

## Outcome Review Meetings (Feb. 13, Feb. 27, Mar. 13)

### **Agenda (sub-bullets itemize planning and implementation actions)**

1. [10 minutes] Meeting Introduction will review the timing, the deliberation / decision-making process, and ground rules of the meeting.

The next portion will be individual Outcome discussions, each with 20 minutes allocated. If GITs/WGs determine a collective grouping of Outcomes is beneficial, that amount of time could be collated into a single session, or moderately reduced to enable more plenary discussion.

- Example: The Wetland Workgroup considers the Black Duck as an Indicator, which would “remove” Black Duck as a formal 2014 Agreement Outcome. 40 minutes could be dedicated to a combined discussion session. If only 30-35 minutes is requested, Outcomes would get a pat on the back from the collective partnership, either enabling more plenary discussion time or reducing meeting time.

### **Outcome Discussion Framework**

2. [30 seconds] Discussion leader introduces the outcome.
  - Sherry Witt will facilitate Outcome discussions
3. [2-3 minutes] Outcome Lead succinctly reviews advice submitted in response to the “Big Question”.
  - Alignment between Outcome and Outcome Review Meetings is being scoped within GITs and Workgroups.
  - Outcome Schedule should be proposed with potential for final adjustments at Dec. 12 MB meeting.
    - If there is interest and it makes sense, Outcome Review Meetings could be of slight variable length in case multiple Outcomes want to be grouped together for a consistent message. It would make most sense for there to be slight front-loading of the three meetings, for instance – 11, 10, 8 – for Feb 13, Feb 27, Mar 13.
    - We have 31 Outcomes; 2 are completed (Blue Crab Management and 2017 WIP). It should be clear if those are being presented or not. This impacts the Agenda Framework and ideally only 29 require collective time.
  - Big Question responses will be posted on the Meeting pages as soon as they are submitted.
4. 7 min - Signatories called on to make a statement about the outcome – round robin. Signatories offer their perspective, refined from their value considerations and GIT/WG response to the Big Question. perform a round-robin with Signatories to provide additional input.
  - This needs to be refined during December 6<sup>th</sup> meeting and discussed collectively at the MB meeting.
5. [10 min] Facilitated discussion: pose any clarifying questions or allow any final considerations. Suggest that the allotted time for each Outcome (20 minutes) must be strongly adhered to for equity purposes. This must be communicated in advance for buy-in.

The above framework covers 20 minutes for each Outcome.

- Assuming 10 Outcomes per Meeting, this would take 3h and 20 minutes.
  - At least two breaks between 10-15 minutes are necessary.
  - Considering the introductory kick-off that calculates to a total of 4h.
6. [15 min] Once the Outcome discussions are completed, a Pulse Check will be performed to capture the range of sentiment for all MB members. This should be conducted using an online survey (e.g., Qualtrics) that is developed in advance and agreed upon by the Management Board. The survey framework should be tested and confirmed at the January 16<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- The survey must be online and enabled to allow MB to walk through each Outcome in a clear manner. Counting fingers will be too slow.
  - 15 minutes allows MB members to access the survey, walk through 10 Outcomes, and transition time for presenting the results, which can be done using the online survey software.
  - The survey IS NOT A CONSENSUS CONTINUUM – but rather scoping which actions should be acted on for consensus. The survey options must be significantly clarified. Applying the exact EC charge language is not coherent for this stage. Suggest working with Dave on a set of clear actions and definitions of what they mean moving forward. This should be agreed upon during the January 16<sup>th</sup> meeting. Suggested survey options and general definitions.
    - Update = Outcome intent/language is largely kept intact, but is either SMARTified, or SMART components are updated appropriately (Time, Specific Measurement).
      - Such a determination would enable an Outcome to begin updating language immediately for review in April, and acceptance in May.
    - Consolidate (i.e., Combine) = Multiple Outcomes would be combined in a single Outcome, or activities contributing to an Outcome are dispersed across others.
      - A specifically proposed consolidation doesn't need to be part of the proposal for voting since there could be multiple permutations of consolidation, it is just agreeing to the next step in refinement.
    - Remove = The Outcome is removed from the 2014 Agreement. The exact post-life of such an Outcome, as an Indicator, Output, etc. is not necessary to be determined this moment.
      - It does bring into question on how an Outcome's post-2025 progress will be evaluated, which should be a consideration during structure and operational changes, and resource modeling.
    - Other actions in the EC that could be final actions, but do not make sense at this stage.
      - Replace – This language suggests that a novel Outcome replaces a current one. That could take place later during April/May when gaps become clearer, but probably not appropriate at this stage.
      - Reducing – This language suggests that the total number of Outcomes are reduced. Unsure what “reducing” a single Outcome looks like, which is the purpose of this stage.
      - Adding – This step is about reviewing the current features of the 2014 Agreement. Again, gaps may become clearer in April/May of what could

be added as an Outcome, however, you could also think of that as “replacing” “removed” Outcomes.

7. Open Comment Period – 30 Min
8. [40 min] Outcome next steps will be discussed. Approximately four minutes per Outcome if even time is allotted. The discussion will be organized based on degree of opinion gap. Minor gaps in Opinion should be quickly acted on.
  - If there is overwhelmingly majority for a specific an Action, for instance, if “Update” holds > 80% of the responses it should be acted on for consensus so that updating the Outcome language can be initiated for initial review in April. A threshold should be pre-determined and agreed upon during the January 16<sup>th</sup> meeting.
  - If there is a wide degree of sentiment, there should be brief discussion on if it can be reconciled. “What would information/action would be needed to adjust sentiment?”
    - At the end of this discussion, the Outcome Discussion Lead may, but are not required, to propose a consensus action to be voted on at the beginning of the next meeting.
      - Because of the potential for indecision after the Mar. 13<sup>th</sup> meeting, a MB meeting on Mar 27<sup>th</sup> should be scheduled for Signatory voting. THIS STILL ALLOWS FOR NEW OUTCOME CONSIDERATIONS depending on gaps identified. That could occur during April or May’s meeting, or even after the summer if enough evidence suggests a late Outcome proposal is needed.
    - If consensus is not reached at the subsequent Outcome Review Meeting, it will then be considered for voting during the March 27<sup>th</sup> meeting, or the next PSC meeting if elevation is needed.
9. [5 min] Meeting is recapped and adjourned.

For Outcomes that achieved consensus to either Update or Consolidate, the April 10<sup>th</sup> meeting will be the next deadline for the first iteration of proposed Outcome language. As best as possible, discussion and deliberation during this time frame should target end-users of the Outcome activities. This period is referenced as SMARTification, which is an iterative development of revised Outcome language.

It is probably not reasonable for any Outcomes with their next step determined on Mar 27<sup>th</sup> to be prepared with an Outcome language on April 10<sup>th</sup>, but some compromise is need for the May 7,8<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## **Snapshot of Next Meetings**

- March 27<sup>th</sup>: A MB meeting with the purpose of making final recommendations.
  - Meeting time should be as brief as possible to avoid meeting fatigue, but is likely dependent on the number of outstanding outcomes for decision-making.
  - A brief discussion will precede a final consensus process to be performed for each outstanding Outcome. If the consensus process is not successful, “the issue will be decided by supermajority vote of signatory members, requiring seven out of nine “yea” votes”, per the ([Governance and Management Framework for the Chesapeake Bay Program](#); p. 12).
- April 10<sup>th</sup>: A MB meeting to review initial Outcome language and to hold discussions on potential gaps with invited participation from NGO partners and other significant stakeholders.
  - Plenary discussion will be held for each Outcome with revised language and determine suggested revisions for May. Discussion leader will introduce and seek resolution – starting with recommending homework before the May meeting.
  - Breakout discussion will be held with all meeting attendees to identify major, outcome worthy gaps. The outcome of such discussion is to identify any significant Outcome proposals for consideration in May.
- May 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>: A two-day MB meeting to review revised Outcome language and consideration for initiating any new Outcomes, identified during the April 10<sup>th</sup> MB meeting.
  - The objective will be to have a revised set of Outcomes for PSC review, and partnership and public engagement, understanding that each audience is different, and multiple conversations must happen in parallel given the time constraints.
    - PSC engagement in later May will provide oversight to ensure effectiveness of the process and the scope of proposed Outcomes.
    - Partnership discussions (including closely collaborating NGOs) should entail how implementation of Outcomes may need to occur considering structural options and operational processes being considered.
    - Public discussions should be focused on what implementation of Outcomes means to the public and seeking their feedback on engaging with aspects of the Partnership (CBP vs State vs NGOs – what is the best partner interface).
  - Following the summer period, Outcomes will have final opportunities for review and discussion in September, with more purposeful discussion on aligning with a modified partnership structure.