**Goals and Governance Refresh**

**Work Session**

The Management Board charged the Enhancing Partnering, Leadership, and Management Goal Team (GIT6) with serving as staff to the MB and with developing options for refreshing our goals and governance. To help facilitate this work, we will break into four groups. Each group will develop a set of options on the attached worksheets for consideration by the full group. The following background information is intended to identify topics and relevant issues/questions that should be considered.

Participants are asked to select one of the four topic groups to help identify topics:

* 1. Protocols for voting responsibilities, conflict resolution, and decision making
  2. Changes to rules and procedures
  3. Changes to governance structure and membership
  4. Adopting partnership goals and outcomes

**Background**

Guiding Principles - The PSC requested that we consider the principles from the 1987 Agreement as a starting point, but update them, particularly referring to the term “voluntary.”   
*1987 Chesapeake Bay Agreement:*

* *“allow for and promote* ***voluntary*** *individual actions coordinated within a well-defined context of the individual responsibilities and authorities of each state and the federal government”*
* *“ensure that actions which require a concerted, bay wide approach be addressed in common and without duplication”*
* *“develop strategic plans and oversee their implementation, based on advice from the public, from the scientific community and from user groups”*
* *“exert leadership to marshal public support”*
* *“be accountable for progress made under the terms of this agreement”*

Additional guiding principle: Fully engage all partners (original signatories, headwater states, federal agencies, NGOs, Advisory Committees, locals).

**Worksheet**

**Breakout Group 1: Protocols for voting responsibilities, conflict resolution, resource allocation (both people and dollars), and decision making** [i.e.,*how we work and make decisions]*

1.a Options needed: Identify governance changes that will enhance clarity of decision making expectations and procedures at the different levels of the program.

Overarching considerations:

* Effective use of delegations in the management structure/hierarchy (i.e., to ensure that voting is fair and is based on one-entity-one-vote.

|  |
| --- |
| Options for voting privileges:  *Considerations: Who gets to vote? Only signatory members? All jurisdictions? All Federal agencies? GIT Chairs? NGO partners? (Example: Each signatory partner (jurisdictions, CBC, EPA as lead Federal agency ) to C2K or new agreement receives one vote at MB and PSC levels.)* |

|  |
| --- |
| Options for voting rules:  *Considerations: Majority rules? Must reach consensus? Dissenting members record their objections? Tie breakers? Rules for conflict resolution. (Example: majority rules at MB level, but consensus must be reached at PSC and EC levels)* |

**Worksheet**

**Breakout Group 2: Changes to rules and procedures** *[i.e., how? – the process and flow of work]*

2.a Options needed: Distinguish the different necessary paths for approving different types of work and issues generated by the GITs and workgroups (policy creation, FYI reports, outside agreements, strategy documents, etc).

Overarching considerations:

* How do we regain/ renew/ recapture the balance between bottom-up and top-down approaches and build upon the desire to be part of a team that is addressing Bay issues holistically?

|  |
| --- |
| Options for approving formal documents:  *Considerations: recommendation v. adoption v. endorsement. At what level of organization (GITs, MB, PSC, EC)? Must document be related to or impact a stated CBP goal or outcome? What if there are implications for jurisdictions to*  *implement? What if document creates a major commitment or change in direction of Partnership? (Example: Externally developed documents [e.g. developed by a sole partner or stakeholder] may be endorsed by the MB after GIT review; logo use conferred).*   1. Externally developed documents. 2. GIT developed documents. 3. With policy or financial implications 4. Without policy or financial implications 5. Federal Partner developed documents 6. Other |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Options for conferring use of CBP logo:  *Considerations: at what level of hierarchy? adoption v. endorsement?* |

2.b Options Needed: What are options for structuring adaptive management reviews/regular evaluations of the program strategy and effectiveness?

Overarching considerations:

* Expanding upon the adaptive management section of the governance document to describe implementing via a cyclical adaptive management loop – a necessary component of which includes regular evaluation of program strategy and effectiveness.

|  |
| --- |
| Options for *scheduling* adaptive management reviews:  *Considerations: Frequency? All GITs at same time or spread out thru year? All goals for each GIT or 1-2 at a time? (Example: 1. At each in-person MB meeting, two GITs will walk through the decision framework for at least one goal (GITs will go in number order) ; 2. Two MB meetings per year will be dedicated to GIT decision framework review sessions)* |

|  |
| --- |
| Options for *structuring* adaptive management reviews:  *Considerations: Format of reporting? What kind of feedback? ChesapeakeStat? (Example: GITs will walk through their decision framework and other GITs must be prepared to discuss cross-cutting opportunities; MB will assess use of the framework and offer suggestions for program performance improvements.)* |

**Worksheet**

**Breakout Group 3: Changes to governance structure and membership** *[i.e., who?]*

3.a Options needed: Extent of changes to program structure and membership (both level and type) necessary to better define and differentiate the role of GITs, Management Board, PSC and EC and appropriate partner representation.

Overarching considerations:

* Regulatory/compulsory vs. voluntary – how to handle?
* What is the value that a “partner” receives from the partnership?

|  |
| --- |
| Options for CBP membership/voting privileges:  *Considerations: Jurisdictions, federal agencies, local orgs, NGOs? Original signatories? Who is a partner v. stakeholder? What does partnership confer and what are expectations/responsibilities? What are the unique responsibilities and obligations of a partner?* |

|  |
| --- |
| Options for governing bodies:  *Considerations: Alternatives to current MB/PSC structure? 0/1/2 MB’s? Membership of each body?.* |

|  |
| --- |
| Options for levels of participation on governing bodies:  *Considerations: Appropriate levels of leadership for EC, PSC, MB, etc. Rules for encouraging/enforcing participation?* |

**Worksheet**

**Breakout Group 4: Adopting partnership goals and outcomes** *[i.e., what’s our endpoint?]*

4.a Options Needed: Methods for developing and approving/adopting program goals with process options for periodically revising, updating based on emerging issues and ensuring continued partner commitment to goals. Options should also be provided for how the partners will memorialize their future work together including the option of a new agreement.

Issues/Questions:

* At what level does signing on to goals and outcomes occur (GITs vs. MB vs. PSC vs. EC) and what does “signing-on” mean? (adopt or endorse or concur (I can live with); accountability and to whom) What are new agreement options ranging from a formal long-term agreement (e.g. C2K) to a simple agreement on vision with an option to select goals and outcomes a partner is willing to adopt ?

|  |
| --- |
| Options for goals approval:  *Considerations: Does a partner have to sign on to all goals/governance issues vs. partial sign-off (i.e., menu driven)? If a partner signs on to only some goals, how does it impact their role in the decision-making process?* |

|  |
| --- |
| Options for CBP participatory document:  *Considerations: Agreement, MOU, etc. Length of time (5,10 yrs, 2025? etc.)? Formal long-term agreement to a simple agreement on vision? Separate document on goals that might be revised/updated based on adaptive management reviews?* |