

Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council Visioning and Strategic Planning Working Group

Ocean Place Resort
One Ocean Boulevard
Long Branch, NJ 07740
Telephone: 732.571.4000

Agenda- Meeting #3 October 15 and 16, 2012

At the end of the meeting, participants will have:

- Finalized a Mission Statement
- Finalized the Goal, Objective, and Strategy Sequences for the *Public Engagement* and *Economic Impacts* themes
- Worked through the initial drafts of the Goal, Objective, and Strategy Sequences for the *Regulatory Processes* and *Governance* themes

Monday, October 15

12:30 PM Registration and Check In

1:00 PM Welcome, Opening Remarks, and Introductions

Mr. Adam R. Saslow, Senior Facilitator - RESOLVE

- Review and approve meeting #2 summary
- Review agenda and meeting materials

1:30 PM Finalizing the Mission Statement

Facilitated by Mr. Adam R. Saslow

- Revise and finalize mission statement drafted in Meetings #1 and #2

2:00 PM Finalizing the Goal Statement for Public Engagement

Mr. Adam R. Saslow

- Revise and finalize Goal Statement conceptualized in Meeting #2

2:15 PM Refining the Public Engagement Objectives and Strategies

Mr. Adam R. Saslow

- Discuss and refine the goal, objective, strategy sequence for *Public Engagement*

3:00 PM Visioning Presentation – Economic Impacts

Mary Clark, Communications Program Coordinator – MAFMC; Mr. Adam R. Saslow

- Review *Stakeholder Input Report* themes and recommendations relevant to the *Economic Impacts* sequence (Clark)

- Perform SWOT Analysis (Saslow)

Participants catalogue organizational strengths & weaknesses – real and perceived - and external opportunities & threats.

3:45 PM Breakout Group Exercise: Economic Impacts

Participants will break into 4 groups and develop a Goal Statement as well as Objectives & Strategies

4:15 PM Goal, Objective, Strategy, Sequence: Economic Impacts

General Discussion Facilitated by Mr. Adam R. Saslow

- Present breakout group reports
- Develop a single goal statement based on goals drafted in breakout exercise

5:15 PM Wrap up and Adjourn

Rick Robins, Chairman – MAFMC

Tuesday, October 16

- 9:00 AM Welcome**
Mr. Adam R. Saslow, Senior Facilitator - RESOLVE
- Review progress from Day 1
 - Review agenda and meeting materials
- 9:15AM Finalizing the *Public Engagement* Objectives and Strategies Sequence**
Facilitated by Adam R. Saslow
- Revise and finalize *Public Engagement* sequence
- 9:45 AM Finalizing the *Economic Impacts* Goal Statement, Objectives and Strategies Sequence**
Mr. Adam R. Saslow
- Revise and finalize economic impacts sequence
- 10:45 AM Visioning Presentation – Regulatory Process and Council Decision Making**
Mary Clark; Mr. Adam R. Saslow
- Review themes and recommendations of the *Stakeholder Input Report* relevant to the *Regulatory Process and Decision Making* sequence (Clark)
 - Perform SWOT Analysis (Saslow)
- 11:30 AM Breakout Group Exercise: Regulatory Processes and Council Decision Making**
Participants will break into 4 groups and develop a Goal Statement as well as Objectives & Strategies
- 12:15 PM Lunch**
On your own
- 1:15 PM Goal, Objective, Strategy, Sequence: Regulatory Processes and Council Decision Making**
General Discussion Facilitated by Mr. Adam R. Saslow
- Present breakout group reports
 - Draft a single goal statement based on goals drafted during breakout exercise
- 2:30 PM Visioning Presentation – Governance**
Mary Clark; Adam R. Saslow
- Review themes and recommendations of the *Stakeholder Input Report* relevant to the *Governance* sequence (Clark)
 - Perform SWOT Analysis (Saslow)
- 3:15 PM Breakout Group Exercise: Governance**
Participants will break into 4 groups and develop a Goal Statement as well as Objectives & Strategies
- 4:00 PM Goal, Objective, Strategy, Sequence: Governance**
General Discussion Facilitated by Mr. Adam R. Saslow
- Present breakout group reports
 - Draft a single goal statement based on goals drafted during breakout exercise
- 4:45 PM Wrap up and Adjourn**
Mr. Richard Robins, Chairman – MAFMC

The times in this agenda reflect the facilitator’s best estimation.



MID-ATLANTIC | FISHERY
MANAGEMENT
COUNCIL

Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council Visioning and Strategic Planning Working Group

Broad Themes - Revised

Adapted from the *Visioning and Strategic Planning Project: Stakeholder Input Report*

<p style="text-align: center;">SCIENCE & DATA</p>	<p>Data Collection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The commercial industry does not trust data generated by the observer program and the NMFS research surveys ➤ MRFSS recreational fishing data are inaccurate. Use of inaccurate data for decision-making has negative impacts ➤ Need more/better catch monitoring and at-sea observer coverage ➤ Need more cooperative research to bring legitimacy to science-based decision making ➤ Reporting process is redundant and inefficient ➤ Time lag between data collection and resulting management decisions is problematic <p>Science and Data in the Management Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Data used by the Council lack accuracy, precision, and detail needed for sound management decisions ➤ There is insufficient transparency and industry involvement in the Research Set-Aside (RSA) funding program ➤ There is misalignment between management actions and fishermen’s on-the-water observations
<p style="text-align: center;">REGULATIONS & MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Some management strategies result in unnecessary discards ➤ Inability to land fish in the nearest port due to state-by-state regulations ➤ Regulations are constantly changing; cumulative weight of regulations is overwhelming ➤ Protected resources are given a disproportionate amount of consideration in the regulatory process ➤ Current recreational size limits result in increased discard mortality and reduced recreational enjoyment ➤ Seasonal closures result in transfers of effort into other fisheries ➤ Drastic recreational penalizations for exceeding quotas ➤ Inadequate enforcement of both recreational and commercial fisheries regulations ➤ Annual fluctuations and inconsistency in state and federal fishing regulations

<p>ENGAGEMENT & COMMUNICATION</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Council meetings are intimidating and difficult to attend ➤ Council communications lack clear explanations of the decision-making processes and justifications for specific decisions ➤ Council doesn't communicate how or when stakeholders can participate ➤ Council communications are difficult to understand ➤ Fishery management organizations (NMFS, MAFMC, states, ASMFC) don't clearly communicate differences in regulations and jurisdictions ➤ Better communication is needed to rebuild trust across all stakeholder groups ➤ The Council process is not as interactive and accessible as it could be
<p>GOVERNANCE</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Commercial fishermen don't participate because they don't feel their voices are being heard ➤ Council membership does not represent the interests of commercial and recreational industries ➤ Council does not represent interests of fishermen who harvest Mid-Atlantic species outside of Mid-Atlantic states ➤ Lack of coordination among fishery management organizations results in complexity and confusion
<p>EQUITY & STAKEHOLDER CONFLICT</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The basis for setting commercial quotas is unfair ➤ Commercial fishermen feel unduly persecuted by the Coast Guard in day-to-day interactions ➤ It is difficult for commercial fishermen to gain or maintain access to a fishery ➤ Recreational fishermen have insufficient fishing opportunities (access is too limited due to regulations) ➤ Regulations favor commercial fishermen over recreational fishermen ➤ Council does not consider the needs and interests of different recreational user groups ➤ Better communication is needed to rebuild trust across all stakeholder groups ➤ There is inadequate enforcement of both recreational and commercial fishing regulations
<p>REGULATORY PROCESS & COUNCIL DECISION- MAKING</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ MSA Reauthorization has reduced the Council's flexibility and authority, resulting in negative impacts ➤ Complexity and insufficient coordination among fishery management organizations ➤ Single-species management does not adequately account for the complexity of the ecosystem ➤ Allocations (State-by-state and Commercial/Recreational) stay the same over time and do not account for dynamic fisheries ➤ Council process is not as interactive and accessible as it could be ➤ ACL-setting system lacks adequate precautionary buffers to prevent overfishing ➤ Annual fluctuations and inconsistency in state and federal fishing regulations ➤ Protected resources are given too much consideration in the regulatory process ➤ Council doesn't consider the economic impacts of regulations on commercial and recreational fishing industries ➤ Council does not consider the needs and interests of different recreational user groups ➤ Inadequate enforcement of both recreational and commercial fisheries regulations

<p>ECONOMICS</p>	<p>Economic Challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Inability to land fish in the nearest port due to state-by-state regulations ➤ Rising fuel costs are a major challenge for the commercial industry; Impacts of management strategies on fuel costs are not adequately considered ➤ Shortened/closed seasons & annual quota fluctuations create economic challenges for recreational industry <p>Economic Considerations in the Council Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Negative impacts of management strategies on markets ➤ Council doesn't consider the economic impacts of regulations on the commercial and recreational fishing industries
<p>ECOSYSTEM/ ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS</p> <p>&</p> <p>NON-TARGET SPECIES</p>	<p>Ecosystem Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Overabundant predators ➤ Pollution, development, and other human activities ➤ Shifting fish populations (i.e. moving North); Climate change impacts ➤ Loss/degradation of fish habitat ➤ Pressure on forage species (due to predators and overfishing) <p>Ecosystem Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is confusion and skepticism about ecosystem based management (EBFM) ➤ The ecological importance of forage populations needs to be reflected in management decisions, especially in the shift to EBFM ➤ Protection and monitoring of fish habitat needs to be emphasized ➤ Single-species management does not adequately account for the complexity of the ecosystem ➤ Protected resources are currently given too much consideration in the regulatory process

Strategic Planning: Facts and FAQs

CONTEXT

The Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council is developing a strategic plan that will guide the Council's fishery management efforts for the next decade. In September 2011, the Council launched the *Visioning and Strategic Planning Project* with the largest stakeholder engagement initiative in its history. Through online surveys, small group meetings, and position letters, more than 1,500 stakeholders provided feedback and ideas for the strategic plan. The results of this outreach and data gathering effort were published in July 2012 in the *Stakeholder Input Report*—a comprehensive and detailed summary of stakeholders' concerns and recommendations for Mid-Atlantic fisheries. The completion of the *Stakeholder Input Report* marked the beginning of the next phase of the project: Strategic Planning.

In August 2012, a working group composed of Council members, advisors, and other stakeholders met for the first time to begin work on a 10-year strategic plan. This fact sheet is intended to answer a few frequently asked questions about the Council's strategic planning process.

WHAT IS STRATEGIC PLANNING?

Broadly defined, strategic planning is a process by which an organization develops a strategy for fulfilling its responsibility and achieving goals more effectively. The planning process enables an organization to clarify its mission, articulate a vision of success, and prioritize specific goals.

The Council's strategic plan will include five main components:

Vision: Describes an ideal state for Mid-Atlantic fisheries and for the Council as an organization.

Answers the question: "What do we want Mid-Atlantic fisheries to look like in the future?"

Mission: Articulates the organization's fundamental purpose.

Answers the question: "What do we exist to do?"

Goals: Broad, long-term aspirations that stay relatively consistent over time.

Answers the question: "What aspirations will help us to fulfill our Mission and move toward our Vision?"

Objectives: Short-term goals with clearly defined milestones and metrics; Can be periodically revised.

Answers the question: "What specific steps do we need to take to accomplish our goals?"

Tactics: Specific action items, or strategies, designed to help the organization achieve its goals and objectives.

Answers the questions: "What are we going to do, how are we going to do it, and who will be responsible?"

A critical component of strategic planning is an assessment of the organization's current internal and external environments. This process, sometimes known as a **SWOT Analysis** (Internal Strengths & Weaknesses, External Opportunities & Threats) helps to identify factors that could help or hinder progress toward the organization's goals.

WHY DOES THE COUNCIL NEED A STRATEGIC PLAN?

Every organization, regardless of their successes or challenges, can benefit from a strategic plan. A strategic plan ensures that individuals understand the priorities and objectives of the. It also helps ensure that the organization operates efficiently while clearly communicating its objectives and rationales for decisions to the public.

HOW IS THE PLAN BEING DEVELOPED?

The strategic plan will be developed using a consensus-based approach with guidance and facilitation from a neutral strategic planning expert. The planning process will rely heavily input collected from stakeholders during the first phase of the project. Working group members, with various areas of expertise and experience, will collaboratively develop specific and actionable strategies for achieving the Council's goals.

WHEN WILL THE STRATEGIC PLAN BE FINISHED?

December 31, 2012 is the target date for completion of a complete draft for public review.

WHO IS INVOLVED IN PLANNING?

The strategic planning working group includes Council members who served on the Visioning and Strategic Planning Committee, former members of the Visioning Advisory Panel, and other key stakeholders. All strategic planning meetings are open to the public. An opportunity for public comment will be announced once the final draft has been published.

WHERE CAN I GET MORE INFORMATION?

Check out the website: www.mafmc.org/vision, or contact Mary Clark: mclark@mafmc.org, (302) 526-5261.



Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council Visioning and Strategic Planning Working Group

Strategic Planning 101 – Glossary

Core Values: Beliefs that are shared among the stakeholders of an organization. Values drive an organization's culture and priorities and provide a framework in which decisions are made.

Vision: outlines what the organization wants to be, or how it wants the world in which it operates to be (an "idealized" view of the world). It is a long-term view and concentrates on the future. It can be emotive and is a source of inspiration. For example, a charity working with the poor might have a vision statement which reads "A World without Poverty."

Mission: Defines the fundamental purpose of an organization or an enterprise, succinctly describing why it exists and what it does to achieve its vision. For example, the charity above might have a mission statement as "providing jobs for the homeless and unemployed."

Goals are broad statements of what the organization hopes to achieve relative to a theme and are qualitative in nature. Although the Council can have short-term and long-term goals, it is important that each goal is clear and can be supported by measurable objectives. Goals should drive the strategic planning preparation and give further definition to the organization's mission. Goals supported by measurable objectives become self-fulfilling. What's more, strategic plans with five to ten overarching goals to be achieved within seven to ten years are the most efficient to manage.***

Objectives are quantitative in nature. In fact, objectives are the only quantifiable elements of the strategic plan. Vision, mission, goals and tactics are all qualitative and describe how things get done, but not how much will be accomplished.

To keep your objectives on track, a good rule of thumb is that every objective should begin with the word "increase" or "decrease." After all, objectives define how much improvement will take place, and that improvement is either in the form of increasing or decreasing a statistic. If you are simply trying to maintain a statistic, it doesn't belong in the strategic plan; it is better suited as a key performance indicator or for a scorecard.

Strategies describe a major approach or method for attaining objectives and resolving specific issues. Strategies begin to answer the question, "How will we go about accomplishing our objectives?" Strategies describe a general approach or method; they don't describe specific activities or projects — that's the work of tactics.

Tactics are the definitions for the strategies. They are the specific ways you do things in order to execute the strategies. As such, they are near term (typically 1-3 years), actionable in nature and are the "concrete" things your people will do to implement the strategies and achieve the objectives.

Whereas objectives should start with the words "increase" or "decrease," strong tactics should start with verbs. Tactics require action, and verbs are best suited for identifying what that action is. But action isn't enough. Tactics, like the strategies and objectives in their family trees, must also have due dates and people assigned to carry them out. Tactics assigned to individuals add a layer of accountability to the strategic plan.

RESOLVE

Collaborative Visioning and Strategic Planning Services