Modified Strategy Review System

4th Cycle – Year 2

Phase 2 Outcome Review

1. **Introduction**
2. Purpose

The Executive Council’s (EC) Charge for Phase 2 activities directs the Principal Staff Committee (PSC) to complete “[r]evisions to the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement (Agreement) with modifications to the existing vision, principles, preamble, goals, and outcomes…”, and to do so by December 1, 2025.

To address this charge, the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) will be modifying its Strategy Review System (SRS) process. For the second year of the SRS’s fourth cycle, instead of producing and/or updating workplans, management strategies, and Outcome Review Summaries, Workgroups (WGs) and Goal Implementation Teams (GITs), will answer an overarching question as means to provide advice to the Management Board (MB) on the next step to take with each Agreement Outcome. The modified process will also reconfigure the SRS’s Quarterly Progress Meetings into three Outcome Review Meetings in February and March 2025.

1. **Methodology**
2. Roles and Responsibilities
   1. Goal Implementation Teams & Workgroups (WG):
      1. GITs and WG will provide the MB with a concise, two-page response to the “Big Question,” defined in Appendix A, for each Outcome. See 2(c) and 2(d) for material due dates.
      2. GITs and WGs will meet to plan responses to the “Big Question”. GITs and WGs will post meeting times on the [Chesapeakebay.net calendar](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/calendar) during which outcome responses will be discussed.
      3. GITS and WGs will identify which Outcomes will be discussed in each of the three Outcome Review Meetings
      4. GIT and WG leadership are expected to participate in Outcome Review Meetings.
   2. Signatories:
      1. Signatories will consider the following two questions for each outcome in advance of the Outcome Review Meetings:
         1. To what extent does the Outcome align with the administrative goals and legislative mandates of Signatory jurisdictions (i.e., DC, DE, MD, NY, PA, VA, WV)?
         2. How does the Partnership provide value in helping Signatory jurisdictions achieve their administrative goals and legislative mandates?
      2. Signatories will self-identify as Outcome discussion leads for the Outcome Review Meetings.
         1. Leads will be confirmed at the December 12th Management Board meeting. Leads are expected to prepare questions in advance and steer the discussion.
         2. Signatories will utilize “Big Question” responses in preparation for their discussions at each Outcome Review Meeting.
         3. Signatories may attend GIT/WG meetings as able and interested.
   3. Advisory Committees:
      1. Advisory Committee members may participate in GIT and WG meetings to plan responses to the “Big Question,” as able and interested.
      2. Advisory Committees may provide input at each Outcome Review Meetings, or synthesized comments following the entire set of review meetings.
   4. Federal Management Board Members:
      1. Federal Management Board members (considering GIT or WG responsibilities), may participate in GIT and WG meetings to plan responses to the “Big Question,” as able and interested.
      2. Federal Management Board members may provide input at each Outcome Review Meetings, or synthesized comments following the entire set of review meetings.
3. “Big Question” Format Guidelines
   * 1. Length – No more than 2 pages.
     2. Spacing – Single line spacing should be used with 6p spacing between paragraphs.
     3. Margins - All margins should be no less than one inch.
     4. Font – Calibri 11pt
     5. References – Should be linked within the text and cited at the bottom of the assessment. References do not count towards the page count, however, please be mindful for the quantity of references and the amount of information they *require* the reader to digest.
4. Outcome Discussion Format
   * 1. The two-page response should be completed two weeks in advance of the MB discussion date. See table below for meeting and material dates.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort | Materials Due | Management Board (Outcome Review Meetings) |
| 1 | Thursday, January 30th, 2025 | Thursday, February 13, 2025 |
| 2 | Thursday, February 13, 2025 | Thursday, February 27, 2025 |
| 3 | Thursday, February 27, 2025 | Thursday, March 13, 2025 |

* + 1. Each Outcome session will be 20 minutes in length and entirely focused on discussion. The discussion will be led by a CBP Signatory.
    2. Meeting format is TBD – see comment of current considerations.

1. Schedule of Milestones

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Action** |
| Nov. 18th | Initiate review. GIT Chairs and Coordinators brief workgroups on the modified SRS process. |
| Dec. 12th | Management Board meeting. Confirm which Outcomes will be discussed during each of the three Outcome Review Meetings. Also confirm Signatory discussion leads for each Outcome. |
| Feb. 13th (C1)  Feb. 27th (C2)  Mar. 13th (C3) | Outcome Review Meetings   * 9-10 Outcomes will be discussed to begin determining Outcome recommendations (i.e., consolidate, reduce, update, remove, replace or add new outcomes) * Outcomes identified as being kept or combined can be moved on to develop new or modified Outcome language (i.e., “SMARTification). * Other needs may also be identified during the meeting such as evaluating shortfalls or the need for new outcomes, or requiring further information. |
| Mar. 27th | It is suggested that at least one recap meeting is held to stimulate input and feedback from partnership stakeholders and other interested parties. |

**Appendix A**

The following question is to be addressed by each GIT for all Outcomes that fall within the GIT’s responsibility. If a GIT feels that one of the Outcomes they are responsible for would benefit from combination with / addition to / revision with an Outcome that is the responsibility of another GIT, they are encouraged to work collaboratively with that GIT. Advisory Committees are invited to also address this question for any or all Outcomes that they wish to respond to.

**“What advice do you have for the Management Board on how to consolidate, reduce, update, remove, replace or add new outcomes within your Cohort/GIT?​”**

In answering this question, responses should consider the following:

Primary Consideration – EC Charge: The December 10, 2024 Executive Council Charge is the driving document for this effort and, therefore, addressing the Charge and its intent must be the primary consideration in drafting responses to the posed question. Particular attention should be given to recommending revisions to the Outcomes that address the seven bullet points on page 2 of the Charge (see item [1] listed in the [Executive Committee Charge to the Principals’ Staff Committee: Charting a Course Beyond 2025](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fd18lev1ok5leia.cloudfront.net%2Fchesapeakebay%2Fdocuments%2FFinal-2024-EC-Charge-Beyond-2025-CORRECTED-11-7-24-clean.pdf&data=05%7C02%7Cbell.douglas%40epa.gov%7Ce7a0c1e5a2c649781c0d08dd0985870a%7C88b378b367484867acf976aacbeca6a7%7C0%7C0%7C638677191286578222%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=l8qIkyhtRmD0ay%2BUU2CNF4Rnk4434YAtIUzpVJrxby8%3D&reserved=0)). ​

Guidelines: The following guidelines are offered for consideration as you craft your answer:​

1. In reviewing your outcome, provide advice to the Management Board on whether "to consolidate, reduce, update, remove, replace or add new outcomes"
   1. Don’t need to provide updated Outcome language at this point in the process.​
   2. If consolidation is recommended, which outcome(s) do you advise combining with?​
   3. Should the outcome be moved or restructured?
2. Consider if the Outcome is SMART, and specifically, whether the current outcome meets the definition of an outcome, as described in the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement (“Agreement”), or if that outcome is an output or indicator.​
   1. Review ERG’s Beyond 2025 Report for existing assessment of **S**pecific, **M**easurement, and **T**imebound.
3. Consider aspects of “what makes a good Outcome”. Many considerations are captured in the report “[Retrospective on Lessons Learned from the Chesapeake Bay Program Strategy Review System’s 3rd Cycle with Suggested Adaptations to Address the Issues](https://d18lev1ok5leia.cloudfront.net/chesapeakebay/documents/2.-Read-Ahead-Retrospective-on-Lessons-Learned-from-the-CBP-SRS’s-3rd-Cycle_5.5.23_2023-05-09-175030_ddta.pdf)” (see p. 5 “The CBPs Secret Sauce: A Recipe for Management Success”). Others proposed include:
   1. Has at least two Partners to Champion.
   2. Avoids subjective language.
   3. Amplifies Signatory implementation activities.
4. Consider the challenges to and opportunities for achieving the outcome. You are encouraged to leverage past documentation and learnings from the Strategy Review System process, as well as Charting a Course to 2025 report and Beyond 2025 Small Group recommendations as they pertain to the outcome.

 ​

1. Consider how the outcome relates or could relate to the Bay Agreement mission, vision, and themes/pillars.
2. Consider the timescale for completing the outcome (5, 10, 15 years). Determine if achieving the outcome is an incremental step or is it a final outcome.​
3. Consider resource needs and availability (high, medium, low).​
4. Consider the risk or unintended consequences of removing the Outcome.
5. What value is added by having the Chesapeake Bay Program work on the outcome?
6. Consider how the Outcome, as written, benefits the public. Does the outcome reflect public input already received and have the potential to galvanize public support/engagement?
7. See [Resource Binder for supplemental information](https://d18lev1ok5leia.cloudfront.net/chesapeakebay/documents/Beyond-2025-Resource-Binder-ToC-11-19-24.pdf), including:
   1. 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement (Item 2)
   2. Charting a Course to 2025 report (Item 4)
   3. Beyond 2025 Recommendations (Item 5)