# 2-Day Biennial Review Meetings

**Purpose / Goal:** Identify scientific, fiscal, policy, and implementation themes and issues that the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership will address in adaptively managing our work over the next two years. This high-level review of progress will be designed to improve the success and efficiency of meeting our Watershed Agreement commitments. This meeting will be led by the Management Board (MB) and directly support the Principals' Staff Committee's (PSC) needs, as articulated in the Watershed Agreement.

**When:** Two-day meeting held at the beginning of each biennial review cycle (i.e., in January of odd years).

**Who:** Open meeting with emphasis on attendance by Management Board Leaders and Members, Outcome Leaders (Goal Implementation Team (GIT) or Workgroup Leaders), Advisory Committee Chairs, and the Scientific, Technical Assessment & Reporting (STAR) Team.

**Guiding Questions:**

1. <u>In general</u>, are we successfully implementing our Workplans at a pace that is reasonably likely to get us to our Watershed Agreement Outcomes?  In what areas are we succeeding and in what areas are we falling short?
2. Have external, influential factors (i.e., our scientific understanding, technological resources, fiscal resources, finance options, or legal, regulatory or policy boundaries) changed sufficiently to warrant change to our Management Strategies and Workplans?
3. Have external program reviews identified needed Partnership action(s) to foster progress toward our Outcomes?
4. What opportunities and obstacles exist to improve or hinder cross-GIT collaboration or yield multiple benefits across Outcomes?

**Objectives:**

1. Identify lessons learned based on a broad retrospective review of Watershed Agreement implementation over the previous two years.
2. Identify observed and anticipated changes in scientific understanding/technical developments, funding sources, and legal/regulatory/policy initiatives that the MB and GITs should consider to modify Management Strategies and foster progress over the next two years.
3. Identify necessary actions to improve success of Management Strategy and Workplan implementation based on External Program evaluations.
4. Facilitate the implementation of cross-cutting, multi-GIT actions that will positively impact progress toward multiple Outcomes.

**Inputs:**

1. <u>Our Performance</u>: In what general areas are we ahead of schedule, on schedule, or behind schedule for meeting out Watershed Agreements? What are the common themes or reasons for our being ahead or behind schedule?
2. <u>External Factors</u>: What external factors have changed (or are expected to change in the near future) in the scientific, fiscal, and policy arenas that are or will influence our success? If we are successful at meeting our Watershed Agreements, do we still expect those successes to have the intended beneficial impacts to the Bay, or has our understanding of how the system will respond changed?
3. <u>Appropriate Responses</u>: Based on the above, what general issues or themes should we keep in mind when evaluating progress and identifying possible modifications to our individual Outcome Workplans over the coming two years?

---

**Outputs:**

1. Shared understanding of effective actions and strategies that should be replicated, ineffective actions and strategies that should be avoided, and new ideas and innovations that can be incorporated into management approaches.
2. Recommendations of scientific and technical, fiscal, and policy developments that the Partnership should consider in its review of assumptions surrounding the factors influencing our progress and the prioritization thereof, and in its modification of management approaches, as appropriate.
3. Recommendations of needed changes to resource allocations.
4. Recommendations to guide program evaluations.
5. Identified topics that need further discussion at Quarterly GIT Progress Meetings.
6. Information to guide the PSC's completion of its "Strategy Information Report" to the Executive Council.

---

**Process:**
1. That is, what needs to happen 2 months in advance of Biennial Meeting?
2. What needs to happen one month after the Biennial Meeting?
3. Who summarizes information in report for transmittal from PSC to EC?

**Note:** The first Two-Day Biennial Review Meeting (tentatively scheduled for January 2017) will differ from future Two-Day Biennial Review Meetings (to take place in 2019, 2021, etc.), as this marks a new undertaking and will not have benefited from the in-depth discussions that will occur during future Quarterly Progress Meetings.

# Quarterly Progress Meetings

**Purpose / Goal:** To improve the success of meeting our Watershed Agreement commitments through, 1) the collective review of progress on individual Outcomes, 2) the identification of what is and is not working, and new developments in the scientific, fiscal arenas, and 3) the resulting implementation of necessary adaptations to our Management Strategies and Biennial Workplans.

**When:** Quarterly Management Board meetings.

**Who:** Management Board Leaders and Members, Outcome Leaders (Goal Implementation Team (GIT) or Workgroup Leaders), Advisory Committee Chairs, and invited outside experts.

**Guiding Questions:**
1. Are we on pace to meet our committed Watershed Agreement Outcome by 2025?
2. What obstacles exist to meeting our Outcome and what potential solutions exist to overcome those obstacles?
3. What new opportunities have presented themselves and how can our strategies be modified to take advantage of those opportunities?

**Objectives:**
1. <u>Assess strategy implementation</u> – are we doing what we said we would do and are we getting the results we expected?
2. <u>Update our understanding of the system</u> – what is working, what is not working, what new developments or understandings have occurred since we began?
3. <u>Identify potential strategy adaptations justified by the current assessment</u> – what, if any, changes to our strategies are warranted based on our evaluation?

**Inputs:**
1. Are we on a trajectory to achieve our stated Outcome?
2. How successful are we in implementing our current Biennial Workplan?
    a. Where are we exceeding expectations and why?
    b. Where are we falling short of expectations and why?
    c. What new developments or understandings have occurred that were not taken into consideration in developing the original Workplan?
    d. How are we succeeding or struggling in managing factors that influence our ability to achieve our outcome?
    e. Are there factors influencing our ability to achieve our outcome that we did not expect? Can we manage or account for these factors in some way?
3. What new changes are required to the Workplan, what new partners do we need to reach out to in order to improve our chances of success?
4. Relevant layers from conservation and restoration composite maps

**Outputs:**
1. Recommendations for strategy adaptation and any change in resources.  This includes needed cross-GIT and/or external program coordination.
2. Updated understanding of the system
   a. Specification of new factors, new collaborators, and new or changed assumptions.
   b. Specification of new response expectations and/or uncertainty (new decision thresholds).

**Pre-Quarterly Meeting Process:**

4 Weeks Prior to Quarterly Meeting:  Lead GIT submits completed Template to GIT 6.
*GIT 6 reviews and works with Lead GIT to clarify any issues / questions.*

2 Weeks Prior to Quarterly Meeting:  GIT 6 submits completed template (including reviewer comments) to Management Board, Advisory Committees, and outside experts.

**Quarterly Meeting Process:**  Chair of Lead GIT provides brief summary of Template submission and responds to any questions.  Management Board Chair then leads discussion revolving around the following three questions:
1. What, if any, are the most important short-term actions that can be implemented to address actions which are behind in the current Biennial Workplan?
2. What, if any, actions should be considered for the next Biennial Workplan or updates to the Management Strategies?
3. Is there any need to consider recommending modification of the Outcome to the PSC and, if so, how?

**Post-Quarterly Meeting Process:**  Management Board Coordinator and staff, Lead GIT Chair, and GIT 6 Chair work to finalize Action Items (including specific changes to the Biennial Workplan) for approval by Management Board at their next meeting.

# Quarterly Progress Meetings:  May 18, 2017
# Riparian Forest Buffer

**Outcome:**  Continually increase the capacity of forest buffers to provide water quality and habitat benefits throughout the watershed.  Restore 900 miles per year of riparian forest buffer and conserve existing buffers until at least 70 percent of riparian areas throughout the watershed are forested.

**Lead GIT:**  Vital Habitats

**Participating Signatories:**  Pennsylvania, Delaware, West Virginia, CBC, Virginia, New York, Maryland.

**Overview of Outcome Progress:**  *Insert brief summary of progress toward Outcome.*
1.  What are the significant factors (positive and negative) affecting achievement of the Outcome? Which of these are manageable, and what are the relevant workgroup and Goal Team doing to manage those factors?
2.  Are we on trajectory to achieve the Outcome?

**2016 – 2017 Biennial Workplan Progress:**
3.  What is the overall progress toward Key Actions?  (i.e. Our Workplan identifies 50 Key Actions, and we expect to meet X of them.)
4.  Which Key Actions do you expect to <u>exceed</u> and what are the reasons for success?
5.  Which Key Actions do you not expect to meet?
6.  For those Key Actions that you do not expect to meet, are they necessary to meet the Outcome? If so, what are the primary factors impeding progress?
7.  Are there recent scientific, fiscal, or policy developments (since initiation of the Workplan) that are positively or negatively influencing progress?

**Discussion – should we adapt to improve progress and, if so, how?**
8.  What are some initial ideas to overcome the factors impeding progress?
9.  What help is needed from the Management Board and other partners to improve progress?
10. Who are the specific CBP partners or other entities that can help, and what do they need to do?