

OCEAN POLLUTION AND COASTAL LIVELIHOOD SECURITY

Dr. P. S. Asha

Principal Scientist and Scientist-in-Charge

Tuticorin Regional Station

ICAR–Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute (ICAR-CMFRI)

Thoothukudi, Tamil Nadu, India

Abstract

Ocean pollution has become a major threat to the ecological integrity of coastal areas and to the livelihood security of communities that depend on fisheries, aquaculture, tourism, small-scale trade, and marine resources. Plastic litter, untreated wastewater, nutrient runoff, industrial discharge, oil residues, and hazardous chemicals alter water quality, damage habitats, and reduce the availability and market value of marine products. These pressures are especially serious for households with limited income diversification and high dependence on daily coastal resources.

This review-based study examines the relationship between ocean pollution and coastal livelihood security through an environmental sustainability perspective. It analyses pollution pathways, ecosystem-level impacts, livelihood exposure, food security concerns, and institutional responses. The study brings together evidence from marine pollution research, coastal governance literature, fisheries reports, and environmental assessments to identify how ecological degradation is translated into economic and social vulnerability for coastal populations.

The analysis indicates that pollution affects livelihoods through declining fish catch, contamination risks, degradation of mangroves and coral reefs, reduced tourism attractiveness, higher health expenditures, and loss of workdays during pollution-related events. Effective livelihood security therefore requires pollution prevention at source, wastewater treatment, circular material systems, community-based monitoring, protection of coastal ecosystems, and inclusive access to adaptation support. Strengthening these measures can improve both marine ecosystem resilience and the long-term economic security of coastal communities.

Keywords: Ocean pollution; Coastal livelihoods; Marine plastic litter; Fisheries security; Wastewater discharge; Blue economy; Coastal governance; Environmental justice; Ecosystem resilience; Sustainable development

1. INTRODUCTION

Coastal regions support millions of people through fisheries, aquaculture, seafood processing, tourism, transport, salt production, and small-scale trade. These activities depend on healthy marine and coastal ecosystems, including mangroves, estuaries, beaches, sea grass beds, coral reefs, and nearshore waters. When these ecosystems are polluted, the consequences extend beyond environmental damage and directly affect employment, food availability, household income, public health, and the ability of communities to cope with shocks.

Ocean pollution originates from a wide range of land-based and sea-based sources. Mismanaged solid waste introduces plastic debris into rivers and coastal waters; untreated sewage carries pathogens and nutrients; agricultural runoff contributes to eutrophication; and industrial chemicals, oil

residues, and heavy metals can persist in sediments and food chains. These pollutants may interact with climate-related stressors, such as warming waters, extreme storms, and sea-level rise, creating cumulative pressure on coastal ecosystems and on people who rely on them.

The livelihood effects of pollution are often unevenly distributed. Small-scale fishers, fish vendors, shellfish collectors, tourism workers, women involved in post-harvest processing, and informal coastal workers may have limited savings, limited access to insurance, and few alternative employment opportunities. A decline in catch quality or beach cleanliness can therefore quickly translate into reduced income and increased household insecurity. Pollution also threatens food safety where contaminated seafood is consumed locally or rejected by markets.

Ocean pollution must consequently be understood as both an environmental and a social development issue. A narrow focus on waste removal after pollution reaches the sea is insufficient. Sustainable responses need prevention at source, resilient waste and wastewater systems, environmental monitoring, ecosystem restoration, and policies that protect the rights and livelihoods of affected communities. This paper evaluates these connected issues and identifies practical pathways for coastal livelihood security.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on marine pollution has documented the rapid accumulation of plastic waste, microplastics, nutrients, chemical contaminants, and untreated effluent in coastal and ocean environments. Research shows that pollution reduces habitat quality, disrupts food webs, increases disease and contamination risks, and imposes costs on fisheries and tourism. Studies of plastic waste have emphasized the links between poor waste management on land, river transport, and the accumulation of debris in marine ecosystems. A second body of literature examines livelihoods, vulnerability, and the blue economy. These studies show that coastal households are highly exposed when ecosystem services are degraded because incomes are commonly linked to seasonal catches, beach conditions, tourism demand, and natural resource access. The literature increasingly argues for integrated approaches that connect marine conservation, pollution control, social protection, community participation, and economic diversification. Such approaches are central to preventing environmental decline from becoming long-term livelihood insecurity.

2.1 MAJOR FORMS OF OCEAN POLLUTION

Plastic pollution is among the most visible forms of marine contamination. Large debris can entangle wildlife, obstruct fishing gear, and reduce the visual quality of beaches and coastal waters. Smaller fragments and microplastics can be ingested by marine organisms and may move through food chains. For coastal workers, plastic accumulation also creates operational burdens because nets, engines, landing sites, and fish handling areas require additional cleaning and repair.

Wastewater and nutrient pollution are equally important but less visible. Untreated domestic sewage and agricultural runoff can increase bacterial contamination and stimulate algal blooms. In enclosed bays and estuaries, excess nutrients may reduce oxygen levels and affect fish breeding and shellfish safety. Communities reliant on nearshore fisheries and aquaculture are vulnerable because pollution can reduce production, create public health concerns, and disrupt market access.

Industrial discharge, oil pollution, heavy metals, and persistent organic chemicals create additional risks. These pollutants may accumulate in sediments or organisms and can remain in the environment for extended periods. Accidental spills and chronic leakage affect coastal fishing grounds, ports, wetlands, and tourism sites. The economic harm may continue after visible pollution is removed because consumer confidence, ecosystem recovery, and local market demand can take longer to return.

Marine pollution is frequently cumulative. Plastic litter, nutrient loads, chemical contamination, coastal construction, and climate pressures can affect the same ecosystem at the same time. This cumulative nature requires assessment methods that consider multiple stressors rather than treating each pollutant as an isolated problem.

2.2 MARINE ECOSYSTEM DEGRADATION AND COMMUNITY EXPOSURE

Coastal ecosystems provide nursery grounds, shoreline protection, carbon storage, recreational value, and food resources. Mangroves, coral reefs, and sea grass beds are particularly important because they support fish populations and reduce exposure to waves and erosion. Pollution weakens these systems by smothering habitats, altering water chemistry, reducing light penetration, and increasing disease pressure on marine organisms.

The exposure of coastal communities depends on location, occupation, gender, income, and access to public services. Households located near polluted estuaries or dumping sites may face direct health risks, while fishers may be affected through lower catches, damaged equipment, or unsafe landing areas. Women who depend on fish drying, shellfish

collection, or small-scale vending may experience income loss when supply is reduced or seafood quality is questioned.

Tourism-dependent areas are also exposed. Beach litter, oil residues, poor water quality, and unpleasant odours can reduce visitor satisfaction and lower earnings for hotels, guides, restaurants, transport workers, and informal vendors. The effects can spread through the local economy because tourism supports numerous secondary jobs and small businesses.

These pathways show why coastal livelihood security should include environmental quality, health protection, decent work, food safety, access to information, and participation in decision making. Pollution management that does not account for social conditions may fail to protect the people who are most directly affected.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The primary object of this study is to investigate how ocean pollution affects the security, stability, and sustainability of coastal livelihoods. The paper examines the relationship between pollution sources, ecological degradation, and the economic and social conditions of households that depend on coastal and marine resources.

The study focuses on key pollution categories including plastic debris, microplastics, wastewater, nutrient runoff, chemical contamination, and oil-related pollution. It evaluates how these pollutants alter fisheries productivity, seafood safety, tourism conditions, public health, work opportunities, and local resource governance.

A further objective is to identify the mechanisms through which environmental exposure becomes livelihood vulnerability. These mechanisms include loss of catch, declining product quality, damaged gear, reduced tourism demand, higher costs of health care and clean-up, limited access to markets, and weakened community confidence in coastal resources.

Finally, the study considers pollution prevention, ecosystem restoration, social protection, community monitoring, and inclusive coastal planning as interconnected strategies for strengthening livelihood security. The objective is not only to describe the

problem but also to clarify practical directions for sustainable and equitable action.

3.1 POLLUTION PATHWAYS AND ECOSYSTEM STRESS

This subsection examines the principal pathways through which pollutants enter coastal waters and affect marine ecosystems.

- Assessment of land-based waste leakage from settlements, markets, tourism areas, and river systems.
- Analysis of untreated wastewater, nutrient runoff, and pathogen exposure in coastal waters.
- Examination of plastic debris, ghost gear, and microplastic accumulation in beaches, sediments, and fishing grounds.
- Evaluation of industrial chemicals, heavy metals, oil residues, and hazardous discharge risks.
- Study of habitat degradation in mangroves, estuaries, coral reefs, and sea grass ecosystems.
- Consideration of cumulative interactions between pollution, climate stress, and coastal development.

The purpose is to identify the pollution pressures that most directly undermine ecosystem services used by coastal communities.

3.2 LIVELIHOOD SECURITY DIMENSIONS

This subsection evaluates the multiple dimensions of livelihood security that may be affected by ocean pollution.

- Fish catch, aquaculture output, and seafood quality for household consumption and local markets.
- Income stability for fishers, processors, vendors, tourism workers, and small coastal enterprises.
- Occupational safety, public health, and exposure to contaminated water and seafood.
- Condition of fishing gear, landing sites, beaches, and marine infrastructure.
- Access to markets, price stability, and consumer confidence in coastal products and destinations.
- Availability of alternative income opportunities, credit, social protection, and community support.

These dimensions are used to understand how environmental degradation can produce

immediate hardship as well as long-term loss of resilience.

3.3 GOVERNANCE AND COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

This subsection considers policy and community measures that can reduce pollution risks while strengthening local adaptive capacity.

- Waste prevention, segregation, collection, recycling, and extended producer responsibility systems.
- Treatment and monitoring of domestic wastewater, industrial discharge, and agricultural runoff.
- Community-led beach, river, and fishing-ground monitoring linked to local reporting systems.
- Protection and restoration of mangroves, wetlands, reefs, and other natural coastal buffers.
- Livelihood diversification, skill development, microfinance, and safety nets for affected households.
- Participatory coastal planning that includes fishers, women workers, youth, indigenous groups, and local enterprises.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a review-based, descriptive, analytical, and comparative methodology to examine ocean pollution and coastal livelihood security. The methodology integrates environmental science, coastal development, fisheries studies, and livelihood analysis to identify the links between pollutant exposure, ecosystem change, and household vulnerability.

The study is based on secondary evidence from peer-reviewed research articles, international environmental assessments, fisheries and coastal development reports, policy documents, and selected community-based studies. The material is interpreted through a thematic framework that considers pollution sources, ecosystem impacts, livelihood consequences, governance responses, and resilience options.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

The research follows a descriptive and comparative design to synthesize evidence on marine pollution and livelihood security.

Component	Description
Research Type	Review-based, descriptive, analytical, comparative
Approach	Environmental sustainability and livelihood security analysis
Data Source	Research articles, reports, policy documents, community studies
Analysis Method	Thematic synthesis and comparative impact assessment
Focus Area	Ocean pollution, ecosystem services, fisheries, tourism, and coastal resilience

4.2 SOURCES AND ANALYTICAL CATEGORIES

The study considers the following evidence categories for evaluation:

- Marine pollution and plastic leakage studies.
- Coastal water quality and wastewater assessments.
- Fisheries, aquaculture, and seafood safety reports.
- Tourism, marine debris, and local economic impact studies.

- Each evidence source is analysed based on:
- Pollution type and source pathway.
- Affected ecosystem or coastal habitat.
- Direct livelihood and food-security implications.
- Distribution of impacts across social groups.
- Governance, prevention, and recovery measures.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis synthesizes evidence on how ocean pollution influences coastal livelihood

security. The relationship is examined through a sequence of linked effects: pollutant release alters water quality or habitat condition; ecosystem functions such as fish nursery support, water filtration, and recreational value decline; and households experience reduced income, higher costs, food safety concerns, and greater uncertainty. This sequence demonstrates that marine pollution is not only an ecological issue but also a driver of economic vulnerability.

Plastic litter creates direct and indirect costs for fishing communities. Direct effects include gear entanglement, propeller damage, time spent removing debris, and reduced quality of landing sites. Indirect effects arise when plastic contamination affects the perceived safety or quality of seafood, reduces tourist arrivals, or shifts fish distribution. The burden can be especially high for small-scale operators who have little capacity to absorb repair costs or income interruptions.

Wastewater and nutrient pollution affect livelihoods through water-borne disease, shellfish contamination, algal blooms, and oxygen depletion. In coastal areas with limited sanitation infrastructure, households may be exposed through drinking water, bathing, fish handling, and consumption of locally harvested seafood. Aquaculture operations are also vulnerable when poor water quality leads to disease outbreaks or reduced growth rates. These risks can undermine both household nutrition and market reliability.

Chemical pollutants and oil residues may have longer recovery periods because they can persist in sediments and food chains. A visible spill can deter visitors immediately, but the livelihood effects may continue through fishery closures, product testing requirements, market distrust, and habitat restoration needs. Communities therefore need access to timely information, emergency support, and transparent monitoring systems.

The evidence also suggests that the impact of pollution is shaped by governance conditions. Where waste collection, sanitation, enforcement, and community participation are weak, pollution sources remain active and damage is repeated. By contrast, integrated waste systems, local monitoring, restoration programmes, and livelihood diversification

can reduce both exposure and dependence on a single polluted resource base.

6. DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that ocean pollution and coastal livelihood security are tightly interconnected. Marine ecosystems are productive assets for coastal communities, and pollution reduces the value of these assets by degrading water quality, habitats, and resource availability. The resulting losses are not limited to fishers. They are distributed across processors, traders, tourism workers, transport providers, informal vendors, and households that depend on affordable seafood.

One important observation is that prevention at source is more effective than relying solely on coastal clean-up. Beach clean-ups can create awareness and remove visible waste, but they do not stop the continuous flow of plastics, sewage, nutrients, and chemicals from upstream sources. Long-term solutions require waste reduction, reliable collection systems, recycling and reuse, treatment of wastewater, cleaner production, and enforcement of discharge standards.

The discussion also highlights the importance of environmental justice. Low-income communities may contribute least to pollution but often live closest to polluted waterways, dumping sites, and degraded shores. They may lack access to clean water, secure tenure, formal employment, insurance, or political representation. Policies must therefore combine pollution control with social protection, livelihood support, and meaningful participation in decisions about coastal development and resource management.

Ecosystem restoration is a livelihood strategy as well as a conservation activity. Restoring mangroves, wetlands, sea grass, and reefs can improve fisheries habitat, reduce erosion, support tourism, and create local employment. Restoration is most durable when it is linked to pollution control, local stewardship, and benefits that are visible to communities rather than treated as a separate technical project.

Finally, coastal livelihood security requires better information and accountability. Community monitoring, water-quality disclosure, seafood testing, pollution reporting, and accessible grievance mechanisms can help communities respond before damage becomes severe. Collaboration among local

governments, fishers, women workers, researchers, waste managers, industries, and civil-society groups is essential for translating environmental goals into equitable economic outcomes.

7. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that ocean pollution is a significant threat to coastal livelihood security because it damages the ecosystem services that sustain fisheries, aquaculture, tourism, food systems, and daily coastal work. Plastic waste, wastewater, nutrient runoff, chemical discharge, and oil pollution can reduce resource productivity, increase health risks, and lower the economic value of coastal environments.

The analysis shows that livelihood impacts occur through multiple pathways, including declining catch, damaged gear, unsafe seafood, reduced visitor demand, higher health and clean-up costs, and loss of market confidence. These pathways are particularly harmful for

households with limited income diversification and high dependence on local marine resources.

Effective response requires an integrated framework that combines pollution prevention, waste and wastewater infrastructure, enforcement, ecosystem restoration, community participation, and livelihood support. The strongest strategies address pollution before it reaches coastal waters while also strengthening the capacity of affected households to recover from environmental and economic shocks.

Future coastal planning should treat clean marine environments as a foundation for decent work, food security, public health, and sustainable development. By protecting coastal ecosystems and ensuring that vulnerable communities participate in decision making, governments and institutions can improve resilience and create more secure livelihood pathways for present and future generations.

8. REFERENCES

1. Allison, E. H., Perry, A. L., Badjeck, M.-C., Adger, W. N., Brown, K., Conway, D., Halls, A. S., Pilling, G. M., Reynolds, J. D., Andrew, N. L., and Dulvy, N. K. (2009). Vulnerability of national economies to the impacts of climate change on fisheries. *Fish and Fisheries*, 10(2), 173-196. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-2979.2008.00310.x>
2. Barboza, L. G. A., Vethaak, A. D., Lavarante, B. R. B. O., Lundebye, A.-K., and Guilhermino, L. (2018). Marine microplastic debris: An emerging issue for food security, food safety and human health. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 133, 336-348. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2018.05.047>
3. Beaumont, N. J., Aanesen, M., Austen, M. C., Borger, T., Clark, J. R., Cole, M., Hooper, T., Lindeque, P. K., Pascoe, C., and Wyles, K. J. (2019). Global ecological, social and economic impacts of marine plastic. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 142, 189-195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2019.03.022>
4. Borrelle, S. B., Ringma, J., Law, K. L., Monnahan, C. C., Lebreton, L., McGivern, A., Murphy, E., Jambeck, J., Leonard, G. H., Hilleary, M. A., Eriksen, M., Possingham, H. P., De Frond, H., Gerber, L. R., Polidoro, B., Tahir, A., Bernard, M., Mallos, N., Barnes, M., and Rochman, C. M. (2020). Predicted growth in plastic waste exceeds efforts to mitigate plastic pollution. *Science*, 369(6510), 1515-1518. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aba3656>
5. Cinner, J. E., McClanahan, T. R., Graham, N. A. J., Daw, T. M., Maina, J., Stead, S. M., Wamukota, A., Brown, K., and Bodin, O. (2012). Vulnerability of coastal communities to key impacts of climate change on coral reef fisheries. *Global Environmental Change*, 22(1), 12-20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.09.018>
6. Diaz, R. J., and Rosenberg, R. (2008). Spreading dead zones and consequences for marine ecosystems. *Science*, 321(5891), 926-929. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1156401>
7. Doney, S. C. (2010). The growing human footprint on coastal and open-ocean biogeochemistry. *Science*, 328(5985), 1512-1516. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1185198>
8. Eriksen, M., Lebreton, L. C. M., Carson, H. S., Thiel, M., Moore, C. J., Borerro, J. C., Galgani, F., Ryan, P. G., and Reisser, J. (2014). Plastic pollution in the worlds oceans: More than 5 trillion plastic pieces weighing over 250,000 tons afloat at sea. *PLoS ONE*, 9(12), e111913. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0111913>
9. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2022). The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2022: Towards Blue Transformation. FAO. <https://doi.org/10.4060/cc0461en>

10. GESAMP. (2015). Sources, fate and effects of microplastics in the marine environment: A global assessment. Reports and Studies No. 90. United Nations Environment Programme.
11. Geyer, R., Jambeck, J. R., and Law, K. L. (2017). Production, use, and fate of all plastics ever made. *Science Advances*, 3(7), e1700782. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1700782>
12. Halpern, B. S., Frazier, M., Potapenko, J., Casey, K. S., Koenig, K., Longo, C., Lowndes, J. S. S., Rockwood, R. C., Selig, E. R., Selkoe, K. A., and Walbridge, S. (2015). Spatial and temporal changes in cumulative human impacts on the worlds ocean. *Nature Communications*, 6, 7615. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms8615>
13. Jambeck, J. R., Geyer, R., Wilcox, C., Siegler, T. R., Perryman, M., Andrady, A., Narayan, R., and Law, K. L. (2015). Plastic waste inputs from land into the ocean. *Science*, 347(6223), 768-771. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1260352>
14. Kershaw, P., Turra, A., and Galgani, F. (Eds.). (2019). Guidelines for the monitoring and assessment of plastic litter in the ocean. GESAMP Reports and Studies No. 99. United Nations Environment Programme.
15. Lau, W. W. Y., Shiran, Y., Bailey, R. M., Cook, E., Stuchtey, M. R., Koskella, J., Velis, C. A., Godfrey, L., Boucher, J., Murphy, M. B., Thompson, R. C., Jankowska, E., Castillo Castillo, A., Pilditch, T. D., Dixon, B., Koerselman, L., Kosior, E., Favoino, E., Gutberlet, J., Baulch, S., Atreya, M. E., Fischer, D., He, K. K., Petit, M. M., Sumaila, U. R., Neil, E., Bernhofen, M. V., Lawrence, K., and Palardy, J. E. (2020). Evaluating scenarios toward zero plastic pollution. *Science*, 369(6510), 1455-1461. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aba9475>
16. Lebreton, L. C. M., van der Zwet, J., Damsteeg, J.-W., Slat, B., Andrady, A., and Reisser, J. (2017). River plastic emissions to the worlds oceans. *Nature Communications*, 8, 15611. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms15611>
17. MacLeod, M., Arp, H. P. H., Tekman, M. B., and Jahnke, A. (2021). The global threat from plastic pollution. *Science*, 373(6550), 61-65. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abg5433>
18. McIlgorm, A., Campbell, H. F., and Rule, M. J. (2011). The economic cost and control of marine debris damage in the Asia-Pacific region. *Ocean and Coastal Management*, 54(9), 643-651. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2011.05.007>
19. Nixon, S. W. (1995). Coastal marine eutrophication: A definition, social causes, and future concerns. *Ophelia*, 41(1), 199-219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00785236.1995.10422044>
20. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2022). Global Plastics Outlook: Economic Drivers, Environmental Impacts and Policy Options. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/de747aef-en>
21. Rabalais, N. N., Turner, R. E., Diaz, R. J., and Justic, D. (2009). Global change and eutrophication of coastal waters. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 66(7), 1528-1537. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsp047>
22. Rochman, C. M., Hoh, E., Kurobe, T., and Teh, S. J. (2013). Ingested plastic transfers hazardous chemicals to fish and induces hepatic stress. *Scientific Reports*, 3, 3263. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep03263>
23. United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. United Nations. <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>
24. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2021). Towards a sustainable ocean economy: Lessons from coastal and island developing economies. UNCTAD.
25. United Nations Environment Programme. (2016). Marine plastic debris and microplastics: Global lessons and research to inspire action and guide policy change. UNEP.
26. United Nations Environment Programme. (2021). From Pollution to Solution: A global assessment of marine litter and plastic pollution. UNEP.
27. United Nations Environment Programme. (2023). Turning off the Tap: How the world can end plastic pollution and create a circular economy. UNEP.
28. World Bank and United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2017). The Potential of the Blue Economy: Increasing long-term benefits of the sustainable use of marine resources for small island developing states and coastal least developed countries. World Bank.

-
29. World Health Organization. (2019). Microplastics in drinking-water. World Health Organization. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241516198>
 30. Zalasiewicz, J., Waters, C. N., do Sul, J. A. I., Corcoran, P. L., Barnosky, A. D., Cearreta, A., Edgeworth, M., Gałuszka, A., Jeandel, C., Leinfelder, R., McNeill, J. R., Steffen, W., Summerhayes, C., Wapre, M., Williams, M., Wolfe, A. P., and Yonan, Y. (2016). The geological cycle of plastics and their use as a stratigraphic indicator of the Anthropocene. *Anthropocene*, 13, 4-17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ancene.2016.01.002>