Enhance Partnering, Leadership, and Management GIT Annual Face-to-Face Meeting: October 10-11, 2017 Follow-Up Action Items

DRAFT October 31, 2017

A. **GIT 6 Operations and Organization**
1) Create GIT 6 Vision Statement and revise existing GIT 6 Mission Statement to better reflect what GIT 6 currently does or should be doing.
2) Add recognition of the "Budget & Finance" and "Local Leadership" workgroups, and their roles/responsibilities, back into the GIT 6 Workplan.
3) Explore incorporation of the Communications Workgroup into GIT 6.
4) As per Governance Document, GIT 6 needs to develop its membership criteria and seek endorsement by the Management Board. Increasing diversity should be considered in developing membership criteria.
5) GIT 6 will move to meeting on a quarterly schedule beginning in 2018

B. **CBP Organizational Effectiveness**
1) Given that the CBP has many committees, workgroups, and teams; but that the CBP partnering agencies are staff and time resource limited, how do we ensure that partners' resources are well spent and that the right partners are represented and participating in the right groups?
   a) Short-Term Action: Analyze some of the existing survey information (ex. ChesapeakeDiscovery) to determine if there are any immediate actions we can take to increase participation.
   b) Medium-Term Action: Seek to better align the "Organizational Analysis" (from Greg Allen's PowerPoint) and "Performance Assessment" (from Carl/Kirk's PowerPoint) methodologies. **Greg Allen and Carl Hershner**
   c) Long-Term Action: As informed by above two actions, devote time (perhaps at 2019 Biennial Strategy Review Meeting) to discussing possible changes to the CBP organization and/or Watershed Agreement Outcomes that would improve the ability of partners to engage and participate.
2) We need to identify ways to better connect Watershed Outcomes → GITs → Workgroups (informed by B.1.b. above).
3) Review and address as appropriate "Log of Revisions and Actions for the CBP Governance Document (updated 9/27/16)"

C. **Strategy Review System**
1) Process for updating Workplans*: Finalize draft "90" Day process for GITs to update Workplans after meeting with Management Board (as described in

"Work plan and Management Strategy Update Schedule" document dated 10/6/17):

    a) Define when, exactly, the 90 days begins (Quarterly Progress Review meeting or follow-up Management Board meeting?)

        1. Related question for future discussion: when is the earliest that workgroups can begin working on new work plans—before quarterly progress meeting? Between quarterly progress meeting and follow up?

    b) Increase time for Step 4: Workgroup send to GIT and appropriate management chain for review

    c) Make a final decision on the role of Step 6: Finalize signatory update of planned participation.

    d) Remove Step 7: Stakeholder review.

    e) Remove Step 8: Send to GIT 6 to ensure appropriate use of Decision Framework – this is now covered by mentors

2) Process for updating Strategies*:

    a) Define what justifies a Management Strategy needing to be revised, and develop and propose to MB a parallel process for Management Strategy updates

    b) Jessica/CAC will work to develop a stakeholder review process for updating Management Strategies

    c) Make note of the conversation we had about incorporating the learning between updates. Where does the learning get reflected? Popular idea was that it gets expressed in SRS QPM materials.

3) Align/coordinate as much as possible the calendars and timeframes of the 2-Year Milestones with the 2 Year Biennial Review process – reach out to workgroup Chair, Suzanne Trevena

*DECISION: The GIT recommends to the Management Board that the proposed 90-day update schedule will apply only to updating 2-year work plans. If workgroups and/or Goal Teams identify changes that need to be made to management strategies, there will be a separate process (to be developed) to "petition" the Management Board to reopen the strategy, which will involve stakeholder engagement and should make use of a "decision threshold" methodology.

Chesapeake Bay Program
Science. Restoration. Partnership.

Enhance Partnering, Leadership and Management
Goal Implementation Team Meeting
Agenda and Minutes

October 10-11, 2017

Day 1 Agenda

(October 10, 2017)

Attendance (October 10):

Laurel Abowd, CRC	**David Goshorn, MD DNR (Chair)**
Greg Allen, EPA (Coordinator)	Kirk Havens, VIMS/STAC
Doug Austin, EPA	Carl Hershner, VIMS/STAC
Greg Barranco, EPA	**Nicki Kasi, PA DEP**
Russ Baxter, Office of the Secretary of Natural Resources	Marel King, Chesapeake Bay Commission
Carin Bisland, EPA (Vice-Chair)	Catherine Krikstan, UMCES
Jessica Blackburn, Alliance/CAC	Dan Nees, UMD EFC/B&FWG Chair
Diane Davis, DC DOE	**Jennifer Pauer, WV DEP**
Sarah Diebel, DOD	**Kristin Saunders, UMCES**
Andy Fellows, UMD/LLWG Chair	Lauren Townley, NY DEC
Kristen Fleming, MD DNR	**Doreen Vetter, EPA**
Rachel Felver, Alliance	Steve Williams, DE DNREC
Laura Free, EPA	Julie Winters, EPA
Emily Freeman, CRC (Staff)	Kristen Wolf, PA DEP
Mary Gattis, Alliance/LGAC	

I. **Getting Started: Order of the Day and Introductions** (12:30 p.m. – 12:50 p.m.)
Dave Goshorn, Enhance Partnering, Leadership and Management Goal Implementation Team (GIT 6) Chair, will outline the objectives and process for the two-day meeting. Updates and announcements from Goal Team and Workgroup members.

II. **GIT 6 Work Plan** (12:50 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.)
1. Review the current GIT 6 mission statement. What (if anything) is no longer valid? What is missing? What do we want to achieve that is not currently described? Update/revise the mission statement – consider revisions that will help the mission read more like an "outcome statement" (see below example). (*20 minutes*)

Ex. Oysters Outcome Statement: Continually increase finish and shellfish habitat and water quality benefits from restored oyster populations. Restore native oyster habitat and populations in 10 tributaries by 2025 and ensure their protection.

2. Identify the factors influencing our ability to achieve our work, current efforts, and gaps using the SRS logic table template. Consider what metrics could measure the success of
3. Update work plan actions based on existing programs and identified gaps, using the SRS work plan template. (*40 minutes*)

Discussion Lead: Greg Allen, EPA/GIT 6 Coordinator; Kristin Saunders, UMCES; Doreen Vetter, EPA

Materials:

II.a. GIT 6 Logic Table and Work Plan (new SRS format) (draft)

II.b. SRS Quarterly Progress Meeting Guide

Notes

Mission Statement:

- Kristin Saunders (KS): For the "stakeholders" piece, the Stewardship GIT is working a lot of improving stakeholder engagement, so are we duplicative in taking on this piece?
  - o If we want to be more inward facing, and looking at the things that the partnership/ partners are taking on, it might help to narrow our vision
- Carin Bisland (CB): Should we be explicit about local leaders being a partner?
- Nicki Kasi (NK): Who exactly are we serving here? Those within the partnership/program, or those that the program serves?
- Greg Allen (GA): The outcome that we are responsible for, Local Leadership, is more outward facing than some of the other work we do, so we should keep that in mind
- Doreen Vetter (DV): If we want to have more of an outcome-type statement, we could keep our mission broader/more aspirational, and then develop and outcome-like statement that flows from the mission
  - o If we don't want to be so specific in the mission statement – an outcome-like statement could help us lay out specifically what our mission/aspiration means to us
- Mary Gattis (MG): I feel like we are really confusing things by moving the GIT toward the logic table/outcome format
  - o It's like fitting a round peg (the GIT) into a square hole
  - o I feel like we are a working group that needs to understand what our purpose is, and keep that separate from the Watershed Agreement and outcomes
    - ▪ We are a group of people working as a management team for the partnership, whereas the outcomes are a defined and more short-lived set of things we have set up to accomplish
- NK: I agree, the Agreement has a defined set of outcomes, but the GIT doesn't fit that
- KS: We aren't trying to create new outcomes that would be approved, but we want to be able to measure the work we are doing so we can see if we are having the impact on the management, etc. that we have set out to do
  - o That's the benefit of having a more measurable outcome statement
  - o But we want to know if we're doing what we said we would do, and if it's having the expected impact

- **Takeaways for the Mission Statement:**
  - Change "improve" to something like coordinate or facilitate
  - Remove stakeholders or more clearly define as local leaders
  - Mention increasing efficiency and effectiveness
  - Mention the role of the GIT in keeping the principles of the Watershed Agreement at the forefront of the work we are doing
  - Local Leadership success – how do we measure success?
    - Idea: **"Continually enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the CBP partnership."**
- MG: One of the ways we are trying to enhance effectiveness, etc. is by trying to bring local governments in as active partners through workgroups, outcomes, etc.
  - So maybe we don't need to explicitly address local leaders in the mission statement, because it's the "how" of getting the work done of the mission statement
- Jennifer Pauer (JP): I think that whatever mission statement we end up with is one that we're sure we can stick with for awhile, it's not something that should be changing often
  - CB: I agree, but in this instance because so many additional responsibilities have been added to our plate I think it was warranted
- Jessica Blackburn (JB): Have we asked the other GITs what they need help with? How can we decide whether something fits our mission or not when we don't know what it is that's needed?
  - And if the goal of this GIT is to create a coherent system to manage the resources of the Bay Program, is that more of a function of the EPA Bay Program Office?
  - NK: I agree, is that something for the CBPO staff to do? What function does this GIT as a GIT serve?
- Andy Fellows (AF): I think the weakest part of the current statement is "[building their capacity] to become environmental leaders in their community." – to me that doesn't really mean anything
  - The end of the statement should be some way of expressing what the Agreement wants to accomplish, maybe quantitatively
    - i.e. What it is that we should be doing with watershed partners and stakeholders.
  - Do we want to further define what success is?
- KS: Success (for this GIT) would probably make sense for us to tie it to the implementation of the Watershed Agreement
  - AF: So maybe it is to measurably implement in the agreement
- Dave Goshorn (DG): I think we should explore the idea of having both a vision statement and a mission statement

Factors Influencing:
- Factors:
  - Public Engagement
  - Legislative Engagement
  - Government Agency Engagement
  - NGO Engagement
  - Partner Coordination
  - Use Conflict

- o   Scientific and Technical Understanding
- o   Funding or Financial Resources
- Not Factors:
  - o   Landowner Engagement
  - o   Population Growth
  - o   Biota (Flora and Fauna)
  - o   Habitat Condition
  - o   Climate Change

Break   (2:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.)

III.   CBP Organizational Analysis   (3:00 p.m. – 4:45 p.m.)
Brainstorm ideas for improving organizational effectiveness (e.g. participation) in ways that can facilitate achievement of the Watershed Agreement Outcomes.
1.   Review organization chart.
2.   Discuss how to make the partnership more engaging to participants
     a.   Exercise on engagement and value continuum
3.   Strategy for moving forward
Discussion Lead: Carin Bisland, EPA/GIT 6 Vice Chair; Greg Allen, EPA/GIT 6 Coordinator; Kristin Saunders, UMCES; Rachel Felver, Alliance
Materials:
III.a. CBP Organization Chart
III.b. Organizational Analysis Possible Areas of Focus
III.c. Continuum Sticky Note Exercise

Notes:
- JP: In WV, we are very limited in our staff, so we had to prioritize where we were going to use our staff resources in relation to Bay Program activities – we don't a lot have salaries coming out of Bay Program grants, so we struggle with finding the time, people, and money to be fully engaged
  - o   Does the Bay Program have to do the same kind of prioritization?
- CB: There is a serious dilemma between the resources that the signatories can put toward achieving these outcomes, which they prioritize, and the fact that these workgroups are still expected to achieve each of their outcomes with or without full participation
  - o   How do we enhance the value of the partnership to the signatories that are on the partnership, in a way that provides the most efficient and effective way of moving forward?
- Jessica Blackburn (JB): Can we switch the paradigm to be more like, "join this workgroup and we will give you tools to do x, y, z," versus, "join this workgroup and help us meet our goal."
- NK: My other concern is why we need to have a workgroup for every outcome?
  - o   Can related outcomes fall under one group? If one outcome's success depend on the actions of another outcome, why would those not be managed together?
- Greg Barranco (GB): What are some examples where we could find some consolidation?
  - o   NK: Maybe another way of looking at it is… What is the expertise you want on a workgroup?

- ▪ Perhaps the groups can be consolidated based on the type of expertise you want – that way you've got a person with a certain expertise on one group instead of four
- KS: You can consolidate multiple workgroups, and maybe even Goal Teams?
  - o Having been at the GIT Chair level and struggling with participation issues, there are ways that a jurisdiction can participate without having someone assigned to that GIT
    - ▪ Ex. A participant for a jurisdiction could be someone from an NGO or a local government that is doing similar work, instead of a state-level person
  - o NK: We do that where we can, but supporting those people then becomes almost a full time job because they don't always know where to find the information they need
    - ▪ Coordinating them to make sure they have what they need is very difficult
  - o MG: Also, most NGOs don't have the resources (funding, staff, time, etc.) to support that level of participation
- CB: So what is this GIT's role in providing some options for how to fix this issue?
  - o NK: We need a problem statement first – what is the problem we are trying to solve with this analysis? Then what are the steps to address it? And in the end, what are we trying to accomplish?
- CB: I think the problem statement is that the current structure of the Chesapeake Bay Program partnership is not sustainable for the signatories
- JP: I think we need some short- and long-term goals in dealing with this
  - o NK: And it needs to go down to the outcome level
  - o Greg Barranco (GB): So saying, "these are the outcomes we need to focus on now, and these are the outcomes that aren't on the front burner/being worked on now, but in the long-term will still be achieved
    - ▪ CB: If we put outcomes on the back burner, are we still going to achieve them by 2025, as stated in the Agreement?
    - ▪ Doreen Vetter (DV): If some are put off until later, we probably need to adjust how much we want to achieve or by when we want to achieve the full outcome as laid out right now
- GB: Maybe this discussion is premature – we haven't had that many outcomes go through the SRS yet, and I don't think we have a good enough read on it yet
  - o I think this is something that is better addressed at the larger SRS Biennial Meeting
- KS: My thought is to spend the next 6-12 months looking at the SRS feedback, talking with GIT Chairs and Coordinators about how they can streamline their own groups, and build this out in a way that moves us up the continuum from the perception that this is a bureaucratic machine that requires too much time (thus they are disengaged and see low value) to a place where people are engaged and see high value
  - o The ways we do this is by determining a streamlined organizational structure that helps people be engaged without feeling spread too thin, and by addressing some of the issues on the "Organizational Analysis Possible Areas of Focus"
- KS: What if we were to ask the Goal Teams who have said that participation is an issue to give us some suggestions as to how we could make it easier for jurisdictions to participate
- DG: I think it's obvious that it is probably unrealistic to have signatory reps on every workgroup, but can we at least ensure that they are represented on every GIT/STAR?

- o CB: Possibly, but we would have to really emphasize that the workgroups would have to feed into the GIT to keep signatory reps up to speed
  - In a lot of workgroups (in WQGIT, for example), things are resolved within the WG and only elevated to the GIT level when they can't reach consensus at the workgroup level – that kind of structure wouldn't work, the GIT would need to be more consistently in the loops on actions and decisions at the workgroup level
  - o CB: The GIT could identify places in the workgroups' work plans where they have a vested interest and want to be given updates on, it wouldn't have to be every action
- JP: Maybe we already have the short-term solution – does it work well enough through the SRS process, that when participation is brought to the Management Board level, those signatory reps take action by going to people in their state to see if and where they can help?
- MG: One thing I've heard a lot is that workgroups want local leaders, on the ground people to be represented on their groups
  - o Is this something the Caitlyn Johnstone could help with? To help go out and find the right person to meet the need(s) of the workgroup
- GA: To do something really major (like combining workgroups, etc.), we want to get through more of the SRS and also see what the Bay Barometer says – until we have clear evidence that we aren't not making our outcomes, we aren't going to make **long-term** major shifts
  - o But we've heard repeatedly that there is concern over participation and engagement, so in the **short-term** we can dig up the Chesapeake Discovery report and look at the results of Laurel's participation survey and see if there are things like meeting structure, trust building, etc. to see if there are things we could suggest to GITs to help with this issue
  - o In the **mid-term**, use the "Organizational Analysis Possible Areas of Focus"
    - Maybe it becomes another element of our work plan, where the work plan has short-, medium-, and long-term components
- **ACTION:** Analyze the results of the Chesapeake Discovery report and the participation survey.

Wrap Up and Adjourn   (4:45 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.)

Dinner   (5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.)
Dinner will be served until 7:30 p.m. in the dining facility on the second floor of the Commons building.

Day 2 Agenda
(October 11, 2017)

Attendance (October 11):

Laurel Abowd, CRC	David Goshorn, MD DNR (Chair)
Greg Allen, EPA (Coordinator)	Kirk Havens, VIMS/STAC

Doug Austin, EPA	**Carl Hershner, VIMS/STAC**
Greg Barranco, EPA	**Nicki Kasi, PA DEP**
Russ Baxter, Office of the Secretary of Natural Resources	Marel King, Chesapeake Bay Commission
Carin Bisland, EPA (Vice-Chair)	Catherine Krikstan, UMCES
Jessica Blackburn, Alliance/CAC	Dan Nees, UMD EFC/B&FWG Chair
Diane Davis, DC DOE	**Jennifer Pauer, WV DEP**
Sarah Diebel, DOD	**Kristin Saunders, UMCES**
Andy Fellows, UMD/LLWG Chair	Lauren Townley, NY DEC
Kristen Fleming, MD DNR	**Doreen Vetter, EPA**
Rachel Felver, Alliance	Steve Williams, DE DNREC
Laura Free, EPA	Julie Winters, EPA
Emily Freeman, CRC (Staff)	Kristen Wolf, PA DEP
Mary Gattis, Alliance/LGAC	

Breakfast   (served until 8:30 a.m.)

IV.   Biennial Strategy Review System (SRS)   (8:45 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.)
1. Highlight to-date accomplishments achieved and challenges identified through the SRS process. (*10 minutes*)
2. Where can GIT 6 focus as the SRS process continues to develop: a STAC perspective. (*10 minutes*)
3. "Completing the Decision Framework:" How does everything we have learned feed into the next phase of the Decision Framework – are the actions you are taking having the expected effect, and are the assumptions we have made correct? (*55 minutes*)

Discussion Lead: Dave Goshorn, MD DNR/GIT 6 Chair (part 1); Carl Hershner and Kirk Havens, STAC/VIMS (parts 2 and 3)

Materials:
IV.a. SRS Highlights/Overview Presentation
IV.b. Biennial SRS Outcome Groupings
IV.c. Decision Framework Graphic
IV.d. Enabling Effective Adaptive Management in the Chesapeake Bay Program

Notes:
- Carl Hershner (CH): If we are going to learn in this process and not suffer repeating things we have already done, it is critical that we document and build a rationale for all of the changes that are occurring
    - What will be most useful in helping the MB to become managers will be the clarification of the decision points
- CH: We knew we would have to confront many issues at the outset of proposing this effort, and that it would be a challenge to keep GITs and workgroups effectively engaged in the process

- CH: Understanding the value added of the Bay Program will help everyone going forward in being more focused in how resources are used and in work plan action development and implementation
- CH: We fear that the SRS has created an expectation that we are moving directly from strategies to managing adaptively
  - This steps over some of what we consider to be most critical in actually learning, and being able to demonstrate what we've learned and why we're doing the things we are doing/changes we are making
    - Specifically, the **monitoring and assessment steps**
      - This is where the learning and accountability come in
- CH: There has been a disconnect between the development of indicators and what exactly the management/decision process requires as information
  - Communicating to the public is secondary to effective management of the program – understanding what's working/what's not, and if our assumptions have been correct
    - We want to reinforce the need to think strategically about the monitoring that is required to effectively adaptively manage
- CH: What change in the system are you trying to affect, and is it working?
  - Have we taken the actions that we said we said we would?
- CH: When your actions are not producing the results you thought you would, that's when we know that there is probably a misunderstanding of the factors influencing success
  - This is a big part of the documentation portion, so you can explain why things haven't worked
    - The first place to look is whether or not your initial assumptions were correct – are things they assumed wouldn't change actually changing during their intervention?
- CH: If workgroups develop expected responses and are able to bound their uncertainty, they are able to tell the MB whether or not they are in the cone of uncertainty
  - If they are not, the system is not responding as expected, that provides a clear rationale for the decisions they are making
- Kirk Havens (KH): Even if people are giving broad uncertainties, at least that's something more than "we're just doing x, y, z…"
  - CH: The size of the cone of uncertainty really speaks to the understanding of the factors influencing… The more factors, the larger the uncertainty can be
- DG: We've been saying all along that there are more steps in the process (i.e. the "optional" parts of the logic table)
  - My understanding is that the optional parts get to the monitoring and assessment steps, and that at some point those steps would become requirement
- CH: What this is designing is ensuring that there is a systematic rationale for whatever changes are occurring within the Bay Program, and it should track back to what they're not seeing as a result of their actions
  - That is tough in this first 2-year round because there hasn't been enough time, and they don't have the monitoring ability or documentation to prove why changes could be essential

- As this evolves, we want to press people to be more consistent in developing this sort of rationale for the MB, so you have a nice record of why you did what you did, why it may not be working, and why you made certain changes to address those issues
- CH: This is a way of trying to train the MB about how to think about these issues – you don't' just want to make change, there should be a consistent underlying analysis that allows the MB to have the information to both decide "yes" or "no," and also to prioritize the importance of the assistance that is requested
- CB: Starting to ask people to think about their outcome in a graphical way (trajectory, cone of uncertainty) won't add a complicated step, but it will get them to think across the full breadth of what impacts their actions will have
  - MG: That's a good point, and for example with Local Leadership, and I see it being a graph similar to the top right (where it takes a long time to see a response, but when you finally see that response it is exponential) – there is a high degree of uncertainty about when that tipping point will occur, but maybe that's ok
- CH: I aspire that whenever a workgroup thinks about making a change, that they are asking themselves, "If they change because we are outside of our expected system response? Is this not consistent with what we expected from the system?"
  - This is a way to document that
  - This thinking is something that should be happening at the start of an action, when it is planned – this is the type of thing you should be able to document at the beginning to explain WHY you're taking an action
- DG: I think what a lot of groups haven't done yet is think about the outcome of their actions in a time-bound, at least semi-quantifiable way
- CH: The real interest here is in system response
  - This becomes important in the outcomes/goals with human dimensions, i.e. number of training programs
    - We can track that, but the reason we are doing them isn't just to have more training programs, it's to produce a change in something (i.e. social perceptions, environmental conditions)
      - That's what needs to be forecast and needs to be the basis of rationale for changes
- CH: This type of analysis should be possible for each action
  - CB: Sometimes it's a series of actions that create a response, so I'm wondering if this sort of analysis is more appropriate for a Management Approach?
- DG: We're two cohorts in out of seven, so I think one of our tasks is to stay the course but begin to plan out how to implement these next steps in the decision framework
  - I'm not sure if we should start teeing this up now, or wait for the next two-year round
    - NK: **Can this be part of the organizational analysis? Can we apply some of this as part of a mid-term analysis that gets us ready to start having a conversation around this, as a performance analysis approach?**
- CH: What I think is most critical at this point is that the Bay Program is, very soon, going to have to come to grips with monitoring

- o So it will be key for each outcome to identify the key metrics and parameters sooner rather than later, and having that solid rationale for selecting certain things
  - ▪ The groups need to be mentored to the process so that the things they're asking to have monitored are those things that will increase the capacity for decision making
- o DG: So I think a next step is for GIT 6 to start working with STAR on this
- **ACTION:** Take the organizational analysis, STAC (Carl, Kirk) will work with Greg A. and see if they can merge that methodology with the decision threshold methodology.

Break   (10:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.)

V.   Bay Program Governance   (10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.)
Discussion will begin with resolution of a 90-day process for updating management strategies and work plans after the SRS Quarterly Progress Meeting for presentation to the Management Board for approval. Remainder of discussion will focus on two objectives:
1. A high level review of the Governance Document to identify necessary edits to include the SRS process (e.g. updating Management Board and GIT roles and responsibilities), and
2. Identify a process for including other Governance Document modifications based on issues identified by the Management Board and GITS previously.
Discussion Lead: Dave Goshorn, MD DNR/GIT 6 Chair; Carin Bisland, EPA/GIT 6 Vice Chair; Greg Allen, EPA/GIT 6 Coordinator; Mary Gattis, Alliance/LGAC Coordinator
Materials:
V.a. Proposed Work Plan Update Schedule (draft)
V.b. Chesapeake Bay Program Governance Document
V.c. Governance Document Log of Revisions (draft)

Notes:
- DG: On step 4 of the proposed work plan update schedule, what does "appropriate management chain" mean?
  - o CB: For example, sending the draft work plan to the fisheries managers
- NK: I think we need to consider revising the timeline(s) of the 2-Year Milestones to line up better with the schedule of when WQGIT is presenting to the MB through the SRS
- MG: If a group is only making major revisions to the work plan, that can probably happen more quickly
  - o But if you need to make major changes to your Management Strategies, such as changing approaches, that has a different timeframe and process
    - ▪ Because major shifts in those strategies are going to require a larger effort to engage stakeholders
  - o In this round, changes may need to be made to the management strategies because we have learned a lot of things since starting SRS, but in the long-term that document shouldn't be changing a lot
    - ▪ If they are needing to have frequent, major changes, you're probably doing something wrong

- NK: Groups wanting to make changes to their Management Strategies need to bring solid justification to the MB during (or soon after) their Quarterly Progress Meeting as to what changes are needed and why
  - MG: It's like a "petition" to reopen the strategy, at which point stakeholders would have to be notified
    - It's also a good use of the "Decision Threshold" graphic to present the reasoning to the MB
- CB: Outcome leads could bring minor changes to work plans to the Management Board during the "dark blue" times of MB meetings, and the version would change from Version 2 to something like Version 2.1
  - And the major revisions to the work plans would happen after the SRS Quarterly Progress Meetings
- **ACTION:** Increase the timeframe for Step 4 in the proposed work plan update schedule. Remove Step 7, and make a final decision on the role of Steps 6 and 8. Further discuss the idea of workgroups beginning to revise 2-year work plans in between the SRS Quarterly Progress Meeting and the follow-up meeting with the Management Board the following month.
- **ACTION:** GIT 6 will collaborate with the 2-Year Milestones Workgroup to begin formulating a way to align the timeline(s) and process(es) that each group is engaged in in relation to the Strategy Review System.
- **DECISION:** The GIT recommends to the Management Board that the proposed 90-day update schedule will apply only to updating 2-year work plans. If workgroups and/or Goal Teams identify changes that need to be made to management strategies, there will be a separate process (to be developed) to "petition" the Management Board to reopen the strategy, which will involve stakeholder engagement and should make use of a "decision threshold" methodology.

Lunch   (12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.)

VI.   **GIT 6 Work Plan**   (1:00 p.m. – 1:45 p.m.)
Review the revised logic table and work plan created on Day 1 of the meeting. If necessary, make further revisions that have been informed by the other Day 1 and 2 agenda topics – CBP organizational analysis, SRS, and CBP governance.
Discussion Lead: Greg Allen, EPA/GIT 6 Coordinator; Kristin Saunders, UMCES; Doreen Vetter, EPA
Materials:
VI.a. GIT 6 Logic Table and Work Plan (see material II.a.)

Wrap Up and Adjourn   (1:45 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.)

Notes – Actions, Decisions, Follow Up, & Next Steps
Work Plan:
- Vision and Mission Statements

- Explore Communications Workgroup becoming part of GIT 6
- **ACTION:** Replace "Management Approach" with "Work Theme" in the GIT 6 work plan.
- Further define the B&FWG and LLWG actions in the GIT 6 work plan
- **DECISION:** GIT 6 will use the decision framework logic as work plan actions are evaluated, but the GIT 6 will not use the logic table.
- Responsible parties for each of the work plan actions should review these actions and highlight any areas for update or further discussion

Organizational Analysis:
- Short-term: analyze some of the existing survey information, such as Chesapeake Discovery, and determine if there are small items we can move on to address issues related to participation
- Medium-term: **Carl and Greg** will start working out how to align the organizational analysis and the performance assessment methodology
- Long-term: At next biennial meeting, assess whether we need to do something to address the ability of partners to actively engage and participate, i.e. reorganization of outcomes, workgroups?
    - o Medium-term will help inform this
- Identify ways to better connect workgroups to their respective Goal Teams
- Define membership for GIT 6 – what does it mean to be a member?
    - o Have a purposeful eye on diversity during this process

Biennial Strategy Review System (SRS):
- Work plan schedule → take out GIT 6 role, increase time for management review/comment of draft work plan
- Define what justifies a Management Strategy needing to be revised, and develop and propose to MB a parallel process for Management Strategy updates
    - o **Jessica/CAC** will work to develop a stakeholder review process for updating Management Strategies
    - o Make note of the conversation we had about incorporating the learning between updates
        - ▪ Where does the learning get reflected?
            - • Popular idea was that it gets expressed in SRS QPM materials
- Align calendars and timeframes with the Milestones – reach out to workgroup Chair, Suzanne Trevena

Governance Document:
- The GIT should talk about big picture changes that need to happen
    - o Volunteers will draft these changes and bring back to GIT 6 for review

NEW GIT 6 MEETING SCHEDULE
- In 2018, GIT 6 will do quarterly face-to-face meetings, location(s) TBD
    - o Keep all 2017 meetings as is
- **ACTION:** Poll with 2-3 options for November GIT 6 meeting