**Protected Areas Learning and Research Collaboration**

**Open Standards Short Course**

Exercise: Strategy Development and Ranking

Summary: Each group will evaluate at least two strategies; and look at strengths and weaknesses of these strategies.

This approach can be used to compare strategies and help decide which ones to select for the plan.

**STEP 1**

1. Choose one of your Goals
2. Look at your Situation diagram and talk about (brainstorm) all the different strategies (actions to improve targets or reduce threats) to achieve the Goal.
3. Write the strategies on yellow sticky notes and place them on the diagram
4. When you have done this for one Goal, pick another and do it again.

**STEP 2**

1. Select just one of the strategies. Use the table provided below and look at the list of criteria for Feasibility and Impact, which will help you think about and give a score to each strategy.
2. The overall score will then be used to compare, and rank, each strategy.
3. Repeat this process for as many strategies as you can.

**STEP 3**

1. Consider the results:
* Were they what you expected?
* Did you identify any weaknesses in your strategy? If so, consider whether the strategy can be improved.
* Are there any strategies that appear to be really strong against these criteria.
1. Select strategies for your plan based on this assessment i.e. which strategies ranked highest
2. You might also think about other things such as the current capacity of the project team, current funding sources etc.

**STRATEGY EVALUATION using a simple scale**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| STRATEGY | IMPACT (next page for ranks) | FEASIBILTY (next page for ranks) | Overall Rank (table below) |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

****

* + - **Potential Impact** – Degree to which the strategy (if implemented) will lead to desired changes in the situation within the scope of your project
* Very High – The strategy is very likely to completely mitigate a constraint/problem/threat or restore a conservation target.
* High – The strategy is likely to help mitigate a constraint/problem/threat or restore a conservation target.
* Medium – The strategy could possibly help mitigate a constraint/problem/threat or restore a conservation target.
* Low – The strategy will probably not contribute to meaningful constraint/problem/threat mitigation or conservation/restoration of target.
	+ - **Feasibility –** Degree to which your project team could implement the strategy within likely ethical, financial/staffing, and technical/time constraints
* Very High – The strategy is ethically, technically, AND financially feasible.
* High – The strategy is ethically and technically feasible, but may require some additional financial resources.
* Medium – The strategy is ethically feasible, but either technically OR financially difficult without substantial additional resources.
* Low – The strategy is not ethically, technically, OR financially feasible.

*Note that there are three feasibility criteria rolled into this rating that must be mentally integrated into the Feasibility rating.*
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