

Questions and Considerations for an Outcome Impact Assessment

Breakout Comments Organized by Theme

Enabling Legislation and Resource Commitments.

- Section 117 of the CWA or other enabling legislation, something that we aren't working on that we should be [G1]
- Identify roles in each outcome and create a list of all existing programs working towards the outcome e.g., Jurisdiction's roles and federal partner roles [G2]
- What kind of investments (both budget and staff/volunteer) have been made and the resulting impact? [G6]

Value Add

- Is CB Partnership providing value to accomplishing that Outcome? What is the jurisdictional / partnership capacity to do this? [G1]
- What is the overall impact of the outcome? [G2]
- Defining prioritization, roles, and responsibilities. How and who? How to engage all stakeholders. Need to be realistic about capacity and recognize what is already being done. [G2]
- Does the outcome fill a gap that is not happening elsewhere? [G3]
- How does each jurisdiction play a role in the outcome? (e.g., PA does not have blue crabs, but the impact they have on the Bay plays a role in the success of blue crabs). [G3]
- How does the outcome relate to residents of the watershed? (is there public buy-in and understanding?) [G3]
- Ability of an outcome to enhance partners that have direct responsibility for an outcome. How can we help them and what can we feed back to us? Avoid duplication. [G6]
- What kind of economic value an outcome provides to the watershed and its people [G6]
- Is there value added? What value is added, and to who/what gets the added value? [G7]
 - What value does the partnership provide to __ (signatories, stakeholders, etc.) __ relative to the goal/outcome?
 - Ex: elevation of multijurisdictional priorities
 - How does the Bay Program help us do the work?
 - What benefit does the Bay Program bring to the goal/outcome?
 - Influence, attention, money, etc?
 - What the outcomes are and how the Bay Program can benefit and influence those outcomes.
- Is the Bay Program a value add to the outcome? What is the Bay Program role in that outcome? If there wasn't a Bay Program would we be in the same with the goal/outcome? [G7]
- Does the outcome and our supporting work influence change? [G7]
 - Black Duck example – can we actually influence change in that outcome? If their population changes independent of our actions, do we really need that outcome?
- If there wasn't a Bay Program, would we still have met the goal/outcome? Ex: are there divisions within jurisdictions that do the work, and that would have done the work independent of a partnership approach. [G7]
 - Did they do it more because of the Bay Program?
 - Would the states/organizations have done what the work without us?

- Do we actually influence the outcome?

Strategic Alignment

- Assess whether the Outcome aligns with jurisdictional goals? [G1]
- Does the outcome capture existing jurisdiction programs? [G2]
- Is this outcome coordinated with other outcomes? If not should it be? If so, how do we streamline and get the right people at the table. Are there gaps or redundancy? [G2]
- How well do outcomes reflect and/or contribute to the goals? [G4]
- Finding connections between existing outcomes may offer opportunity to add more [G4]
- Does the outcome have an impact to the goals, one or more (stacking). [G7]
- Is the outcome relative to stakeholder's goals? Is it relative to partners (signatories and fed agencies). [G7]
- There needs to be a step to determine the relationship between the goals and the outcomes (and the alignment that does/does not exist there) [G7]
 - Look at outcomes and determine how they impact our ability and drive to achieve the goal.
 - Do we have the right outcomes?
 - Does the outcome support the goal?
 - Does it support more than one goal? How does this impact more than one goal/outcome?
 - Does it match the values of the stakeholders who interact with this goal?
 - Consider how the outcomes are relative to stakeholders goals. Is this what is important to people?

Programmatic Relevancy and Information Resources

- Use the Beyond 2025 Committee report 25 recommendations from the 5 Focus Groups and evaluate the current CBP Outcomes according to whether they are accomplished the recommendations- evaluate whether the Beyond 2025 Report accurately reflect the 25 recommendations [G1]
- Existing Bay Agreement: Relevance of the outcome to the goals, vision, principles of the agreement [G1]
- CCSR Report Considerations [G1]
- Biennial Meeting Chesapeake Bay Café Summary (2023) to develop red flag issues [G1]
- Re-analyzing where we need to go with each outcome. (e.g., we have more knowledge now than where we originally started, can CCSR help us analyze?) [G3]
- Use evaluation materials that already exist (SRS, ERG report, SRS Lessons Learned) [G4]
- Reaching 2025 Report – looked at existing outcomes and had valuable information that could feed into these conversations. [G7]

Outcome Language and Interpretation

- Modifications needed to increase effectiveness: can the SMART acronym be applied? ERG Steering Committee report [G1]
- Is the goal numeric or programmatic? Is this outcome a forward leaning outcomes? [G2]
- Does the outcome follow criteria of SMART? [G2]
- Is the outcome a true outcome? Output vs. Outcome. Does it need to be modified to become an outcome? [G2]

- Discuss the time frame of each outcome. Do we understand the inputs to get the outcome in X amount of time? If not, should it be revisited at a future time? [G2]
- Where does each outcome fall under the ERG report 'Smart Review'? [G3]
 - ERG report needs to be a crucial part of Phase 2.
 - Even if it's not part of ERG's Smart Review, the outcome should be SMART.
- Are the goals SMART and can SMART outcomes be developed under the goals? [G4]
- SMART – E – include equitable in the criteria, weaves equity throughout each outcome. Add climate too [G4]
- Need quantifiable goals – clear target, measurable; Consider SMART application [G5]
- Does every outcome have to be SMART. Or have more qualitative outcomes. No. [G6]
- It's important to evaluate against SMART rubric, but making intentional decision to not make quantitative is ok. [G6]
- The outcomes that don't have specific indicators currently, didn't have them 10 years ago, but now do. Are there outcomes that have potential to develop SMART. They could have potential to be smart. [G6]
- Is the outcome expressed the right way? Right Outcome – wrong metric. Are we measuring the right way. [G7]
- Is this the right outcome? [G7]
 - Are they expressed the right way?
 - Are our outcomes expressed as an outcome of water quality or recognized for their intrinsic value?
 - Is the outcome what we actually want to do.
 - How does this contribute to our ability to achieve the work we actually want to do?
 - Is the outcome a metric, or a functional outcome of the goal?
 - Some of our outcomes are outputs or indicators.
 - Are we working towards the bigger vision, and does our assessment match?
 - Assessment of if the outcome is an actual outcome.
 - Example: 300 new public access sites versus people who don't have waterfront homes have access to the water

Outcome Attainability

- Simple Criteria: has Outcome expired/been achieved, is it currently on course and effectively being met. [G1]
- Has the outcome been met, is the outcome still relevant? If the outcome has been met, do we simply remove it? Set a new target? Maintain, not restore? [G3]
- Are additional resources needed to complete the outcome than what is currently available (funding and staff)? [G3]
- Finding connections between existing outcomes may offer opportunity to add more
- Resource evaluation to determine how reasonable it is to achieve the outcome in timeline identified. Allows for flexibility in determining short vs long term outcomes. [G4]
- Are we measuring the right thing(s)? [G7]
 - Do we have influence over what we are measuring? (population vs habitat to support population).

Other Considerations

- Use the Beyond 2025 Committee report 25 recommendations from the 5 Focus Groups and evaluate the current CBP Outcomes according to whether they are accomplished the recommendations- evaluate whether the Beyond 2025 Report accurately reflect the 25 recommendations. [G1]
- Address existing outcomes first and establish- whether we need to recommend whole new outcome, combination with other outcomes, drop the outcome. [G1]
- Note within the criteria whether additional actions or targeted workgroups were created within an Outcome. It would be helpful to know that because it may mean there is precedence for reorganizing or rethinking that Outcome. [G1]
- Additional outcomes should be on the table [G4]
- Don't conflate outcomes with structure, both need to be considered though [G4]
- Deadlines may not be appropriate for some outcomes, short vs long-term milestones may be considered [G4]
- Overarching themes that need to be elevated because they are so impactful to the future of the Bay (climate, carbon, plastic, education, toxics, etc). [G4]
- Example of outcome with successful factors is the oyster outcome, look at those factors for other outcomes – potentially expand to ribbed muscles (more successful at reducing nutrients). Are there other living resources that can help represent outside of those right on the Bay? How can we make the public care about the health of the bay/watershed? Example fresh water muscles and clams [G5]
- Are there other living resources that can help represent outside of those right on the Bay? How can we make the public care about the health of the bay/watershed? Example fresh water muscles and clams [G5]
- Integration of climate into all the outcomes – climate framework when assessing consolidated, reduced, updated, replaced outcomes Bigger budget for Climate – i.e., Climate GIT - so than there are more specific outcomes for climate such as flooding, coastal resilience, heat island [G5]
- Either established monitoring plan or future development of the monitoring [G5]
- Secret Sauce factors of an outcome – Reaching 2025 report Having a Champion!! Someone needs to lead it! Quantifiable [G5]
- Define short term, medium term, long term needs. Prioritize based on time horizon and needs associated with the time horizon. [G6]
- If an investment in an outcome gets bang for buck for other outcomes. If an action impacts multiple outcomes, the same of amount of resources impacts multiple goals. Having resources address multiple outcomes with the same action, get more bang for buck. [G6]
- Can we evaluate multiple benefits under one assessment framework? Decreasing silos. [G7]
- Conversations need to have depth. Not just is this the right goal (yes or no), but how could we make it better? Does it need to be adjusted? [G7]
- How many goals should we have? [G7]
- Should we have this in the Agreement? [G7]
- Some outcomes might be political (ex: importance of blue crab) [G7]

Questions

- Are these recommendations based on the existing CBP framework or a restructured CBP strategy/structure based on Beyond 2025 considerations [G1]
- Who will do the outcome impact assessment? E.g., gap analysis [G2]
- Is there an opportunity for information sharing/lessons learned between partners? [G3]
- Order of events, what is evaluated first matters: Vision, Mission, Goals (Phase 1 or 2), Outcomes (Phase 2 or 3?) Need to start w/ Goals in order to better assess outcomes [G4]
- Support outside of the CBP to help make these criteria and how to simplify. The CBP has made attempts in the past to simplify (i.e, SRS) and we were not successful in making it less complex (multiply people in group agreed with outside support) [G5]
- Need agreement on timing and sequencing of outcomes, governance, etc. [G6]
- Before we do the evaluation, we need to decide what we are evaluating. [G7]
 - What about the outcome impact are we assessing?
 - The “impact” in “outcome impact assessment” can be defined in very different ways.
 - What do we mean by assessment?
 - Once we come up with assessment questions, we need to consider how we conduct the assessment. Can we evaluate multiple benefits under one assessment framework? Decreasing silos.
- Who are the stakeholders who need to be involved in the decision? [G7]
 - How do we involve local voices?
 - Alignment with stakeholder values.
 - Build consideration of stakeholders in up front in the process
 - How is value weighted?
- Application of Theory of Change? [G7]
 - Creating a logic model and fixing it where needed.
 - Do our inputs contribute to achieving the outcome?
 - Consider making a logic model and working backwards

Chat Transcript for Session on Phase 2

Barranco, Gregory 7/25 1:55 PM



I'd love to hear how STAC folks think about an impact assessment. how would they define?

Handen, Amy 7/25 1:57 PM Edited



My hand is raised as non steering committee member

Peter Tango (Unverified) 7/25 1:59 PM



Per our draft report - language of the report indicates we are working "toward achieving a holistic vision of a healthy and resilient Bay and watershed". Whatever we agree is the conceptual model a defining the holistic vision could/should be used to drive outcome fit/editing/adjustment for the future Beyond 2025. Without that, it is difficult to gauge if outcomes are fitting, appropriate, aligned with goals and needs. Maybe that is a task of Phase 2, item 2a - agree on the conceptual model of the holistic vision of achieving bay and watershed health.



1

Kristin Reilly (Guest) 7/25 2:01 PM



I would say the partners Gina is referring to also includes NGOs and implementers



1

Barranco, Gregory 7/25 2:02 PM



It's more than just meeting the outcomes, it's also do we have the right outcomes to meet the mission and vision. Right?



2

Martin, James (DCR) (Unverified) 7/25 2:03 PM



Great point Gina! What does P do to advance your outcome? What could a reimagined P do?



1

P=Partnership

Whitcomb, Jill (Unverified) 7/25 2:04 PM



Perhaps define "Impact Assessment"?



1

Barranco, Gregory 7/25 2:05 PM



Yes, we need to define impact assessment first. and i think our STAC folks should help us with that.



1

Hanson, Jeremy (Guest) 7/25 2:05 PM



a "rubric and criteria" implies there would be some sort of structured elicitation style scoring exercise. Or it assumes some sort of TBD methodology. To me, that would be one line of evidence in an assessment, not the whole assessment. We have all the source materials that fed into this group's report to supplement and inform a larger impact assessment (other lines of evidence).



3

KC Filippino (Unverified) 7/25 2:07 PM



If we're solely talking about outcomes, wouldn't we consider SRS, and the findings from the ERG evaluation of outcomes, in addition to any other information to support decisions? I would think once the outcomes are evaluated, an impact assessment could follow to determine how to achieve those outcomes effectively through the appropriate partnership structure.

Martin, James (DCR) (Unverified) 7/25 2:10 PM



Could we assume the "On Course" outcomes are in a good place regarding if the Partnership adds value? Focusing effort on the rest?

Jess Blackburn (she/her) (Guest) 7/25 2:10 PM



I would ask "value" to whom? The partnership, the resource, the people?? I feel like the Vision comes first.



3

Barranco, Gregory 7/25 2:11 PM



I think we need to look at things logically: Mission > vision > goals > outcomes > strategies to achieve outcomes > what resources and structure do we need to achieve the strategies?



KC Filippino (Unverified) 7/25 2:12 PM



Using the 'on course' outcomes as successful examples of what's working is valuable context for what's not working.

Kathy Boomer (Unverified) 7/25 2:12 PM



B25 recommendations point to the need to revisit goals, objectives and outcomes, as well as governance. Accordingly, it seems more strategic to start from the top (i.e., goals and objectives). As a follow-up thought, there's lots of opportunity to foster a CBP that all stakeholders value. For example, the agriculture community would greatly value more resources and science support to achieve on-farm and off-farm benefits, to shift from maximizing yield to maximizing efficiency for conservation - especially if they were included through a soil health goal.

O'Sullivan, Wendy (Guest) 7/25 2:14 PM



Unknown User 7/25/2024 2:10 PM

Could we assume the "On Course" outcomes are in a good place regarding if the Partnership adds value? Focusing effort on the rest?

James - would be important to understand the range of reason outcomes are "On Course" -- some may have thin or limited direct benefit from the Partnership itself.



Saunders, Kristin 7/25 2:15 PM



Unknown User 7/25/2024 2:12 PM

Using the 'on course' outcomes as successful examples of what's working is valuable context for what's not working.

in addition, you can apply the "secret sauce" recipe we have identified by studying the common elements that have led those outcomes to success. This is explained in the Lessons Learned document included in the reference materials.



Breck Sullivan (Unverified) 7/25 2:16 PM



Unknown User 7/25/2024 2:12 PM

Using the 'on course' outcomes as successful examples of what's working is valuable context for what's not working.

Those factors are included in this document from lessons learned from the 3rd SRS cycle. But I agree with Amy that an outcome may not have one of these factors. but could and would help them be more successful.

Rachel Felver (Unverified) 7/25 2:16 PM



Saunders, Kristin 7/25/2024 2:15 PM

in addition, you can apply the "secret sauce" recipe we have identified by studying the common elements that have led those outcomes to...

Also, in the Reaching 2025 report.

Whitcomb, Jill (Unverified) 7/25 2:16 PM



We are only looking at an objective criteria that would help us assess the outcomes. Not actually assess the outcomes.

Hanson, Jeremy (Guest) 7/25 2:18 PM



reflecting on the "value" it's worth revisiting the "world cafe" breakout from the 2023 Biennial meeting about that very topic: https://d18lev1ok5leia.cloudfront.net/chesapeakebay/documents/6.-Cafe-Summary_D2Q1_Value-of-partnership.pdf

ERG and Beyond 25 effort build on that, but revisiting some original thoughts/comments may generate ideas for today.



Omoleye-Hall, Brittany S (Guest) 7/25 2:19 PM

BO

I'd like to once again encourage folks to be bold here. If there are capacity needs and further research needs to reach the ideal, we should be clear about that so leadership can consider redistribution of resources.

👍 2

So let's not limit our assessment to what's currently achievable.

Peter Tango (Unverified) 7/25 2:34 PM

PT

Outcome impact - within the context of existing mission, vision and goals I assume. If any or all of those change, then impact assessment changes.

Omoleye-Hall, Brittany S (Guest) 7/25 3:17 PM

BO

I got cut off on my last comment in Group 1, but I wondered if we should somehow note if additional action teams or targeted workgroups were created within an Outcome. It would be helpful to know that because it may mean there is precedence for reorganizing or rethinking that Outcome.

Kevin Du Bois, DoD CBP 7/25 3:20 PM

DB

James, in addition to the CWA, federal agencies need to take action on Executive Orders, like 13508 for Protection and Restoration of the Chesapeake Bay and 14007 and 14057 regarding climate, etc.

👍 2

Omoleye-Hall, Brittany S (Guest) 7/25 3:22 PM

BO

Could you explain what you mean by programmatic vs numeric?

Whitcomb, Jill (Unverified) 7/25 3:23 PM

JW

There's also CWA 319, 106, 402, 404....the federal requirements for states to implement - and state laws and regs.

O'Sullivan, Wendy (Guest) 7/25 3:24 PM

WO

Unknown User 7/25/2024 3:20 PM

James, in addition to the CWA, federal agencies need to take action on Executive Orders, like 13508 for Protection and Restoration of the...

And like James said - other national enabling legislation -- such as for NPS - Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 (Chesapeake Gateways) and the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historical Trail Act -- and for the FWS - Chesapeake WILD Act... and any state level legislative established considerations.

👍 3

Peter Tango (Unverified) 7/25 3:27 PM

PT

Even qualitative statements could be reevaluated, refreshed for measurable change, e.g., if you say we "we need to approve something above a baseline", that sounds qualitative, but if you reference a baseline to compare to then you have the basis for an effective comparison. Something to consider for refreshing then in the evaluation.

improve, not approve. Sorry.

Kevin Du Bois, DoD CBP 7/25 3:30 PM

DB

Like the SMART-E

❤️ 1

Martin, James (DCR) (Unverified) 7/25 3:30 PM

JM

SMART-EC

👍 2

Kevin Du Bois, DoD CBP 7/25 3:30 PM

DB

Is the C climate>

👍 1

Martin, James (DCR) (Unverified) 7/25 3:44 PM

JM

I just want to be clear that I think there is more to SMART assessment than qualitative/quantitative

👍 1