

Overview of ERG's Component in Beyond 2025

- **Charge**: High-level programmatic evaluation. Approved by SC in September.
- **Aim**: Review effectiveness of CBP structure / processes; Impact assessment.
- **Method**: Content analysis, interviews, small groups, listening sessions.

[illegible]

Content Analysis


1. Not technical analysis, rather a synthesis and documentation process.
2. Analysts produce a summary for each document. Not entirely exhaustive, but purposeful...particular focus on statements that align with the evaluation questions.
3. Summary statements cross-reviewed to determine throughlines or potential conflicts.
4. Integrate “statement of findings” into final report.

Found on B25 Homepage on ChesapeakeBay.Net

Material Title (Author(s), Affiliation, Publication Date)

- [Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement](#) (Chesapeake Bay Program Partners, 2014)
- [Chesapeake 2000](#) (Chesapeake Bay Program Partners, 2000)
- [Governance and Management Framework for the Chesapeake Bay Program – Version 5.0](#) (Chesapeake Bay Program Partners, 2022)
- [Achieving Water Quality Goals in the Chesapeake Bay: A Comprehensive Evaluation of System Response](#) (Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee Publication 23-006, 2023)
- [Charting a Course to 2025: A Report and Recommendations for the Chesapeake Executive Council on How to Best Address and Integrate New Science and Restoration Strategies Leading up to 2025 \(Draft\)](#) (Chesapeake Bay Program, 2023)
- [Rising Watershed and Bay Water Temperatures: Ecological Implications and Management Responses](#) (Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee Publication 23-001, 2023)
- [Enhancing the Chesapeake Bay Program Monitoring Networks: A Report to the Principals' Staff Committee](#) (Chesapeake Bay Program, 2022)
- [Chesapeake Governance Study: Report of 2021 Decision-Maker Interview Results](#) (D.G. Webster, Dartmouth College, 2023)
- [Recognizing political influences in participatory social-ecological systems modeling](#) (Lim, T. C., Glynn, P. D., Shenk, G. W., Bitterman, P., Guillaume, J. H. A., Little, J. C., & Webster, D. G., *Socio-Environmental Systems Modelling*, 2023)
- [Enhancing Chesapeake Bay Partnership Activities by Integrating Social Science](#) (Wainger, L. et al., University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science, 2023)
- [Retrospective on Lessons Learned from the Chesapeake Bay Program Strategy Review System's 3rd Cycle with Suggested Adaptations to Address the Issues](#) (Chesapeake Bay Program, 2023)
- [Café Summaries and Report Products from Chesapeake Bay Program Strategy Review System's 3rd Cycle Biennial Meeting](#) (Chesapeake Bay Program, 2023)
- [Using Ecosystem Services to Increase Progress Toward, and Quantify the Benefits of, Multiple CBP Outcomes: Day 1 Workshop and Day 2 Workshop](#) (Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee, 2023)
- [Linking Soil and Watershed Health to In-Field and Edge-of-Field Water Management](#) (Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee, 2020)
- [Using Local Monitoring Results to Inform the Chesapeake Bay Program's Watershed Model](#) (Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee, 2023)
- [Advancing Monitoring Approaches to Enhance Tidal Chesapeake Bay Habitat Assessment](#) (Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee): [Session 1: SAV](#) (2021), [Session 2: Chlorophyll a](#) (2022), and [Session 3: Dissolved Oxygen](#) (2022)

CBP+ Engagement

1. Interviews, small group discussions, listening sessions.
2. Initial discussions organized by Program Structure. 
3. Follow-up engagements will be identified:
 1. Functional (e.g., monitoring, GIS, financial, staffing/web support)
 2. External Stakeholders (e.g., local officials, SWCD, NGO, Ag industry)
4. In total, approximately 30 engagements between January and March.
5. Integrate “statement of findings” into final report.

A	B	C	F
#	Focus Group	Participants	Perspectives
1	Jurisdiction (NY/PA) + CBC Rep	7 representatives (3 per jurisdiction + CBC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on (1) how the jurisdictions work within or interact with the CBP organizational structure and (2) how the jurisdictions align/reconcile their own goals/objectives with CBP goals/objectives, focusing on the topics of EQ1. • Focus on how the jurisdictions provide CBP-based or -derived information to its own stakeholders, focusing on the topics of EQ2.
2	Jurisdiction (MD/DE/DC) + CBC Rep	10 representatives (3 per jurisdiction + CBC)	
3	Jurisdiction (VA/WV) + CBC Rep	7 representatives (3 per jurisdiction + CBC)	
4	Federal (NRCS; USFS; DHS; EPA; DOT)	10 representatives (2 per Agency)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on how the agencies work within and interact with the CBP organizational structure, focusing on the topics of EQ1. • Focus on how the agencies provide CBP-based information to its stakeholders, focusing on the topics of EQ2.
5	Federal (USGS; FWS; NPS; NOAA, USACE, Navy)	12 representatives (2 per Agency)	
6	STAC	6 members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on how STAC functions within the CBP structure focusing on the topics of EQ1. • Focus on how STAC facilitates/works on providing information to stakeholder; focus on topics related to EQ2.
7	SAC	6 members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on how the CBP interacts with stakeholders (as defined under the SAC scope) using EQ2 as a guide. • Identify areas where the CBP has been effective and areas where improvement is needed. • Some discussion on how SAC interacts within the CBP structure to address EQ1 topics.
8	LGAC	6 members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on how the CBP interacts with local governments as a specific stakeholder group using the topics of EQ2 as a guide. • Some discussion on how LGAC interacts within the CBP structure to address EQ1 topics.
9	Cross GIT	12 members (2 per GIT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on how the CBP works from the cross-GIT perspective, focusing on aspects identified in EQ1.
10	GIT1	6 members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each group separately, a detailed discussion on the goals covered by each group focusing on the aspects identified in EQ3.
11	GIT2	6 members	
12	GIT3	6 members	
13	GIT4	6 members	
14	GIT5	6 members	
15	GIT6	6 members	
16	STAR	6 members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss the aspects of EQ1 related to the functioning of STAR.
17	Strategic Engagement Team	6 members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion that focuses on relevant aspects of EQ2, mostly on reaching stakeholders.
18	Management Board	TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A higher-level discussion of how the CBP functions based on the topics in EQ1. Focus on how MB interacts within the CBP structure. • A higher-level discussion of the topics in EQ3.

PROPOSED SCHEDULE

- **November – January 2024:** Topical groups convene, discuss, and develop recommendations to be considered by the Beyond 2025 Steering Committee.
- **February 2024:** 2-day symposium to discuss and potentially refine topical group recommendations.
- **March 2024:** Adoption of topical group recommendations by the Beyond 2025 Steering Committee and review of the first draft of recommendations from the Beyond 2025 Steering Committee.
- **April 2024:** Adoption of the Beyond 2025 Steering Committee recommendations.
- **May – June 2024:** Solicit public feedback on the Beyond 2025 Steering Committee recommendations.
- **July 2024:** Revise and affirm the Beyond 2025 Steering Committee recommendations based on public input.
- **August – September 2024:** Seek approval of Beyond 2025 Steering Committee recommendations from the Management Board and Principals' Staff Committee.
- **October 2024:** Present and request approval of Beyond 2025 Steering Committee recommendations from the Executive Council.

PROCESS

