

Instructions/Input Form:

IC Homework from June 16 Meeting

Due June 24

Instructions to Prioritize Strategies for Pressure Reduction

The strategies in the attached spreadsheet were derived from the conceptual models we developed as a group exercise in the May 5 and June 16 IC meetings. Please refer to the criteria on page 2 of these instructions when rating each draft strategy within the spreadsheet. Note the spreadsheet averages your scores as you add them. Please leave notes next to any scores for which you'd like to discuss differently weighting the criteria or any other factors for discussion.

How The Results Will Be Used

The results will be compiled, scores will be averaged, and summary scores will be reviewed and discussed by the IC via WebEx on June 27, 2016 (1:30 – 3:30 p.m.). In that review we will:

- Look for strategies that are clear priorities
- Look for strategies that provide larger cross-cutting opportunities to improve multiple components
- Consolidate strategies where possible/necessary
- Determine any gaps where additional strategies are needed for success
- Determine which strategies will be the highest priority for implementation based on their likelihood for successfully achieving recovery
- Guide development of implementation strategies

Key Terms

A **strategy** is a bundle of actions that, when combined, are intended to achieve a common goal. Strategies are intended to mitigate pressures or their underlying conditions and root causes, restore ecosystems or species populations (components/Vital Signs), or provide capacity to achieve goals. Strategies include one or more actions (capital projects, programs, etc.) and are designed to achieve specific outcomes, objectives, and goals. They are usually developed on a long-term time horizon, with associated actions addressing nearer-term objectives.

An **action** is focused on delivery of a specific outcome or output associated with a desired result. Actions include capital projects (e.g., restoration and acquisition), program development or implementation, education, research, etc.

Criteria for Strategy Prioritization

Potential Impact

Degree to which the strategy (if implemented) will lead to desired changes in the LIO, via pressure reduction and/or component and Vital Sign improvement

- **Very High** – The strategy is likely to completely or significantly mitigate the pressure or restore the components and Vital Signs
- **High** – The strategy is likely to completely or significantly mitigate the pressure over the long-term, and/or restore the components and Vital Signs
- **Medium** – The strategy could possibly help mitigate the pressure and/or restore the components and Vital Signs but there is uncertainty about the potential impact
- **Low** – The strategy will probably not contribute to meaningful mitigation of the pressure and/or restoration of the components and Vital Signs

Feasibility

Degree to which the LIO could implement the strategy within likely time, financial, technical, and other constraints

- **Very High** – The strategy is both technically and financially feasible at this time
- **High** – The strategy is technically feasible, but may require some additional financial resources
- **Medium** – The strategy is either technically OR financially difficult without substantial additional resources
- **Low** – The strategy is not technically OR financially feasible at this time

Readiness for Implementation

Degree to which the social and/or political context is ripe for successful implementation of the strategy

- **Very High** – There is sufficient social and political support to ensure successful implementation of the strategy in the next 2 – 6 years
- **High** – There is substantial social and political support for the strategy but some investment of resources would be needed to ensure increased social OR political support and successful implementation of the strategy in the next 2 – 6 years
- **Medium** – There is currently limited social and/or political support for the strategy and increased support would require substantial investment of resources
- **Low** – Building social and/or political support for the strategy would be very difficult, even with substantial resources