

# Framework for Novel Outcome Proposals

The 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement (Agreement) recognizes that the scientific, technical, economic and policy arenas that we collectively operate within are constantly changing. Accordingly, the Agreement was designed to adapt to these changes and, therefore, included language allowing for the adoption of novel Goals and Outcomes that fill a critical gap in existing efforts, if warranted.

The [Governance Document](#) (pg. 25) notes that a “lead GIT or MB (with lead GIT input) may propose... the creation of new Outcomes to the MB.” Therefore, individuals and Workgroups should take proposals through the established approval process of their respective Goal Implementation Team (GIT) or Management Board representative before that lead GIT or MB member brings the proposal for a new or novel Outcome to the Management Board as a whole. This information was provided to the Management Board and interested parties via email on February 6, 2025.

**Novel Outcomes will be proposed and discussed at the Management Board meeting on March 27, 2025.** Meeting mechanics for novel outcome introductions will allow for:

- 3 minutes - Outcome Lead succinctly reviews GIT advice.
- 7 minutes - Facilitated discussion with voting and non-voting Management Board member, focusing on identification of clarifying questions and additional work by or information needed from GITs to inform consensus attempt on April 10<sup>th</sup>.

The **Outcome or GIT lead** responsible for proposing the Outcome should **provide a single PowerPoint slide for each novel outcome no later than noon on Wednesday, March 19, 2025.** A template is available via email. Email both PowerPoint and PDF versions of slides to Erin Sonnenburg, Sarah Brzezinski, Amy Handen, and Bo Williams at: [sonnenburg.erin@epa.gov](mailto:sonnenburg.erin@epa.gov); [brzezinski.sarah@epa.gov](mailto:brzezinski.sarah@epa.gov); [handen.amy@epa.gov](mailto:handen.amy@epa.gov); [williams.james@epa.gov](mailto:williams.james@epa.gov)

Following the meeting, voting and non-voting Management Board members will record their Pulse Check preference to:

- Recommend the novel outcome to the PSC, as provided by the GIT.
- Recommend the novel outcome to the PSC with modifications to be specified in the Pulse Check “rationale” column.
- Refer the recommendation back to the lead GIT for further revision and possible resubmission.
- Reject the novel outcome recommendation.

**Pulse Check responses from the Management Board should be submitted by noon on Tuesday, April 1, 2025.**

On April 10, 2025, the Management Board will vote on whether to recommend the proposed novel outcomes to the PSC using the framework established and utilized for the disposition of existing outcomes on March 27, 2025.

# Documentation for Novel Outcome Proposals

Brief documentation (2 pages maximum), accompanied by the short presentation and discussion described above, will support the Management Board's determination of whether to recommend a novel outcome to the Principals' Staff Committee. It is recommended that the following should be considered in drafting supporting documentation:

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 proposals for novel outcomes. Particular attention should be given to developing novel outcome proposals 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](#)).

Secondary Consideration – Governance Document: The process and criteria for proposing new outcomes is described in Section VIII. Process For Changes to the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement Goals, Outcomes and Management Strategies: Outcomes ([Governance and Management Framework for the Chesapeake Bay Program](#), page 25). Specific notations to bear in mind include the following quotations:

- “Outcomes related to each Goal are the specific, time-bound, measurable targets that directly contribute to achievement of the Goals.”
- “Accompanying the recommendation should be **a brief, written description providing justification and background, data to support the recommendation, proposed wording, partner and resource implications[,]... proposed baseline measures and lead Workgroup.**“

Tertiary Considerations – Appendix A of the Modified Strategy Review System Guidance Document: While the Modified Strategy Review System Guidance Document was designed to inform the development of 2-pagers for existing outcomes, many of the guidelines set forth, such as aspects of “what makes a good Outcome” and the timescale for completing the outcome, are applicable to novel outcome proposals.

## Format Guidelines

- i. Deadline for submission **no later than noon on Wednesday, March 19, 2025.**
  - a. Email both Word and PDF versions of this documentation to Erin Sonnenburg, Sarah Brzezinski, Amy Handen, and Bo Williams at: [sonnenburg.erin@epa.gov](mailto:sonnenburg.erin@epa.gov); [brzezinski.sarah@epa.gov](mailto:brzezinski.sarah@epa.gov); [handen.amy@epa.gov](mailto:handen.amy@epa.gov); [williams.james@epa.gov](mailto:williams.james@epa.gov)
- ii. A template is available via email.
- iii. Length – No more than 2 pages.
- iv. Spacing – Single line spacing should be used with 6p spacing between paragraphs.
- v. Margins - All margins should be no less than one inch.
- vi. Font – Calibri 11pt
- vii. 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.