Team Charter
4/15/2003

Boundary Team Participants

Team Participants:

1. Bill Douros, MBNMS
2. Dan Howard, CBNMS
3. Maria Brown, GFNMS
4. Julie Barrow, NMSP
5. Brady Phillips, NMSP
6. Anne Walton, GF/CBNMS
7. Sean Morton, MBNMS
8. Dave Lott, NMSP
9. Mitchell Tartt, NMSP
10. Columbine Culberg, NMSP
11. Mark Monaco, NCCOS
12. Rod Ehler, NMSP

Sanctuary Advisory Council Observers:

12. Richard Charter, GFNMS SAC representative
13. Dan Haifley, MBNMS SAC representative
14. TBD, CBNMS SAC representative

SAC Observer Guidelines:

1. The purpose of the SAC Observer is to allow each SAC to follow NMSP work done by the Cross Cutting Boundary Internal Team during the Joint Management Plan Review Process and to promote improved SAC involvement in Phase II as described in the JMPR Work Plan (www.sanctuaries.nos.noaa.gov/jointplan). In brief, Phase II of this process incorporates a presentation of the findings of the Crosscutting Boundary Team to each SAC, a review and comment period for each SAC , and the submission of SAC comments, along with the initial findings of the Boundary Team, to the NMSP Director in the form of a Final Report.

2. SAC Observers will not participate in discussions during Team meetings other than to ensure their understanding of the discussions/actions of the Team.

3. Scheduling of Team meetings will not be delayed due to schedules of SAC observers.

4. Each SAC Observer is advised to have an alternate to attend meetings should designated SAC member have a conflict.

5. Only one SAC Observer from each SAC may attend a given meeting

Team Charter
4/15/2003

Team Goal and Objectives

Goal

To bring together key NMSP staff and work through a process designed by the group that will generate a supportable and logical <u>resolution</u> to two boundary issues using clear and concise analytical thinking and teamwork.

Objectives

1) To develop and implement an analytical process designed <u>to determine a set of boundary alternatives</u> relative to the MBNMS/GFNMS shared boundary using the best available information and resources.

2) To prepare an appropriate set of boundary alternatives (including a preferred alternative), evaluations of each alternative, and recommendations for action to be presented to the Sanctuary Advisory Councils of the MBNMS and GFNMS for their review and comment.

3) To develop and implement an analytical process designed to evaluate the inclusion of the existing San Francisco/Pacifica exemption area in NMSP jurisdiction using the best available information and resources.

Team Charter

Team Products

1. A set of criteria to evaluate boundary issues. (It is anticipated that this set could be used in other boundary development processes as reference/starting point.)

2. A framework to guide development and selection of boundary alternatives.

3. A set of boundary, administrative, and/or regulatory alternatives that address the shared boundary of the GFNMS and MBNMS, including a preferred alternative, and explanation for each.

4. A set of boundary, administrative, and/or regulatory alternatives that address the San Francisco/Pacifica exemption area, including a preferred alternative, and explanation for each; or an Action Plan that documents an extended evaluation and review of this issue.

5. A Findings Report from the Team for the SAC of each site that documents all work and recommendations of the Internal Team regarding each boundary issue.

6. A Final Boundary Evaluation Report for presentation to the NMSP Director. This report will include the Findings Report prepared by the Team and comments/recommendations from each of the site SACs

Team Charter
4/15/2003

Team Ground Rules

1) There will be no lobbying of parties external to the Working Team. All issues/concerns taken to parties outside of the Team will be done through the Team Lead.

2) Should schedule changes open up time on the calendar of any team member, that team member should notify the Team Lead <u>and</u> reserve that time for this team until further notice (or as long as possible.

3) Decision of the group will be documented in written form and distributed to the entire team.

4) Team will adhere to the JMPR Self-governance Guidelines (provided in the final section of this Charter)

Team Charter
4/15/2003

Team Decision Making Guidelines: Part I

The existing JMPR "*Consensus Based Decision Making*" document (included at the end of this document) will be used as a starting point. The following process will be added to the existing set of guidelines to assist the team should consensus not be readily reached. These guidelines will be used through the development of boundary alternatives. Once boundary alternatives (not including the preferred alternative) are developed, the Team will refer to *Decision Making Guidelines: Part II* for guidelines on preparing the Team Findings Report for the SACs.

First motion for consensus
    A) Proposal
- Statement of proposal
- Clarification within team of what is being proposed
- Open floor for concerns to be voiced

    B) First call for consensus

If no consensus is reached:
    C) Resolution of concerns
- List, clarify, group, and address all concerns
- Resolve as many as possible through discussion, clarification of concern, clarifications and/or changes to the proposal, or concerned member offers to proceed without concern being accepted

    D) Second call for consensus

If no consensus is reached:
    E) Calibrate unresolved concerns with goals and purpose of this team and the issues being addressed
- Discuss and characterize each unresolved concern in detail
- Discuss and evaluate agreed upon goals and process
- Discuss and re-evaluate proposal
- Modify goals, proposal, or concern if appropriate

    F) Third call for consensus

If no consensus is reached:
    G) A brief written summary will be prepared that documents the issue(s), the groups position, describes the concerns (both resolved and unresolved). The Team Lead (Mitchell Tartt) will present the report to the NMSP Director for review, comment, and decision. This action will only be taken with group consensus or, subsequently, Team Lead recommendation.

Team Charter
4/15/2003

Team Decision Making Guidelines: Part II

Final Stage – No Consensus on Preferred Alternative:

  I. A summary report will be prepared that documents the Team's position relative to the alternatives developed. The Team Lead (Mitchell Tartt) will present the report to NMSP Director for review, comment, and a decision on the preferred alternative. This action will only be taken with group consensus or, subsequently, Team Lead recommendation.

 II. The Team will prepare and present the Findings Report (including a preferred alternative per guidance from the NMSP Director) to the SACs for review, comment, and recommendations.

III. The SAC will review the report submitted and provide comments/ recommendations to the Team. The Team will prepare a Final Boundary Evaluation Report that includes the Team Findings Report and all comments/recommendations from the SAC. The Team will present the Final Boundary Evaluation Report to the NMSP Director for review/decision/action.

General Process

See Boundary Evaluation Process Diagrams for more specific information

Team Charter
4/15/2003

Proposed Schedule

Phase 1

- **April 3:** Initial conference call

- **April 7:** Conference call

- **April 7 - 15**: Working period to develop and process target data and to draft proposed questions and criteria.

- **April 17/18:** Meeting in California to finalize the Team Charter, finalize evaluation process, review/revise criteria framework, develop criteria for data assessment, and review available data *(open to SAC observers).*

- **April 21 – May 5**: Working period to conduct preliminary analyses.

- **April 21 – May 5**: Interim internal conference cal to discuss progress and next steps. Date TBD.

- **May 7** - Meeting in California to review preliminary analysis results and develop/conduct subsequent targeted analyses *(open to SAC observer).*

- **May 8 – May 30:** Working period to conduct analyses and develop boundary alternatives.

- **May 8 – May 30:** Interim internal conference call. Date TBD.

- **End of May** - Meeting in California to review analysis results, draft boundary alternatives and justifications for each *(open to SAC observer).* Date TBD

- **1st week of June** – Draft Findings Report prepared for Team review.

- **2nd week of June** – Final Findings Report prepared for presentation to SAC.

Phase 2

- ***TBD*** *based on issue of individual vs. joint SAC presentations*

Team Charter
4/15/2003

Consensus Based Decision Making Process
Joint Management Plan Review—Cross-Cutting Working Groups

Decision Making Process
The working group will strive to achieve consensus. For matters of substance associated directly with its goals and objectives, the working group will strive for unanimity. In seeking consensus, each member has an obligation to articulate interests and build agreements by negotiating a recommendation for adoption by the Sanctuary Advisory Councils (SACs). In exchange, each member has the right to expect:

- a full articulation of agreement and areas of disagreement, if any; and
- an opportunity to revisit issues on grounds of substantial new information that becomes available during the working group's deliberations.

When unable to support consensus, a member has an obligation to demonstrate that the item at issue is a matter of such principle or importance that his or her constituent's interest would be substantially and adversely affected by the proposed decision. In addition, it is the responsibility of the dissenting party to 1) state he reason(s) underlying their withholding of consent in sufficient detail and 2) offer an alternative suggestion that satisfactorily addresses not only their concerns and interests, bur also those of other members of the working group.

Definition of Consensus
One definition of consensus is unanimity. This means that all participants will work toward reaching agreement as a group on all major elements of their collective decisions. In practice, however, where the challenge is a balance of interests and issues, it is necessary to provide for differing levels of support between members and issues in constructing a viable set of agreements. In the unlikely event that one or more members disagree on a specific aspect of the issue, the recommendation will be forwarded to the SACs indicating points of agreement and points of disagreement. In the case of an incomplete recommendation (anything less than full consensus), the final decision will rest with the sanctuaries.

From a practical and operational standpoint, the sanctuary program has used the following definition for consensus:
Consensus is a process used to find the highest level of agreement without dividing participants into factions. Everyone in the group supports, agrees to, or can accept a particular decision. In the end, everyone can say, "whether or not I prefer this decision above all others, I will support it because it was reached fairly and openly."

Levels of Agreement
In seeking consensus on an interim or final recommendation, it is understood that members should voice their concerns with specific proposals along the way, rather than waiting until the final recommendation has been developed. In addition, the working group may choose to use the following five levels of agreement to indicate a member's degree of approval and support for any proposal or decision being considered by the working group and to determine the degree of consensus among the working group:

- **Level 1**—I feel we have no clear sense of agreement among the group. <u>We need to talk more before considering a decision</u>.
- **Level 2**—I do not agree with the group's proposal. I feel the need to block its adoption and <u>propose an alternative</u>.
- **Level 3**—I may not be especially enthusiastic about it, but I<u> can accept the group's proposal</u>.
- **Level 4**—I think this <u>proposal is the best choice of the options available to us</u>.
- **Level 5**—<u>I am enthusiastic about the group's proposal</u> and am confident it expresses the best wisdom of the group.

The goal is for all members of the working group to be in the upper levels of agreement. The working group would be considered to have reached consensus if all members are at Level 3—5. If any member of the working group is at Level 1 or 2, the working group will stop and evaluate how best to proceed.

In the event of significant disagreements, the working group will decide, in consultation with the facilitator, how best to move forward. For example, additional discussion may be needed to help understand unresolved concerns before proceeding further, or the group may benefit from creating additional options. If, after exhausting all other options, a working group member feels that he or she cannot go along with consensus developed by the working group, they have the option to withdraw as an official member of the working group.

Straw Polls
Straw polls may be taken to assess the degree of preliminary support for an idea, before being submitted as a formal proposal for final consideration by the working group. Members may indicate only tentative approval for a preliminary proposal, without fully committing to its support. It is understood that agreement on a final recommendation will typically require consideration by constituent groups on all elements of the recommendation that ultimately emerges from the working group.

Member Absence During the Decision Making Process
When members cannot attend a meeting of the working group, they will seek to communicate their views to other members of the group prior to the meeting. Absence of a member is interpreted as assent.

Lack of Consensus
If consensus cannot be reached on a recommendation to the Sanctuary Advisory Councils, the working group will forward to the SACs a summary of their areas of agreement and areas of disagreement.

Implementation Considerations
Although the working group as a whole is not directly responsible for implementation of its recommendation to the SACs, members should be continually mindful of the feasibility and practical aspects of any recommendations they develop.

Team Charter

4/15/2003

Guidelines for Self-Governance
Joint Management Plan Review—Cross-Cutting Working Groups
April 9, 2003

Guidelines for self-governance constitute the core principles by which members of the group agree to treat one another and expect to be treated. The guidelines also articulate the actions and behaviors for which every member commits to hold him/herself accountable, as well as others.

How we treat one another

• Respect our differences and diverse backgrounds and recognize that everyone adds value to the greater good. Afford everyone equal respect by displaying acceptance, tolerance, patience, and sensitivity.

• Help create a "safe" and creative working environment where individual members can be themselves, speak truths, and share feelings and concerns without retribution. What is said within the group stays here.

• Do not interrupt or cutoff others. Be sensitive to how we use available "air time," striving to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to participate.

• Embrace humor, but avoid "cheap shots."

How we manage ourselves

• Come prepared.

• Embrace and project a positive attitude.

• Actively listen to others.

• Strive to be fully present and engaged (e.g., not thinking or doing something other than paying attention and participating).

• Be honest with one another and yourself. Act out of trust and model trustworthiness.

How we will learn and work together

• Recognize that we all need to take leadership for what we want to see happen.

• Stay focused on the subject at hand.

• Seek clarification for those things that we do not understand.

• Adhere to the agreed upon consensus-based decision making process.

• Respect the team leader's role and do not lobby parties external to the working team.

- Be respectful of your and others' time. We are all responsible for how we use it.

- Maintain flexibility. Be ready for change and ready to go in different directions.

- Celebrate successes, both individual and group.

- Give this opportunity our all, and have fun in the process.

How we manage our meetings and conference calls

- Start and end sessions on time, unless there is consensus among the group to modify the original proposal.

- Distribute agendas and background materials in a timely manner.

- Prepare and distribute meeting summaries, including group decisions, in a timely manner.

- Plan and schedule meetings in advance. Individuals have a responsibility to ensure they can attend proposed meetings/calls.

Coming together is a beginning.
Staying together is progress.
Working together is success.

-Henry Ford-