Appendix D

A Step-by-Step Approach to Developing Conservation Strategies

Conservation Strategies
Instructions

Use the attached *Summary of Strategies Worksheet* (refer to the *Illustrative Example*); or use the analogous automated worksheet on the Summary sheet of the Microsoft Excel workbook entitled *Site Conservation/Measures of Conservation Success Workbook*.

IDENTIFY CRITICAL THREATS AND PERSISTENT STRESSES.

Conservation strategies should be developed to address those active sources of stress with an Overall Threat rank of "Very High" or "High" (i.e., the critical threats), and for "Very High" ranked persistent stresses whose associated historical sources have an Overall Threat rank of "Very High" or "High".

Critical threats can be identified directly from the Threat Summary Worksheet for Active Sources (see Appendix A).

Persistent stresses can be identified in two steps:

- On the Threat Summary Worksheet for Historical Sources, identify historical sources that have a "Very High" or "High" Overall Threat ranking (see Appendix A).
- Using the Sources of Stress worksheets you have developed for each target (see Appendix A), trace these historical sources back to the "Very High" and "High" ranked stresses they have caused to each individual target. These stresses are the persistent stresses.

DEVELOP A LIST OF POTENTIAL STRATEGIES.

For each critical threat, devise a list of potential threat abatement strategies to evaluate. For each persistent stress, devise a list of potential restor-ation strategies to evaluate. State each threat abatement and restoration strategy as precisely as possible. For example, "control residential development" is too broad. "Secure an improved local development ordinance to limit density to agricultural areas" is more focused. Ultimately, you want to select **up to sixteen** conservation strategies to rank

RANK THE POTENTIAL STRATEGIES.

Rank each conservation strategy you identified according to the following factors, as described in Chapter VII of the handbook.

Benefits

- Abatement of either Critical Threats or Persistent Stresses
- Leverage

Probability of Success & Feasibility

- Lead individual and institution
- Ease and lack of complexity

Costs of Implementation

- Commitment of limited discretionary resources

The attached *Strategy Ranking Guidelines* provide a set of benchmarks and worksheet templates for ranking all of the six indicators except Abatement of Threats/Stresses, and rules for combining the ranks within each of the three factors—benefits, feasibility and probability of success, and costs of implementation. The set of rules for determining a strategy ranking, as a function of the three factors, is also provided in table form. (*Note: the benefits, feasibility, cost, and overall strategy rank, are computed automatically in the Summary of Strategies Worksheet on the Summary sheet of the Excel workbook.*)

Tables for ranking the restoration and threat abatement benefits of the strategies are found in the individual Stresses-Sources-Strategies worksheets. The tables are entitled "Strategies for Threat Abatement and Restoration" and are found below the Source of Stress table. Type in the first strategy in the first row. In the next column to the right, select the source at which the strategy is directed. If the strategy is directed at more than one source, copy the strategy to a new row and enter the next source. The worksheet will automatically pull-down the threat ranking for each stress-source combination when you enter the source from the pull-down list of selected sources. In the box to the right of the threat ranking, indicate if the strategy will reduce that ranking by one full rank or more. Continue this process for all the strategies developed to address Critical Threats and Persistent Stresses.

Ranking the Abatement of Critical Threats and Persistent Stresses indicator is best accomplished using the *Strategies for Threat Abatement and Restoration Table* in the Excel spreadsheet. *Note: Analogous manual instructions and lookup tables are not provided.*

Strategy Ranking Guidelines—BENEFITS

Abatement of Critical Threats

Use the *Strategies Worksheets* found on each individual target sheet of the Excel workbook entitled "Site Conservation/Measures of Success Workbook" to determine the Threat Abatement benefit of a threat abatement strategy.

Abatement of Persistent Stresses

Use the *Strategies Worksheets* found on each individual target sheet of the Excel workbook entitled "Site Conservation/Measures of Success Workbook" to determine the Persistent Stress Abatement benefit of a restoration strategy.

Note: a strategy can have either a threat abatement benefit or a persistent stress abatement benefit, not both.

Leverage — *Estimate any leverage towards* other *high-impact strategies.*	
Very High	Immediate, visible, tangible results and high leverage towards another high-impact strategy
High	Immediate, visible, tangible results or high leverage towards another high-impact strategy
Medium	Moderate leverage
Low	No apparent leverage

Overall Benefits Ranking Chart

↓ *LEVERAGE*	***CRITICAL THREAT/PERSISTENT STRESS ABATEMENT***			
	Very High	**High**	**Medium**	**Low**
Very High	Very High	Very High	High	Medium
High	Very High	High	Medium	Medium
Medium	Very High	High	Medium	Low
Low	Very High	High	Medium	Low

Strategy Ranking Guidelines—FEASIBILITY

Lead Individual/Institution	
Very High	A lead individual ("champion") with sufficient time, proven talent, substantial relevant experience and institutional support is available and committed to lead implementation of the strategy
High	An individual with sufficient time, promising talent, some relevant experience and institutional support is available and committed to lead implementation of the strategy
Medium	An individual with promising talent and sufficient time is available, but lacks relevant experience or institutional support
Low	No lead individual currently available

Ease/Lack of Complexity	
Very High	Implementing the strategy is very straightforward; this type of strategy has been done often before
High	Implementing the strategy is relatively straightforward, but not certain; this type of strategy has been done before
Medium	Implementing the strategy involves a fair number of complexities, hurdles andor uncertainties; this type of strategy has rarely been done before
Low	Implementing the strategy involves many complexities, hurdles and/or uncertainties; this type of strategy has never been done before

Overall Feasibility Ranking Chart

↓ ***EASE***	***LEAD INDIVIDUAL/INSTITUTION***			
	Very High	**High**	**Medium**	**Low**
Very High	Very High	High	High	Medium
High	High	High	Medium	Medium
Medium	High	Medium	Medium	Low
Low	Medium	Medium	Low	Low

Strategy Ranking Guidelines—COSTS

Discretionary TNC Dollars	
Very High	Total cost of implementing the strategy—including staff time—in unrestricted or discretionary TNC dollars (i.e., dollars that might be applied to other purposes) is *$1,000,000 or more*
High	Total cost of implementing the strategy—including staff time—in unrestricted or discretionary TNC dollars (i.e., dollars that might be applied to other purposes) is *$100,000 or more*
Medium	Total cost of implementing the strategy—including staff time—in unrestricted or discretionary TNC dollars (i.e., dollars that might be applied to other purposes) is *$10,000 or more*
Low	Total cost of implementing the strategy—including stafftime—in unrestricted or discretionary TNC dollars (i.e., dollars that might be applied to other purposes) is *$1,000 or more*

COST RANKING RULES:

Use the score above.

Overall Strategy Ranking Table

Benefits	Probability/ Feasibility	Costs	Strategy Rank
Very High	Very High	Low	*Very High*
		Medium	*Very High*
		High	*Very High*
		Very High	*Very High*
	High	Low	*Very High*
		Medium	*Very High*
		High	*Very High*
		Very High	*High*
	Medium	Low	*Very High*
		Medium	*Very High*
		High	*High*
		Very High	*High*
	Low	Low	*Very High*
		Medium	*High*
		High	*Medium*
		Very High	*Medium*
High	Very High	Low	*Very High*
		Medium	*Very High*
		High	*High*
		Very High	*High*
	High	Low	*Very High*
		Medium	*High*
		High	*High*
		Very High	*Medium*
	Medium	Low	*Very High*
		Medium	*High*
		High	*Medium*
		Very High	*Medium*
	Low	Low	*High*
		Medium	*Medium*
		High	*Low*
		Very High	*Low*

(table continued on facing page)

Overall Strategy Ranking Table (continued)

Benefits	Probability/ Feasibility	Costs	Strategy Rank
Medium	Very High	Low	*Very High*
		Medium	*High*
		High	*Medium*
		Very High	*Medium*
	High	Low	*High*
		Medium	*Medium*
		High	*Medium*
		Very High	*Low*
	Medium	Low	*High*
		Medium	*Medium*
		High	*Low*
		Very High	*Low*
	Low	Low	*Medium*
		Medium	*Low*
		High	—
		Very High	—
Low	Very High	Low	*High*
		Medium	*Medium*
		High	*Low*
		Very High	*Low*
	High	Low	*Medium*
		Medium	*Low*
		High	*Low*
		Very High	—
	Medium	Low	*Medium*
		Medium	*Low*
		High	—
		Very High	—
	Low	Low	*Low*
		Medium	—
		High	—
		Very High	—

Summary of Strategies Worksheet

Site_____

Strategies	Benefits				Feasibility			Costs	Overall
	Threat Abatement Rank	Persistent Stress Abatement Rank	Leverage	OVERALL BENEFITS	Lead Individual/ Institution	Ease of Implemen-tation	OVERALL FEASI-BILITY	OVERALL COST (TNC $)	OVERALL STRATEGY RANK

Summary of Strategies Worksheet—Illustrative Example

Site *Agate Desert, OR*

Strategies	Benefits				Feasibility			Costs	Overall
	Threat Abatement Rank	Persistent Stress Abatement Rank	Leverage	OVERALL BENEFITS	Lead Individual/ Institution	Ease of Implementation	OVERALL FEASIBILITY	OVERALL COST (TNC $)	OVERALL STRATEGY RANK
Guide the Wetland Conservation Plan	Very High	—	Very High	***Very High***	Medium	Medium	***Medium***	***Medium***	**Very High**
Secure title, easement, and management agreements	Very High	—	High	***Very High***	Very High	High	***High***	***Very High***	**High**
Develop landowner agreements with ODFW for habitat protection tax exemption	High	—	Medium	***High***	Medium	High	***Medium***	***Medium***	**High**
Develop, demonstrate, and encourage adoption of BMP's for range	High	—	Medium	***High***	Low	Medium	***Low***	***Medium***	**Medium**
Develop "grass bank", if feasible	High	—	Medium	***High***	Low	Medium	***Low***	***Medium***	**Medium**
Develop and implement comprehensive restoration plan	Medium	—	High	***Medium***	High	Medium	***Medium***	***Medium***	**Medium**
Develop and implement comprehensive and integrated weed management plan	Medium	—	Low	***Medium***	High	Medium	***Medium***	***Medium***	**Medium**
Develop and implement comprehensive fire management plan	Medium	—	Low	***Medium***	High	Medium	***Medium***	***Medium***	**Medium**

Appendix E

A Step-by-Step Approach to Assessing Conservation Capacity

Conservation Capacity
Instructions

Use the attached *Capacity Scorecard* (refer to the *Illustrative Example*); or use the analogous automated worksheet on the Capacity sheet of the Microsoft Excel workbook entitled *Site Conservation/Measures of Conservation Success Workbook*.

VERIFY THE TYPE OF SITE.

Conservation Capacity is assessed only at sites where the Conservancy is playing (or will play) a meaningful role, i.e., action sites. Action sites fall into three categories, as described in Chapter VIII (*Measuring Conservation Success*):

- Conservancy-led projects
- Joint ventures with partners
- Partner-led projects

ASSESS THE CAPACITY INDICATORS.

For those sites that meet the above criteria, score each capacity indicator on a scale of 1.0 to 4.0. The attached Capacity Assessment Guidelines provide a draft set of benchmarks for scoring the indicators.

ASSIGN OVERALL CAPACITY.

For each of the three capacity success factors, calculate the average score of the associated indicators. The overall average score is then calculated as the simple average of the three average success factor scores. Assign the Overall Capacity for the site as "Very High", "High", "Medium" or "Low" according to the following grading scale for the overall average score:

>= 3.5	Very High
3.0 – 3.4	High
2.0 – 2.9	Medium
< 2.0	Low

(Note: the Capacity score and rank, based on the assessment of the seven capacity indicators, is computed automatically in the Capacity Scorecard *on the Capacity sheet of the of the Excel workbook.)*

Capacity Scorecard

Site _____

Factor	Score
Project Leadership and Support	
Focused Staff Responsibility for Action Site	
Conservation Manager or Mentor	
Project Support Team	
Project Leadership and Support	
Strategic Approach	
Understanding/Application of TNC's Five "S's"	
Iterative, Adaptive Approach to Developing Strategies	
Strategic Approach	
Funding and Sustainability	
Start-Up or Short-Term Funding	
Sustainable Support	
Funding	
OVERALL AVERAGE	

OVERALL CAPACITY _____

Assign the Overall Capacity for the site as "Very High", "High", "Medium" or "Low" according to the following grading scale for the overall average score:

>= 3.5	Very High
3.0 – 3.4	High
2.25 – 2.9	Medium
< 2.0	Low

Capacity Scorecard—Illustrative Example

Site *Agate Desert, OR*

Factor	Score
Project Leadership and Support	
Focused Staff Responsibility for Action Site	3
Conservation Manager or Mentor	3
Project Support Team	2
Project Leadership and Support	*2.7*
Strategic Approach	
Understanding/Application of TNC's Five "S's"	4
Iterative, Adaptive Approach to Developing Strategies	N/A
Strategic Approach	*4.0*
Funding and Sustainability	
Start-Up or Short-Term Funding	3
Sustainable Support	3
Funding	*3.0*
OVERALL AVERAGE	**3.0**

OVERALL CAPACITY *High*

Assign the Overall Capacity for the site as "Very High", "High", "Medium" or "Low" according to the following grading scale for the overall average score:

>= 3.5	Very High
3.0 – 3.4	High
2.0 – 2.9	Medium
< 2.0	Low

Capacity Assessment Guidelines

Project Leadership and Support

Focused Staff Responsibility for Action Sites	
4	A staff member has (1) clearly assigned responsibility, authority, and accountability for conserving the site, (2) adequate experience, and (3) sufficient time to focus on developing and implementing conservation strategies at the site.
3	Staff member has any two, but not all three, elements of focused staff responsibility (responsibility, experience, time)
2	Staff member has no more than one of the three elements of focused staff responsibility (responsibility, experience, time)
1	No staff member with designated job responsibility for site conservation.

Conservation Manager or Mentor — *Involvement by experienced mentor or manager with proven results in conserving other sites that have a similar level of complexity—i.e., developing and implementing successful strategies to abate threats.*	
4	The project has regular, sufficient, ongoing, hands-on involvement by an experienced conservation manager or mentor (i.e., at least 5 years experience **and** proven results in conserving sites with a similar level of complexity).
3	The project has regular access to and advice and counsel from an experienced manager or mentor (i.e., at least 5 years experience **and** proven results in conserving sites with a similar level of complexity).
2	The project has regular access to and advice and counsel from a less-experienced conservation manager or mentor (i.e., less than 5 years experience and some initial promising results in conserving sites with a similar level of complexity).
1	The project does not have access, or has only sporadic access, to a conservation manager or mentor.

Project Support Team — *e.g., conservation science, protection, land and water management, applied research, government relations/public funding, development, operations*	
4	The project receives regular, high-level assistance from a full-service, experienced support team (e.g., on-site staff, state, country, international program, or partner organization staff).
3	The project receives assistance from a support team—but regular, high-level assistance is not available in one important functional area needed for successful strategy implementation.
2	The project receives assistance from a support team—but regular, high-level assistance is not available in two important functional areas needed for successful strategy implementation.
1	The project receives insufficient assistance in several functional areas.

Strategic Approach to the Project

Understanding/Application of the Five-S framework (systems, stresses, sources, strategies, success)	
4	Staff project director and multidisciplinary team have completed a thorough assessment of the five "S's" and developed a sufficiently documented site conservation plan and appropriate site maps.
3	Staff project director and multidisciplinary team have applied a "rapid" assessment of the five "S's" through the Efroymson Fellowship Program or otherwise, with preliminary or incomplete documentation and/or with insufficient site maps.
2	Project staff have participated in a site conservation planning meeting or other effort, but have not worked with multidisciplinary team to complete a rapid Five-S assessment or site conservation plan.
1	Project staff has not yet participated in strategic planning.

Iterative, Adaptive Approach to Developing and Implementing Key Conservation Strategies *(Note: This factor is not applicable to a new action site during its first year)*	
4	Key components of ecological systems and threat status are being monitored **and** multidisciplinary project team meets regularly (e.g. quarterly, biannually, or annually) to assess progress, evaluate results, review & test strategic hypotheses, and make necessary strategic adjustments.
3	Key components of ecological systems and threat status are being monitored **and** multidisciplinary project team has met within past two years to assess progress, evaluate results, review strategic hypotheses and make necessary strategic adjustments.
2	Haphazard monitoring of ecological systems and threat status **or** staff project director has met informally with others to assess progress and to re-assess the strategic plan (systems, stresses, sources and strategies).
1	Key components of ecological systems and threat status are not being monitored **or** no review or update of strategic plan.

Project Funding and Sustainability

Start-Up or Short-Term Funding — *Adequacy and predictability for operations and programs*	
4	Funding has been secured, pledged or is highly probable for core operations for at least two years, as well as major private or public funds to *implement* key conservation strategies.
3	Funding has been secured, pledged, or is highly probable for core operations for at least two years, as well as private/public funds to *develop and launch* key conservation strategies.
2	Funding has been secured or pledged for core operations for at least one year.
1	Funding has not been secured or pledged for core operations for one year.

Sustainable Support — *Development of a base of long-term funding, community support and institutional partners that will ensure continuity of strategy implementation at the site*	
4	The project has sufficiently developed a mix of long-term funding (broad donor base, endowment, or predictable funding), strong community support, and strong institutional partners.
3	The project has sufficiently developed two elements of sustainable support (funding, community support, or partners).
2	The project has sufficiently developed one element of sustainable support (funding, community support, or partners).
1	The project has none of the elements of sustainable support sufficiently developed.