Appendix B. A scoring guidepost template for evaluating enabling and disabling conditions of MSP

Table B.1. A template of scoring guideposts for evaluating the enabling and disabling conditions of MSP on a scale of 0 to 10 (adapted from Botero et al. 2016). This is intended as an example; the authors acknowledge that the relevance of specific scoring guideposts will vary among plans.

CONDITION	SCORING GUIDEPOST: 0	SCORING GUIDEPOST: 3	SCORING GUIDEPOST: 7	SCORING GUIDEPOST: 10
Institutional capacity	There is no previous experience with planning (either on the planning side or the intended audience side) and planners have little knowledge of the natural and social systems of the plan area. There are not sufficient resources for continued plan implementation, monitoring and enforcement, and adaptation.	Either planners or the intended audience have prior experience with planning (but not both). There is not necessarily trust or social legitimacy of the planning group. Planners have a basic knowledge of the natural and social systems of the plan area. Little effort has been made to identify sufficient resources for continued plan implementation, monitoring and enforcement, and adaptation.	Both planners and the intended audiences have some prior planning experience; the two groups are in the process of developing trust and social legitimacy. Planners have a solid knowledge of the natural and social systems of the plan area. Work is ongoing to identify sufficient resources for continued plan implementation, monitoring and enforcement, and adaptation.	Both planners and intended audiences have previous experience, and there is trust across all entities involved in the planning process. Planners have a deep knowledge of the natural and social systems of the plan area. Sufficient resources have been identified for continued plan implementation, monitoring and enforcement, and adaptation.
Clear objectives	There are no objectives.	The plan has objectives, but they are unclear and/or include no or only vague targets or indicators. Stakeholders were not included in the development of objectives or were included in a limited way.	The plan has objectives. It includes some targets and indicators, or the targets and indicators do not have all of the SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound) attributes, or are not set up to measure progress towards objectives. Stakeholders were only somewhat included in development of objectives.	The plan has clear SMART objectives, includes targets and indicators that measure progress towards objectives, and clearly describes how stakeholders were fully included in development of the objectives.
Data and evidence	Data sources are not identified in the plan. Data characteristics	Data sources are identified in the plan, but data characteristics	Data sources and characteristics are provided in detail in the plan.	Data source and characteristics are provided in the plan. Data

	(e.g., temporal resolution, spatial resolution, thematic resolution, time coverage) are not mentioned. Exploratory analyses were not performed. Decisions on methodological steps were not guided by evidence (literature or empirical information). Data informing the plan is heavily-skewed toward one data type (e.g., qualitative or quantitative), one sector (e.g., offshore energy), one format (e.g., spatial) or one dimension (e.g., ecological).	are lacking or incomplete. Data preparation included some exploratory analyses, though the plan is not transparent regarding how methodological choices were made. Data informing the plan is somewhat skewed toward one data type (e.g., qualitative or quantitative), one sector (e.g., offshore energy), one format (e.g., spatial) or one dimension (e.g., ecological).	Exploratory analyses were performed, but individual behavior of aggregated ecological and social data were not presented. Decisions on methodological steps and choices were identified, but it is not clear that they were guided by evidence. Data informing the plan includes multiple data types (e.g., qualitative or quantitative), sectors (e.g., offshore energy), formats (e.g., spatial) and dimensions (e.g., ecological).	preparation included exploratory analyses and respected the geographical integrity of the system. Individual behavior of aggregated ecological and social data were presented. Decisions on methodological steps and choices are presented and were guided by evidence. Data informing the plan is balanced across multiple data types (e.g., qualitative or quantitative), sectors (e.g., offshore energy), formats (e.g., spatial) and dimensions (e.g., ecological).
Future-oriented	No visioning or future scenario-planning was done as part of the planning process. The plan makes no mention of future social and environmental conditions or future ocean uses. Climate change and its many impacts are not considered in the MSP.	A basic visioning or scenario-planning was done as part of the planning process, but stakeholders did not play a role in this process. The plan mentions future social and environmental conditions and/or future ocean uses, but has no plan in place to address these future conditions. Climate change and its many impacts are a minor part of the MSP.	Visioning or scenario-planning was done as part of collaborative processes between planners and stakeholders. Both future social and environmental conditions and future ocean uses are discussed in the plan, along with some mention of strategies to address them. Climate change and its many impacts are discussed throughout the plan and were considered in the development of policies, actions and management strategies.	Visioning or scenario-planning was done as part of collaborative processes between planners and stakeholders. Both future social and environmental conditions and future ocean uses are discussed in the plan, along with well-developed strategies for addressing them. The plan accounts for climate change and its many impacts by way of plans for both adaptation and mitigation. Data related to climate change at the scale relevant to planning was used for the development of policies, actions and management strategies.

Trade-offs	No trade-offs were addressed or mentioned in the plan.	Potential trade-offs have been discussed and acknowledged, but without any analyses.	Trade-offs were recognized and formally addressed. However, proper analytical tools were not used; rather, "rules of thumb" or perceptions from the participants were used to analyze trade-offs.	Trade-offs were recognised and formally addressed. Appropriate tools were used and analyses properly done (including taking into account how much of each objective compromised others) and discussed. Analyses and compromises made were properly communicated with stakeholders.
Cumulative impacts	The plan does not mention cumulative impacts or multiple stressors. It is mainly on one or two ocean use sectors or stressors.	The plan acknowledges and addresses more than one sector or stressor, but fails to consider ways that they might interact and/or how to best manage them cohesively.	The plan clearly articulates many stressors involved in management It acknowledges that stressors can interact, but does not articulate a plan to account for and manage those interactions.	The plan clearly lays out a conceptual understanding of multiple, interacting stressors. It identifies a framework for monitoring and assessing multiple stressors, their interactions, and their impacts on the system. The plan lays out strategies to monitor and manage cumulative impacts.
Monitoring, evaluation and learning	There is no plan to collect information on the ecological, socio-cultural or economic impacts and outcomes of the MSP.	There are plans and resources allocated to collecting some information pertaining to the ecological, socio-cultural or economic impacts and outcomes of the MSP. No plans are articulated for using monitoring information to support improving and adapting the MSP.	There are plans and resources allocated to collecting information pertaining to the ecological, socio-cultural or economic impacts and outcomes of the MSP. There are some plans and resources for using information to support improving and adapting the MSP.	There are detailed plans and sufficient resources allocated to collecting information deemed important to diverse stakeholders on the ecological, socio-cultural or economic impacts and outcomes of the MSP. There are robust plans and resources for using monitoring information for improving and adapting the MSP.
Adaptability	The plan does not outline a process to facilitate plan updates.	The plan mentions ongoing plan updates and adaptations, but it is not clear whether legal	A process for updating and adapting the MSP is in place, as is the legal authority to carry it out.	A stakeholder-inclusive process for updating and adapting the MSP is in place,

		authority to adapt the plan exists. Stakeholder engagement in the adaptation process is not discussed.	The plan mentions the potential for stakeholder needs to change or new threats to the system to arise. Though no solid plan is outlined, stakeholder involvement in plan adaptation is mentioned.	including legal authorities and a mandated timeline. The plan discusses methods for incorporating ongoing monitoring data and evaluation results into the adaptation process. Monitoring plans include ongoing assessments of stakeholder needs and threats to the system.
Legal authority	There is no clear authority or mandate for the MSP. As such, the plan is not legally-binding or regulatory.	Authority for the plan is in place, but it is limited to a subset of sectors and/or concerns in the planning area.	There is clear legal authority for the MSP, but political will and leadership limit the ability of the MSP.	There is clear legal authority for the MSP. The political capabilities exist to implement and adapt the plan.
Inclusion of rightsholders	There is no acknowledgement of traditional or local rightsholders in the plan.	Traditional and/or local rightsholders are acknowledged in the plan and included as stakeholders in the process.	Traditional and local rightsholders are acknowledged in the plan and their rights are respected in the plan's actions and strategies. Rightsholders were included in some decision-making processes, but were not equal governing partners.	Traditional and local community rightsholders are acknowledged and legitimized in the plan. Rightsholding groups are given equal decision-making and governing power as part of the MSP process. The MSP process provided a venue for Indigenous peoples and/or local communities to assert their rights and gain meaningful representation in coastal and marine governance.
Enforcement mechanisms and incentives for plan compliance	The plan does not outline a process for enforcement activities or to incentivize compliance. No funding avenues for enforcement are identified.	The plan outlines a process for enforcement activities and discusses the importance of incentivizing stakeholder compliance. The MSP contains plans to pursue legal authority for enforcement activities and assessing penalties. Potential	The enforcement activities laid out in the plan are ongoing. Steps to establish legal authority for enforcement and penalties are being pursued but are not fully realized. Minimal work has been done to implement plans to	The plan outlines both formal and informal enforcement mechanisms and activities. Implementation of the enforcement plan is ongoing. Legal authority for enforcement and to assess penalties is in place. The MSP

		sources of funding for enforcement are identified.	incentivize stakeholder compliance.	contains detailed plans to provide stakeholders incentives to comply with the plan. Implementation of these plans is ongoing.
Stakeholder engagement and participation	Few stakeholders are/were aware or interested in the MSP process. There is evidence of widespread and major barriers to stakeholder participation. Stakeholder roles were/are predominately passive or reactive, and the plan mentions little regarding stakeholder empowerment.	Some stakeholders were/are aware of their role and responsibilities within the MSP process. There is evidence of some barriers to participation. Stakeholder roles tended toward passive or reactive, with few opportunities for active involvement in planning or decision-making.	Key stakeholders were/are aware of their role and responsibilities within the MSP process. In most cases, stakeholders play(ed) an active and constructive role in the planning process and are empowered to participate in decision-making.	All stakeholders were/are aware of their role and responsibilities within the MSP process. Stakeholders play a sustained, active and constructive role in the planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation processes. Stakeholders continue to be empowered to participate in decision-making.
Power in MSP	Power asymmetries are not mentioned in the plan and were not considered before or during the planning process.	Power asymmetries between some groups (e.g., between planners and stakeholders) were considered, but there is little or no evidence of intentionality in overcoming these asymmetries.	Power asymmetries between groups (e.g., between planners and stakeholders) were considered, and stakeholder engagement processes reflect an intention to empower groups deemed likely to be marginalized or disenfranchised in the MSP process.	Power asymmetries between planners and stakeholders and among stakeholder groups were considered, and work was done to address power imbalances during the planning process. The diverse identities of stakeholders were acknowledged, and care was and continues to be taken to empower those who were deemed likely to be marginalized or disenfranchised in the MSP process. Decision-making processes reflect an attentiveness to power dynamics and aim to overcome the exclusion of less-powerful groups.

Equity and justice	MSP planning and implementation processes clearly excluded stakeholders and their diverse perspectives.	Some efforts were undertaken to ensure that diverse stakeholders and their perspectives were/are included in MSP planning and implementation, but stakeholders were/are not part of the decision-making process. Equitable distribution of benefits results from the MSP is discussed in the plan, but no strategies to facilitate this are outlined.	Substantial efforts were undertaken to ensure that diverse stakeholders and their perspectives were/are included in MSP planning and implementation, and stakeholders were/are able to take part in the decision-making process. Equitable distribution of benefits results from the MSP, and strategies to facilitate this are included in the plan.	Major efforts were undertaken to ensure that diverse stakeholders and their perspectives were/are included and empowered as part of MSP planning and implementation. Stakeholders were/are given genuine decision-making power. Processes are in place to ensure transparency and accountability for the individuals and institutions leading the MSP. Strategies, actions and monitoring for the equitable distribution of benefits are outlined in the plan.
Cross-boundary integration	The plan does not identify ecological, administrative, jurisdictional or social boundaries that might impact plan implementation or outcomes. No cross-boundary coordination occurred during the planning process.	The plan identifies some ecological, administrative, jurisdictional or social boundaries that might impact plan implementation or outcomes. Stakeholders across boundaries were notified of the MSP or minimal coordination occurred during the planning process.	The planning process included consultation with stakeholders across some relevant administrative and jurisdictional boundaries. Ecological and socio-cultural boundaries were identified. The sharing of MSP-related information across administrative and jurisdictional boundaries is mentioned in the plan, though no solid process is in place to implement this.	The planning process included consultation and coordination with stakeholders across all relevant administrative and jurisdictional boundaries. Ecological and socio-cultural boundaries were identified and considered throughout the planning process. Plans are in place to engage in the sharing and exchange of data relevant to the MSP across administrative and jurisdictional boundaries.
Integration across levels of government	No coordination or collaboration occurred between different levels of government. No assessment of policy compatibility across levels of government was undertaken.	Some coordination or collaboration occurred between different levels of government. A preliminary assessment of policy compatibility across levels of government was	Multiple levels of government coordinated and collaborated on the plan throughout the planning process. A plan is in place to continue collaboration throughout the implementation process. Steps	All relevant levels of government coordinated and collaborated on the plan throughout the planning process. A plan is in place to continue collaboration

		undertaken during the planning process.	have been taken to correct any policy inconsistencies identified across levels of government.	throughout the implementation process. Regular communication among levels of government occurs and processes are in place for continued communication. All policy inconsistencies across levels of government have been corrected.
Policy and sectoral integration	The plan is focused on one or two ocean use sectors and makes little or no mention of other sectors.	The plan integrates a range of coastal uses, social and environmental concerns, and economic sections. However, one or more sectors are intentionally or unintentionally omitted. Minimal steps were taken to ensure consistency across the plan and existing sector-based policies.	The plan integrates a range of coastal uses, social and environmental concerns, and economic sections. While steps were taken to ensure consistency across the plan and existing sector-based policies, discrepancies still exist.	The plan integrates (with legal authority) the full range of coastal uses, social and environmental concerns, and economic sections. There is consistency across the plan and existing sector-based policies.
Knowledge integration	Diverse perspectives are not included in the MSP process or the plan.	Some diverse perspectives are included in limited ways and/or are only reflected in limited ways in the plan outputs.	Diverse perspectives are included, but not as equivalent to Western scientific perspectives, or incorporation was not guided by relevant knowledge holders.	Diverse knowledges are included in the MSP process and plan outputs, and inclusion is guided by knowledge holders.
Integration of ecosystem-based approaches	The plan does not address ecological or conservation objectives. The plan vision and overarching goals do not mention the maintenance of ecosystem health or provisioning of ecosystem services. The plan does not mention the relevance of the spatial and temporal scales of ecosystem processes and functions. The plan does not	The plan addresses some ecological or conservation objectives. The plan vision and overarching goals refer to the maintenance of ecosystem health or provisioning of ecosystem services. The plan mentions the relevance of the spatial- and temporal scales of ecosystem processes and functions, but actions and management strategies do not	The plan addresses ecological or conservation objectives related to multiple ocean uses, habitats or species. The plan vision and overarching goals address the maintenance of ecosystem health or provisioning of ecosystem services. The plan identifies and justifies the relevant spatial and temporal scales of ecosystem processes and functions that were used in formulating the plan. The	The plan addresses ecological or conservation objectives related to multiple ocean uses, habitats or species. The plan vision and overarching goals explicitly mention the maintenance of ecosystem health or provisioning of ecosystem services. The plan identifies and justifies the relevant spatial and temporal scales of ecosystem processes

	attempt to balance economic, social and ecological objectives.	reflect this. Discussions related to the balance of economic, social and ecological objectives were part of the planning process.	planning process demonstrates an approach to balance economic, social and ecological objectives.	and functions that were used in formulating the plan. The planning process clearly demonstrates an approach to balance economic, social and ecological objectives in a way that considers the feedbacks and interdependencies among these systems.

Literature Cited

Botero CM, Fanning LM, Milanes C, Planes JA. 2016. An indicator framework for assessing progress in land and marine planning in Colombia and Cuba. Ecological Indicators 64:181-193.