



Pacific Islands RPB Meeting

March 30-31, 2016

Pago Pago, American Samoa

RPB Members in Attendance:

American Samoa: Ruth Matagi-Tofiga,
Claire Poumele,
Chris King (alt)

CNMI:

Guam: Dr. Jason Biggs

Hawaii: Justine Nihipali (alt), Elia Herman (alt)

WPFMC:

NOAA: Michael Tosatto

JCS: CDR Joan Malik (Navy) (alt)

DOD: Nicole Griffin (USMC)

EPA: Michael Wolfram (alt)

DOT:

DOI: Matt Brown

USCG: CDR Brian Donahue (alt)

USDA: Bruce Petersen

Others and Public:

Executive Secretary: Sarah Pautzke

Facilitators: Miranda Foley, John Parks

Public: Nate Ilaoa (WPFMC), Lauren Nutter (Udall Foundation), Mia Comeros (AS EPA), Tom Murphree (Naval Postgraduate School (NPS)), Arlene Guest (NPS), Kevin Foerster (US FWS).

AGENDA OVERVIEW

- RPB update
- Discussion about capacity needs
- Discussion of data and tools
- Discussion about stakeholder engagement
- Input into American Samoa ocean planning process

The meeting opened with a welcome by the co-lead Mr. Tosatto and American Samoa host Dr. Matagi-Tofiga. The RPB members and alternates, followed by the audience, then introduced themselves and stated the agency or company for which they work (if applicable).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Pacific Islands Regional Planning Body (PI RPB) met in Pago Pago, American Samoa on March 30-31, 2016. The PI RPB has divided its workload between three building blocks for successful development of the Pacific Islands Ocean Plan: capacity, data and tools, and stakeholder engagement. The meeting was structured to develop goals and related directives/recommendations that will forge progress on these building blocks in the year ahead.

Meeting Outcome #1: Consensus on the PI RPB goals for 2016

- 1) Capacity Building: Complete Part 1 of the Pacific Islands Ocean Plan: the American Samoa Ocean Plan. The Pacific Islands Ocean Plan will also include sub-plans for the Pacific Remote Island Areas, the Marianas (Guam and CNMI), and Hawaii.
- 2) Data: Begin development of a mapping interface and decision support tool to improve coastal and marine spatial planning throughout the US Pacific Islands, as well as identify data and data gaps.
- 3) Stakeholder engagement: Improve the stakeholder engagement process, starting with a stakeholder assessment and stakeholder engagement action plan for American Samoa. This would later be replicated for the other jurisdictions.

Meeting Outcome #2: Recommendations and directives for the Executive Secretariat to act on over the next year.

Regarding process for development of the AS Ocean Plan: The PI RPB encourages a consistent approach for ocean planning across all jurisdictions. The PI RPB will provide peer support and guidance during the scoping and drafting phase of plan development, and will provide peer review and serious guidance during draft review. It has not decided how it will provide input during draft revision and adoption of the final product.

Regarding capacity needs: The PI RPB directed the Executive Secretariat to 1) identify funding gaps related to capacity needs, and 2) develop strategies to address them. This includes identifying a local facilitator and local coordinator in American Samoa, as well as other capacity needs across the region.

Regarding data and tools: The PI RPB agreed to initiate a data and tools team, led by DOD RPB member Nicole Griffin. To that end, PI RPB members will provide a team member recommendation (or more than one) from their agency, including people from non-government organizations.

Regarding stakeholder engagement: The PI RPB encouraged development of a formal stakeholder engagement process and an accompanying stakeholder engagement action plan to support jurisdictional ocean planning. It agreed to identify supporting partners for stakeholder engagement, including Udall Foundation.

Meeting Outcome #3: Support and comment to the American Samoa Ocean Planning Team

- 1) The Executive Secretariat will work with the American Samoa Ocean Planning Team to identify the local coordinator, as well as determine the logistics and funding for the position.
- 2) The PI RPB provided feedback regarding the vision statement developed by the ASOPT.

PI RPB UPDATE

Ocean planning updates:

- The term for Beth Kerttula, the Director of the National Ocean Council, expires in June 2016; it is unclear if a new director will be selected.
- The IUCN World Conservation Congress will be September 1-10, 2016, in Honolulu; it has several CMSP sessions. <https://portals.iucn.org/congress/sessions>
- The World Ocean Council hosted the Sustainable Ocean Summit in November 2015 that focused on developing MSP management practices that included industry input.
- The US federal administration will be changing. The national ocean planning efforts stem from 16 years of bipartisan efforts under the last 2 administrations, so while ocean planning may undergo rebranding, the efforts should continue.

National RPB update:

- The New England RPB has released its plan for internal review. The goal is to have it finalized before the administration change.
- The Mid Atlantic RPB is planning to release its draft plan in June 2016. Its goal is also to have the plan finalized before the administration change.
- The Pacific Islands RPB has started its ocean planning efforts in American Samoa. The goal is to have the American Samoa Ocean Plan complete in draft form by December 2016.
- The Caribbean signed its charter and the West Coast RPB is in the process of signing its charter.
- All other RPBs are still facing roadblocks to development.

PI RPB Recap:

The PI RPB accomplished several tasks since the last in-person meeting, including its first CMSP training, which was held in February 2015 in Honolulu; it also coordinated a second training held in 2016 in Portland, OR. The PI RPB developed its vision for ocean planning in the Pacific Islands, had initial conversations with PacIOOS about hosting a potential mapping interface, discussed funding opportunities with Udall Foundation, secured a Moore Foundation grant, and established the American Samoa Ocean Planning Team (ASOPT).

The PI RPB goals for 2016 are:

- 1) Complete Part 1 of the Pacific Islands Ocean Plan: the American Samoa Ocean Plan
- 2) Begin development of a mapping interface
- 3) Improve the stakeholder engagement process

Discussion

Mr. Tosatto suggested the PI RPB think about other jurisdictions that the PI RPB could initiate ocean planning in, offering that the PRIA might be low hanging fruit due to few stakeholders. There were no objections to working on the PRIA ocean plan. PI RPB members suggested that the Executive Secretariat create a timeline for progress on jurisdictional plans. The question was raised about what the PI RPB will do when the Moore Foundation funding is exhausted. At this time, there is no answer to that question – the Executive Secretariat is pursuing external non-governmental funding opportunities outside Moore Foundation.

CAPACITY BUILDING: AMERICAN SAMOA OCEAN PLANNING

CDR Donahue provided a summary of the progress of the ASOPT. The ASOPT has drafted a vision statement for the American Samoa Ocean Plan, completed an initial stakeholder survey, identified capacity needs for near-term ocean planning in the jurisdiction, and described a process¹ for peer and public review of the plan.

Discussion

The PI RPB discussed when input would be appropriate in the American Samoa Ocean Plan planning process, as well as the depth of the input. It was agreed that American Samoa should own their plan, but the PI RPB should provide comment and guidance when needed. Since the AS Ocean Plan will feed into the overarching PI RPB Regional Plan, the PI RPB must adopt the AS Ocean Plan. It was agreed that adoption of the AS Ocean Plan should not be held up because other territorial or state plans are not ready for adoption.

The PI RPB agreed that, to ensure the plan is on track, review at critical points is important (such as reviewing the draft vision statement, draft goals and objectives, and draft revisions as it moves to final adoption). Seeing smaller pieces is important so that some issues could be solved prior to the plan going to public review. PI RPB review could happen coincidentally with public review such that all comments are then received by the ASOPT simultaneously. When the draft is done, it will need to be reviewed internally by agencies before it is ultimately approved.

The review could be done via email: the Executive Secretary emails the item for review, collects comments, then provides the comments to the ASOPT. It would look more like an informal peer support review. Discussion can also be done via teleconference or an in-person meeting.

One major take home message is that the public must review throughout the planning process to promote community buy-in and appropriate incorporation of community knowledge on uses and resources. The public review process should include input frequently, and the plan should demonstrate how the input was incorporated.

The PI RPB agreed that the process developed for American Samoa can be used to start planning in the other jurisdictions and amended as necessary to address issues, different ways of doing business, or different cultural frameworks.

Recommendation:

- 1) In the planning process (See Appendix A), the PI RPB will provide comment and guidance in steps 1 and 2 (scoping content and preparing draft). For step 3 (draft review), the PI RPB will provide peer review and serious guidance.

¹ See Appendix A: American Samoa Ocean Planning Process

CAPACITY BUILDING: OPERATIONS IN A BIGGER CONTEXT AND CAPACITY NEEDS

PI RPB members were invited to introduce relevant initiatives in their agencies and jurisdictions that may have bearing on the three 2016 goals.

Guam: 1) The University of Guam is developing a bio-repository to digitize grey literature and biosamples into a georeferenced database, into which DOD can also add their habitat work. 2) The Governor of Guam started the Imagine Guam scoping plan to develop the vision for Guam over the next 40 years, which will probably include pieces of CMSP, as well as land planning. 3) Molesso has a community-based fishery management plan that is spatially based that regulates and protects their nearshore environment.

Hawaii: 1) Under new leadership, the Dept. of Land and Natural Resources-Department of Aquatic Resources is interested in doing additional ocean planning. 2) The Office of Planning will support other agencies' process for data or information needs because there are no funds allocated toward the CMSP effort or a local mandate.

Western Pacific Fisheries Management Council: 1) Community based plan development, though it is not CMSP, the plans are spatial in nature.

Discussion

The PI RPB co-leads introduced a discussion on the PI RPB's limited capacity to initiate its ocean planning process. While there is funding through the Moore Foundation grant to begin work, there is not enough to do everything required for a complete CMS plan in the Pacific Islands or address the data needs.

The non-federal co-lead highlighted that a major capacity need is data; jurisdictions lack data to back up decisions or fully inform their decision-making process. There are data layers that are available that can be incorporated, and visualization tools that can help, including decision support tools. It was suggested that one-on-one meetings are much better at gathering data and support than larger meetings.

The federal co-lead underscored that CMSP should make everyone's day jobs easier, thus an impetus for investing in the process. NOAA and other agencies bring a lot to the table. He asked how best to get more data to the table; he suggested a PI RPB data working group may be a good way to get more data.

The PI RPB members were invited to state CMSP-related capacity needs by jurisdiction, then regionally.

American Samoa

Capacity needs include:

- A full-time staff person to serve as coordinator of the ocean planning effort in American Samoa for at least 2-3 years to foster the ocean plan from development through implementation – a local hire that can bring their current relationships to the table and speaks Samoan. One suggestion was the hire be a permanent position with a formal position description through the standard hiring process.
- Training for individuals and agencies involved in the planning process.
 - ❖ Mr. Petersen offered that USDA is providing land-based training in American Samoa that could feed into ocean planning by training about upland sediment controls to reduce coastal runoff. And, it provides federal finance assistance to people through the Farm Bill.

- There should be funding partnerships with allocations for ocean planning efforts.

Guam

Capacity needs include:

- There are several data gaps that need to be filled that lack funding, although staffing is available. Gaps include public opinion on ocean use types and patterns. DOD has supported habitat assessments. Public scoping should go through the Governor's existing Imagine Guam initiative.
- Already working closely with PacIOOS to create data storage. Limited funding has already been secured.
- The PI RPB should consider thinking about a Marianas plan (an archipelagic approach) when thinking about capacity needs – not as separate jurisdictions – although separate plans may be drafted in the long run for various reasons.

Hawaii

Capacity needs include:

- Additional data beyond those required by the Ocean Resources Management Plan.
- Funding to identify and collate available data, including data at state agencies and the university
- Additional work beyond the Human Uses Atlas to gather data from stakeholders for activities within state waters.
- Identify, understand, and integrate local CMSP efforts, including community-based plans such as the Maunalua Bay Plan.
- Funding is needed for Hawaii staff to conduct CMSP at an archipelagic level.

Regionally

Capacity needs include:

- Ensure communications in each jurisdiction are in the host language.
- Federal data sets should be shared with regional planning efforts (publicly accessible).
- The Executive Secretary position is critical to moving the regional effort forward because the position carries the PI RPB annually, assists with securing additional external finance assistance, assists with expanded process support including external facilitation assistance (e.g. Udall Foundation), and assists with securing the jurisdiction-based coordinator.
- Additional funding from private foundations / donors and others (such as federal partners) to cover PI RPB and jurisdiction-specific meeting costs including venue, supplies/equipment, events, catering, and travel.
- Facilitation for stakeholder engagement.

Constraints and Issues

- How are the PI Region's capacity needs best communicated at the national level (e.g. to the National Ocean Council)?
- The PI RPB needs to remember that capacity needs extend beyond planning and design to implementation of the finalized plan.
- Shifting from planning to implementation support will be more challenging than the initial planning.
- The PI RPB should foster partners like the New England and Mid-Atlantic RPBs have done.

Recommendation:

- 1) The PI RPB directs the Executive Secretariat to 1) identify funding gaps related to capacity needs, and 2) develop strategies to address them.

DATA AND TOOLS

Mr. Tosatto introduced the data and tools presentations. He cautioned that tools will cost something, but the PI RPB needs to assess existing capacity to reduce costs. Several presentations were given that described what a data portal is and demonstrated a prototype portal for American Samoa (<http://www.oc.nps.edu/CMSP/portals/AS>) (CDR Malik), a data portal and mapping interface already in American Samoa (Mr. Meredith), and what a decision support tool (DST) can do and look like (Mr. Parks). Ms. Foley then presented the NOAA-BOEM Human Uses Atlas data, which are housed at NOAA's Marine Cadastre site and are spatially explicit such that they could be incorporated into a mapping interface.

Discussion

The PI RPB asked questions of the presenters. Mr. Parks explained that it took roughly a year to build the data set for the MARXAN DST analysis. The analysis is reliable for 3-5 years. However, if a climatic event such as the major storm that hit Fiji occurs, the confidence in the analysis becomes moot and the analysis must be redone. In Fiji, they must rebuild the models using new information.

An issue brought up for American Samoa is that the data are very siloed across agencies, so the PI RPB will have to work to gather the data into one spot.

There was brief discussion about the difference between a mapping interface and a DST. It was clarified that a mapping interface is less complicated and allows data to be displayed. A DST can do an analysis on the data provided to give best estimates of where a potential use could/should occur based on parameters input into the DST. Someone in the public may want to explore and visualize data, while a lease applicant may want to download data and analyze it.

The PI RPB members discussed crowd sourcing and its potential role in providing data. For example, if someone has published a paper they would like to provide the data for, how would they go about doing that. An issue with crowd sourcing for data is that the data must be quality-controlled prior to publication. A positive aspect of crowd sourcing is that there is increased buy-in by the general public if they feel they are part of the process of generating data utilized in decision making.

Dr. Matagi-Tofiga informed the PI RPB of a climate change grant American Samoa received through the Office of Insular Affairs. Mr. Wolfram provided additional information about the grant. DMWR and the DOC is working collaboratively with AS EPA on work that segues well with the PI RPB efforts with regards to data collection, mapping, and providing layers and maps of all available data, including marine and environmental data. The data will eventually be pulled together in a shared data portal. The funding is housed at DOC.

Mr. Wolfram also shared information about grant funding from US EPA to AS EPA. An exchange network grant was approved that collects format data that can be exchanged with EPA Headquarters. Also, a company has been contracted to assist AS EPA IT, which can help the PI RPB effort. Federal dollars are being leveraged to fund a GIS manager for AS EPA.

The PI RPB was asked about interest in starting a data team and the PI RPB agreed. The Naval Postgraduate School participants (Dr. Murphree and Ms. Guest) offered to participate on the team. The PI RPB member representing DOD, Ms. Griffin, agreed to lead the team. The data team will develop its mission, terms of reference, and its process. The team can include government employees as well as non-government per the PI RPB charter. The aim of the data team is to gather and assess relevant data, identify an adequate data host site and mapping interface, and identify/develop decision support tools that further coastal and marine spatial planning (CMSP) in the Pacific Islands Region.

In the upcoming couple months, PI RPB members will identify appropriate members for the data team, Ms. Griffin will reach out to team members to set up first meeting, and she will work with the Executive Secretariat to develop the agenda for the first meeting.

Recommendation:

- 1) The PI RPB agreed to initiate a data and tools team, led by DOD RPB member Nicole Griffin. To that end, PI RPB members will provide a team member recommendation (or more than one) from their agency, including people from non-government organizations.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN

The PI RPB reviewed the stakeholder engagement plan (SEP) that the PI RPB authored in 2014. More detailed information is now needed about how, when, and where to engage stakeholders. It was agreed that the stakeholder engagement plan would not be amended, but that further work will be done outside of the plan in a stakeholder engagement action plan that includes specific actions and timelines. Ms. Nutter of the Udall Foundation offered Udall's experience with garnering support from locally facilitated meetings, as well as identifying stakeholder groups. Stakeholder needs and interests should be identified for each jurisdiction, as well as how best to engage with them.

The PI RPB discussed potential additional stakeholder groups. An ocean user is different from an ocean impactor, which can make it difficult to identify some groups, such as the upland piggeries in American Samoa.

Stakeholder Engagement Action Plan Suggested Items:

- 1) Provide specificity on stakeholder engagement implementation
 - a. Expand on page 2, #4 of the current SEP that define how the PI RPB will incorporate stakeholders input into PI RPB committees and working groups: add specifics on how stakeholder engagement will be conducted effectively within jurisdictions
 - b. Outline a summary of the stakeholder engagement action plan and timeline and link it to the overall PI RPB plan/timeline
 - c. Add to the stakeholder list for reach jurisdiction, including the addition of upland stakeholders as "ocean impactors" instead of "ocean users" due to their role in nearshore waters.
 - d. Identify the responsible leads for implementing stakeholder engagement for each jurisdiction (see below - #2)
 - e. Identify supporting partners, such as Udall Foundation, and their roles and contributions

- f. Summarize support offered by Udall Foundation including conducting stakeholder assessments in each jurisdiction, sharing other regional lessons and experiences with stakeholder engagement, and providing technical direction and input to the PI RPB.
 - g. Ensure the stakeholder engagement action plan for each jurisdiction is translated into the local language, or if the action plan is long, provide it with a summary attached in the local language for consistency, transparency, and accountability in the process.
 - h. Identify who is responsible for ensuring implementation of the action plan, describe the role of traditional leadership fostering stakeholder engagement, and state that while the PI RPB charter and its generated plans are non-binding, the charter implies that the plans (ocean, stakeholder, and stakeholder action plans) will be upheld at the jurisdictional level and the PI RPB members agree to support capacity needs, data and tools needs, and stakeholder engagement needs.
- 2) Add a section on dedicated stakeholder engagement human resources needed, as strongly recommended by the Hawaii and American Samoa PI RPB members:
- a. A full- or part-time hire at the jurisdictional level that can work on local focal points, provide coordination across the region as a team with other local coordinators and the Executive Secretariat, and share lessons.
 - b. The hire must be fluent in the local language and conduct stakeholder engagement in a culturally-appropriate manner using traditional protocols.
 - c. The person brings their traditional knowledge and current relationships to the position and leads the development of the jurisdictional stakeholder engagement action plan.

PI RPB Stakeholder Engagement Action Items:

- 1) Government agencies specific to the planning process should follow through with stakeholder engagement as it applies to the actions they are agreeing to.
- 2) Clarify CMSP data access for stakeholders, specifically, what is private versus publicly accessible data due to government commitments regarding data confidentiality.

Recommendation:

- 1) The PI RPB encourages development of a formal stakeholder engagement process to support jurisdictional ocean planning.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT: STAKEHOLDER ASSESSMENT SURVEY

Mr. Parks described the stakeholder assessment survey sent to 61 stakeholders prior to the listening session. The stakeholders were uniformly distributed across 12 key stakeholder groups. There were 25 responses. Over half the respondents were commercial ocean users or managers; more than half had less than 10 years of experience; and more than half had lived in American Samoa for more than 20 years. The ocean was important to all respondents for economy and livelihoods, food security, cultural identity/values, and being dependent on the ocean.

The primary issues identified were pollution, climate change, and overfishing, but the outlook was generally optimistic regarding resolving issues. It was felt that the highest negative impacts were pollution and climate change.

Respondents suggested jurisdictional actions include pollution controls and waste management, interagency coordination, human use mapping, ocean zoning that balances multiple uses, and improved fisheries management. In the future, respondents are looking for reduced pollution, economic growth, an implemented ocean plan, and community resiliency. Respondents felt that across the Pacific Islands, similar issues include overfishing, pollution, sustainable recreation, and balancing / protecting cultural uses. They suggested that the PI RPB have solid community and stakeholder engagement, public education and awareness, and share their regional skills, lessons, and resources.

Discussion

Regarding the PI RPB process, it was felt that the PI RPB should encourage strong community involvement in the planning process. Cultural values and identity will have great bearing on the priorities within the regional plan. To that end, in American Samoa, the Office of Samoan Affairs will continue to be invited to participate in the development of the ocean plan.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT: LISTENING SESSION

The PI RPB received an overview and summary of the listening session that was hosted by the PI RPB and ASOPT with the public on March 30 from 5-7 pm.

Thirty-five people were officially invited representing a cross-section of the industries and interests in the coastal and marine waters. Of those, plus members of the public and representatives from the local government, more than 30 people attended. Attendees were divided into two groups to address 4 questions.

1) ***Why are the ocean waters around American Samoa important to you? Why do you care about them?***

Individuals identified several reasons that the waters are important, including food, economic sustenance, cultural importance, protecting the land, recreation, supplying the canneries, and transportation. The groups replied that the waters are important for the same reasons, adding additionally protection/preservation of indigenous rights and treaties, and beauty.

2) ***What do you believe are the most important issues currently facing the ocean waters around American Samoa?***

Individuals identified important issues facing the ocean waters of American Samoa as: over-regulation, uninformed federal decisions, climate change, pollution, overfishing, resource sustainability, border security, maintaining traditional access to fishing grounds, and maintaining recreational opportunities. There were several group responses including climate change, pollution, sustainability, lack of or inconsistent federal communication, no inclusion of the indigenous people in decision making, and clarifying local and federal government roles and partnerships.

3) ***In 10 to 15 years time, what would we see happening in American Samoa as a result of the coastal and ocean waters being effectively managed and multiple ocean uses balanced?***

Individual responses included healthy ecosystems, canneries still operating, thriving fish and marine resources, clean water, economy in great condition, better partnerships between local and federal agencies and between agencies and non-government organizations, fair representation of local people in decision making, sustainable tourism, and access to commercial and recreational opportunities. The group responses echoed those of the individuals, although feelings about the

canneries' success varied from closure of the canneries to the canneries acting as a hub for the US Pacific.

- 4) ***Does the proposed vision statement (below) adequately capture the key concepts that you have shared and discussed tonight for American Samoa's ocean waters? What changes do you suggest?***

Proposed vision statement: "American Samoa's sustainable oceans, coasts, and developing communities lead to a thriving ecology, economy, and culture."

Some people liked the vision statement, others had minor edits (e.g. "ecology" to "ecosystem") to trying again because the statement is too general and does not reflect the passion the people of American Samoa have for their waters. Others felt that it did not capture their vision solely because they felt that the government did not include them in the development of the vision statement. The group responses reflected the same sentiments.

There were similarities between the key messages and suggestions from the online assessment and the public listening session, including a) similar perceived issues, problems, and threats, b) shared rationale for why ocean resources are important, and c) similar suggestions on the proposed vision for ocean planning efforts in American Samoa. There was a desire from the stakeholders, including the public, for expanded outreach at the village/community level, and through the traditional leadership structure. The feedback was that there are key roles for Office of Samoan Affairs and the Governor's Office in the stakeholder engagement process. The ASOPT also needs to ensure it can identify who has not been invited into the ASOPT outreach efforts, as well as who did not respond to the online survey and who did not attend the listening session. Lastly, it was stressed that ocean planning is an appropriate discussion right now due to the government-led American Samoa land use planning effort currently underway.

Group 2 of the listening session also provided process recommendations that included generating enthusiasm, ensuring due process, sharing intent and promoting transparency, committing to the process and staying visible during its development, listen to stakeholders, ensuring participation by also including Office of Samoan Affairs and translating documents, and have funder/donor visibility.

Discussion

The PI RPB discussed that the American Samoa and regional stakeholder processes should be parallel using a consistent approach that is culturally appropriate with indigenous/traditional leaders, and focus on on-site community engagement. The public should be engaged, not just consulted, during ocean plan development. Public listening sessions should not only gather input during ocean plan development, but also be used as an opportunity to refine the stakeholder engagement process, including listening sessions with the matai/Fono. Additionally, the PI RPB should look to other regions' ocean planning stakeholder engagement processes to see if there are lessons learned or practices the Pacific Islands region could utilize.

PI RPB VISION STATEMENT INPUT FOR ASOPT

The PI RPB reviewed the vision statement drafted by the American Samoa Ocean Planning Team: ***American Samoa's sustainable ocean, coasts, and developing communities lead to a thriving ecology, economy, and culture.***

Comments included:

- Add watersheds to the statement to reflect upstream impacts that can occur.
- “Security” or “access” was also recommended for addition
- There was concern that “developing” sounded like developing countries, so it was suggested to say “developed economy” instead.
- “Healthy” was recommended instead of “sustainable”
- Use “environment” instead of “ecology”

WRAP UP

There was some brief discussion about forming a leads team that could tackle things such as issues that come up in the ASOPT – the ASOPT could bring up an issue to the leads team, who discusses how to handle it, and then guides the PI RPB for final feedback. No decision was made on creating the leads team.

The PI RPB discussed having quarterly meetings – every other quarter would be a teleconference call. The question was raised: how much progress does the PI RPB and ASOPT need to make before the next meeting and does that affect when the PI RPB will hold the next meeting? No decision was made about when the next meeting would be.

AS CMSP PLANNING PROCESS

