
Workshop Proceedings

WORKSHOP ON REGIONAL OCEAN GOVERNANCE

Held at the Coastal Zone 2005 Conference

July 20, 2005, 2:00-5:00 pm

Marriott New Orleans, Balconies I-K

New Orleans, Louisiana USA

August 12, 2005

INTRODUCTION	1
OPENING PLENARY	2
<i>Welcome and Overview of Workshop</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Overview of Regional Initiatives.....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>WEST</i>	<i>2</i>
Alaska	2
Pacific Northwest	3
California.....	3
Hawaii and Pacific Islands	4
<i>CENTRAL</i>	<i>4</i>
Gulf of Mexico.....	4
Great Lakes	5
SE Aquatic Resources Partnership.....	6
<i>EAST.....</i>	<i>6</i>
Gulf of Maine	6
Mid-Atlantic.....	7
South Atlantic.....	8
<i>Overview of Selected National Activities and Perspectives.....</i>	<i>9</i>
John H. Dunnigan, NOAA Fisheries	9
Suzanne Schwartz, EPA, Office of Water	10
Amanda Leland, Ocean Policy Project	10
Tom Malone, Ocean.US.....	12
BREAKOUT SESSION.....	12
<i>Breakout Group Notes.....</i>	<i>12</i>
Breakout Group A – Purpose & Goals of ROG Projects	12
Breakout Group B – Attributes of ROG Structures.....	14
Breakout Group C – Actions to be taken in next 12-18 months.....	17
Breakout Group D – Links with Regional Information Initiatives/Information Needs.....	19
CLOSING PLENARY	21
<i>Breakout Group Reports.....</i>	<i>21</i>
Breakout Group A Report, David Keeley	21
Breakout Group B Report, Michael Donahue	21
Breakout Group C Report, Lynne Hale.....	22
Breakout Group D Report, Margaret Davidson.....	23
<i>Closing Discussion.....</i>	<i>23</i>
ADDITIONAL MATERIALS	25
<i>Additional Comments.....</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Agenda for Action.....</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Revised Overview of ROG Activities in US.....</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Workshop Participant List.....</i>	<i>25</i>

INTRODUCTION

The Regional Ocean Governance workshop held on July 20, 2005, in New Orleans, was a huge success! Thank you very much, again, for your participation and your interest in the emerging concept of regional ocean governance in the US. The workshop generated lots of good information and considerable enthusiasm!

These proceedings contain the output of the workshop and include plenary notes, speaker notes, breakout group notes, and breakout group reports. Attached or referenced are several additional files available at the noted URLs below. These files were not included in this document due to file size restrictions but they are important pieces of the workshop and continued dialog.

Additional Comments: Written comments submitted during the workshop

<http://depts.washington.edu/oceangov/czdocs/ROGWSComments.pdf>

Agenda for Action: Revised statement – with and without track changes

<http://depts.washington.edu/oceangov/czdocs/ROGWSAction.pdf>

Revised Overview of ROG Activities in US: Updates and corrections

http://depts.washington.edu/oceangov/czdocs/USRegProfiles_Rev1.pdf

Workshop Participant List: Registrants and others

<http://depts.washington.edu/oceangov/czdocs/ROGWSParticipants.pdf>

We added information to the background paper in a number of categories, particularly for SE New England and for IOOS activities in various regions. The action statement is considerably revised based on the many useful suggestions we received from the four breakout groups.

Feel free to circulate this information to your colleagues. We hope that the topic continues to get the attention it deserves.

We encourage additional comments on the documents and will post them in a separate file labeled “commentary”. Unfortunately we cannot do another iteration, but hope that a future project can build on this one and move the regional ocean governance idea forward.

Marc Hershman, Workshop Moderator
Craig Russell, Workshop Coordinator
John Hansen, Proceedings Coordinator

University of Washington
School of Marine Affairs
3707 Brooklyn Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98105

OPENING PLENARY

Welcome and Overview of Workshop

Marc Hershman, University of Washington

Background:

Credit to NOAA Ocean Service, Craig R., and the TCS assistants
Introduces Facilitators
Reviews Action Statement

Why this interest in ROG?

The USCOP Report, ROG received great deal of attention

ROG reflected in more than half of the chapters in USCOP—Governance, information generation, stewardship issues. Central concept, linked to the federal level via the NOC. USCOP added the concept of “oceans” to the idea of regionalism, using LMEs.

Four Objectives of this workshop:

1. Recon—Who’s out there, what’s happening?
2. Community building
3. Recognize the fact that we have a complex and poorly defined concept (ROG), explore the parameters--players, variables, forces that play upon the activities.
 - Existing players
 - Looking at ecological forces in large marine ecosystems
 - Movement towards OOS
 - Existing resource mgmt, activities, such as FMCs
4. Examine draft Action Agenda

Overview of Regional Initiatives

WEST

Alaska

Kurt Frederiksson, Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation; Chair, Alaska Ocean Policy Sub-Cabinet

Far too often AK is depicted as a small insert next to Guam! However, it is a significant state, takes the ocean initiative seriously, region on to itself, 2/3 coast line of the nation, 50% of the nations wetlands—Ocean state.

AK has a healthy, productive ecosystem and is an example of good ocean mgmt. Where as many states border other states, AK is unique, international boundaries with Russia, Canada, etc.

AK has taken the USCOP seriously, active Governor: Adopting admin order 223—Ocean policy office, recognizes large scale ecosystems, heavily dependent on fisheries resources and is thus concerned with their protection.

AK Ocean Coordination: Internal state agency coordination, state/federal partnerships, priorities and funding agreements to make more effective use of the resources that they have.

Pacific Northwest

Marc Hershman, University of Washington, School of Marine Affairs; PI of Northwest Regional Ocean Governance Project

PNW, “tale of two OPACS”.

1. OOPAC, Oregon Ocean Policy Advisory Council, set up in 1991, four meetings in June.
2. Washington Ocean Policy Advisory Council—Just beginning to explore important ocean issues.

Two would like to work together:

NANOOS

Cabled observatory

Ocean renewable energy projects

Tribal rights and jurisdictional issues

ESA issues with salmon

Combo of OPAC and WOPAC will be the two pillars of regional activity in the PNW

Also, TNC doing eco-regional planning off the Washington Coast

California

Amber Mace, California Resources Agency, Ocean Resources Management Program;
California Ocean Protection Council

CA Secretary of Resources just met with white house, urged the secretary to look at ROG for the west coast, so this meeting is very timely.

ROG not new in CA: 1100 miles of coastline, region on to itself. Regional break at point conception dividing the north and south. Many different regions and habitats and a growing population.

Long beach Ocean Economic Summit this week, releasing a report of the ocean economy.

Regional efforts currently exist at different spatial scales

1. CA wetlands recovery project
2. Coastal Sediment mgmt working group
3. Marine life protection act init., mandate to establish MPAs, taking regional approach.

Governor has made ocean protection a top priority.

Ocean Protection Council—Established in Sept. of 2004 (COPA). Council met twice. High level, executive. Engaged in reauthorizing CZMA, moratorium on oil and gas.

Have begun discussion with WA, OR, and AK—Want to take a look at multi state approaches, but do so with caution. Don't want to create a solution in search of a problem

For ROG to be successful, need to work on strong state incentives, value added for state efforts, which includes support (\$).

Hawaii and Pacific Islands

Peter Young, Hawai'i Department of Land and Natural Resources; Chair, Hawai'i Ocean and Coastal Council

Started in 11/03, informal gathering of five cabinet levels, trying to see if they could come up with the top five ocean issues related to the state of Hawaii. Tough job.

Gathered again to address the USCOP. Finally the governor formalized the Hawaii Ocean and Coastal Council. 30 members. Met three times, updating the states ocean resources management plan. Committed as a group to meet every 3 weeks to come up with recommendation for a draft plan.

CENTRAL

Gulf of Mexico

Katherine Andrews, Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), Office of Coastal and Aquatic Managed Areas (CAMA); Gulf of Mexico Alliance

Gulf of Mexico Alliance—When USCOP released report, governor Bush wrote a letter to the other four gulf governors to figure out this regional thing. Wanted FL in a leadership role, and wanted states to lead the effort.

Five states got together along with the GOMEX Program, and picked 5 priority areas, added to US Ocean Action Plan. Meeting in June, states formed action plans to develop five white papers to address the five priority areas.

The meeting will be a springboard to turn the white papers into an action plan. August 11th, next meeting will develop a draft action plan.

Next steps:

Involvement of Mexican Governors

Talk about a long-term sustainable effort

Great Lakes

Mike Donahue, URS Corporation, Water Resources and Environmental Services; Former Executive Director, Great Lakes Commission

“The 4th coast”

Institutional ecosystem of great lakes governance: Collection of laws and people that work together and against each other for ROG

Key message—the complexity of the hydrological system pales to the complexity of the geopolitical system. State and international jurisdictions very much an issue.

G Lakes are a huge, but finite, resource, intensively used from an economic standpoint

From an ROG perspective, Great lakes are a mature system, dealing with ROG for over 100 years. Had to, because of the geopolitical complexity.

Trends:

Great lakes have been “rediscovered” as a resource.

Comp planning returning with a vengeance

Heightened political interest

Emerging consensus

Gaining more stature as a national resource

Important developments:

USCOP recognized the GLs as part of the ocean governance structure

Recognized as resource of national sign., presidential exec. order.

Priorities for restoration and sustainable use: See slides

Opportunities for new approaches to regional governance: Long history of institutional experimentation, recognize the concept, understand how ROG works, have drivers (USCOP) moving them forward, degree of existing political complexity.

Challenges:

Agencies can fear the unknowns
Jurisdictional differences
Binational status
Funding is a constraint, states in a recession
Unique freshwater needs
Equal status for the nation's fourth seacoast. Freshwater, but still oceans.

SE Aquatic Resources Partnership

Doug Fruge, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Gulf Coast Fisheries Coordination Office
Gulf of Mexico fisheries coordinator

Summary of SARP:

Exists through the combined efforts of member organizations in the partnership. Established in 2001 in response to aquatic crisis. Series of meeting focused on one issue, but needed to expand as well. Steering committee, 16 resource agencies in 13 states, FWS, NOAA fisheries, and councils.

Modeled after N American Water Fowl

Mission:

Key concepts, steering committee operates through consensus, coordinate mgmt and advocacy, builds upon existing programs, maximizes efficiency through joint ventures, integrating inland and coastal resource mgmt.

Next Steps:

Employ full time coordinator
Develop SE fish habitat plan
Establish exec, advisory board
Expand partner base to tribes

Opportunities and constraints:

Opps—Favorable attention, consistent support among steering committee, see an opportunity to better integrate coastal and inland waters

Const—Lack permanent infrastructure, fiscally challenging environment, social awareness and values regarding aquatic resources.

EAST

Gulf of Maine

David Keeley, The Keeley Group; Policy and Development Coordinator, Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment

Watershed to EEZ—US and Canada

Priority Issues:

Habitats

Human health and ecosystem integrity

Sustainable maritime activities

Helping people connect (Gulf of Maine Times, people finder, workshops (tools))

Gulf of Maine Council

Governors, premiers, and Federal Governments

Principal issues:

Focusing on regional needs:

Lessons learned:

Shared vs. those things that we have in common

Need time to set priorities

Collegial and genuine—working with people

Hallmark is action plan

Maintaining staffing commitment:

Lessons learned:

Participation and turnover are a challenge

Inertia and culture to get regions to work together, must be overcome

Working in a regional setting

Duties assigned

Build capacity and empower others to act:

Lessons learned:

15 years to create foundations with cracks

partnering is key to leveraging resources

Mid-Atlantic

Sarah Cooksey, Delaware Coastal Management Program

Ongoing programs in the area, populated part of the country with many established governance programs.

What's new?

DelMarVa Atlantic watershed network established, Working to define issues that we can't solve with a regional approach.

Need good science and regional assessments in Delaware bay and out into the ocean, collaboration opps.

What can we do with the information we have?

What's needed? Regional energy plan for alternative energy sources, governed cradle to grave. Also need an LNG plan.

South Atlantic

Paul Sandifer, NOAA/NOS; Chief Scientist, National Centers for Coastal and Ocean Science

New, what's happening, opportunities.

SE activities in relation to regional governance, 2 areas:

1. SECOORA and other OOS.
2. Delineation of Regional Ecosystem based management concepts and areas. How do you organize around eco-regional boundaries? What are they? LMEs a good place to start, but as you move inshore things get much more complicated. SE is still looking at this. TNC a major player, as is NOAA.

Next regional workshop in Wilmington

Three priority areas for discussion...

Overview of Selected National Activities and Perspectives

John H. Dunnigan, NOAA Fisheries

Lead, Ecosystem Goal Team

Most of it all been said already, will provide comments on the last hour:

Federal government under the ocean action plan has begun to move forward at the federal level on ROG. Cabinet level commitment that is indicated in the president's ocean action plan. States are fully at the table and understand the importance of the problem and are willing to step up and do something. States are positioned to help the federal government.

Aquabox, sub cabinet coordinating body—This is a system that the agencies are being expected to take very seriously.

Very actively engaged, at the federal level we have begun to address ways to make the federal agencies play together better in the sandbox.

LME's, NOAA push. Trying to base it on science. Struggling with ways to divide the country up into ecosystems, and aligning the nation in common policy areas and collaboration.

Great Lakes not an LME at first, but because of its importance, NOAA is dealing with it as such. Also Pacific Islands are clumped together as is AK, though there are differences. Convenient politically and administratively.

LME model seems to be getting a lot of attention. Nested ecosystems, further delineation needed. Spatial scale of your ecosystem depends on what's important to you. Coastal management is in a different spatial scale.

Four Atlantic Coast FMCs have begun to develop pilot projects related to LMEs and ecosystem management, as have the Pacific Council. Fisheries side, regional councils are trying to be as creative as they can, moving beyond single species management

Ecosystem management is not new. Have been doing aspects of it for decades, we need to move ever more deliberately towards applications that recognize the interconnection and interrelatedness.

Far more complicated and challenging than they ever would have imagined it would be.

Beginning to look for areas of opportunities: GOMEX alliance, Great Lakes, also recognized that within NOAA there is an opportunity to improve with how we produce products on an ecosystem level.

Recognize that this is hard, complex, but looking for state and federal partners to move forward.

Suzanne Schwartz, EPA, Office of Water

Oceans and Watersheds; Director, Ocean and Coastal Protection Division

Program Overview:

Watershed management—More than a decade of experience, multi stakeholder efforts within the states.

NEP—estuaries of national significance, 28. Stakeholder driven local collaborative process

Great Lakes Regional Collaboration—Draft strategy released July 7th

Gulf of Mexico Regional Partnership—Hypoxia dead zone fueled by an enormous watershed, requires a lot of upland partnerships and large effort. Nested levels, ecosystems.

Ocean Action Plan Governance Structure—Getting high level of attention within the federal government. Cabinet level sitting together and talking about ocean issues, looking for progress. That's dramatic, will filter down and cause lots of stirring and production work.

Subcommittee on Integrated Management of Ocean Resources: Support regional and local collaboration, developing a work plan under that priority. Trying not to create a new national program for establishing regional programs, but to improve existing structure and federal government wherever possible.

Lessons Learned:

Base efforts on locally/regionally identified priorities

Invite broad base participation into strategy development from the beginning

Start with realistic, achievable goals

Environmental and programmatic monitoring critical

Issues for Discussion:

- Tension between being comprehensive and having manageable and effective structure
- How to successfully integrate science and resource management.

Amanda Leland, Ocean Policy Project

Ocean Policy Director, OPP, A Coalition of Environmental Defense, Natural Resources Defense Council, and The Ocean Conservancy funded by the Packard Foundation

Focused on growing support for a new vision and new approach for healthy oceans through public outreach and education.

USCOP—Need a new vision for how to do business in the oceans. New vision needs new approach.

Vision for Ocean Stewardship: Protect maintain and restore the health of ocean and coastal resources, sustainable use.

In order to align governance with an ecosystem approach, need an approach that recognizes ROG.

Establish a national oceans policy
Enhance federal leadership
Strengthen NOAA
Strengthen partnerships

Who should be in a ROG partnership: Who? Government officials, States, Tribes. Advisors, Academics etc.

What is a ROG partnership?: National network of regional alliances that: ID Key regional ocean and coastal problems, determine solutions that address the problems, and implement the solutions that get results.

Where is an ROG? Organized around LME's and the Great Lakes, but need flexibility to take up issues at the local level. Argue against smaller scale approaches principally, need large scale approach

When? Today with a long-term commitment.

Why? Need a regional approach

How? Build momentum among regional stakeholders, grow leadership (governors, executive, leg), need to organize efforts underway

Oceans-21 bill (hr 2939)

Title 4 discusses regional coordination and planning, guiding principals and 8 regional ocean partnerships, provides \$1 billion dollars to states

Opportunities:

Leg, exec, states, outreach

Tom Malone, Ocean.US

Director, Ocean.US, Office for Integrated and Sustained Ocean Observations

NOPP

Ecosystem-based adaptive mgmt, need rapid and repeated detection of changes, timely predictions of such changes. Don't have that capability today. Why?
Data mgmt systems ineffective right now.

IOOS Multi scale system that goes from climate to local coastal ecosystems

Regional assoc. are responsible for organizing goals and priorities. Responsible for engaging federal bodies, for informing federal agencies of user needs for data and info, Enhance the backbone and build on existing data.

EBMGT in CAZ, Coastal component needs to address basin scale changes and two other things (?)

Regional assoc. 11 groups funded to meet requirements for certification

Main reason to worry about fixed boundaries: collaboration, funding,

IOOS regional association establish a governance mechanism by incorporating enhancing and supplementing existing OS

Legal structure

Business Plan

Linking to ed and training in the region

BREAKOUT SESSION

Breakout Group Notes

Breakout Group A – Purpose & Goals of ROG Projects

Moderator: David Keeley, The Keeley Group

- Scale of threat: Scales of threats help ID regions
- Stakeholders needed: Input of stakeholders in process needed, process cannot be ignored
- Gather info: Instead of bullet one, gather more information
- Regions too big: Rare to find issues that encompass entire regions

- Common problems: To get people to work together, must ID problems that multiple people/groups have.
- IOOS: IOOS arbitrarily divided up because nat'l observing system needed divisions, more out of convenience than purpose.
- Tactical solutions: No indication that group in action would actually do anything tactical, but only delegation, ought to be clear
- ID problem: Hard to solve problem if it hasn't been identified first, will require mitigation and changes in behavior, not something willingly done.
- 5th bullet: Doesn't say anywhere that other stakeholders would be involved; stakeholder better term, includes more than general public
- Governance mechanisms: No direct reference to governance mechanisms, must be created in some instances, ROG should support mechanisms that address measurable goals, ecosystem health, etc...
- Ocean Action plan: OAP says prior authority would be respected, everyone must be assured that their authority will not be removed; current structure built brick by brick, do we just start over?
- Fishery mgmt councils: FMCs completely unintegrated with other coastal mgmt, someone should hold door open to integrate councils in other mgmt
- 1st page, 2nd bullet: Should be fleshed out more, what are existing mandates among existing entities?
- Good guidelines, but...: When you go to region, you actually have to do something. Somewhere, must be ID of pilot project that is working or will work, an actionable item, that will get attention and momentum behind it, this document doesn't quite set that out.
- Int'l: Can't really say ecosystem without including Mexico, Canada, contiguous borders cannot be ignored, and they must be included from the beginning of any effective ROG. South America needed in some cases (shorebirds), ecosystems cannot be ignored.
- Regional boundary fit issue addressed
- But now have 25 boundaries for 25 problems, isn't that what we're already doing? How do we address multiple problems.
- How many problems? Maybe really only 5.
- Gulf of Mexico IOOS, know what information is needed in order to support, what system will provide that information is needed. Don't just tell us what problem is, tell us what you need.

-Purpose should be healthy ecosystems, healthy/productive/sustainable, must remember that is why we are doing this, not just moving boxes around. Need for a system/network, all regions should be talking/continuity.

-Why do you need continuity? Ans: whole earth is ecosystem.

-Should be some consistency among regions, but must allow each region to determine its own structure (council here, governance body there, etc.)

-But plan is needed, agreement on why we are doing this at all.

-If region wide problems are addressed by this body, will sub-regional problems be inevitably tackled as well?

-Governance mechanisms must have some common: Authority, responsibility, decision-making, execution/follow-through, info systems, evaluation; without these not really governance mechanisms, rather just support systems for decision-makers.

-Just moving people around will really do anything? PEW vs. USCOP: regulation vs. just movement.

-Find balance between existing authority vs. effective solutions.

-Must agree that something needs to change, problem ID key.

-Keeps coming back to shared problems, agree that something needs to be done, THEN figure out what to do.

-Need to be comprehensive, see how problems interact in order to reach goal of healthy entire ecosystems, don't let issue drive boundary but begin to link looking at all problems together.

-Must id procedural mechanisms to do this, once political momentum dies there will be nothing left to work on this/continue, need to convince legislators that this needs to be done long-term.

Breakout Group B – Attributes of ROG Structures

Moderator: Mike Donahue, URS Corp.

Boundaries

Tom Malone: should be clear that primary rationale for fixed boundaries should be for groups to partner for funding and accountability; ecosystem boundaries should be flexible depending on issue

Jessica Landmin: “contain contributing watersheds” – impossibility for large watersheds, needs to be clarified to reflect realistic view; realistic approach to focusing efforts for these entities

Jim Good: ocean, coastal and great lakes commission, obscured by title ‘Regional **Ocean** Governance’ – the general public is going to think of the sea, coast needs equal billing with ‘ocean’

Don Roman: the whole thrust of the ocean concept is to get away from the blinder view of the ocean to recognize that the ocean issues extend all the way up the watershed, the minute you start to emphasize specific areas, you emphasize parochial concerns instead of the issues we’re trying to address

JG: need to integrate, regional ocean does not imply this to the guy on the street

JG: on Tom’s comment, boundaries need to be focused on collection of issues you are dealing with

Jack Dunnigan: why are boundaries important? We should be talking about things that are together

Moderator: need to draw the circle around something

Tom: Have to have boundaries, can’t have a set of fixed boundaries, but can address things by...it’s going to be hard..

Rick Schwabacher: interesting to think about the ability for boundaries to change over time based on needs and what’s learned, understanding of issues

JG: really liked the term “institutional ecosystems” – maybe think of boundaries not just in terms of landscape, but in terms of institutions, economic and social landscape; who needs to be involved, for instance, thinking in terms of the other kinds of boundaries

Moderator: NG did a survey of college students, asked to draw circle around the Midwest on a map, varied greatly, good point

Jessica Landman: if addressing marine ecosystems through gov’t entities, should be looking at existing government entities to rationalize those boundaries against ecosystems

Tom kitchens (?): involved in USCOP, started to back off from federal agencies, could not tell the EPA what to do, our hope is a bottom-up consensus would help the realignment

Heather Brandon: ecosystem mgmt should be based on biological boundaries first and foremost; boundary issue of nested ecosystems should be secondary to biological

Tom Malone: that works well for hard-bottomed, rocky communities, but does not work for pelagic systems

Representation

TM: too limited, a little bit of tension b/t second and third bullet, rep. should not be limited to government, should be public and private sectors

Tom Kitsos: As you reach out to NGOs, public, etc., where do you draw the line?

RAs are doing this now...very important to bring NGOs and public to the table

Jessica Landman: missing key question: what is the legal authority of this entity? Do they have any authority that supercedes the authority of the entities it is bringing together. This is a very central issue for Reg. Gov.

Unk: Responsibility and reliability, as well

Doug Fruge: Maybe having different levels of participation... we have a steering committee...it's also important for everyone who wants to participate should be able

JL: Do you mean having voice be heard or have a vote?

DF: Not practical to have a vote, I think having their voice be heard

JG: Policy-makers should have some kind of lead role, as well...those who implement policies (in agencies), resource users (fishing, marine transportation, etc)...thinking of representations in the form of different clusters

Moderator: other categories: Participation, Integration, Coordination, Other

Unk: What is the entity going to govern?

TM: USCOP addresses this nicely, says there will not be

HB: In our region, using 'binding' and 'nonbinding' – very strongly leaning towards 'nonbinding' b/c people do not want to lose authority

JM: integrated coastal management focuses on integration across horizontal, vertical...it's well-defined, focuses on sustainable development, seeks to harmonize...regional ocean governance is trying to reinvent something that is already defined in ICZM...this is already described and vetted in the literature that has come out over the past few years...it started here, but got better defined elsewhere

TM: Add 'interoperability' under coordination, being able to share information and data

JL: would endorse the national backbone, a base level of consistency

JL: if these are organizations with their own legal ability, they will not be able to reconcile inconsistencies, cannot say 'no additional legal authority' and also expect to resolve consistencies; replace "reconcile" with a non-regulatory word

Don Roman: No mention of funding, budget authority...what control is the agency going to have over the regional program

Unk: go beyond "enable" and focus on promoting regional and local interest; focus on reach out and engagement (participation section)

JG: why not require?

Peter Young: How does participation work if not voting? We're about ready to have regulatory community based management of resources.

Don Roman: most of this

Breakout Group C – Actions to be taken in next 12-18 months

Moderator: Lynne Hale, TNC

Important to come up with a statement of purpose and also some action objectives. Building on actions that we have already heard about, what other good action would be good to do?

Action Plan Draft, Comments:

Purpose:

We should build on what we've done, not reinvent the wheel. Recognize and build on past efforts. Mitchell bill mentioned.

Economy of scale and achieve efficiencies.

Not clear who accomplishes bullet points. Maybe the purpose needs to better define the institutional structure. But, are we really trying to create an institutional structure?

Mandating some form of interagency communication. Is this captured in the 6th bullet? This might be coming out more within the action strategy.

For at least three of these regions, there are international jurisdictional boundaries and institutions to consider.

To ensure that effective institutional integration and collaboration occurs across sectoral and jurisdictional lines

The need to create a sense of place or purpose for people. So people engage, so it's important to them.

Attributes

Let's not create a huge new "encrustation" of government. An attribute should be that it maximizes or leverages existing government structures. Look for easy ways to do this rather than cumbersome.

Learning issue, part of the purpose, not captured in attributes. Need to add a learning bullet.

The modern buzzword "transparency" getting the public to be able to find out how these things are happening. Could be picked up in the participation attribute? No, this is general knowledge we're talking about, not specific public participation. We need to be sure that the general public knows what we're doing with ROG.

Make the attribute points explanations more general

One of the attributes should be that this will be science driven

Service-driven, and services science driven.

No place for the private sector here, though they are major players in global ocean use. Needs to be highlighted.

How are the actions going to be determined? Who will execute these actions? These are ideas for action. Priorities not yet set. The idea is to get some concepts and thoughts on the table. Some concern over how the action agenda will be used after the meeting.

What are some of the actions that the community as a whole can take in the next 12 to 18 months?

Increasing the availability of data to aid Ocean and Coastal mgmt.

Sea Grant program could do something about a needs assessment. Carry out a needs assessment with user groups. Research needs assessment, to support eco-regional assessment, market assessments, needs, delivery routes.

A lot of activities are occurring towards identifying priorities, mapping, etc.. A lot of things out there that can help us move along. Share that info right across. Info is potentially available for anyone out there. ID and share existing regional planning efforts, look to NGOs and others. Plenty out there, use it!

Look at existing legal authorities. Review existing federal, state, and local authorities and see how they apply to the oceans and coasts. Building on the existing legal and institutional analysis, have regions review what additional work needs to be done.

Public health is a priority that needs to be developed. The list is a little ad hoc as it exists now.

It is clearer to say: Aims, objectives and measurable goals: (referring to second bullet).

In addition to documenting positive and negative experiences in the US, we should look at international efforts as well. This will reduce competition between regions and foster a sense of learning in good faith about what works and what doesn't.

Time to see some action. At the state and local level, need to see more folks like Kacky Andrews to take the initiative and to get out on the road and talk to other regions. Support active sharing of ongoing work, successes, and constraints.

Increase capacity to fund. Feds needs to support existing regional activities and sustain them. (\$)

Still unclear on what this story is all about. Who reacts, when and why? How will this whole thing be organized? Can we put organization on the action list?

Governors need to get involved. Governors' councils need to coalesce around what their priorities are. Need some executive leadership direction to the federal agencies.

Breakout Group D – Links with Regional Information Initiatives/Information Needs

Moderator: Margaret Davidson, NOAA/NSC

- Draft agenda needs more IOOS description (Margaret Davidson)
- Every region needs to develop a regional info system or systems (MD)
 - Everyone agrees
 - (MD) How do we go about finding out what info systems we need?
 - Engage stakeholders, find out what we need
 - Who does it serve? State, local, private needs? Need to figure out who we are serving
 - First priority: gov't systems, then private. (Dan Dorfman)
 - Second priority: people who are impacted- public, private, whoever
 - (MD) Public sector = government parties, local, state, national, international, first priority
 - (MD) Second = NGOs, private sector, whoever is impacted
 - The actors and the acted upon
 - Public/private NGOs (impacted parties, include NGOs)
 - What do we want to do? **Process:**
 - Education, outreach, research, user needs assessments
 - Use existing assessments, for example, Sea Grant programs
 - Where would you get this information?
 - Existing assessments, surveys, public interactions
 - Are there any other processes you would want to do? Draft document maybe?
 - Synthesis report
 - Performance assessment of existing processes, and how they work
 - An inventory assessment of existing info systems

- (MD) Assessments:
 - They are about quality,
 - gap analysis,
 - scope,
 - user satisfaction surveys,
 - look at the requirements ahead of time
 - It will be a complicated system, but you have to know what exists, and where the gaps are; where you are going in order to figure out how they can all come together.
 - Compatibility
 - Question: What do we mean by “requirements”?
 - (MD): information needs and products
 - Question: How do they know what they need?
 - An example is that AK fishermen need climate/weather data
 - They need to know NMFS and DFG have good data and science to manage fisheries well (Kurt Frederickson)
 - Real time data
 - What kind of data sets do they need? Need to get down to all that
- (MD) Do we want to make a matrix of data requirements, then see how much we can fill in, and what we still need to collect? Can we do anything with the data with confidence?
 - Need QA/QC for that data
 - Need confidence and reliability of data
 - QA/QC in the data management communications... (DMAC): Some systems are not going to address QA/QC, need to know if the system will provide QA/QC or not, some don't (DMAC) (Tony Lavoie). Some are saying we need to make sure that happens.
 - Resource managers NEED data confidence. There is never enough data, so this is very crucial that the data is good.
- (MD) Where and how often do you do the QA/QC process?
 - Need to filter your system to make sure you get accurate data.
 - There may be multiple screenings/filters (EX: Level 1 for fast, real time monitoring data and Level 2 to clean up data, look at trends, etc.). Depends on the data. Ex: water quality data
 - The process needs to be consistent
 - Ascribe/understand the different levels of confidence
- Comment: We are missing something in the integration
 - (MD): How do we get around this?
 - Never have enough data. There are main drivers, maybe we don't always need as much information. Some stakeholders just need to know what the key drivers are of the system.
 - Who should be involved? EVERYONE. Need to know the key drivers (Scott Rehmus)
 - Also test the models
 - Sensitivity analyses

- Everyone wants endless, 100% data. But that doesn't exist, it's not real. So we need risk assessments: who is accountable to the receivers and to the investment (EX: oil drilling)? (Kurt Fredriksson) It's all about accountability, for decisions, and for how much is enough, etc. Investment strategy
- Frequency/accuracy, aka RISK
- Ken: We don't have endless funding, so they will only invest money if they feel they are at the proper risk level. They won't invest in an oil drill unless they KNOW there is oil. There are economic and political risks.
- Risk analysis and decision.
 - (MD): Product design and service
 - We need to look at this with an ecosystem perspective. How do we do all this in an ecosystem way?
 - (Dave Fluharty): Data and trends develop models. Models have to be multi-variable, i.e. bio, geo, physical, etc. Habitat, water quality, cause and effects, etc.
 - Interoperable, accessible, transparent
 - Linkages/relationships
 - Modeling, representation

CLOSING PLENARY

Breakout Group Reports

Breakout Group A Report, David Keeley

Came up with 4 things:

Issue must drive boundary, probably a small set of issues that drive large ecosystem area need for mgmt

Clarity on why are we creating these ROG structures? More work possibly needed.

While we want network for ocean governance structures, but must recognize flexibility needed. Goals could be created, ROG responds.

Ying/yang on authority/responsibility; some said great to preserve entities existing, others said we created them, we can take them down b/c its not working anymore, must look at all of it to make decisions for next 200 years. Do we hold everything inviolate, create decision-support teams, or do we really make new governance structures.

Breakout Group B Report, Michael Donahue

Lots of similarity with A;

Boundaries should be fixed and defined, but flexible, bio characteristics go into boundary def.

Coastal/GL secondary to ocean issues.

Representation: shouldn't be limited to simply public officials; public, NGOs must be involved, address by having varying levels of authority/involvement

Should not be fed dominated.

Participation: statement should be more aggressive in outreach, look at existing models for ROG

Integration: build on what we have, if institutions not fully utilized use them before creation

Reconcile replaced with non-regulatory

Recognize historical/cultural practices

Coordination: interoperability implemented into statement, ensure base level of consistency for all regions

New category: define authority (level of authority, consistent with USCOP, soft mgmt not regulatory) address issues of funding entities, operational control, sustainable over long-term.

Issue-driven flexible boundary, fixed boundaries should be in place for collaboration as needed.

Do entities have legal authority, or should soft mgmt or new legal authority be put in place?

Breakout Group C Report, Lynne Hale

Considered purpose and attributes in our group

Purpose: sense of place for ocean area, needed to create effective ROG; recognize and build from past

Attributes: key attribute of transparency, people need to know and care about ocean in order to make progress, make issues real

Short term actions: Q: who is going to execute these actions? Ans: up to all of us in this room, ideas for everyone here, advance cause we believe in. –Reinforce need for continued learning, need assessment key. – Clear aims/obj/goals, look internationally for examples; States/regions learn from each other, tell everyone else about your experiences, feds should facilitate. –Fed agencies needed to take more national level approach in order to support

ROG efforts, need to figure out how to support/sustain all of them, in order to share info and keep them going.

- Continue dialog, must commit
- Build/leverage form what exists
- Expand support to all regions
- Do it and learn as you go.

Breakout Group D Report, Margaret Davidson

Action plan should have something about central importance of info systems

First thing to do is engage stakeholders (people who have public responsibilities, people impacted by those who have responsibilities, scientists/general pub/public and private entities)

Develop requirements, people in public sector don't know what they need, first have assessment/inventory, data you already have and how fit is it? Look at what are current info systems

Requirements: products you need, decision-support tools, models that would drive those products all way down to data, then test to fit against existing systems, check for gaps. Compatibility, QAQC for accuracy, precision, confidence in using data for science/politics. Levels for different people based on their needs, must be able to understand different levels so that decision makers can understand parameters.

How much data is enough? Should come from those accountable for decision being made. Based on level of risk (econ/political).

Key point: whatever you set up, however used, whatever produced, → should be interoperable, accessible, transparent, show linkages and relationships in order to get robust ROG info system

Closing Discussion

MJH – what have we started? What are you willing to do to continue? What is most useful to you?

Output will be: take comments and revise agenda for action statement and get back out to everyone. Too early for consensus. –Revise background paper to be more up-to-date. – Contact list for roster (some didn't get it, check at back to make sure you are on list) –Could

check with Gale, someone with conference. –Turn in comments forms. –Have a report on workshop, summary, brought together with other documents. Workshop will conclude with record on what we actually did.

What do you feel is appropriate next? (Our ability at UW ends with report from this workshop, do you have vehicles for keeping it going)

-Depends on how you expect action plan to be used, and who will take advantage of it? –
Ans: certainly get to players here, turning into action plan is next step

-Hill staff might find this useful, folks trying to write bills, deeper treatment of ROG could be useful. Provide this document/report etc back to regions, ask groups here to respond and confirm/deny in order to get additional input.

-Concerned that funding needs to be addressed enough, lack of money to do what we know we need to do. Don't send message to hill without addressing this, can't say we want to do this without accounting for getting money for it.

-Consider annual ROG workshops in order to update what regions are doing, coincide with CZ or TCS conferences, keep communication and lesson sharing info going forward. Would take some initiative from people here in order to achieve that; CSO could add this to their portfolio

-Interested in what is happening at federal level as relating to each region, region by region. Must address what states are doing/starting, then what feds are doing to respond at each regional level.

-DUKE law school hosting symposium on this topic, in Oct.

End of Workshop

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS
(See Separate Documents)

Additional Comments

<http://depts.washington.edu/oceangov/czdocs/ROGWSComments.pdf>

Agenda for Action

<http://depts.washington.edu/oceangov/czdocs/ROGWSAction.pdf>

Revised Overview of ROG Activities in US

http://depts.washington.edu/oceangov/czdocs/USRegProfiles_Rev1.pdf

Workshop Participant List

<http://depts.washington.edu/oceangov/czdocs/ROGWSParticipants.pdf>