

Strategy rating criteria proposed by the MARISCO methodology

Table 1: Feasibility criteria¹

	Excellent	Good	Problematic	Poor
Necessary resources	<p>No resource problems = 4</p> <p>There are sufficient financial, personal, time and knowledge resources within the managing institution to implement the strategy</p>	<p>Some resources available = 3</p> <p>There are some resources to at least partially implement the strategy, and additional resources are likely to be obtained</p>	<p>Only limited resources available = 2</p> <p>Only a few limited resources are available to implement the strategy, and only very small-scale and fairly isolated activities can be carried out. It will be difficult to obtain additional resources.</p>	<p>Not enough resources = 1</p> <p>There are not enough resources within the managing institution to implement the strategy and it is unlikely that additional resources can be obtained.</p>
Level of acceptance from relevant stakeholders	<p>Very good acceptance = 4</p> <p>The strategy is accepted by (almost) all of the relevant stakeholders.</p>	<p>Good acceptance = 3</p> <p>The strategy is accepted by a major part of the relevant stakeholders.</p>	<p>Fairly low acceptance = 2</p> <p>The strategy is supported by a minor part of the relevant stakeholders, but there is no rejection</p>	<p>Extremely poor acceptance = 1</p> <p>The strategy is supported by only a few of the relevant stakeholders and is rejected by most of them.</p>
Probability of benefiting from external factors (especially opportunities)	<p>Very high = 4</p> <p>It is highly likely that the strategy can make use of existing or arising opportunities such as additional resources or external support</p>	<p>High = 3</p> <p>It is quite probable that the strategy can make use of existing or arising opportunities such as additional resources or external support</p>	<p>Medium = 2</p> <p>It is not very probable that the strategy can make use of existing or arising opportunities such as additional resources or external support.</p>	<p>Low = 1</p> <p>It is highly unlikely that the strategy can make use of existing or arising opportunities such as additional resources or external support.</p>

¹ Based on MARISCO-guidebook (Ibisch and Hobson 2014)

Probability of harmful risks	Unlikely to be affected by risks = 4 There is (almost) no probability of risks that (could) complicate the implementation of the strategy.	Probably not threatened by risks = 3 There is a low probability of risks that (could) somewhat complicate the implementation of the strategy.	Probably threatened by risks = 2 There is a high probability of risks that (could) complicate or even hamper the implementation of the strategy.	Extremely threatened by risks = 1 There is a high probability of risks that (could) significantly hamper the implementation of the strategy or even make them completely ineffective.
Adaptability to change	Very adaptable = 4 The adaptation of the strategy to changing circumstances or unexpected events can be easily achieved without any additional resources.	Rather adaptable = 3 The adaptation of the strategy to changing circumstances or unexpected events is likely to be achieved with some additional resources.	Not adaptable without significant additional resources = 2 The adaptation of the strategy to changing circumstances or unexpected events could possibly be achieved, but significant additional resources will be required.	Poorly adaptable, if at all = 1 The strategy is (possibly) not adaptable to changing circumstances or unexpected events

Table 2: Impact criteria²

	Excellent	Good	Problematic	Poor
Creation of social, political and institutional conflicts	Very low risk of conflict generation = 4 There is no or almost no probability that the strategy will give rise to any conflicts between different stakeholder groups.	Medium risk of conflict generation = 3 d) It is possible that a certain amount of conflict will be generated between different stakeholder groups and that this will have the potential to influence the conservation project/site.	High risk of conflict generation = 2 It is fairly likely that relevant conflicts between different stakeholder groups will be generated and that these will have the potential to influence the conservation project/site.	Very high risk of conflict generation = 1 It is (almost) certain that relevant conflicts between different stakeholder groups will be generated, and that these will influence the conservation project/site.

² Based on MARISCO-guidebook (Ibisch and Hobson 2014)

Creation of new risks increasing the vulnerability of conservation objects	<p>Low risk of increasing the vulnerability of conservation objects = 4</p> <p>There is no risk that the implementation of the strategy will contribute directly or indirectly to the conservation objects' vulnerability in the management area.</p>	<p>Medium risk of increasing the vulnerability of conservation objects = 3</p> <p>It is not very likely that the implementation of the strategy will contribute directly or indirectly to the conservation objects' vulnerability in the management area.</p>	<p>High risk of increasing the vulnerability of conservation objects = 2</p> <p>There is a high risk that the implementation of the strategy will contribute directly or indirectly to the conservation objects' vulnerability in the management area.</p>	<p>Very high risk of increasing the vulnerability of conservation objects = 1</p> <p>There is a very high risk that the implementation of the strategy will contribute directly or indirectly to the conservation objects' vulnerability in the management area.</p>
Synergies with other strategies	<p>Very high probability of synergies with other strategies = 4</p> <p>The strategy is very likely to develop important synergies with several other strategies</p>	<p>High probability of synergies with other strategies = 3</p> <p>The strategy is likely to develop important synergies with some other strategies</p>	<p>Medium probability of synergies with some strategies = 2</p> <p>The strategy will eventually develop important synergies with a few other strategies.</p>	<p>Low probability of synergies with other strategies, if at all = 1</p> <p>The strategy is fairly isolated and is not likely to develop any synergies with other strategies.</p>
Conflicts with other strategies	<p>Low probability of conflicts with other strategies, if at all = 4</p> <p>The strategy conflicts with (almost) no other strategy that is being implemented in the management area.</p>	<p>Medium probability of conflicts with other strategies = 3</p> <p>The strategy somewhat – but not problematically – conflicts with other strategies that are being implemented in the management area.</p>	<p>High probability of conflicts with other strategies = 2</p> <p>The strategy conflicts with a number of the strategies that are being implemented in the management area.</p>	<p>Very high probability of conflicts with many strategies = 1</p> <p>The strategy severely conflicts with a substantial number of strategies that are being implemented in the management area.</p>
Threat abatement effectiveness	<p>Very highly effective in treating threats = 4</p> <p>The strategy is very effective: it will result in the</p>	<p>Highly effective in treating threats = 3</p> <p>The strategy is quite effective: it will result in the</p>	<p>Somewhat effective in treating threats = 2</p> <p>e) The strategy is not very effective: it will only result in a</p>	<p>Rather ineffective in treating threats = 1</p> <p>The strategy is (almost) not effective: it will not even</p>

	significant and sustainable reduction, or even eradication, of several threats	large-scale reduction of at least one threat.	minor reduction of a threat, and this may only be temporary.	indirectly lead to the reduction of threats.
Direct increase of functionality of biodiversity objects	Very positive for biodiversity functionality = 4 The strategy will safeguard or completely restore the long-term functionality of one or more biodiversity objects.	Positive for biodiversity functionality = 3 The strategy will contribute to the restoration or maintenance of one or more biodiversity objects' functionality	A small and rather indirect contribution to biodiversity functionality = 2 The strategy will make a minor contribution to the conservation or restoration of one or more biodiversity objects	Not measurably improving biodiversity functionality = 1 The strategy is unlikely to contribute to the conservation or restoration of any of the biodiversity objects.
Level of potential regret	No-regret strategy = 4 The strategy will create clear collateral benefits, even if the originally intended impact is not achieved.	Medium-regret strategy = 3 The strategy is likely to create some positive collateral effects, even if the originally intended impact is not achieved.	High-regret strategy = 2 The potential level of regret is high. If the originally intended impact is not achieved, the strategy will not create (significant) positive collateral effects. The strategy will also be difficult to reverse and might end up wasting resources.	Very high-regret strategy = 1 The potential level of regret is very high. If the originally intended impact is not achieved, the strategy will not create positive collateral effects. The strategy will be impossible to reverse in time and would clearly end up wasting resources.