

MASSACHUSETTS OCEAN PARTNERSHIP FUND

DRAFT

CONVENING REPORT

**October 2006
(rev. 1)**

DRAFT
MOPF Convening Report

Table of Contents

1) Introduction3

2) MOPF Statement of Purpose3

3) Overview of MOPF Activities To-Date and Preliminary Schedule through June 2007 ...4

4) Roles, Responsibilities and Procedures for the Strategic Planning Process6

5) Preliminary Outline: Five-Year Strategic Goals for the Partnership Fund9

Attachment 1: Strategic Planning Group and Steering Committee Members¹12

Attachment 2: Summary of MOPF Stakeholder Interviews13

¹ The Science/Technical Group will be formed later this fall. A list of members will be circulated at that time.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Massachusetts Ocean Partnership Fund (MOPF) is a multi-stakeholder initiative underway in Massachusetts to establish a public/private partnership and funding entity with the goal of improving the health, management and understanding of marine and coastal resources in order to ensure thriving ocean ecosystems and their continued capacity to serve vital ecological, economic, recreational and other needs. This Draft Convening Report provides a summary of the important developments to-date toward launching MOPF, and an overview of the proposed stakeholder process.

This report is being distributed to members of the planning groups - the Strategic Planning Group and the Science/Technical Group – who have agreed to participate in this effort through June 2007, the duration of the initial planning period. Once reviewed by the SPG, the Convening Report will also be distributed to a wide range of stakeholders who expressed interest in MOPF, many of whom were interviewed earlier this summer and offered valuable input on both process and substantive issues. The document will soon be available to the public at www.maopf.org, or by contacting the MOPF Project Coordinator.

2. MOPF STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND EARLY OBJECTIVES

Context

In the last three years, two national studies concluded that our nation's oceans are being adversely affected by inadequate management of ocean resources, coastal development, land-based pollution, climate change and other factors. These stresses to ocean ecosystems manifest both ecological and socioeconomic consequences, including decreasing biodiversity and biomass, loss of coastal and marine habitat, impaired water quality, declining fishing industries, and more extensive and costly damage from coastal storms. These commissions were unanimous in recommending ecosystem based management for the nation's oceans.

In parallel with these national studies, the Massachusetts Ocean Management Task Force recently examined the Commonwealth's management of the public trust marine and coastal environment and the state's capacity to effectively manage the intensifying demand on ocean resources from a variety of recreational, commercial and industrial uses. These uses include wind and wave energy facilities, liquefied natural gas terminals, sand and gravel mining, gas pipelines, recreational and commercial fishing, and other uses. The multi-stakeholder Task Force identified significant challenges in effectively managing these growing multiple-use demands and recognized the potential to exacerbate marine resource depletion, habitat and water quality degradation, and conflicts among user groups if these challenges are not addressed. In 2004, the Task Force concluded that a comprehensive approach to ocean management is needed to protect the marine ecosystem and ensure its continued capacity to serve economic, recreation and other public needs.

Achieving the management coordination, integration of scientific information, and stakeholder involvement and support for comprehensive ocean management will require new levels of collaboration among public and private entities involved in ocean activities. Massachusetts has a timely opportunity to pioneer such a comprehensive approach in the U.S. The Task Force findings, the possibility of ocean planning legislation, along with several high profile ocean-related proposals (wind power, liquefied natural gas ports, sand and gravel mining, etc.), together set the stage for proactive change in Massachusetts.

In late 2005, a team led by the Massachusetts Environmental Trust, along with others involved in the MA Ocean Management Task Force, applied for funding to support ocean management efforts in MA from the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation. A planning grant was approved and is currently in place to support the first phase of the MOPF effort.

Statement of Purpose

The Massachusetts Ocean Partnership Fund (MOPF) is an emerging public/private initiative with the goal of improving the health, management and understanding of marine and coastal resources to ensure thriving ocean ecosystems and their continued capacity to serve vital ecological, economic, recreational and other public needs. A strategic focus of MOPF is to advance efforts to develop and implement comprehensive ocean management in Massachusetts to achieve sustainable resource use, maintain and enhance economically viable marine industries, and encourage vibrant coastal communities.

MOPF will seek to:

- Catalyze stakeholder involvement in ocean management discussions and activities
- Promote the integration of natural and social science information into ocean management decisions to reflect an ecosystem management approach
- Create partnerships and collaborative approaches that will coordinate ocean planning and research activities and reduce duplication of efforts
- Establish a funding network to support relevant management, research and planning activities
- Cultivate ocean literacy and build an interested and informed constituency among marine sectors and the general public

Objectives in the First Year

With major funding from the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation and support from the Massachusetts Environmental Trust, MOPF is conducting an 18-month planning process to establish a public/private partnership to support and advance comprehensive ocean management in Massachusetts. The objectives through the June 2007 planning period are to:

- Conduct an effective stakeholder process that affords opportunity for meaningful participation from a full range of interests
- Convene a Steering Committee (SC), Strategic Planning Group (SPG) and Science and Technical Group (STG) to provide leadership for the process
- Develop a five-year Strategic Plan for the public/private partnership that defines its mission, institutional structure, governance and staffing, funding strategy, as well as its programmatic and philanthropic goals and objectives
- Generate a policy-relevant Science/Technical Plan to support the programmatic goals of the Strategic Plan
- Produce a science gap analysis and other relevant studies

3. OVERVIEW OF MOPF ACTIVITIES TO-DATE AND PRELIMINARY SCHEDULE THROUGH JUNE 2007

The 18-month planning period began January 2006 and preliminary work focused on hiring a Project Coordinator and identifying stakeholders interested in the MOPF initiative. Stephanie

Moura, with experience in ocean issues and managing multi-stakeholder processes, began work as the Project Coordinator in mid-April 2006. About 30 stakeholders participated in a kick-off meeting at the end of April, followed by stakeholder interviews over the summer.

By late summer/early fall, with the benefit of this input from diverse parties, the SC expanded its original composition, invited a group of broadly representative stakeholders to participate on the SPG, and developed a draft statement of purpose and draft responsibilities and procedures to guide the work of the SC, SPG and STG during the planning period. In addition, the SC identified a preliminary list of studies MOPF will conduct this year, and began scoping the gap analysis.

In coordination with Communication Partnership for Science and the Sea (COMPASS), a national network of scientists and communication professionals to improve marine science communication among policy makers, resource managers, the media and the public,² MOPF is currently conducting interviews with additional stakeholders from the natural and social sciences community and intends to invite participation on the STG by mid-October. As one means of communication with larger constituencies beyond the SPG and STG, MOPF plans to launch a website this fall. Below is a preliminary schedule of key MOPF activities through the remainder of the planning period.

Preliminary Schedule through June 2007

Oct. 23-24, 2006	SPG Meeting 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt procedures • Scope Strategic Plan • Initiate coordination with STG on Science Plan • Update on gap analysis; scope additional studies
End Oct. 2006 – Late Jan. 2007	Staff and SPG/STG committee work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare 1st Draft Strategic Plan • Draft Science Plan Outline • Procure/manage contracts for additional studies
Early Feb. 2007	SPG/STG Meeting 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review 1st Draft Strategic Plan • Review Draft Science Plan Outline • Update on gap analysis and additional studies
End Jan. 2007 – Late Apr. 2007	Staff and SPG/STG committee work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare Final Draft Strategic Plan • Prepare Draft Science Plan • Prepare additional studies • Initiate transition beyond planning phase
Late Apr. 2007	SPG/STG Meeting 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Final Draft Strategic Plan • Review Final Draft Science Plan • Report on gap analysis and other studies
End June 2007	Staff and SPG/STG committee work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize, produce and distribute Strategic Plan • Finalize, produce and distribute Science Plan • Report on gap analysis and additional studies • Transition beyond planning phase

² See www.compassonline.org for more information.

4. ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS

Three planning groups, representing a wide range of stakeholder interests, will collaborate in efforts to establish MOPF and achieve the objectives of the planning period. Please see Attachment 1 for a list of SC, SPG and STG members. (Bios will be available on MOPF's soon-to-be-launched website at www.mopf.org)

- A Steering Committee (SC) composed of those involved in developing the concept and securing the initial funding for MOPF. The SC members will also be members of the SPG.
- A Strategic Planning Group (SPG) composed of representatives from a broad range of stakeholder interests involved in ocean management and use.
- A Science and Technical Group (STG) composed of individuals with expertise in the natural and social sciences engaged in relevant ocean study.

MOPF's SC for the planning phase is committed to a participatory and transparent process for consulting with diverse interests about MOPF's strategic and science plans with the goal of establishing an organization that is useful to all of the constituencies involved in ocean management and use. The SC, considering input from earlier stakeholder interviews, is inviting stakeholders to participate on the SPG and STG. Each member's capacity to work and problem-solve collaboratively with the broad range of stakeholders will be important to our success.

Each of these three groups will be guided by procedures and ground rules tailored to its task. Draft procedures for each group are presented below. The drafts will be discussed, revised as needed, and adopted by each group at its first meeting.

Role of the Steering Committee

The MOPF SC is the entity responsible for direction and management of MOPF efforts during the planning period, and for transitioning the MOPF effort into the implementation stage. The SC is responsible for ensuring that MOPF's planning efforts accomplish its goals.

The SC will act as convener and coordinator for the stakeholder and research planning processes, working with the Strategic Planning Group and the Science and Technical Group. The SC will also administer the planning grant, and manage staff and consultants during the planning period. The SC has overall responsibility for satisfying the terms of the grant, as well as presenting the plan to other interested stakeholders and potential partners. The SC also has responsibility for developing a science plan that supports implementation of the strategic plan. This science plan will be developed by the Science and Technical Group, in consultation with the Steering Committee and the Strategic Planning Group.

SC responsibilities are expected to include:

- Overseeing the development of and endorsing the five year Strategic Plan and the associated Science/Technical Plan by June 2007, and other MOPF products needed to advance MOPF's goals
- Participating in and ensuring coordination between the SPG and the STG
- Planning and overseeing stakeholder outreach
- Fostering strategic partnerships
- Successfully transitioning MOPF beyond the initial planning period

- Administering the planning grant
- Managing staff and consultants during the planning period

Process

1. The SC will operate by consensus. Consensus means that all agree to live with a SC decision. When consensus is not possible, the SC members will determine how to address their disagreement.
2. As convener, the SC will participate in the meetings of the SPG and STG and will abide by the same ground rules as the members.
3. The SC will make decisions about funding research, stakeholder involvement, and other expenditures from the planning grant. In the event that a SC member is an applicant for funding from MOPF during the planning period appropriate safeguards will be used as needed to address perceptions of bias or influence in the funding decisions

Role of the Strategic Planning Group

The SPG is convened for the purpose of providing a representative multi-interest forum that will work with the SC to develop an appropriate and implementable five-year strategic plan for the partnership fund. The SPG is a forum for consultation among stakeholders and the SC about the goals, objectives and actions needed to support comprehensive ocean management in MA.

The role of the SPG is to:

- Serve as the main vehicle for representation and consideration of a broad range of stakeholder interests related to developing MOPF and advancing comprehensive ocean management in Massachusetts
- Scope and participate in the development of key MOPF products, including the five year Strategic Plan and Science/Technical Plan
- Bring together interests for the development of proposals for partnerships and other initiatives to avoid duplication of efforts and to collaboratively address contentious issues.

Product

The SPG will work with the Steering Committee to produce a five-year strategic plan that provides a framework for establishing the partnership fund and accomplishing its early goals.

Membership

The MOPF SC will invite members to join the SPG, seeking balanced and broad representation of stakeholder interests. Steering Committee member John Bullard will serve as chair for the SPG.

Members will have the following specific responsibilities:

1. Endorsing and abiding by the procedural safeguards listed below.
2. Preparing for and attending meetings.
3. Bringing their views and those of their organizations and constituencies to the discussions.
4. Endorsing the strategic plan, science plan and other key MOPF documents to the extent possible. For this process, endorsement means that each SPG member will include his or her name and organization on the final strategic plan, with any caveats they desire regarding commitments of their organization to the product. Members also may endorse the document with reservations, which they may outline in a statement of reservations or minority report.

Role of the Science and Technical Group

The STG is convened for the purpose of providing scientific and technical expertise to the MOPF planning effort. The STG will develop, in consultation with the SC and the SPG, a research plan to accompany and support the strategic plan. The SC is currently working with the Communication Partnership for Science and the Sea (COMPASS) to form the STG.

Product

The STG is charged with developing a research plan that supports the strategic plan and MOPF's focus on integrated comprehensive ocean management. The STG will build on a yet-to-be-developed gap analysis, taking into account the needs of policy makers/resource managers and an ecosystem management approach.

Membership

The MOPF SC will invite membership on the STG, seeking balanced and broad representation among the natural and social sciences. The SC may also appoint a chair or co-chairs.

Members will have the following specific responsibilities:

1. Endorsing and abiding by the procedural safeguards listed below.
2. Preparing for and attending meetings.
3. Bringing their expertise and perspective to the research plan discussions.
4. Endorsing the research plan to the extent possible.

Procedural Safeguards for SPG and STG

In order to have frank and open discussion within and among the SPG and STG, the following ground rules and procedures will be helpful.

Collaboration: Members accept that each constituency is one segment of the larger ocean management and user community, and that all views are important to include in the dialogue. Members are asked to not only bring their views and those of their sector to the table, but also to strive for broad agreement with other stakeholders by engaging constructively in collaborative dialogue and problem-solving. Doing so will foster the development of partnerships critical to addressing ocean management challenges.

Good Faith: Members will act in good faith in the discussions. For this forum, good faith means that members will be forthright and communicative about their views, and that the views they express in the MOPF forums will be consistent with the views they express in other forums, including in press communications. To support collaboration, members agree that if a member asks to "float" an idea or proposal without being quoted regarding that proposal, they will honor that request.

Press: In press contacts and other public statement, SPG members will not speak on behalf of the SPG as a whole, but can speak from their own perspective. SPG members agree not to characterize the views of other members.

Constituency Communication and Input: It is desirable for members to bring their views and those of their sector into the MOPF discussion. This may involve bringing information from the members to constituencies and obtaining their feedback on issues under discussion. To assist with this constituency outreach, summaries of the SPG/STG meetings will be developed and placed on the

MOPF web site. Meeting summaries will not attribute views or comments to any individual member. Also, SC members and MOPF staff will be available to meet with constituency groups about the strategic plan on request.

Decision Making: The goal for the SPG and STG is consensus on the plans they develop. Consensus means all can live with and agree to support the plans. It is hoped that by working collaboratively the SPG and STG will achieve broad agreement on the substance of the Strategic Plan and Science Plan and endorse the final products to the extent possible.

Overcoming Barriers to Communication: The SPG and STG will have greater success as groups if they maintain and act with respect in meetings, defined as treating every individual, including those with whom they disagree, in the manner that they would want to be treated. This may involve

- Seeking common needs through listening for and addressing interests
- Giving others the benefit of the doubt
- Sharing the time for discussion so that no one view dominates

Use of proxies: Given the short duration of the strategic planning process, it will be important to maintain consistency of participation. Members are asked to attend each meeting.

Committees: Committees or subcommittees formed by the SPG or STG may be asked to prepare draft options and/or proposals for review by the full plenary group. All Subcommittee products are considered draft, and must be agreed upon by the full SPG or STG before they become final.

Role of the Chair: The role of the chair will be to keep discussions on track and ensure that productive conversation and deliberation is the norm, as well as to work with the SC to shepherd the development of the strategic plan.

Facilitation: The role of the facilitator will be to assist the chair in keeping discussions focused and on topic. The facilitator will not take positions on any of the substantive issues under discussion.

5. PRELIMINARY OUTLINE: FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC GOALS FOR THE PARTNERSHIP FUND

Below is a preliminary outline of the strategic goals for MOPF. This first cut at articulating MOPF's strategic goals generally reflects input from stakeholder interviews as well as further cogitation among the SC members. This template is intended to serve as a starting point for discussion among the SPG.

I. Establish MOPF as an entity

- a. Develop and agree on mission, organizational niche among existing ocean-focused entities in the area, near-term and long-term objectives, and "theory of action" (what is MOPF's source of influence?)
 - i. Consider initial input from stakeholder interviews (reflected in Draft Statement of Purpose) to refine MOPF mission statement, define MOPF's niche and identify objectives

- ii. Develop processes to garner further stakeholder consultation on these elements
- b. Determine organizational structure of the partnership fund
 - i. Governance – structure and policies
 - ii. Management – structure and policies
 - iii. Staffing
- c. Determine institutional home of the partnership fund
 - i. Institutional form (independent? nested within existing organization?)
 - ii. Location and other logistics
- d. Develop transition plan and schedule to move beyond planning period, including identifying candidates for governance body (BOD?)

II. Catalyze, support, and participate in stakeholder involvement in ocean issues and MOPF activities

- a. Develop a stakeholder involvement strategy/model to guide MOPF activities
- b. Convene stakeholder involvement forums and processes around timely ocean management issues
- c. Support stakeholder involvement efforts initiated by MOPF partners

III. Develop strategies to advance comprehensive ocean management that uses an ecosystem management approach, with a particular focus in MA

- a. Seek to advance comprehensive ocean management based on the application of an ecosystem management approach in multiple forums, including policy, management, scientific and educational
- b. Support research and other efforts to acquire needed data and other information to improve understanding of the ocean-human systems interfaces
 - i. Identify policy relevant research through communication with area scientists, resource managers, resource users and others
- c. Improve integration of science into management decisions
 - i. Foster more effective and timely communication between the scientific/technical community and decision makers on ocean management issues
- d. Support the development and application of models/tools to allow integration of information about multiple ocean uses and evaluation of trade-offs across sectors

IV. Create partnerships and approaches that promote collaboration among stakeholders, enable leveraging of resources, improve coordination of ocean management activities and reduce duplication of efforts

- a. As diverse stakeholder groups themselves, SPG and STG generate approaches for further collaboration among and within academic/research, resource manager, user group/industry, advocacy organization, educational communities
- b. Develop relationships with other key partners, including funders
- c. Support collaborative efforts that bring players together to meaningfully address ocean management challenges

V. Develop and implement a funding plan and process for MOPF operations and for MOPF philanthropic programs that address the MOPF mission

- a. Based on organizational/institutional plans developed in I. above, develop and implement funding strategy to support MOPF operations
 - i. Develop staffing plan
 - ii. Develop budgets for consultants, expenses including outreach and education materials, and other support for MOPF as an entity
- b. Based on programmatic goals developed in III.-VI. below, develop and implement funding strategy to support MOPF philanthropic goals
 - i. Engage funders (foundations, corporations, individuals, etc.) in MOPF
 - ii. Identify funding priorities or criteria for priorities
 - iii. Develop a decision making process for funding projects
 - iv. Develop estimates of funding needed for specific elements of MOPF mission and goals

VI. Promote ocean literacy

- a. Develop MOPF public communication /outreach plan and goals
- b. Develop strategies and mechanisms for communicating with target audiences
- c. Support the development of public information and educational materials

**ATTACHMENT 1
STRATEGIC PLANNING GROUP AND STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS³**

FirstName	LastName	Affiliation	Title
Bill	Adler	MA Lobstermen's Association MA Fisheries Commission	Executive Director Member
* Priscilla	Brooks	Conservation Law Foundation	Director Ocean Conservation Program
* John	Bullard	Sea Education Association	Executive Director
Fara	Courtney	Good Harbor Consulting	President
Richard	Delaney	Horsley Witten Group	Executive Vice President
* Paul	Diodati	MA Division of Marine Fisheries	Director New England Regional
Barry	Gibson	Recreational Fishing Alliance	Director
Deborah	Hadden	Massport	Deputy Port Director
Greg	McGregor	MA Association of Conservation Commissions	BOD NOAA Regional Coastal Management Specialist
Betsy	Nicholson	NOAA Coastal Services MA Division of Energy Resources	Commissioner
David	O'Connor	Northeast Seafood Coalition	Executive Director
Jackie	Odell	Massachusetts Environmental Trust	Executive Director
* Robbin	Peach	Coalition for Buzzards Bay	Executive Director
Mark	Rasmussen	New England Aquarium	President
Bud	Ris	MA Marine Trades Assoc.	Executive Director
Leona	Roach	UNH-Institute for Study of Earth, Oceans and Space	Professor
* Andy	Rosenberg	MA Office of Coastal Zone Management	Director
* Susan	Snow-Cotter	The Analysis Group	Managing Principal
Sue	Tierney	City of Gloucester	City Councilor
Bruce	Tobey	MA Technology Collaborative	VP Sustainable Development & Renewable Energy
* Greg	Watson	Urban Harbors Institute	Executive Director
Jack	Wiggin		

* Indicates member of the Steering Committee

³ This list is current as of October 11, 2006; additional SPG invitees may respond prior to the October 23-24 meeting. The Science/Technical Group will be formed later this fall. An updated list will be circulated when available.

ATTACHMENT 2 SUMMARY OF MOPF STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

Summary of Responses from MOPF Stakeholder Interviews Conducted Summer 2006

Introduction

Following-up from the MOPF kick-off meeting in April 2006, Stephanie Moura, MOPF Project Coordinator, conducted over 30 stakeholder interviews during the summer. These interviews were an opportunity to learn more about the issues raised at the April meeting as well as gather input on a range of topics relevant to developing the MOPF Strategic Plan and Science Plan. A second interview program is being conducted this fall with natural and social scientists, as well as resource managers, to focus in greater detail on issues pertinent to developing the MOPF Science Plan.

The following pages provide a summary of responses from the initial stakeholder conversations. The summary is organized according to the six interview questions, from the *MOPF Stakeholder Interview Topics and Questions*, shown here in abbreviated form. A list of the stakeholders interviewed during this period is appended.

Summary of MOPF Stakeholder Interviews

1. Describe your personal and professional relationship to ocean issues.

As expected, no two stories of personal and professional relationship to ocean issues were alike. Collectively, stakeholders' professional involvement ran the gamut from resource manager to marine-dependent business to educator and personal connection ranged from scuba diver to sailor to seafood enthusiast. Most individuals reflected not a simple, single-issue view, but rather a synthesis of perspectives from having held a range of different positions over the years.

2. What do you feel are the “top three” priority ocean issues for MA/Gulf of Maine and the obstacles to solving them? Can you think of “success stories” where these problems have been effectively addressed?

The majority of responses to Question 2 can be grouped into three main categories (A-C below).

A. The existing marine and coastal policy and management framework is inadequate to effectively balance increasing demands for multiple uses of ocean resources.

This issue, and related variations noted below, was the most frequently cited priority problem, raised by 27 of the stakeholders interviewed.

- Governance obstacles, most notably:
 - the perception that Massachusetts' “home rule” provision hinders regional approaches to solving problems that reach beyond municipal borders

- a lack of coordination among local, state and federal agencies responsible for ocean resource management, and conflicts of interest among institutional programmatic, funding or political priorities.
- Absence of political will to make resource management decisions that involve difficult ecological, economic, or political trade-offs.
- Lack of comprehensive ocean planning to integrate the myriad existing laws and regulations; the current framework is a confusing, sometimes conflicting, patchwork.
- Absence of comprehensive ocean planning is, in part, a reflection of a pervasive attitude that the oceans are a boundless resource, which leads to “tragedy of the commons” and inadequate stewardship of public trust ocean resources.
- Inadequate application of existing tools (incentives, regulations, etc.) to limit/prevent inappropriate coastal development.
- Insufficient water quality and habitat monitoring: DEP WQ monitoring almost non-existent, DMF stock assessments not adequate, habitat monitoring gutted when the state watershed initiative was cut.
- Inadequacies of the fisheries management system, including how managers implement it: some felt the current system doesn’t serve fishermen’s needs; others felt it isn’t adequately protective of the ecosystem.

Relevant success stories / models

Stakeholders offered the following as successful examples potentially relevant to the challenges identified above.

- Port Camargue, France: an example of comprehensive planning, balancing multiple uses (including public access) for a mixed-use port. See www.portcamargue.com
- Recent MA SJC decisions upholding “common sense” limits to inappropriate coastal development, e.g. coastal flood hazard zoning to prohibit new residences. See *Gove v. Chatham*; *Lovequist v. Dennis*; and *Golden v. Falmouth*.
- Several people noted MWRA’s clean up of Boston Harbor / D.I. sewage treatment plant as a success despite its high cost to ratepayers. The outfall relocation process wasn’t “pretty” but there was extensive stakeholder involvement and the outcome has generally been viewed as positive.
- CZM approach in the late 1970s for dealing with the myriad land-based activities: instead of creating a new layer of bureaucracy, CZM wove together *existing* laws to identify 27 *principles* for formulating CZM Plan. Perhaps this model could be adapted for comprehensive ocean planning.
- Cooperative research programs involving fishermen, NMFS and NE Consortium yielding good data for use in management decisions and beginning to change the culture gap between fishing, management and scientific communities.

B. Threats to the marine and coastal ecosystem

Most stakeholders listed one or more specific contributors to marine ecosystem degradation. Climate change, fisheries management and water quality issues topped the list.

Threat	Related Impacts	Times Cited
Climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • acidification of the oceans • coastal hazards, intensifying storm patterns • sea level rise • algal blooms 	6
Fisheries management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • over fishing • reduced biomass affects on marine ecosystem • bycatch • benthic habitat degradation from destructive gear 	6
Water quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • nutrient loading from coastal runoff • public health issues, especially in urban areas 	6
Habitat loss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • marine/benthic areas • coastal/wetlands areas from inappropriate coastal development 	3

C. Lack of public awareness and understanding of the oceans' ecological and economic value

This issue, cited 12 times, was frequently raised in conjunction with a related concern:

- Inadequate public *access* to the marine and coastal environment
 - urban youth especially lack ocean recreational opportunities
 - private coastal development squeezes public access, e.g. boat ramps

Other problems within this constellation of issues included:

- Lackluster public *involvement* in ocean issues contributes to disinterest and inadequate leadership among lawmakers and regulators.
- Difficulty gauging how “public trust” resources are valued by the public, lack of baseline and ongoing public opinion research about attitudes/behavior toward the marine and coastal environment.
- Poorly developed “culture of water dependence” in the Commonwealth despite its rich marine heritage.

Relevant success stories / models

- Rhode Island and Florida have a framework of tax incentives and other policy tools to promote a culture of water dependence. Ocean literacy is perceived by many to be more advanced in Rhode Island, Florida and California than in Massachusetts.

3. Identify the main emphases/goals of your agency, organization, or business over the next five years. What are the key obstacles you face in accomplishing those goals?

Responses to this question are summarized in the table at the end of this document.

4. What do you think are the important strengths and weaknesses of ecosystem-based management (EBM)? What are the key obstacles to implementing EBM? Do you think it would be constructive for MOPF to focus on advancing EBM initiatives?

Virtually all interviewees were familiar with the concept, though most were not aware of the COMPASS effort to develop a widely-accepted definition. Generally, stakeholders either heartily embraced the EBM concept or, at a minimum, recognized the growing momentum of it being the “approach of choice” of federal and state resource agencies, the scientific community, and others. Interviewees’ key observations about EBM are noted below.

Strengths of EBM

- The EBM concept links maintaining healthy marine ecological systems with the ability to provide “environmental services” humans either depend on (coastal hazard protection, climate regulation, source of food, livelihood, etc.) or value (aesthetics, etc.). Quantifying environmental services of the marine/coastal ecosystem can demonstrate the socioeconomic necessity of sustainable management of multiple uses to a broad audience rather than relying on value-laden imperatives about the intrinsic value of the oceans.
- EBM provides a framework to better assess cumulative impacts from the many pressures on ocean ecosystems and to incorporate a long-term perspective on resource management. A goal should be to improve ocean’s capacity to recover from stresses.

Obstacles / cautions

- Stakeholders shouldn’t assume that “sound ecological science” will make resource management decisions clear cut. Integration of the economic, political and institutional factors must be transparent. Quantifying/describing these factors is important, but developing approaches for *comparing* and *choosing* among options is critical and probably the most difficult challenge in applying EBM models.
- There is a perception among some resource users that moving from current management structures to EBM will negatively impact them (at least in the short term). This belief leads to a resistance to EBM, creating barriers to its implementation. To better understand these barriers there must be an examination of the likely short-term impacts to different interests.
 - Some among the commercial fishing industry and fisheries management agencies don’t embrace the EBM concept, while others feel compelled to get involved in shaping how it is implemented because the “train is leaving the station.”
- Despite EBM being a popular buzz word, the media doesn’t adequately promote it, current state laws don’t reflect it, businesses are neither “incentivized” nor required to adopt it and NGO’s are fragmented over it (e.g. open space groups may neglect wildlife corridors).
- Dueling definitions. Avoid getting bogged down in mincing words - NEFMC has its own definition, COMPASS has developed another definition, etc. Several interviewees noted it will be more constructive to develop/implement projects that *apply* EBM principles to build a body of experience and evaluative data. The definition will work itself out over time.

MOPF and EBM

- A vast majority of stakeholders strongly supported “advancing EBM” as a priority goal for MOPF. The few hesitant interviewees were not opposed to EBM per se, but rather more concerned that MOPF’s efforts “add value”, instead of competing for the same resources.

5. What feedback would you like to offer about the proposed process and structure for developing MOPF during the strategic planning period?

The Project Coordinator outlined the organizational process/structure for the MOPF strategic planning phase, noting that this is a work-in-progress shaped by input from these interviews and further refined by the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) and the Science/Technical Group (STG). Stakeholders highlighted certain process/structure themes, offered suggestions and identified key challenges for consideration. These included:

- Structure/process during strategic planning phase. Almost universally, people had the following process/structure questions.
 - Who is ultimately responsible for developing and implementing the MOPF 5-Year Strategic Plan?
 - What are the respective roles and responsibilities of the Steering Committee, Strategic Planning Group and Science/Technical Group?
 - How will decisions be made? (Consensus? Majority?)
 - What will be the relationship of the Advisory Committee, created by the MA Oceans Management legislation, and the MOPF SPG/STG?
- Strategic Planning Group. Specific comments on the SPG included:
 - Clarify to what extent SPG members are expected to represent a group's interests, and with what authority they do so. The SPG needs leaders who can exercise "enlightened self interest" – effectively speak for their affiliation but also understand bigger picture and long-term issues.
 - Collectively, the SPG must have political credibility, institution building experience and substantive expertise in ocean issues.
 - Consider ex officio roles for state agency directors on the SPG, especially given the administration change in fall 2006.
 - If the SPG has a Chair, that role will provide critical leadership for the MOPF planning process and will likely be called upon to loosen logjams among the SPG to keep the process moving forward. Accordingly, the Chair should have a reputation as an independent thinker, hold considerable clout among stakeholders/SPG members and be an experienced decision-maker in complex, multi-stakeholder situations.
- Science / Technical Group. Specific comments on the STG included:
 - Identify members who can knit together academic institutions that don't normally work together.
 - Include federal and state agency scientists.
 - Include local knowledge; resource users who have participated in cooperative research projects.
- Outside perspectives. Several people favored the idea of reaching beyond traditional stakeholders to involve respected leaders from *outside* the marine field in the planning and development of MOPF. This would provide an opportunity to raise the profile of ocean issues more broadly and bring to bear a different level of accountability to an often insular

community. This could help shift entrenched debates to more constructive dialogue and expand funding opportunities. Stakeholders suggested a number of people who could potentially serve in that capacity.

- Beyond the “usual suspects”. Consider ways to involve/reach out to broader interests, such as inland communities, and *new* voices from traditional stakeholder groups (not just the “usual suspects”).
 - Consider how to involve disenfranchised populations; MOPF shouldn’t be a club of the “moneyed”. Reaching out to marginalized populations has great political appeal to elected officials.
 - Put serious effort into engaging the business community. Not only for potential financial support, but also for the clout with elected officials and other decision makers. Emphasize “what’s good for the environment is good for business” backed up by evidence. (E2 has been very successful at this.)
- Enlist problem-solvers. The strategic planning process will benefit from engaging effective *problem-solvers*, not just staunch advocates for one position or another.
- Skill sets not just interests. It will be important for the SPG to be equipped to advance the *institution building* aspect of this effort. While hiring consultants during the planning phase may be needed, focus on engaging SPG members who possess complementary skills and expertise in organizational development, strategic planning, public and private funding strategies and public relations and education.
- Fair and balanced. Stakeholders from *across the spectrum* noted the importance of establishing a Steering Committee, SPG and STG widely viewed as fair and balanced and who can legitimately work toward identifying common direction rather than advancing particular interests.
- Why participate? For the already over-committed, what will make it worthwhile for stakeholders to participate in this strategic planning process?
 - Consider ways to minimize barriers and enhance motivation to participate. Minimize time commitment, use people’s time wisely.

6. What suggestions do you have for the development of MOPF’s Strategic Plan – the role of the public/private partnership fund, its programmatic goals, etc.? What suggestions do you have for the development of MOPF’s Science Plan?

MOPF’s Role

The Project Coordinator outlined the roles/functions MOPF expects to fill and explained that these will be refined through the strategic planning process. Some stakeholders were skeptical of the need for another “ocean” organization, given the already crowded landscape of research entities, advocacy groups, user group associations, regulatory agencies, educational institutions, etc. Overall, however, interviewees were generally supportive of a new public-private partnership to serve the functions preliminarily defined below.

- *Convener* to help stakeholders forge agreement on process design, planning, and scientific components of difficult ocean policy/management issues.

- *Funder* of promising initiatives, programs and studies to
 - advance comprehensive ocean management and the integration of science/technical information into management decisions,
 - foster sustainable use of ocean resources and
 - promote ocean literacy among Massachusetts residents and visitors.
- *Agent* for leveraging opportunities that amplify the effectiveness and benefit of new and existing programs, such as by attracting new funding sources or supporting state management efforts.

Considerations for MOPF's Strategic Plan

Certain observations were broadly shared among the stakeholders interviewed:

- *Add value.* Recognizing Massachusetts' numerous existing marine and coastal oriented public and private entities, development of MOPF must aim to avoid redundancy which would intensify competition for limited resources (e.g. human capital, funding, etc.). MOPF should seek to *add value* by filling an institutional void and *enlarging the pie*.
- *Define the problem.* The SPG should clarify not only the anticipated mission of MOPF, but also articulate the “problem” the partnership will seek to address.
- *Coordination.* The current lack of coordination among the many governmental and non-governmental entities creates considerable inefficiencies and is a hindrance to advancing ocean policy, science and public education. “Everyone is playing cards, but not the same card game.” MOPF might consider taking on a coordination role.
- *Carrot rather than stick?* Strategic planning for the partnership fund should seriously consider what legitimacy MOPF will have once formally established. How will MOPF motivate participation absent legislative, regulatory or enforcement authority? If MOPF isn't an “uber- agency” and doesn't wield a stick, perhaps it has to wave a carrot, e.g. being a significant funder.

Stakeholders suggested possible MOPF objectives:

- Develop EBM (including a truer accounting of externalities) as a robust tool through extensive pilots to promote its use as the Standard Operating Procedure for government, business and NGOs.
- Convene DMF and others to define how FMPs will be integrated with the Ocean Management Plan, as called for in the pending MA legislation.
- Begin to shift dynamic of “fishermen as the problem” to “fishermen as part of the solution” by cooperatively addressing problems not *caused by* fishing, but which pose threats to the broader marine ecosystem.
- Assist with developing MMS “real estate” map (cadastre) of eastern seaboard; assist with refining OPIS a clickable oceans/coastal map with information about applicable laws and agency jurisdictions.
- Revive the partnership between state universities and state agencies to develop and implement monitoring programs and other ways to integrate science and management.

Other notable observations

- Several stakeholders were interested in/concerned about MOPF's degree of independence from state government.

- If MOPF has no legal or regulatory authority/power, how will it effectively mobilize/engage interested parties? Absent a legislative mandate, what teeth will MOPF have to advance comprehensive ocean management in MA?
- A few stakeholders were concerned about MOPF's ability to think/act independently if the Steering Committee is dominated by government appointees beholden to the Secretary of Environmental Affairs.
- Sentiment was mixed about limiting MOPF's efforts to state jurisdictional waters. On one hand, targeting a focused geographic area would be less costly and perhaps have a better chance of engaging interested parties. However, focusing on state waters creates an artificial boundary on existing/proposed uses and the marine ecosystems. Either way, the MA comprehensive ocean management planning effort should aim to develop tools and models that can be replicated elsewhere.
- Consider tools from the emerging "social marketing" field which may offer new approaches to promoting behavior change, among MOPF partners and more broadly with the public.
- Several stakeholders underscored the usefulness of public opinion research for understanding current perceptions, attitudes and behaviors and establishing baseline against which to measure success of programs in changing attitudes/behaviors.

Examples of successful public/private partnerships

- Chesapeake Bay Program (www.chesapeakebay.net)
- Corporate Wetlands Restoration Partnership (www.coastalamerica.gov/text/cwrp.html)
- Thompson Island Outward Bound (www.thompsonisland.org)
- Central Park and Rose Kennedy Greenway Conservancies (www.centralparknyc.org) (www.rosekennedygreenway.org)
- Fort Devens Redevelopment (www.massdevelopment.com/re/devens.aspx)

Considerations for MOPF's Science/Technical Plan

These interviews focused on the MOPF Strategic Plan and only touched on the related Science Plan efforts. A summary of the science interviews being conducted this fall will be distributed at a later date. There was virtually unanimous agreement that MOPF's Science/Technical Plan should focus on issues relevant for making policy and management decisions.

3. Identify the main emphases/goals of your agency, organization, or business over the next five years. What are the key obstacles you face in accomplishing those goals?

This table summarizes interviewees’ responses about their agency, organization or business priorities. It is organized into three main categories, though there may be considerable overlap among them: Public Awareness/Involvement and Public Access; Planning, Management Coordination to Balance Multiple Uses; and Research and Technical Assistance.

Emphasis of Organization / Agency Work	Obstacles	What’s Needed to Overcome Obstacles / Other Comments
Public Awareness/Involvement and Public Access		
Develop an informed constituency/public about nonpoint source and stormwater management issues to influence local and state decision-makers		
Educate young people and teachers about the ecological, economic and social importance of the oceans using experiential methods		
Build constituency for Boston Harbor resources (e.g. Harbor Islands) to promote both wise use and conservation		
Improve public access to waterways for recreational, educational and related uses		State commitment to create public/private partnerships to acquire access rights to private lands at waters’ edge
Planning and Management Coordination to Balance Multiple Uses		
Resolve issues related to marinas and navigation: dredge disposal sites, decrease obstacles to expanding/building new marinas	Environmental review process is overly politicized rather than weighing the pros and cons; many objections that can stall a project aren’t valid/meaningful	Need a streamlined/more efficient EIR/ approval process for relatively simple projects, for lifeline utility projects and other projects that provide significant public benefit
Installation of electric transmission facilities; continued remediation of ocean/coastal contaminated sites from predecessor company		
Support development and application of EBM		
Nantucket Shelf Plan: taking it from “vision” to a pilot comprehensive ocean management plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding: estimated cost to develop this project as a pilot is \$2-3M • State/Federal cooperation 	

NOAA: building regional partnerships – internal and interagency, Subcom. on Integrating Management of Ocean Resources (SIMOR)		Note: possible link to state – federal coordination for comprehensive ocean management?
Cape Cod Bay Ocean Sanctuary and Monitoring Program: creation of Cape Cod Bay Council as a “voice” for CC Bay		
Stellwagen Bank master planning		
Build strategic partnerships to advance DMF objectives in atmosphere of increasing competition for funds		
Provide technical assistance for sustainable resource use / development, e.g. improve public acceptance of and streamline regulatory process for renewable energy projects		
Advance the Cooperative Habitat Protection Partnerships (NMFS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buy-in from NOAA on need for CHPP • Lack of funding 	
Preserve broad recreational fishing access, incl. working with marine sanctuaries and MPAs		
Ensure fair/equitable allocation of fisheries quotas to recreational interests		
Restore anadromous fish runs / reopen shellfish beds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of funding and staff for municipalities and watershed associations • Home rule makes regional coordination difficult 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need incentives for municipalities to participate. Coastal issues can’t compete with local education funding. <p>Note: potential to build coalitions among wetlands/habitat community and recreational fishing community around these common interests?</p>
Support/advance the work of local ConComs: wetlands protection, open space and wildlife preservation	Under funded budgets	Secure grant funding for education, training, etc.
Fisher Initiative: cooperative research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mutual wariness among fishing, resource management and scientific communities • Lack of funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve communication / collaboration among interests • Generate funding

Pass the MA Oceans Management Act; develop and implement comprehensive ocean management plan	Lack of ocean awareness, especially among legislators	
Ensure economic viability / competitiveness of Port-based industries		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve collection of boat excise taxes for communities Beef up local aid for cities and towns. • Control health care and solid waste management costs which are eating up municipal budgets. • Reconcile contradictory regulatory mandates to limit water service hookups yet build more affordable housing and encourage commercial/economic development. 		
Improve planning and funding for regional wastewater infrastructure for Cape Cod		
Protection of marine and coastal habitat		
Research, Technical Assistance		
<p>Conduct research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop the scientific basis for implementing EBM • Distinguish the true signals of global climate change from effects of local management • Assess effects of invasive species • Investigate ocean ecosystem regime shift • Predictive modeling for red tide 		
Assess coastal hazards related to global climate change	Lack of money	
Provide technical assistance / research to advance development of MPAs	Lack of money	
Ocean monitoring: coordination, development and implementation of Integrated Ocean Observing System		

**MOPF Stakeholder Interview List
Summer 2006**

Last Name	First Name	Title	Affiliation
Adler	Bill	Director Member	MA Lobstermen's Assoc. MA Fisheries Commission
Baker	Peter	Campaign Director	Cape Cod Commercial Hook Fishermen's Assoc.
Barrett	Ed	President	MA Fishermen's Partnership
Bergeron	David	Director	MA Fishermen's Partnership
Borrelli	Peter	Director	Provincetown Center for Coastal Studies
Bullard	John	Director	Sea Education Assoc.
Callanan	Joe	Manager of Environmental Affairs	National Grid
Clarke	Jack	Director, Public Policy & Government Relations	Mass Audubon
Courtney	Fara	President	Good Harbor Consulting
Davis	Rebecca	Staff	Senator Robert O'Leary's Office
Delaney	Rich	Executive Vice President	Horsley Witten Group
Diodati	Paul	Director	MA Division of Marine Fisheries
Gibson	Barry	New England Regional Director	Recreational Fishermen's Assoc.
Hartman	Berl	New England Co-founder	Environmental Entrepreneurs
Hunt	Jim	Director	City of Boston, Energy and Environment Department
Hymovitz	Marc	Legislative Analyst & Coordinator of Federal Policy	MA Municipal Assoc.
Kaufman	Les	Professor	Boston University, Marine Program
Kay	Liz	Vice President	Cramer Strategic Communications
Leone	Mike	Director of Port Operations	Massport
Madeja	Jamy	Legal Affairs and Policy Consultant	MA Marine Trades Assoc.
McGregor	Greg	Board of Directors	MA Assoc. of Conservation Commissions
Nicholson	Betsy	Regional Coastal Management Specialist	NOAA Coastal Services
Northcross	Wendy	Director	Cape Cod Chamber of Commerce
O'Connor	David	Commissioner	MA Division of Energy Resources
Phillips	John	Director, New England Regional Office	The Ocean Conservancy
Powers	Tom	President	Island Alliance
Rex	Andrea	Director	ENQUAD, MWRA
Rodrigues	Kathi	Senior Policy Analyst	NMFS Habitat Conservation Division
Solow	Andy	Director	Marine Policy Center, WHOI
Watson	Greg	VP for Sustainable Development & Renewable Energy	MA Technology Collaborative
Wiggin	Jack	Director	Urban Harbors Institute, UMass, Boston
Woods	Samantha	Director	North/South Rivers Watershed Assoc.