Mangroves benefit both people and the environment by providing shelter for brackish-water organisms, such as fish and shrimp. They form a green-belt area that protects land from abrasion and tsunamis, along with goods and services for people, e.g., fruit, fish and charcoal. However, unmanaged use of mangrove ecosystems has resulted in a widespread decline in their function and conflicts between users. A paucity of research on mangrove management and spatial zoning is also contributing to the decline of these ecosystems. This study develops a prioritisation process with Spatial Multi-criteria Analysis (SMCA) for social-ecological mangrove management, based on a case study in Baros, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. We include social (participation and perception), demographic, economic (economic value of mangroves) and ecological criteria (water quality, mangrove density and diversity, phytoplankton diversity and density) criteria and spatial considerations informed by remote sensing imagery. We consider the three different conservation scenarios of habitat protection areas, sanctuary areas, and restricted areas to help configure management plan options. We demonstrate how SMCA can support managers and policymakers in mapping conservation areas based on complex and diverse social-ecological data. However, further discussion with stakeholders in Baros is required to validate the produced map for future use. The involvement of stakeholders and governing bodies from the beginning or within the SMCA analysis will always be crucial in community-based prioritisations.

Keywords: *ecosystem, ecological criteria, mapping, conservation management, social criteria.*

1. Introduction

Mangrove ecosystems are found in Africa, America, Asia and the Pacific region and cover an estimated 22%; 30%; 38% and 10% respectively of the total mangrove area worldwide (Vegh et al., 2014). Mangrove ecosystem services include fisheries, timber, coastal protection, tourism, recreation, carbon sequestration, biodiversity and filtration (Vegh et al., 2014). They provide nursery, spawning and feeding grounds for associated organisms such as fish and shrimp (Adeel and Pomeroy, 2002). However, these wetland ecosystems are threatened by overexploitation, pollution, urban development and land-conversion (Alongi, 2002; Giri et al., 2008), which has caused a 62% global loss of mangrove area worldwide (Goldberg et al., 2020). Effective management strategies are required to reduce these threats. Management strategies need to be matched to ecosystem service needs, for example, whether the mangrove system is to be maintained or improved for coastal protection, food provisioning, or timber production. Conserving existing mangrove ecosystems enables ecosystem services to be maintained, and it is more economical and easier to prevent mangrove loss rather than to restore degraded mangroves (Schmitt and Duke, 2015).

Indonesia's mangrove forest is one of the largest in the world, covering an area of approximately 3 million hectares; 22.6% of the total global mangrove area (Giri et al., 2011). This ecosystem contributes significant ecological and social-economic benefits to local communities. It is estimated that the total economic value of mangrove resources in Indonesia is US\$3,624–US\$26,734.61/ha/year (Rizal et al., 2018). This value results principally from provisioning services, such as wood, tannin, charcoal, food and material for the paper industry. It also provides protective benefits by protecting land from coastal abrasion, salt-intrusion,

48 storm and tsunami damage and ecological benefits by providing nursery and breeding areas for
49 a range of organisms (Rizal et al., 2018). However, the extent of Indonesian mangroves has
50 been declining due to over-exploitation of wood resources and their conversion to brackish
51 water aquaculture and coastal development e.g., villas, housing areas and roads (Andika et al.,
52 2019). Management and conservation strategies are vital to halt the decline, to sustain the
53 ecosystem, and preserve its functions for ecological and social-economic purposes. However,
54 decision-making for mangrove conservation and management can be problematic because
55 many parties, from the government to the local community, are involved. It can be challenging
56 to meet the needs of every stakeholder. Thus, decision-making strategies that incorporate not
57 only ecological factors, but also social-economic variables to reflect the needs of different
58 stakeholders are necessary.

59 Multi-criteria analysis is a tool that can assist decision-making for ecosystem
60 management. It supports mixed-data analysis with the direct involvement of stakeholders and
61 local user groups (Mendoza et al., 2000). The approach allows researchers to combine complex
62 multidimensional data, such as socio-economic, ecological and management information, to
63 explore management and conservation options in a particular area (Cortina & Boggia, 2014).
64 For example, the Analysis Hierarchy Process (AHP) – a hierarchically structured approach to
65 multi-criteria decision making – can help to integrate heterogeneous data and specify
66 interactions between a large numbers of criteria (Chen et al., 2013). While multi-criteria
67 analysis aims to investigate a complex issue, combining it with spatial contexts allows policy
68 makers to better understand how the outputs are spatially distributed (Boggia et al., 2018).
69 Thus, spatial multi-criteria analysis (SMCA) approaches that can combine qualitative and
70 quantitative data and produce maps are useful to managers and stakeholders who want to assess
71 the benefits of conservation projects or options.

72 Effective management strategies are required to balance its various economic,
73 commercial uses and conservation goals. It is essential to consider both the ecological and
74 socio-economic factors in a transparent prioritisation process. Hence, multi-criteria analysis
75 provides a powerful approach to achieving this integration (Comino et al., 2016). The ability
76 to combine multi-criteria decision-making approach with spatial data or Geographic
77 Information Systems (GIS) has been studied in other ecosystems worldwide, such as using
78 SMCA in forest conservation planning (Phua et al., 2005), SMCA for Marine Protected Areas
79 (MPA) zoning and management (Habtemariam et al., 2016), and SMCA for assessing
80 mangrove health (Vaghela et al., 2018). Therefore, we believe that we could use SMCA for
81 mangrove conservation planning and SMCA is the most suitable method to facilitate and
82 manage the complex interactions between users and managers who have different goals and
83 reasons for managing the mangroves.

84 In this study, we investigated the possible social and ecological criteria used for SMCA
85 analysis and prioritise areas for different types of use. Unlike most SMCA studies that use only
86 community perceptions (Karlsson et al., 2017; Danumah et al., 2016), which are prone to bias,
87 we used a combination of community perceptions, mangrove economic value, and ecological
88 observations to support the analysis. Furthermore, we applied three main management types,
89 i.e., core zone, buffer zone and transition zone in conservation area, akin to UNESCO's
90 Biosphere zonation (Batisse, 1990). Specifically, our goals were to (1) understand spatial,
91 ecological and socio-economic parameters that are suitable and applicable for conservation
92 management planning of mangroves; and (2) demonstrate how multi-criteria analysis can be
93 employed in spatial conservation planning for mangrove ecosystems. To demonstrate the
94 framework, this study developed possible management and conservation options for the Baros
95 mangrove forest.

96 2. Case study methods: incorporating socioeconomic factors into SMCA

97 2.1 Study area

98 Mangrove restoration has been extensively undertaken in Indonesia and include both top-
99 down (government-driven) and bottom-up (community-driven) efforts (Turisno & Siti, 2020;
100 Van Oudenhoven et al., 2015). One such community-driven example comes from Baros,
101 located between 07°59'25'' - 08°00'45''S and 110°16'46'' - 110°17'22 E. The study area, which
102 is located in Tirtohargo village, covers 281.89 hectares, with the majority of land used for
103 farming (approx. 176.6 hectares of the total area) (**Figure 1**). A significant part of the
104 community are farmers (67.5%), who plant various seasonal crops (Tirtohargo Village,
105 Demographic data, 2013). Baros is located adjacent to the coast and an estuary. Therefore, salty
106 winds and salt-water intrusion have become major threats to crops. Recognising the potential
107 benefits of mangroves, this community established a new mangrove forest in a previously
108 unforested coastal area in 2003. Over the following ten years, the area was expanded to a 5-
109 hectare mangrove forest, dominated by *Avicennia* sp., *Rhizophora* sp., *Bruguiera* sp., and *Nypa*
110 *fruticans* comprising 60%, 20%, 10% and 10% respectively (Trialfhianty et al., 2014). This
111 process resulted in numerous benefits for the local community, including protecting farmland
112 from salty winds which regularly destroy crops as well as abrasion along the coast.

113 In 2014, the area was designated as a conservation area managed by the local government
114 and Ministry of Marine and Fisheries (MMAF) Indonesia. However, the conversion from a
115 freely used area to a conservation area led to conflict between users (i.e., community) and
116 managers (i.e., local government). Thus, to facilitate both the local government and the local
117 community in setting up an ideal conservation zone, we propose a conservation zoning area for
118 Baros mangrove using SMCA by incorporating heterogeneous data such as spatial, ecology
119 and socioeconomic from the local community in Baros. Ecological and socioeconomic data
120 were collected between June 2013 and February 2014. Six distinct locations were randomly
121 chosen (inside and outside mangrove area) as stations for the field observations (**Figure 1**,
122 Supplementary data Table S1).

123

124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163





Figure 1. Case study location in Baros, Yogyakarta Province, Java Island, Indonesia

2.2 Research design

We divided the research process into five steps (**Figure 2**). In the research design step, we identified what activities mangrove users carry out and the type of benefits local people obtain from mangrove ecosystems in the area. Using a questionnaire, people were asked if they benefit from mangroves, what sort of activities they do to benefit and how often they do it. From this ecosystem services identification, we chose the criteria for management options. Finally, then we propose a zoning scenario for mangrove conservation management that has the potential to be implemented in the Baros mangrove area following Gubbay (2004). The zoning scenarios consist of various criteria that were generated from multiple parameters (**Table 1** for a detailed parameter and its source).

The next step was data collection of ecological and socioeconomic data for our SMCA. We applied an Analysis Hierarchy Process (AHP) matrix approach to determine weights for each criterion and factor. AHP allowed us to measure the importance of each parameter in each criterion in a hierarchical structure. This measurement helped with the decisions about which parameters or criterion were more or less important.



164 **Figure 2.** Flow chart of the study method using SMCA in the mangrove area.

165 2.2.1 Spatial Multi-criteria Analysis (SMCA)

166 2.2.1.1 Identification of criteria

167 Defining the criteria for conservation options (Habtemariam & Fang, 2016) is a
 168 key requirements for the spatial multi-criteria approach. These criteria can be established
 169 by examining social data, such as stakeholder preferences, to identify priority areas for
 170 various uses (Strager & Rosenberger, 2006), but also the environmental and socio-
 171 economic functions of the area (Portman, 2007). However, here, we did not only rely on
 172 stakeholders' perceptions or preferences concerning land management options. We also
 173 investigated several ecological data types that were collected to justify whether the area
 174 was suitable for such criteria. For example, we explored potential physical disturbances
 175 such as abrasion to capture the protection services of mangroves. Based on our field
 176 observations, the Baros area is prone to abrasion and flooding of coastal land, so we
 177 included Accessibility and Potential Disturbance (APD) as one of the criteria assessed in
 178 this study. Identifying criteria that are relevant for the location is important and can be
 179 undertaken by looking at either the social or ecological aspects.

180 Criteria used in this study included Natural Value of Coastal Environment (NVC),
 181 Commercial Value (CMV), Recreational and Cultural Value (RCV) and Accessibility
 182 and Potential Disturbance (APD). NVC describes the mangrove function as protection of

183 farming land from salty wind and salt-water intrusion. Farmers reported that salty wind
 184 and salt-water from the sea are the biggest threats to their crops, resulting in severely
 185 damaged crops and decreasing production. If the area is to be expanded as conservation
 186 land to maintain its value/benefit, several parameters were required to build the NVC
 187 criterion. Here, we used ecological data, for instance, water quality, chlorophyll and
 188 plankton identification, along with the significance of the mangrove to develop the NVC
 189 criterion (**Table 1**). These data described the suitability of the area for a mangrove
 190 nursery and planting, besides its function as a green-belt area for farming.

191 The commercial value (CMV) of the mangrove ecosystem in Baros was reported
 192 as a commercial benefit to local people. The mangroves have benefited locals in three
 193 different ways; a) they have served as a fish habitat to improve fishers' yields, b) they
 194 provided a brackish water habitat suitable for shrimp aquaculture that is an important
 195 income stream, and c) they increased biodiversity/vegetation in the surrounding
 196 terrestrial area used as a feeding area by cattlemen (grazing cows, goats and ducks). Thus,
 197 we used three parameters to build the CMV criterion: aquaculture, feedlots and
 198 traditional fishing.

199 The Recreational and Cultural Value (RCV) encompasses mangrove benefits for
 200 tourism and education purposes. There was a camping ground that was established to
 201 allow people to spend the night in the natural area the mangroves provide, including
 202 research and bird watching. The parameters required to develop the RCV criterion
 203 included education, research and tourism.

204 **Table 1.** Details of criteria, type and source of data used in this study

Criteria	Parameter	Type of Data	Source of Data and Methods			
			Remote Sensing Imagery	Interview/questionnaire	Field obs.	GIS
Natural Value of Coastal Environment (NVC)	Green-belt area for farming	Water quality	-	-	X Sampling using various laboratory tools	Interpolation
	Mangrove nursery and planting	Chlorophyll & Plankton	-	-	X Sampling using a plankton net	Interpolation
		Important value index of mangrove	-	-	X Quadrant transect	
Commercial Value (CMV)	Aquaculture	aquaculture area and its economic value	-	X	X	Interpolation
	Feedlots	Feeding ground and its economic value	-	X	X	Interpolation
	Traditional fishing	Fishing ground and its economic value	-	X	X	Interpolation
Recreational and Cultural Value (RCV)	Education and research	Sites and their economic value	-	X	X	Interpolation
	Tourism; bird watching and camping		-	X	X	Interpolation
Accessibility and Potential Disturbance (APD)	Coastal abrasion and flood	Area of prone disaster	X	X	X	Visual interpretation and interpolation

205

206 2.2.1.2 Identification of zoning scenario

207 We propose and analyse three different management zones for the conservation
208 area in Baros (Gubbay, 2004):

209 1) Restricted access zone

210 This area is established as a no-take and no entry zone focused on improving
211 ecological habitat. A mangrove nursery could be located in this area to support
212 future mangrove expansion.

213 2) Sanctuary zone

214 This zone is highly protected and free from commercial use. However, low-risk
215 activities, such as tourism and education/research may be allowed.

216 3) Habitat protection zone

217 This area allows access for commercial use with clear rules regarding how the local
218 community can access and use the area.

219 2.2.2 Analysis Hierarchy Process (AHP) in SMCA

220 2.2.2.1 Criteria and scenario weighting for AHP

221 Weights were given to each parameter and criterion to construct the AHP matrix,
222 following the method introduced by Saaty (1977). The matrix has a row and column,
223 listing all parameters or criteria in each row and column. A matrix construction aims to
224 calculate the weight and score of each parameter to indicate which parameter is stronger
225 in comparison to others.. Measuring the weight using the AHP allowed many criteria to
226 be simplified and numbered. It should be noted that this comes from individual
227 preferences or perspectives about ecosystem services. Furthermore, AHP is easily
228 compatible with GIS ranking models (Strager & Rosenberger, 2006). The paired
229 comparison analysis is based on the matrix (Saaty, 1977):

230

$$\begin{array}{c|cccc}
 & A_1 & A_2 & \dots & A_n \\
 \hline
 A_1 & W_1/W_1 & W_1/W_2 & \dots & W_1/W_n \\
 A_2 & W_2/W_1 & W_2/W_2 & \dots & W_2/W_n \\
 \vdots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\
 A_n & W_3/W_1 & W_3/W_2 & \dots & W_3/W_n
 \end{array}$$

231

(1)

232

233 A = parameters; criteria

234 W = weight

235

236 Here, we first valued each parameter within each criterion by assigning weights.
237 Weights can be drawn from local knowledge or by asking stakeholders about their
238 individual preferences (Strager & Rosenberger, 2006). We employed several data, such
239 as economic calculations of mangrove services, ecological survey, and social survey to
240 help us justify the value of each parameter. Then, each parameter within each criterion
241 and each criterion within each scenario was subsequently weighted for pairwise
242 comparisons and suitability rating using Analysis Hierarchy Process (AHP) analysis
243 (Table 2).

244 **Table 2.** Suitability and importance value for each criterion

Comparative Importance	Suitability Rating	Numerical Expression*
Equal importance	Not suitable	1

Moderate importance of one over another	Marginally suitable	3
Essential or strong importance	Moderately suitable	5
Very strong importance	Highly suitable	7
Extreme importance	Optimally suitable	9
Intermediate values		2,4,6,8

*following Saaty (1977) and Zabihi et al., (2019)

The weight assignment was based on the importance value and suitability between each parameter. For example, here in the NVC matrix, water quality (listed in column) and chlorophyll (listed in row) were only moderately linked (given a value of 5), while water quality had a very strong importance for the value index of the mangroves (given a value of 8). An identical parameter (when a parameter/criterion is compared to itself), such as water quality (listed in row) and water quality (listed in column) is given equal importance presented by the number 1. However, not only identical parameter was given equal importance. Certain parameters, for example, traditional fishing and aquaculture, were also equally important, because they were considered as similar activities that had a similar impact on the mangroves and had a similar annual economic benefit to the community (Supplementary methods F Matrix calculation 1 and 2).

The similar process of weight assignments were also applied to construct AHP matrix for each criterion within each scenario. For example, here in all matrix scenarios for Restricted Access Zone, Sanctuary Zone and Habitat Protection Zone, APD (listed in row) and NVC (listed in column) were strong importance one to other (given value of 5) because nature value of mangrove ecosystem and accessibility of mangrove ecosystem and its potential disturbance had to be strongly considered when designing mangrove conservation zone (Supplementary methods F Matrix calculation 3).

In order to validate the derived scores, we calculated the Consistency Ratio (CR) for the AHP matrix based on the matrix' Eigenvalue and a Consistency Index (CI) (Saaty, 1977):

$$\lambda_{\max} = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \left(\frac{\omega_j}{\omega_i} \right) \dots \dots \dots (2)$$

a_{ij} is A from the matrix (1)

ω = weight

λ_{\max} = maximum eigen value

$$\text{Consistency Index (CI)} = \frac{\lambda_{\max} - n}{n - 1} \dots \dots \dots (3)$$

n = number of elements

$$\text{Consistency Ratio (CR)} = \text{CI/RI} \dots \dots \dots (4)$$

where RI is the random index (Table 3).

Table 3. Random index matrix following Saaty (1980).

Number of criteria	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
RI	0.00	0.58	0.90	1.12	1.24	1.32	1.41	1.45	1.49	1.51

285 The matrix calculation has a Consistency Ratio (CR) between 0.051 (5.1%) and 0.094
286 (9.4%) (Supplementary methods F). CR is the value of the Consistency Index divided by
287 the Index of the corresponding random matrix. The assessment of the importance of each
288 criterion may be inconsistent/unreliable if the CR value exceeds 0.1 (10%) (Saaty, 1977).
289 It is important to calculate the CR and ensure that the assessment is reliable prior to
290 making a decision.

291 2.3 Data collection

292 2.3.1 Spatial ecological and environmental data

293 Mangrove data were collected using a quadrat sampling method that captured a
294 100m² area in each station. The sample area was marked using a 40m rope (creating a
295 quadrat with 10m sides), and mangrove data were collected, i.e., species, number of
296 mangrove trees in the area and diameter of mangrove trees, following the method
297 employed by Curtis and McIntosh (1950) (Supplementary methods B).

298 The coastal area south of Yogyakarta, where the Baros mangrove forest was
299 established, is prone to coastal abrasion. The sandy beach material in the study area is
300 vulnerable to change due to erosion or sedimentation (Saputro et al., 2017). Therefore,
301 we also included data for coastal abrasion estimation in the area (as Accessibility and
302 Potential Disturbance criterion) for future decisions in managing the Baros mangroves.
303 These data were collected using satellite datasets, interviewing local people, undertaking
304 a literature study and via field observation. The classification was determined based on
305 two factors, i.e., elevation and distance from the shoreline (Naufal et al., 2019).

306 Firstly, we studied an abrasion susceptibility assessment in Baros (Naufal et al.,
307 2019) (Supplementary methods D). Secondly, we asked local people to identify areas
308 affected by abrasion. Then, using Google Earth, we marked areas based on interview
309 data. Finally, we gathered all the information above to identify mangrove areas that are
310 susceptible to abrasion. Additional ecological data, such as water quality and
311 phytoplankton were taken from published data (Agustina, 2014) (Supplementary data C
312 and D).

313 2.3.2 Spatial socio-economic data

314 A total of 72 respondents were identified using the snowball sampling method or
315 chain-referral-sampling (Somekh and Lewin, 2005). We first interview the leader of
316 village and ask him to separately provide a list of potential key informants most suited to
317 answer questions related to our study. Using gatekeepers (leader of village and local
318 NGO) to identify key informants can reduce the risk of getting false information because
319 they (the gatekeepers) know better than anyone especially about the area, conservation
320 projects, related rules and activities. Asking various gatekeepers can minimise any
321 potential bias, leading to one reliable and accurate list of information. From the key
322 informants, we went into the field and asked farmers/fisher/cattleman who are currently
323 working on the field inside and outside mangrove area to fill out our questionnaire.

324 Qualitative data were collected using a questionnaire comprising open-ended
325 questions for the respondents, and in-depth interviews, using a topic guide, for key
326 informants. The questions in the questionnaire covered the perceptions of each individual
327 in the community regarding mangrove benefits, their participation in mangrove
328 conservation activities, management of the mangrove and their knowledge of the
329 mangrove's conditions and locations. A Likert scale (5 points from completely disagree
330 to completely agree) was applied to record each respondent's answer to each question.
331 The questionnaire also collected quantitative data, such as the economic value associated
332 with the mangroves and the total number of each ecosystem service used by each
333 individual in the community (how often and how many people benefit from mangrove

ecosystem services) (Trialfhianty et al., 2014, Supplementary data E and F). To calculate the economic value, people were asked by means of the questionnaire what benefit they received from the mangrove and the value associated with it. For example, if they thought that the existence of the mangrove provides a habitat for fishes and they were fishing in the area, we asked them how much profit (production minus effort) they earn from the fishing activity.

Data were processed using SPSS IBM 26 for statistical analysis. Prior to the data collection, the questionnaire was piloted with a small set of volunteers to reduce errors and misunderstandings.

2.4 Spatial analysis and prioritisation

Spatial analysis to conduct interpretation and interpolation procedures used ArcGIS Pro software to create spatial data related to the Baros mangroves (Menno-Jan Kraak & Ormeling, 2010). We created maps pertaining to each parameter and criteria, which are subsequently combined to create a conservation and management map for each scenario. Spatial data was acquired from UAV photography using fixed-wing and completed with Ground Control Points (GCPs) in 2011, high-resolution satellite imagery derived from SPOT 6 and Worldview-2 in 2013. These data were collected from *Badan Informasi Geospasial* (Geospatial Information Agency as national map authority of Indonesia).

Interpretation, together with the digitisation of remote sensing imagery, was conducted using visual techniques to generate land use maps (Shalaby & Tateishi, 2007) and to identify vulnerability to abrasion and flooding (Marfai, 2011). Land-use maps were employed to define the zoning scenario and distinguish the boundary between mangroves and other land uses nearby, while a vulnerability map was employed to define Accessibility and Potential Disturbance (APD) criterion. The overall accuracy percentage for this map is 88 % (Supplementary methods A).

Inverse distance weighting (IDW) interpolation was utilised to convert field measurement data into a spatial data set (Varatharajan et al., 2018). IDW interpolation works by predicting a value for an unmeasured area using weights based on the value of neighbouring areas. The influence of a measured point is diminished by the distance from that point (Lu and Wong, 2008). The coordinate points of the five sample locations were converted into a shapefile in ArcGIS as a parameter layer, together with the score given for each parameter as data attributes.

IDW interpolation enabled the calculation of raster format data that covers every specific location on a map (Siska & Hung, 2001). However, standardisation was required to normalise the data using fuzzy logic, so that each had the same interval on a continuous scale between 0 to 1 (Malczewski, 2004, in Hizbaron et al., 2012). A criteria map was derived by combining parameter maps of each criterion through an overlay process using the Spatial Analyst Tool in ArcGIS, which weighs the value of each parameter in each criterion according to the AHP process (Habtemariam & Fang, 2016). The last calculation defined the scenario map that combines all criteria with different weight value compositions (Habtemariam & Fang, 2016). This process applied the same technique (IDW interpolation) as described previously and it resulted in three different final maps.

3 Results

Three zoning scenarios consist of various weights relating to each criterion assigned using the AHP tool (**Figure 3**). The NVC criterion weight varies among zoning scenarios by 65.8% (read from 0.658, Figure 3) for a restricted access zone, 55.4% for a sanctuary zone and 50.8% for a habitat protection zone. These results demonstrate that the largest protected area has the largest NVC value, because it reveals which area is suitable for mangrove planting to support its function as green-belt area for crop protection. In contrast to this, the CMV weights

383 were decreased from 21.3% in the habitat protection zone to 15% in the sanctuary zone and
 384 7.5% in the restricted access zone. The expansion of the protected area would diminish the
 385 commercial value of mangroves, because fewer people would be able to visit the area for
 386 fishing, grazing or to set up aquaculture activities.

387 Interestingly, the NVC criterion had the largest value in all scenarios. If we look closely
 388 at the NVC's parameters, it consists of water quality, chlorophyll, and important value of
 389 mangrove, from which water quality weighed 74.2%. This result showed that water quality is
 390 the most essential element that support many activities in mangrove areas, such as fishing,
 391 aquaculture, mangrove planting and recreation.






Figure 3. The summary of weights in each criterion and scenario in each conservation zone.

397 Geospatial interpretation of the spatial multi-criteria analysis results confirmed that each
 398 zoning scenario has a different management scheme based on criteria weights (**Figure 3**). We
 399 divided the suitability value into three categories. The lowest values represent areas that are
 400 suitable for utilisation, the middle value (ranging from 0.4 to 0.6) represents areas that may be
 401 used for both utilisation and protection. The highest values represent areas that are suitable for
 402 a protected area.

403 Both Sanctuary Zone and Habitat Protection Zone scenarios revealed results that were
 404 virtually similar (**Figure 4**), only the area suitable for utilisation in Habitat Protection Zone is
 405 bigger than in Sanctuary Zone. In all scenarios, we found that location 5 (middle area) was
 406 suitable for utilisation or commercial purposes, for instance, traditional fishing, aquaculture
 407 and feedlots. An alternative location was suitable for a buffer zone or an area that could support
 408 limited commercial purposes and encourage ecosystem protection, such as recreational and
 409 educational activities. These zones also displayed similar weight proportions with respect to
 410 the NVC, CMV, RCV and APD criteria. The Sanctuary Zone has a NVC of 55.4%. This is
 411 followed by APD (21.4%), RCV (8.2%) and CMV (15%), whereas the Habitat Protection Zone
 412 has a NVC (50.8%), followed by APD (21.1%), RCV (6.8%) and CMV (21.3%).






Values	Description
0.2 – 0.4	Suitable for utilisation
0.4 – 0.6	Moderate
0.6 – 0.8	Suitable for protected area

413
414
415

416 **Figure 4.** Map of Baros mangrove area under several scenarios, such as Restricted Area Zone,
417 Sanctuary Zone and Habitat Protection Zone determined by its suitability value and proportion
418 of criteria weight, such as the Natural Value of Coastal Environment (NVC), Commercial
419 Value (CMV), Recreational and Cultural Value (RCV) and Accessibility and Potential
420 Disturbance (APD).

421 The combination of the analysis in the three maps above shows a finalised map of the
422 mangrove conservation zone (**Figure 5**), the middle area of the mangrove is suitable for
423 commercial utilisation as Habitat Protection Zone (sample location 5), with the area outside it
424 appropriate for recreational and educational purposes. The outer area of the mangrove is
425 suitable for protection with nursery and planting areas. In the protected zone (read as Restricted
426 Area Zone on the map), shows that sample locations 1, 2, 4 and 6 need to be protected. These
427 areas are highly suitable to support mangrove nursery and planting, and function as a green-
428 belt to protect farming areas. Mangrove nurseries can be located in dry areas far from the
429 river/estuary. When the seedlings are ready, they can be transferred to a muddy substrate
430 located on the edge of the river/estuary.

431
432



445 **Figure 5.** Proposed conservation zoning area for the Baros Mangrove.

446 **4 Discussion**

447 This paper presents how Spatial Multi-Criteria Analysis (SMCA) and the Analytic
448 Hierarchy Process (AHP) can be applied for spatial planning in mangroves. A case study was
449 conducted in the Baros mangrove area, Indonesia. The area has several specific characteristics,
450 such as: (1) the mangrove ecosystem was established by the local community and later
451 managed by the local government; (2) it provides both economic and ecological benefits to
452 local people; and (3) it is used simultaneously for several activities related to commerce,

453 recreation, and conservation. For spatial planning, we applied the SMCA method which
454 allowed us to include both qualitative and quantitative data drawn from social, economic and
455 ecological surveys. We were thus able to include local stakeholder values. The inclusion of
456 local stakeholder values in conservation planning is critical to understand human influence on
457 resources, examine multiple-use objectives and identify and resolve conflicts within the area
458 (Pomeroy and Douvere, 2008). Spatial analysis that is supported by quantitative and qualitative
459 data suggests that the management scenarios identified here should be well-understood by
460 various stakeholders from various backgrounds, because they highlight which areas need to be
461 protected or utilised. The outcomes of this study may also be suitable for future decision-
462 making about management-related conservation for a particular area. It is imperative that
463 effective decisions are made, with the aim of ensuring that conservation projects achieve good
464 outcomes for both local community and environment. By examining the result of this study,
465 we argue that the common approach to conservation zoning introduced through biosphere
466 reserves may not be appropriate for certain ecosystems in specific areas due to their particular
467 ecological or socioeconomic conditions.

468 The SMCA in this study follows the methods of several other case studies conducted by
469 Habtemariam & Fang, (2016); Villa et al., (2002); Raaijmakers, Krywkow & van der Veen,
470 (2008) and Strager & Rosenberger, (2006). SMCA is a proven approach to combine multi-
471 criteria decision analysis and spatial analysis to achieve effective management decisions under
472 several scenarios or options. The method supports decision-making in complex environments
473 and combines both quantitative and qualitative data (Varatharajan et al., 2018). SMCA also has
474 been widely used in intra-disciplinary studies, including land suitability for crops (Rahman and
475 Saha, 2008); land-suitability for construction (Jamali et al., 2014); determining natural hazard
476 susceptible areas (Karlsson et al., 2017); urban land-use planning (Mosadeghi et al., 2015) and
477 for mangrove management such as mangrove vulnerability assessment (Omo-Irabor et al.,
478 2011) which also include social and ecological data into its analysis. Most of the studies in
479 SMCA were using various, quantitative and qualitative data into the analysis to create a detailed
480 and specific goal either in management or conservation. Thus, a method in this study that uses
481 SMCA and AHP tool with various data and assessment including socioeconomic can also be
482 applied to any spatial planning for any purposes including conservation in mangrove area not
483 only in Indonesia but also other parts of the world with similar environments.

484 The use of various data in conservation planning to support the decision-making process
485 for future management is essential. Spatial analysis and planning also help to clarify the
486 management objectives and reduce conflict by involving stakeholder perceptions and interests
487 to support the analysis (Collie et al., 2013). In this study, we also included ecosystem services
488 data by asking respondents what sort of benefits they obtain from the mangroves. Integrating
489 ecosystem services data into spatial planning can reduce the trade-offs between ecological and
490 socioeconomic aspects (Grêt-Regamey et al., 2017), thus, strengthening the analysis for future
491 management options. Furthermore, the inclusion of socioeconomic value in this study also
492 helps to provide reliable data and analysis. For example, the Baros mangrove area has a total
493 feedlots value of US\$1,458.23/ha/year (Supplementary data F) that is higher than fishing or
494 aquaculture economic value. Thus, under CMV criterion, feedlots has the highest weight
495 among all parameters. Our study revealed that the use of various quantitative and qualitative
496 ecological and socioeconomic data is vital and will better support local conservation
497 management planning and decision-making.

498 Using the AHP tool in SMCA has a potential drawback, because AHP is not capable to
499 address uncertainty inherent to the social data (such as individual perceptions in the community
500 and expert's perception). Although we have calculated the Consistency Ratio (CR) to ensure
501 that we had a reliable judgement, we need a sensitivity analysis included in the process of
502 assigning weights in AHP. Thus, we recommend including matrix sensitivity or weight

503 sensitivity (Chen et al., 2010; 2013) for future studies using AHP tool in SMCA. In this case,
504 we need to emphasise that although the final result of this study has proposed what we believe
505 to be an ideal mangrove conservation zone, it is important to validate the result with all
506 stakeholders (local community, manager and local government) before any action can be taken
507 to avoid disagreement and conflict in the future.

508 Biosphere reserves, with the concept of spatial zoning for conservation, were introduced
509 by UNESCO (1996). These reserves have a core zone (non-take zone) surrounded by a buffer
510 zone, where low-impact human activities are possible. Beyond the buffer zone is an outer area,
511 known as a transition zone, that allows medium-impact activities, such as small-scale farming
512 and selective fishing (Coetzer et al., 2014). This concept is used for protected areas around the
513 globe, where managers plan for a non-take zone protected by a buffer and transition zone,
514 supposedly to enable resource accumulation in the core with spill-over into the buffer or
515 transition zones and to build cooperation between human and conservation where both
516 activities are possible (Jaisankar et al., 2018).

517 In contrast, this case study discovered the opposite. The outer area is suitable for a
518 protected area and the middle is most suited to commercial activity (**Figure 5**). Mangrove
519 nurseries must be protected from anthropogenic disturbance, for instance, waste, destructive
520 human activities and are frequently located in areas far from the river/estuary. In this study, the
521 area that would be identified as a buffer zone following the UNESCO approach would be more
522 suited to be a core habitat because the area is essential for the survival and preservation of
523 biological diversity (Semlitsch et al., 2001). Similar to this, the conservation zone in Matang
524 Mangrove Forest also showed that most of restricted and protected area are at the outer zone,
525 whereas all productive zone (cultivation zone) located in the centre area of the mangrove (Otero
526 et al., 2019). In addition, landward buffer zones need to be placed to maintain mangrove
527 development (Harty, 2004) and all human settlement needs to locate at least >10 km from the
528 outer mangrove zone (Vaghela et al., 2018). These discoveries make zoning for mangrove
529 conservation potentially different to what is used for other ecosystems or other local contexts.
530 Thus, further studies on spatial conservation zoning in mangrove forests are crucial.

531 **5 General Implications**

532 Mangrove ecosystems are unique as they are located at the interface of estuaries, the sea,
533 and land ecosystems. A study involving a mangrove suitability index showed that most
534 mangroves can only survive with muddy substrate (Chakraborty et al., 2019). Furthermore, the
535 juvenile of mangrove trees needs to be protected from the strong waves while receiving a
536 brackish water from river and sea. Thus, mangrove conservation planning can be hard if not
537 supported by multi-disciplinary knowledge that involves ecology and social aspects, including
538 stakeholder perceptions and local understanding on mangrove socio-cultural and economic
539 dimensions (Borges et al., 2017).

540 In this study, we plan a multi-use zoning plan for mangroves in Baros. We believe that
541 our approach could be applied elsewhere, particularly for areas with heterogeneously
542 distributed mangroves. The Baros mangrove area is approximately 5-hectare large and has been
543 benefiting locals by providing shelter for fish, blocking salty wind onto croplands, providing
544 space for shrimp aquaculture, and providing a natural venue for tourism. The extent of
545 ecosystem services provided by mangroves and the size of mangrove area in different places
546 might require different approaches depending on the services presence (e.g. firewood
547 availability in larger mangroves (Christensen et al., 2008) that was not considered for Baros)
548 and the preferences of the community. These different considerations are particularly relevant
549 for old-growth mangrove forests, where sustainable management requires considering the
550 biodiversity and socio-economic value of old versus restored mangroves, accessibility, and
551 wider ecosystem impacts beyond the local scope that we discuss here. Yet, considering multiple

552 factors, including social, cultural, ecological and community values, and their spatial context,
553 will always be a crucial component of mangrove management.

554 **Acknowledgements**

555 This study supported by Indonesia Endowment Funds for Education (LPDP) scholarship. We
556 are grateful to Sandra Agustina, Andromeda Noholo, Perbawa Agung, KP2B (*Kelompok*
557 *Pemuda Pemudi Baros*) team, Handoko and PGSP *Badan Informasi Geospasial* for their great
558 contributions in helping with data collections. The research instruments used in this study were
559 assessed and approved by Universitas Gadjah Mada, and research permits for surveys were
560 issued by Bantul Regency, Yogyakarta Province. We thank all anonymous reviewers for their
561 feedback that helped improving our manuscript.

562 **References**

- 563 Adeel, Z., & Pomeroy, R., 2002. Assessment and management of mangrove ecosystems in
564 developing countries. *Trees*, 16(2-3), 235-238.
- 565 Agustina, S., 2014. Komunitas Fitoplankton Di Perairan Mangrove Baros Kabupaten Bantul.
566 *Thesis*. Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta.
- 567 Andika, I. B. M. B., Kusmana, C., & Nurjaya, I. W., 2019. Dampak pembangunan jalan tol
568 Bali Mandara terhadap ekosistem mangrove di Teluk Benoa Bali. *Journal of Natural*
569 *Resources and Environmental Management*, 9(3), 641-657.
- 570 Alongi, D.M., 2002. Present state and future of the world's mangrove forests. *Environmental*
571 *Conservation*, 29, 331-349.
- 572 Batisse, M., 1990. Development and implementation of the biosphere reserve concept and its
573 applicability to coastal regions. *Environmental Conservation*, 17(2), 111-116.
- 574 Boggia, A., Massei, G., Pace, E., Rocchi, L., Paolotti, L., & Attard, M., 2018. Spatial
575 multicriteria analysis for sustainability assessment: A new model for decision making.
576 *Land Use Policy*, 71, 281-292.
- 577 Borges, R., Ferreira, A. C., & Lacerda, L. D., 2017. Systematic planning and ecosystem-based
578 management as strategies to reconcile mangrove conservation with resource
579 use. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 4, 353.
- 580 Chakraborty, S., Sahoo, S., Majumdar, D., Saha, S., & Roy, S., 2019. Future Mangrove
581 Suitability Assessment of Andaman to strengthen sustainable development. *Journal of*
582 *Cleaner Production*, 234, 597-614.
- 583 Chen, Y., Yu, J., Khan, S., 2010. Spatial sensitivity analysis of multi-criteria weights in GIS-
584 based land suitability evaluation. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 25, 1582e1591
- 585 Chen, Y., Yu, J. and Khan, S., 2013. The spatial framework for weight sensitivity analysis in
586 AHP-based multi-criteria decision making. *Environmental modelling & software*, 48,
587 pp.129-140.
- 588 Christensen, S. M., Tarp, P., & Hjortsø, C. N., 2008. Mangrove forest management planning
589 in coastal buffer and conservation zones, Vietnam: a multimethodological approach
590 incorporating multiple stakeholders. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 51(10), 712-726.
- 591 Comino, E., Bottero, M., Pomarico, S., & Rosso, M., 2016. The combined use of Spatial
592 Multicriteria Evaluation and stakeholders analysis for supporting the ecological
593 planning of a river basin. *Land Use Policy*, 58, 183-195.

- 594 Cortina, C., & Boggia, A., 2014. Development of policies for Natura 2000 sites: A multi-
595 criteria approach to support decision makers. *Journal of environmental management*,
596 *141*, 138-145.
- 597 Collie, J. S., Beck, M. W., Craig, B., Essington, T. E., Fluharty, D., Rice, J., & Sanchirico, J.
598 N., 2013. Marine spatial planning in practice. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf*
599 *Science*, *117*, 1-11.
- 600 Curtis JT., 1959. The vegetation of Wisconsin. An Ordination of Plant Communities.
601 University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, p 657.
- 602 Curtis JT, McIntosh RP., 1950, The Interrelations of certain analytic and synthetic photo socio
603 logical characters. *Ecology* *31*:438–455
- 604 Coetzer, K.L., E.T.F. Witkowski, and B.F.N. Erasmus. 2014. Reviewing Biosphere Reserves
605 globally: Effective conservation action or bureaucratic label? *Biological Reviews* *89*:
606 82–104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12044>
- 607 Danumah, J. H., Odai, S. N., Saley, B. M., Szarzynski, J., Thiel, M., Kwaku, A., ... & Akpa, L.
608 Y., 2016. Flood risk assessment and mapping in Abidjan district using multi-criteria
609 analysis (AHP) model and geoinformation techniques,(cote
610 d’ivoire). *Geoenvironmental Disasters*, *3*(1), 1-13.
- 611 Fachrul, M.F. 2007. Metode Sampling Bioekologi. Bumi Aksara. Jakarta.
- 612 Habtemariam, B. T., & Fang, Q., 2016. Zoning for a multiple-use marine protected area using
613 spatial multi-criteria analysis: The case of the Sheik Seid Marine National Park in
614 Eritrea. *Marine Policy*, *63*, 135-143.
- 615 Jaisankar, I., Velmurugan, A., & Sivaperuman, C., 2018. Biodiversity Conservation: Issues and
616 Strategies for the Tropical Islands. In *Biodiversity and Climate Change Adaptation in*
617 *Tropical Islands* (pp. 525-552). Academic Press.
- 618 Jamali, I.A., Mörtberg, U., Olofsson, B. and Shafique, M., 2014. A spatial multi-criteria
619 analysis approach for locating suitable sites for construction of subsurface dams in
620 Northern Pakistan. *Water resources management*, *28*(14), pp.5157-5174.
- 621 Giri, C., Ochieng, E., Tieszen, L. L., Zhu, Z., Singh, A., Loveland, T., ... & Duke, N., 2011.
622 Status and distribution of mangrove forests of the world using earth observation satellite
623 data. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, *20*(1), 154-159.
- 624 Giri, C., Zhu, Z., Tieszen, L.L., Singh, A., Gillette, S. & Kelmelis, J.A., 2008. Mangrove forest
625 distributions and dynamics (1975–2005) of the tsunami-affected region of Asia.
626 *Journal of Biogeography*, **35**, 519–528.
- 627 Goldberg, L., Lagomasino, D., Thomas, N. and Fatoyinbo, T., 2020. Global declines in human-
628 driven mangrove loss. *Global change biology*, *26*(10), pp.5844-5855.
- 629 Grêt-Regamey, A., Altwegg, J., Sirén, E. A., Van Strien, M. J., & Weibel, B. 2017. Integrating
630 ecosystem services into spatial planning—A spatial decision support tool. *Landscape*
631 *and Urban Planning*, *165*, 206-219.
- 632 Gubbay, S. Marine Protected Areas in the Context of Marine Spatial Planning – Discussion
633 Paper for WWF-UK (http://www.wwf.org.uk/filelibrary/pdf/zoning_mpa__msp.pdf),
634 2004.

- 635 Harty, C., 2004. Planning strategies for mangrove and saltmarsh changes in Southeast
636 Australia. *Coastal Management*, 32(4), 405-415.
- 637 Karlsson, C.S., Kalantari, Z., Mörtberg, U., Olofsson, B. and Lyon, S.W., 2017. Natural hazard
638 susceptibility assessment for road planning using spatial multi-criteria
639 analysis. *Environmental management*, 60(5), pp.823-851.
- 640 Kiruba-Sankar, R., Krishnan, P., Dam Roy, S., Raymond Jani Angel, J., Goutham-Bharathi,
641 M. P., Lohith Kumar, K., ... & Ramesh, R., 2018. Structural complexity and tree species
642 composition of mangrove forests of the Andaman Islands, India. *Journal of Coastal
643 Conservation*, 22(2), 217-234.
- 644 Lu, G. Y., & Wong, D. W., 2008. An adaptive inverse-distance weighting spatial interpolation
645 technique. *Computers & geosciences*, 34(9), 1044-1055.
- 646 Ludwig, J.A. and Reynolds. 1988. *Statistical Ecology : A Primer Methods and Computing*.
647 John Wiley and Sons. New York.
- 648 Marfai, M. A., 2011. The hazards of coastal erosion in Central Java, Indonesia: *Geografia :*
649 *Malaysian Journal of Society and Space*, 7(3), 1-9.
- 650 Malczewski, J., 2004. GIS-based land-use suitability analysis: a critical overview. *in* Hizbaron,
651 D. R., Baiquni, M., Sartohadi, J., & Rijanta, R. (2012). Urban vulnerability in Bantul
652 district, Indonesia—Towards safer and sustainable development. *Sustainability*, 4(9),
653 2022-2037.
- 654 Menno-Jan Kraak, & Ormeling, F., 2010. *Visualization of Spatial Data* (3rd Ed.). Pearson
655 Education.
- 656 Mendoza, G., Macoun, P., Prabhu, R., Sukadri, D., Purnomo, H., & Hartanto, H., 2000.
657 Guidelines for applying multi-criteria analysis to the assessment of criteria and
658 indicators. *Guidelines for applying multi-criteria analysis to the assessment of criteria
659 and indicators*.
- 660 Melià, P., 2017. Multi-criteria Decision-Making for Marine Protected Area Design and
661 Management. *Management of Marine Protected Areas*, 125-144.
- 662 Mosadeghi, R., Warnken, J., Tomlinson, R. and Mirfenderesk, H., 2015. Comparison of Fuzzy-
663 AHP and AHP in a spatial multi-criteria decision making model for urban land-use
664 planning. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 49, pp.54-65.
- 665 Naufal, M., Nandini, M., Rahmanu, Y. A., Najib, D. W. A., Kusumaningrum, P. B., Ahyar, M.
666 I., & Hizbaron, D. R., 2019. Disaster mapping as decision support system to decrease
667 abrasion impact due to climate change in Bantul Coastal Area. *IOP Conference Series:
668 Earth and Environmental Science*, 303(1), 012020. [https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-
669 1315/303/1/012020](https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/303/1/012020).
- 670 Omo-Irabor, O.O., Olobaniyi, S.B., Akunna, J., Venus, V., Maina, J.M. and Paradzayi, C.,
671 2011. Mangrove vulnerability modelling in parts of Western Niger Delta, Nigeria using
672 satellite images, GIS techniques and Spatial Multi-Criteria Analysis
673 (SMCA). *Environmental monitoring and assessment*, 178(1), pp.39-51.
- 674 Otero, V., Van De Kerchove, R., Satyanarayana, B., Mohd-Lokman, H., Lucas, R., &
675 Dahdouh-Guebas, F., 2019. An analysis of the early regeneration of mangrove forests
676 using Landsat time series in the Matang Mangrove Forest Reserve, Peninsular
677 Malaysia. *Remote Sensing*, 11(7), 774.

- 678 Phua, M.H. and Minowa, M., 2005. A GIS-based multi-criteria decision making approach to
679 forest conservation planning at a landscape scale: a case study in the Kinabalu Area,
680 Sabah, Malaysia. *Landscape and urban planning*, 71(2-4), pp.207-222.
- 681 Portman, M. E., 2007. Zoning design for cross-border marine protected areas: The Red Sea
682 Marine Peace Park case study. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 50(7), 499-522.
- 683 Pomeroy, R and Douvere, F, 2008. The Engagement of Stakeholders in the Marine Spatial
684 Plannong Process. *Marine Policy*, 32, 816-822.
- 685 Raaijmakers, R., Krywkow, J., & van der Veen, A., 2008. Flood risk perceptions and spatial
686 multi-criteria analysis: an exploratory research for hazard mitigation. *Natural hazards*,
687 46(3), 307-322.
- 688 Rahman, R. and Saha, S.K., 2008. Remote sensing, spatial multi criteria evaluation (SMCE)
689 and analytical hierarchy process (AHP) in optimal cropping pattern planning for a flood
690 prone area. *Journal of Spatial Science*, 53(2), pp.161-177.
- 691 Rizal, A., Sahidin, A., & Herawati, H., 2018. Economic value estimation of mangrove
692 ecosystems in Indonesia. *Biodiversity International Journal*, 2(1), 98-100.
- 693 Saaty, T. L., 1980. *The Analytic Hierarchy Process, Priority setting, Resource allocation*, Mc.
694 Graw-Hill, New York, 19.
- 695 Saaty, T. L., 1977. A scaling method for priorities in hierarchical structures. *Journal of*
696 *mathematical psychology*, 15(3), 234-281.
- 697 Saputro, G. B., Marschiavelli, M. I. C., Ibrahim, F., & Maulana, E., 2017. Identification of
698 typology related to the coastal line changes in Bantul. *IOP Conference Series: Earth*
699 *and Environmental Science*, 54(1), 012099. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/54/1/012099>.
- 701 Semlitsch, R. D., & Jensen, J. B., 2001. Core habitat, not buffer zone. *National wetlands*
702 *newsletter*, 23(4), 5-6.
- 703 Schmitt, K., & Duke, N. C., 2015. Mangrove management, assessment and
704 monitoring. *Tropical forestry handbook*, 1-29.
- 705 Shalaby, A., & Tateishi, R., 2007. Remote sensing and GIS for mapping and monitoring land
706 cover and land-use changes in the Northwestern coastal zone of Egypt. *Applied*
707 *Geography*, 27(1), 28-41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2006.09.004>
- 708 Siska, P. P., & Hung, I.-K., 2001. *Propagation of Errors in Spatial Analysis*.
- 709 Soegiarto, A. 1994. *Ekologi Kuantitatif*. Usaha Nasional. Surabaya.
- 710 Strager, M. P., & Rosenberger, R. S., 2006. Incorporating stakeholder preferences for land
711 conservation: Weights and measures in spatial MCA. *Ecological economics*, 57(4),
712 627-639.
- 713 Turisno, B. E., & Siti, M., 2020. The regulation and policy models of Pekalongan Local
714 Government toward mangrove conservation. *AACL Bioflux*, 13(5), 2910-2920.
- 715 Trialfhianty, T.I., Suadi, S. and Djumanto, D., 2014. Economic valuation of mangrove resource
716 in Baros Coast Tirtohargo Village Sub-District of Kretek. *J. Kawistara*, 4, pp.142-149.

- 717 UNESCO, 1996. *Biosphere reserves: The Seville strategy & the Statutory framework of the*
718 *World Network*. Paris: UNESCO
- 719 Vaghela, B. N., Parmar, M. G., Solanki, H. A., Kansara, B. B., Prajapati, S. K., & Kalubarme,
720 M. H., 2018. Multi criteria decision making (MCDM) approach for mangrove health
721 assessment using geo-informatics technology. *International Journal of Environment*
722 *and Geoinformatics*, 5(2), 114-131.
- 723 Varatharajan, R., Manogaran, G., Priyan, M. K., Balaş, V. E., & Barna, C., 2018. Visual
724 analysis of geospatial habitat suitability model based on inverse distance weighting with
725 paired comparison analysis. *Multimedia tools and applications*, 77(14), 17573-17593.
- 726 Van Oudenhoven, A. P., Siahainenia, A. J., Sualia, I., Tonneijck, F. H., van der Ploeg, S., de
727 Groot, R. S., ... & Leemans, R., 2015. Effects of different management regimes on
728 mangrove ecosystem services in Java, Indonesia. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 116,
729 353-367.
- 730 Vaghela, B.N., Parmar, M.G., Solanki, H.A., Kansara, B.B., Prajapati, S.K. And Kalubarme,
731 M.H., 2018. Multi criteria decision making (MCDM) approach for mangrove health
732 assessment using geo-informatics technology. *International Journal of Environment and*
733 *Geoinformatics*, 5(2), pp.114-131.
- 734 Vegh, T., Jungwiwattanaporn, M., Pendleton, L., & Murray, B. (2014). Mangrove ecosystem
735 services valuation: state of the literature. *NI WP*, 14-06.
- 736 Villa, F., Tunesi, L., & Agardy, T., 2002. Zoning marine protected areas through spatial
737 multiple-criteria analysis: the case of the Asinara Island National Marine Reserve of
738 Italy. *Conservation Biology*, 16(2), 515-526.
- 739 Yan, L., & Guizhu, C., 2007. Physiological adaptability of three mangrove species to salt
740 stress. *Acta Ecologica Sinica*, 27(6), 2208-2214.
- 741 Zenger, A., Warren, G., Hill, P., Robertson, D., Weidemann, A., & Lawton, K., 2011. Multi-
742 criteria assessment for linking regional conservation planning and farm-scale
743 actions. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, 26(1), 103-110.
- 744 Zabihi, H., Alizadeh, M., Kibet Langat, P., Karami, M., Shahabi, H., Ahmad, A., . . . Lee, S.,
745 2019. GIS Multi-Criteria Analysis by Ordered Weighted Averaging (OWA): toward an
746 integrated citrus management strategy. *Sustainability*, 11(4), 1009.
- 747