Strategy rating criteria for TRANSECT

Table 1: Feasibility criteria[1]

Rating category	Excellent	Good	Problematic	Poor
Level of acceptance by relevant stakeholders	Very good acceptance = 4 The strategy is accepted by (almost) all of the relevant stakeholders.	Good acceptance = 3 The strategy is accepted by a major part of the relevant stakeholders.	Fairly low acceptance = 2 The strategy is supported by a minor part of the relevant stakeholders, but there is no rejection.	Extremely poor acceptance = 1 The strategy is supported by only a few of the relevant stakeholders and is rejected by the most relevant ones.
Supportive legal framework	Strong binding legal framework = 4 There is a clear, strong and binding legal framework in place that supports the implementation.	Non-binding legal framework = 3 There is a non-binding legal framework in place that supports the implementation.	Weak or missing legal framework = 2 There is a weak or diffuse legal framework in place, or the legal framework is missing.	Conflicting legal frameworks = 1 There are seemingly conflicting legal frameworks in place that might hinder the implementation.
Necessary resources	No resource problems = 4 There are sufficient financial, personal, time and knowledge resources available to implement the strategy.	Some resources available = 3 There are some resources to at least partially implement the strategy, and additional resources are likely to be obtained.	Only limited resources available = 2 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.	Not enough resources = 1 There are not enough resources within the managing institution to implement the strategy and it is unlikely that additional resources can be obtained.
Plausibility of ownership	Strong ownership = 4 The involved stakeholders developed a strong ownership of the strategy and will undergo considerable efforts to maintain it in the long-term.	Some ownership = 3 The involved stakeholders developed some ownership of the strategy and will undergo some efforts to maintain the strategy at least partially in the long-term.	Only limited ownership = 2 The involved stakeholders developed only a limited ownership of the strategy and it is unlikely that it will make efforts to maintain it in the long term.	No ownership = 1 The involved stakeholders developed no ownership of the strategy and will not make any efforts to maintain it in the long term.

---

[1] Based on MARISCO-guidebook

	Rating category	Excellent	Good	Problematic	Poor
	Probability of benefiting from external factors, especially opportunities *(if yes then state which)*	Very high = 4 It is highly likely that the strategy can make use of existing or arising opportunities such as additional resources or external support.	High = 3 It is quite probable that the strategy can make use of existing or arising opportunities such as additional resources or external support.	Low = 2 It is not very probable that the strategy can make use of existing or arising opportunities such as additional resources or external support.	Very low = 1 It is highly unlikely that the strategy can make use of existing or arising opportunities such as additional resources or external support.
	Probability of barriers and risks to the success of the strategy *(if yes then state which)*	Very unlikely to be affected by barriers and risks = 4 There are most likely no barriers and risks that could complicate the success of the strategy.	Probably not affected by barriers and risks = 3 There are probably no barriers and risks that could complicate the success of the strategy.	Probably affected by barriers and risks = 2 The sucess of the strategy is probably complicated or even hampered by barriers and risks.	Affected by severe barriers and risks = 1 There is a high probability that barriers and risks significantly hamper the success of the strategy or even makes it 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 criteria[2]

		Excellent	Good	Problematic	Poor
	Synergies with other strategies	Very high probability of synergies with other strategies = 4 The strategy is very likely to develop important synergies with several other strategies.	High probability of synergies with other strategies = 3 The strategy is likely to develop important synergies with some other strategies.	Medium probability of synergies with some strategies = 2 The strategy will eventually develop important synergies with a few other strategies.	Low probability of synergies with other strategies, if at all = 1 The strategy is fairly isolated and is not likely to develop any synergies with other strategies.

---

[2] Based on MARISCO-guidebook

		Excellent	Good	Problematic	Poor
	Conflicts with other strategies	Low probability of conflicts with other strategies, if at all = 4 The strategy conflicts with (almost) no other strategy that is being implemented in the management area.	Medium probability of conflicts with other strategies = 3 The strategy somewhat – but not problematically – conflicts with other strategies that are being implemented in the management area.	High probability of conflicts with other strategies = 2 The strategy conflicts with a number of the strategies that are being implemented in the management area.	Very high probability of conflicts with many strategies = 1 The strategy severely conflicts with a substantial number of strategies that are being implemented in the management area.
	Reduction of ecological threats	Very effective in reducing ecological threats = 4 The strategy will result in the significant and sustainable reduction, or even eradication, of several threats to ecosystems.	Somewhat effective in reducing ecological threats = 3 The strategy will result in the significant reduction of at least one threat to ecosystems.	Barely reduces ecological threats = 2 The strategy will only result in a minor reduction of an ecological threat, and this may only be temporary.	No reduction of ecological threats = 1 The strategy will not even indirectly lead to the reduction of ecological threats.
	Reduction of existing threats to social systems and services	Very effective in reducing social threats = 4 The strategy will result in the significant and sustainable reduction, or even eradication, of several threats to social systems and the provision of/access to services.	Somewhat effective in reducing social threats = 3 The strategy will result in the significant reduction of at least one threat to social systems or the provision of/access to services.	Barely reduces social threats = 2 The strategy will only result in a minor reduction of one or more threats to social systems and the provision of/access to services, and this may only be temporary.	No reduction of social threats = 1 The strategy will not even indirectly lead to the reduction of threats to social systems and the provision of/access to services.
	Direct increase in functionality of (agro-)ecosystems	Very positive for ecosystem functionality = 4 The strategy will safeguard or completely restore the long-term functionality of one or more (agro-)ecosystems.	Positive for ecosystem functionality = 3 The strategy will contribute to the restoration or maintenance of the functionality of one or more (agro-)ecosystems.	A small and rather indirect contribution to ecosystem functionality = 2 The strategy will make a minor contribution to the conservation or restoration of one or more (agro-)ecosystems.	Not measurably improving ecosystem functionality = 1 The strategy is unlikely to contribute to the conservation or restoration of any of the (agro-)ecosystems.

		Excellent	Good	Problematic	Poor
	Direct improvement of well-being	Very positive for livelihoods and well-being = 4 The strategy will have a strong and lasting effect on improving the well-being of the main population groups in the target area.	Somewhat positive for livelihoods and well-being = 3 The strategy will somewhat improve the well-being of significant parts of the main population groups in the target area.	Small and rather indirect improvement of livelihoods and well-being= 2 The strategy will only make a minor contribution to improving the well-being of people belonging to the main population groups in the target area.	Not measurably improving livelihoods and well-being = 1 The strategy is unlikely to contribute to the improvement of well-being of people belonging to the main population groups in the target area.
	Creation of negative impacts on ecosystems *(if yes then state which)*	No risk of creating negative impacts on ecosystems = 4 There is no risk that the implementation of the strategy will create negative ecological impacts.	Low risk of creating negative ecological impacts = 3 It is not very likely that the implementation of the strategy will create negative ecological impacts.	Rather high risk of creating negative ecological impacts = 2 There is a rather high risk that the implementation of the strategy will create negative impacts in at least one ecosystem.	Very high risk of creating negative ecological impacts = 1 There is a very high risk that the implementation of the strategy will create negative impacts in several ecosystems.
	Creation of negative impacts on well-being *(if yes then state which)*	No risk of negative impacts on livelihoods and well-being = 2 There is no risk that the implementation of the strategy will have negative impacts on the well-being of the population in the target area.	Rather low risk of negative impacts on livelihoods and well-being = 2 There is a rather low risk that the implementation of the strategy will have negative impacts on the well-being of the population in the target area.	Rather high risk of negative impacts on livelihoods and well-being = 2 There is a rather high risk that the implementation of the strategy will have negative impacts on the well-being of the population in the target area.	Very high risk of negative impacts on livelihoods and well-being = 1 There is a very high risk that the implementation of the strategy will have negative impacts on the well-being of the population in the target area.
	Fair and equitable distribution of benefits and risks *(if inequitable, specify winners and losers)*	Very fair and equitable = 4 The benefits and risks created by the strategy will be distributed in a very fair and equitable manner among different population groups, and the strategy will significantly contribute to the reduction of social inequalities in the target area.	Somewhat fair and equitable = 3 The benefits and risks created by the strategy will be distributed in a somewhat fair and equitable manner among different population groups, and the strategy will not affect or slightly reduce social inequalities in the target area.	Rather discriminating and inequitable = 2 The benefits and risks created by the strategy will be distributed in a rather discriminating and inequitable manner among different population groups, and the strategy is likely to increase social inequalities in the target area.	Highly discriminating and unequitable = 4 The benefits and risks created by the strategy will be distributed in a highly discriminating and inequitable manner among different population groups, and the strategy will significantly increase social inequalities in the target area.

		Excellent	Good	Problematic	Poor
	Creation of social, political and institutional conflicts *(if yes then state which)*	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 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 target region.	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 target region.	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 target region.
	Generation of collateral benefits *(if yes then state which)*	Very high probability of collateral benefits = 4 The strategy will create clear collateral benefits, even if the originally intended impact is not achieved.	High probability of collateral benefits = 3 The strategy is likely to create some positive collateral effects, even if the originally intended impact is not achieved.	Rather low probability of collateral benefits = 2 The strategy is not very likely to create (significant) positive collateral effects. If the originally intended impact is not achieved, the strategy may have made not positive contribution.	Very low probability of collateral benefits = 1 The strategy will not create (significant) positive collateral effects. This, if the originally intended impact is not achieved, the strategy will not have any positive effect at all.