

Crosswalk – Comparison of Ocean Policy Task Force Framework Goals and Guiding Principles and NROC October Workshop-Generated Ideas and Objectives

Ocean Policy Task Force CMSP Framework	NROC October 26-27, 2009, Workshop Proceedings
Governance Process	
<p>In <i>Months 4-6</i>, the NOC would coordinate with states and tribal representatives to establish regional planning bodies and enter into a development agreement.</p> <p>In <i>Months 9-24</i>, each regional planning body would develop a formal regional work plan describing agreed-upon process for CMSP and development of CMS plans (including milestones, resources, time frames, etc.), with the flexibility to account for particular circumstances of a given region and ability to focus on issues of highest regional priority (e.g., organize data efforts, develop regional plan objectives, etc.).</p> <p>Each regional planning body would prepare and execute a CMSP Development Agreement to commit to working cooperatively and to identify lead representatives for each of the partners and define ground rules, roles, and responsibilities of partners within the region.</p> <p>Dispute resolution process would be designed in a way to ensure most disputes resolved at regional level.</p> <p>Each regional body should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify regional objectives • Identify existing efforts that should help shape the plan throughout the process 	<p>Organic planning preferred over top-down requirements for a regional marine spatial plan.</p>
<p>Regional planning bodies would include, but be limited to: representation for resource management, science, homeland and national security, transportation, and</p>	<p>Include additional federal representatives; DOT, DOD, FEMA, FERC. Need to include tribal representatives.</p>

public health. Would also include tribes.	
Regional planning body should ensure state representation from all states within a region, through (or part of) existing regional governance structures. Northeast will include VT.	NROC currently includes all New England coastal states, and continues to keep VT informed should they wish to become reengaged.
Recognition that development of plan will be a flexible, iterative process not meant to hinder ongoing state efforts. Identify and incorporate existing state and other regional plans into comprehensive regional plan.	Allowance for continuation of collaborative state/federal ocean planning without being slowed down or prescribed conflicting methods.
Extend landward of the mean high-water line; extend seaward to the EEZ 200-mile boundary; includes inland bays and estuaries. Further inland expansion is determined by regional planning body.	Organic approach in how to define manageable geographic scope of plans.
In <i>Months 9-18</i> , regional planning bodies begin to identify key stakeholders, scientific and technical experts, non-governmental organizations, and other partners Each regional body should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage stakeholders and the public at key points throughout the process Consult scientists and technical and other experts 	Develop communication and outreach plan to define key audiences. Recognize regional stakeholder engagement is critical and resource intensive. Non-governmental partners wish to become involved in an advisory and project management capacity.
Define local and regional objectives and develop and implement CMSP in a way that is meaningful to regionally specific concerns.	Partners stressed importance of regional marine spatial plan that relies upon a developed value system for the region.
In <i>Months 4-6</i> , the NOC would coordinate with states and tribal representatives to establish regional planning bodies for each of the nine regions and enter into a development agreement. These planning bodies would ideally become part of existing regional ocean governance groups.	NROC should take on regional MSP by either creating a MSP committee or a technical subgroup that would handle discussions on regulatory efficiencies and product development toward more effective MSP.
A consistent planning scale with which to initiate CMSP is at the large marine ecosystem scale; i.e., regionally. In Northeast, planning scale would encompass New	Regional approach should be in line with how federal agencies manage ecological resources as this would alleviate the overextension of staff and monetary

England.	resources when compared to a state-by-state approach.
Regulatory Efficiencies and Coordination	
<p>Achieve regulatory efficiencies, less administrative delay.</p> <p>State and federal regulatory authorities would adhere to the processes for “improved and more efficient permitting, environmental reviews, and other decision-making identified in the CMS Plan to the extent these actions do not conflict with existing legal obligations.”</p> <p>For example, agencies could enter into MOUs to coordinate or unify permit reviews and decision-making processes.</p>	<p>States agree that a federal mandate to engage in CMSP would enable enhanced efficiency and better consistency in the regulatory process.</p> <p>Feds are concerned in meeting expectation of engaging earlier in process (being proactive) without changes to existing legislative authorities, which rely on reacting.</p>
State and federal agencies would be expected to formally incorporate relevant components of the CMS Plan into their ongoing operations or activities consistent with existing law.	States propose that state ocean planning efforts be incorporated into federal requirements.
	States requested that federal agencies produce a common and comprehensive list of requirements for required federal statutes.
	States requested that feds develop a standardized expression of how much information is enough and when certain thresholds are satisfied.
Data Needs, Collection, and Standards	
In <i>Months 1-9</i> , a robust and accessible national information management system to meet the data requirements of CMSP would begin to be developed (may take up to two years).	States articulated data needs and standards as necessary to inform CMSP at a regional scale and to satisfy federal review requirements.
In <i>Months 1-9</i> , a robust and accessible national information management system to meet the data requirements of CMSP with either a central portal or regional portals would begin to be developed (may take up to two years).	<p>States expressed data and baseline assessment priority needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seafloor mapping • Bathymetry • Sediment types

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human uses including VMS • Offshore datasets <p>NROC recognized strong potential role for partners in developing data management system and regional viewer (e.g., NERACOOS).</p>
<p>NOC would ensure that information is publicly available and easy-to-access through computer readable files, etc. that support a variety of user needs.</p> <p>Leverage support from federal government to access CMSP data.</p>	<p>States requested improved accessibility of data to the states and educate users of the utility of data sets (i.e., science translation).</p> <p>States want access to technology/software and trained staff.</p>
<p>Minimum data standards would be adopted for the national information management system and include standards for information quality.</p>	<p>Need standardized protocols for data collection and sharing.</p>
<p>Decision Product Needs</p>	
<p>In <i>Months 1-9</i>, begin development of nationally consistent, specialized decision-support tools to provide a framework for regional assessments and alternative future use scenarios.</p> <p>Accessibility of data through CMSP portal(s).</p> <p>Regional planning body should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and evaluate alternative future use scenarios and tradeoffs 	<p>Decision support tools needed, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scenario analysis • Trade-off and cost-benefit analyses • Habitat characterization model • Cumulative impact analysis • Human use atlas • Decision support for non-energy drivers (e.g., docks, marine trade, dredge disposal, and aquaculture)
<p>Role of NROC and Other Regional Ocean Governance Groups</p>	
<p>Sustain federal participation on regional planning bodies of representatives empowered to make decisions on behalf of respective agencies; helping to integrate and improve decision-making.</p>	<p>NROC would serve as liaison among states and federal agencies to promote consistent guidance on information and regulatory needs.</p>
<p>Leverage, strengthen, and magnify local planning objectives through integration with regional and national planning efforts.</p>	<p>NROC would serve as forum to share successes/lessons/strategies in CMSP processes and transfer of information among state and federal agencies and across regions.</p>

<p>In <i>18 months to 5 years</i>, regional planning bodies develop a mechanism, through reports, to share lessons learned, best practices, and routine and frequent communication nationally and among the regions.</p>	
<p>In <i>Months 1-9</i>, NOC to assess resource needs including personnel, financial, and technical CMSP support.</p> <p>Leverage support to build CMSP capacity, and acquire scientific, technical, and financial assistance.</p>	<p>NROC agrees to pursue aspects of CMSP that require a regional approach and seek increased capacity in areas of staff support, funds, and technical ability for data analysis, etc.</p> <p>NROC recognizes the strength of federal-state partnership and level of talent among regional partners.</p>
<p>Each regional body should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage stakeholders and the public at key points throughout the process • Consult scientists and technical and other experts 	<p>Agreement that stakeholder engagement is a necessary accompaniment to the science.</p>
<p>Regional planning bodies will provide States with a clearer and easier point of access for all federal agencies, their sustained participation, and representatives that have authority to make decisions.</p>	<p>States request that NROC promote consistent response by federal agencies (“federal perspective”) and continued federal interagency communication.</p>
<p>Proactively minimize use conflicts before they escalate as the regional level.</p>	<p>NROC as place to coordinate all CMSP-related projects getting underway and place to discuss appropriate management of oceans at “pre-planning” phase (identify “no go” areas early).</p>
<p>Federal government to better manage resources or address processes that transcend jurisdictional boundaries.</p>	<p>Explore regional compatibility and edge-matching of data from boundary to boundary (e.g., state boundaries).</p>
<p>In <i>Months 9-18</i>, regional planning bodies begin to identify key stakeholders, scientific and technical experts, non-governmental organizations, and other partners.</p>	<p>NROC provide facilitation and communication among scientists and managers.</p>
<p>Goal of CMSP Framework is to move toward comprehensive, integrated, flexible, proactive, ecosystem-based CMSP, this would be implemented</p>	<p>Embraced concept of a coarse-level regional ocean plan within 3-5 years and opportunity to grow into its role as a regional convener.</p>

over time. Encouraged to have initial plans completed in *three years*; and initial plans certified and implemented by *mid-2015*.

