



MedSeaRise

Interreg
Euro-MED



Co-funded by
the European Union



December 2025

METHODOLOGY VALIDATION ON ECOSYSTEM IMPACTS

Deliverable D.3.2.1

<https://medsearise.interreg-euro-med.eu/>





Deliverable ID

Project acronym	MedSeaRise
Project title	Supporting Adaptation to Mediterranean Sea Level Rise
Project mission	Protecting, restoring and valorising the natural environment and heritage
Project priority	Greener MED
Specific objective	RSO2.4 Promoting climate change adaptation and disaster risk prevention, resilience, taking into account eco-system based approaches
Type of project	Study project (Thematic Project)
Project duration	01/01/2024 – 31/03/2026 (27 months)

Deliverable title	Methodology validation on ecosystem impacts
Deliverable number	D.3.2.1
Deliverable type	Report
Work package number	3
Work package title	Methodology validation, capacity building and amplification
Activity name	Validation of methodology on ecosystem risk classes
Activity number	3.2
Partner in charge (author)	CCINCA
Partners involved	ANATOLIKI S.A., ARPA FVG , CCINCA, UoM-IBMK, BCC, UM

Document history

Versions	Date	Document status	Delivered by
Version 0.1	23/10/25	Draft	PP2
Version 1.0	27/12/25	Final	PP2



Table of contents

Introduction and Objectives	5
The key points of methodology validation	7
Questions suggested to address to the audience	8
Questions related to methodology Strengths	8
Questions related to methodology Weaknesses	9
Questions related to methodology Opportunities	9
Questions related to methodology Threats	9
Method for the general SWOT analysis	10
Where to store files with stakeholders feedback results	11
Validation by each Project Partner	12
Deliverable indicators	14
Conclusions and validation results	15
Annex 1 – Example of positive quantitative SWOT Analysis	17
Annex 2 – Example of negative quantitative SWOT Analysis	17
Annex 3 – PP2 - ARPA FVG - SWOT Analysis	18
Annex 4 – PP4 - UoM-IMBK - SWOT Analysis	19
Annex 5 – Comprehensive - SWOT Analysis	20
Bibliography and Sitography	21



Abbreviations

ANATOLIKI	Organisation for Local Development, Anatoliki S.A. – Project Partner - LP1
ARPA FVG	Regional Environmental Agency of Friuli Venezia Giulia Region- Project Partner - PP2
CCINCA	Chamber of Commerce and Industry Nice Côte d’Azur - Project Partner - PP3
UoM-IMBK	Public institution University of Montenegro - Institute of Marine Biology - Project Partner - PP4
BCC	Barcelona Chamber of Commerce - Project Partner - PP5
UM	University of Malta - Department of Geosciences- Project Partner - PP6
PP	A Project Partner, in general. Nobody specifically indicated
PPs	All Project Partners
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats
GWL	Global Warming Level
WP1	Work Package 1 of the MedSeaRise project - Information retrieval, data input and stakeholder awareness
WP2	Work Package 2 of the MedSeaRise project - Information analyses, methodology development and tools generation
WP3	Work Package 3 of the MedSeaRise project - Methodology validation, capacity building and amplification



This is a deliverable of the project MedSeaRise. The project contributes to the Natural Heritage mission of the Euro-MED Programme and it belongs to the Study Project class.

The document summarizes the work done in the frame of the project activity 3.2, describing how the project partners have shared the results of the MedSeaRise methodology application with the stakeholders.

Specifically, here are reported the basic concepts that have led to a common approach for the methodology validation that is based on the feedback of the stakeholders and the experts which has been used to quantify the methodology usefulness and efficacy by means of the SWOT analysis technique.

Starting from an outlook on the aim and the objectives of the methodology validation, then the validation concepts are described in detail with the aid of examples that have supported the PPs in the harvesting of the needed information and its analysis.

The document is completed with a summary of the available SWOT analyses and annexes that give further insights to specific aspects of the work done. Deliverable indicators are reported too.



The methodology validation aim

Introduction and Objectives

This document presents a specific contribution in the achievement of the general MedSeaRise WP3 objective, namely the validation of the methodology on the sea level climate scenarios data usage and the related risk assessment processes. This was carried out by means of examples of MedSeaRise application to a selected set of cases, which has been identified thanks to the stakeholders participation and the experts analyses.

The methodology and the supporting tools, such as datasets and benchmarks, which have been developed through the MedSeaRise projects activities belonging to WP1 and WP2, required to be properly presented and explained to all the stakeholders who have expressed interest in the project results. That gave them the awareness of the ideas and methods the project has produced, showing applications that are meant to be replicated to a larger spectrum of sea level related impacts.

It is expected that the work done by the PPs in this project activity contributes to increase the capacity building of the involved actors, besides to prepare the ground for the amplification of the project results with further application and tests across the cooperation area too. Specifically, one of the results foreseen to come from the Activity 3.2 is the evaluation of the MedSeaRise methodology efficacy and its easiness in the application. That result was achieved thanks to the involvement of stakeholders, associated partners and experts.

In fact, application of the methodology on specific impacts, first has produced a set of case studies and, in a second phase, the evolution of selected subset of those in benchmarks, namely standard example of risk assessment for an impact due to the increase of the sea level rise that has to be considered as a tool for the evaluation and comparison of the risk sensitivity from the input data on the sea level trends, according to a specific metric.

In a series of dedicated meetings, benchmarks have been presented to the stakeholders together with a schematic summary description of the MedSeaRise methodology. During such meetings, the participants followed the practical application of the conceptual steps that starting from the finding of the suitable sets of data on sea level rise scenarios, proceeding with the datasets retrieval and usage, according to the guidelines defined in the WP2, lead to the risk assessment.

After the presentation, each stakeholder was asked to fill in a questionnaire. The addressed questions focus on the easiness and difficulties in understanding and applying the methodology, besides to the opportunities the methodology can exploit in the environment in which the stakeholder would apply it or the threats against which its application could fall.

To allow a comparison among all the results coming from each interaction PPs have with the stakeholders, in the frame of the activity 3.2, a guideline was defined on how to organize the meetings, to present the MedSeaRise methodology and to generate the



questionnaire. The guideline is completed with a few rules on the conduction of the quantitative SWOT analysis, using the answers received through the questionnaire. That allowed us to pick up which of the external and internal factors of the methodology have to be considered for further improvements.

This deliverable describes how the MedSeaRise methodology validation, applied to classes of ecosystem impacts, has been blueprint and performed. The results of the SWOT analyses are annexes of this deliverable and are available as files attached to the document.



Basic concepts of methodology validation

The key points of methodology validation

The methodology developed in the frame of the MedSeaRise project is meant for an effective use of sea level rise scenarios in climate change impact risk assessment. It is validated through the involvement of stakeholders, associated partners and experts.

This means that each PP collects the feedback from the involved actors. Those information are harvested organizing meetings with stakeholders, associated partners and experts, if the latter are needed.

During those meetings, the methodology is presented in a summary, by points, or in detail; that is up to the meeting organizers. Furthermore, one or more benchmarks are shown and commented to describe the application of the methodology, step by step.

Naturally, the benchmarks are chosen among those the PP has generated for the area on which it has focused the case studies. Anyway, it is possible a PP uses benchmarks generated by other PPs.

Benchmarks presentation is important because it allows to explain, with the aid of methodology applications, what sets of data on sea level rise scenarios are suitable, from where data are accessible, what are the other data required to define the impact indicators related to the specific exposed and vulnerable target in the benchmark, what is the sensitivity of the impact from the variations in input data, what are the hardest steps found in methodology implementation and so on and so forth.

After the methodology and benchmark presentation, the stakeholders, associated partners and experts are requested to answer a set of questions. Through those questions, the PP collects the information useful to conduct the methodology validation.

In case the actors have already received information on methodology and benchmarks, it is possible to bypass the meetings and to ask them to fill in the questionnaire only.

Easiness and difficulties in applying the methodology are collected from all the PPs questionnaires and a SWOT analysis [1.1] is conducted with the aim to pick up which of the external and internal factors of the methodology have to be considered good enough and those requiring further improvements.

A quantitative SWOT analysis [1.2], [1.3], is the preferred approach. Each PP can provide its own SWOT analysis and a comprehensive one is going to be conducted including all the PPs contributions. There will be an analysis on results coming from the methodology application to anthropic risks and another to its application to the risks affecting



ecosystems.

To make the harvesting of the information easier and the preparation of the questionnaire, in the next section there is a set of suggested questions and their link to the corresponding area of SWOT analysis. Certainly each PP may enrich the set of questions according to the special points to be explored; of course, they are welcome.

To make the results coming from each PP suitable to feed a general SWOT analysis, the score given to each question will be normalized by the total number and weight of the adopted question. Also in this case a detailed description is presented later.

Questions suggested to address to the audience

Here below, there are questions and the associated area of SWOT analysis. A **value** is given to each question and it ranges from 0 worst and 10 best. Furthermore a **weight** can be given to the question by the questionnaire organizers. The weight ranges from 0 to 1. So the quantitative score given to an answer is the product **value x weight**. In case of more than one answer to the same question, that is there is more than one actor answering, then the average of the values shall summarize the result of the questionnaire.

To **mitigate possible imbalances** between the Strengths and Weaknesses, as for Opportunities and Threats, **the weights assigned to each value have to sum to the same total**. This means the sum of the weights used for Strengths equals that of the weights used for Weaknesses, as well as the sum of the weights used for Opportunities and that for Threats. This is very important to get a quantitative SWOT analysis useful for quality assessment.

Questions related to methodology Strengths

Questions on Strengths are meant to collect information on aspects and features **internal** to the methodology that are considered valuable and improve the process of impact assessment, besides to make the job easier to assess. Here are some questions that may be used for the purpose.

1. How clear and understandable do you find the methodology to be?
2. Would you have the methodology be applied in the assessment of risk you consider relevant?
3. Could you apply the methodology with the involvement of human resources available inside your staff?
4. Do you consider it useful to have the results of the impacts expressed as a function of the Global Warming Levels?



5. Do you consider it useful to have the impacts presented with the range of uncertainties?
6. Do you consider the methodology to have a wide range of applications?

Questions related to methodology Weaknesses

Questions on Weaknesses are meant to collect information on aspects and features **internal** to the methodology that are considered limiting or worsening the process of impact assessment and the job to assess heavier. Here are some questions that may be used for the purpose.

1. Does the methodology require specific know-how to be understood?
2. Does the methodology application require too many resources (time, economical or human) in comparison to your availability?
3. Does the methodology application require hiring experts outside your staff?
4. Do you think it is difficult to interpret the uncertainty of an impact due to sea level rise?
5. How difficult is it for you to see the link between the increase of the sea level and the impacts on your asset?

Questions related to methodology Opportunities

Questions on Opportunities are meant to collect information on actual or potential elements **external** to the methodology, for example the environment or the context in which the methodology is used, that may leverage the efficacy and efficiency of methodology in assessing the impact, besides to let the job to assess easier. Here are some questions that may be used for the purpose.

1. Does your sector or asset consider the risk assessment in decision making valuable?
2. Is the methodology a new or innovative tool in the sectors you are working on?
3. Do you think that many other operators of the sector you are working in could be interested in learning about and using the methodology?
4. Is there an adaptation strategy in which the methodology can be helpful?
5. Would you base your strategic plans on the methodology?
6. Would you propose the methodology for the application to other sectors than yours?



Questions related to methodology Threats

Questions on Threats are meant to collect information on actual or potential elements **external** to the methodology, for example the environment or the context in which the methodology is used, that may hinder the efficacy and efficiency of methodology in assessing the impact, besides to let the job to assess heavier. Here are some questions that may be used for the purpose.

1. Are external experts hard to find in order to apply the methodology?
2. Is the cost of the methodology a burden for its application, even for a case of your interest?
3. Do you think the methodology is too complicated for the environment where you are operating and working?
4. Do you think there is a lack of data to assess the impacts of sea level rise in your asset?
5. Is it possible that the results of the methodology are not taken into consideration in defining adaptation planning related to progressive sea level rise?

Method for the general SWOT analysis

To proceed with quantitative SWOT analysis we need to define some quantities we are going to use.

With S, W, O, and T we represent the sum of the values coming from questions belonging to Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats, respectively. Those are all values greater than or equal to zero.

The total SWOT score (**D**) is the sum of the difference between Strengths and Weaknesses and the difference between Opportunities and Threats

$$\mathbf{D} = (\mathbf{S} - \mathbf{W}) + (\mathbf{O} - \mathbf{T})$$

D represents the net balance between positive (Strengths and Opportunities) and negative (Weaknesses and Threats) factors.

The total score magnitude (**M**) is the sum of all the values. Those

$$\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{S} + \mathbf{W} + \mathbf{O} + \mathbf{T}$$

The relative SWOT analysis score (**R**) is the ratio between the total SWOT score (**D**) and total scores magnitude (**M**), that is:

$$\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{D}/\mathbf{M}$$



For a SWOT analysis completely positive, no Weaknesses at all ($W=0$) and no Threats at all ($T=0$), the relative SWOT analysis score is **+1**. While for completely negative analysis, that is no Strengths at all ($S=0$) and no Opportunities at all ($O=0$), the relative SWOT analysis score is **-1**. In a general case R ranges from -1 to +1. Values of $R > 0$ accounts for a general positive analysis result, while values of $R < 0$ reports a general negative analysis result.

$R > 0$ Positive SWOT analysis result

$R < 0$ Negative SWOT analysis result

For $R=0$, the analysis shows that Strengths balance the Weaknesses and the Opportunities the Threats.

In Annex 1 there is an example of SWOT analysis resulting in a positive result, whereas in Annex 2 an example of negative outcome is reported.

Where to store files with stakeholders feedback results

When each partner will meet the stakeholders and receive the feedback on the methodology application, that information is going to be stored in files. Those files are required to report the work done in achieving the results foreseen in project activities 3.1 and 3.2.

Besides the list of participants, with signatures, the slides used during the meetings and the photos, it is expected there is **a summary of the filled in questionnaires, together with the analysis of the questionnaire outcomes**, that is at least the excel file with the SWOT analysis. Of course, each questionnaire can be added to the set of saved files too.

To make the SWOT analysis easier, there is the template spreadsheet file **SWOT_analysis_example.xlsx** that is available in the same folder where this document is.

It is important to split the feedback result files according to the kind of impact you have used to describe the methodology, that is impacts on anthropic activities and impacts on ecosystems.

For feedback related to **anthropic impacts**, which belong to the project **Activity 3.1**, each PP is requested to store the files in the subfolder of [WP3/Activity_3.1](#) which is named with the PP ID.

For feedback related to **ecosystem impacts**, which belong to the project **Activity 3.2**, each PP is requested to store the files in the subfolder of [WP3/Activity_3.2](#) which is named with the PP ID.



Methodology validation

Validation by each Project Partner

MedSeaRise activity 3.2 has produced some meetings with stakeholders and consequently there is one quantitative SWOT analysis for each of the PPs that have generated case studies on impacts affecting the ecosystems. Due to the specific competences of each PP contributing to the project activities, there are two partners only, namely PP2 and PP4, who have identified and explored the consequences of sea level rise to ecosystems. They are listed here below. For these two contributions, the essential information is presented, whereas in the annexes it is available the spreadsheet with the quantitative SWOT analysis carried on by each partner.

Finally, it is presented a comprehensive SWOT analysis, that was performed using the results of all the feedbacks collected from stakeholders participating to the presentation of the methodology and the benchmarks focusing on sea level impacts related to ecosystems.

PP2 and PP4 were committed to work on sea level impacts affecting both anthropic activities and ecosystems, but only PP4 was able to conduct separate validation questionnaires, while PP2 was unable to divide the results of the anonymous questionnaires. So for this Project Partner the contribution to the SWOT analysis is the same as that used for the impacts on anthropic activities. Anyway, PP2 considers the result achieved through the questionnaire representative of both classes of stakeholders, because the participants to the survey were quantitatively almost balanced between those interested in the Methodology application to sea level impacts affecting anthropic activities and those who have focused the attention mainly on the ecosystem responses to the progressive sea level increase.

Project Partner	Annex
PP2 - ARPA FVG	Annex 3
PP4 - UoM-IMBK	Annex 4
Comprehensive SWOT analysis	Annex 5

It is worth noting that the set of questions proposed to the stakeholders are common to all PPs and they have been translated in the other language used by the stakeholders, to facilitate the understanding of the contents and the objective of the question.

Furthermore, the set of weights given to questions, according to the method described here above, are not shared by both PPs. In fact, they decided to use the weights to emphasize the relevance of questions in the contest of the stakeholders.



This does not create problems in comparing the results among partners' validations, because the weights are compliant with the fundamental constraint on the sum of the weights in each class of the SWOT elements. Thanks to that, it is also possible to aggregate the quantitative SWOT addends coming from both PPs, with the aim to achieve a comprehensive SWOT analysis, that is an overall MedSeaRise methodology validation.

Details on the questions' weight and the scores of each element contributing to the quantitative SWOT analyses are reported in the Annexes. Further details on each answer given by stakeholders, together with the documentation on the meetings with the stakeholders are stored in compressed archive files (zip files), that area attached to this document.



Indicators of deliverable achievement

Deliverable indicators

The achievement of the objective described in this deliverable is summarized by means of the indicators reported here below. For each of them the expected indicator value and the actual one are presented. In addition, comments are reported too, if any.

Indicator	Expected value	Actual value	Comments
Number of meetings	2	2	One meeting for each PP that was involved in impacts related to ecosystems
Number of feedbacks	2	3	One SWOT analysis for each of the sets of questionnaires distributed during the meeting, plus a comprehensive analysis using all the available information.

For each meeting, a specific documentation and SWOT analysis is available as an annex.



Conclusions

Conclusions and validation results

The MedSeaRise methodology is a compound of coordinated set of good practices, datasets and examples of its applications, namely the benchmarks, that are meant to support the assessment of risks and the adaptation actions related to sea level rise, due to climate change scenarios, specifically suited for the Mediterranean coastal areas.

Since the methodology is focused on a hazard, which is common to the entire Mediterranean and it is shared among economic, safety and ecosystem preservation stakeholders, it is expected that a large-scale application of the methodology will produce benefits to the whole cooperation area.

Keeping in mind this ambitious goal, it is straightforward the MedSeaRise main result was subjected to the first validation check, before being released as project output. That validation was carried out thanks to the efforts of all the project partners and the many stakeholders and experts, each PP has been involved in the MedSeaRise endeavour.

Not only just a theoretical and abstract presentation of ideas considered suitable for possible application was proposed to the evaluators. Instead, the MedSeaRise methodology was presented and described with examples of its applications, including the problems and the key solutions that each Project Partner has found to put it in practice on real case studies.

The evaluation was characterized by a quantitative approach, applying the well-established method of the quantitative SWOT analysis.

Looking at the specific results achieved, thanks to the application of the methodology to problems affecting the ecosystems, that was carried out by two PPs only, both the SWOT analyses produced a positive evaluation of the MedSeaRise methodology.

In particular, PPs have found that methodology Strength and Opportunities got a comparable high score (more than 8, see Annex 5) revealing that the positive internal and external features of the method and its applications have been considered clearly present.

Weaknesses are lower than strengths but there is not a clear difference between the two responses, that is, in the Northern Adriatic community, they are considered more relevant than the feeling expressed by stakeholders focusing on the South Adriatic ecosystem impacts.

Reversed is the outcome for the external threats that can limit the large-scale use of the methodology. In fact, the score recorded from the questionnaires collected from North Adriatic stakeholders is significantly lower than the corresponding score obtained in the frame of the Southern Adriatic community.

Since the partial scores have the same sign, for both the validations, and the differences found analysing the results of each of the two surveys are small with respect to the score itself, then it is possible to construct the overall SWOT assessment, joining all the information available.



The resulting R index reaches values greater than 0.17, supporting the prevailing of the Strengths and the Opportunities with respect to the internal methodology Weaknesses and the external possible Threats.

Concluding, the SWOT analysis coming from the evaluation expressed by stakeholders, who are mainly involved in the assessment of the sea level rise impacts affecting the ecosystems, suggests the MedSeaRise methodology is a good tool to explore that class of impacts.

Furthermore, the prevalence of the scores obtained by the Opportunities with respect to the Threats, stimulates the promotion of the application of the methodology because the cultural and technical environment is prone to valorise its implementation and the coming results, at least in the Adriatic basin.



Annexes

Annex 1 – Example of positive quantitative SWOT Analysis

Example of positive quantitative SWOT analysis

Type	Question	Value	Weight	Score			
S	Alpha	10	0.50	5.00	S	W	S-W
S	Beta	10	0.50	5.00	10.6	4.8	5.8
S	Gamma	2	0.30	0.60	O	T	O-T
W	Omega	2	0.65	1.30	12.5	11.75	0.75
W	Zetta	5	0.70	3.50			
O	Sound	10	1.00	10.00			
O	Melody	5	0.50	2.50	D	6.55	
T	Noise	5	1.00	5.00	M	39.65	
T	Cry	3	0.75	2.25			
T	pain	5	0.90	4.50	R	0.165195	

Annex 2 – Example of negative quantitative SWOT Analysis

Example of negative quantitative SWOT analysis

Type	Question	Value	Weight	Score			
S	Alpha	10	0.50	5.00	S	W	S-W
S	Beta	10	0.50	5.00	10.6	10.75	-0.15
S	Gamma	2	0.30	0.60	O	T	O-T
W	Omega	2	0.65	1.30	13.2	16.75	-3.55
W	Jotta	7	0.85	5.95			
W	Zetta	5	0.70	3.50			
O	Sound	10	1.00	10.00			
O	Opera	7	0.10	0.70	D	-3.7	
O	Melody	5	0.50	2.50	M	51.3	
T	Noise	5	1.00	5.00			
T	Cry	3	0.75	2.25	R	-0.07212	
T	Shy	10	0.50	5.00			
T	pain	5	0.90	4.50			



Annex 3 – PP2 - ARPA FVG - SWOT Analysis

The SWOT analysis conducted by PP2 ARPA FVG.

Type	Question	Value	Weight	Score
S	How clear and understandable do you find the methodology to be?	8.5	0.25	2.13
S	Would you apply this methodology to assess risks that are relevant to your organisation?	8.14	0.25	2.04
S	Could your organisation apply the methodology using only internal staff?	7.43	0.10	0.74
S	Do you find it useful to express the impacts as a function of Global Warming Potential (GWP)?	8.68	0.15	1.30
S	Do you find it useful to present the impacts together with their range of uncertainty?	9.43	0.15	1.41
S	Do you consider that this methodology can be applied to a wide range of sectors?	9.14	0.10	0.91
W	Does the methodology require specialised technical know-how to be applied?	7.43	0.25	1.86
W	Does applying the methodology require too many resources (time, budget)?	6.93	0.30	2.08
W	Does applying the methodology require hiring external experts that are not available in your organisation?	6.61	0.10	0.66
W	Is it difficult for you to interpret the uncertainty of the impacts obtained?	6.61	0.15	0.99
W	Is it difficult for you to see and understand the link between sea level rise and coastal erosion?	3.25	0.20	0.65
O	In your sector, is risk assessment an important element in decision-making?	8.57	0.25	2.14
O	Is this methodology new or innovative compared to the tools normally used in your sector?	6.78	0.10	0.68
O	Do you think that many other operators in your sector could be interested in this methodology?	7.89	0.15	1.18
O	Is there an existing or planned adaptation strategy (e.g. for climate or sea level rise) in your sector?	7.93	0.15	1.19
O	Would you be willing to base or support your strategic planning using this methodology?	7.96	0.20	1.59
O	Would you recommend this methodology for application in sectors other than your own?	8.68	0.15	1.30
T	Are external experts with the required skills difficult to find for applying this methodology?	5.19	0.20	1.04
T	Is the cost of applying the methodology a burden for your organisation?	5.33	0.25	1.33
T	Is the methodology too complex for the working environment or organisation?	4.29	0.25	1.07
T	Is there a lack of suitable data to assess sea level rise impacts on the area of interest?	5.31	0.15	0.80
T	Is there a risk that the results of this methodology would not be taken into account?	5.07	0.15	0.76

S	W	S-W
8.53	6.24	2.29
O	T	O-T
8.09	5.00	3.09

D	5.38
M	27.86
R	0.1932

Archive file storing all the information collected by PP2 in the frame of methodology validation.

File: **Act_3.2_MedSeaRise_methodology_validation_PP2.zip**



Annex 4 – PP4 - UoM-IMBK - SWOT Analysis

The SWOT analysis conducted by PP4 UoM-IMBK

Type	Question	Value	Weight	Score
S	How clear and understandable do you find the methodology to be?	9.33	0.20	1.87
S	Would you apply this methodology to assess risks that are relevant to your organisation?	9	0.15	1.35
S	Could your organisation apply the methodology using only internal staff?	8.33	0.15	1.25
S	Do you find it useful to express the impacts as a function of Global Warming Potential (GWP)?	8.33	0.20	1.67
S	Do you find it useful to present the impacts together with their ranges?	8.33	0.15	1.25
S	Do you consider that this methodology can be applied to a wide range of sectors?	8	0.15	1.20
W	Does the methodology require specialised technical know-how to be applied?	6	0.25	1.50
W	Does applying the methodology require too many resources (time, budget)?	3.66	0.15	0.55
W	Does applying the methodology require hiring external experts that are difficult to find?	7.66	0.15	1.15
W	Is it difficult for you to interpret the uncertainty of the impacts obtained?	5.33	0.25	1.33
W	Is it difficult for you to see and understand the link between sea level rise and the impacts?	2.33	0.20	0.47
O	In your sector, is risk assessment an important element in decision-making?	6.66	0.30	2.00
O	Is this methodology new or innovative compared to the tools normally used?	9	0.10	0.90
O	Do you think that many other operators in your sector could be interested in using this methodology?	6.66	0.15	1.00
O	Is there an existing or planned adaptation strategy (e.g. for climate change) in your sector?	6.33	0.15	0.95
O	Would you be willing to base or support your strategic planning using this methodology?	9	0.20	1.80
O	Would you recommend this methodology for application in sectors other than yours?	7.66	0.10	0.77
T	Are external experts with the required skills difficult to find for application of this methodology?	6	0.15	0.90
T	Is the cost of applying the methodology a burden for your organisation?	3.66	0.25	0.92
T	Is the methodology too complex for the working environment or organisation?	8	0.20	1.60
T	Is there a lack of suitable data to assess sea level rise impacts on the coastal zone?	7.66	0.30	2.30
T	Is there a risk that the results of this methodology would not be taken into account?	5	0.10	0.50

S	W	S-W
8.58	5.00	3.58
O	T	O-T
7.41	6.21	1.20

D	4.78
M	27.20
R	0.1759

Archive file storing all the information collected by PP4 in the frame of methodology validation.

File: **Act_3.2_MedSeaRise_methodology_validation_PP4.zip**



Annex 5 – Comprehensive - SWOT Analysis

The SWOT analysis conducted using all the feedbacks coming from stakeholders.

PP	S	W	O	T	S-W	O-T			
PP2	8.53	6.24	8.09	5.00	2.29	3.09			D 9.91
PP4	8.58	5.00	8.36	7.41	6.21	0.95			M 57.21
All_PPs	17.11	11.24	16.45	12.41	5.87	4.04			R 0.1733
averages	8.56	5.62	8.23	6.21	4.25	2.02			

Archive file storing comprehensive SWOT analysis.

File: **Act_3.2_MedSeaRise_methodology_validation_all.zip**



References

Bibliography and Sitography

[1.1] Structured decision making: A practical guide to environmental management choices. Gregory, R., Failing, L., Harstone, M., Long, G., McDaniels, T., Ohlson, D. (2012), Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

[1.2] Improving reintroduction planning and implementation through quantitative SWOT analysis, Thomas H. White, Yara de Melo Barros, Pedro F. Develey, Iván C. Llerandi-Román, Omar A. Monsegur-Rivera, Ana M. Trujillo-Pinto, (2015), Journal for Nature Conservation, Volume 28, Pages 149-159, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnc.2015.10.002>.

[1.3] Quantitative SWOT analysis: A structured and collaborative approach to reintroduction site selection for the endangered Pacific pocket mouse, Rachel Y. Chock, William B. Miller, Shauna N.D. King, Cheryl S. Brehme, Robert N. Fisher, Hans Sin, Peggy Wilcox, Jill Terp, Scott Tremor, Matthew R. Major, Korie Merrill, Wayne D. Spencer, Sherri Sullivan, Debra M. Shier, (2022), Journal for Nature Conservation, Volume 70, 126268, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnc.2022.126268>.



MedSeaRise

**Interreg
Euro-MED**



Co-funded by
the European Union

