Table 4. Criteria to evaluate island ILSM projects against indicators.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | **Scoring criteria** |
| 1a. Explicit time frame of implementation stated (including overall timescale and review frequency) | Timeframe of plan implementation stated: 2 Timeframe of plan implementation not stated: 0 |
| 1b. Proportion of linked ecosystems incorporated in plan | All linked ecosystems explicitly included in plan: 2 Management actions for some but not all linked ecosystems: 1 Management actions only for one ecosystem and no consideration of linkages: 0 |
| 1c. Presence of coordination body or mechanism to integrate sectors (e.g., public versus private; land versus sea mandates) | Coordination body exists: 2 Coordination body does not exist: 0 |
| 1d. Accounting for cumulative impact of multiple threats to the coastal zone | Management measures exist for multiple threats: 2 Management measures exist for one threat: 0 |
| 1e. Accounting for lag time for impacts to be realized and benefits from management to accrue across realms | Lag times considered and planned for: 2 Lag times not considered and planned for: 0 |
| 1f. Objectives integrate ecological, social, economic and cultural issues and feedbacks that account for connectivity between land and sea realms | Yes: 2 No: 0 |
| 2a. Degree to which spatial boundaries of the management zone matches boundaries of watersheds and linked coastal areas | High degree of overlap: 2 Moderate degree of overlap: 1 Very mismatched boundaries: 0 |
| 2b. Management boundaries represent scale of ecological processes and threats for priority features relevant to ILSM | Boundaries cover full scale of ecological processes and threats: 2 Boundaries do not cover full scale of ecological processes and threats, but areas covered are likely to have most impact/relevance: 1 Boundaries do not cover full scale of ecological processes and threats, and do not cover areas likely to have most impact/relevance: 0 |
| 2c. Resource users are aware of management boundaries | All resource users aware: 2 Most resource users aware: 1 Most resource users not aware: 0 |
| 2d. Decision-makers and decision-making processes clearly identified | Everyone aware of who are decision-makers and decision-making process is transparent: 2 Everyone aware of who are decision-makers and decision-making process is a bit unclear: 1 It is not clear who makes decisions and how decisions are made: 0 |
| 3a. Appropriate strategies proposed and management actions identified to minimize land-based threats to downstream systems relative to number of issues | Proposed strategies and actions will be fully effective at minimizing downstream impact from existing threats: 2 Proposed strategies and actions will be somewhat effective at minimizing downstream impact from existing threats: 1 Proposed strategies and actions will be not be effective at minimizing downstream impact from existing threats: 0 |
| 3b. Appropriate strategies proposed and management actions identified to restore connectivity processes relative to number of issues | Proposed strategies and actions will be fully effective at restoring connectivity processes: 2 Proposed strategies and actions will be somewhat effective at restoring connectivity processes: 1 Proposed strategies and actions will be not be effective at restoring connectivity processes: 0 |
| 3c. Strength of social networks that connect people using land and sea resources | People who use land and sea realms are strongly connected through social networks via sharing of information and resources: 2 People who use land and sea realms are somewhat connected through social networks via sharing of information and resources: 1 People who use land and sea realms are poorly connected through social networks via sharing of information and resources: 0 |
| 4a. Proportion of population who access and use land and sea resources in the management area able to participate in management planning and implementation | All resource users have opportunity to directly (e.g., attend planning meetings) or indirectly (e.g., submit comments) contribute to management planning and implementation: 2 Only some resource users can directly contribute and there are no processes for others to indirectly contribute: 1 Decisions are made by people from outside the management area without input from resource users: 0 |
| 4b. Proportion of different sectors and stakeholder groups across land and sea realms participating relative to presence in area | All relevant sectors and stakeholders are involved in planning: 2 Most relevant sectors and stakeholders are involved in planning: 1 Key relevant sectors and stakeholders are missing: 0 |
| 4c. Opportunities for input from marginalized sectors of communities in affected areas | There are processes for gaining input from marginalized sectors and these are followed: 2 There are process for gaining input from marginalized sectors, but these are not followed through: 1 There are no processes for marginalized sectors to give input: 0 |
| 4d. Consistency of mandate through changes in political leadership | Mandate for ILSM remains/will remain through leadership change: 2 Mandate for ILSM changes/may change through leadership change: 0 |
| 5a. Management objectives reflect local concerns and issues related to cross-system threats and processes | Management objectives clearly incorporate local concerns and issues: 2 Management objectives incorporate some local concerns and issues, but also include objectives from outside actors: 1 Management objectives are fully imposed by outside actors: 0 |
| 5b. Local perception that benefits of management outweigh costs | The majority of people affected by management rules feel that they are benefitting: 2 Some people feel that they are benefiting: 1 A majority of people feel that the costs outweigh the benefits: 0 |
| 5c. Equity in distribution of management costs and benefits across land and sea resource users | Resource users perceive equitable distribution of costs and benefits across land and sea realms and users: 2 Resource users perceive inequitable distribution of costs and benefits across land and sea realms and users: 0 |
| 6a. Level (formal or informal) of recognition of management authority | Management authority is legally recognized and locally perceived as legitimate: 2 Management authority has no legal recognition but is locally perceived as legitimate: 1 Management authority is not legally recognized or locally perceived as legitimate: 0 |
| 6b. Clearly defined and demarcated ownership of both land and sea and use rights of land and sea resources | Ownership and resource use rights for the land and sea are legally defined: 2 Ownership and resource use rights are not legally defined and/or there is a contradiction between customary and national law: 0 |
| 7a. Frequency and effectiveness of monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) integrated across land and sea realms | MCS is performed regularly across both land and sea realms: 2 MCS is performed irregularly or regularly in one but not multiple realms: 1 MCS is performed irregularly and only in one realm: 0 |
| 7b. Proportion of offenses that are adequately punished across both land and sea | Large proportion of offenses are punished across both realms: 2 Offenses inconsistently are punished across realms: 1 Most offenses go unpunished: 0 |
| 8a. Existence of forum or means to settle disputes | Forum for conflict resolution exists: 2 Forum for conflict resolution does not exist: 0 |
| 8b. Perception that conflict resolution is handled fairly and in culturally appropriate way | People within management area feel that conflict resolution is handled fairly and appropriately: 2 People within management area feel that conflict resolution is not handled fairly or appropriately: 0 |
| 9a. Monitoring information relevant to the spatial scale of impacts of human activities on linked ecosystems and responses of linked ecosystems to management interventions is communicated to decision-makers | Monitoring information relevant to the spatial scale of impacts, processes and responses is regularly collected and communicated: 2 Monitoring information is collected and only sometimes cpmmunicated: 1 Monitoring information is not collected or communicated: 0 |
| 9b. Decision-makers use relevant information to adapt management measures | Management measures are adapted based on monitoring information about land-sea impacts, processes and responses: 2 Management measures are not adapted when monitoring information indicate a need to change rules: 0 |
| 9c. Adaptions to rules consider present and future uncertainty regarding cross-system threats and processes | Present and future uncertainty regarding cross-realm threats and processes considered: 2 Present and future uncertainty regarding cross-realm threats and processes not considered: 0 |
| 10a. Management actions/monitoring is carried out by individuals across land and sea realms who report to coordinating body | Individual actors or groups implementing management are reporting to coordinating body: 2 Individual actors or groups implementing management do not report to coordinating body: 0 |
| 10b. Frequency and consistency of communication between lower to higher scales of nested systems (upward and downward communication) | There is regular communication between vertical governance scales: 2 There is patchy communication between vertical governance scales: 1 There is no communication between vertical governance scales: 0 |
| 10c. Consistency in goals and motivations between nested levels in achieving ILSM outcomes | Goals and motivations are consistent across nested levels: 2 Goals and motivations are not consistent across nested levels: 0 |