

January 15, 2013

Purpose: The next step in Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) Decision Framework implementation requires the Management Board to incorporate the underlying logic in its discussions and actions if the CBP is to achieve the primary objectives of **enhancing accountability** and **enabling adaptive management**.

Effective achievement of these two objectives requires an entity within the CBP that can critically evaluate the rationale for planned activities, the design of monitoring strategies, and implementation of adaptive management decisions. Currently, the Management Board is the logical source for that oversight. To begin providing this oversight, the Leadership Goal Implementation Team (GIT) has prepared a few basic questions Management Board members should consistently ask GITs and workgroups related to accountability and adaptive management.

1. Are the goal statements/definitions clear and unambiguous?

Rationale: *Accountability* requires a willingness to be explicit about what we are trying to accomplish and how we expect the system to respond to our actions. Recent work has focused on perfecting goal statements by the GITs and this question ensures the goal statements are understood by a broad audience.

2. Are the planned strategies sufficient to achieve the goal/outcome?

Rationale: Equally important to *accountability* is the logic that connects the management strategies (planned program activities) to those goals.

3. Are we monitoring the targeted system/environmental outcome?

Rationale: Monitoring is an obvious requirement for *accountability*, but the single most important type of monitoring for accountability is tracking of the targeted environmental outcome. It is useful to know if planned management efforts are being undertaken, but the critical information is how the system responds to management efforts.

4. How and when do we expect the system to respond to management efforts?

Rationale: *Adaptive management* requires a constant commitment to learning, not simply a willingness to change. In a complex and publicly funded program like CBP where experimentation is not practical, learning can be accomplished by explicit, *a priori* identification of expected system responses combined with effective monitoring of those responses. The challenge is to make CBP participants clearly articulate expectations for system responses.

5. What are the potential changes to management efforts if the system does not respond as expected?

Rationale: Truly effective *adaptive management* will only occur when we also explicitly identify the uncertainties in our current understandings and prepare to address them as we iterate the process.