

**Management Board Charge to
Environmental Finance Symposium Report Action Team**

- **Background:** In July 2015, the Chesapeake Executive Council (EC) charged the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) Principals' Staff Committee with holding an environmental financing symposium in 2016. A grant was awarded to the University of Maryland Environmental Finance Center (EFC) in September 2015, to conduct this symposium and prepare a final report and recommendations to the PSC following the symposium. The EFC held the Chesapeake Bay Environmental Finance Symposium in April 2016, and provided the CBP with draft reports for Program review and comment on July 8, and August 8, 2016. Following the receipt of comments and the preparation of a response to comment document by the EFC, the final symposium report and recommendations were provided to the CBP on September 1, 2016 (1-page summary attached).

The PSC Chair reported to the EC on the Symposium Report at the October 2, 2016 EC Meeting and informed them that the PSC would be reporting back to them on the Program's response to the report recommendations in 2017.

- **The Charge:** The Management Board will convene an action team that will include the members of the GIT 6 Budget and Finance Workgroup and other interested partners to propose a "path forward" regarding the recommendation in the report and the issues raised at the symposium. The action team will report to the Management Board by March 2017. The action team will consult with symposium attendees and others with financing and environmental market expertise.
- In developing its proposed response and path forward, the Environmental Finance Symposium Report Action Team shall undertake, at a minimum, the following actions:
1. **Draft a plan and a "path forward"/schedule** for further analysis, studies, or other actions that may need to be taken by the CBP to address these recommendations over time Present the draft plan at the March 2017 Management Board Meeting and at the Spring 2017 PSC Meeting.
 2. **Identify those recommendations that are most likely to benefit from a coordinated CBP partnership approach** vs. those that may be best addressed through separate actions by individual jurisdictions, agencies or other partners.
 3. **Assess challenges of and opportunities** to support selected recommendations, including, but not limited to, cost, workload, and resource implications.
 4. **Prioritize which recommendations should be acted on first** so that other responses can build upon those actions as well as any that can be pursued simultaneously.
 5. **Consider short-term vs. long term actions** that may be taken to address each recommendation.
 6. **Identify work being done by the CBP, our partners, and in other regions of the country** that may serve as models for others seeking to address recommendations.
 7. **Identify which Goal Team, workgroup or other partner** within the CBP organization would take the lead in responding to recommendations. Also identify those actions that may require use of an external entity through use of a grant, contract or other vehicle.