

RMT - Develop Criteria for Reviewing Process

1. Based on Framework standards, identify Criteria that should have a minimum or maximum standard, standards that are pass/fail, and more qualitative standards that are interdependent
2. Develop Suggestions for standards Criteria
 - a. Request GRSG Science Team to review recommended quantitative standards
 - i. Review focus: Will this minimum standard likely lead to net conservation benefit at the landscape level over 50(?) years?
 - b. Differentiate between standards required for Service approval and additional criteria required for a prelisting mitigation agreement with the Service
 - c. Standards criteria recommendations and justifications presented to ARD/RDs
3. Approved criteria used to create a sufficiency checklist
4. Develop internal and external templates to promote understanding of standards criteria in checklist.
5. Append materials to or update Framework, if necessary

Deleted: I

Comment [SG1]: See draft SOP tables. Some standards are just a yes/no. Others may be more qualitative. Others will depend on the strength of the other standards... We may not have answers for each one, but we can at least identify the ones that are more complicated than minimum criteria. I'm concerned the ARDs will expect minimums for all, and it's not that easy...

Edits suggested here reflect that complication

Comment [LZC2]: Is meeting the criteria required for Service approval or a pre-listing mitigation agreement, or are those the same thing? Are there criteria (or levels of criteria) that would be sufficient to the Service to approve a program, but a higher standard needed for prelisting mitigation agreement.

Added suggestion to #2 based on this

Deleted: minimum

Deleted: minimum

Formatted

Deleted: Minimum s

Deleted: minimum standards