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STEP 1: SET GOAL AND GEOGRAPHIC FOCUS

1A. Identify and Prioritize Goals

|  |
| --- |
| **List and describe the priority goals for your management area. Summarize the process and decisions made in generating the list of goals.**  |
| **Priority restoration goals:**  |
| **Summary of process:**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Rewrite your goals using the SMART approach. Summarize key problems addressed by each goal and the process used to generate the details of these goals. We suggest working with up to three priority goals as a starting point.** |
| **SMART goals:**  | **Key problems addressed by the goal:** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| **Summary of process:**  |

1B. Identify Geographic Focus for Each Goal

|  |
| --- |
| **Describe and provide a labeled map of the geographic focus area(s) for each priority goal. Provide notes about the functionality and benefits, and management and biophysical context. Then, summarize the process used or experts consulted for this work.** |
| **GOAL 1:**  |
| **Geographic Focus: Round 1 – Functionality and Benefits** * **What areas currently or in the recent past have performed functions that are relevant to the goal?**
* **What areas are currently experiencing the problems that the goal seeks to address?**
* **Within these areas, where could reef restoration provide social and ecological benefits?**
 |
| **1) What areas have reefs that are currently, or in the recent past, performing functions that are relevant to the goal?** |  |
| **2) What areas are currently experiencing the problems that the goal seeks to address?** |  |
| **3) Within these areas, where could reef restoration provide social and ecological benefits?** |  |
| **Map:**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Geographic Focus: Round 2 - Management and Biophysical Context** * **What are the greatest management challenges in each area for achieving the restoration goal?**
* **What is the biophysical context in which these challenges will need to be addressed?**
* **What is the likelihood of overcoming these challenges? What are unique opportunities?**
 |
| **Context** | **Area A** | **Area B** | **Area C** |
| **Management Context**  |  |  |  |
| * Land-based pollution
* Overfishing
* Tourism Overuse
* Government Policies & Programs
 |  |  |  |
| **Biophysical Context** |  |  |  |
| * Oceanographic processes
* Geomorphology
* Ecological connectivity
* Watersheds and hydrology
* Ocean temperature, bleaching & disease
* Ocean acidification
* Sea level rise
* Storm surge & runoff
 |  |  |  |
| **Summary of process used:**   |

|  |
| --- |
| **GOAL 2:**  |
| **Geographic Focus: Round 1 – Functionality and Benefits** * **What areas currently or in the recent past have performed functions that are relevant to the goal?**
* **What areas are currently experiencing the problems that the goal seeks to address?**
* **Within these areas, where could reef restoration provide social and ecological benefits?**
 |
| **1) What areas have reefs that are currently, or in the recent past, performing functions that are relevant to the goal?** |  |
| **2) What areas are currently experiencing the problems that the goal seeks to address?** |  |
| **3) Within these areas, where could reef restoration provide social and ecological benefits?** |  |
| **Map:**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Geographic Focus: Round 2 - Management and Biophysical Context** * **What are the greatest management challenges in each area for achieving the restoration goal?**
* **What is the biophysical context in which these challenges will need to be addressed?**
* **What is the likelihood of overcoming these challenges? What are unique opportunities?**
 |
| **Context** | **Area A** | **Area B** | **Area C** |
| **Management Context**  |  |  |  |
| * Land-based pollution
* Overfishing
* Tourism Overuse
* Government Policies & Programs
 |  |  |  |
| **Biophysical Context** |  |  |  |
| * Oceanographic processes
* Geomorphology
* Ecological connectivity
* Watersheds and hydrology
* Ocean temperature, bleaching & disease
* Ocean acidification
* Sea level rise
* Storm surge & runoff
 |  |  |  |
| **Summary of process used:**   |

|  |
| --- |
| **GOAL 3:**  |
| **Geographic Focus: Round 1 – Functionality and Benefits** * **What areas currently or in the recent past have performed functions that are relevant to the goal?**
* **What areas are currently experiencing the problems that the goal seeks to address?**
* **Within these areas, where could reef restoration provide social and ecological benefits?**
 |
| **1) What areas have reefs that are currently, or in the recent past, performing functions that are relevant to the goal?** |  |
| **2) What areas are currently experiencing the problems that the goal seeks to address?** |  |
| **3) Within these areas, where could reef restoration provide social and ecological benefits?** |  |
| **Map:**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Geographic Focus: Round 2 - Management and Biophysical Context** * **What are the greatest management challenges in each area for achieving the restoration goal?**
* **What is the biophysical context in which these challenges will need to be addressed?**
* **What is the likelihood of overcoming these challenges? What are unique opportunities?**
 |
| **Context** | **Area A** | **Area B** | **Area C** |
| **Management Context**  |  |  |  |
| * Land-based pollution
* Overfishing
* Tourism Overuse
* Government Policies & Programs
 |  |  |  |
| **Biophysical Context** |  |  |  |
| * Oceanographic processes
* Geomorphology
* Ecological connectivity
* Watersheds and hydrology
* Ocean temperature, bleaching & disease
* Ocean acidification
* Sea level rise
* Storm surge & runoff
 |  |  |  |
| **Summary of process used:**   |

1C. Select Goal and Geographic Focus for Restoration Planning and Design

|  |
| --- |
| **Describe the restoration goal your team selected to continue with for planning and design, as well as the final geographic focus area(s). Describe the process and rationale used to make this determination.** |
| **Goal:**  |
| **Geographic Focus:**  |
| **Summary:**  |



Stakeholder Engagement

|  |
| --- |
| **List technical experts, stakeholders, and partners including scientists, engineers, community members, private sector, and federal and local government engaged to review and prioritize restoration goals and geographic focus area(s).**  |
| **Technical Expertise** | **Key Stakeholders** |
|  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Provide a summary of stakeholder engagement activities to be taken for this step.** |
|  |

STEP 2: IDENTIFY AND SELECT SITES

2A. Identify Potential Restoration Sites

|  |
| --- |
| **List restoration sites within the geographic focus area being considered for restoration. Document their location and provide a brief rationale for why each site was selected.****Alternately, GIS software can be used to set a grid over the geographic focus area(s) and your team can determine the reef habitat cell/area size and make a map showing the gridded area and describing the number of grid cells.** |

| **Site Name/ Coordinates**  | **Site Dimensions** | **Rationale** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Management in Effect** Causes of reef degradation have been identified and are under effective management (now or in the future) | **Reef Value is High** Reef provides important ecosystem services that offer multiple benefits in addition to the goal, or has high cultural value | **Data Are or Can Become Available**Long-term monitoring takes place, data and information on the site are available or accessible, or plans and resources are available to collect new data |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

2B. Use Framework to Prioritize Sites

|  |
| --- |
| **List available datasets applicable to each part of the prioritization framework. Document any data or information that are missing or need to be collected.**  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Framework Part** | **Available Datasets** | **Sites** |
| Relevance to Restoration Goal: *To what extent would restoration at the site help to achieve the set goal?* |  |  |
| Potential to Improve Condition: *To what extent will restoration improve site condition?* |  |  |
| Future exposure: *What is the likely frequency and severity of future disturbances?* |  |  |
| Resilience/ecological processes: *What is the capacity of the site to resist and recover from disturbances?* |  |  |
| Human impacts: *What are the types and severity of human impacts affecting coral reef communities at the site, and which are or could be mitigated through management actions?* |  |  |
| **Remaining Data Needs:**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Describe the rationale for your decision to complete the framework quantitatively or semi-quantitatively, including the advantages and disadvantages *in your case*.**  |
|  |

***Completing the framework semi-quantitatively***

|  |
| --- |
| **Develop a statement for each framework part to be graded by local experts (first column; you may use the statements in the table below as examples). Record responses (on a scale from 1-5) and calculate the average. Complete this process for EACH site. You can use the table below or create a similar spreadsheet.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **SITE NAME:**  |
| **Example Statements for Each Framework Part** | **Rating** | **Total (N)** | **Average** |
| **Strongly Agree (5)** | **Agree (4)** | **Neutral (3)** | **Disagree (2)** | **Strongly Disagree (1)** |
| **Relevance to Restoration Goal:** *Restoring this site is extremely and directly relevant to achieving our restoration goal.* | 5, 5, 5 | 4,4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 26 (6) | 4.3 |
| Document data or rationale provided |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Future exposure:** *This site is among those in our geographic focus that is likely to rarely be exposed to disturbances or is projected to be exposed to these disturbances much later.***Considerations:** future exposure to cyclones, coral bleaching, extreme low tides, predation, and other disturbance events. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Document data/rationale used for rating. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Resilience/ecological processes:** *This site is relatively resilient, with great relative capacity to resist and recover from disturbances.***Considerations:** common resilience indicators include coral recruitment, coral diversity, herbivore biomass, macroalgae cover, crustose coralline algae cover, coral predation, coral disease, and temperature variability. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Document data/rationale used for rating. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Human impacts:** *Human impacts are relatively low at this site.***Considerations:** common human impacts on reefs include reef fish fishing, marine-based pollution, watershed-based pollution, marine debris, coastal development, tourism, and shipping.  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Document data/rationale used for rating |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Potential to improve condition:**  *Restoration will greatly improve condition at this site***Considerations:** extent to which ecological condition has declined or degraded in recent years. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Document data/rationale used for rating |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

|  |
| --- |
| **For each site, average the values for all framework parts, so each site has one numerical score. Use color coding to denote relative restoration priority. Develop your criteria for low, medium and high priority or use the criteria in Step 2B of the Guide (Tables 2.3 and 2.4).** **Create a table with the average values for each framework part for all candidate restoration sites. Table 2.5 in the Guide provides an example of a completed table.** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reef Name** | **Priority Level FINAL** | **Average** | **Relevance to Goal** | **Potential to Improve Condition** | **Short and long-term survivorship****[Climate Vulnerability]** |
| **Future Exposure** | **Resilience** | **Human Impacts** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***Completing the framework quantitatively***

|  |
| --- |
| **Develop metrics and units to support quantitative assessment of each framework part. For each framework part, at least one metric and units should be defined.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Framework Part** | **Metrics and Units** |
| Relevance to Restoration Goal: *To what extent would restoration at the site help to achieve the set goal?* |  |
| Potential to Improve Condition: *To what extent will restoration improve site condition?* |  |
| Future exposure: *What is the likely frequency and severity of future disturbances?* |  |
| Resilience/ecological processes: *What is the capacity of the site to resist and recover from disturbances?* |  |
| Human impacts: *What are the types and severity of human impacts affecting coral reef communities at the site, and which are or could be mitigated through management actions?* |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Document the process used to decide on the metrics to be used to quantify each framework part.** |
|   |

|  |
| --- |
| **Use the analysis steps that follow to build a Final Results Table similar in format to the completed example in Table 2.6 of the Guide. Start with a Raw Data Table. The columns ‘Priority Level’, ‘Priority Score Final’, and ‘Priority Score Raw’, ‘R’ (for final Resilience score) and ‘HI’ (for final human impacts score) will all be blank to start. As you proceed, document each analysis step by copying this table and adding notes above or to the side.**  |
|   |

|  |
| --- |
| **Develop a Normalized Data Table. Normalize values to a 0-1 scale for each framework part and sub-parts (for resilience and human impacts). Copy the Raw Data table but have blank cells. Calculate the maximum value for each metric, indicator, variable and impact in the row that is just below your last site. Use spreadsheet software, such as MS Excel, to calculate the maximum value using the formula ‘= max (cell range)’. Fill in the blank table using formulas to divide all cell values for each metric, indicator, variable and impact by the maximum value that you calculated. This will generate new data values in each cell that will range from 0-1. Document this analysis step with notes on the process.**  |
|   |

|  |
| --- |
| **Develop a Uni-directional Resilience Indicators Table. Copy the data table from above. The data for resilience indicators will need to be unidirectional such that a high score is a good score. Subtract the normalized values you calculated in the previous step from 1 (this reverses their direction) for indicators such as macroalgae cover and coral disease (where high values for raw data are bad scores). Copy across all of the other data as is. Document this analysis step with notes on the process.**  |
|   |

|  |
| --- |
| **Develop a Final Resilience Scores Table. Copy the data table from above. Calculate the resilience score (filling in the blank ‘R’ column) by averaging the unidirectional normalized scores for the resilience indicators. Then, normalize that raw resilience score by dividing all the raw scores by the maximum value. This sets resilience for the group of candidate restoration sites as relative to the site with the greatest raw resilience score. Document this analysis step with notes on the process.**  |
|   |

|  |
| --- |
| **Develop a Final Human Impacts Scores Table. Copy the data table from above. The human impacts score can be calculated by averaging the human impacts scores. Those scores were purposefully *not set* to the same uni-directional scale as the resilience scores. It is intuitive that high scores mean high human impacts. This ensures stop-light color shading can be used to highlight whether each type of impact is relatively low or high at a site. However, *the composite human impacts score needs to have the same direction as resilience,* so you will need to average human impacts scores, normalize by dividing by the maximum value, and then subtract those values from 1. Document this analysis step with notes on the process.**  |
|   |

|  |
| --- |
| **Develop Final Priority Scores for each candidate site. Calculate the raw priority score by averaging the final values for Relevance to goal; Projected future exposure; Resilience; Human impacts; and Potential to improve condition. The ‘Final Priority Score’ is the raw priority scores normalized by dividing by the maximum value. Use a stop-light color scheme to color shade all data in your table. For the framework parts and any indicators or variables combined into a final framework part score (e.g., for resilience), use three categories (where avg is average and sd is standard deviation): high (>avg+1sd - [Blue]), medium (<avg+1sd and >avg-1sd - [Orange]), and low (<avg-1sd - [Red]). Color shade the final priority scores and set the final priority levels, following the criteria below or similar criteria developed by your team. A high score will not always mean higher final priority level (low, medium or high). This is because sites with low scores for any one of the framework parts should be lower priority, unless a score for a framework part is judged to be correctable through management action, thereby changing the perceived priority level. Develop criteria for low, medium and high final priority or use the criteria described in the Guide. Document this analysis steps with notes on the process.**  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Develop the Final Results Table, which will be similar to Table 2.6 in the Guide. Write the final priority level into the ‘Priority Level’ cells and re-sort the table by priority level (this ensures the sites with the highest priority scores are at the top of each priority level). Document this analysis steps with notes on the process.**  |
|   |

2C. Final Site Selection

|  |
| --- |
| **Provide a brief description of the highest priority sites selected for restoration. Include the site name, general description of the site, and a summary (quantitative or qualitative) on how each site compared to other sites using the prioritization framework. You may also use this table to indicate which site(s) might be suitable for the pilot phase.** |
| Site Name | Site Description and Area | Comparison to Other Sites (based on framework) | Pilot Phase? |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Develop a map of the geographic area of focus for the restoration goal with the final selected sites clearly marked.**  |
|   |

|  |
| --- |
| **Provide a summary of the process used to finalize your list of restoration sites, including stakeholders or decision-makers involved.**  |
|   |



Stakeholder Engagement

|  |
| --- |
| **List technical experts, stakeholders, and partners including scientists, engineers, community members, private sector, and federal and local government engaged to review and prioritize restoration goals and geographic focus.**  |
| **Technical Expertise** | **Key Stakeholders** |
|  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Provide a summary of stakeholder engagement activities to be taken for this step.** |
|       |

STEP 3: IDENTIFY, DESIGN, AND SELECT INTERVENTIONS

3A: Brainstorm an Array of Intervention Options

|  |
| --- |
| **List the full array of intervention options that could be applied towards your restoration goal, indicating how they connect to the goal where appropriate. Then, summarize the process used to make these decisions.** |
| **Goal:**  |
| **Intervention Options:** |
| **Process:**  |

3B: Apply Climate-Smart Design Considerations

|  |
| --- |
| **For each intervention option, use the Step 3B table provided to record your answers to the basic design questions that apply. After reviewing the climate-smart design considerations in Table 3.3 (and adding any further questions appropriate to your situation), build climate-smart improvements into all relevant design elements in your Step 3B table. Add additional Option columns until all brainstormed intervention options from 3A above have been designed.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Design Questions** | **Restoration Interventions** |
| **OPTION 1** | **OPTION 2**  | **OPTION 3** |
| *What coral species will be used?* |  |  |  |
| *Where will corals be obtained?* |  |  |  |
| *What coral propagation and/or outplanting methods will be used?* |  |  |  |
| *What biological control techniques will be used?* |  |  |  |
| *What physical or engineering techniques will be used?*  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Use the checklist of climate-smart design considerations to indicate which questions apply to each intervention option to support discussion of climate-smart improvements. Add questions as necessary to address Category 1 and 2 considerations.** |
| **Design Questions** | **Category 1:** *How will climate change and its interaction with local stressors of concern impact the biological resilience of the restoration intervention?* | **Category 2:** *How will climate change affect the physical functionality of the restoration intervention through direct impacts on structural components?* |
| *Indicate (X) which questions apply to the option to support discussion and development of climate-smart improvements.*  | **Option 1** | **Option 2** | **Option 3** | *Indicate (X) which questions apply to the option to support discussion and development of climate-smart improvements.*  | **Option 1** | **Option 2** | **Option 3** |
| What coral species will be used? | What is the vulnerability of the site to bleaching conditions? Are certain coral species more resistant to bleaching and disease? |  |  |  | How much is wave energy expected to increase with increasingly intense storms? Are certain coral species less brittle or more robust against storm damage? |  |  |  |
| How is climate change affecting sediment and nutrient transport to the site? Are certain coral species more tolerant? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| What are the implications of ocean acidification for coral growth rates and skeleton density/strength? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Are enough coral species being used to account for genetic and functional diversity and redundancy to spread the risk of local losses from coral bleaching and disease? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Where will corals be obtained? | Are there in situ sites where corals have naturally been acclimatized to bleaching or poor water quality? |  |  |  | Are there sites that have experienced intense storm events from which corals that have withstood damage could be collected? |  |  |  |
| Are there lab-designed species or genotypes with special characteristics with respect to climate change-related stressors specific to the restoration site? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Are there enough brood stock genetic diversity to maximize chances of long-term survival and potential to scale-up efforts in the long-term? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| What coral propagation and/or out-planting methods will be used? | Are there nursery sites in the field where corals could be acclimatized during propagation? |  |  |  | How much is wave energy expected to increase with increasingly intense storms? Does this affect the decision whether to use natural substrate or build an artificial substrate? (Also see engineering question below.) |  |  |  |
| Is there a lab with options for pre-treating corals to acclimate them to variations in temperature or other stressors? |  |  |  | How often will it be necessary to outplant more corals to replace losses from storms? |  |  |  |
| How often will it be necessary to outplant more corals to replace losses from bleaching? |  |  |  | At what depths should outplants be placed given projected rates of sea level rise? |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Will materials or methods used to outplant corals be able to withstand wave energy from storms? |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | How will the laboratory where corals will be propagated be safeguarded to withstand intense storms? Are structures and water intake fortified? Is there back-up power generation? |  |  |  |
| What biological control techniques will be used? | How will climate change affect predator or algal outbreaks? Will this affect the frequency or intensity with which removal techniques will need to be used? Will removal techniques be able to keep up with algal growth under changing conditions? |  |  |  | Will certain predator or algal removal techniques be difficult to do in areas of increasingly high wind and wave energy? Will this limit the time of year or efficiency (amount that can be done in a given time) with which the technique can be used? |  |  |  |
| How is climate change affecting environmental conditions for valued herbivore populations? Will regular replenishment of herbivores be needed? |  |  |  | How will the laboratory where herbivores will be reared be safeguarded to withstand intense storms? Are structures and water intake fortified? Is there back-up power generation? |  |  |  |
| How will climate change affect the frequency and severity of disease outbreaks? Will this affect the type, method, or frequency of treatments needed? Should it affect the coral species chosen? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| What physical or engineering techniques will be used? | Is there anything about the coral attachment methods or materials that could render corals more or less susceptible to climate change- related stress? |  |  |  | Will the chosen materials be able to stand up to increasingly intense wave energy and storms? |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Will increasing water temperatures have any effect on the lifetime of epoxy or other adhesives? |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | At what depth should structures be placed to account for sea level rise given coral growth rates? |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Prepare a summary description of each intervention option, synthesized from the detailed design information that you have developed. Each intervention option should be specifically tailored to the goal, address all relevant design elements, and include climate-smart design details as appropriate. Add additional rows to include all of your brainstormed intervention options.**  |
| **Option 1:**  |
| **Option 2:** |
| **Option 3:** |

3C: Evaluate & Select Restoration Interventions

|  |
| --- |
| **Describe the evaluation criteria used to select restoration interventions and provide a summary of how these details were determined.** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Record ratings for each evaluation criteria (scale from 1-5) for each intervention option, using criteria from Table 3.4 and/or criteria developed by your planning team. Add additional columns until all brainstormed intervention options have been evaluated.**  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Restoration Intervention Ratings**Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Neutral (3), Disagree (2), Strongly Disagree (1) |
| **Option 1** | **Option 2** | **Option 3** |
| **Effectiveness** |  |  |  |
| Intervention will be technically effective at achieving restoration goal  |  |  |  |
| Intervention will be climate-smart in addressing changing conditions and uncertainties in climate change projections  |  |  |  |
| ***Average rating***  |  |  |  |
| ***Rationale*** |  |  |  |
| **Feasibility** |  |  |  |
| Costs of implementation and maintenance are feasible  |  |  |  |
| Technical capacity will be in place to implement intervention (data, technical knowledge, number of staff) |  |  |  |
| Physical infrastructure is achievable to implement intervention (e.g., land-based laboratory) |  |  |  |
| Required government regulations and permits are obtainable within the implementation timeline |  |  |  |
| Strong community, political, and private sector acceptance/support for intervention is available |  |  |  |
| ***Average rating***  |  |  |  |
| ***Rationale*** |  |  |  |
| **Flexibility** |  |  |  |
| Intervention is designed to be adjustable to accommodate changing conditions and incorporate learning |  |  |  |
| Intervention is reversible if needed  |  |  |  |
| ***Average rating***  |  |  |  |
| ***Rationale*** |  |  |  |
| **Urgency** |  |  |  |
| Degree of threat and cost of inaction is high if intervention is not implemented |  |  |  |
| There is an immediate opportunity associated with implementing the intervention based on availability of partnerships, funding, or leveraging other existing efforts |  |  |  |
| Results from the intervention can be achieved in a timeframe aligned with urgency of threat |  |  |  |
| ***Average rating***  |  |  |  |
| ***Rationale*** |  |  |  |
| **External Benefits** |  |  |  |
| Intervention achieves benefits outside of the target system, to other ecosystems and/or human communities (e.g., coastal protection, biodiversity, larval source, education, or research benefits) |  |  |  |
| Intervention minimizes unintended negative consequences, including carbon footprint |  |  |  |
| ***Average rating***  |  |  |  |
| ***Rationale*** |  |  |  |
| **Interactions** |  |  |  |
| ***Are there interdependencies, sequencing requirements, or conflicts with other options?*** |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Document the intervention(s) that best support the priority goal as well as the process and rationale used during your evaluation process.** |
| **Selected Intervention(s):** |
| **Process and rationale:**  |



Stakeholder Engagement

|  |
| --- |
| **List technical experts, stakeholders, and partners including scientists, engineers, community members, private sector, and federal and local government engaged to review and prioritize restoration goals and geographic focus.**  |
| **Technical Expertise** | **Key Stakeholders** |
|  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Provide a summary of stakeholder engagement activities to be taken for this step.** |
|       |

STEP 4: DEVELOP RESTORATION ACTION PLAN

4A: Define SMART Objectives

|  |
| --- |
| **Identify potential performance metrics and intermediate results for the priority goal and restoration intervention(s) selected in Step 3C.** |
| Objectives | Time (Years) |
| 1– 3 | 4 – 6 | 7 – 10 | 10 – <20  |
| Potential Performance Metrics (from Step 3A) |  |  |  |  |
| Intermediate Results (Goal) |  |  |  |  |
| Intermediate Results (Restoration Intervention) |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Craft SMART objectives and metrics that will be used to monitor performance of the restoration intervention(s) towards the goal.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions to identify targets for metrics of medium to long-term objectives related to the *goal*:** | **Activity to Address Information/Data Gaps:** |
| **Intervention(s):** |
| **Questions to identify targets for metrics of short-term and medium-term objectives related to the *intervention*:** | **Activity to Address Information/Data Gaps:** |
| **List SMART Objectives** | **Corresponding Performance Metrics** |
| **Objective 1:**  |  |
| **Objective 2:**  |  |
| **Objective 3:**  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

4B: Develop Activities and Implementation Timeline

|  |
| --- |
| **Prepare a table describing restoration activities with the timeframe and responsible party for completing each activity.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Goal:**  |
| **SMART Objective 1:**  |
| **Performance metrics:** |
| **Activities** | **Timeframe** |
| 1.1 |  |  |
| 1.2 |  |  |
| 1.3 |  |  |
| 1.4 |  |  |
| 1.5 |  |  |
| **SMART Objective 2:**  |
| **Performance metrics:** |
| **Activities** | **Timeframe** |
| 2.1 |  |  |
| 2.2 |  |  |
| 2.3 |  |  |
| 2.4 |  |  |
| 2.5 |  |  |
| **SMART Objective 3:**  |
| **Performance metrics:** |
| **Activities** | **Timeframe** |
| 3.1 |  |  |
| 3.2 |  |  |
| 3.3 |  |  |
| 3.4 |  |  |
| 3.5 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Prepare a table with this information for any supporting management and community engagement activities.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Management Activities** | **Timeframe** |
| M.1 |  |  |
| M.2 |  |  |
| M.3 |  |  |
| M.4 |  |  |
| M.5 |  |  |
| **Community Engagement Activities** | **Timeframe** |
| C.1 |  |  |
| C.2 |  |  |
| C.3 |  |  |
| C.4 |  |  |
| C.5 |  |  |

## 4C: Build Action Plan

|  |
| --- |
| **Develop your Action Plan (you can use Appendix 2 as a template). Provide an overview of the process used to develop your plan.** |
|  |



Stakeholder Engagement

|  |
| --- |
| **List technical experts, stakeholders, and partners including scientists, engineers, community members, private sector, and federal and local government engaged to review and prioritize restoration goals and geographic focus.**  |
| **Technical Expertise** | **Key Stakeholders** |
|  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Provide a summary of stakeholder engagement activities to be taken for this step.** |
|  |