Pilot Options Multicriteria Assessment

Step 1 – Criteria ranking

The criteria were determined by the draft Coastal Community Adaptation Profiles report. Elected members ranked the criteria by importance.

Criteria	Ranking
Exposure	3
Community Readiness	2
Relationship Building Required	1

Step 2 – Criteria weighting

Elected members distributed the weighting out off 100 to determine the scale of importance.

Criteria	Ranking	Weight
Exposure	3	60
Community Readiness	2	30
Relationship Building Required	1	10
Total		100

Step 3 –Scoring

3.1 Scoring guide

Elected members rated the pilot option's ability to meet the criteria. For each location they assigned a 1, 5 or 9 based on the scoring guide below.

Criteria	Least (1)	Middle (5)	Most (9)
Exposure	• Limited exposure for the exposure indicators, with 50 yr timescale showing little exposure. • The risks and impacts will be specific to a certain aspect of the community.	• Medium-high exposure, for either both 50 yr and/or100yr hazards, across some of the exposure indicators, including long-lived assets. • There are clear risks and impacts to multiple aspects of the community.	• High-extreme exposure for 50 yr and 100 yr hazards, across most or all the exposure indicators, including longlived infrastructure. • The risks and impacts span almost all aspects of the community. • High potential for ad-hoc responses resulting in lock-in. High potential impact on development/redevelopment.
Community readiness	• Evidence of recent community history of paralysing, conflicting views. Projects or initiatives that failed or were substantially delayed due to community conflict. • Minimal organised community groups or very low participation rates. • Conflicting views/issues with spatial plans and/or low engagement.	• Evidence of mixed degree of capacity and desire to engage. • Some well-established community groups or key community members and stakeholders, but work required to increase participation rates or reach historically disengaged groups. • Spatial plans are generally supported and had some engagement.	• Evidence of community capacity and desire to engage. • Multiple, well organised groups with good participate levels. • Strong evidence of adaptive pathways process as opportunity to address issues. • Spatial plans are well-supported and had high engagement.

Relationship building required	• Evidence of strong community distrust with Council. • One or more community groups actively against Council initiatives and work. • Very limited knowledge of the current community among council staff. • Existing issues with community engagement processes likely to complicate adaptation planning.	• Evidence of mixed relationships with Council. • Some good working relationships with certain groups or on certain projects, or evidence of growing relationship. • Knowledge of the current community among council staff varies across groups, neighbourhoods etc. Some gaps. • Existing community engagement processes that may complicate adaptation planning.	• Evidence of strong working relationship with multiple groups and stakeholders across the community. • Multiple active projects or recent successful initiatives. History of high engagement and participation in local government processes. • Substantial knowledge of the current community among council staff. • Existing engagement that supports or feeds into adaptation planning. 3

3.2 Example scoring sheet

Elected members completed the scoring for each pilot option. The total scores are shown on the right-hand column for each pilot option.

1- Baylys Beach			
Evaluation criteria	**Weight**	**Score**	**Total**
Exposure	60	5	300
Community Readiness	30	9	270
Relationship Building required	10	9	90
			660

2 - Ripiro / West Coast			
Evaluation criteria	**Weight**	**Score**	**Total**
Exposure	60	1	60
Community Readiness	30	1	30
Relationship Building required	10	5	50
			140

3- Poutō East			
Evaluation criteria	**Weight**	**Score**	**Total**
Exposure	60	1	60
Community Readiness	30	5	150
Relationship Building required	10	9	90
			300

4 - Raupo / Ruawai			
Evaluation criteria	**Weight**	**Score**	**Total**
Exposure	60	9	540
Community Readiness	30	9	270
Relationship Building required	10	9	90
			900

5 - Tinopai + surrounds			
Evaluation criteria	**Weight**	**Score**	**Total**
Exposure	60	1	60
Community Readiness	30	1	30
Relationship Building required	10	1	10
			100

6 - Pahi/Whakapirau + surrounds			
Evaluation criteria	**Weight**	**Score**	**Total**
Exposure	60	5	300
Community Readiness	30	1	30
Relationship Building required	10	5	50
			380

3.3 Final scores

The final scores were averaged across the Elected members. Final scores are shown below.

Pilot Options	Average total scores
Ruawai/Raupo	836
Baylys	492
Pahi-Whakapirau	428
Poutō East	380
West Coast	340
Tinopai	292