**Supplementary Online Material 2. Absolute threat ranking and Pairwise threat ranking processes**

**Process used for absolute threat ranking**

The following steps were used in absolute threat ranking.

* Each assessment team identified an area or geography of the wildlife corridor as the scope for analysis. The team held a discussion and came to a consensus on the targets that represent the wildlife corridor. Targets are usually related to biodiversity and they include species and habitat, and sometimes ecological process. The group listed 12 targets for Basanta corridor: forests, ungulate wildlife, Bengal tiger, Asian elephant, wetlands, key aquatic species, sarus crane *(Antigone antigone)*, river, greater one-horned rhinoceros, vulture, grassland and river dolphin *(Platanista gangetica)*. The other group listed 15 targets for Laljhadi-Mohana corridor which were: Bhawar (or Bhabar, the region south or below Siwalik or the Chure Hills), medicinal plants, grasslands, vulture, freshwater turtle, waterfowl, python *(Python bivittatus)*, crocodile *(Crocodylus palustris)*, river, prey base, endangered forests (plant species), nilgai *(Boselaphus tragocamelus)*, wetlands, tiger and forests.
* The team then listed the direct threats affecting the targets. The team listed 10 direct threats for Basanta corridor namely: invasive species, flood and erosion and sedimentation, poisoning (fishing), use of diclofenac, illegal logging, uncontrolled forest fire, excessive firewood extraction, encroachment, excessive grazing, and poaching. The other team listed nine direct threats for Laljhadi-Mohana corridor namely: lack of food and shelter (for vulture), use of poison in river, illegal grazing, poaching, encroachment, river bank erosion and siltation, timber smuggling, uncontrolled forest fire and illegal extraction of fuelwood.
* The biodiversity targets and the direct threats were inserted in the ‘diagram’ sheet in the Miradi software. The team discussed if a particular direct threat affects one or more targets, and each direct threat was then linked to the corresponding biodiversity target(s) in the diagram. Each team carried out the exercise for the Basanta corridor and the Laljhadi-Mohana corridor, respectively. The diagram serves as a conceptual model (Figures 2 and 4). The software automatically transfers the target and direct threats to its ‘threat rating’ sheet.
* On the threat rating sheet of the software, each direct threat is ranked by the three criteria of scope, severity and irreversibility using the four-point scale (very high, high, medium and low) and the definitions found in Table 1 for each criterion. The team discussed each direct threat and its effect on the corresponding target. The team assigned a rating for each criterion of the direct threat. For example, the team assessed ‘illegal extraction of fuelwood’ as a direct threat affecting ‘Forests (target)’ in the Laljhadi-Mohana corridor; the team assigned ‘high’ for the scope of the direct threat, ‘very high’ for the severity of the direct threat and ‘medium’ for the irreversibility of the direct threat (to the target); and the software automatically calculated an aggregate threat rating of ‘high’ from the three criteria. The team then conducted scaling of all the threats with the corresponding targets. The Miradi software shows the rating of each criterion as well as the aggregate threat rating from the three criteria in the threat rating sheet or table. In addition to threat ratings for each threat-target combination, an overall threat rating for each target is shown in the far-right column. The overall project threat rating is also shown in the bottom right corner of the rating sheet or table (Figures 3 and 5). The exercise was conducted twice, once for the Basanta corridor and then for the Laljhadi-Mohana corridor.

**Process used for pairwise threat assessment**

The following steps were used in pairwise threat ranking.

* Each team identified the major threats for the wildlife corridor after rigorous discussion. Nine major threats were identified in Basanta corridor: encroachment, overgrazing, poaching, forest fire, Chure degradation, illegal timber smuggling, river-bank cutting, wetland/habitat loss, infrastructure development. Similarly, 10 major threats were identified in Laljhadi-Mohana corridor: poaching, forest fire, encroachment, poisoning (river), river-bank cutting and flooding, illegal fuelwood collection, open grazing, habitat loss, boulder/sand extraction, and human-wildlife conflict.
* A table was created and the threats were listed in the first row and first column for comparison. Each team created a table for each corridor and listed the threats accordingly. For Basanta corridor, the team compared/matched the first threat with other threats and placed the most important of the two threats in the cell. For example, the team compared ‘encroachment’ with ‘overgrazing’ and placed ‘encroachment’ in the cell based on the importance or prioritisation by the team; so, ‘encroachment’ was compared with all other eight threats. The team repeated the exercise for all the threats (Figure 6). The second team conducted the same comparison of threats for Laljhadi-Mohana corridor (Figure 7).
* For each threat, the team counted the threats placed in the cells in the table and added them in the total score column on the right-hand side of the table. So for Basanta corridor, ‘encroachment’ was placed in eight cells and so was given a score of ‘8’ in the total. The team then added the total score for each threat in Basanta corridor. The team identified nine threats for Basanta corridor, so the highest score for any threat was eight and the lowest was zero. The team categorised the scores as very high (7-8), high (5-6), medium (3-4) and low (0-2). The second team conducted similar total scoring for Laljhadi-Mohana corridor. The team identified 10 threats for Laljhadi-Mohana corridor, so the highest score for any threat was nine and the lowest was zero. The team categorised the score as very high (8-9), high (6-7), medium (3-5) and low (0-2).