

# SITE PRIORITIZATION SCORECARD

## 1 COUNTRY RESTORATION POTENTIAL

Review and score the criteria below to provide a quantitative/qualitative analysis on the level of need and restoration potential for a specific target country.

### NEED AND FEASIBILITY CRITERIA

Score the following as **Highest (5)**, **High (4)**, **Moderate (3)**, **Low (2)**, **Unknown (1)**; highest possible combined score is 40.

Country Name: _____	
Level of Need	Score
Seascapes (containing multiple coastal habitat types in close proximity) are present including both functioning reference and impaired sites in need of restoration	
Impaired seascape condition/intervention needed	
Several important areas (e.g., protected areas) will benefit from seascape restoration	
Numerous communities will benefit from seascape restoration	
Feasibility Potential	Score
High support and motivation for restoration likely	
Legislative frameworks or policies in place	
Sufficient funding and capacity available	
Scalability of restoration approach to other areas	
<b>Total Score:</b>	

# 2 CRITERIA FOR PRIORITIZING SITES FOR RESTORATION

Within the country you selected, identify 1-3 sites as candidates for restoration, keeping in mind the overall objectives of restoration and potential restoration actions to be taken. Score these criteria as **High (4)**, **Medium (3)**, **Low (2)**, **Unknown (1)**; highest possible combined score is 100.

Country Name: _____	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3
Ecological Criteria (Structure)	Score	Score	Score

**Abiotic Factors** are present and suitable to support restoration (e.g., flow, water quality, light sediments)

**Biodiversity** sufficient to support restoration (diversity of species, presence of endangered or unique species)

**Community Structure** fairly intact (presence of multiple coastal habitat types, abundance of species, biogeochemical factors)

**Habitat Extent** will support restoration (sufficient size, proximity/connectivity to adjacent habitats, migratory corridors/spawning grounds)

Ecological Criteria (Function)	Score	Score	Score
--------------------------------	-------	-------	-------

**Reproduction/Condition** is sufficient to sustain restoration (presence of recruitment, low mortality/disease, link to breeding areas)

**Primary/Secondary Production** intact to support restoration (trophic dynamics or food webs intact)

**Biological Stressors** are low/will not prevent restoration success (i.e., herbivory not too high, low competition, no invasive species)

**Biogeochemical Processes** are intact (nutrient cycling, litter dynamics, reef accretion)

Socio-Economic/Ecosystem Services Criteria	Score	Score	Score
--	-------	-------	-------

**Provisioning** (restoration will provide raw materials, food, fisheries)

**Regulating** (restoration will improve coastal protection, erosion/sediment stabilization, water purification, carbon sequestration)

**Cultural** (restoration will improve livelihoods, environmental perceptions, human health, history/heritage, social equity/stability)

**Economy** (restoration will improve economic services like tourism, recreation, gender & employment, and economic productivity and stability)

Country Name: _____	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3
Feasibility	Score	Score	Score
<b>Social Feasibility</b> (sufficient interest/motivation to restore area, likelihood for citizen science participation in the restoration project)			
<b>Governance Feasibility</b> (policy/legislation in place to support restoration)			
<b>Implementation Feasibility</b> (restoration feasible because factors like clear goals, ability to abate threats, access to site, restoration methods available)			
<b>Economic Feasibility</b> (sufficient funding likely, cost effective, cost benefit analysis can be done, compliments other management efforts)			
Drivers of Change/Threats	Score	Score	Score
<b>Pollution</b> is (or can be) abated, water quality is sufficient to support restoration; nutrient loads, bacteria and metals are low, water quality programs in place, and mechanisms in place to identify, track, address and remediate land-based sources of pollution			
<b>Land Use</b> (coastal, tourism, agriculture) does not affect restoration or can be mitigated, management plans adopted; direct and indirect impacts from land use are avoided in restoration area			
<b>Fishing Practices</b> are sustainable; regulations/enforcement are established; certified fisheries products standardized; replenishment zones and protected fish spawning aggregations established in or near restoration areas			
<b>Global Climate Change</b> effects are (or will be) considered in restoration planning and implementation and address resilient refugia, sea surface temperatures, ocean acidification, sea level rise, and increased hurricanes			
<b>Total Scores:</b>			

# 3 COMPARISON OF CANDIDATE SITES

Briefly compare the candidate sites by conducting a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis.

Potential Sites For _____	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3
<p><b>Restoration Objectives:</b>            Goal 1. Strengthen ecosystem health, biodiversity, and resilience            Goal 2. Sustainable use of coastal and nearshore marine resources            Goal 3. Strengthen restoration governance and partnerships            Goal 4. Effectively manage the marine/coastal resources            Goal 5: Sequester and store carbon</p>			
<p><b>Potential Restoration Actions:</b>            Improve water flow/connectivity, population enhancement, control invasive species, remove hard structures, improve management or protection, increase social benefits, increase resilience to climate change, other</p>			
<p><b>Strengths:</b>  <i>What can help improve likelihood of success? Community, financial, or political support? Adjacent to healthy habitat? Within protected area? Proven technologies?</i></p>			
<p><b>Weaknesses:</b>  <i>What are potential of restoration? Cost prohibitive? Likelihood of failure? Lack of community engagement? Lack of capacity or technology?</i></p>			
<p><b>Opportunities:</b>  <i>Are there opportunities to improve success? Build on existing projects or partnerships? Transboundary cooperation? Private or existing financing?</i></p>			
<p><b>Threats:</b>  <i>Lack of funding? Community support or governance? Land tenure? Pollution or other threats that reduce restoration success?</i></p>			
<b>Scores (from Step 2 above):</b>			

# 4 SELECT HIGHEST PRIORITY SITE AND DEVELOP SCORECARD

After conducting the SWOT analysis for potential restoration sites, select one final site to fill out the scorecard based on Steps 1-3. Whichever site is selected, provide restoration objectives, rationale, and justification. The highest possible combined score from Steps 1 and 2 is 140.

## PRIORITY SEASCAPE RESTORATION SCORECARD

Country, Site Name: \_\_\_\_\_

### Need and Feasibility: Enter results from Step 1

Need and Feasibility	Score	Comments
Need Score		
Feasibility Score		
Restoration Score		

**Total:**

### Restoration Priority Potential: Enter results from Step 2

Restoration Potential	Score	Comments
Structure		
Function		
Ecosystem Services		
Feasibility		
Threat Abatement		

**Total:**

**Restoration Success Potential:** Enter more detailed results from SWOT Analysis for selected site

Potential for Success

Comments

Restoration Objectives:

---

Potential Restoration  
Actions:

---

Strengths:

---

Weaknesses:

---

Opportunities:

---

Threats:

**Score (total score from Step 4 above):**