

Meeting Summary  
MRIP Executive Steering Committee  
February 23, 2016  
Holiday Inn Capitol, Washington, DC

In attendance. ESC members and participants: Ned Cyr, Chair; Bonnie Ponwith; Dick Brame; Alan Risenhoover (for Emily Menashes); Doug Mecum; Gordon Colvin; Kitty Simonds; Russ Dunn; Miguel Rolon; Bob Beal; Dave Donaldson. Guests: Dave Van Voorhees; Chris Wright; David Detlor; Pres Pate; John Boreman; Leah Sharpe; Rob Andrews; Lauren Dolinger Few; David Bard; Janelle Mueller.

I. Review Agenda: Ned Cyr, Chair: The agenda was approved as submitted.

II. Review of GAO Review of MRIP and NOAA Response: Gordon Colvin

Mr. Colvin reviewed the results of the GAO review of MRIP, and the single concluding recommendation: that NMFS prepare a Strategic Plan for the program. The DOC recently provided a final Statement of Actions Taken regarding the review, in which the agency agrees to develop a Strategic Plan, and notes the initiation of the NAS review and the implementation of a new Strategic Communications Plan for the program.

Ms. Simonds advised the group that the Western Pacific Council is involved in a regional committee that includes the heads of the island government natural resource agencies and the NMFS RO and FSC. The committee is working on a 5-year strategic plan for managing the islands' marine resources. Marlowe Sabater of the Council staff is coordinating the effort, which will kick off with a meeting in April. It was noted that it may be possible to include the MRIP Regional Implementation Plan under this effort.

Mr. Dunn asked whether the states understand the overall MRIP strategy (first address fundamental design issues raised by the 2006 NRC review, then scale up sampling to address additional needs for precision, timeliness, coverage, etc. Develop regional implementation plans to identify and prioritize needs.) Mr. Colvin noted that one thing the GAO state interviewees had expressed concern about is having better communication about the specific status and expected time frame for implementing MRIP initiatives. Mr. Beal stated that the states understand the big picture but perhaps not the details. He noted that there are a number of moving parts of MRIP ongoing this year (Regional Implementation Plans; GAO report results; NAS review; Rec Policy and Implementation Plan), and the states will have difficulty staying on top of them. Mr. Donaldson noted that next week's State Directors' meeting is an opportunity to discuss how these initiatives are intertwined.

The committee also discussed concerns expressed by some states regarding initiatives to advance electronic for-hire trip reporting. States may not have sufficient authority and funding to apply this method to state waters fisheries. Ms. Simonds also noted that there are potentially difficult issues to address regarding data security, confidentiality and encryption for logbook programs.

III. Process Options for Strategic Planning: Dave Van Voorhees and Gordon Colvin

Dr. Van Voorhees and Mr. Colvin briefed the Committee on a proposed process for developing the MRIP Strategic Plan. They initially consulted with the American Society for Quality (ASQ), which has assisted ST with strategic planning for FIS. The ASQ put them in touch with one of their associates, Jeff Fuchs,

who met with them to discuss MRIP's status and needs, and to offer a preliminary strategic planning process option. It was noted that this process is not starting from scratch and that there has been significant planning and related strategy development that we can build from.

Mr. Fuchs recommended a high level three-phase strategic planning framework that is outlined in the attachments below. He suggests working with a small group drawn from the ESC and MRIP teams to build the basic plan using a PESTLE process, and then to more broadly involve the MRIP teams and stakeholders, possibly through a workshop later this year, in finalizing the basic plan. The plan would also describe the year-by-year process for setting priorities and implementing initiatives, possibly utilizing a process similar to the Hoshin process used by FIS.

Following discussion, the ESC asked Dr. Van Voorhees and Mr. Colvin to ask ASQ/Fuchs for examples of how they have carried out similar strategic plans for other agencies/programs. Pending receipt and review of those examples, the ESC is prepared to proceed as recommended.

Four **action items** resulted from this discussion, all due within two weeks of the meeting (By March 9):

- Van Voorhees/Colvin: Obtain Strategic Plan examples from ASQ and distribute to ESC;
- All ESC: Advise Ned if you are willing to sit on the sub-group that will develop the draft plan;
- All ESC: Review attached Content from Existing MRIP Documents that Speak to MRIP's Mission, Vision, Goals, and Strategies, and send Dr. Van Voorhees and Mr. Colvin your thoughts regarding specific content from those documents that we need to be sure to include in mission/vision/goal statements for the plan;
- Mr. Andrews and Ms. Dolinger Few will determine whether there are additional MRIP legacy documents that may have content that should be considered in the initial phase of the strategic planning and forward them to Mr. Colvin.

#### IV. Report on Status and Schedule for National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine/Ocean Studies Board Review of MRIP: Dave Van Voorhees and Gordon Colvin

Dr. Van Voorhees and Mr. Colvin reported on the status of the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine (NAS) review of MRIP. Per our contract, the NAS has assigned staff and recruited an expert review Committee. The initial meeting is being held this week, and the MRIP staff will provide a comprehensive briefing on the status of the program and how it has addressed the recommendations of the 2006 NRC review. Mr. Colvin will send the presentation materials to the ESC when they are finalized.

#### V. FY 16 MRIP Spend Plan: Dave Van Voorhees and Ned Cyr

Dr. Van Voorhees reviewed the proposed FY 16 MRIP Spend Plan spreadsheet. We do not yet have final numbers from M&B, but believe the available funding will be approximately \$9.425 M. The spend plan as presented will likely need to be adjusted to provide additional funds for the Strategic Planning and to cover the FY 15-approved South Carolina charter boat logbook project. Contingencies for reducing project funding to cover any such additional costs were reviewed. The ESC approved proceeding with the spend plan and contingency project funding as presented, pending receipt of final distribution of funds from M&B.

#### VI. Briefing on Communications Plan: Leah Sharpe and Dave Bard

Dr. Sharpe and Mr. Bard updated the ESC on MRIP Communications planning efforts. Building from the Strategic Communications Plan developed and reviewed with the ESC last year, the team is now focusing on improving the plan and on the following priorities:

- Expanding the Communications and Education Team (CET) within NOAA.
- Re-thinking the CET membership structure, and considering a structure similar to the Transition Team.
- Conducting the Needs Assessment (with partners and stakeholders) via a qualified contractor, and seeking quantitative results that can be repeated and used as a measure of program effectiveness in the future.
- Making some adjustments that will more effectively operationalize the current plan.
- Emphasizing partnership efforts that include MRIP as one piece of a much larger whole of NOAA activities/programs that assure healthy, sustainable recreational fisheries.
- Placing more emphasis on using print and electronic media to get our messages out.
- Developing Key Message statements that are higher level/less granular, recognizing that the details will remain in Talking Points, FAQs, etc.

Mr. Dunn recommended that the Key Messages include: NMFS data IS state data;

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon.

=====

#### Attachment 1: Outline of Recommended Strategic Planning Process

1. Establish a Working Group (SPWG) comprised of representatives from the MRIP ESC and Teams.
2. Enter into a Training arrangement with American Society for Quality for services of a consultant (Jeff Fuchs) to provide advice, to coordinate SPWG actions, and to facilitate any meetings or workshops that are to be held. (Note: this approach has been used for FIS strategic planning with positive results.)
3. Prepare MRIP Mission Statement and Goals:
  - a. Draft will be developed by SPWG, working with legacy MRIP documents;
  - b. Input on draft will be sought from full ESC, Team Leads, and key stakeholders.
4. Consultant and SPWG will carry out PESTLE process to complete an environmental scan to assess influencing factors and their capability to present opportunities for success in, and threats to, achieving MRIP goals: political; economic; social; technological; legal; environmental.
  - a. Note: Other analytical methods may be explored, e.g. SOAT analysis.
  - b. In the future, annual action plans could be developed from this framework using a Hoshin approach.
5. SPWG, with advice from consultant, will utilize the results of the PESTLE analysis of influencing factors to develop effective strategies that address the program goals.
  - a. This will likely require a face-to-face facilitated process;
  - b. Results will be vetted through full ESC, Teams, key stakeholders.
6. SPWG will build out timelines, performance measures, decision-making criteria for strategies.

---

Attachment 2: NOAA MRIP Strategic Plan Development: Jeff Fuchs preliminary proposal

The MRIP Strategic Planning Process clearly communicated structured process with interim milestones. This framework will enable stakeholders to understand the overall process, and to see the strategy as it evolves. It will afford stakeholders the opportunity to voice any concerns, and to provide their responses and input, while minimizing the potential schedule delays of a large planning group that includes all stakeholders. The MRIP Strategic Planning Process will be divided into three phases:

Orientation and Preparation

Preliminary Strategy Design

Final Strategy Design

Prior to the first phase, project team participants must be identified and communicated to all stakeholders. Selection should take into consideration the relationship of participants to all stakeholders, as the participants will be the representatives of all stakeholders during the planning process.

#### Phase 1: Initial Orientation and Preparation Workshop:

- Identify shared goals, common vision, criteria for making decisions
- Assess deliverable requirements of the strategic plan
- Review/assess existing/past strategic plans
- Assess gaps and planning targets
- Introduce PESTLE Analysis framework (political, economic, social, technological, legal/regulatory, ecological/environmental) and assign data collection roles
- Prepare interim out-brief summary to stakeholders and communications plan

#### Phase 2: Preliminary Strategy Design Workshop:

- Review interim out-brief summary comments and input from stakeholders
- Review and assess PESTLE analysis information
- Summarize PESTLE environmental analysis
- Introduce/review strategic planning tools and methods (X-Matrix, Hoshin Planning, etc.)
- Brainstorm/develop strategic plan elements
- Review/evaluate/down-select strategic plan elements
- Develop preliminary strategy
- Prepare interim out-brief summary to stakeholders and communications plan

#### Phase 3: Final Strategy Design Workshop:

- Review interim out-brief summary comments and input from stakeholders
- Develop final strategic plan
- Develop final strategic plan details and requirements
- Prepare final out-brief summary to stakeholders and communications plan

