**Roles and Responsibilities**

Implementing adaptive management through the decision framework can (and over time, should) occur at multiple organizational levels. This is the information that ultimately *provides the basis for coordination, collaboration,* *and the development of program strategy.* Implementation will begin at the GIT organizational level. Each GIT should be able to articulate their goals, identify the actions planned, and provide a compelling rationale for those actions.

***a. Goal Implementation Teams***

All GITs will evaluate and describe their work using the categories described in the decision framework i.e., explicitly articulate their goals, action plans, and the rationale for those plans. They will work with the Leadership GIT and Chesapeake*Stat* team to develop content for inclusion in Chesapeake*Stat.* The intended audience for their content is their own GIT/workgroup, other GITs, the MB, the Principals’ Staff Committee, Executive Council, and the Federal Leadership Committee. While not the intended audience, the public and other interested stakeholders will be able to view the information presented in Chesapeake*Stat*.

When this is accomplished, it will be possible for the GITs to identify their individual monitoring and analysis needs – thereby tasking Scientific and Technical Analysis and Reporting (STAR) (data collection and analysis) and enabling Chesapeake*Stat* (management issue identification and framing).

At present, the leadership of the Habitat and Watersheds GITs and the Agriculture Workgroup of the Water Quality GIT have committed to describing the basic information in a consistent format (*aka* decision framework) necessary to enable the adaptive management process. The Water Quality and Fisheries GITs have activities underway and much of the essential information developed could be captured in the framework necessary to initiate the process. The Leadership GIT is best positioned to staff the adaptive management process and the Management Board given their current suite of responsibilities.

***b. ChesapeakeStat Process Implementation Workgroup, ChesapeakeStat Development Team, and STAR***

The Chesapeake*Stat* Development Team (Development Team) and STAR will continue to work with early implementers by assisting in data collection, analysis, and performance reporting - as those needs are identified by each GIT. The Chesapeake*Stat* Process Implementation Workgroup (PIW) and the Development Team will work with the other GITs to develop a schedule for developing content in advance of presenting this schedule to the PSC in July. The Development Team is responsible for continuing to build in additional capabilities within the website to report elements of the decision framework and support the adaptive management process. The PIW (with the support of STAR) is responsible for performing a quality check on the information being presented in the decision framework to ensure the logic connecting all the pieces is clear, articulated, and adequate. That is, have the GITs articulated their goals in clear and observable terms? Have they assessed and reported the elements that must be managed in order to achieve their goals? Have they developed a management strategy with performance expectations? Is there a monitoring strategy with appropriate indicators and reporting/analysis planning?). STAR could provide a method for responding to the monitoring and assessment needs in a documentable way.

The evaluation of these management strategies should engage the Independent Evaluator (logic and performance assessment) and perhaps STAC (management performance expectations, indicator selection, and monitoring plan).

Specifically, the PIW is responsible for:

* Overall coordination of the Chesapeake*Stat* process with the GITs, STAR and STAC;
* tracking and reporting progress by the GITs in developing the information required by the decision framework;
* implementing Chesapeake*Stat* by supporting the development of MB and PSC agendas;
* working with the MB to establish a schedule for cross-goal topics at each MB meeting and review of individual GIT work described in Chesapeake*Stat*;
* working with the GITs and the Development Team to ensure content is available on Chesapeake*Stat* to support the discussions (see Chesapeake*Stat* Content Development Process document); and
* providing necessary follow-up with GITs, including coordination among the GITs and both STAC and STAR.

***c. Advisory Committees***

The three Advisory Committees (Citizens, Local Government, and Scientific and Technical) provide independent perspectives from critical stakeholder groups and strengthen the natural and social science basis for Bay restoration activities. The Advisory Committees are the independent thinkers and advisors to the EC, Principals’ Staff Committee (PSC) and MB and provide support to GIT requests for policy, scientific and technical input as allowed by the limited time that Advisory Committee members are able to apply. As such, they are critical to supporting implementation of the adaptive management framework.

Ask STAC to provide a small group to coordinate oversight/review of indicators and monitoring plans as they are developed. (Does STAC review indicators and monitoring plans currently?)

***d. Management Board***

The **MB will review performance, identify opportunities for coordinating resources, identify opportunities for strategic coordination and leveraging of complementary efforts, help address project roadblocks, and recognize when program redirection is necessary.** This process will also inform other partners and the public about CBP priorities and progress toward achieving those priorities.

Time will be allocated in each MB meeting to discuss cross-goal topics of concern that highlight the work of more than one goal team. Data and information would be accessed via established content on Chesapeake*Stat* and, after follow-up actions are assigned, tracking of that follow-up would occur on Chesapeake*Stat*, and be reported during the next Management Board meeting.

These monthly portions of the meeting agenda would be balanced so that over the course of the year, the Management Board would have the opportunity to hear from each of the GITs individually and as part of cross-goal topic discussions. These monthly topic discussions would build over time into a regular quarterly annualized schedule.

**Supporting GITs and Workgroups in Developing Decision Framework**

The Leadership GIT will appoint a small workgroup to work with the GITs as they develop all the elements of the decision framework to ensure that their effort is consistent with the intent, comprehensive enough to make the effort effective, and that the information is appropriately used to generate true adaptive management of the program's activities. This will not be an insignificant effort and we need to implement a support mechanism for the GITs to ensure a good start.

**Facilitated workshops and mentor**. Creating a small cadre of individuals who can work individually with GITs/workgroups/staff to develop the initial elements of the decision/logic framework in a consistent and appropriate manner is crucial. Specifically, it will be necessary to lead the groups through development of clear and concise articulation of goals, and the logic modeling necessary to develop initial management strategies. In some cases, this will simply involve revisiting existing plans to ensure they are clearly explained and all necessary questions are appropriately answered. Once this has been accomplished, the exercise of developing performance expectations and monitoring plans will need to be led by a mentor(s) so that the output is sufficiently uniform and of adequate quality to profitably engage STAC and STAR. To do this effectively, we need to identify the key individuals in each GIT to engage in this process, and begin tracking and reporting progress.

**Proposed Workshop Options:**

* Schedule session at GIT Chairs and Coordinator/Staffers meetings.
* Schedule session at proposed all GIT meeting.
* Schedule series of webinars for each of the GITs separate from their scheduled meetings to ensure enough time to devote to this topic.

**Development of Early Successes to Demonstrate the Value in the Process**

Intensive work with those GITs and workgroups willing to invest real effort can generate significant progress and a well developed straw-man for further discussion in a larger group. Progress with interested groups has, to date, been generated by a few individuals and needs to engage the broader memberships of these groups to be effective in the long term. The SAV Workgroup, the Agriculture Workgroup, Wetlands Action Team, the Healthy Watersheds GIT, and the Monitoring Workgroups would be the best early targets for focused attention.  
  
Specifically, the monitoring workgroup is in a good position to ensure that their proposal for expanded monitoring is presented in a format that highlights the application of the decision/logic framework. Articulating their rationale and tying the proposal directly back to accomplishment of the goal set for that group in the realignment process is critical to the success of their proposal. Engaging some of the STAC folks who led the MRAT process to demonstrate the application and value of the decision framework would be helpful.

**Short Term Next Steps Leading up to Executive Council Meeting**

1. Joint meeting of the Chesapeake*Stat* **Action** Team and the Leadership GIT to further refine implementation approach for the Chesapeake*Stat* process.
2. The SAV and Agriculture workgroups and the Watersheds GIT will have content built out using the decision framework in Chesapeake*Stat* in advance of the EC Meeting.
3. At the June/July MB meeting, options for cross-goal topics to be discussed at the next several MB meetings and a tentative schedule will be part of the agenda.
4. Discuss topic options with MB and EC Planning Committee that may be timely for demonstration of the benefits of implementing the Chesapeake*Stat* process at the private portion of the EC Meeting.
5. Chesapeake*Stat* Development Team (of Leadership GIT) will continue to develop the website to report elements of the decision framework, and the Leadership GIT will develop a monitoring/tracking method. This will clarify expectations for the GITs and transparently identify progress.
6. Ask STAC to provide a small group to coordinate oversight/review of indicators and monitoring plans as they are developed.
7. Ask STAR to provide a method for responding to the monitoring and assessment needs in a documentable way.